## BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Application of NRG Ohio
Pipeline Company LLC for :

Approval of a Letter of : Case No. 14-1717-GA-BLN

Notification for the Avon : Lake Gas Addition Project : in Lorain County, Ohio. :

- - -

## PROCEEDINGS

before Ms. Sarah Parrot, Administrative Law Judge, at the Ohio Power Siting Board, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10 a.m. on Friday, April 24, 2015.

## VOLUME II

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

- - -

215 1 APPEARANCES: 2 Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Mr. Dylan F. Borchers 3 and Mr. Daniel Gerken 100 South Third Street 4 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 5 On behalf of the Applicant. 6 Goldman & Braunstein, LLP By Mr. Michael Braunstein 7 Mr. William Goldman and Mr. Clinton Stahler 500 South Front Street, Suite 1200 8 Columbus, Ohio 43215 9 On behalf of the Intervenors Lorain 10 County Property Owners. 11 Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur, LLP By Mr. Robert J. Schmidt, Jr. 12 41 South High Street, Suites 2800-3200 Columbus, Ohio 43215-6194 13 On behalf of the Intervenors Ohio Edison 14 Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and American 15 Transmission Systems, Inc. 16 Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General By Mr. William L. Wright, 17 Section Chief Public Utilities Section 18 Mr. John H. Jones, Assistant Section Chief 19 180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 2.0 Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General 2.1 By Ms. Sarah Anderson, Assistant Attorney General 2.2 30 East Broad Street, 25th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 23 On behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power 24 Siting Board. 25

				216
1	INDEX			
2				
3	Wit	ness		Page
4		n Eavenson		
5	C	Direct Examination by Mr. Braunstein Cross-Examination by Mr. Gerken Redirect Examination by Mr. Braunstein		218 221 252
6		ecross-Examination by Mr. Ge		254
7	Gary Conlin Direct Examination by Mr. Braunstein Cross-Examination by Mr. Gerken Redirect Examination by Mr. Braunstein Recross-Examination by Mr. Gerken			25.0
8				256 258
9				263 264
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Schmidt		268	
		ert Kubasak		
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Braunstein Cross-Examination by Mr. Gerken			270 271
12		-		
13	Mary Thorne Direct Examination by Mr. Braunstein Cross-Examination by Mr. Gerken			273 276
14		<del>-</del>		
15	Samuel Davis Direct Examination by Mr. Braunstein Cross-Examination by Mr. Gerken			282 284
16				
17	LCP(	O Exhibit	Identified	Admitted
18	9	Direct Testimony of John Eavenson	219	255
19	10	Direct Testimony of		
20	10	Gary and Kathleen Conlin	257	269
21	11	Direct Testimony of Robert Kubasak	271	273
22			2/1	275
23	12	Direct Testimony of Brandon & Mary Thorne	275	280
24	13	Direct Testimony of Samuel Dennis	283	290
25			203	Z 3 U

217 1 Friday Morning Session, 2 April 24, 2015. 3 4 ALJ PARROT: All right. Let's go back on 5 the record. This is the continuation of the hearing in Case No. 14-1717-GA-BLN. 6 7 Let's begin with brief appearances, names 8 only and on whose behalf you are here today. And we 9 will start with the company. 10 MR. BORCHERS: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the applicant Dillon Borchers and Dan 11 12 Gerken. 13 ALJ PARROT: Thank you. MR. BRAUNSTEIN: On behalf of the Lorain 14 15 County Property Owners, Michael Braunstein and Clint 16 Stahler. 17 ALJ PARROT: Thank you. 18 MR. SCHMIDT: On behalf of the 19 FirstEnergy intervening companies, Robert Schmidt. 2.0 ALJ PARROT: Thank you. 2.1 MR. JONES: On behalf of the staff of the 22 Ohio Power Siting Board, John Jones. 23 ALJ PARROT: All right. Very good. Are 24 we ready to call the next witness, Mr. Braunstein? 25 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes. John Eavenson,

218 1 please. 2 ALJ PARROT: Okay. 3 (Witness sworn.) 4 5 JOHN EAVENSON being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 6 7 examined and testified as follows: 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Braunstein: 9 10 Q. Good morning. Good morning. 11 Α. 12 Q. Sir, could you state your name, please. 13 Α. John Eavenson. 14 I'm sorry I mispronounced it. Q. That's okay. 15 Α. 16 And, John, where are you employed? Q. 17 I'm employed with K. Hovnanian Homes out Α. 18 of Cleveland, Ohio. And what is your business address? 19 Q. 2.0 6150 Park Square Drive, Lorain, Ohio. Α. 2.1 0. Okay. And how long have you been 22 employed with K. Hovnanian Homes? 11-1/2 years but that was per a buyout. 23 24 We were originally Oster Homes and then K. Hovnanian. 25 Q. Right. And are you involved with the

Arlington Place Subdivision in Lorain County?

- A. I have been from the beginning.
- Q. And what is your involvement or what are your duties at K. Hovnanian?
- A. I am the director of land for the Ohio division of K. Hovnanian, and I directly oversee the installation of infrastructure.
- Q. All right. And did you submit written testimony in this matter?
  - A. I did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. And I am going to show you what has been marked as LCPO No. 9. LCPO is Lorain County Property Owners. And is that a copy of your written testimony?
  - A. It is.
- Q. Thank you.

17 ALJ PARROT: The exhibit is so marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. And since preparing that testimony did you have occasion to -- well, let me back up for a second. Your testimony has a number of exhibits or figures attached to it; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
  - Q. And since preparing that testimony, did

you have occasion to have those figures checked by a licensed surveyor?

A. T did.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And that -- were those -- was the surveyor given the signed legal description that you were given by NRG to check the figures?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And what was the result of the review by the licensed surveyor?
- A. The licensed surveyor declared that the original exhibits we submitted were in line with what the original legal description displayed.
- Q. All right. And if I were to ask you all of the questions that you responded to in your written testimony here today while you were under oath including the exhibits, would your answers and would the exhibits or figures, if you will, be the same?
  - A. Yes, they would.
    - MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.

Your Honor, I would submit the witness to cross-examination. If you have any questions on the figures that are attached, they are somewhat complicated, I am sure the witness would be happy to answer them.

221 1 ALJ PARROT: Any questions from 2 FirstEnergy companies? 3 MR. SCHMIDT: No, ma'am. 4 ALJ PARROT: All right. Very good. NRG? 5 6 MR. GERKEN: Yes, your Honor. 7 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 By Mr. Gerken: 10 0. Good morning, Mr. Eavenson. I am Dan 11 Gerken, an attorney for NRG. Have you and I spoken 12 before? 13 Α. I'm sorry? Have you and I spoken before? 14 15 Α. We did on Monday, I believe, during an 16 oral deposition over the phone. 17 And during that deposition I asked you some questions about your direct testimony; is that 18 your recollection? 19 2.0 Yes, sir. Α. 2.1 And about the figures 1 through 4 22 attached to that testimony? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And your testimony concerns property

owned by your employer, K. Hovnanian; is that right?

1 A. Yes.

4

10

- Q. And is that the same property discussed by Tom Oster in his direct testimony?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Could you just restate -- it was difficult for me to hear earlier. What was your job title?
- A. I am the director of land -- director of land for K. Hovnanian Homes in the Ohio division.
  - Q. Do you maintain any professional licenses for your job?
- 12 A. I do not.
- 13 Q. You are not a licensed surveyor, correct?
- 14 A. I am not.
- 15 Q. You are not a licensed engineer, correct?
- 16 A. Tam not.
- Q. Who prepared figures 1 through 4 in your attached testimony?
- A. Myself and a person from our office, Cody
  Bruce.
- 21 Q. Cody Bruce you said?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- Q. Is Mr. Bruce a licensed surveyor?
- A. He is not.
- Q. Is Mr. Bruce a licensed engineer?

