### BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Application of Harrison :
Power Transmission, LLC :
for a Certificate of :

Environmental : Case No. 17-2084-EL-BTX

Compatibility and Public : Need for the Harrison : Power 138 kV Transmission : Line Project. :

- - -

### PROCEEDINGS

before Jay S. Agranoff, Hearing Examiner, at the Ohio Power Siting Board, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-C, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, September 21, 2018.

\_ \_ \_

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

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

- - -

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
            Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP
            By Michael J. Settineri
 3
            and MacDonald W. Taylor
            52 East Gay Street
            Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
 4
            614-464-5462
 5
            mjsettineri@vorys.com
 6
                 On behalf of Harrison Power
                 Transmission, LLC.
 7
            Kincaid, Taylor & Geyer
 8
            By William J. Taylor
            50 North 4th Street
 9
            Zanesville, Ohio 43702-1030
            740-454-2591
10
            wjt@kincaidlaw.com
11
                 On behalf of Ascent Resources-Utica, LLC.
12
            Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General
            By Thomas Lindgren
13
            and John H. Jones
            Assistant Attorneys General
14
            Public Utilities Section
            30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
15
            614-644-8599
16
            Thomas.lindgren@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
17
                 On behalf of the Staff of the Public
                 Utilities Commission of Ohio.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		3			
1	INDEX				
2					
3	Witness	Page			
4 5	Brian O. Williams Direct Examination by Mr. Settineri Examination by The Examiner	8 17			
6	Kaitlyn Kiehart				
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Settineri Examination by The Examiner	25 29			
8	Jon C. Pawley Direct Examination by Mr. Lindgren 32				
9	Examination by The Examiner	37			
10					
11	Joint Exhibit Ider	ntified Admitted			
12	1 Joint Stipulation and Recommendation	10 40			
13					
14	Applicant Exhibit Identified Admitted				
15	1 Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and	9 24			
16	Public Need for the Harrison Power 138 kV Transmission Line				
17	Project				
18	2 Notice of Proposed Utility Facility	9 24			
19	3 Notice Regarding Modification	10 24			
20	of Project Footprint				
21	4 Direct Testimony of Brian Williams	10 24			
22	5 Direct Testimony of Jill Vovaris	10 31			
23	6 Supplemental Direct Testimony of	10 24			
24	Brian Williams				
25					

				4
1	Sta	ff Exhibit	Identified	Admitted
2	1	Prefiled Testimony of Jon Pawl	ey 37	37
3	2	Staff Report of Investigation	33	37
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Friday Morning Session, September 21, 2018.

2.1

THE EXAMINER: Let's go on the record at this time. The Ohio Power Siting Board has assigned for evidentiary hearing at this time and place Case No. 17-2084-EL-BTX which is captioned In the Matter of the Application of Harrison Power Transmission, LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for Construction of the Harrison Power 138 kV Transmission Line Project.

My name is Jay Agranoff and I am the Administrative Law Judge assigned by the Ohio Power Siting Board to preside over this evidentiary hearing.

At this point in time, I'll take the appearances. On behalf of the Applicant.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor.

On behalf of Harrison Power Transmission, LLC, Mike

Settineri and MacDonald Taylor with the law firm of

Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, 52 East Gay Street,

Columbus, Ohio, 43215.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

On behalf of the Interveners.

MR. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I'm William

Taylor for Kincaid, Taylor and Geyer from Zanesville, and I'm here representing Ascent Resources-Utica, LLC who acquired the assets of Hess Ohio Development, LLC and is substituted as the Intervener.

2.1

THE EXAMINER: Thank you, sir.

On behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board.

MR. LINDGREN: Thank you, your Honor, on behalf of the Staff, Ohio Attorney General Mike

DeWine, by Thomas G. Lindgren and John H. Jones,

Assistant Attorneys General, 30 East Broad Street,

16th floor, Columbus, Ohio, 43215.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. I would note that the public hearing in this matter was held on September 12th, 2018 in Cadiz, Ohio, and that pursuant to the entry of July 3rd, 2018, this evidentiary hearing was scheduled for today at this time and place. It's my understanding that the parties have reached a Joint Stipulation at this point in time?

