BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

- - -

In the Matter of the Application of The Ohio State University for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Combined Heat and Power Facility in Franklin County, Ohio.	:	Case No. 19-1641-EL-BGN

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Ms. Sarah Parrot, Administrative Law Judge, and Mr. Samuel Randazzo, Chairman, Ohio Power Siting Board, called at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 4, 2020.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4620
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481

- - -

APPEARANCES:

Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP
By Mr. Steven D. Lesser
and Mr. Trevor Alexander
1200 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of The Ohio State University.

Sierra Club
By Ms. Megan Wachspress
2101 Webster Street, 13th Floor
Oakland, California 94612

On behalf of the Sierra Club.

- - -

INDEX

- - -

INDEX

- - -

Tuesday Evening Session,

August 4, 2020.

- - -

ALJ PARROT: Everyone, as I just said, my name is Sarah Parrot. I'm the ALJ that will be conducting the hearing this evening in Case No. 19-1641-EL-BGN, which involves an application filed by The Ohio State University for a certificate to construct a combined heat and power facility on its campus in Columbus.

Due to the COVID-19 emergency that remains in effect under Executive Order 2020-01(D) issued by the Governor of the State of Ohio, and consistent with Amended Substitute House Bill 197, this public hearing is being held through Webex which enables interested persons to offer testimony on the University's Application by telephone or, video on the internet.

The hearing, as Matt said, is also being live streamed at www.youtube.com/user/pucoohio. So before we get started with our testimony I'm going, as I said, to go over some preliminary issues.

First, if you experience technical difficulties during the public hearing, you have several options. If your internet connection drops

at any point you can always try to join the Webex event by video again, or you can participate by phone. If those options are unsuccessful, please call the Board's Legal Department immediately for assistance.

Finally, if you are merely here this evening to observe, you can view the live stream event on You Tube. More information about these technical help options can be obtained through the chat feature which will be available throughout the hearing.

Please click on the chat button at any time to obtain technical assistance or to ask procedural questions during the hearing. The chat feature should not be used for any other purpose such as to offer comments about the proposed project that is the subject of tonight's public hearing. Please also be aware that chats are recorded and should not be considered private. Chats are not part of the official record for this case.

During the hearing individuals who have registered to testify should be ready to speak when I read their name from the witness list. To avoid unnecessary background noise we will keep your microphone on mute unless you are testifying.

Individuals who are testifying by video through the internet will be unmuted by the Board Staff member when it is time for their testimony. If you are testifying by telephone a Board Staff member will call you at your phone number when it is your turn to testify. Please be sure that your phone line is not busy as we get close to your name on the witness list which is posted in the docket and on the Board's website.

Also, consistent with the July 15th, 2020 Entry issued in this case, if you registered to speak at tonight's hearing, but you previously testified at the first hearing, you will not be called upon to testify again, although you may supplement your testimony by submitting written comments to the Board.

Your prior testimony is already part of the record in this case, and we want to hear from the other individuals that are waiting to offer their views to the Board tonight.

As we work our way through the witness list we ask that you bear with us as we cue up each individual to testify, which may take some time. It may also divert our attention at times from what is happening in the hearing. When this happens please

be patient and know that we are working hard to ensure that everyone on the witness list has an opportunity to participate this evening.

For this reason we ask that you keep your testimony to no more than five minutes, and avoid repetitive comments so that we have time to hear from everyone on the witness list.

Again, if you have questions about this process as the hearing proceeds, please use the chat function. With those preliminary issues now addressed, I'm going to officially get started with this hearing.

The Ohio Power Siting Board has assigned for public hearing at this time and place Case No. 19-1641-EL-BGN which is captioned in the Matter of the Application of The Ohio State University for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Combined Heat and Power Facility in Franklin County, Ohio.

As I mentioned earlier, my name is Sarah Parrot. I am an Administrative Law Judge in the Board's Legal Department, and I will be conducting the hearing. Also with me tonight are Sam Randazzo, the Chairman of the Ohio Power Siting Board and the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, and Sarah

Huffman, Executive Director with the Ohio Department of Agriculture.

I believe that Mr. Randazzo has a few words to share with us this evening.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you, Judge Parrot, and thanks to everybody for being here with us tonight. I'm not going to extend this -- I don't have any comments I want to add, I think it's more important to get on with the witness' testimony. So thanks, Judge Parrot, and also thanks to Matt Butler for doing a nice job and helping everybody to understand how to participate.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also, as Matt said, have several staff members from the Board assisting with the hearing this evening.

We have Mary Fischer and Brittany Waugaman as our event co-hosts. They are overseeing the event on Webex and You Tube. Matt Butler, Matt Schilling, and Jill Kocher will be also helping to facilitate the hearing process by monitoring the chat function, and cuing up individuals testifying by phone.

At this time I would like to take the appearances of the parties, beginning with the

Applicant.

MR. LESSER: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of The Ohio State University, the law firm of Calfee, Halter & Griswold by Steven Lesser and Trevor Alexander, 41 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. And on behalf of the Sierra Club.

MS. WACHSPRESS: Megan Wachspress on behalf of the Sierra Club, 2101 Webster Street, 13th Floor, Oakland, California 94612.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. The subject of today's hearing is an application filed by The Ohio State University for the purpose of constructing a combined heat and power major utility facility on the University's campus in Clinton Township in Franklin County, Ohio.

The proposed facility would serve as a primary source of heating and electricity for the University's Columbus campus. The Application was filed by the University on November 6th, 2019.

I would also note that the Board's Staff filed a Report of Investigation on June 15th, 2020. This report is a recommendation of the Board's Staff and does not necessarily reflect what the Board's

final determination in this case will be.

Tonight's public hearing is only one aspect of the process in this case. A public hearing was previously held on June 30th, 2020, which was followed by an evidentiary hearing on July 14th and 15th, 2020. Both of these hearings were also held through Webex.

The purpose of this evening's public hearing is to receive testimony regarding the Application from regional organizations and persons in the local community who are affected by the proposed project, and who did not already testify at the first public hearing on June 30th.

Tonight's public hearing is not a question and answer session, but is an opportunity to let the Board know what you think about the proposed project.

Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter. We have Valerie with us from Armstrong & Okey. If you plan to testify, please speak clearly so that she can accurately reflect your comments on the record.

After I finish with this introduction I will begin by inviting individuals on the witness list to speak about the proposed project. Each

person testifying tonight will be permitted to speak once about the project.

Before you present your testimony I will ask you to take an oath or affirmation that what you're about to say is the truth. I will then ask you to state your name and address for the record, followed by your comments on the proposed project.

Please be aware that you may get questions about your statement from the parties to the case, from the Chairman, from Ms. Huffman, or from me. When you're finished, the testimony that you have provided will be considered part of the official record in this case, and it will be reviewed by the Board before a final decision is made on the University's Application.

If you change your mind for any reason and decide that you do not want to testify when I read your name from the list, you can merely pass to the next witness.

At this time we are going to begin with the testimony. Our first witness this evening is James Matzorkis. And I apologize in advance I will, I'm sure without a doubt, mispronounce names this evening. I apologize for that in advance.

MR. MATZORKIS: You did fine. Can you

hear me now?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you.

MR. MATZORKIS: Great.

ALJ PARROT: We can get your video started. Just a general note to everyone, there are buttons at the bottom of the screen, you may need to click to see them. There's a little film camera icon. If you click that you'll be able to broadcast to the world.

All right. I can see you and hear you. Are you ready, Mr. Matzorkis? Raise your right hand for me.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. MATZORKIS: My name is James Matzorkis, 22540 Lennox Drive in Fairview Park, Ohio 44126.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Please proceed with your testimony.

MR. MATZORKIS: Okay. Well, the first thing that I noticed when I looked at the plan was that there are several beautiful trees on the site next to a few research greenhouses, and these would presumably all need to be removed in order to install

the 105-and-a-half megawatt combined heat and power plant. It will run on natural gas until the green hydrogen technology becomes available, and then it will transition over to that.

So this is a pretty big investment, and it will probably stay on campus for decades to come. And if the as-yet undeveloped technology does not become available quickly it will represent an investment -- a long-term investment, high volume, they call it fracturing.

Now, the thing about hydraulic fracturing is that it disfigures nature as a matter of course. In order to get the gas out of the cracks in the shale layer they have to send a pipe down through the groundwater so that the energy company can force biocides, proppants, you know, a laundry list of chemicals I cannot pronounce, mixed with thousands upon thousands of gallons of locally sourced fresh water down and in, and this fresh water is removed from the water cycle permanently.

Then that same poison has to come back up the pipe, out along with -- into the fractured shale and naturally occurring radiation that ordinarily stays safely below the water table.

Now, I'm telling you, a five year old

can sense that this is a very, very bad idea. None of the industry's plans are full proof. Spills, leaks, and fires happen, and they happen often. And even if they do manage to get the garbage down the pipe, back up without polluting the groundwater, they still have an immense amount of toxic waste to deal with.

I've seen videos. It goes like just right up into the winds, all over, you know, emits the brine right into the forced air, and the flow back winds up on these gargantuan trucks that like move up and down these little access roads, and these quiet country places, to the roads and highways. And if they manage to make it to the dump site without like a leak or a car accident happening, best case scenario, it goes into an injection well encased in concrete and metal until, you know, natural decay or else they induce site emission --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. When you get real close to your microphone you distort and I can't hear you.

MR. MATZORKIS: I'm sorry. So it ruptures and usually winds up spilling out into the earth anyway, creating brown fields. And the sludge, the radioactive sludge in the bottom of the pit is

very common to wind up in local agriculture which is simply not a good thing anyway. And then it rains and the people get sick.

So let me tell you that when OSU or anybody else tries to tell you that this power plant will reduce emissions, a carbon footprint generally, they are not counting the methane flares, they are not counting the dead trees and animals in the forest, they are not counting the long-term risks to our groundwater and our soil fertility.

They are not counting the brown fields around the injection wells, and they are certainly not counting the toll placed on thousands of rural Americans like Jillian and Eric Hunkler who got so sick she had to literally move out of her own house when the frack pad came up next door. And then she got spied on, stalked, and threatened by that company's private security guard when she started talking loud enough about it to threaten their public image.

And here we are talking about locking OSU potentially into supporting this industry, practicing the way that it practices, for who knows how long, you know. And, you know, this is just -- this is just the sad reality of fossil fuel

dependence. And it is paralyzingly depressing for me, for persons who watch us as a people just be forced to be part of it all the time, you know what I mean?

And we promised ourselves we're trying to wean ourselves off of it so we don't have to pass that dependence down to the kids. And schools, and companies, and cities tell us they are with us, and they pass these resolutions and they pass these pledges, and they pass these promises, and then something like this comes along and it demonstrates to the rest of us that that is just a bunch of public relations, you know, crap. And as someone that really cares, I'm telling you I'm not having it, and I don't think you should either. Thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for this witness?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next witness this evening is Mary Louise Hawkins.

MS. FISCHER: I do not see Ms. Hawkins listed as an attendee.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Thank you,

Ms. Fischer. I will note that.

Okay. Our third witness is Michael Bertolone. All right. I can see and hopefully I can hear you. Are you there?

MR. BERTOLONE: I'm here. Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you very good. If you could raise your right hand for me, please.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Can you state your name and address for the record, please?

MR. BERTOLONE: Yeah, Michael Bertolone, B-e-r-t-o-l-o-n-e, 1188 Dublin Road, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, and go ahead with your testimony.

MR. BERTOLONE: Thank you very much. Good evening. My name is Michael Bertolone. I'm a business representative with the Operating Engineers Local Union 18.

I'm here today on behalf of the 16,000 plus members to testify in full support of The Ohio State University combined heat and power facility.

The Operating Engineers are the individuals who operate heavy equipment such as

cranes, backhoes, excavators, bulldozers and so on. The roads and bridges that you -- most of you drive on were most likely built by the members of Local 18, along with their fellow union tradesmen and women. The members of Local 18 also perform work related to the energy and power industry, in addition to all of our road work.

If the proposed combined heat and power facility is approved then the men and women of Local 18 can look forward to being involved in another great project that would help pay into our benefits packages such as healthcare, retirement, and training while earning their wages.

The Ohio State University combined heat and power facility has a potential to create hundreds of construction jobs during its construction, as well as the ongoing maintenance jobs that come along with it.

The Ohio State University campus in Columbus has provided hundreds of construction projects over the years, and Local 18 is excited to add the proposed power facility to that list.

In closing, I would like to encourage the Ohio Power Siting Board to join the Operating Engineers in supporting The Ohio State University

combined heat and power facility and approve their Application. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Bertolone. Thank you for joining us. All right. Our next witness is Michael Engbert.

MR. ENGBERT: Hello?

ALJ PARROT: Good evening. Can you hear me?

MR. ENGBERT: Yes. Can you hear me now?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you and see you. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Could you state your name and address for the record, please?

MR. ENGBERT: Michael Engbert, 2625 Winchester Pike, Columbus, Ohio.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. And go ahead with your testimony.

MR. ENGBERT: Good evening everyone. My name is Michael Engbert. I'm a member of Labors International Union of North America Local 423 headquartered right here in Columbus, Ohio.

My fellow members gain a chance to work on this project if it is allowed to pass through and go on to the construction phase. What does that mean? That means an opportunity for dozens of my fellow brothers and sisters in Local 423. It gives them an opportunity to earn a living, and we're not just talking about regular minimum wage type jobs. The jobs that this project will create help families pay off mortgages and quite frankly to put food on the table at the end of the day.

Our members stand to make close to $30 an hour on this project. That is nothing to laugh at, that's a serious wage, and this job -- this project means jobs to our members at the end of the day.

I will say that with that being said, this project will create positive benefits for the community as the workers will be from my local union who live here in Columbus, and the surrounding area of Franklin County.

The contractor scheduled to construct the combined heat and power facility is Frank Lill, they are out of New York State, and they have much experience with building, with designing, constructing, and maintaining central heat and steam

plants all over North America. The higher education market in particular, they have plenty of experience.

They have done work all across the country for universities such as Syracuse University, Indiana University, Iowa State University, and Penn State University, just to name a few. I won't spend my whole presentation listing off all those folks.

But I can tell you that they are an experienced contractor in this field. All of the workers that are dispatched out to the contractor will have the required OSHA certifications for the project, as well as any safety training passport programs that are needed, and no one will go out there without the proper credentials to make this a safe project worksite and make sure everyone goes home safe at the end of the day.

Thank you very much for this presentation.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Engbert?

MR. LESSER: None, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

All right. Our fifth witness on the list is Evelyn Van Til.

MR. FISCHER: She's not listed.

ALJ PARROT: Don't see her on our attendee list at the moment, so I will make a note of that. All right. Next we have Cheryl Johncox.

MS. JOHNCOX: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you. Let's see if we can get your camera started. Should be a camera button at the bottom of the screen.

MS. JOHNCOX: Yep.

ALJ PARROT: Okay, very good. Can you please raise your right hand for me?

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Please state your name and address.

MS. JOHNCOX: My name is Cheryl Johncox, my address is 340 East Lake Road -- Street, Richwood, Ohio 43344.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. JOHNCOX: Good evening. I thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on this very important project. I would like to start off by requesting that a third hearing be held regarding this issue so that incoming Ohio State University

students have an opportunity to also testify.

My name is Cheryl Johncox. I am an Ohio State University alum, and a graduate from the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences, with a degree in natural resources policy and education.

I can't express enough how reckless it is for Ohio State University to propose this dirty fracked gas power plant. Fracking occurs predominantly in low income communities in Ohio with few resources to protect themselves.

Methane at toxic radioactivity, at cancer causing chemicals, pollutions, are released all along the fracking production process from punching a hole in the ground, to liquid waste flow back, open flaring, transportation through pipelines, compressing, processing, and underground injection of radioactive waste.

Ohio has the highest population, 3.1 million people in the country, living within a half a mile of oil and gas infrastructure. This area is commonly caused -- is commonly called the threat radius. That's over 28 percent of Ohio's population that is within that radius.

Within this radius people, our families,

friends, and neighbors, are significantly more likely to experience adverse health effects from a fracked gas production. There's a mountain of research linking fracking to serious birth defects including congenital heart defects, neural tube defects, infant mortality, low birth rates, preterm birth, pediatric asthma hospitalizations, and high risk pregnancy in mothers.

Incidences of hospitalization among adults living in this threat radius are statistically significantly higher. These hospitalizations occur for cardiology complications, neoplasma and blood immune system hospitalizations, skin and genitourinary hospitalizations, urinary bladder cancer, and acute lymphatic leukemia. Also of note are statistically significant increases in sexually transmitted diseases such as gonorrhea and chlamydia.

None of this even addresses the impact on the community, and on students who will be living in the shadows of this. None of this addresses the impact on the community of Columbus or on students who will be living in the shadows of this. We already know that because of economic and environmental factors, the City of Columbus, and the entire State of Ohio, have some of the nation's

highest infant mortality rates for women of color in this country.

The proposal could have been an innovative approach to carbon reduction if research on climate change, methane emission, and public policy had stopped in the year 2000, but at the moment I'm thankful that research has continued to show that methane from the entire fracking production process is one of the main drivers of our rapidly warming world, severe weather events, and environmental injustices.

Methane is a greenhouse gas on steroids. It's 87 times more powerful than CO-2 over a 20-year period. This project is outdated, a sham, and should be rejected. I also have a question for The Ohio State University as well. Will the University be rolling out public education campaigns in the City of Columbus and at every county extension office saying sorry, but we're making you sick? Thank you for this opportunity.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Johncox?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. Our next witness is Ann

Martyniak.

MS. MARTYNIAK: Hello.