A. He is not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- Q. Describe for me the process that you and Mr. Bruce used to develop figures 1 through 4 just generally, if you would.
- A. We took the original -- original legal description that was given to us in November of 2014, and we plotted out using that legal the exhibits, originally used that to lay out the direction of the line through our property, and then we took that and overlaid it over our subdivision and created the exhibits from this.
- Q. You said that you used the legal description from NRG; is that correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Could you please turn, Mr. Eavenson, to figure 1 that you prepared attached to your direct testimony which is property owners' page 48.
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. Is this figure drawn to scale?
- A. It is drawn to scale. It is not printed to scale.
  - Q. Explain that to me, please.
- A. This was drawn to I think 20 scale and when it was printed, I am not sure what -- what this -- I don't know what it's printed out to here,

```
but it was -- it was drawn to scale.
```

- Q. As it was submitted as a -- as -- well, as submitted in this proceeding, was it submitted to scale?
- A. It was drawn to a scalable exhibit. You could place a scale on it. We did not place a scale on it.
  - Q. So there's no scale on this figure.
  - A. There is not.
- 10 Q. Is there a scale on any of the figures 1
  11 through 4?
- 12 A. No, there is not.
  - Q. Would you call this a plat map?
- 14 A. I would call this a proposed plan.
- 15 Q. Is that a "No"?
- 16 A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Would you call this a survey?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. This figure 1 is titled "Arlington Place
- 20 Phase 10, approved plan"; is that right?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- Q. How many phases are there in the
- 23 Arlington Place Development in total?
- A. There's 10 -- there was 10 original
- 25 phases. We've added another one which would make it

Is that a "No"?

23

24

25

Α.

Ο.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: He answered the

This is a representation of that plan.

```
question. Your Honor, I object to the idea of he
 1
 2
      asked a question, he gets an answer, and then he
 3
      recharacterizes it as a no or a yes.
 4
                  MR. GERKEN: I'm sorry. It's a yes or no
 5
      question.
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: It was not a yes or no
 6
 7
      question.
 8
                  MR. GERKEN: Is this the plan that was
      submitted to the staff?
 9
10
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: This actual document?
                  ALJ PARROT: I am going to allow the
11
12
      question to stand.
13
                  Do you need us to reread it at this
14
     point, the last pending question, or do you recall
      what it was?
15
```

17 question?

16

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

18 ALJ PARROT: Yes, we can do that.

19 (Record read.)

A. Could you clarify the question? What does a plan mean to you?

THE WITNESS: Could you reread the

- Q. Is the plan that you and Cody drafted that's depicted in Figure 1 the plan that was submitted and approved by the city of Avon?
- 25 A. This is the plan that was submitted to

Avon and approved.

2.0

2.1

- Q. What we see here on the page is what was submitted to the city of Avon?
- A. I guess I am still not understanding the question. This layout, this was what was submitted to the city and approved.
- Q. My question isn't do the streets and buildings represented on figure 1 comprise the streets and buildings represented on the plan submitted to the city of Avon. That's not my question. If I was unclear, I apologize. The question is as depicted here in front of you on property owners' testimony 48 without a scale, without a surveyor's seal, is this the plan that was submitted to the city of Avon?
  - A. This was exhibits created by myself and Cody Bruce.
- Q. This wasn't submitted to the city of Avon.
  - A. This was not submitted to the city.
  - Q. Are any of the homes depicted on figure 1 built today?
    - A. No, they are not.
- Q. And I think on Monday, if I recall correctly, you described them as hypothetical homes.

- Do you remember saying that?
- A. I described them as homes that we offer in that subdivision.
- Q. Do you remember you using the phrase "hypothetical homes"?
  - A. I don't recall that.
  - Q. Okay. If you could turn, Mr. Eavenson, to figure 2 which is the next page.
    - A. Okay.
  - Q. Is that figure drawn to scale?
- 11 A. It is drawn to scale.
- 12 Q. As presented here, is this figure 2
- 13 scaled?

1

6

7

8

9

- 14 A. It is not printed to scale.
- 15 Q. What is the scale?
- 16 A. It doesn't have a scale on the sheet.
- 17 Q. Okay. Would you call this a plat or a
- 18 survey?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. And this also says "approved plan"; is that correct?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- 23 Q. Would our discussion about whether figure
  24 2 was submitted to the city of Avon similar to our
  25 discussion that we had --

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Excuse me, your Honor.

I am going to have to object again. This does not say "approved plan" on figure 2. It says "approved plan overlayed with proposed NRG pipeline/easements."

I think it's important that he be precise in creating a record of what he is referring to.

ALJ PARROT: Can you rephrase your question, please, Mr. Gerken?

MR. GERKEN: I'll move on.

ALJ PARROT: Okay.

2.0

2.1

- Q. If you could turn to figure 2, exhibit A,
  Mr. Eavenson. Is this figure as depicted here
  scaled?
  - A. It is not scaled on this sheet.
  - Q. What did you try to show in drawing figure 2, exhibit A?
  - A. What we are showing here is the proposed pond for the subdivision which we've started already constructing where the easement was proposed to us, where our outflow structures are to be installed, and the proposed temporary easement for NRG as well as our financial easement line. Based on our research, when we finance the homes, we have to have 10 foot off the easement, so we have put that on this drawing too.

- Q. Could you turn, please, to the next page, figure 2, exhibit B.
  - A. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

- Q. Do you remember our conversation about this figure on Monday afternoon?
  - A. I do.
- Q. During that conversation did you discuss a modification that would probably need to be made to this figure in order to more accurately portray the pipeline location on figure 2, exhibit B?
- A. I remember the conversation but since that conversation there's been some other factors that have gotten involved. And if I can explain that.
- Q. What was the modification that you and I discussed on Monday afternoon?
- A. We discussed moving the pipe to the west or to the left side of the sheet.
  - Q. When you say moving the pipe, you mean depicting the pipe in a different location than is pictured here?
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. And for what purpose?
- A. At the time what I believed was true information I did agree we should move the pipe.

- Q. To more accurately reflect the as proposed location of the pipe?
- A. Per the exhibits that were sent to me on Monday, yes.
- Q. So here in figure 2, exhibit B, the proposed pipe location appears near the surface of the wall of the retention pond; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. What is your understanding of the accurate as proposed by NRG location of the pipeline as you sit here today?
- A. I believe it's exactly the way we are showing here on this exhibit.
- Q. What has changed between our discussion on Monday afternoon and your assessment of figure 2, exhibit B, as you sit here today?
- A. The easement on Monday that you forwarded to me during our conversation is different than what was submitted to us originally in November. So when our offer when NRG submitted an offer to us, they sent us a different legal than what you represented that day, and so I was confused during my deposition because it didn't make sense. And so today I sit here and say this is the way it was sent to us.
  - Q. Does that comport with the easement that

we examined during your deposition on Monday or not?

- A. It was a total different legal description.
  - O. Is that a "No"?
  - A. That's a "No."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

- Q. So you compared -- I just want to understand what happened. You confirmed what you stated today is your understanding about the pipe location by looking at a prior draft of an easement submitted by NRG?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to object as it mischaracterizes his testimony. There has been no testimony about drafts.
  - MR. GERKEN: I can rephrase.
- 15 ALJ PARROT: Okay.
  - Q. You -- in order to confirm your understanding of the pipe location --
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. -- in the proximity of the retention pond we have been talking about, you compared your figures 1 through 4 with an easement that NRG submitted in November and not the easement that we discussed during your deposition; is that correct?
- A. All of these exhibits were created from the original easement that was submitted to us which

- I have a copy of it here today. So our understanding of what NRG was asking for was based on the original offer.
- Q. Your testimony about a licensed surveyor today --
  - A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. -- having corroborated and reviewed figures 1 through 4 --
  - A. Correct.
- Q. -- was that in -- did he analyze those as compared to the easement proposed in November?
- A. He analyzed them per the easement that we believed was the true easement in November.
  - Q. What do you mean when you say the true easement?
  - A. Well, the one that I have is signed and sealed by a professional a surveyor which was sent to us originally in November. The one you sent over on Monday didn't have any seals or anything. It was just a piece of paper. I am assuming that the one that was legally signed and sealed is the one that we were working off of and that's what all our exhibits were created from.
  - Q. Did you seek to confirm which easement was the accurate and current proposal from NRG at any

time?

1

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

23

24

- 2 A. I didn't realize there were two of them.
- 4 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Wait a minute.
- 5 A. That's a "No."

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: The question is

misleading. The witness can't know what is in NRG's

mind. NRG -- the testimony is NRG gave him an

easement which was signed and sealed. To ask this

witness to say what's in their mind for their plan is

a question he cannot possibly answer and it's

misleading to even ask it that way.

MR. GERKEN: I didn't ask what was in my client's mind.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: He asked what was the correct easement.

ALJ PARROT: And I believe the witness already answered the question that was pending, so I think we are --

MR. GERKEN: Agreed, your Honor.

21 ALJ PARROT: -- we are past the point of objecting.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Mr. Eavenson, if you would give me time to object, I would appreciate it.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

- Q. (By Mr. Gerken) Mr. Eavenson, you said you recalled being deposed by telephone with me on Monday afternoon?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Do you recall being sworn in --
  - A. I do.