MR. SETTINERI: Yes, your Honor, a Joint Stipulation has been entered into by Harrison Power Transmission as well as Staff. And regarding Ascent Resources, Harrison Power does not object to the Notice of Substitution, and also that there has been

```
a separate side agreement executed between those parties separate and outside of this proceeding.
```

2.1

2.2

THE EXAMINER: When you say there's a separate agreement between those parties, can you clarify for me which parties?

MR. SETTINERI: That separate agreement was executed between Ascent Resources and Harrison Power Transmission.

THE EXAMINER: Is that part of the record for our consideration?

MR. SETTINERI: That is not part of the record for your consideration as a separate third party agreement.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Taylor, is there any objection on behalf of your client to what is currently before the Commission -- before the Board for consideration?

MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor.

MR. SETTINERI: If we can go off the record for a moment.

THE EXAMINER: Certainly.

(Off the record.)

THE EXAMINER: Let's go back on the record at this time. Mr. Settineri, if you want to proceed.

8 1 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor. 2 At this time, we would like to call Brian Williams to 3 the stand. THE EXAMINER: Will you stand. Please 4 5 raise your right hand. 6 (Witness placed under oath.) 7 BRIAN O. WILLIAMS 8 9 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 10 examined and testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 By Mr. Settineri: 13 Q. Good morning, Mr. Williams. 14 Α. Good morning. 15 Q. Can you please state your name and business address for the record, please. 16 My name is Brian O. Williams. My 17 Α. 18 business address is 100 Lenox Drive, Suite 100, 19 Lawrenceville, New Jersey, 08648. 20 Thank you, sir. Q. 2.1 MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, at this time, 22 we would like to mark a series of exhibits if I may. 23 THE EXAMINER: Certainly. 24 MR. SETTINERI: We'll start first with 25 Applicant Exhibit 1. That is the Application to the

Ohio Power Siting Board for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Harrison Power 138 kV Transmission Line Project submitted January 2018.

2.1

THE EXAMINER: It shall be so marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. SETTINERI: We would also then like to mark as Applicant Exhibit No. 2, a packet with the first page being a Notice of Proposed Major Utility Facility. This packet contains all the public notices issued for the project including the scheduling of the public hearing.

THE EXAMINER: That shall be so marked as well.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. SETTINERI: Then, your Honor, we would like to mark as Applicant Exhibit 3, the Notice Regarding Modification of Project Footprint that was submitted in June of 2018.

THE EXAMINER: Is that a public notice or is that the notice that was provided to the Board?

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, that is the notice to the Board and contains the supplemental information that is in the binder.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. SETTINERI: Then we would like to mark as Applicant Exhibit No. 4 the Direct Testimony of Brian Williams.

2.1

We then would mark as Applicant Exhibit 6 the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Brian Williams.

And next we would mark as Joint Exhibit 1 the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation entered into between Harrison Power Transmission, LLC and the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board.

THE EXAMINER: Those exhibits shall be marked accordingly.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

THE EXAMINER: What was Exhibit 5?

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, we can mark that at this time. That is the Direct Testimony of Jill Vovaris, V-O-V-A-R-I-S.

THE EXAMINER: That shall be marked as well.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

Q. (By Mr. Settineri) Mr. Williams, if you can, please, I would like to walk through the exhibits with you, so if you could identify for the record what we marked as Applicant Exhibit 1, please.

- A. Applicant Exhibit 1 is Application to the Ohio Power Siting Board for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Harrison Power 138 kV Transmission Line Project as submitted by Harrison Power Transmission, LLC January 2018.
- Q. Was this application prepared at your direction?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Could you identify for the record what's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 2, please.
- A. Applicant Exhibit 2 is a packet of public notices.
  - Q. And these notices were issued related to the project that's proposed before the Board today, correct?
- 17 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

20

2.1

- Q. Could you please identify for the record what's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 3, please.
  - A. It's a Notice Regarding the Modification of the Project Footprint as submitted June 2018.
- Q. And this related to shifts of the preferred route from the original application, correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

- Q. Was that prepared at your direction?
- 2 A. Yes.