ALJ PARROT: Hello.

MS. MARTYNIAK: I don't have a camera on my laptop, so...

ALJ PARROT: Okay. I'm going to ask if you could just raise your right hand for me and assure me that you've done that.

MS. MARTYNIAK: Yes, I've done that.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Very good. If you could state your name and address for the record, please.

MS. MARTYNIAK: My name is Ann Martyniak, I live at 1499 Ashland Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43212.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. MARTYNIAK: Good evening. My name is Ann Martyniak and I work at the University. I care about our environment and I care about our community. I understand the need for bridging technology. I understand that we cannot build a power plant off a hundred percent renewable energy. It is not perfect, but it is a step in the right direction.

I am a member of the campus community and I'm in full support of this project. I also live in the Grandview area. I'm about a half a mile away from the proposed location. I am steps away and I'm still in support of approving this Application. Thank you very much for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony this evening.

Our next witness on the list is James Fisher. Mr. Fisher had reached out to us in advance of the hearing to indicate that he would be unable to testify this evening. So after Mr. Fisher on the list is Aimee Ulstad.

MS. ULSTAD: Hello. Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you. Do you have a camera that we can get started?

MS. ULSTAD: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. There you are, I can see you. Very good. If you could please raise your right hand for me.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and

address for the record.

MS. ULSTAD: Aimee Ulstad, my address is 5556 Caplestone Lane, Dublin, Ohio 43017.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. ULSTAD: Just so you know, my role is as a faculty member in integrative systems engineering and a concerned citizen. As a background of my testimony, I am a mechanical engineer.

I became interested in engineering when I was in high school back during the OPEC oil embargo of 1978. I was on the debate team and I learned about a lot of interesting things around foreign oil, and many unheard of ideas at that time about new alternative energies like wind and solar, but for me it was really about energy improvement.

So at that time cars got about 8 to 10 miles per gallon, and there were scientists and engineers that said we could get 20, 30, even 40 miles per gallon. I thought this was outrageous, but that was 40 years ago, and I committed myself to working on energy improvement.

Fast forward. I spent the majority of my career in engineering working for Anheuser-Busch. I worked in many capacities in engineering,

utilities, maintenance, and finally as the resident engineer.

I've spent a lot of time working on energy efficiency. I personally spent hours tuning boilers, working on an anaerobic waste treatment plant that allowed us to burn biogas as a fuel, and we reduced our energy and water usage significantly.

Five years ago I came to Ohio State and became a faculty member in integrative systems engineering. Still working on my goals of energy efficiency, I wrote case studies on things like the through-slab HVAC, lighting upgrades and more.

And as part of these case studies we actually set up so the students could tour these actual engineering applications right in their own backyard. I say these things because I want you to know that being smart about energy usage is important to me, and has been for many years.

Now on to the CHP. Ohio State has two types of energy needs; electricity and heat. It seems weird on August -- in August to think that we need heat 365 days a year, but we do. Of course on January 10th when it's 5 degrees outside, we'll realize we need heat.

We need heat for the buildings, the

dorms, the classrooms, for sterilization in the hospital. It's very important. Heat is currently produced at the McCracken Power Plant and distributed throughout campus in underground piping and tunnels, some of witch I've toured.

The same piping leads to heat exchangers in various places like dorms. I've actually taken women engineering students on dorms -- on tours of the mechanical room dorms so that they can see what it looks like.

Steam is actually a beautiful heat transfer fluid. I have a lot of experience. It packs a large amount of energy into a small space. And you don't have to pump it with a separate large electric pump like you would water.

Steam is water vapor that flows out to all the buildings, it condenses into heat exchangers, provides heat for the dorms for example, and the remaining condensate flows back to the power plant to be revaporized. It's a highly efficient heat transfer process. It packs a large amount of heat in a small amount of space.

Because Ohio State needs both heat and electricity, the CHP is the best solution to meet their energy needs. Electricity can be generated in

multiple ways, which is true, but steam cannot be, not efficiently today. And this is a factor that really ties this project together.

The existing infrastructure consists of miles of piping and thousands of heat exchangers, all designed for steam. And that dictates that we need steam for the future, which is why we need to maintain the CHP; it not only provides electricity, but steam as well.

With this proposal the greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced by 35 percent. That means every three years we're actually going to cut one year of greenhouse gas emissions from the campus. That's phenomenal, and the reason that I support the CHP, and I hope the Power Siting Board does as well.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

MR. LESSER: No questions, your Honor.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: I have one, your Honor. This is Sam Randazzo, if I may. Your familiarity with the existing facilities, what is the fuel that is currently being used at McCracken?

MS. ULSTAD: I believe it's natural gas.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you. That's all I have. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: All right. Very good. Thank you very much, Ms. Ulstad.

All right. Our next witness is Zachary Bollheimer. I believe he indicated he needed someone to call, but I think maybe he's on our Webex event.

MR. BOLLHEIMER: I am on the phone, but I am also in there. I joined the Webex, but I --

ALJ PARROT: Okay. As long as you're connected one way or the other. If you could please raise your right hand for me.

MR. BOLLHEIMER: I am.

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Thank you.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. If you could please state your name and address for the record.

MR. BOLLHEIMER: My name is Zach Bollheimer. I reside at 520 Clinton Street, Columbus, Ohio 43202.

To the Ohio Power Siting Board, members of our community, and to all those watching this testimony, I am a neighbor to Ohio State University. I live in what the University calls the University District. I'm a past employee of Ohio State's Division of Facilities, Operations, and Development, and I am a natural resource manager, educator at the

colleges by profession.

I'm speaking here today because Ohio State University is pursuing the construction we are building -- I am calling in today because we're being pushed to be building a natural gas power plant. Our University, in my opinion, selfishly is wanting to burn more fossil fuels.

Natural gas through the extraction process actively degrades soil, air, and water quality, and lowers the quality of life in rural Appalachian Ohio, and contributes to the loss of sensitive aquatic species, species such as our numerous threatened and endangered muscles and fish, and amphibians such as our federally endangered eastern hellbenders, which is only now being reintroduced to rivers that have been --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir, you're breaking up terribly.

MR. BOLLHEIMER: Sorry. I do natural resource management for a living, and I moved back to Ohio because I didn't see anyone in Ohio really pushing for ecological change here in Ohio.

By committing to this project we are going to be continually creating an impact in the environment. Natural gas has been proven across the

board to impact water, soil, and air quality, and by ignoring that and ignoring the impacts it has upon rural Ohioans, we are just committing to this process over and over again. We need to stop that.

This project has been idealized in several of the previous testimonies by supporters for this project as something that will make people money, $30 an hour for some workers, even suggesting bringing out-of-state workers from New York.

I do not see how making money on this system, on this -- is not progress, this is money being made by a small group of people to -- it does not benefit the greater good, it does not benefit the Ohio community.

In addition, the City of Columbus has set the goal for our city to be powered by renewable energy by 2022. That is not natural gas, that is renewable energy. By approving this, or allowing this to -- this process to continue to approve this, is just unbelievable. The idea that our city around us is trying to commit to renewable energy and our Ohio State University wants to move forward with natural gas, I do not -- there's a disconnect there that I think Ohio State needs to think about and I think that the Board needs to think about.

I ask that you, the Ohio Power Siting Board, reject this proposal, and in addition to that I ask that you hold additional hearings, as holding these hearings right now while students aren't on campus, it does not facilitate listening to the community, and while we're in the midst of a pandemic it makes it very difficult for all of us. So allowing additional time would be very helpful. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Thank you. Mr. Bollheimer. Our next witness I believe is joining us by phone. That's Randi Pokladnik. I'm sorry, I'm sure I mispronounced that one.

MS. POKLADNIK: Yes. Yes, can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: We can hear you. If you could please raise your right hand for me.

MS. POKLADNIK: I have.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MS. POKLADNIK: My name is Dr. Randi

Pokladnik, my address is 86200 Tappan Highlands Road, Uhrichsville, Ohio 44683.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you.

MS. POKLADNIK: -- the proposed natural gas power plant at OSU will cut greenhouse gas emissions and be a step towards sustainability, is in fact failing to recognize several issues.

All fossil fuels create carbon dioxide when burned. Carbon dioxide persists in our atmosphere for thousands of years. This plant will be using fracked gas supplied via high-pressure hydraulic fracking.

One must also consider all the emissions of carbon dioxide stream and full cycle gas extraction, including infrastructure construction, transporter fracked water, transporter fracked waste and equipment, and energy for concrete and chemicals used.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. I'm sorry. Something beeped in or whatever. I have the advantage of lower carbon dioxide emissions.

MS. POKLADNIK: I'll just read that sentence over again.

The advantage of lower carbon dioxide emissions of natural gas is negated when we look at

the amount of methane spewing from natural gas operations every day. The methane molecule is about 90 times as effective absorbing heat in the troposphere.

The atmospheric concentrations of methane have increased by over 150 percent since the industrial revolution. Jessica Chance, an energy expert at MIT says that in order to keep from soaring above the 2 degree Celsius goal, we must keep any extra methane from leaking into the atmosphere.

Lena Hoglund Isaksson, she's a greenhouse staff expert at Austria's International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, said it's impossible to hit the climate target with methane in the mix. She also says a strong increase in global methane emissions after 2010 are explained by increased methane emissions from shale gas production in North America.

A recent study in Greenland published in the February 2020 National Geographic showed that oil and gas operations have a much bigger footprint on methane emissions than previously known.

Those operations result in methane emissions from drilling wells, transportation in pipelines, leaks, spills, and storage. The Union of

Concerned Scientists noted that preliminary studies and field measurements show fugitive methane emissions range from 1 to 9 percent of total lifecycle emissions.

In February of 2018 in Belmont County, a blowout of a natural gas well run by an Exxon Mobile subsidiary, XTO, released more methane than the annual emissions from oil and gas industries of many nations. This leak was observed by the new satellite Tropomi, a troposphere monitoring instrument which can measure methane in the atmosphere. The leak took 20 days to plug, and released about 132 tons of methane per hour according to reports from scientists. During those 20 days area residents were exposed to a highly toxic mix of air pollutants.

This proposed plant in Columbus has been exempted from analysis of emissions, but science tells us that the local residents in the area will suffer with exposures to air pollutants in the form of particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide.

What the proposal also neglects to reveal are the effects on the residents of southeastern Ohio, the area that will most likely be supplying the fracked gas. The counties of this region will be disproportionately harmed by the

continuation of an extremely destructive process. I know because I lived in one of those counties, Harrison County.

Harrison County and Belmont County are far from the Columbus campus, but it will be those counties that see more fracking waste, more water withdrawals, more truck accidents, more air pollution, more water pollution, more social externalities, more man camps, more ecosystem destruction, and more health effects.

By committing to this project the future of residents of southeast Ohio will be locked into years of caustic fracking. Their lives and communities will be sacrificed by this power plant.

I live in Harrison County, the third most fracked county in the state. I live five miles from ejection wells, six miles from water withdrawal wells. Compressor stations which emit volatile organic pollutants can be seen along the country roads.

Our rural area, which was once a beautiful setting of forests and small farms has become an industrial zone. Fracking has spread across the landscape much like cancer invades the body. Our valleys and hillsides are a spiderweb of

pipeline, one of which is less than a quarter mile from my home.

We have the Falcon Pipeline crossing the northern portion of our county, and the Rover Pipeline seven miles east of our home. Even the night sky marred by the lights from fracking won't pass.

Natural gas is not a step in the right direction towards sustainability, it's just the opposite, a step backwards that continues our reliance on fossil fuel resource that pushes the planet closer towards extinction.

This project should be ended and replaced with a true renewable sustainable energy source. The levelized cost of energy for solar and wind is already lower than that of natural gas without considering the enormous subsidies and externalities. Natural gas is just a bridge to destruction. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

MR. LESSER: No questions, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much. We are on the 12th witness on our list. It is Jordan Clark.

MR. CLARK: Yes, I'm here.

ALJ PARROT: Very good. Mr. Clark, do you have a camera? It looks like perhaps you joined by phone.

MR. CLARK: I'm on Webex as well, but I can get the audio to work better.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. That's fine. If you could just assure me you've raised your right hand.

MR. CLARK: I raised it.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Please state your name and you address for the record.

MR. CLARK: I'm Dr. Jordan Clark, my address is 544 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MR. CLARK: I'm an assistant professor at the College of Engineering at Ohio State. My research focuses on reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions attributable to commercial building operations.

I do share the broad concerns of many on this call, including the Sierra Club, with regards to the need for greenhouse gas reduction and the

mitigation of climate change. With that said I'd like to speak unequivocally in favor of the construction of the proposed CHP plant.

I see three broad reasons to move this project forward. First of all, I have read OSU's Climate Action Plan which includes the plan for construction of the CHP, and the projections of a 24 percent reduction in CO-2 as a direct result of the construction of this plant.

First of all, I believe that these numbers are reasonable. There's quite a bit of efficiencies to be gained from reducing the length over which the transmission of energy occurs, and from the secondary effect of using the heat to heat our buildings.

The other thing is in a climate like Ohio's, CHP is the first thing I would recommend to a client or anyone looking to find a large reduction in energy or emissions, and that's simply because of the fact that while Ohio is a great place to live, we don't have a lot of sun here, especially in the winter, and other than the northwest corner we also have a fairly poor wind resource.

So that means our choices are really between something like a CHP, and the status quo

which is a mix of coal-fired and natural gas-fired power plants, and not between perfectly clean renewable energy from sun or wind, and CHP.

Second of all, this is a wonderful opportunity for a living laboratory in which we can conduct research and development on community scale energy systems and to keep students in a hands-on and in-person environment.

I'm already being contacted by colleges across the country who have heard about the projects going on at Ohio State, including the CHP plant. They want to use Ohio State's campus as a living laboratory for these sorts of community scale energy systems.

Lastly, I have reviewed the Sierra Club's National Energy Resources Policy, and on page 14 it says that they speak favorably about CHP, that they agree with it completely, and I assume this was informed by experts. And I think -- like I said, I think we're on the same page when we want to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions, especially from buildings, and mitigate climate change, and I think this is one of the best ways to do that in a climate like Ohio's.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Are

there any questions for this witness?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Your Honor, I have a question for the witness. Sir, you referenced a Sierra Club policy, and a page 14. Do you know the title of that document by any chance?

MR. CLARK: Yes, I'm looking at it. It just says Energy Resources Policy. I got it off of their website, and I can track down the link if you need it. And then it's page 14 under "Combined Heat and Power." Would you like me to read it?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: No, I just -- I'd be more interested in having some -- if you have a link to the document, if you could provide that to us, that would be great.

MR. CLARK: Sure.

ALJ PARROT: And Mr. Clark, you can send that by electronic mail or submit it as a comment to the Board's website.

MR. CLARK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you, sir.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. All right. Our next witness is Christopher Hadad. Hello, can you hear me? I'm not sure I can hear you. Let's give him a minute here. Okay. I think we're ready. If you could raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. HADAD: My name is Christopher Hadad, 5890 Vandeleur Place, Dublin, Ohio 43016.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Please proceed with your testimony.

MR. HADAD: My name is Christopher Hadad, and I thank you for the opportunity to testify. I'm a professor of chemistry and biochemistry at Ohio State University.

Over the years my research team has worked on a variety of scientific projects including energy related activities from solar power conversion to improvements in batteries, as well as efficient combustion methodologies, and including funding from the U.S. Department of Energy.

In a service role I have been involved in Ohio State's Energy Advisory Committee, and our committee is a combination of faculty and staff who oversees the energy consumption and utility plans for OSU, and for all energy related decisions of the campus as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

As an example, our committee evaluates the tunnels that provide heating and cooling

capacity, distribution across campus from the existing fracking power plants, and the combined heating and power facility is critical for our campus' sustainable future, especially for hot water distribution.

I can certainly attest to the tremendous diligence in the review of the CHP facility, but it is also important to remember that the CHP plant is just one component of the University's climate, cost neutrality, and sustainability plan.

OSU has indeed invested in a variety of alternative energy sources across campus, and our committee has evaluated all of those aspects. Over the years OSU has invested in wind farms, solar power, hydrogen use, alternative transportation, as well as alternative fuels.

The CHP is consistent with our demand for heat and cooling across campus, while also consistent with current technology, and as well as fiduciary consistence.

Over all I strongly endorse the proposed project. The energy requirement and planning are required for efficient use of State resources and providing value to all aspects of OSU's mission from teaching and research, and across many different

components of our campus from medicine and health sciences, agriculture, engineering, and the rest of the University, including my College of Arts and Sciences.

As I noted, the Energy Advisory Committee has explored many different sources of energy and evaluated alternatives. OSU's climate plan is well-developed, and the CHP is just one component of the cost neutrality goals for OSU.

Indeed OSU's Sustainability Institute also advocates endorsing the CHP plant, and the plant is just one component of our goal for sustainability and for fiduciary use. I encourage you to approve the plant, and thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. We appreciate your testimony. Our next witness is Sandra Bolzenius.

MS. BOLZENIUS: Am I on?

ALJ PARROT: You are coming through. Let's see if we can get your video going.

MS. BOLZENIUS: The video I do not have.

ALJ PARROT: That's fine. If you could

assure me you've raised your right hand please.

MS. BOLZENIUS: It's raised.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: If you could state your name and address for the record.

MS. BOLZENIUS: Sandy Bolzenius, I live at --

ALJ PARROT: You're cutting in and out.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: The sending signal is cutting in and out and it sounds like you have it on hands free as well.

MS. FISCHER: Can I suggest that we give her a call and switch the witness?