2.0

2.1

Q. — before that testimony was given? I am going to hand you the one and only exhibit that was discussed during that deposition and just to see if that refreshes your recollection about whether the plat attached to that exhibit is stamped by a land surveyor that's licensed through the state of Ohio. After you review that, can you confirm for me whether that refreshes your recollection?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to object again, your Honor. There has been no testimony that the plat was not stamped by a surveyor. The testimony was that the legal description was not signed or sealed.

MR. GERKEN: The testimony, if I recall it, and I may be misrecollecting, was that
Mr. Eavenson overlaid a map or a plat onto certain internal documents maintained by K. Hovnanian. And then he later said that he did not recall that there was a survey stamp on such documents proposed by NRG.

I am seeking to clarify the record on that point.

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: And the witness may clarify in his answer if he needs to. The objection is overruled.

- A. The legal description that was sent over to me on Monday didn't have a seal on it. This one -- this is not the legal. This is the exhibit to a legal and it does have a seal on it.
- Q. I am just going to leave that there for now. I am not sure I have any more questions about it at the moment. In your direct testimony,

  Mr. Eavenson, you refer to silting and freeboard stabilization. It's lines 57 to 58 if you want to take a look at it. And this is, I believe, activities related to maintenance of the retention pond that K. Hovnanian would have to abide by; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. If the pipeline were rather than very near the surface of the retention pond wall instead approximately 10 feet inside that earthen embankment making up the mound containing the water to the retention pond, would your concerns about safety related to silting and freeboard stabilization activities be alleviated?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to object again, your Honor. This is a fact witness and he is asking a hypothetical.

2.0

2.1

MR. GERKEN: Several hypotheticals were allowed yesterday.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Experts, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: I agree. The objection is overruled.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Those were to expert witnesses. This is a fact witness.

ALJ PARROT: The objection is overruled. To the extent that the witness is able to answer the question, he may do so.

- A. I assumed that it would be more protected 10 feet way.
  - Q. Those concerns would be alleviated?
- A. I don't know what my concerns are. I don't know enough about it, but I am assuming it would be more protected. That's my answer.
- Q. Well, I get it. And I am just referring to your testimony about what's -- what would be required under certain circumstances. And it's your testimony that there would be certain safety concerns related to silting and freeboard stabilization activities, correct?

A. That is correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And is it your opinion as you sit here today those concerns would be alleviated if the pipeline -- pipeline, sorry, were located 10 feet inside that earthen embankment?
  - A. Yes, I believe.
- Q. If you could turn back to figure 1, please. I want to try to figure out and clarify for the record what parts of figure 1 represent what has been approved by the city and what parts of figure 1 represent structures or other boundary lines or other features that have not been approved by the city. Do you understand my question?

I haven't asked anything specific yet but generally that's what I am going to try do with a couple of questions here. Are the lots as they are represented in figure 1 --

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Excuse me, Dan. Can you move so I can see the Judge? Thank you.

MR. GERKEN: Sure.

Q. Are the lots as subdivided here in figure 1, do those coincide -- and I know that we don't have scale and I know that it's not a sealed figure, but do those coincide with the lots that were approved by the city of Avon?

A. Yes, they do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. The homes depicted here inside of those lots, are those structures -- were those what was proposed and approved by the city of Avon?
  - A. No, they are not.
- Q. These are representations of homes that a buyer could build; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the footprint of those homes is yet to be determined; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Because K. Hovnanian offers eight different homes each which has a different footprint.
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. As you sit here today, is it your opinion that some of the lots in figure 1 would be impacted by the proposed pipeline in this proceeding?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. Which lots?
- A. Well, as you look at the pond, 10 lots to the right of the pond.
- Q. The pond is the sort of rounded off rectangle sort of near the middle of the page?
- A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. Okay. And we counted 10 lots to the

right of it which you believe is to the south of the pond; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. There's no cardinal direction indicator on this figure, is there?
  - A. There is not.
- Q. Okay. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. So to me that looks like the lots directly adjacent to the pond, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. The first of those 10 and then continuing down that line to what looks like a corner lot that appears on this unscaled drawing to be larger than any of the previous nine parcels; is that correct?
  - A. Yeah, that's the width of it, yes.
- Q. Okay. How would, in your opinion as you sit here, those lots be impacted by the proposed pipeline route?
- A. They would make them unbuildable per the current homes that we sell.
  - Q. And why is that?
- A. Because the 50-feet easement that's been requested would encroach into the building envelops of the homes that we've proposed.
  - Q. Could you turn to figure 2, please, which

is the next page. There's kind of a bubble there that purports to zoom into a section of the property. Do you see that?

A. Yes, sir.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And it zooms into a section that you just testified depicts lots that would be impacted by the pipeline; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. I'm not going to, you know, play games with you, but I want to dial in on this 10-foot issue that we discussed on Monday afternoon to see what your testimony is before the court today. And to make the record clear, so I am going to ask you a question about that zoomed in area there. The zoomed in area depicts a 50-foot permanent easement, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the width of that 50-foot permanent easement as depicted in your figure 2 is indicated with diagonal small lines where it intersects the boundaries of such easement; is that correct?
  - A. I believe so.
- Q. As depicted here, does the western edge, which would be toward the bottom of the page, correct?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Could you move back just a little?

A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Does the western edge of the 50-foot permanent easement that you and Cody depicted on figure 2 coincide with the western boundary of the property today? And to clarify I mean the western boundary of the property which coincides with the Norfolk Southern property.
- A. This -- this figure does not indicate it's the western property line.
- Q. How far away from the western property line is it indicated on your figure 2?
  - A. Approximately 10 feet.
  - Q. And why is that?
- A. Because we utilized the original easement that we were given the legal description and we plotted the easement on this -- on our drawings and that left that gap there.
- Q. Are you aware that the 50-foot permanent easement proposed by NRG as of today, the date that you are testifying, the western boundary of such proposed easement coincides with the property line that this property shares with Norfolk Southern?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Again, I am going to

```
object. There is no evidence in this record that
 1
 2
      would allow that question to be asked that the
 3
      easement -- that the NRG easement proposed today
 4
      coincides with the western property line. The
 5
      witness has testified that based on the only -- other
      than deposition exhibits, the only legal description
 6
 7
      he has been given is the one that's shown here.
 8
      they have a secret other description, they will have
 9
      to figure out how to present that.
10
                  MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, if I could
11
      reply.
12
                  ALJ PARROT: I was going to say again the
13
     objection is overruled.
14
                  So go ahead, please, Mr. Eavenson, and
      answer the question. Do you need us to?
15
16
                  THE WITNESS: Well, I am trying to -- my
17
      answer -- I guess is it a "Yes" or "No" answer?
                                                       I am
18
     trying to figure that out.
19
                  ALJ PARROT: If you need -- I want you --
2.0
      if you need to elaborate, don't feel like you have to
2.1
      give a "Yes" or "No." You may clarify with a
22
      complete response if you need to do that. But do you
23
     need us to reread the question?
24
                  THE WITNESS: No.
                                     Thank you.
25
                  ALJ PARROT:
                               Okay.
```

- A. The legal that was given to us is represented in our figures, and I don't know if -- which one is the official one today. So, no, I would say today I believe it's 10 feet inside the property line.
- Q. You are aware that a survey of a proposed easement could change from time to time?
  - A. I would assume so, sure.
- Q. And any such proposed easement could and should, in fact, be -- in order to be authenticated and reliable should be stamped with a surveyor's seal?
  - A. I would agree.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

Q. Just one moment, Mr. Eavenson.

For the lots that you believe are impacted by NRG's proposed pipeline route, what is the rear building setback as approved by the city of Avon?

- A. It's 25 feet.
- Q. K. Hovnanian is not allowed to build any structures west of that setback line, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that includes morning rooms, correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And decks; is that right?

A. That's correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And any other structures or option that K. Hovnanian might add?
  - A. That's correct.

MR. GERKEN: If I could have just one moment, your Honor, I think I am wrapping up.

ALJ PARROT: Okay.