8

9

14

17

18

19

- Q. And could you identify for the record what's been identified at Applicant Exhibit 4, please?
- A. Applicant Exhibit 4 is my Direct
  Testimony.
  - Q. Also could you identify for the record what's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 6?
- A. Applicant Exhibit 6 is my Supplemental Direct Testimony.
- Q. And both pieces of testimony, were they prepared by you or at your direction?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you identify for the record what's been marked at Joint Exhibit 1, please?
  - A. Joint Exhibit 1 is the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation between Harrison Power

    Transmission, LLC and Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board.
- Q. Were you were involved in the
  negotiations that resulted in this Joint Stipulation
  and Recommendation?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. If we could turn back to your Direct

Testimony, sir, which has been marked as Applicant Exhibit 4, please, do you have that in front of you?

> Yes, I do. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

15

16

18

19

- Do you have any changes or revisions to Ο. that testimony today?
- Yes, I do. One change on Page 10 Α. starting at line 5 where the sentence says, "One possible mitigation option is to develop a traffic pattern change with the nearby Harrison County 10 Airport," I'd like to strike that sentence. And then in the following sentence in line 7, instead of 12 "Another...", it would be "A possible mitigation 13 option..."
  - Do you have any other changes to your Ο. Direct Testimony that's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 4?
- 17 No, I do not. Α.
  - If I asked you the questions in that Q. Direct Testimony, would your answers as revised be the same today?
- 2.1 Α. Yes.
- If we could turn to Applicant Exhibit 6, 22 Q. 23 please. This is your Supplemental Direct Testimony, 24 correct?
- 25 Α. Yes.

- Q. That was prepared by you or at your direction?
  - A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

- Q. Do you have any changes or revisions to that testimony today, sir?
  - A. No, I do not.
- Q. Now, in your testimony, your Direct
  Testimony, Applicant Exhibit 4, you reference the
  relocation of two poles, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. For the record, can you identify those pole numbers?
  - A. Pole No. 20 and 21.
    - Q. And why were those poles moved?
- 15 A. Pole No. 20 was relocated to drop a

  16 landowner and to only deal with one landowner, Consol

  17 Energy.
- Q. Does Consol Energy have other properties along the preferred route where the poles and wires will be located?
- A. Yes, Consol Energy has the majority of the structures located on their properties.
- Q. And is Harrison Power Transmission
  currently negotiating easements and/or right-of-ways
  with Consol today?

A. Yes, we are currently negotiating easements.

1

- THE EXAMINER: Is Consol the only
  Property Owner on the project?
- 5 THE WITNESS: No, your Honor, Consol and 6 the County, Harrison CIC.
- 7 THE EXAMINER: Are they the primary?
- 8 THE WITNESS: They are the primary. The
  9 majority of the structures are located on Consol
  10 Energy property.
- Q. (By Mr. Settineri) Regarding Pole No. 21, why was that relocated?
- A. 21 was relocated to maintain the height for FAA concerns.
- Q. And how far is Pole 20 being relocated?
- A. Pole 20 is relocated approximately
  405 feet east.
- Q. And how far is Pole 21 being proposed to be?
- 20 A. Approximately 75 feet west.
- Q. And for these two new locations, are they both within the study corridor for the project?
- A. Yes, they are.
- Q. And to clarify for the record, I believe you may have already answered this, but these pole

locations do not require a new landowner to the project?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. And regarding I think you were here for a discussion on Ascent Resources previously that was on the record, just for the record itself, does Harrison Power Transmission have an agreement in place with Ascent Resources?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. And that is a separate contract?
- A. Between Harrison Power Transmission Line and Ascent Resources.
- Q. Your testimony also references that a possible mitigation option could include the underground installation of certain sections of the transmission line. For the record, where would you anticipate that occurring at this time, what pole numbers?
  - A. That would be structures 21 through 27.
- Q. And why may those poles be -- transmission lines be placed underground?
- A. That would be due to correct any issues or concerns with the FAA.
- Q. I'm going to jump ahead to Joint Exhibit
  1, the Joint Stipulation. Am I correct there's a

Condition there that does address the underground placement of transmission lines as they occur?

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Could you identify that Condition for the record, please.
  - A. That would be 24.