ALJ PARROT: I completely missed that, but let's try that. We are going to try to see if we can reach you by phone. And while we're doing that, let's go ahead.

Our next witness No. 15 is Aaron Dunbar, and I believe he is with us on the Webex event. So let's go to Mr. Dunbar. Mr. Dunbar, can you hear me?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you and see you. If you could just raise your right hand for me.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and

address.

MR. DUNBAR: My name is Aaron Dunbar, I live at 230 4th Street in Lowell, Ohio.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MR. DUNBAR: Okay. I would first like to express -- agree with the participants before me who have suggested a third hearing, and now I'll begin my testimony.

There is evidence that the amount of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere is increasing rapidly as a result of the combustion of fossil fuels.

If the future rate of increase continues as it is at the present, it has been predicted that because the CO-2 produces radiation the temperature of our earth's atmosphere will increase, and that vast changes in the climate of the earth will result.

Such changes in temperature will cause melting of the polar icecaps which in turn will result in the inundation of many costal cities including New York and London.

The words I'd like to share with you are not my own, nor are they the words of any fellow environmentalists, instead these words come from a

publication known as The Mining Congress Journal circulated among those in the coal industry all the way back in 1966.

By 1977 oil giant Exxon Mobile was doing their own research into global warming with internal documents warning of significant changes in the earth's climate, including rainfall distribution and alterations in the biosphere as early as 1982. And Royal Dutch Shell, in 1991, produced an entire half hour educational film titled Climate of Concerns explicitly detailing the looming threat of climate change.

With the wealth of the very best science available to them, when Shell assumed the fossil fuel industry was at the utmost vanguard when it came to taking immediate and large scale action on climate change in order to avert the crisis and to preserve the state of our planet for future generations, and one would be dead wrong about that assumption.

Instead, the fossil fuel industry has spent the past half century doing its absolute damndest to convince the public that there is no threat and that we can ask all just go on caring about our business as usual.

They spent literally billions of dollars

on lobbyists, they paid off politicians, they have lied to their investors, and they've undertaken vast campaigns of climate disinformation intentionally deceiving the public to make it appear as though the science was in any way unsettled.

Now as temperatures in the Arctic reach 100 degrees Farenheit, as our CO-2 levels reach their highest point in the past 23 millions years, and as climate scientists warn that we have only a decade to cut our emissions before the damage we have done becomes catastrophic and irreversible, the industry responsible for these conditions would like very much for you to believe that we are entering the era of the fossil fuel renaissance.

Consider the following from the American Petroleum Institute's Website. Natural gas produces one half of the carbon emissions compared to coal when used to generate electricity, and since 2005 the share of natural gas and power generation has increased dramatically. That's the leading reason why levels of carbon dioxide are at their lowest in nearly 25 years.

In fact the U.S. Energy Information Administration reported that almost two-thirds of the carbon dioxide emission reductions between 2006 and

2014 are the result of fuel switching to natural gas, end of quote.

That sounds great, doesn't it? It is true in fact that burning natural gas produces about half the CO-2 emissions as coal from being used to generate electricity. However, the actual extraction and transport of natural gas is responsible for releasing huge quantities of methane into our atmosphere, greenhouse gas, considered to be up to 120 times stronger at trapping in heat than CO-2, depending on how long it's been present.

And so for a plant powered by natural gas to put out less cumulative emissions than even a coal-fired plant, the entire system must maintain an amount of methane leakage that falls below 3.2 percent.

Then there's the argument that natural gas serves the so-called middle grounds, the transition fuel designed to bridge the gap as we built our way to renewable energy; this again is untrue.

Natural gas is as abundant as it is profitable in the short-term for those responsible for its extraction. Abundant and profitable is all the fossil fuel industry needs to hear to continue

tearing apart our planet to its foundations indefinitely, even if they do everything in their power to hinder the meaningful development of renewable energy.

Living as I do in small a Appalachian community, I have by now grown used to this short of indoctrination being peddled by the natural gas industry on those of us living in so-called sacrifice zones where we're often most susceptible to the clouds by fossil fuel extraction when things inevitably go wrong.

Earlier this year Rolling Stone published a report on the dangers of radioactive material and fracking waste fluid, and our local paper, The Marietta Times, wrote an article covering the issue. Shortly thereafter the Times received a fuming response from one Kennedy Copeland of the Ohio Oil and Gas Energy Education.

It took me very little digging to find that Ms. Copeland was a former employee of the right wing nonprofit Turning Point USA, frequently a racist organization funded in part by the fossil fuel industry with an extensive history of pushing climate change denial. And so while I was skeptical of Copeland's claims, I was not thoroughly convinced of

her bad faith intentions in responding to the Times' article.

Consider the following passage found in the original Rolling Stone's piece. Many industry representatives like to say the radioactivity in brine is so insignificant as to be on par with what would be found in a banana or a granite countertop.

So when Peter, the pseudonym used for an oil and gas trucker, demanded his supervisor tell him what he was being exposed to, his concerns were brushed off. The liquid in his truck was no more radioactive than any room of your home he was told, end quote.

Hilariously it only takes Ms. Copeland three paragraphs into a letter to the Times to point out that a banana, for example, delivers a radiation dose, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, you broke up for a second.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Dunbar, I'm sorry to interrupt as well, but since we've already done it, just let you know you're past the five-minute mark as well, so if you could kind of work towards wrapping up your remote. Thank you.

MR. DUNBAR: I'm getting to the end.

A banana, for example, delivers a radiation dose, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC.

The same applies to many other items such as, but not limited to, countertops, brick houses, and cross-county flights, citing the industry has been advised fracking has been linked to a vast array of health hazards, including but not limited to respiratory problems, premature births, childhood leukemia, cardiac issues, and birth defects.

In addition to these risks, a 2015 EPA report cited over 150 occurrences of groundwater contamination as a result of fracking and shale drilling.

Though the industry of course denies it, scientists have made a strong causative link between fracking and an increased rate of earthquakes in states such as Ohio, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Arkansas.

I can personally attest that the only earthquake I have ever experienced while living in this area occurred not long ago, after the celebrated National Gas made its way in southeast Ohio. Earthquakes, radioactive water, babies being born

prematurely; these are all examples of what the fossil fuel industry considers to be externalized costs.

As one source I found succinctly put it, fracking profits go to private industry, but the public, families, and communities bear the cost of the many health complications. The same can be said for the myriad of environmental impacts as well.

If you were to listen only to those speaking on behalf of the fossil fuel industry you would be disinclined to believe that these impacts were happening at all, much less that the benevolent captains of industry should be compelled to externalize them.

Just this past week when Chris Ventura of the Consumer Energy Alliance, as far as I can tell, is an OSU grad from Columbus, who I'd wager has never once set foot in our small community, had his own letter to the editor published in my local newspaper, which basically amounted to 500 words of pure unadulterated fossil fuel propaganda.

He went on at length about the supposed myriad of benefits to natural gas extraction, citing impressive figures regarding the reduction of emissions. Though again I noticed that methane was

conspicuously absent from the list of substances mentioned.

He also went on to firmly objecting to new fossil fuel projects as energy extremists, which to me beautifully encapsulated the attitude of sheer contempt this industry has for consumers, particularly those who dare to challenge the legitimacy of their deadly suicides. And I'm almost done, I promise.

The fossil fuel industry lies; it's simply what they do. They lie about clean coal, they lie about the size of oil spills, they lie about regulating themselves. They have lied for decades and continue to lie about climate change robbing us of the dwindling opportunity we might have had to immediately address the issue on a measurable scale.

And now, true to character, they are lying their through teeth about natural gas, at a time when we know that we must leave an estimated 80 percent of fossil fuels in the ground if we are to have even a snowball's chance of averting the catastrophe they have unleashed upon us.

I truly feel that your students, faculty, staff, and community are being sold a bill of goods and will in due time come to regret the

decision to move forward with the facility being discussed here this evening.

I strongly urge all parties involved to reconsider this plan and to redouble their efforts at coming up with clean renewable and sustainable sources of energy. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak with you this evening, and thank you all very much for your time. And I'm sorry for going over.

ALJ PARROT: Are there any questions for Mr. Dunbar?

MR. LESSER: No questions.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. I think we're going to go back to Sandra Bolzenius, I believe is on the phone.

MS. BOLZENIUS: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you. Again, I believe we have already sworn you in, so I'll just remind you you're still under oath.

I believe we have your name and address on the record. So if you'd go ahead and start again with your testimony, please.

MS. BOLZENIUS: Okay. Thank you. I have a few properties in walking distance to OSU, so

I'm talking to you about in this from a business perspective. My tenants attend OSU, I also live in this University neighborhood, and I love it.

I'm just concerned about my business and the environment, which of course go hand in hand. OSU scholars and my tenants have a healthy fear of fracking. If one potential student finds out that OSU is building a natural gas plant as a product of fracking, that we know about now, they will reject OSU as a place to study. I know I would, and students feel the same. Students do not want to financially, or much less morally, support fracking.

And we've seen in our State legislature of late the energy industry will do anything it must to prop up this propaganda in this case that fracking and natural gas is safe, clean, and let's not forget, will lead to jobs, jobs, jobs, maybe for a short time, but not permanently. None of this is true for a college coed.

Please note that students -- actually top tier students will have their choice of universities. They are not going to choose ones with a great big natural gas plant on its main campus. Students know fracking and natural gas is dangerous. The process and the pipeline leaks, explodes, causes

earthquakes, harms property, sickens people, and on and on, which some of the testimonies have already gone into.

I also know that it's dangerous, and that it's a dying industry. These two factors, the dangerous operations and the dying industry put together -- put together, what do we have? We have threats of accidents, and eventually things leak. This happens time and time again. And who foots cleanup bill? It's the locals.

Like most small business owners I operate on a low profit margin. Just about everything I make goes back into my business, my houses. Yet I'll be paying for the dangers to our University and for the wider city in lost revenues of student tenants and higher taxes to pay for the cleanup.

OSU scholars, current and future, are not stupid. Those who have a viable stake will surely prefer to attend a university that genuinely supports sustainable energy, not pushes the old tag line that natural gas is a sustainable energy for the future.

This plant is a bad idea for all campus businesses and property owners around the University.

We stand to lose our livelihood, and for what? For a dying industry?

When word gets out that OSU -- and I guarantee you it will make headlines -- that OSU is building a natural gas plant on campus, I guarantee you that we'll lose students. Meanwhile, an accident will kill various businesses -- area businesses and like mine, literally will kill them financially and literally -- quite literally. This is dangerous stuff we're talking about.

If you want to help OSU, its students, and the community and businesses prosper, then don't give into the fracking industry. It's a false science on the fracking industry. People are not asking for this to happen. The industry is coming in and saying this is what we want to do, putting in way too much natural gas. We have got to find other ways.

If you want to really help the industry and small businesses -- like you want to help small businesses like me and the students, invest in generally clean sustainable alternative energy, wind power, solar, but not anything to do with the fossil fuel industry. It makes no sense to invest in something that is going out of -- going out anyway.

It's a dying industry.

This plant will detrimentally affect my businesses. So don't take my word for it, schedule a third hearing, this time when students are in session and students are available, and see what they have to say about it. Thank you very much.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for this witness?

MS. WACHSPRESS: No.

ALJ PARROT: All right. Thank you very much. Our next witness is Val Middle (sic), and are you there? Can you hear me?

MS. MIDDLETON: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: And you just need to confirm you are Val Middle. You're on only by your first name on our Webex event.

MS. MIDDLETON: It's Val Middleton.

ALJ PARROT: If you could please raise your right hand for me?

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MS. MIDDLETON: My name is Val Middleton, I live at 78 Scottwood Court in Delaware, Ohio 43015.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Please go ahead with your testimony.

MS. MIDDLETON: I wanted to say that I know there's a lot of people in here that are very knowledgeable and understand the science and the issues of this plant being proposed to be built on the OSU campus. And I know that the gas industry, as someone had already mentioned just a little while ago, ensures how safe everything will be and that there's procedures and protocols and backup plans and ensure safe measures are in place in worst case scenario, but accidents happen.

And just today there was a -- luckily it was a Category 1, or tropical storm, at the -- I can't say the name -- that headed up the east coast of the United States today, and if that had been a larger -- stayed a larger hurricane a lot more damage could be done to places that have a lot of safety protocols in place to make sure things don't go wrong, especially in the gas and oil industry.

And there's also flooding, tornadoes. And I'm mentioning these storms because they are unpredictable and you can't control them no matter how hard you try. And you can't control things that go wrong such as earthquakes or other natural or

unnatural disasters that can occur at a power plant, especially that runs off of fracking. There's no safety plan for weather alone.

I know that they say that the industry is extremely safe and they may have protocols for weather and procedures and safety plans to prevent accidents, but they are not a hundred percent -- they are not a hundred percent safe because they can't protect a hundred percent.

So if there's a problem or anything that goes wrong on this plant, the whole city is going to know, the whole city is going to see it burning for hours and hours and hours.

And that's not to mention the destruction that could be occurring around it, or the environmental issues with the smoke and the soot that is falling down that people are breathing in. We already have enough issues going on with lung issues.

So people will see it and know about it and wonder why Ohio State, which is supposed to be a higher learning institute, would decide to do -- sacrifice safety over people's lives, you know, with people -- people's lives and the livelihood and well-being overall.

So I think a lot of other people

mentioned things I was going to mention today, but I think a lot of people are going to think twice about attending OSU after this happens, and especially if they have got health issues, especially if they have some sort of asthma or other lung issues that they will need to pay attention to where they go, what they are around.

And so I think that's all I have for right now. And just thank you, and hope -- that I don't think that this has anything to do with safety and the people, I think it has more to do with profit.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Thank you. I think we lost our witness from the camera view. Were there any questions?

MR. LESSER: No questions.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Thank you very much. Witness No. 17 on our list is Colin Odden.

MR. ODDEN: Hi there. I'm showing my video. Can you see me?

ALJ PARROT: I can, and I can hear you as well. If you could please raise your right hand for me.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and

address for the record.

MR. ODDEN: My name is Colin, C-o-l-i-n, Odden, O-d-d-e-n. I live at 407 Wyandotte, W-y-a-n-d-o-t-t-e, Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43202.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony, please.

MR. ODDEN: Thanks so much for having me. I'm an OSU alumnus. I'm currently the Assistant Chief Research Information Officer of the College of Medicine and Wechsler Medical Center. I emphasize that I do not speak on behalf of my employer.

I'm also grateful to have been with the University for nearly three decades, and that's been half a mile from campus, and I raised my child here where they went to the Sophie Rogers Laboratory School from preschool, so I'm embedded in the University. My father was faculty, my child has gone to school at OSU. I'm a lifer here.

I'm not here to raise concerns about myself or my household, or even my neighborhood. The core of my concern and my present objection to the CHP proposal as it's currently written is its neglect to properly consider the significant negative impact on Ohio communities affected by the extraction and transport of fracked gas, communities who deserve

equal consideration to me or to anyone who stands to benefit from the CHP.

I want to note that in the proposal all Ohio State faculty staff and students on providing comment today, they have the same access as I do to the scholarly literature and other resources that illuminate the severe impact on communities that are unlucky enough to be close to fracking operations. I'm seriously concerned at the omission of those considerations.

It's been consistent with diligent scholarly practice, and failure to draw on expertise at Ohio State, they could have better eliminated these concerns.

Ohio State is a land grant University. It works in the service of the State dating back to the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1861. It's one of the things that makes me proudest to be a Buckeye. Its work and service to all Ohioans manifested through expansion of educational opportunity, but it's also done amazing work -- Ohio State has done amazing work engaging communities statewide on matters that are critical to health and wellness and to the State's livelihood.

I am very proud to have worked on

several projects here at Ohio State related to addressing statewide health crises, including infant mortality and preterm birth, as well as the social and environmental deterrence of adverse health outcomes that harm lives and livelihoods, especially among our most vulnerable citizens.

These determinants include factors such as proximity to fracking, they are associated with severe health issues including, but not limited to, those adverse outcomes that could significantly elevate the risk of infant deaths.

OSU is a leader in production of knowledge for the public. It is wonderful how, in recent years, it has really turned its emphasis outward towards the State, and shared its knowledge and intervened on behalf of Ohioans, and I don't see how this proposal is consistent with that spirit and mission.

Again, I have no concerns about the safety for my neighborhood, what I'm concerned about is proximity to key elements of the process. I recommend the paper, again available to everyone at Ohio State, including other commentators who are my colleagues, "Distance: A Critical Aspect For Environmental Impact Assessment of Hydraulic

Fracking."

I want to acknowledge real limits on the availability of more ideal energy sources without these impacts. I know there are tradeoffs, I know there are challenges, but this hearing is not a referendum on energy alternatives, it's about this particular proposal and its acceptability or not on its own merits. And I'm claiming that those considerations must include the impact on Ohioans who the State and Ohio State University serves through its public mission and public funding, including some of the counties in southeastern Ohio from whom some of our speakers -- on whose behalf some of our speakers have raised concerns.

I just want to say a prior speaker and faculty member made reference to support for CHP in a Sierra Club policy. I looked that up on the call and I notice he did not cite page 18 in the same document that in no uncertain terms advises against natural gas; I'm concerned that he just didn't make it past page 14.

I also want to note that the arguments made in favor of the plant's construction fall short of actually supporting this particular plant. Those are arguments for job creation, they are not

arguments for this plant compared to with an alternate proposal that could have been brought forth.

The plant's construction will also create demand for healthcare work, especially in southeastern Ohio, for reasons that have been raised on this call and should be well understood by all.