MR. GERKEN: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. I just have a couple more questions,
  Mr. Eavenson. I will try to wrap this up. So the
  building setback on the rear of these homes that you
  have testified are affected by the pipeline is 25
  feet, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And that's 25 feet from the property line proposed to the city of Avon? What I am getting at, I am not trying to confuse you, the existing property line coincides with the Norfolk Southern property line, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And my understanding, tell me if I am wrong, I believe it's your understanding too, that property line is going to shift 10 feet sometime in the near future because a 10-foot strip is being conveyed to the city of Avon for a walking path or

something similar?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. So the proposed boundary line on the back end of these 10 lots will be 10 feet closer to the home than the current property line; is that right?
- A. I would say closer to the proposed road but, house, road.
  - Q. 10 feet closer to the east.
  - A. Closer to the east, yes.
- 11 Q. Okay.
  - A. Thank you.
  - Q. So presuming that the western boundary of the proposed easement from NRG coincides with the present day western boundary of the property which abuts the Norfolk Southern line, are you with me so far?
  - A. Uh-huh.
    - Q. And presuming further that that 10-foot strip to be conveyed to the city of Avon is located entirely within the 50-foot permitted easement, are you with me there?
    - A. Yes.
- Q. Extends up from that 40 feet and that would be the eastern edge of the proposed easement,

correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, I am going to object just for the record.

ALJ PARROT: Grounds?

hypothetical that I believe is unintelligible, calls for one assumption piled on top of another.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: That this is a

ALJ PARROT: I think so far anyway the witness has said he's following along, so if we get to the point where he needs to request clarification, we can let him do that, but I think so far we're good.

- Q. The point of my question is is there an easement width that would permit K. Hovnanian to build homes on these parcels?
- A. Are you saying as it's proposed today or a different -- a whole another offer of easement?
- Q. A different offer. If the width of the permanent easements which I take it is the problem here, wouldn't you agree with that, it's the permanent easement?
  - A. I wouldn't necessarily agree with that.
  - Q. You would?
    - A. I would not.
- 25 Q. Okay.

- A. I don't think that's the only problem that we have, but I am trying to answer your question.
- Q. Well, I didn't see any other problems in your direct testimony, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And you didn't testify today that you had additions to your direct testimony, did you?
  - A. If you could just give me a minute.
  - Q. Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Do I just -- okay.

ALJ PARROT: Yeah. If you are ready.

- A. It's not only the homes but the retention pond that's there. We have a concern of how the retention pond would be put in with the proposed easement that or legal description that we received.
- Q. Understood. The concern with regard to the 10 homes that you mentioned is primarily, if not universally, with the permanent easement; is that correct?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, I am going to have to object. I don't know what universally means in this context.
- MR. GERKEN: I need to understand the

universe of his concern. I believe it's limited to the permanent easement. This is a set-up question to be honest so I can move on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

ALJ PARROT: To the extent the witness is able to answer the question, you may do so.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: And, your Honor, could you instruct the witness if he is being asked the universe of his concern, he can then reply to concerns that are not necessarily in his direct testimony. That's not the question.

A. I mean, I have a lot of concerns.

ALJ PARROT: Are you able to respond to the question, Mr. Eavenson?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. GERKEN: I can rephrase.

ALJ PARROT: Let's do that.

- Q. What's your main concern with regard to the 10 lots you referred to earlier?
- A. We would like to be able to sell them in a timely manner.
- Q. And it's your belief that you can't sell the lots?
- A. We believe it would be very difficult with the installation of the pipeline where it's being proposed.

Q. But not impossible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

- A. I can't say anything is impossible.
- Q. Your concern about not being able to sell the lots, which to be clear you are in the business of selling lots with homes constructed on them; is that right?
- A. My primary job is putting the lots in, but our primary goal is to sell homes, yes.
- Q. Is there a plan to sell these 10 lots without a home on them?
  - A. No, not at this time.
- Q. Could you do that and comply with the city of Avon's proposed plan?
  - A. That could happen, sure.
- Q. Similarly you could build a smaller home with a smaller footprint on these lots whether or not it's currently on the list of eight homes that you currently sell, correct? And that would still comply with the city of Avon's proposed plan?
  - A. I don't know that.
  - Q. Why not?
- A. Avon has a minimum area footage for the downstairs, and I can't say exactly today what that is, but it's in their code. I don't know how small that house could be on the first floor to be built

- 1 properly and to be approved by the city.
- Q. I think you mentioned today "financial easement line." Do you recall that?
  - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

19

- Q. What were you referring to then?
- A. FHA requires there to be a 10-feet separation between the easement and the construction of a structure for financial purposes when our homeowners go to get loans.
  - Q. That's the Federal Housing Authority?
- A. (Witness nods head.)
- Q. What percentage of homes bought by buyers at K. Hovnanian get FHA mortgages?
  - A. I don't know the answer to that.
    - Q. Is it more than 80 percent?
- 16 A. I don't know.
- 17 Q. Is it more than 60 percent?
- A. I don't know.
  - Q. Do you have any idea what percentage of buyers use FHA mortgages?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, I am going
  to object again. This is argumentative now. He said
  he didn't know.
- MR. GERKEN: I am trying to figure out percentage. It goes directly to damages which he put

1 at issue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Damages are not at issue in this case. The only issue in this case is the impact of this easement on the property, the impact of this pipeline on this property.

MR. GERKEN: Mr. Eavenson has said that there is some impediment to development based on a mortgage line. I am trying to figure out what that is and what the likelihood of impact will be.

ALJ PARROT: And I believe the witness has already said he doesn't know so let's move on.

MR. GERKEN: I have no further questions.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you.

Mr. Jones, any questions from staff?

MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you.

Any redirect?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Briefly, your Honor.

- - -

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Braunstein:

Q. Just so that I'm clear how many signed and sealed legal descriptions has K. Hovnanian been presented with relative to this easement?

A. One.

- Q. And is that signed and sealed legal description the one that you used to present these -- your testimony and these figures?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And were you also given during your deposition another legal description?
  - A. I was.
  - Q. Is that the first time you had seen it?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Was it signed by a licensed surveyor?
- 11 A. It was not.
- 12 Q. Was it sealed?
- 13 A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Notwithstanding all the questions you have been asked on cross-examination, as you sit here today, do you still believe that your testimony as -- your direct testimony as reflected in LCPO Exhibit No. 9 is true and correct including the figures attached to it?
- 20 A. Yes, it is.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.
- 22 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Schmidt?
- MR. SCHMIDT: No questions.
- 24 ALJ PARROT: Very good.
- 25 Any follow-up, Mr. Gerken?

1 MR. GERKEN: Just one question, if I 2 could, your Honor. ALJ PARROT: Yes. 3 4 5 RECROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Gerken: 6 7 Are you aware that your counsel has been 8 provided with NRG's current proposed easement with 9 regard to K. Hovnanian? 10 I'm aware. Α. MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to object to 11 12 it because I don't know that it's true, your Honor, 13 so I don't know how the witness could answer it. 14 Plus it calls for attorney-client communications. MR. GERKEN: It doesn't call for that. 15 16 It calls for whether he is currently aware as 17 Mr. Braunstein's client of the current proposal of 18 the easement, width and scope of that easement, from 19 NRG which goes directly to his testimony today. 2.0 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Eavenson, I am going to 2.1 direct you not to get into anything you consider to 22 be discussion between you and your counsel. But I am also going to ask you, 23 24 Mr. Gerken, if you could maybe try to rephrase the 25 question that you put to the witness and let's try it

that way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

Q. Can you say with certainty that you know today what NRG's current proposal is regarding the location and scope of the easement that it proposes for the K. Hovnanian property?

A. No.

Q. Can you say for certain as you sit here today that that has not been provided to your counsel?

A. No.

MR. GERKEN: No further questions.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you.

Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Thank you very much, Mr. Eavenson. You are excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Braunstein, you may go ahead and move for the admission of your exhibit.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

We would move for the admission of LCPO No. 9.

ALJ PARROT: Are there any objections?

Hearing none LCPO Exhibit No. 9 is

24 admitted.

25 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

256 1 ALJ PARROT: And you may call your next 2 witness. 3 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor. 4 Mr. Gary Conlin. 5 (Witness sworn.) ALJ PARROT: Please have a seat. 6 7 8 GARY CONLIN being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 9 10 examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 12 By Mr. Braunstein: 13 Q. Good morning. 14 A. Good morning. Mr. Conlin, could you state your name, 15 Q. 16 please. 17 Gary Conlin. Α. 18 Ο. And spell your last name for the court 19 reporter. 20 C-O-N-L-I-N. Α. 2.1 Q. And what is your address? 22 37560 Eagle Nest Drive, Grafton, Ohio Α. 44044. 23 And is Eagle Nest Drive rel -- or is your 24 0. 25 home located within the Flint Ridge Subdivision?

- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And is your home -- or your property, rather, impacted by the proposed NRG pipeline?
  - A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. And just for clarification you are a client of my law firm, Goldman & Braunstein?
  - A. Yes, I am.
  - Q. Okay. And you prepared written testimony in this case; is that correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. And I am going to show you a copy of your written testimony which we have tentatively marked as LCPO No. 10 and ask you if that is a correct copy of your testimony.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 ALJ PARROT: The exhibit is marked LCPO
  17 Exhibit No. 10.
- 18 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- Q. And as you sit here today, if I asked you those same questions under oath, would your answers be the same?
- 23 A. Yes, they would.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.
- 25 Your Honor, the witness is available for

258 1 cross. 2 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Schmidt? 3 MR. SCHMIDT: No, ma'am. 4 ALJ PARROT: All right. 5 Mr. Gerken? MR. GERKEN: Yes, your Honor. 6 7 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Gerken: 9 Good morning, Mr. Conlin. My name is Dan 10 Q. Gerken. I am an attorney for NRG. How are you? 11 12 Α. I'm good. How are you? 13 0. Good, thanks. If you could refer to the 14 testimony that Mr. Braunstein just directed you to, your direct testimony lines 54 through 56. Do you 15 16 have a copy that shows the line numbers? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Okay, okay. Could you read starting with 19 "The Flint Ridge Development" through the end of line 2.0 56, please. 2.1

A. Sure. "The Flint Ridge Development has always been known for its quiet, scenic beauty which provided a peaceful serenity to the visits and any visitors to our neighborhood. This will now be compromised due to the pipeline."

22

23

24

- Q. Are you aware that an interstate natural gas pipeline regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission traverses the entire width of the Flint Ridge Subdivision and has been there since 1963?
  - A. No, I don't.
    - Q. You are not aware of such a pipeline?
- A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Asked and answered, your Honor.
- Q. So not being aware of it, that pipeline hasn't affected your opinion that Flint Ridge is known for its "quiet, scenic beauty"; is that right?

  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: There is no evidence that the pipeline is there, your Honor. It's just a question; it's not evidence so I object.

ALJ PARROT: Overruled.

- Q. You can answer the question, sir.
- A. Repeat the question.
- Q. Not being aware of that pipeline, that pipeline hasn't affected your opinion that Flint Ridge is known for its "quiet, scenic beauty"; is that correct?
- A. It doesn't affect my opinion of -
  because the quiet, scenic beauty was there when we

- purchased our property; and, now, it will be changed due to your proposed pipeline.
- Q. If you could turn to line 75 of your direct testimony.
  - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. Could you please read starting with "I requested again" at line 75.
- A. "I requested again to talk with Alan Sawyer and also to have him come to view my property. This request again went unanswered. On the last offer the total easement area was reduced to 35 feet total."
- Q. Did you engage Mr. Braunstein to represent you in this proceeding after the events you describe here occurred?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. Is it your understanding that communications regarding pipeline placement and easements must occur through counsel after that point in time?
- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Is it your understanding that after engaging Mr. Braunstein, communications about the pipeline occur through counsel?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Have you voiced concerns to NRG about minimizing the pipeline's impact on trees on your property?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And to clarify by your I mean you or your wife.
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

2.1

22

23

- Q. Do you recall that in early October,
  2014, some folks representing NRG visited a wooded
  section of your property?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you or your wife escort them to the affected wooded portion of that property?
- 14 A. I am not sure escort. But walked back
  15 there with them?
- 16 Q. Yep.
- 17 A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. Do you recall that they plotted the location of specific trees on your property?
- 20 A. Yes, I do.
  - Q. Is it your understanding that they plotted the location of those trees in an attempt to accurately assess their location and to minimize the impact of the pipeline on those trees?
- 25 A. That was the purpose of it.

1 Do you happen to recall how many days Q. 2 they were on the property for that task? 3 Days? Α. 4 That's right. Q. 5 Α. One. Do you recall that NRG followed up with 6 0. 7 you about this issue by phone a few weeks later? 8 MR. GERKEN: Could we let the record 9 reflect that the witness is reviewing some notes that 10 have not been admitted as evidence. Oh, they are probably -- well, the notes 11 12 are a -- the only other phone call was on October 31 13 after the October 8 day that they came and measured 14 trees and was at that point just stating what their easement price would be. There was no -- there was 15 16 no other conversation regarding the trees. 17 MR. GERKEN: I have no further questions. 18 ALJ PARROT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Jones? 19 2.0 MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor. 2.1 ALJ PARROT: Any redirect? 22 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Very briefly, your 23 Honor. 24

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Braunstein:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. I'm going to direct you specifically without reading it to question No. 15 and your response to that question. Why don't you take a second just to look at that. That's lines 78 to 81.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Is that still your testimony as you sit here today?
- 10 MR. GERKEN: Asked and answered.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, but it's come up in the cross-examination, and I am trying to do this as briefly as possible.
- 14 ALJ PARROT: I will allow it.
- A. Regarding the route that was stated to be final and no changes would be made?
- 17 Q. Yes.
  - A. Yes, there was -- I mean, the land representative from NLS, John Nipperer, at one point stated to me that he had a meeting with the NRG folks and that one of the project managers slammed down their, you know, paperwork and said there will be no changes to this line.
    - Q. Thank you.
- A. And, you know, we are just asking for

some consideration here.

Q. All right. And notwithstanding the cross-examination that you've just had and the questions that were posed, is the remainder of your testimony, you've already testified with respect to question 15, do you believe that the remainder of your testimony is still true and accurate as of this moment?

A. Absolutely.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Schmidt?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, ma'am.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Gerken?

MR. GERKEN: Just very briefly, your

15 Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

16

## 17 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

18 By Mr. Gerken:

- Q. You just testified that you are just looking for some consideration, Mr. Conlin.
- A. I am looking for the pipeline to be moved out of the Flint Ridge Development due to safety concerns of the pipeline and --
  - Q. I'm sorry.
- 25 A. I am not done speaking.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Gerken, let him finish, please.

- A. Due to the safety of the development being where the pipeline is going to cross under a road that goes that we have only the one way in and out of our development and the pipeline is going under there so if there was to be a catastrophe situation, no resident could get in or out of the development nor could safety forces come in to help.
  - Q. And is it --
  - A. That --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Is it your --
- A. We are concerned about that.
- Q. -- opinion that those concerns will be addressed through Mr. Braunstein, your counsel in this matter?
- A. I hope that they will.
- 18 MR. GERKEN: No further questions.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I hope that they are.
- 20 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.
- 22 THE WITNESS: If I could --
- 23 ALJ PARROT: We're done.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Well, he didn't let me
- 25 | finish talking so that's fine.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, your Honor, can he just finish?

ALJ PARROT: Did you finish?

THE WITNESS: I did not.

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: You are talking with respect to Mr. Gerken's final question?

THE WITNESS: His question what's my concern about consideration. Well, consideration is — my consideration is I want it moved because of the safety issues and because the pipeline is also going to be transversing the Ohio Energy power lines as well as the LORCO sewer lines three times within about a 400-yard distance from one side of our development to the other of the pipeline, so crisscrossing. That is an absolute accident waiting to happen just because they can come and maintain those pipelines, those power lines, and do something to the gas line which would be very dangerous.

I mean, we just had some roads replaced in front of our house. And, yes, the lines were all marked for the electrical, the gas lines, and things like that. And so everybody knows where they are. But was there an accident? Did somebody nick the pipeline, the gas line, and gas had to be shut off and there was gas smells? Yes.

```
MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, I have to
 1
 2
              These questions should have been asked --
      object.
 3
                  ALJ PARROT: Hang on.
 4
                  MR. GERKEN:
                               These questions should have
 5
     been raised and asked on direct. We are now past
      that point; and, you know, the witness respectfully
 6
 7
      to his concerns is engaging in a soliloguy about his
 8
     grievances here. This is not the correct procedure
 9
      for that.
10
                  MR. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I am also going
      to interpose an objection to in particular anything
11
12
     having to do with the power lines.
13
                  ALJ PARROT: Mr. -- before we proceed
14
      there, were you finished with your response,
     Mr. Conlin?
15
16
                  THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
                  ALJ PARROT: With that I think I am going
17
18
     to allow his testimony to stand.
19
                  Mr. Gerken, do you have any follow-up
2.0
      questions you wish to ask in light of what you've
2.1
     heard since you --
22
                  MR. GERKEN: No, your Honor.
23
                  ALJ PARROT: Okay. Mr. Jones?
24
                  MR. JONES: No, your Honor, no questions.
25
                  ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Mr. Conlin.
```

268 1 are excused. 2 MR. SCHMIDT: Your Honor. 3 ALJ PARROT: I'm sorry, Mr. Schmidt. 4 quess in light of the fact that -- yes, we will take 5 things a little out of order. Yes, go ahead. 6 MR. SCHMIDT: I appreciate that. Just a 7 couple of questions. 8 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 By Mr. Schmidt: You indicated you have some safety 11 12 concerns regarding the intersection of the proposed pipeline and Ohio Edison's power lines? 13 Α. 14 Yes. What's the basis for that concern? 15 Ο. 16 It's just there will be people from Ohio 17 Edison on the pipeline potentially. 18 So you don't have any specific 0. 19 information that would suggest the pipeline cannot 2.0 coexist in the area of power lines? 2.1 Α. No, I don't. 22 Q. Thank you. 23 Α. I am just saying things that could happen

that are unexpected and why put something in a

situation that doesn't have to.