MR. SETTINERI: At this time, your Honor, the witness is available for cross-examination.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

Any questions on behalf of Ascent?

MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Staff?

MR. LINDGREN: No questions, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Mr. Williams, I do have a

couple questions.

16

## 17 EXAMINATION

18 | By The Examiner:

Q. First question, if you know or whether you need to defer to counsel, the reason for why the separate agreement with Ascent and Harrison Power is not being submitted as part of the record in this case.

THE EXAMINER: Mr. Settineri?

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I think I can

best answer that. It is a separate contract that not only addresses issues in this case specific between the parties but also addresses other issues between the parties as well.

2.1

And it is a side agreement, has been disclosed to all the parties in the case. And at least my experience with Commission practice, the key issue with side agreements is to disclose the existence of a side agreement.

As the terms, the side agreement does include a requirement or an agreement that Ascent will not object to the Application in this proceeding.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you.

- Q. (By The Examiner) Mr. Williams, if you could turn, please, to your Direct Testimony that has been marked as Applicant Exhibit 4, and specifically if you could turn to Page No. 9. Let me know when you're there.
  - A. Yes, I'm there.
- Q. And your response to Question 20, that pertains to the modifications that have been made to the Application subsequent to the June modification that had been previously made?
- A. That is correct.

Q. And could you just explain to me what the rationale for the June modification was.

- A. The June modification was to correct a structure relocation that was not in parallel with the existing corridor, with the existing AEP corridor.
- Q. And the modification that is being done now is primarily as a result of what particular rationale?
- A. The modification currently is being done in order to relocate structures 20 and 21. Structure 20 is to relocate to drop a landowner which was Anderson Tree Farm and to relocate that structure onto Consol property who has the majority of the structures on their property.
  - Q. So the changes that we are now discussing, do they pertain to Pole 20 and 21?
    - A. Pole 20 and 21, yes.
- Q. The same poles that were part of the June modification as well?
- A. They were not part of the June modification.
- MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, if I may clarify for the record.
- THE EXAMINER: Certainly.

MR. SETTINERI: Mr. Williams, the Poles 20 and 21 were in the June modification, correct?

2.1

2.2

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR. SETTINERI: But these new locations in your testimony are different from the locations in the June 2018 modification?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. That's what I was trying to make sure we were clear on.

- Q. (By The Examiner) Then if you could turn to your Supplemental Testimony that's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 6, let me know when you have that document.
  - A. I have it, your Honor.
- Q. Thank you. And specifically if you turn to Page 2, which is really a continuation of your response to question 4 on Page 1, I just want to be clear that the Conditions that are discussed on line 4 of Page 2, which were Conditions 3, 17, 20, 24, 25 and 26, are those the Conditions that were addressed in the Staff Report?
  - A. Yes, your Honor.
- Q. And then in your response to Question 5, you indicate that there had been some form of negotiation taking place with respect to what was

ultimately going to be included in the Stipulation. Could you explain to me whether what was negotiated relative to the Conditions that I had just delineated were basically what Staff was recommending or was there some negotiation that actually took place to end up with a result different than what the Staff was proposing in their Staff Report relative to those Conditions?

2.1

- A. Yes, your Honor. I do have a redline of the Stipulation showing what those changes are.
- Q. If you could just kind of give me a generic....
- A. Okay. First Stipulation, No. 3 on Page 3, that first change was basically that we will be allowed to -- for any changes that proceed forward with the route, that we will provide that to the Staff to allow them to review that to make sure it's in accordance with the Conditions of this agreement.
- Q. Would that include the undergrounding of facilities as we talked about earlier?
- A. Yes, it would, your Honor. And then

  Condition 17 is a Stipulation concerning the bald

  eagle and the presence of the bald eagle being within

  660 feet of a nest or a direct line of site.
  - Q. Was that consistent then with what Staff

had proposed in the Staff Report?

2.1

A. There was a change to that. We did strike where it previously had said work within 660 feet of a bald eagle's nest or within a direct line of site of a nest shall not occur from January 15th through July 15th.