So I heard zero arguments from job perspectives that would not be equally valid for a power solution that does not bring such significant liabilities for other parts of our state. Thanks very much for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Odden? Thank you very much. All right. Our next witness is Dennis Pales. I believe he's joining us by phone.

MR. PALES: Yes. Hello?

ALJ PARROT: Can you hear me, Mr. Pales?

MR. PALES: I can.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Very good. If you could assure me that you have now raised your right hand.

MR. PALES: Yes, I've raised my right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. PALES: Dennis Pales, my address is 65 West Maynard Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43202.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony, Mr. Pales.

MR. PALES: Thank you. Hello. I'd like to thank the Board for giving me the opportunity to speak today, although I wish this hearing and project wasn't taking place or being pushed through during a pandemic where decreased public participation is likely and the democratic process is truly undermined. Nonetheless, I'm so grateful for the opportunity to have the voice of the community heard in some capacity today.

My name is Dennis, and I'm a student at Ohio State. When I first toured Ohio State in the Columbus area I was impressed by how much the University and the City of Columbus appeared to value sustainability, and how much sustainability initiatives were emphasized off campus in other areas.

I believed that the community's values are an issue that really is tremendously important to young people aligned with my own values. I'm sure

that many of my peers feel the same way.

To hear that the same University and local decisionmakers are now also considering potentially okaying the construction of a gas plant that runs counter to the goals of anyone who really values environmental protection in taking care of our most vulnerable is extremely disheartening.

This does not reflect the desires and values that Ohio State students and the University commutes. While I have heard from others that this is in the best interest of the community and something a majority of students want, I know that that is not true.

It appears that the University and local officials have maybe not made significant effort to actually find out what the students want, but I have some information that hopefully will guide your decision and actually illustrate students' of Ohio State and other community members' desire.

Personally I wanted to echo the words of my friends, neighbors, and fellow community members on why this plant is a terrible idea for a variety of environmental and economic reasons. Others have and will say a great deal on why a gas plant is terrible for those reasons, and I absolutely agree with them.

However, I wanted to focus on what Ohio State students actually expect from their University and local officials. Less than two years ago the 51st General Assembly of the undergraduate student government voted unanimously to approve a resolution to urge Ohio State to commit to 100 percent renewable energy on its campus, and adjust their sustainability goals accordingly.

I want to emphasize that this resolution passed unanimously. There were no students that came out against this initiative, no one who wanted us to adopt fracking instead of renewable energy, and there's absolutely no disagreement among the elected representatives of the General Assembly. Every elected representative of the undergraduate student body voted for this initiative because we believed in a renewable future, and not one based in the thinking of the past.

It is hard to get every single student senator to agree on something of significance, but clearly this issue is that important. As someone who helped draft this resolution I wanted to make it especially clear that a future of natural gas with fracking was out of the question.

What good is the category of renewable

energy at this late hour? It is why one of our clauses state, and I quote, and be it further resolved that the Ohio State University will avoid taking action that could increase the use of fossil fuel or delay the transition to 100 percent renewable energy.

I have submitted a copy of this resolution as an exhibit item that I think confirms its unanimous passage by the General Assembly which can be found on the document as well, clearly as students that absolutely reject any action that would delay the transition to 100 percent renewable energy and building a new gas plant on campus would certainly be against the wish of the students.

This plant would go against the wishes of unified division of the undergrad student body and undermine the voices of students, University, and local officials repeatedly claim to value. Students are tired of symbolic gestures and victories that do little to actually support the --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, could you start over again, you were a little garbled, with students are tired of symbolic gestures and victories, and slow down just a little bit?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Yes, please slow

down.

MR. PALES: Okay. Students are tired of symbolic gestures and victories that do little to actually support sustainability on campus, and we're ready for those in power actually listen to student voices, students who live and make our homes in Columbus.

Students make Ohio State and the University area what it is. We're tired of having our voices feel like they mean nothing. There is no way I could justify this project when a vast majority of students are against it. Others can claim that most students support this, but I have seen no evidence to suggest that. And in fact, I have provided proof that students overwhelmingly reject things like this, and any plan to the contrary is false.

Students do not want this plant in our community and we want actual sustainable solutions that reflect a plan that is 100 percent renewable.

I am also deeply concerned that such a big issue is being pushed through in a time when many students and local residents have not returned home to Columbus, in a time of unprecedented turmoil and inaccessibility that form the democratic

participation.

For this reason I believe a third hearing should take place, or the consideration of this project be delayed. However, if this does not occur, I strongly urge the Board to reject this proposal for the numerous environmental and other health concerns, as well as the fact that most students, community members, and voters do not want this. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Mr. Pales. Are there any questions for this witness?

MR. LESSER: No questions.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much.

MR. LESSER: Thank you very much.

ALJ PARROT: No. 19 on our list is Zane McNulty. I do not believe that Mr. McNulty is on the call. I'm going to make a note of that. No. 20 on the list is Bryn Hendrickson. Are you able to hear me?

MS. HENDRICKSON: Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: Another person who is here by first name only, so I want to confirm you are Bryn Henderson?

MS. HENDRICKSON: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: If you could please raise

your right hand for me.

(Witness sworn.)

MS. HENDRICKSON: I do.

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MS. HENDRICKSON: My name is Bryn Hendrickson, and I live at 1615 North Fourth Street.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. HENDRICKSON: Thank you. So I'm Bryn. I am going into my third year at Ohio State. I was born in Columbus and I've lived here for the past two years. I would like to request that a third hearing on this matter be scheduled as many students are not aware of this proposal, and will be moving in this month and beginning a new semester.

So there needs to be further consideration into the long-term effects on the environment and the residents of Columbus and Ohio. Fracking severely impacts the environment in so many ways. It appears there's part related to toxic chemicals and emits methane into the atmosphere. I do not believe that fracking is in the best interest of the University, City of Columbus, and State of Ohio, or the world as a whole.

I'm particularly worried about the plant's affects on air quality and how it will affect the health of Columbus residents and Ohio State students and staff. Processing fracked gas discharges toxic chemicals into the air that leads to increased risks of cancer with chronic exposure. I'm concerned for the health and safety of OSU students and all residents of the city, including my grandmother who lives very close to the campus where the plant will be built.

We need to do everything we can to limit greenhouse gas emissions in order to mitigate the effects of climate change, and we are quickly approaching the point of no return, and decisions that are made in the next decade will determine the future of our world.

I believe Ohio State can do more to reduce its carbon emissions and invest in green energy. I urge you to think about who will profit from this plant and who will ultimately face the negative externalities of it. So I urge you to reject this proposal, and request another hearing be held. Thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much. All right. No. 21

on our list is Carolina Lopez-Ruiz. Can you see and hear me? Can you hear me? She is moving to another room, so let's give her just a minute.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Looks like she's muted as well.

MS. LOPEZ-RUIZ: Is that better? Now I will talk to you now.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Very good. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MS. LOPEZ-RUIZ: Carolina Lopez-Ruiz, and I live in 4498 Dominion Boulevard, Columbus, Ohio 43214.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. LOPEZ-RUIZ: Thank you so much for your attention and for holding a second hearing. I want to say that I speak as a member of the community, a resident of Columbus for 15 years, and an OSU employee. I am a professor there and outgoing University Senator in Arts and Sciences.

I do not speak on OSU's behalf or on that of any organization in particular. I want to

express my opposition to OSU's new gas plant on campus, and to also ask the Siting Board to deny the permit as it is now. It is not too late for OSU to hit the pause button and take the higher road. First, this is just not the time.

Perhaps when the plant started to take form years ago it seemed like a halfway good solution to cap emissions to some degree while meeting the needs of the University in an affordable way even for later, the better path open of aiming for fuel renewable and sustainable energy.

This is a general message, without going into details, that I gathered from conversations I had asking about this to other parties, and for instance at meetings, and the students. I found it ironic last year that they created a Sustainability Institute which was a really high investment, economic investment, precisely it seems at the same time as the plant was moving forward.

If OSU wants to be an example of caring about sustainable energy and investing in it, this is the time to show it. Other Ohio universities are doing so and are way ahead of us. And I won't mention all of them, but there's quite a long list.

OSU should aim for a higher goal and

lead the way. We wouldn't patch a crack on the roof of our house with poor material just because it would work for now, even if it will damage the house structure, right? Cheaper in the end costs more and signals a lack of leadership, and we are giving attention and making a better house for everyone. A house metaphorically, of course, is our campus, our city, our planet, and we all know we cannot keep relying on natural gas unlimited resource, especially extracted by fracking.

As my OSU colleague Professor Enrico Bonello said, who is a molecular and clinical ecologist, the plant will produce substantial amounts of particles that will make the air more toxic for OSU and all Columbus community, lowering the quality of life and increasing the cost of care for people with chronic asthma and other conditions. He said, and others have said, we don't know the exact impact of this because OSU got an exemption from the environmental impact analysis that is otherwise usually required.

I also learned from him that the plant means the demolition of perfectly operational and state-of-the-art greenhouses, but even the economic aspect in that sense it's not a -- even in the

economic sense it's not a good investment.

I agree with the recent testimony of my colleague Michael Birdy, that not only is renewable energy cheaper than natural gas now, but the price of renewable energy will keep dropping relentlessly, so its price advantage over natural gas will keep growing as well.

Indeed, as more shale gas companies go bankrupt because they can't compete with renewable energy pricing and make a profit, the price of natural gas is likely to rise in the long term. That is why it does not make sense to make a decade-long commitment to natural gas right now. It would become a major money looser in the end from that point of view.

Now going to a pollution aspect that others have covered better, that the entire historical moment goes against this sort of investment right now. Even at the local level, OSU's plant would work at cross purposes with the city's own plans received entirely to renewable energy in the next few years.

Then comes the reality of global warming, the words global crisis, only now temporarily overshadowed by another disaster of the

global pandemic. Then comes the pandemic itself. Less bad than coal is not nearly good enough for our time and circumstances when there is no decade to lose, and it shouldn't be for OSU.

And finally, I want to encourage and request that the Siting committee hold a third hearing, and all the town voice when school is back in school activity, or whatever activities the campus allows, and that it extends its period of deliberations for what it takes to make the right decision. Thank you very much for listening.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for this witness?

MS. WACHSPRESS: No.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Our next witness on the list is Yasmeen Quadri. I do not see that she is on our Webex event. I'm going to make a note of that.

Witness No. 23 is Pierlutigi Bonello who had indicated to the Board in advance of the hearing that he would not be able to testify this evening, he had submitted written comments to the docket.

Witness No. 24 is Stephanie Stockar. Can you hear me?

MS. STOCKAR: Yes, I can.

ALJ PARROT: If you could raise your right hand please.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address for the record.

MS. STOCKAR: Stephanie Stockar, 1180 Pennsylvania Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. STOCKAR: Thank you, and good evening everyone. My name is Stephanie Stockar. I'm an Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The Ohio State University. My research is in optimum control of energy systems, specifically the objective operation to reduce energy usage and emissions associated with the building sector as well as the commercial and residential buildings. I also would like to note that I'm not speaking on behalf of the University in my testimony.

As many other witnesses during this hearing, I also show concern about the urgency of radioactivity emissions as well as the certain -- the natural gas for the CHP system.

I do believe that now it's time to push in the direction of reducing future emissions, and

considering the location of -- well, Columbus to Ohio, as well as the technology that Ohio State is currently relying on for heating and electricity production. I do believe that the proposed project is a step in the right direction, is an improvement compared to the current status.

Specifically in my testimony I would like to focus on the unique research platform that if the CHP system is built at Ohio State will be provided to Ohio State faculty, researchers, and students for both research and educational purposes.

This represents having a medium-sized CHP facility within the University, and having the ability to collaborate with the management of the facility will provide us a unique platform for analyzing generation's consumption data, the study of advanced control algorithms, and modern technology design approaches.

In particular it will allow us to explore the integration of renewable energy systems in CHP systems, which is fairly common right now, especially in Europe. So this facility will provide collaboration among OSU faculty, companies and national laboratories, and this collaboration will support the development and -- the implementation and

development of cutting edge technology.

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you slow down just a little bit?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Yes, Professor, this is Sam Randazzo. I just want to stress how important it is for the reporter to be able to understand what you're saying because she is the one that is responsible for making sure that all of your testimony gets in the record.

So I know it may be more comfortable for you to move quickly, but please go as slowly as you can to make sure the reporter is understanding what you're saying. Thank you.

MS. STOCKAR: Thank you. So this facility will provide collaboration among OSU faculty, companies and national laboratories, and this collaboration will support the development and the implementation and development of cutting edge technology.

Beyond research, the CHP system will provide a hands-on experience to train the next generation of engineers related to energy efficiency, which is of crucial importance right now in the area. I would like to thank everybody for the ability to speak this evening at this hearing, and thank you

everyone.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Stockar?

MR. LESSER: No, thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. Witness No. 25 on our list is Katie Gaffney. I believe she is joining us by phone.

MS. GAFFNEY: Hello.

ALJ PARROT: Ms. Gaffney, if you could please assure me that you have raised your right hand.

MS. GAFFNEY: Yes.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right very good. State your name and address, please.

MS. GAFFNEY: My name is Katie Gaffney, my address is 144 East Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. GAFFNEY: Okay. So I am Katie Gaffney. I am a recent graduate of Ohio State, I graduated this past spring, and I am the former Vice-President of the OSU sector of the Society For Ecological Restoration, an organization that looks at

heat and power plants, and we would ask that please hold a third meeting for -- a third hearing after OSU has returned to school so that more students are aware of the proposed project and may speak out.

I know of many, many students who have no idea that this is going on and are shocked and appalled when I tell them that this is happening.

All right. So first of all, OSU is committing to this for decades. That is a very -- this is a long-term commitment, and we do not have a long time to combat climate change.

First, the Clean Air Act analysis has been deemed unnecessary because OSU is a nonprofit educational institution, so they are not required to conduct an analysis. This is unacceptable. We need to know what impact the plant will have so we can make an informed decision about the proposed project.

As has been discussed before, fracking has many negative impacts. There are methane flares, toxic water waste and the water is also extremely salty. If this water spills on the fields or gets into aquifers that's bad news, we're in trouble. Our water source will be contaminated and fields will not be able to grow once that salty water is on our fields. They won't be able to grow for years. Those

farmers will not have that land anymore.

Fracking also cracks the bedrock and can cause earthquakes, and the negative impacts are mainly on communities that are further away from OSU, and they are often lower income communities.

Overall, fracking is not a clean source of energy. It may be better than coal-powered plants, but it is not clean. We need clean energy because we are running out of time to address the planet crisis.

There are other alternatives, alternative energies that are available. There are jobs in building renewable infrastructure. This plant is not the only way for jobs to be created. We have the O'Shaughnessy Dam on the Scioto River which is currently being serviced, but will be open again in a couple years. Central Ohio Bioenergy, it is biogas developing, and then Columbus -- the Columbus website says the Division is also exploring other renewable energy options like solar to help the city meet its goals.

So this plan is proposed to get away from dependency on AEP, but it isn't a good plan. Community Choice Aggregation has been proposed for Columbus and will be voted on in November with the

goal of Columbus being on 100 percent renewable energy by 2022.

So I was wondering, when I saw that Columbus was supposed to be 100 percent renewable by 2022, well, how are we going to do that? It is through the Community Choice Aggregation program. If this is voted through it would be an opt out program, people would automatically be enrolled, which would push the community toward more renewable energy, which must be taken into account when OSU is saying that getting off the grid is going to be much better for the environment. Aggregation will allow for us to buy other energy other than AEP's, and then the fracked gas company.

It has also been found across Community Choice Aggregations in the United States, when compared to other energy, fossil fuels and nuclear, they have higher renewable energy portfolios obviously, and they still maintain competitive rates for energy.

We need to have a better plan, and a better plan for all of Columbus is coming, so at the very, very least I ask that the Board holds off on approving this plan to at least see if Columbus approves the Community Choice Aggregation plan.

If the plant is going -- if this power plant plan is going to be pushed through, it at the very least needs revisions. One, the -- there needs to be an analysis under the Clean Air Act guidance -- guidelines that will be conducted, and it needs to be conducted and analyzed before the construction of this plant.

Two, if this plant is pushed through, there must also be at least continued investment in renewable so that the University is not solely relying on natural gas.

And three, I was reading that there is consideration that in the future this could be used as a biogas plant. With the Central Ohio Bioenergy Company, I believe that there should be more consideration for at least -- if this plant is going to be built despite the disagreement of the majority of the student body, then biogas should at least be considered before using fracked gas. This way we can at least be collecting greenhouse gases that may otherwise enter the atmosphere from decomposition; this is from landfills and human waste, et cetera.

So we're quickly approaching a point of no return in regards to the planet. This fracked gas plant may be an improvement to grid power, but we

need a better plan for emission reduction. Our planet is going through traumatic changes and it's only getting worse. We need to be a part of the solution, not a part of the problem, and right now we're not really being part of the solution. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Gaffney? All right. Thank you very much. The next witness on our list is Zoe Crist.

MS. CRIST: Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can.

MS. CRIST: Okay. Can you see me?

ALJ PARROT: I need to confirm you are Zoe Crist. Is that correct?

MS. CRIST: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: If you would please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Please state your full name and address.

MS. CRIST: My name is Zoe Crist, and I live on 345 East 13th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio. I am testifying as an extremely concerned citizen of Columbus, Ohio and also the United States.

This -- I actually recently learned about this gas plant, and I have a few points I'd like to make. So one, the issue is it's very ironic that Ohio State is pushing for this gas plant even though there are many reviews and research papers out there if you -- that you can find with a simple Google on the internet, and many researched topics by Ohio State, itself, about the negative effects of fracked gas and the processing. And so I really just don't understand how this plant is even being justified at this point.