24

```
269
 1
             Q.
                  But you have no --
 2
             Α.
                  I am not an engineer, no. I am not a
 3
      construction guy either.
 4
                  MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Thank you. No
 5
      further questions.
                  ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you.
 6
 7
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Is Mr. Conlin excused,
 8
      your Honor?
 9
                  ALJ PARROT: Yes, he is.
10
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: You can stay or.
                  ALJ PARROT: Mr. Braunstein, you can go
11
12
      ahead and move for admission of your exhibit.
13
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, at this time
14
      we would move for the admission of LCPO No. 10,
15
      Mr. Conlin's direct testimony.
16
                  ALJ PARROT: All right. Are there any
17
      objections to the admission of LCPO Exhibit No. 10?
18
                  MR. GERKEN: No, your Honor.
19
                  ALJ PARROT: Hearing none it is admitted.
2.0
                  (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
2.1
                  ALJ PARROT: And next witness,
22
      Mr. Braunstein.
23
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
24
      Robert Kubasak.
25
                  (Witness sworn.)
```

270 1 ALJ PARROT: Please have a seat. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 3 4 ROBERT KUBASAK 5 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 By Mr. Braunstein: 9 0. Good morning. 10 Α. Good morning. Still morning, yes. Could you state your 11 Q. 12 name and spell your last name for the record. 13 Α. Sure. My name is Robert Kubasak, last name is K-U-B-A-S-A-K. 14 And, sir, where do you reside? 15 16 I reside in Flint Ridge. My address is 17 37580 Eagle Nest Drive in Grafton, Ohio 44044. And is your property impacted -- your 18 Ο. 19 Flint Ridge property impacted by the proposed NRG 2.0 pipeline? 2.1 Α. Yes, it is. 22 All right. And did you prepare written Q. 23 testimony in this case? 24 Α. Yes, I did.

And I am going to show you what has been

25

Q.

My apologies. I am Dan Gerken, also not

24

25

a doctor.

- A. Okay.
- Q. Do you recall approximately what date you engaged Mr. Braunstein with regard to this
- 4 proceeding?

1

9

- A. I would have to go back and check; but, no, I don't know exactly what date, no.
- Q. Approximately what date, the month and the year maybe?
  - A. Possibly January.
  - Q. Of this year?
- 11 A. Yeah, maybe before. Again, I don't
- 12 recall.
- MR. GERKEN: No further questions.
- 14 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.
- 16 ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you.
- 17 I'm sorry, Mr. Braunstein. Did you have
- 18 redirect in response to that?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Extensive redirect.
- 20 ALJ PARROT: I cut you off. I assumed
- 21 maybe you wouldn't.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: No. I was just kidding.
- 23 ALJ PARROT: You might want to clarify
- 24 something.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: No redirect.

273 1 ALJ PARROT: Sorry. I was just making a big assumption there. 2 3 Thank you, Mr. Kubasak. 4 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: And it was correct. And 5 at this time may we move for the admission of the witness's direct testimony, LCPO 11. 6 7 ALJ PARROT: All right. Very good. Are 8 there any objections? 9 Hearing none LCPO Exhibit No. 11 is admitted. 10 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 11 12 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor. 13 Is the witness excused? 14 ALJ PARROT: Yes, he is. 15 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Next, we would like to 16 call Mary Thorne. 17 18 MARY THORNE 19 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 20 examined and testified as follows: 2.1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 By Mr. Braunstein: 23 Q. Good morning. 24 Α. Hi.

Can you state your name for the record,

25

Q.

274 1 please. 2 Α. I am Mary Thorne, M-A-R-Y T-H-O-R-N-E. 3 Thank you. And what is your address? Q. 4 Α. 37570 Eagle Nest Drive, Grafton, Ohio 5 44044. And is that part of Eagle Nest Drive 6 Ο. 7 within the subdivision commonly referred to as Flint 8 Ridge? 9 Α. Yes. 10 And is your property impacted by the Q. 11 pipeline? 12 Α. Yes. And if you know, approximately how far is 13 0. the pipeline from your home? 14 15 Α. I do not know that answer to that. 16 Do you reside on the property? Q. 17 Α. Yes. And do you have children? 18 Q. 19 Α. Yes. 2.0 And what are their ages? Q. 2.1 Α. 2 and 4. 22 Q. Thank you. And you are married to 23 Brandon? 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. Okay. Great. And I am going to show you

a document which has been tentatively marked for identification as LCPO 12 and ask you if that is a true and accurate copy of your direct testimony that was filed in writing in this case.

A. Yes, this is what I rendered.

ALJ PARROT: The exhibit is marked as LCPO Exhibit 12.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. And if I asked you all the same questions today that you responded to in your written testimony, would your answers be the same?
- A. They would be similar based on what I recall from answering, yes.
- Q. I understand. Let me ask it another way. Are the answers that are contained the testimony that is contained in LCPO 12; is that correct and your sworn testimony under oath?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you. The witness is available for cross.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you.

Mr. Schmidt?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, ma'am.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Gerken?

Proceedings 276 1 MR. GERKEN: Yes, your Honor, just 2 briefly. 3 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 By Mr. Gerken: Good morning, Mrs. Thorne. How are you? 6 Q. 7 Α. Nervous. 8 0. No need to be nervous. Can I refer you 9 to the direct testimony that you gave in this case 10 which Mr. Braunstein just put in front of you, specifically line 47. I think it's on the last page 11 12 at the top. 13 Α. Yes. Would you like me to read the whole 14 response? 15 Q. Well, you see where it says "the company 16 insists on tearing up this small, quiet 17 neighborhood"? Do you see that part? 18 Α. Yes. 19 That's your testimony? Q. 2.0 Α. Yes. 2.1 Are you aware that pipeline construction 0. 22 regulations require NRG to reasonably restore the

property to its original condition?

Yes.

Α.

Q.

23

24

25

Are you aware that NRG meets or exceeds

all municipal, county, and state regulations regarding restoration of property?

2.0

2.1

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Again, I am going to object, your Honor. There is no evidence of that and, in fact, some of the testimony from Mr. Sawyer, I think, was to the contrary in terms of subsoil ending up at top.

MR. GERKEN: I take issue with

Mr. Braunstein's characterization of Mr. Sawyer's

testimony. Mrs. Murphy's testimony was unequivocal
on this point.

ALJ PARROT: And I am going to allow the question. If you know. If you don't know, please state that. If you do know, you can answer the question.

- A. No, I am not aware of NRG's practices.
- Q. If you could refer to lines 36 through 38 of your direct testimony now on the previous page.

  Could you read question 13 and your answer, please.
  - A. Ouestion 13.
  - Q. Do you see there line 36 through 38?
- A. Oh. "Have you had any direct contact with NRG or its land agents regarding the pipeline project?" And I said, "Yes, until we hired a lawyer."

- Q. So you had "direct contact" with NRG?
- A. Well, it was with their contract -- contractor for them.
  - Q. Understood. Was that contractor's name Matt Countryman?
    - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And he was a land agent working on behalf of NRG; is that your understanding?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Was -- well, to you I'll ask did it appear that Matt appeared to make a good faith effort to consider your concerns and, to the extent he could, to address them?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Were you making progress in your discussions with him, you and Brandon I'll include in this question?
    - A. I -- I don't know. I guess what would -- what would you say would be progress? Almost signing a contract with him?
  - Q. Well, say on a scale of 0 percent to

    100 percent where 0 percent is -- you've got concerns

    that seem irreconcilable and 100 percent is you

    signed the easement. Where were you on a scale of 0

    to 100 percent?