And then striking also further, no tree clearing shall occur within 660 feet of a bald eagle nest or within any woodlots supporting a nest, tree unless coordination with the U.S. Fishing and Wildlife Service reflects a different course of action.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, we would be glad to if it would be helpful for the Bench to share a copy of the redlines if you'd like to see it.

THE EXAMINER: It's not necessary, but thank you.

- Q. (By The Examiner) Any others?
- A. For Condition 20, Condition 20 is concerned with blasting. Basically the hours of blasting have been changed from previously noted at 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. shall be limited to the hours between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

And then Condition 24 is concerning the FAA. The change to that was that the Applicant to

place sections of the transmission line underground in order to alleviate aviation hazards. Applicant shall include such locations and information to Staff with the final engineering design so Staff can confirm that no changes to the Certificate Conditions are necessary and that the underground installation will not create any additional material adverse impacts.

Next condition, 25, that was changed from notification on preconstruction conference from 30 days to 10 days prior for the preconstruction conference.

> Q. And finally 26?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

And finally, 26 concerns with obstruction marking; the change, obstruction marking and lighting, or as otherwise observed and prescribed by the FAA. The move was the marking and lighting shall be maintained in a operable condition for the life of the transmission line.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. Based on my questions to Mr. Williams, did any of the other parties have any follow-up?

MR. LINDGREN: No, your Honor.

MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. MR. SETTINERI: Thank you. Your Honor, at this time, if you would like to wait until we're done with all the witnesses, but I would just like to move into the record Applicant Exhibit 1, Applicant Exhibit 2, Applicant Exhibit 3, Applicant Exhibit 4, Applicant Exhibit 6 and Joint Exhibit 1.

THE EXAMINER: Why don't we hold off on Joint Exhibit 1 for the time being, but with respect to Applicant Exhibit 1, 2, 4 and 6, are there any

2.1

MR. LINDGREN: No objections.

MR. TAYLOR: No objection.

objections to the aforementioned exhibits?

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I think you missed Applicant Exhibit 3.

THE EXAMINER: And Applicant Exhibit 3.

To the extent that there are no objections, the aforementioned exhibits shall be admitted as part of the record at this time.

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

THE EXAMINER: Mr. Williams, you're excused. Please call your next witness when you're ready.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, at this time, we would call Kaitlyn Kiehart to the stand, please.

THE EXAMINER: Please raise your right

25 hand. 1 2 (Witness placed under oath.) 3 4 KAITLYN KIEHART 5 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Settineri: 8 Good morning, Miss Kiehart. 9 Ο. 10 Α. Good morning. 11 Could you please state your name and Ο. 12 business address for the record, please. 13 Α. My name is Kaitlyn Kiehart. I'm an Environmental Scientist for Kleinfelder, and my 14 15 business address is 1368 Anmoore Road, Suite 103, 16 Bridgeport, West Virginia, 26330. 17 MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I believe 18 previously we marked as Exhibit 5, Applicant Exhibit 19 5, the Direct Testimony of Jill Vovaris. At this 20 time pursuant to a Notice we filed in the docket, we 2.1 would like to submit Miss Kiehart, allow her to adopt 22 the testimony of Miss Vovaris and testify today. THE EXAMINER: That will be fine with the 23 24 Bench.

25

Q.

(By Mr. Settineri) Miss Kiehart, there

are a few specific questions as to Miss Vovaris in the testimony today, so first of all, I'd like to direct your attention to Applicant Exhibit 5, please. Do you have that before you?

A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. And so let's start first, you've already given your name, title and business address. Can you describe the question for you what are your duties as an Environmental Scientist?
- A. My duties as an Environmental Scientist include conducting field work consisting of wetland and stream delineation, endangered species surveys, bat habitat assessments and Phase 1 environmental site assessments. In addition, I coordinate with state and federal agencies and prepare permit packages for a variety of energy clients.
- Q. Miss Kiehart, what is your educational and professional background?
- A. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in biology and a Master of agriculture, forestry and consumer sciences from West Virginia University. I am a Professional Wetlands Scientist and a Licensed Remediation Specialist in the state of West Virginia.

I've spent two years working for the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection as a

Mining and Reclamation Environmental Inspector. I spent the majority of my eight years of experience working for a consulting firm, including Larson Design Group and now Kleinfelder as an Environmental Scientist.