From the long term of health views, Franklin County has already been given an F in air quality by the American Lung Association, and so like not only are the climate change effects huge on the long-term and the short-term scale, the health of the citizens I feel like should be number one, and it really just doesn't make sense.

Fracked gas causes earthquakes, it ruins the air quality with the release of carbon monoxide and methane into the environment and the air. It ruins gallons and gallons of water. It's only like 10 percent of the water can actually be reused after the natural gas has been processed. And already with Ohio being worried about its water

supply and the water quality, I don't understand how that's being justified.

I think this opportunity could present an incredible amount of green research and jobs. Earlier it was said that this is going to be essentially like a living laboratory and a living experiment that's student will be able to look into.

I think we should allocate our resources into something that will actually be viable in the future, and make the future viable itself. Instead of trying to teach our students about fracked gas, we should be using our resources to learn about solar power and renewable energy and long-term energy storage and generators, and use this opportunity like to think about the future instead of the present.

So I think Ohio State should take responsibility to set precedent not only as a University, but also as a power plant in America, because I feel like not only do we have the resources, but we also have the brain power to do so.

Something I'd like to point out is clearly the people who are responsible for this gas plant know the risks and have been well educated, but they don't care, which is, I think, extremely dangerous that we are allowing the future of not only

the environment, but also the citizens of Franklin County and of Ohio be put into the hands of these obviously selfish people.

There are definitely a lot better ways to create jobs that will not only be long-term as with more need for renewable energy comes, Ohio State can supply that energy and create the long-term conditions that will actually be beneficial to our economy and our state and environment.

Also I want to point out that recently the State has been made aware of a $60 million scandal that has cost the taxpayers $1.5 billion to build the nuclear energy plant and to support that in policy, so I think we as citizens should be extremely critical right now of the types of people and companies and entities who are trying to invest in the power of Ohio state, because obviously there are some snakes in the grass and we should be investigating as thoroughly as possible into the real intentions of the people trying to push so hard for this.

It seems as if they have been trying to push it forward while the students were not on campus to be able to speak out against it and to get the accurate information. And it kind of feels like they

are trying to back door this like multimillion dollar investment instead of actually critically figuring out what is best for the communities. So thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Crist?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Your Honor, this is Sam Randazzo. I do have a couple of questions. Ms. Crist, are you a student at Ohio State?

MS. CRIST: Yes. Excuse me. I'm a third-year environment science student.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Yes. And you indicated you just recently found out about this project, did I understand you correctly?

MS. CRIST: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: And how did you find out about it?

MS. CRIST: I found out about it from the Sierra Club and fellow students who are -- were advocating against it.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: And do you know whether or not they have attempted to reach out to other students to make them aware of this proceeding?

MS. CRIST: Yes, there is definitely a movement trying to get more students involved and aware on social media.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: All right. And the -- if you know, are you aware that Ohio University already uses natural gas to meet its heating requirements?

MS. CRIST: I am aware, yeah.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Are they currently using, as you call it, fracked gas?

MS. CRIST: I'm not exactly sure where all of Ohio State's energy and heating sources come from, but I do know that there has been a lot of legislation and movement throughout the years to get fracked gas in Ohio, and it's been proven many times that that is not best for Ohioans for many reasons.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Have you reviewed the Path to Carbon Neutrality, Ohio State's Climate Action Plan?

MS. CRIST: I am aware that they are --

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: My question to you is have you reviewed it?

MS. CRIST: No.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you. That's all I have.

MS. CRIST: Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Anything else? All right. Thank you, Ms. Crist. All right.

Witness No. 27 on our list is Nicolas Renouil. Can you please raise your right hand?

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MR. RENOUIL: My name is Nicolas Renouil and I live at 2300 Wolfe Ranch Parkway, Georgetown, Texas, 78628.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MR. RENOUIL: First off I do want to thank the Ohio Power Siting Board and Chairman Randazzo for the opportunity to speak on the Ohio State University's proposed CHP.

To give you a little bit of background about myself and why I care about this issue despite living in a different state, I graduated from Ohio State just last year where I was deeply involved in sustainability on campus.

One would achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions not by pulling resources away from the campus community, but instead by operating more efficiently. To this end, I interned within my junior and senior years where I mapped out the entire campus' energy consumption each year.

Although I may no longer live on campus, as someone who cares deeply about sustainability and the University community, I wanted to speak out in support of the proposed combined heat and power plant.

The main reasons why I support the CHP are because it will make the University more energy efficient and sustainable, it will increase the campus' energy resilience, and it offers the opportunity to increase the campus' share of renewable energy without increasing the price of power.

To my first point, CHP has a potential to be far more efficient than generating electricity and heat separately. Indeed, when electricity and heat are generated separately, roughly 45 to 55 percent of the available energy will typically be lost.

In contrast, CHPs have the potential to house that loss, converting 65 to 85 percent of the available energy into usable power. Additionally, somewhere between 8 and 15 percent of electricity generated off-site is then further lost during the transmission process.

The fact that the CHP will be a local

resource will allow the University to eliminate much of this transmission loss resulting in greater energy efficiency for the campus.

Taken together, these characteristics of CHP will likely allow the University to drastically decrease the amount of primary energy required to meet its heating and electricity needs, as well as displace energy coming from the local power grid, of which 46.8 still comes from coal in Ohio as of 2018.

By decreasing the amount of resources consumed and displacing old carbon intensive power sources with a CHP, the University will immediately and drastically cut down the amount of greenhouse gases it produces by an estimated 35 percent in the first year of operation.

Another important benefit of the CHP is that it will increase the campus' energy resilience. Of course it's incredibly disruptive when the power goes out at home, when the power in question is supplying a major medical campus, ensuring that medical staff are able to perform lifesaving operations and keeping critical equipment like ventilators working by ensuring 100 percent electrical uptime is crucial.

Building predictable on-site generation

resources like the CHP will allow the University to increase its energy resilience, so that even in the event if the external grid were to be disrupted, its core power needs could still be met.

The last benefit that I see to the CHP is that it will allow the University to increase its share of renewable without raising the cost of power. Indeed CHP can provide lower energy costs for the user by displacing a higher price purchase of electricity and boiler fuels with lower cost self-generated electricity, and recover thermal energy, energy which otherwise would have gone to waste.

With those savings the University could and should absolutely invest in securing additional renewable power at no additional cost to the campus community, something that was highlighted in the University's 2020 Climate Action Plan.

The reality is that CHP and renewable power technology can play complimentary roles. Not only can a CHP help make renewable energy financially feasible for the University without pulling resources away from students and faculty, but since the CHP can be ramped up and down to meet campus energy needs my understanding is that it could be ramped down to

avoid curtailing renewable energy when output is high, and then ramped back up to avoid pulling on the State grid when renewable output is low.

I'd also like to point out a number of people have highlighted concerns around using natural gas. The Ohio State campus actually already does use gas for its main heating source in McCracken, and furthermore, according to the 2015 Residential Consumer Survey, 64 percent of homes in the U.S. cold and very cold regions actually use natural gas as their main heating source. So it is a very safe and proven technology.

In conclusion, I strongly support the installation of the CHP on campus. Climate change is an issue which affects all of us and is too urgent for us to sit on our hands and wait for the perfect solution to fall from above.

While the CHP may have drawbacks, it is my understanding that it will drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions from the moment that it enters operations, increase the campus' energy resilience, and has the potential to make renewable power more cost effective for the University. We have an opportunity to make a real difference here, let's not waste it. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

MR. Lesser: No questions, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: No? Thank you very much. Our next witness is Joseph DeMare.

MR. DE MARE: Can you hear me now?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you. Mr. DeMare, do you have a camera?

MR. DE MARE: I do not have a camera on my computer.

ALJ PARROT: That's fine. If you could assure me you've raised your right hand, please.

MR. DE MARE: Oh, yeah.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MR. DE MARE: My name is Joseph DeMare, my address is 517 South Main Street, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Please proceed with your testimony.

MR. DE MARE: I am the Political Director for the Ohio Green Party. Although I am not speaking officially on behalf of the Green Party at this point, I will be introducing a resolution to the

State Committee, and I have no doubt that they will affirm opposition to this combined heat and gas program, just as I am expressing personally right now.

The last time I spoke in front of an official Ohio body in opposition to an energy policy was in front of House Bill 6. I testified there four times, twice in front of the House and twice in front of the Senate, opposing that law -- opposing that policy. And I am feeling deja vu because the main people that spoke in favor of that, the minority -- the overwhelming majority of testimony was in opposition, but the minority of people who spoke in favor of it were people who stood to benefit personally and directly from the project, people who were expecting to get high wages from it, people who were expecting returns on their investments, and the majority of the speakers and the majority of the State of Ohio were locked out of the decision, that their views were listened to, written down, and promptly ignored.

And we now know, of course, that there was a great deal of immorality and possibly a very great deal of illegality in the process, and that process, the House Bill 6, the hearing, were merely a

formality, they were merely a show.

I'm hoping this process will be more than just a show because it's -- this Board, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, and the Siting Board specifically, has achieved some measure of fame for its concern for environmental species, for endangered species specifically.

In fact, a few months ago this Board blocked a large solar power project citing that -- concerns over endangered species, a solar project produced by AEP. And then a few weeks ago they blocked -- well, they put conditions on a wind project proposed for Lake Erie, again citing concerns about endangered species, but conditions which make that program uneconomical and probably will not now be built.

And so I don't want this Board to be accused of favoring natural gas projects while opposing wind and solar projects, and so I think that they would do well to disregard the testimony of professors that stand to benefit for their particular academic program, and people who specifically would get personal gain in terms of high wages for this project, and instead listen to the voices of the community.

And there are just a few points -- additional points I want to make. One is that geothermal heating has not been explored as far as I'm aware with this project. Geothermal heating is an extremely efficient and local source of power because you're taking the energy out of the ground. And in fact, it's more efficient. You get more energy out in terms of thermal energy than you use in electrical energy, and that would be a good source of heating for the plant.

And the need for steam, it's also my understanding that when you transmit steam over long distances, even through tunnels, it's got to go through pipes, and there's energy loss all along the way. Steam is -- it would be better to examine whether or not steam generated at the point of use would be more efficient than generating steam from a central point.

And someone made the point that there wasn't much solar energy in the Columbus region. Well, I think that it's good to know that Ohio and Germany have about equivalent levels of solar energy, and Germany has committed to 100 percent renewable energy that is wind and solar, while rejecting coal and nuclear, and they are well on their way to doing

that because they have found that as they proceed, they come up with the innovations necessary to increase sufficiency and to generate a truly sustainable energy source. And that is the valuable lesson that Ohio State students should be learning in the future, not reducing greenhouse gases, because I'm afraid we're past the point where that is an acceptable solution.

I just want to remind people that this past week there were record highs in the middle east, 125 degrees in Bagdad most of the week, 127 degrees Farenheit in Bazra, and that heat is being exacerbated by the greenhouse effect, and the gases that are making the greenhouse effect worse were generated in coal and natural gas plants like this one were made -- decisions were made and they were built.

But now we have the value of hindsight, and in that value of hindsight I also want to point out that people are losing faith in our institutions, and that things like House Bill 6 are exacerbating that and accelerating it.

Here PUCO has a chance to perhaps stem that loss of faith by telling Ohio State to go back to the drawing board, look at truly green sources of

energy like geothermal, and come back to us when you have a truly green energy proposal. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. DeMare?

MR. LESSER: No, your Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Chase Novello.

MS. NOVELLO: Hello. I don't have video.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. If you could assure me you've raised your right hand, please.

MS. NOVELLO: I have.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: State your name and address, please.

MS. NOVELLO: My name is Chase Novello, and my address is 1800 North Star Road, Columbus Ohio 43212.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. NOVELLO: Okay. Yeah, I am a graduate student in the school of Environment and Natural Resources at OSU. At their annual conference this past January the Association of Big 10 Students voted unanimously to pass a resolution calling on the

schools to freeze new investments into the fossil fuel industry, and also to develop a timeline to divest from industry.

As both a student researching the effects of human pollution on aquatic ecosystems and a young person who will live, work, raise children, and care for friends and family in a world increasingly devastated by climate catastrophes, this resolution was empowering. This is the kind of big change we absolutely need right now to protect people and ecosystems.

By February the University of Michigan had frozen new investments into the fossil fuel industry. They also initiated a study of their existing investment policies to consider the possibility of full divestment. Ohio State has done neither of these, and is now proposing to build more fossil fuel infrastructure intended to run for decades to come showing, among other things, a deep lack of care for the values, commitments, and well-being of its own students.

The University should be ashamed to consider construction of this plant even as its biggest rival makes great stride on climate change, mitigation, and sustainability. The construction of

this gas plant flies in the face of the University's own mission to improve the well-being of our state, regional, national, and global communities.

Even if major universities all over the country, and Columbus itself, begin to take the kind of action necessary to fight climate change, OSU is doing the opposite.

As young people with little institutional powers and a huge personal stake in the repercussions of climate change, we rely on those running our institution to mitigate climate catastrophes, not to continue to build the very infrastructure that exacerbates it.

I request that the Board hold a third hearing on this issue, and I urge the Board to reject this proposal. And also just building on something that was said just before me, I would like to point out that multiple people who have testified in support of the proposal have shown industry ties and they should be kept in mind when considering whether their testimony really reflects the interests of the community.

So based on their web pages, Dr. Stephanie Stockar has been funded by Ford Motor Company and Fiat Chrysler Automobiles,

Dr. Christopher Hadad, his students have gone on to work at GM, Chemical Extracts, Dow Chemical, Marathon Oil --

MR. LESSER: Your Honor, I don't believe this is relevant to the proceeding to denigrate public witnesses.

ALJ PARROT: Ms. Novello, I think you've made your point. If you could go ahead and let's -- I think I'm going to agree with Mr. Lesser on this one. If we could -- feel free to make your point, but I don't know that we need to bring the witnesses, students, into this especially.

MS. NOVELLO: I think it's perfectly reasonable to say something that is on their webpage, but I would just like the folks here to consider that, and other than that, thank you for having me.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: I just have one, your Honor. This is Sam Randazzo. Have you reviewed Ohio State's Path to Carbon Neutrality, the Ohio State Climate Action Plan?

MS. NOVELLO: I have about a month ago, so not fresh on my mind.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: All right. Are you

aware that Ohio State does use geothermal energy?

MS. NOVELLO: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Anything else? Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony. Witness No. 30 on our list is Amy Bedinghaus.

MS. FISCHER: It appears they just dropped off.

ALJ PARROT: I'm going to make a note of take that and see if she comes back on. Actually at this point we are a little over halfway through our list. Valerie, you're comfort is my concern here. Do you need a break at this point?

COURT REPORTER: I'm good.

ALJ PARROT: We will keep moving along. I think we're making good progress on our list. I'm continuing to monitor for individuals that we were not able to pick up on our first pass, so we will see if we can get them back on. James Kelling is next. And I believe he's joining by phone. Can you hear me, Mr. Kelling?

MR. KELLING: Yes, I can hear you.

ALJ PARROT: If you could assure me that you have raised your right hand.

MR. KELLING: It's raised.

ALJ PARROT: Very good.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MR. KELLING: My name is James Kelling. I live at 5358 Apple Creek Drive, Sheffield Village, Ohio 44054.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Please go ahead with your testimony.

MR. KELLING: Good evening everybody. My name is James Kelling and I am a current student at OSU studying for ecosystems. I'd like to start by saying that since OSU was deemed exempt from achieving an environmental analysis there is no way to know just how adverse the effects will be if the new power plant is built.

Some previous speakers have mentioned a reduction in emissions, and I believe that this is true only in the direct campus area, as fracking still continues elsewhere and greenhouse gas emissions will still be released at the fracking site.

Building the gas plant in the midst of the crisis is extremely counterintuitive and goes against what the rest of Columbus is doing in regards

to a transition to renewable energy.

By going against Mayor Ginther's announcement to make Columbus powered by 100 renewable energy by 2022, I believe the University is making a bad, selfish decision since it is wilfully acting against the Mayor's progressive energy program.

I also believe that the University failed to consider other sources of energy that are much greener and more renewable. For these reasons I think the proposed power plant at OSU is a bad idea and I request that the proposal be rejected.

As an OSU student it's sickening to see our University going against the desires of a city's Mayor and a number of the students. As a developing force industry professional it hurts me to see the University that I call home using sustainable forced resources while at the same time worsening the climate crisis and providing the opportunity for an unknown amount of pollution to impact the University, the City of Columbus, and the communities surrounding fracking sites.

How could a University that has taught me the danger and negative impacts of fracking be so open to a project such as this?

Lastly I'd like to ask for the third hearing on this topic take place. Since both hearings have taken place over summer break I feel there are students who are busy working and preparing for the approaching school year that were unable to find the time to share their thoughts on this issue, and I believe the same goes for incoming freshman who may not yet be aware of this problem. Thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Are there any questions for Mr. Kelling? Thank you very much.

MR. KELLING: Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Next we have Alice Cai.

MS. CAI: Hi. Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you and see you. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Please state your name and address.

MS. CAI: My name is Alice Cai. My address is 7663 Brandon Way Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017.

ALJ PARROT: Please go ahead with your testimony.

MS. CAI: All right. Hi. My name is

Alice Cai. I am a third-year undergraduate student at Ohio State, and I'm studying microbiology. I just wanted to start off by thanking Adam and Becca and the Sierra Club and all the other people who have worked so hard to organize today's hearing.

Ohio State claims that the $278 million gas plant we discuss today will reduce carbon emissions by 35 percent, helping the University reach its goal of carbon neutrality by 2050, but this purported clean energy initiative falls short in many areas.