- A. I would say for me personally, because my husband and I were not in agreement, I was maybe about 40 or 50 percent.
- Q. Where do you think your husband was on that scale?
  - A. Probably about 60 or 70 percent.
- Q. And after that time, you engaged counsel for this matter?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 10 Q. Do you recall approximately what timeframe?
- 12 A. Yes. It was, I believe, the third week 13 of October, 2014.
- MR. GERKEN: I have no further questions.
- 15 ALJ PARROT: Thank you.
- 16 Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.
- 18 ALJ PARROT: Any redirect?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: No, your Honor.
- 20 ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very
- 21 much. You are excused.
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, at this time
- we would move that our Exhibit No. 12 be admitted
- 24 into evidence.
- 25 ALJ PARROT: All right. Are there any

280 1 objections? 2 Hearing none LCPO Exhibit No. 12 is 3 admitted. 4 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 5 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Braunstein, do you have any further witnesses today? 6 7 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes. Is Ms. Thorne 8 excused, your Honor? 9 ALJ PARROT: She is. MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you. We do, 10 Mr. Samuel Dennis. 11 12 MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, if we could 13 request a brief recess due to a witness named now 14 that was not noticed yesterday? 15 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: That's fine. I didn't 16 believe Mr. Dennis was going to be able to make it 17 because I think he just had surgery and didn't think 18 he could come down. 19 MR. GERKEN: And before the recess could 2.0 I just ask any other additional witnesses be 2.1 identified at this time? 22 ALJ PARROT: Yes, Mr. Braunstein. Do we 23 have others?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: There are no other

2.4

25

additional witnesses.

281 1 ALJ PARROT: With that, Mr. Gerken, 10 minutes is sufficient? I do want to give you some 2 3 time in light of the fact --4 MR. GERKEN: Yes, your Honor. I think 10 minutes would do the trick. 5 ALJ PARROT: Let's go off the record for 6 a 10-minute break. Thank you. 7 8 (Recess taken.) 9 ALJ PARROT: Let's go back on the record. Mr. Braunstein. 10 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I can't remember, your 11 12 Honor. Was the witness sworn? 13 ALJ PARROT: Not yet. I just want you to go ahead and officially call him on the record for 14 15 us. 16 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I'm sorry. Your Honor, 17 we call Samuel Dennis. 18 ALJ PARROT: Thank you. 19 Mr. Dennis, please raise your right hand. 2.0 (Witness sworn.) 2.1 ALJ PARROT: Very good. 22 23 24

	282
1	SAMUEL DENNIS
2	being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
3	examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	By Mr. Braunstein:
6	Q. Sir, can you state your full name and
7	spell your last name.
8	A. Samuel Dennis.
9	Q. And state your full name and spell your
10	last name for the court reporter.
11	A. Samuel Dennis, D-E-N-N-I-S.
12	Q. And where do you reside, Mr. Dennis?
13	A. 965 Salem Avenue in Elyria.
14	Q. And is what do you own property
15	that is affected by the proposed NRG pipeline?
16	A. Yes, sir.
17	Q. And is that the property you reside on?
18	A. No, sir.
19	Q. And where is that property located?
20	A. That's located on Chestnut Bridge in
21	north Eaton.
22	Q. Eaton Township?
23	A. Yes, Eaton Township.
24	Q. Thank you. And the pipeline is going
25	through that property?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Now, I am going to show you what we have -- what we have tentatively marked as LCPO Exhibit 13, which is a copy of your direct testimony, and ask you if that is a true and accurate copy of the direct testimony that you submitted in this case.
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I'm sorry?

ALJ PARROT: So marked.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. And if I asked you all the same questions that you were asked and responded to in writing, would your responses be the same today as you sit here under oath?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you. The witness is available for cross, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Schmidt?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, ma'am.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Gerken?

MR. GERKEN: Yes, your Honor. Just

25 briefly.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 By Mr. Gerken:

1

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Dennis.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. My name is Dan Gerken. I am an attorney for NRG. How are you?
  - A. Good. And yourself?
  - Q. I'm good, thanks. Did you raise concerns to NRG or its land agents about the pipeline's proximity to your pond?
  - A. Yes, I did.
    - Q. And are you aware that NRG has responded to your concerns by routing the pipeline away from your pond?
- 15 A. Yes, sir; yes, sir.
  - Q. Are you aware that the existing proposed pipeline construction plan which you can access in this proceeding and is available through your attorney includes additional --
  - MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Again, I am going to object. I don't know that a construction plan for this pipeline is available to me. I don't believe I've ever been provided with it.
- MR. GERKEN: I haven't completed the question yet, and I represent that the substance of

this question is in the record in this proceeding.

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: All right. Please finish your question and then we'll go from there.

- Q. Are you aware that the existing proposed pipeline construction plan includes specific erosion and sediment control measures like silt fencing specifically with regard to the area around your pond?
- A. I understand that that wasn't my problem
  I was having. Just past experiences with pipelines,
  I've been out on construction, and a lot of times the
  water will find a way and will drain my pond. See,
  that's one of the problems.
- Q. Are you aware that this pipeline, the one proposed by NRG, that the erosion and sediment control plan for this pipeline which deals with erosion and water issues meets or exceeds any applicable regulation regarding these issues?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to object, your Honor, foundation, no statement of applicable regulation of statement that the witness -- no evidence the witness has ever reviewed it.

- A. I don't understand. My concern is just --
- 25 ALJ PARROT: There is an objection

pending, but you said you didn't understand the question though?

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

THE WITNESS: Yes. I was going to bring up another issue.

ALJ PARROT: Let's wait there then. The fact that the witness has requested some clarification, Mr. Gerken, if you could try it another way.

MR. GERKEN: I'll move on.

ALJ PARROT: Okay.

- Q. Are you aware that in response to your concerns regarding the pond NRG obtained an additional easement from your neighbor to reroute the pipeline around your pond -- or, sorry, to avoid your pond?
- A. It wasn't just my pond. It's the wetlands around me.
- Q. Do you recall your last proposal to NRG in terms of compensation from them to acquire an easement in your property? Do you remember --
- 21 A. I don't understand what you are getting 22 at.
- Q. Do you remember what your last proposal moneywise to NRG was?
- A. It was around 40.

- Q. Is it your recollection that NRG's last counterproposal to you was \$55,352?
  - A. I don't remember that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I am going to have to object again. They have said repeatedly, and I agree, this is not the eminent domain case. The compensation has nothing to do with this case. What we are objecting to is the route and the failure to consider alternatives, not to the compensation issue.

MR. GERKEN: To the extent there has been admitted into the record testimony regarding these issues which, of course, as the record reflects, NRG has opposed, that has opened the door to this discussion.

ALJ PARROT: And I agree the door was opened through the witness's own direct testimony, so I am going to allow the question.

MR. GERKEN: Do we need to read the question back to the witness?

- Q. Do you recall the question, Mr. Dennis?
- A. No, I don't. I don't.

(Record read.)

- A. I don't remember nothing like that.
- Q. Do you recall that NRG offered you the appraised value of the entire fee interest in your

front parcel where the driveway is in exchange for an easement on that property that would allow you to keep the fee ownership of that parcel?

- A. I remember something like that but nothing in writing. I never got anything in writing from them, nothing except for the -- what they were trying to offer me on the money part.
- Q. Do you recall when you engaged counsel for this matter?
  - A. It was early summer.
- Q. And you understand that all conversations and negotiations about the pipeline and the easements must occur through counsel since having obtained counsel?
  - A. Right, uh-huh.
  - Q. Yes, sir? I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
- A. I didn't understand. Can you say it again?
  - Q. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- A. I got a hearing problem.
  - Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Do you understand that since you engaged Mr. Braunstein for this matter all of the negotiations about the pipeline and the easement must occur through Mr. Braunstein rather than from NRG --

- A. Yes, I understand.

  Q. -- directly to you?
- A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

- Q. Okay. Just only a couple more questions, Mr. Dennis. Did you raise issues regarding a gate on your property with NRG?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And did they respond to those concerns in any way?
- 10 A. They did a lot of talking, that's all I
  11 can say, but nothing in writing.
- Q. Okay. Did you raise concerns about a culvert pipe on your property with NRG?
  - A. That's what the creek runs through my property, yes.
- Q. And did they also have discussions with you about that concern?
- A. They -- they had a discussion, that's about it. I never seen anything in writing and so that's why I am here today, I guess.
- MR. GERKEN: I have no further questions.
- 22 ALJ PARROT: Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor.
- 24 ALJ PARROT: Any redirect?
- MR. BRAUNSTEIN: No, your Honor.