As part of my experience, I have supported a number of industries in technical consulting, including transportation, oil and gas, power, utility, mining and land development.

- Q. And Miss Vovaris's testimony stated that Miss Vovaris was the Lead Environmental Consultant. Were you part of the team of the environmental consultants that worked on this project?
  - A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. And you have familiarity with the project?
  - A. Yes, I do.
  - Q. And can you describe some of your activities that you were involved with specifically as to this project?
- A. Yes, I worked on field surveys for the project and also drafting and preparing the permit applications.
- Q. And are you familiar with all of the matters that were raised and are raised in

Miss Vovaris's Direct Testimony?

A. Yes, I am.

2.1

- Q. You've obviously reviewed Miss Vovaris's testimony, correct?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. At this time, do you have any changes or revisions to that testimony?
- A. I do. The first revision, line 18, Page 6, please add the following sentence, "Note: Because Condition 9 stipulates coordination with Staff and OHC concerning potential effects on cultural resources prior to the commencement of construction, I anticipate that an additional letter from OHC will be submitted to satisfy this condition."
- Q. Do you have any other changes or revisions to the testimony?
- A. Yes, the next revision, line 17, Page 7, please add the following statement, "Note: That although Page 20 of the Staff Report indicates that the Applicant documented a bald eagle nest within the project area, my understanding is that the Applicant did not document a bald eagle nest within the project area. I would also note that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Correspondents has confirmed there are no bald eagle nests within five miles of the project area."

29 1 Q. Any other changes or revisions? 2 Α. No. 3 If I was to ask you the questions that Q. are in this testimony today, would the answers be the 4 5 same as you have revised? 6 Α. Yes. 7 MR. SETTINERI: At this time, your Honor, the witness is available for cross-examination. 8 9 THE EXAMINER: Thank you. I just have 10 one quick question with respect to the modifications that you've just provided. The reference to OHC, is 11 12 that a defined term elsewhere in your testimony or 13 just for --14 THE WITNESS: OHC is Ohio History Connection. 15 16 THE EXAMINER: Thank you. 17 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 18 THE EXAMINER: Any cross-examination? 19 MR. LINDGREN: No, your Honor. 20 MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor. 21 THE EXAMINER: I did have one 22 clarification that I was seeking. 23 24 EXAMINATION 25 By The Examiner:

- Q. If you could please turn to Page 3 of the testimony, and specifically the answer to Question 7.
  - A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you, your Honor.
- Q. Line 5, there's the discussion about the project footprint on June 11th, June 12th and June 14th of 2018.
  - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

- Q. The first modification that occurred with respect to the application I believe was June 27th?
  - A. That's right.
- Q. So obviously then the answer to this question was prior to or was considering the information prior to that modification?
- A. Yes, the delineations needed to be completed in order to draft that modification.
- Q. So then the further explanation that is given in response to Question 7, would those findings and conclusions be applicable to the June 27th modification as well or --
  - A. Yes, they would.

21 THE EXAMINER: That's all I had with 22 respect to your testimony. Any follow-up questions 23 based on what I had asked?

- MR. LINDGREN: None, your Honor.
- MR. TAYLOR: None, your Honor.

```
1
                 THE EXAMINER: Thank you.
 2
                 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 3
                 MR. TAYLOR: Your Honor, at this time,
     the Harrison Power Transmission would move into the
 4
 5
     record Applicant Exhibit 5, the Direct Testimony of
 6
     Kaitlyn Kiehart.
 7
                 THE EXAMINER: Any objections?
 8
                 MR. LINDGREN: No objections.
 9
                 MR. TAYLOR: No objections.
10
                 THE EXAMINER:
                                There being no objections,
11
     Applicant Exhibit 5 shall be admitted as part of the
12
     record at this time.
13
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
14
                 THE EXAMINER: Anything else,
    Mr. Settineri?
15
16
                 MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, that finishes
17
     our presentation subject to our motion to move into
18
     the record Joint Exhibit 1.
19
                 THE EXAMINER: Thank you.
20
                 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you.
2.1
                 THE EXAMINER: At this time,
22
    Mr. Lindgren, are you ready to proceed?
23
                 MR. LINDGREN: The Staff would call Jon
24
     C. Pawley to the stand.
25
                 THE EXAMINER: Please raise your right
```

1 hand, sir.