OSU has not conducted a proper cost/benefit analysis of this natural gas plant against other clean renewable energy sources on the market. Ohio State's factoid of bridges emissions does not account for the devastating toll of gas extraction. Ohio, who is fifth in the nation in natural gas extraction, is also exceedingly lax in its regulations.

There are over 1,400 fracking wells in Ohio, and our state is exempt from federal guidelines dictating what can be injected into those wells and what happens to the toxic wastewater that comes out.

In addition to these environmental impacts, Ohio State has not adequately considered

this plant's public health implications. Areas where drilling for natural gas occurs experience elevated levels of hazardous air pollutants, and the plant itself will emit 40 tons of fine particulate matter every year.

We are in the midst of a pandemic and there exists a well-researched, long-standing relationship between air pollution and respiratory diseases. SARS, another coronavirus, is closely related to COVID-19, and a 2003 study found that SARS patients living in highly polluted areas were 84 percent more likely to die.

For COVID-19 specifically, a recent study from Harvard found that a small increase in long-term exposure to fine particulate matter corresponds with a large increase in COVID-19 death rates. This corroborates similar analyses coming out of Europe.

Fine particulate matter does more than damage the lungs because it is so small it can be inhaled into the blood stream where it can cause widespread damage throughout the body, and especially hurt the immune system. The potential health impacts of this plant are serious even under ordinary circumstances. When considering our current

situation this decision by the University is especially grim.

While I commend Ohio State's vision to reduce carbon usage, sinking millions of dollars into a gas plant we will be locked into for years to come is not how to achieve this end. We do not have so many any other years to waste.

If OSU were serious about climate action this money would be put toward renewable energy sources that would not damage our health, poison our air, and dig us further into the climate crisis.

I am tired of being asked to solve the climate crisis with our personal choices. We are asked to recycle, to compost, to save water and electricity, to walk, to bike, to reduce plastic use. Ohio State even urges us to be a green Buckeye to reduce our consumption and conserve other resources, and every young person I know does their part because we care about our planet and are worried about the future.

We know that we have been destroying the earth and that if we continue on our current course we will make this place unlivable. How sad and frustrating it is that the same institution that asks us to make conscious decisions of our impact on the

environment commits to this plant. We are asked to make all these small changes but nothing we can do even compares to the effect of the harm corporations and institutions such as our own University generate.

How futile it is for us to use metal straws or take the bus, or take shorter showers, in the face of a $278 million plant that will operate for over a decade to come. How can we, with our silly attempts at reducing our carbon footprint, compete with so many more years of natural gas and the leaks and drilling and pollution that come with it? I urge to you reconsider.

This plant will negatively effect our environment, our health, and our futures. I urge the University to instead invest in clean renewable energy. If you are unwilling to do so I demand another hearing. It is unfair for this discussion to be held before the semester starts when the very so deeply students affected by this plant are not on campus. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Are there any questions for Ms. Cai? Thank you very much for your testimony.

All right. Next we have Elizabeth Roka. Can you hear me?

MS. ROKA: Yes, and it's "Roka", your

Honor.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Do you have a camera?

MS. ROKA: I believe now it should be on.

ALJ PARROT: There you are. Very good. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Please state your name and address.

MS. ROKA: It's --

ALJ PARROT: Ms. Roka, I think you're breaking up a little bit. Maybe put the camera back off again and let's see if that is better. State your name and address, please.

MS. ROKA: My name is Elizabeth Roka, my address --

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead, your address.

MS. ROKA: My address is 2208 Indiana Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. And please proceed with your testimony.

MS. ROKA: Thank you. Good evening, your Honor, members of the Ohio Power Siting Board. Firstly I'd like to thank the Board for holding this

hearing to begin with, and allowing me to speak tonight, but I would also like to second the request of speakers before me to hold a third hearing once students and faculty are back on campus and made better aware of the gas plant's construction.

My name is Elizabeth Roka. I'm a rising third-year student at The Ohio State University. I'm the President of the Collegiate Council on World Affairs which is one of the largest student political science organizations on campus, and I study geology with a specialization in environment and society.

I didn't know what I was going to study before I came to the University, but it was at OSU I started to study the climate crisis. It was at OSU that I was taught about the irreversible effects of methane, CO-2, and other harmful chemicals released from burning natural gas, and it was at OSU that I learned if we're going to prevent irreversible damage to the environment for my generation, for my children's generation, we need to stop the burning of fossil fuels, period.

So you can imagine my disappointment and my shame when I learned it's at OSU that a fracked gas plant is being built on west campus right across the Olentangy River from Lincoln Tower, the dorm I

lived in my freshman year. And it's unfortunate for OSU that they gave me a proper education on climate change and instilled in me the knowledge to express firm opposition to their plans to build a gas plant without first considering more sustainable alternatives, and second, without properly assessing whether the horrors of this project will be worth their cost.

So firstly on the question of renewable alternatives. Those who have supported the plant who have spoken have expressed that somehow this gas plant can be converted through innovation and research into a renewable energy plant once it becomes more affordable at some indistinguishable point in the future; however, there has been no publicized action plan made available explaining how exactly this gas plant will transform into one that utilizes renewable energy, and there's been no publicized agreement holding the University accountable in making sure that happens.

Even so, that presupposes, to begin with, a renewable energy isn't already available. To those on this call who have expressed that it isn't, ask yourself if reliance on renewable energy isn't already possible, how is it that Southwestern

University is able to provide 100 percent of renewable resources, how is it that the University of Minnesota, Morris is producing 60 percent of its energy needs with renewable technology, or how is that the City of Columbus has pledged to deliver 100 percent renewable electricity by 2022?

We're not asking the University to provide us perfect solutions as the prior speaker said. We're not asking them to do the impossible, we're asking them to provide us with these answers and to provide us with their due diligence before they invest $278 million while other universities are investing into renewables, and so far they haven't proved to us they are even trying.

As a speaker two people before me has stated, according to OSU's Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, the University was exempt from the EPA from having to complete a prevention of significant deterioration air quality analyses because it's a nonprofit educational institution.

It is exempt from having to complete site specific air modeling studies, and it was exempt from having to determine if their project would exceed national ambient air quality standards. That

the University simultaneously is purporting that this plant will reduce emissions, when in reality they haven't conducted the required tests in order to make that determination, and making the slim tests they have already conducted, it didn't account for methane, which is a far more harmful pollutant then carbon dioxide.

Yet they are still making this claim and proposing this process under the guise of a climate protection plan. So you can call this a clean project, you can call the gas we're using clean, when in reality it is fracked, but members of the OPSB, you cannot grant the University their certificate to enable them to build this plant and still have a clean conscious, because it's the well-being of my student body, my generation, and your future daughters on the line, and we will not be donating for another half measured, halfhearted attempt at a so-called Climate Action Plan. Thank you for your time and I yield the remainder of mine to the Judge.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Roka? Thank you very much for your testimony.

No. 34 on our list Sahil Patel.

MR. PATEL: Hello. I should probably

turn my camera on.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Very good. If you could raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MR. PATEL: My name Sahil Patel and I live at 26300 Spring Trace Drive, Perrysburg, Ohio 43551.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Go ahead with your testimony.

MR. PATEL: My name Sahil Patel and I'm currently a junior at The Ohio State University. I transferred from the University of Toledo after my freshman year. When relatives ask me about my freshman year at Toledo my response is always nonchalant, I don't know what you're talking about, because in my eyes I've always been a Buckeye.

I will always take pride in being a student here and the University's legacy is of great importance to me as it is to every person who has testified here before today. A lot of people will sign a petition or say they would fight for something.

Also I would like to say thank you to

the committee for being willing to hear out students before making a decision. Some of you may think building this new plant is a positive for the environment and the energy needs for the University, but I believe it to be the exact opposite. Just like the autobots, there's more than meets the eye to this power plant.

The University has set a goal to become carbon neutral by 2050. When many people want a goal set it does not matter how you get to the coal even if it means you're pressing backwards for a few years, as long as the goal is met by the deadline, but others would prefer the goal to be met earlier even if it means a bigger financial toll than expected.

The proposed plant would cost an estimated $278 million. I already did the currency conversion; that is in fact in U.S. dollars. That's more than I expect to earn in my lifetime. Hopefully that makes you guys see the scope of how large the number really is.

The plant is to be primarily powered by natural gas in its first year of operation, and in comparison to the current plant it is claimed to cut carbon emissions in the first year by 35 percent.

Ohio State is taking a gamble that the new plant can transition to a greener, friendlier fuel. Ohio State is taking a gamble that the new plant can transition to a greener, friendlier fuel in the not so distance future, such as green hydrogen. Not all gambles end up going in your favor, and the loss of investment at that time will cause more negative harm than good.

There are renewable energy options that have been proven and could be provided for without the gamble of hoping green hydrogen becomes more affordable and sustainable in the near future.

So imagine this is a battery that can charge in seconds, and is cheaper to produce and holds a larger charge. That's something that's been in development for ten years. They are called cobalt free lithium ion batteries and they were promised to the public ten years ago, yet they still haven't been provided. This is just an example of one sustainable gamble that went south and is still in development.

My point is that the gamble may seem smart right now, but every project has its shortcomings, and I think the likelihood of finding an alternative to natural gas in the near future will be the downfall. There are many ways to extract

natural gas, but there's only one way that is economically feasible for the University, and that is fracking.

Ever since the 2016 election environmental regulations on fracking have been lax in favor of the economic boom it would cause in the short term without looking at the pollution or the negative side effects of fracking such as water pollution, air pollution, and so on.

Being carbon neutral but signing a contract for fracking does not seem to go hand in hand. Being carbon neutral helps the environment, while fracking is used as a means to achieve it, but fracking in turn may lead to environmental disaster.

Powering this plant with natural gas means the University will be locked into a contract for the foreseeable future. If Ohio State is serious about carbon neutrality, then it could honestly be achieved before 2050, so why wait that long.

There are renewable options currently available. Retrofitting every rooftop on campus with solar panels is one option. Elon Musk who owns Tesla I think would love to have Ohio State contract them for their solar panels, so why not be the first University to start the domino effect. Acquiring

more wind turbine contracts is also another option.

So back when I took my tour at Ohio State I remember walking through the south oval and thinking this is a very beautiful place, and I walked past one of the residence halls and there was a sign that said that a few of the buildings in the south oval use geothermal walls for cooling, and I thought at that moment that that's pretty cool, so I guess I'm going here. So with that, geothermal is always an option.

In addition to developing or purchasing more renewable energy, Ohio State could continue to use energy from the grid as City of Columbus plans transition to renewable energy by 2022. There's more than one route here, and I'm not saying I'm an expert, but I urge the University to postpone their plans, take into account the testimony of the others here today, then make a decision.

I also urge for there to be a third hearing, as two of these have taken place over the summer and many more students will want to have their voices heard. Thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Patel? Thank you very much. Okay. Next we have Chloe Wells.

MS. WELLS: Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can hear you. Do you have a camera?

MS. WELLS: I do, yes. Sorry.

ALJ PARROT: If you could raise your right hand, please.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: State your name and address.

MS. WELLS: My name is Chloe Wells and my address is 30 East Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43221.

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. WELLS: Again, my name is Chloe Wells and I'm a third-year student at Fisher School of Business at Ohio State, and I'm speaking in opposition of the construction of this power plant.

Early on in my childhood I was diagnosed with asthma, as was my sister. It's believed that the air pollutants that we were exposed to from residing in Ohio influenced the development of this disease.

Throughout our lives we have both experienced asthma attacks varying in severity, the

worst of which occurred when my sister was nine years old when she suffered an asthma attack where both of her lungs collapsed. This led to oxygen surrounding her heart and she was only a few hours short of it approaching her brain, at which point she would experience irreversible brain damage or death. Thankfully my mother, a nurse practitioner with over 20 years of experience, recognized her symptoms and took her to the nearest ER. We're very fortunate that she's alive today, although other families may not be as lucky as ours.

Research shows that exposure to air pollutants has been consistently linked with poor asthma control in children. Moreover, it is proven that asthma symptoms in all ages only worsen when exposed to air pollutants.

This natural gas plant is expected to emit 40 tons of fine particulate matter annually in the Columbus area. This information only guarantees that this plant will cause many young children like my sister and myself to develop asthma.

Furthermore, due to the consistent exposure of these pollutants it will cause not only the development of asthma, it will cause an increase in asthma attacks and reduce lung function in people

of all ages. It is worth noting that the natural gas solution also leads to increased rates in cardiovascular disease and cancer.

The approval of this gas plant would only make Ohio State and the Ohio Power Siting Board further complicit in worsening the quality of life, or possibly even death for all those residing in communities surrounding where this plant is being constructed.

However, these concerns have rarely stopped either of these parties involved from continuing on this destructive bath. As a business student I emphatically believe that it is important to put the lives and safety of the citizens above the potential cost savers the University could experience from this plant.

I'm also aware that renewable energy is on tap to be a major cost saver for consumers, and that renewable energy issues supporting the green new deal are becoming increasingly both bipartisan, leading to an increased possibility of this form of energy being shut down before the reusable lives end, meaning that this reckless investment would be worthless for all those impacted. Therefore, I urge this plant not to be approved.

Finally, I would like, as the request of previously speakers, to hold a third hearing in order to provide incoming Ohio State students an opportunity to become informed on this plant and share their thoughts on the possible approval of this plant. Thank you very much for my time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Wells?

MR. LESSER: No, thank you.

ALJ PARROT: All right. No. 36 on the list is Piper Womelsdorf. Can you hear me?

MS. WOMELSDORF: Yes, I can hear you.

ALJ PARROT: Do you have a camera? There you are. Very good. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MS. WOMELSDORF: My name is Piper Womelsdorf. My address is 91 Northwood Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Go ahead with your testimony.

MS. WOMELSDORF: Good evening everyone. My name is Piper Womelsdorf. I'm a fourth-year

rising senior at The Ohio State University studying international studies and geography.

I want to first thank the Board for offering the additional hearing tonight and express my appreciation for the opportunity to be speaking before you today.

I am from Cincinnati, Ohio and have lived in the state of Ohio for my whole life, the last three years of which I have spent in Columbus. Ohio State is my school, and Columbus is my home, and as both an Ohio resident and as a student of The Ohio State University, I strongly oppose the building of a new combined heat and power plant powered by natural gas. I'm speaking to you today in hopes of holding my school accountable in protecting my community from the dangerous proposal.

Ohio State proclaims its mission is to provide its students with education for citizenship, yet with the proposal of this plant Ohio State is failing to live up to the duties of environmental citizenship to our local, regional, national, and global communities.

I am heartened by my school's commitment to reaching carbon neutrality by the year 2050. I question if it fully intends to uphold this

commitment when it is proposing now, in the year 2020, the building of additional nonrenewable energy infrastructure which will only serve to deepen our dependence on nonrenewable resources.

The capital resources needed for this project would be much better utilized for the purpose of building proven renewable energy infrastructure.

I believe the detrimental environmental impact for this proposal has been clearly articulated by previous witnesses, and so I would like to speak as a student of international studies. The focus of my testimony will deal with responsibilities and implication of Ohio State's actions.

At a time when our world is undoubtedly on the precipes of a global climate catastrophe, Ohio State is proposing the construction of new natural gas infrastructure.

In the Paris Climate Accord of 2016 nations of the world agreed to the goal of limiting global warming to within 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, prevent the effects of climate change from becoming a reality.

The International Energy Agency estimates that if we are to have any hope of keeping global warming within the 2 degree Celsius range,

then 80 percent of allowable emissions have already been locked in by the existing energy infrastructure that powers or world, infrastructure which Ohio State is now proposing to expand.

While the building of this plant may be said to decrease the University's carbon footprint in the present moment, it will in fact lock in our University's dependency on nonrenewable resources for the foreseeable future.

What is even more disappointing is that Ohio State has failed to give due consideration to renewable alternatives in the building of this plant, or the environmental impact of this plant with the exemption it received from the EPA.

If they had fully considered these options, as well as adequately considered the needs and interests of their students and the community, truly they would not move forward with a power plant fueled by fracked natural gas in the year 2020 when renewable resources are more widely available than ever.

Supporters for the plant today have acknowledged that this plant is not the most sustainable option, but they would like you to believe that is the best that we can get. I have a

hard time believing this is true.

This perspective is extremely short-sided and reflects that this power plant is at best a short-term solution, the long-term negative consequences of which outweigh any immediate gain.

It is true that Ohio State currently powers its facilities using natural gas, but just because this is our current reality, it should not be the standard we are striving for.

If the University planned to invest another couple hundred millions of dollars in its energy infrastructure, why not spend this money on building renewable energy structure? Ohio State is neglecting its duty to a future powered by clean renewable energy and pushing its responsibilities off to a later date.

The money invested in this project should be redirected to a transition to a sustainable energy network. We know what we need to do to save our society from the disastrous affect of runaway global warming. We know that natural gas and fracking create more problems than they solve. Ohio State knows this well enough to teach it to me in its curriculum, so why now are they choosing to be woefully ignorant?

I came to Ohio State because it is a leading public institution for higher education in Ohio, and a leader among Big Ten public schools across the country, yet in the proposition of this power plant Ohio State is falling far behind other schools.

I want to go to a school that promotes education for citizenship not only through words alone, but by embodying these principles in action.

Almost everything I have learned about sustainability in the climate crisis, I have learned at Ohio State. Through classes and research Ohio State has taught me the importance of these issues, and our responsibility to solving them, yet in its actions it is sending a different message.