290 1 ALJ PARROT: All right. 2 Thank you very much, Mr. Dennis. I 3 appreciate it. 4 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor. 5 At this time we would move that LCPO 13 be admitted into evidence. 6 7 ALJ PARROT: Are there any objections to 8 the admission of LCPO Exhibit 13? 9 Hearing none it is admitted. 10 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 11 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: And the witness can be 12 excused? 13 ALJ PARROT: He has been. 14 MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, NRG wishes to 15 renew its earlier motion to strike 16 appropriations-related testimony from the direct 17 testimony in Lorain County Property Owners' Exhibits 18 9 through 13. 19 ALJ PARROT: And the objection is noted 2.0 on the record. I am going to allow the testimony to 2.1 stand, and the Board will determine what weight, if 22 any, to give to it. Thank you, Mr. Gerken. Thank 23 you, Mr. Braunstein. 24 Any further witnesses, Mr. Braunstein? 25 MR. BRAUNSTEIN: We have no further live

testimony, your Honor. I do have some motions to make regarding the admission of other testimony.

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: All right. Let's go ahead and take those up now.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: As to the testimony of Charles Borling, Wesley Parker, and Mary Miller on cross-examination -- excuse me, on redirect examination of NRG's, the applicant's, witnesses, reference was made to that testimony and parts of it either read into the record or distinctly referred to. I believe that having entered a part of the written document into the record, we are entitled to have the whole document written -- excuse me, the whole document included in the record, and I would request and move that that testimony be admitted.

ALJ PARROT: And are any of those witnesses here today?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: No, they are not, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Response?

MR. GERKEN: NRG vigorously objects to the admission of any direct testimony from any witnesses who are not available to appear and to be cross-examined specifically on the authority of In Re: Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC, 138

Ohio St. 3d 43, a decision from the Supreme Court of Ohio in 2013. Only when a witness is sworn in at the hearing says the Supreme Court of Ohio does he or she adopt the prefiled testimony under oath. It is at that point that the written testimony becomes evidence, not at the time of filing. Allowing —further, allowing written testimony to be admitted without the opportunity for cross—examination develops an incomplete record. We have made further still — NRG has made out—of—town witnesses available for cross—examination and has not sought to enter any direct testimony into evidence without making them available for cross—examination.

2.0

2.1

And, finally, as we hope we've exhibited yesterday, we've attempted to limit our objections to each and every mention of appropriations and compensation-based issues yesterday in the proceedings and this morning in the proceedings. And it would be contrary to Ohio Supreme Court precedent and the Board's hearing procedures to admit this testimony into the record.

For those reasons we adamantly oppose and in the alternative move affirmatively in limine to eliminate that testimony from the record.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Schmidt.

MR. SCHMIDT: The FirstEnergy intervenors would join in that objection to the admission of prefiled direct testimony that the witnesses were not made available for cross-examination.

2.0

2.1

MR. JONES: Your Honor, staff would join in that objection as well.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: It seems that there are a number of -- that there is resistance to the motion.

ALJ PARROT: To say the least.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I would point out that the distinguishing factor here — we are going to move to admit the other testimony too, but the distinguishing factor here is that NRG, the applicant, has used that testimony in their direct and redirect examination. That is the source of the incomplete record and we are entitled as a matter of the Rules of Evidence to have the entire document included once a portion of it is referred to.

MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, NRG's affirmative anticipation of certain narrow excerpts from the testimony that Mr. Braunstein just referred to was only made by virtue of the Lorain County Property Owners' failure to identify an exhaustive list of the witnesses. That was the only reason for

affirmatively anticipating that testimony.

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Mr. Gerken.

With that the motion is denied. I would note though that to the extent that the testimony of NRG's witnesses makes reference to the property owners' testimony, the Board will be cognizant of the fact that the property owners' testimony has not been admitted into the record.

So with that I am saying the Board will not be relying on testimony from NRG witnesses that's pointing to testimony that's not been admitted into the record. So I am just making that clarification, but the motion is denied.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

And just for the record and without argument, I would also move that because of hardship of people appearing at this hearing who live in Lorain County and who are employed and who went to great effort to prepare written testimony, I would ask that their written testimony be admitted as well. Thank you, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: And I will likewise deny that motion, but I will make a statement at this point that if there are any individual members of the group of property owners, intervenors, excuse me,

```
that have filed testimony in this proceeding that
 1
 2
      weren't able to be here, they do have the choice to
 3
      withdraw from the group of intervenors, and at that
 4
     point they could file their testimony -- what's now
 5
      called their testimony but what would be considered
      then by the Board as a public comment in the docket
 6
 7
      of the case but that would require that they withdraw
 8
      from party status. So that's a choice they have to
 9
      make. They may either remain a party of the group of
10
      intervenors or they may withdraw from the group and
      notice all the parties to that effect by filing
11
12
      something in the docket along with their public
13
      comments.
14
                  MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
15
                  MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, to that last
16
     point, if I may, it has come to our attention that
17
     property owner Cheryl Vajada --
18
                  ALJ PARROT: Yes. I have noticed that as
19
      well.
2.0
                  MR. GERKEN: -- V-A-J-A-D-A is not a
2.1
     party to this case.
22
                  ALJ PARROT: Yes.
23
                  MR. GERKEN: And we would, therefore,
24
     move that all of her direct testimony either be
      stricken or that she somehow -- if she is engaged by
```

counsel, be instructed of the same instruction that you just advised Mr. Braunstein of moments ago.

2.0

2.1

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Your Honor, I believe that she is a party now. Was she not in the second group?

ALJ PARROT: She was not included in the second group of intervenors that were recently granted intervention, so if she was here to testify, it was my intention to clarify what -- what her plans were, if she just was merely inadvertently excluded from your second petition to intervene, if she was filed -- trying to file this testimony in some other capacity then as a member of the group of intervenors.

So because she is not here and hasn't, you know, attempted, we haven't had any admission of her testimony, I kind of see it as a nonissue at this point unless she does wish to be part of the intervenor group still at this stage. And if so, you will need to file a late petition for intervention on her behalf, and we will take it up from there.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Instead of doing that -- and I have to admit I am not certain why she was not listed, but instead of doing that, could I just ask that the court accept her written testimony since she

is not an intervenor as a public comment?

2.0

2.1

ALJ PARROT: In light of the fact she is not here, I think I would be more comfortable with you checking with her first, and then if that is truly her intention not to be part of your group of intervenors, at that point I think you can file something in the docket to that effect and along with her public comment.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. GERKEN: Your Honor, just one more point to maybe clean up on that same issue, would there be a timeframe for the withdrawal of any of the direct testimony and submission to the public record?

ALJ PARROT: I am not expecting anybody to formally -- it's not part of the record. I haven't admitted any of this other testimony.

MR. GERKEN: Understood.

ALJ PARROT: I have only admitted the witnesses that were here and available for cross-examination. That is considered the record that the property owners have submitted in this case. As far as I'm concerned, the rest of it is just a filing that's out there in the docket. If they do though wish to withdraw as part of the intervenor group, they need to do that -- I am not going to set

a deadline but in an expeditious fashion. I think
all the parties to the case realize the Board is
working under a very tight timeframe here. And with
that in mind they will need to do that quickly.

That's all I am going to say.

MR. GERKEN: Understood. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: All right. At this point
let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ PARROT: Let's go back on the record.

Mr. Gerken, the company had reserved the
right to request to file rebuttal testimony, if
necessary. And at this point I will turn things over
to you to address that request.

MR. GERKEN: Thank you, your Honor. NRG

2.0

2.1

MR. GERKEN: Thank you, your Honor. NRG will waive its reserved rebuttal. There is no need for that.

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much.

With that while we were off the record the parties have discussed a briefing schedule. In light of the timeframe for a Board decision in this matter, a briefing deadline has been set of Tuesday, May 5, 2015. The parties will all file simultaneous briefs on that date and that will be the only

briefing that is had in this case. Is there anything else to come before the Board today? MR. JONES: No, your Honor. ALJ PARROT: Hearing nothing the matter will be submitted to the Board for its consideration. Thank you. (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded at 11:51 a.m.) 2.1 

CERTIFICATE I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Friday, April 24, 2015, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-6034) 

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

4/27/2015 9:18:59 AM

in

Case No(s). 14-1717-GA-BLN

Summary: Transcript in the matter of NRG Ohio Pipeline Company LLC hearing held on 04/24/15 - Volume II electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.