2 (Witness placed under oath.)

THE EXAMINER: Please proceed,

4 Mr. Lindgren.

5 | - - -

JON C. PAWLEY

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was

examined and testified as follows:

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 | By Mr. Lindgren:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Pawley. Could you please state your full name and your business
- 13 address.

- A. Yes, my name is Jon Pawley. I work with
- 15 | the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East
- 16 | Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215.
- Q. Thank you. And what was your involvement
- 18 | with this case?
- 19 A. I was the Staff Project Lead for this
- 20 case which meant I was responsible for compiling --
- 21 proceeding with an investigation and compiling a
- 22 recommendation through the Staff Report and filed
- 23 | timely on the docket.
- Q. Thank you. Do you have in front of you a
- 25 copy of your Prefiled Testimony that has been marked

as Staff Exhibit No. 1?

1

8

9

10

- A. I have Prefiled Testimony marked as Staff

  Exhibit 2.
- Q. I'm sorry, will you change that to Staff
  Exhibit 2.
- THE EXAMINER: It will be so marked as

  Staff Exhibit 2.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Pawley, did you prepare this testimony?
- 11 A. I did.
- 12 Q. And do you have any changes or 13 corrections to it?
- A. No, I do not.
- Q. If I were to ask you all of these questions today, would your answers be the same?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. Are you familiar with the terms of the Stipulation and Recommendation that the parties have entered into?
- 21 A. Tam.
- Q. Thank you. And as Mr. Williams testified
  earlier, there are several changes made in this
  Stipulation to the Conditions recommended in the
  Staff Report. Do you agree with these changes to

these Staff's original Conditions?

A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. Thank you. Would you care to explain why they are acceptable to Staff?
  - A. Sure.
  - Q. Thank you.
- A. The changes made to Staff -- or from the Staff Report, Condition 1, changes were made to include the Applicant's Prefiled Testimony from Mr. Williams, and so the route that was the preferred route that was originally recommended for approval stayed the same, but it included the modifications that were introduced in the Applicant's Prefiled Testimony.
  - Q. Thank you.
- A. Changes to Condition No. 3, again, these picked up the shift and pole locations that were addressed in Mr. Williams' testimony.
  - Q. Thank you.
- A. Changes to Condition 17, materially the conditions stayed the same in terms of work prohibitions within certain amount of feet within a bald eagle's nest, that all stayed the same for the most part.
- 25 What was added was that the -- that Staff

and the Applicant agreed that an Environmental Specialist would perform a survey in the area to conclude whether there was -- there was some speculation I guess that there might be an eagle's nest in the area, but it was never confirmed.

So Staff supports the changes to this condition because we agreed to have an Environmental Specialist actually go out and perform that work and confirm one way or the other.

Q. Thank you.

2.1

- A. Condition 20 -- 20, 25 and 26 I would add or note that the changes were made to mirror or match the same conditions that were in the Harrison Power Plant which was 17-1189-EL-BGN. So the language that you see now were the agreed upon changes in the Stipulation and mirrored or matched what had already been gone through the process, through the recommendation process.
  - Q. Thank you.
- A. And changes to Condition 24, one thing that I think that is important to note with this change, this is the piece where the applicant may place some of the line underground. Staff would note, and I think it was picked up in Miss Vovaris's testimony, that the center line would still stay the

same, so the applicant isn't running off somewhere with a different center line in placing the line underground.

It's Staff's understanding that, yes, we are okay with placing this line underground along the same center line as an option to alleviate aviation concerns that Staff raised in its report. That's it.