I am a proud Ohio State student, but I am not proud of the proposed power plant, especially when at the same time other schools in Ohio and across the country are honoring their commitment to the environment by taking actionable steps toward the transition to renewable energy. Ohio State, on the other hand, is doing exactly the opposite.

I am here today because I love my school. I believe deeply in our ability to be that landmark University and to be a leader among public

institutions. I'm here because of what I have learned from Ohio State about being a good citizen and the duties that accompany this.

We can't solve the climate crisis overnight, but we can make sure that we do our part as citizens and community not to exacerbate this crisis, but instead to lay the foundation for a more sustainable future. For this reason I urge the Board to exercise their oversight to reject this irresponsible plan. Thank you for your time.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions? Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Womelsdorf. Okay. Next we have Ryley Sexton.

MR. SEXTON: Can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can. Do you have video, Mr. Sexton?

MR. SEXTON: Yeah. Can you see me?

ALJ PARROT: I can now. Thank you. Raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Very good. State your name and address, please.

MR. SEXTON: My name is Ryley Sexton and I live at 184 West 9th Avenue in Columbus.

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead with your

testimony.

MR. SEXTON: Okay. As I initially stated, my name is Ryley Sexton. I'm going into my third year at Ohio State to study mechanical engineering, and I just want to begin by explicitly saying that I am asking for the rejection of this proposed -- this proposal to build the combined heat and power plant.

I'll admit, upon initially researching into this, I thought there was some attractive things about this proposal such as being less reliant on the coal and older natural gas plants of American Electric Power, and the 35 percent reduction in carbon emissions, I thought that was very flashy and attractive.

But after delving deeper into this beyond the surface level of research, I looked into the fracking and stuff like that, and a lot of people think carbon dioxide is the boogieman of greenhouse gases, but as it's been said multiple times today, I believe I read the number 86, and someone earlier today even said like 120 or something like that, and it's -- methane is several times more potent of a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, and I'm not exactly sure where that is mentioned in the proposal

for the combined heat and power plant, and that is a grave concern of mine.

And additionally, as other people today have brought up, adding fine particulate matter into the air can be very harmful, as are the chemicals used in fracking.

Honestly, fracking seems quite environmentally destructive and harmful to humans, especially over the long run. So I don't see how this can be sported, especially by OSU. That is my opinion, and mine alone. I don't speak for anybody.

And of course I also, while researching this, ran into the fact that the Columbus Mayor -- I don't know if it's his goal exactly, but I know he's associated with it, the 100 percent -- the goal of 100 percent for the goal of renewable energy for the City of Columbus by 2022, and there's no way fossil fuels -- a campus running on fossil fuels can help reach that goal.

And I don't believe Ohio State -- Ohio State has meant to help us become leaders and lead us into the future, and I don't see how they can help us do that by helping us become more reliant on fossil fuels which are ways of the past and have proven to be destructive, you can't really argue with the

science, and I would like to see the University research further into other renewable energy options. And that is all I have to say.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Sexton? Thank you very much. Our next witness is Andrew Franz. I believe he's joining us by phone.

MR FRANZ: Hello.

ALJ PARROT: We can hear you.

MR FRANZ: My name is Andrew Franz, I live --

ALJ PARROT: Hang on. I'm sorry, Mr. Franz, sorry to interrupt. Can you assure me that you've raised your right hand?

MR. FRANZ: I'm sorry. Yes, I'm raising it.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Okay. Now go ahead with your name and address and testimony.

MR. FRANZ: Okay. My name is Andrew Franz, I live at 15875 Millfield Road, Millfield, Ohio 45761, and here are my comments.

I only have a few comments so this will be brief. My understanding is that Columbus has a plan to transition to renewables by 2022. This plan

for this facility is clearly not in line with the spirit of the community.

And I have a few rhetorical questions. How long will this plant operate? Will it be become a liability when renewable energy becomes even more applicable? Also, this plant will increase the air pollution of Columbus, which I understand is already not good.

Next, to meet the Paris Climate Accord plans, drastic action is needed, and building a brand new hydrocarbon powered plant is not the direction that this society should go through the worst of climate change.

The waste from powering this kind of a facility is being injected into the ground in my community. I live in Athens County, Ohio and it will likely -- it will likely escape and contaminate our watershed. And I am reminded every day of the long-term effects of hydrocarbon extraction. The Sunday Creek runs right past my house. It is a bright orange from the mining activity of the last century.

I fear the waste injection sites will lead to similar permanent environmental damage. We do not know what this wastewater looks like or what

color is it this time, but what color do you want my rivers, creeks, ponds and streams to be in the future?

Lastly, I just want to say that the decades of reliance on fracked gas extraction for this plant worsens the health of many millions of Americans like me. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Any questions. Thank you very much. Next we have Larkin Cleland.

MR. CLELAND: Hello.

ALJ PARROT: Can you please raise your right hand?

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: State your name and address.

MR. CLELAND: My name is Larkin Cleland, I live at 1355 Dennison Avenue in Columbus. First I just want to -- I'll try to keep this brief. I want to reiterate what so many other students and members of the campus community have said about the negative effects of climate change.

I also want to say that there does need to be a third hearing at least when students get back to campus. There are many people who were unable or just unaware of this hearing and of the project in

general. And I think there also should be some type of mass communication to let people know about this project, which will have a huge impact on our campus and on our community.

So I'm a third-year student, and I just want to say how ironic it is to me that I sometimes like learning in class, reading studies about how the proximity of schools to sources of greenhouse gas emissions, the particulate matter emissions, have a direct negative correlation on academic achievements, and also causes health problems. That is well documented in scientific literature, and we study it at Ohio State. It's ironic to me that Ohio State is then planning to build one such source of particulate matter emissions directly on campus.

I also think it's ironic that so many engineering professors, especially, have spoken tonight claiming to be experts on sustainability, and they are also either ignorant or deliberately ignoring the fact that -- that while there may be a 35 percent decrease in emissions on campus, that that damage is just spread around the whole state.

For example, my childhood home is in Medina County, and only a couple miles away from a compressor station and a newly built natural gas --

or fracked gas pipeline, and that already there have been -- there's a group that does air quality monitoring; it has drastically negatively impacted the air quality around my home.

And so I just want to conclude, the student body does not want this plant and the community does not want this plant, we want a real alternative that is clean, that is renewable power for the future, and I ask you please to reject this plant.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Cleland. The 40th witness on our list is Jan Nespor. I do not believe that I see Jan on the call, or Webex event. No. 41 is Loraine McCosker. Okay. Lorain, can you hear me?

MS. MC COSKER: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: Do you have a camera?

MS. MC COSKER: Yes, I do.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. If you could raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: State your name and address.

MS. MC COSKER: My name is Loraine

McCosker, my address is 59 Elmwood Place, Athens, Ohio.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. MC COSKER: Good evening, Chairperson, the Ohio Power Siting Board committee members, and meeting attendees. Thank you for accepting my testimony regarding the future of this combined heat and power plant project.

I would like to also thank all the people attending this hearing. I would like to encourage an additional hearing when the students return to campus virtually or in their place, so their voices may be heard. It is on those students' future and engagement that this institution depends.

I'm Loraine McCosker, a resident of Athens County. We have had a couple people tonight from Athens County in southeast Ohio. Athens is one of the 32 Appalachian counties in Ohio where much of the Ohio oil and gas is extracted. Athens County is rated as a distressed county by the Appalachian Ohio Regional Commission with a 32.5 percent poverty rate directly related to the legacy of coal and oil and gas extraction.

I'd like to begin my testimony with a

quote from the late civil rights activist and Representative John Lewis; "When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to say something. You have to do something."

I would like to state that I do not support the combined heat and power plant project. I have worked as an environmental studies educator at Ohio University since 2007 focusing on legacy impacts of extraction and resilience in Appalachian Ohio, the boom bust of extractive industries, as well as sustainability education and higher education. I also worked as a public health nurse for 15 years with degrees from the University of Florida and Ohio University. Health and the environment are directly related.

I'd like to discuss the following three concerns regarding this proposal. Number one is the responsibility of higher education as leaders during this climate crisis. There is indeed a responsibility of higher education to address the climate crisis, to model sustainable actions to its students so those very students have a livable and productive future.

I would like to comment that because OSU

utilizes gas in its current energy generation does not validate its continued use. In fact, it likely began to use gas prior to the fracked nonconventional gas entering the market, and of course before that it was coal.

In addition, it is not a failure if a student is not familiar with the Climate Action Plan. There is a steep learning curve when it comes to energy and sustainability, and that is where I -- that's what I do daily with students at our institution.

According to the OSU 2020 Climate Action Plan, the proposed combined heat plant stationary emissions will generally rise from fiscal year '19 levels thereby exacerbating air quality within the city.

This would seem to be a contraindicated practice for health concerns within a city that has experienced air quality spikes over the years monitored by the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Council. In recent years air quality has improved, so this -- this plant in fact would exacerbate the gains that have been made in Columbus.

I would also like to comment that now we know that there's a higher morbidity and mortality

level rate in relation to COVID-19 in regions impacted by poor air quality.

The Climate Action Plan also states that the project will simultaneously achieve a net emissions reduction across scope 1 and 2 emissions. From the plan it appears that the environmental and social justice footprint of the nonconventional or fracked natural gas was not included in the scope 1 and scope 2 analysis, and combustion was only considered in its analysis of greenhouse gas emissions.

Greenhouse gas evaluation at combustion analyzes that moment at the time of burning fuel, hence the 35 percent reduction in the first year. It does not address the extensive extraction, transport and waste, and resulting greenhouse gas emissions.

So I'd like to just address the ecological footprint of this unconventional natural gas extraction, and I think we have heard it over and over tonight, the impacts. But something that I'd like to address are two things. One is the fracked waste, what's called fracked waste, and that is an issue that is very aware -- awake in our community. My own Athens community maintains seven of 241 deep well -- injection wells in Ohio. Yes, we have 240

deep injection wells that accept oil and gas waste.

And we receive the waste product of fracked gas from Ohio and adjacent states. Since the inception of the fracking boom in 2012 to 2018, our County alone has received 22 million barrels of hydraulic fracking waste. Each barrel is 42 gallons. That is 924 million gallons of waste.

This is a hazardous material that is injected in the Class 2 wells without evaluation of possible contamination of water systems, aquifers, and adjacent community health impacts. And I'd like to say that Class 1 wells is hazardous waste.

During that same period the State of Ohio received 198 million barrels of waste, million barrels, to inject into their 241 injection wells. And if I could just make a comment that the adjacent state of Pennsylvania, because of its regulations, has between eight and nine injection wells. So guess what? The injection well waste comes from other states. That's not to say this is material that OSU buys, it can come from anywhere, they are just likely going to buy what is cheapest on the market, where they can get the best.

Again, this is not classified as hazardous waste, this is the waste product of the

extracted and manufactured gas that will be used in the proposed plant. There's nothing clean about it. And quickly to go over methane pollution.

ALJ PARROT: Ms. McCosker, I'm sorry to interrupt you, you're quite a bit past your five-minute mark, so I'm going to ask you to finish up with your final comments.

MS. MC COSKER: I'd like to comment that the $290 million project is a long-term investment that will exacerbate the climate crisis, while mandating OSU's dependence on a fuel that was experiencing economic volatility before the pandemic, while that volatility has been exacerbated globally.

We must ask the question will the supply chain of the fracked gas to be used in OSU's proposed facility be squeezed with driving costs and thereby impact the cost of generation? It seems likely.

This is not the fossil fuel 20th century. We cannot afford to continue to burn fossil fuels, fuels that have been extracted at the environmental and social expense of communities in Ohio and globally. Thank you very much.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank you for your

testimony. Are you familiar with OU's steam -- Ohio University's steam facilities?

MS. MC COSKER: Most certainly, yes.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: You're aware they have steam tunnels?

MS. MC COSKER: Oh, yes, I've been in there. One of my favorite things is to go visit that old coal plant, and then OU turned around and they made it into a natural gas plant.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: I was just going to ask you -- ask you if you were aware that they were using natural gas.

MS. MC COSKER: Yes, very much so. And they are actually building another one.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: And they use the steam for fueling as well.

MS. MC COSKER: They do. They buy their electricity on the market, and it used to be from AEP. I'm not sure where it is from now.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: And does Ohio University have a sustainability objective?

MS. MC COSKER: For their climate? Yes. Want to know the dates?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: No, I know the dates.

MS. MC COSKER: It's quite hysterical, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: So --

MS. MC COSKER: But I don't think 25 years is going to make a difference between 2050 and 2075 the way we're going.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: So presently, how is Ohio University meeting its sustainable -- let me ask the question more directly. Is it true that they are purchasing renewable energies?

MS. MC COSKER: Yes, they are, and I think between 35 and 50 percent. But they are also purchasing unconventional gas to cool and to heat and to warm up their water.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: So when you say unconventional gas, is that the same thing that some people call fracked gas?

MS. MC COSKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: So how much more natural gas do you believe would be produced in Ohio?

MS. MC COSKER: How much more?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: How much more would be produced in Ohio as a result of Ohio State's combined heat and power plant?

MS. MC COSKER: Total? It's a long

process, but I was in the Statehouse in 2011 under Governor Kasich and when they were pushing for expanding nonconventional gas, and the oil and gas -- OGA, is very influential in making policy.

So I believe that every time you put something like this on the line, you will expand the need and -- you know, the extraction, the expansion of the wells.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Do you know how much of the gas that is produced in Ohio is exported outside the State?

MS. MC COSKER: I do not know that right now. Do you?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Yes, I do.

MS. MC COSKER: What is it, let's educate --

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: You indicated that you admitted Googling. You can Goggle it. Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

MS. MC COSKER: I'm happy to have a conversation offline with you.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: You seem like a delightful person --

MS. MC COSKER: I think that this gas likely will not just come from Ohio, it will

become -- I'm not that up on the -- the extension of all this gas and how the market is working with it. But just it's basic, the more demand you put, the more the supply will grow. And it's not a stepping stone anymore, it's not a bridge.

I mean, we're at this critical juncture that we can't afford it. And actually OU, and their plant, they didn't build this gigantic thing, they did something -- they did a stepdown, and our students worked very hard with them.

They investigated geothermal and all sorts of alternatives, but essentially it's economics and our accounting and so forth that has driven what's happened. It's not good. I'll say it.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Thank ou.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Ms. McCosker. All right. Our next witness is Reed Kurtz. Mr. Kurtz, can you hear me?

MR. KURTZ: Hi. Can you hear and see me?

ALJ PARROT: There you are. Very good. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Please state your name and address.

MR. KURTZ: My name is Reed Kurtz, my address is 1245 Forsythe Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MR. KURTZ: I am a recent graduate of OSU where I completed my PhD in political science. My research focuses on the politics of climate change, specifically the impacts and injustices that our addiction to fossil fuel and resulting climate change creates for life on earth.

For me climate change and energy politics are not merely academic matters, but directly affect the lives and well-being of all. I'm also a neighbor to OSU, so emissions from this power plant effect me and my family directly.

I'm also a lover of the outdoors, and I care about the communities threatened by the fracking necessary to supply the fossil gas for projects like this one. I would also like to call for a third hearing so that more OSU students can participate.

As a student I served on the graduate student government working group to review the comprehensive energy management plan as the University called it.

I was also part of the grassroots opposition to the energy privatization, or sellout as we called it, precisely because we knew the stakes. We knew that the idea of OSU, a public land grant institution of higher education representing a public good for the people of Ohio, ceding control of its energy to a private company motivated by profit contradicted the very values that OSU claims to stand for.

Of course these concerns were never seriously considered or addressed by the University. The interests of the private company managing this project are opposite the public interest that OSU should represent, and the interest that I hope this Board intents to defend.

Hence, it is very irresponsible for advocates of this project to claim an exemption to avoid a thorough environmental review due to OSU's nonprofit status, and thus I encourage a full environmental review, one that would take into consideration all impacts along the supply chain, including the precise extraction to go forward.

We have heard from labor and engineers. These are precisely the workers who need to be part of a just transition to a green economy.

But the reality is that fossil fuels are a dead end. Whatever economic and jobs benefits may come will be more than offset by the short and long-term environmental impacts from the air pollution from burning the gas, the fracking to supply the gas, and the resulting global warming from the greenhouse gas emissions locked in due to yet another fossil fuel project.

We need workers and engineers, but their skills would be best suited for carbon neutral projects such as those in wind and solar energy already reaping dividends across Ohio. We also need workers and engineers to create effective ways to dismantle the fossil infrastructure and refit it for the means of alternative low carbon energy supplies.

It is unfortunate that these are rarely, if ever, seriously considered by those with interests of profit and efficiency at heart. A reality is climate change is here, it is already harming communities all over the world, and we need concrete actions to reorient energy systems to avert catastrophic global warming.

To quote the Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg, the fact that we are speaking of lowering instead of stopping emissions is perhaps the

greatest force behind the continuing business as usual.

Climate science tells us we have about a decade to reduce our emissions by about 50 percent, and until 2050 to achieve net zero to avoid the worst. Achieving these goals won't come from another fossil fuel project, one that only feeds our fossil fuel addiction.

We are being sold the myth that fracked gas can be a bridge to lower emissions. The reality is that we must stop burning fossil fuels as soon as possible, not develop new fossil fuel infrastructure, and instead invest all of these resources towards carbon neutral technology.

Perhaps this idea of burning a different type of fossil fuel with a marginal and smaller carbon footprint offset by its methane impacts could have made sense 30 years ago when the international community first began to recognize what fracked climate change poses, but in 2020, after generations of opposition from the fossil fuel industry and their political allies, bridge solutions based on fracked gas and existing fossil fuel infrastructure are a recipe for disaster.