- Q. Thank you very much. So would you recommend that the Board adopt this Joint Stipulation and issue the certificate?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. Thank you. Mr. Pawley, do you also have in front of you the Staff Report of Investigation that I would ask to have marked as Staff Exhibit 1?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Thank you. And were you involved in the preparation of this report?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. Does it accurately reflect the results of your investigation?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Thank you.
- MR. LINDGREN: I have no further questions for this witness.
- THE EXAMINER: Thank you. Staff Exhibit

```
37
 1
     1 shall be marked accordingly.
 2
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 3
                 THE EXAMINER: And at this time, any
     cross-examination from the Applicant?
 4
 5
                 MR. SETTINERI: No, your Honor, thank
 6
     you.
 7
                 THE EXAMINER: From Mr. Taylor?
 8
                 MR. TAYLOR: No questions, your Honor.
 9
                 MR. LINDGREN: Thank you, your Honor. I
10
     would then move for the admission of Staff Exhibits 1
11
     and 2.
12
                 THE EXAMINER: The aforementioned
13
     exhibits shall be admitted as part of the record at
14
     this time.
15
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
16
17
                          EXAMINATION
18
     By The Examiner:
19
            Q. And I do have one question for you,
20
    Mr. Pawley. With respect to the revision that took
2.1
     place relative to the Application on June 27th of
22
     2018, as well as the revision that's discussed in
23
    Mr. Williams' Direct Testimony, do Staff consider
24
     either of those modifications to be major
```

modifications relative to the consideration of the

Application before the Board?

2.1

A. No. Both modifications were made for various reasons within the thousand foot corridor -- study corridor. Staff has walked the site with the Applicant, particularly in the northern portion of this where modification 2 took place. And there is no material change in terms of environmental impact in terms of structure location.

Staff has had concerns in this case regarding aviation issues, i.e., height of the transmission towers. And it's our understanding that these changes were made predominantly to take care of those concerns.

The Board approved the Nottingham -- it was an AEP Nottingham transmission line several years ago I believe through a letter of notification process, and so we are familiar with the area and the Consol property. And the changes that were made in the June modification basically mirrored that line, the AEP line that was already approved by the Board.

And also it's my understanding that the most recent modification, staff raised a concern in their report in the aviation section that it appeared that there were two locations for structures that were given.

One was what was submitted to the Board and one was one set that was slightly different, was given to the FAA for their review and approval. So we wanted to true up or match, make sure that those pole locations were the same, and it's our understanding that the second modification does that. The pole locations come closer to what was submitted to the FAA.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. Based on my clarifying question, do any of the parties have any further questions of the witness?

MR. SETTINERI: No, your Honor.

MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor.

MR. LINDGREN: No, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Pawley.

2.1

I believe we've already ruled on Staff Exhibit 1 and Staff Exhibit 2's admission to the record. If not, at this point, Staff Exhibit 1 and Staff Exhibit 2 shall be admitted as part of the record at this time.

That leaves us with Joint Exhibit 1, and I believe, Mr. Settineri, you had already moved for the admission of that Exhibit?

MR. SETTINERI: That's correct, your

1 Honor. 2 THE EXAMINER: Any objections from either 3 of the parties? MR. TAYLOR: No, your Honor. 4 5 MR. LINDGREN: No objections, your Honor. 6 THE EXAMINER: Thank you. There being no 7 objections, Joint Exhibit 1 shall be admitted as part of the record at this time. 8 9 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 10 THE EXAMINER: Is there anything else 11 that we need to deal with? 12 MR. TAYLOR: Your Honor, on behalf of the 13 Intervener Ascent Resources-Utica, LLC, I want to 14

Intervener Ascent Resources-Utica, LLC, I want to confirm the existence of the Site Agreement between Harrison Power Transmission, LLC and Ascent Resources-Utica, LLC as described by the Applicant and notify the Board that Ascent as Intervener and pursuant to the agreement with Harrison Power Transmission does not oppose the issuance of the certificate sought by the Applicant.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. Anything else? If not, the matter shall be considered as submitted on the record and we are adjourned.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. LINDGREN: Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
41
                 (The hearing was concluded at 10:45 a.m.)
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# 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, September 21, 2018, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Cynthia L. Cunningham

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

10/5/2018 11:33:13 AM

in

Case No(s). 17-2084-EL-BTX

Summary: Transcript In the Matter of the Application of Harrison Power Transmission, LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Harrison Power 138 kV Transmission Line Project, hearing held on September 21, 2018 electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Cunningham, Cindy