OSU's energy policy and climate plan is

only ambitious from the advantage point of a country, the United States, that bears the greatest historical burden from the climate crisis we face. It is not enough to use this as an excuse to justify further fossil fuel consumption, instead we should use it to justify greater emission for carbon neutrality.

The narrowly defined economic incentive and short-sided logic motivating this project are especially concerning given the historical circumstances we face.

The recent HB-6 scandal highlights the need for increased scrutiny into all aspects of the fossil fuel industry, including the representation of disclosure of economic interests and impact.

Globally we are living amidst an unprecedented series of changes taking place in our world economy due to the COVID-19 pandemic which presents a unique opportunity to radically rethink how we organize society.

Not only does this open new paths to rethink possibilities for a more sustainable world that is shocking the global fossil fuel economy, meaning that any cost benefit calculation on which this project is based must completely be re-evaluated, when coupled with mass movement

pressing for more adequate accounting of the cost of fossil fuels and climate injustices, including carbon taxes as part of a broader push for green new deals all over the world, it only becomes clearer that these fossil fuel based projects are unsustainable.

I echo calls made by others to thoroughly consider our historical movement when making a decision, and not rely on short sided and narrowly defined interests prone to disarray of contemporary conditions of COVID-19 and mass movements that mean equity and justice response to the social and ecological crises we face.

I encourage the Board to consider the public interest and oppose the plan.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you Mr. Kurtz. Are there any questions? Mr. Roger Kalter is next. I believe he's joining us by phone.

MR. KALTER: Hello, I'm here.

ALJ PARROT: Mr. Kalter, if you could tell me that you've raised your right hand, please.

MR. KALTER: It is up.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: All right. Please state your name and address.

MR. KALTER: Roger Gene Kalter, 138 East

Spring Street, Marietta, Ohio 45750.

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead with your testimony.

MR. KALTER: Thank you. Marietta is in the foothills of Appalachia, like our neighbors in Athens County. Clean public drinking water is one of our most valuable resources for survival. Marietta is served by a aquifer that runs parallel to the Muskingum River near where it meets the Ohio River.

Our aquifer is threatened from all directions. A dry-cleaning chemical discovered in the 1980s has been threatening our seven water wells ever since. They have been diverting a million and a half gallons of water, drinking water, per day to keep the pollutant out of our drinking water, out of our seven working wells.

About 20 years ago DuPont Chemical Company, their Teflon process resulted in a chemical called C-8, which is contaminating the water supplies in the western part of Washington County, area residents there face a life of health monitoring because of the impact from the C-8 chemical on them.

And in addition, the subdivision of Devola, which is just outside of Marietta, about 500 households are threatening the Marietta water

supplies because of their failing septic systems. They're under a court order to connect to proper sanitary sewage, but in the meantime their human waste is drifting towards Marietta. So now in addition, we have 13 injection wells within Washington County.

Two days from today the U.S. Corp of Army Engineers will have a hearing very similar to the one you're conducting tonight, and this is asking for permission for barges to be brought in with 126 thousand gallons at a time of hydraulic fracking waste. Now it's coming in by truck and then being piped into our -- several of our 13 wells here. And the point with the hydraulic fracking waste is when it -- once it is injected under pressure, it is here forever. It's here as long as the planet is here.

And the question is what is the benefit to our population here. We have heard tonight a lot of comments about the air quality in Columbus, but I guarantee you, down here in the foothills of Appalachia the air quality is not good to start with, and the impact of the fracking industry is having a huge impact on the -- on our natural resources here, air and water.

While the natural gas has a smaller

carbon footprint than coal-fired plants, the footprint, including the hydraulic fracking process and the injection of millions of gallons of wastewater, which generally include about 25,000 gallons of mixed chemicals being pumped into our county, are just having a devastating effect.

I would request that we have a comprehensive examination of solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, and sustainable and renewable energy sources rather than just using natural gas for decades in Columbus that's supplied from Washington and Athens Counties.

Washington County's largest employer is Marietta Memorial Ellison, a hospital, and a large part of that is the cancer Strecker Society. You wonder why all that is. Unfortunately Appalachia is an area where residents have paid the price for over two centuries for this use of coal and natural gas. We are people here also, we are just not in huge numbers.

I would ask that Ohio State University -- The Ohio State University study this much more thoroughly. I think Ohio State can do much better. If not, please ask the fine scientists at Ohio University, please think about those humans that

hope to follow us. Thank you very much for your time. Good night.

ALJ PARROT: All right. Very good. Were there questions for Mr. Kalter?

MR. Lesser: No questions.

ALJ PARROT: Checking my list. Our next witness is Maritza Pierre. Ms. Pierre, can you hear me and see me?

MS. PIERRE: I can hear you, I can see you.

ALJ PARROT: Do you have a camera? Very good. If you could just tell me that you have raised your right hand, please.

MS. PIERRE: I have.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MS. PIERRE: My name is Maritza Pierre, and I live at 364 14th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. PIERRE: I am currently a graduate in the School of Environment and Natural Resources at OSU. When I found out earlier this year that a combined heat and power plant powered by natural gas

was about to be built on campus, I was very surprised because nobody on campus seemed to be aware of it.

I started asking other students about it, and every time I was the first person to tell them. This lack of transparency about the plant worried me and I wanted to learn more. Beyond the information available from the campus information and the Ohio Power Siting Board website, was a brief mention on an OSU website that the plant would support the University's sustainability goal.

Now there are some publications about the plant, but at the time there were not. If this plant supports the University's sustainability goal, then perhaps the University should consider revisiting its sustainability goal.

While natural gas is a necessary evil when compared to coal, the process of fracking is so very problematic. There is still a possibility of leakage which compromises our environment. The extraction process of natural gas also puts carcinogenic pollutants in the air.

Additionally, there were social costs associated with fracking in rural communities which end up not benefitting financially when someone creates a job to outside workers, not to mention

other issues, like to increase violence and crime, which leads to other crimes, population surge in man camps.

The rationale provided by those advocating for the plant ignores what happens when the gas makes its way to OSU. These externalities are too big to ignore. In the wake of climate change, having the plant on campus is a regressive move for OSU. I see no reason for OSU to continue to invest in natural gas.

In addition, if OSU were to choose to go with renewable energy, the same argument made by some earlier about creating jobs and construction would still apply, as the need for labor is not contingent up the plant being powered by natural gas.

I hope that the Board considers the benefits and who loses from the construction of the plant, and not just in financial terms. I am urging the Ohio Power Siting Board to grant a third hearing to the public given that many students who are away during the summer still don't know about this, and are not able to voice their concerns.

Lastly, I want to mention that I oppose the construction of the combined heat and power plant, and I thank the Board for allowing me to

speak.

ALJ PARROT: Are there any questions? Thank you very much. Next we have Matthew Szollosi. All right. If you could please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and address.

MR. SZOLLOSI: Thank you. Matthew Szollosi, my address is 1707 Stanford Road, Columbus, Ohio.

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead with your testimony.

MR. SZOLLOSI: Thank you, Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board. I appreciate the opportunity to address you this evening.

As mentioned, I'm Matthew Szolosi, Executive Director of Affiliated Construction Trades, Ohio Foundation, or Act Ohio. Act Ohio is a 501(c)(5) organization created to facilitate economic and industrial development opportunities, and to promote industry best practices for Ohio's public and private construction.

Act Ohio represents 137 union affiliates

across the State, which the aggregate represents nearly 96,000 Ohio or building tradesmen and women. Our members include union construction workers in 12 distinct trades who live and work in central Ohio.

Among them are electricians, plumbers and pipe fitters, ironworkers, boilermakers, and other essential union tradespeople who build and maintain Ohio's diverse energy infrastructure.

We have long advocated for an all-encompassing strategy for energy production in the State of Ohio. Our members are trained to build and maintain every type of energy generation plant, including co-generation facilities like the combined heat and power facility proposed for construction at The Ohio State University.

These are the same union tradespeople who have built the vast OSU campus over the course of the last hundred or so years from the construction of OSU's academic halls to the Wexner Medical Center. Our trades people have helped grow Ohio State from a small land grant college into an economic driver for the Buckeye state.

Act Ohio fully supports the construction of OSU's combined heat and power facility. This power CHP facility is a wise investment for the

University, which generates $15.2 billion in economic impact annually for the State of Ohio.

The proposed CHP plant will guarantee energy resiliency for Ohio State's critical medical, educational, and research operations. By establishing an on-campus micro grid the University will decrease the cost of power generation, while lowering OSU's carbon footprint, and anchor in future infrastructure development on campus.

It is my hope that with savings generated through the CHP we begin investment in campus enhancements including renewable energy initiatives strongly encouraged.

During this statewide economic and fiscal crisis, this project will create local construction jobs providing middle class wages and healthcare for over 100 working Ohio families. These jobs have dual impact benefitting central Ohio municipalities through payroll income taxes.

Act Ohio and our members support the OSU CHP facility as a timely and responsible initiative that will create essential central Ohio jobs in an environmentally and physically conscious manner. Thank you for your consideration of this very important proposal.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

MR. LESSER: No.

ALJ PARROT: All right. We have Stephanie Sforza.

MS. SFORZA: Hello, can you hear me?

ALJ PARROT: Hi. I can hear you. If you have a camera go ahead and turn it on.

MS. SFORZA: I can't use a camera right now.

ALJ PARROT: Please raise your right hand. Have you done that?

MS. SFORZA: Yep.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your full name and address for the record.

MS. SFORZA: My name is Stephanie Sforza and my address is 77 West Northwood Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. SFORZA: I'm a graduate student of the School of Environment and Natural Resources. Ironically I need to point out that I'm actually calling in during a power outage at my home residence

in New York currently, which is due to a tropical storm, and this is exactly the type of disturbance that will actually increase in frequency as climate change progresses. In other words, this type of disturbance that caused the power outage here can be linked as a direct effect to the methane leakage into the atmosphere that results from fracking which fuels natural gas plants.

I want to make it clear that I hope for Ohio State University to embody the leadership it strives for in other areas in regards to sustainability by abandoning nonrenewable and unclean energy resources in favor of more technologically advanced and less harmful alternatives.

As a student of wildlife science I can't support an energy resource that receives its benefits at the expense of significant disturbances to wildlife habitats, resources, and livelihoods. I cannot support water pollution that could put further strain on limited resources for current and future generations as clean water continues to drain.

This plant also puts students, faculty, and Columbus residents at risk of severe health conditions directly caused by air pollution, which is something I can't support, and I find it

disappointing that our school is entertaining such an idea.

I don't believe the perceived economic benefits outweigh the cost to local residents, cost to wildlife, and the undeniable economic cost that will result from this plant such as unpredictable increases in healthcare to combat pollution related health issues, and lowered values for local properties just to name a few examples.

Finally, I want to make it clear that I reject the combined heat and power plant and ask that you hold a third hearing for those who couldn't attend and for those who weren't aware. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much.

Number 47 on our list is Kristi Lekies. She had contacted us in advance of the hearing indicating that she would not be able to testify this evening, so I'm going to move to Caleb Goddard.

Mr. Goddard, can you hear me? If you have a camera, go ahead and turn it on. If you could raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

CALEB GODDARD: 53 Knob Hill Drive North, Gahanna, Ohio. Okay. I am a lifelong

Columbus resident, senior at Ohio State and student employee. This pandemic could have unforeseen consequences on how higher education is conducted. This past spring and summer semester have shown that most University business can be conducted remotely.

This upcoming semester all my classes and my job will be conducted online. I won't set foot into an OSU building until earliest, January 2021, and haven't been in one since March.

OSU students and a large portion of staff aren't using OSU infrastructure right now. We should be able to put off expanding and building a gas plant for now. The landscape of energy and of higher education could be completely different in the next couple of years.

I'd like to see efforts made to beautify campus instead. West campus houses a bird climate center, athletic fields, parks, and agricultural facilities. It seems ironic that we would build a gas plant in the most nature focused, nicest looking and peaceful part of campus. This ugly gas plant would not only be seen by students, but also by Columbus natives driving by on 315.

Additionally, I think it's worth noting that union jobs created by this gas plant would also

be created by any alternative OSU construction project that could be pursued.

Finally, I'd like to talk about money. In recent years OSU, the public University, has been privatizing some of its resources. Parking was sold to Campus Park which was formed by Australian investment managers. Energy has been leased to NG which is a company headquartered in France.

It makes sense that OSU energy partners/NG would be putting people over profits by building a gas plant. If profits were not the driving motive I don't think I would have to be here testifying against a gas plant, but I do not support it being built on my campus as I don't think it would have been chosen to be built in the first place. Thanks.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Goddard? Thank you very much. All right. Next we have Ellen Kieser.

MS. KIESER: Hi. Yes, can you see me and hear me?

ALJ PARROT: I can. If you could raise your right hand, please.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: Please state your name and

address.

MS. KIESER: Yes, my name is Ellen Kieser, K-i-e-s-e-r, my address is 6221 Bona Vista Place, Cincinnati, Ohio 45213. Thank you members of the Power Siting Board and others listening tonight for giving me the opportunity to testify.

My name is Ellen, as I said, and I'm an Ohio native and a concerned undergraduate student at The Ohio State University. I'm studying environmental science within the School of Environment and Natural Resources, and most of my classes are located on west campus, many in Kottman Hall, which to my understanding is in very close proximity to the proposed site of the combined heat and power plant.

I'm also active with the Sierra Club Student Coalition on campus. I know a lot has been said already, so I'll try not to repeat too much of what has already been said, but I would like to speak tonight and voice my opposition to the construction of the proposed fracked gas plant on Ohio State's Columbus campus.

As an environmental science student I'm deeply concerned about continuing our dependence on fossil fuels, and I feel that erecting a gas plant on

campus, another one, would push us as a community backwards in an unnecessary effort to transition to clean renewable energy.

And it has been mentioned several times tonight, but that this gas plant seems to contradict the sentiments of the Columbus community as whole. The Community Choice Aggregation program was recently approved to be featured on the ballot this fall which would allow the city to pursue its goal of being powered by 100 percent renewable energy by 2022.

Although the CHP plant may reduce emissions to some extent, the construction of this plant at the center of the Columbus community will still produce emissions and particulate matter overall, which is concerning. And quite frankly, it's disappointing to see our institution, one that I would like to be able to be proud of, pushing for this plant in the midst of a community seeking otherwise.

These points were elaborated on earlier, but I would just like to reiterate that the fracking itself is an extremely invasive process that can be detrimental to communities and environments where the actual fracking takes place, but within our own community I'm also concerned that the emissions from

the plant will have a negative impact on air quality, threatening the students, faculty, families, and all those living and working near west campus like me.

As I mentioned earlier, it's my understanding that the plant will be -- the proposed site is in close proximity to my own building, and earlier testimony referred to the CHP as a living laboratory. However, as a student often on west campus, I would prefer not to be a rat.

And I would also like to request that a third hearing be held so that my fellow Ohio State community can have the opportunity that I did tonight as they make their way back to campus. Thank you for giving me the time to voice my concerns.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Your Honor, this is Sam Randazzo. I just have one question. Ma'am, you and a number of witnesses have referenced the Columbus Aggregation Program, and talked about the 100 percent renewal.

MS. KIESER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Are you aware that the opportunity for the City of Columbus to move forward with an aggregation program became effective

in 2001?

MS. KIESER: No, I was not familiar with that. I'm in Cincinnati. I was in Cincinnati at the time, and when I was growing up where I believe that was already an option here.

CHAIRMAN RANDAZZO: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

ALJ PARROT: Thank you, Ms. Kieser. All right. And next we have Carolyn Harding. Ms. Harding, can you hear me?

MS. HARDING: Yes.

ALJ PARROT: All right. If you have a camera, go ahead and turn it on.

MS. HARDING: I'm not sure -- I should have a camera, but let me see.

ALJ PARROT: The buttons at the bottom of the screen, you may kind of click --

MS. HARDING: I don't see my name for me here.

ALJ PARROT: It shows everyone else's name, but I think it assumes you know your own. So I don't see mine either. I think that's normal.

MS. HARDING: So where do you click for my camera?

ALJ PARROT: There's a series of 5, 6, 7

buttons at the bottom, and the second from the left is a little camera icon. There you go. We can see you.

MS. HARDING: I mean, after COVID we're all learning how to deal with it. Now I've got to find my testimony because I put it somewhere behind everything.

ALJ PARROT: Go ahead and do that.

MS. HARDING: Here it is. Can you still see me?

ALJ PARROT: If you can raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALJ PARROT: And state your full name and address for us, please.

MS. HARDING: My name is Carolyn Harding, and I live at 156 North Roosevelt Avenue, Bexley, Ohio 43209.

ALJ PARROT: Okay. And go ahead with your testimony.

MS. HARDING: Thank you. I am an artist activist. I've been working on the fracking issue for about eight years, and some colleagues and I started a radioactive waste alert because there was going to be fracked waste recycling on the Alum

Creek.

And we wrote awareness about the water solubility of fracked drill cuttings, which are full of radium 226 and 228, and that facility stopped trying to process fracked waste.

And then we -- we continued on and decided that we wanted to give citizens the right to say no to fracked waste dumping in our community, and so we created the Columbus Community Bill of Rights. And it had to be -- it was a ballot initiative for the city of Columbus, and we're still working on that.

But I'm also a host and producer of a radio show called Grassroots Ohio where I interview activists all over the State of Ohio working on really important issues, not just environmental.

So my big issue with this gas plant is the 50-year commitment to using natural gas which, yeah, as many, many people have said, it burns clean, but it's being very irresponsible and very quite -- actually quite a lie to say it's clean, because the birth of natural gas to the death of natural gas is so toxic and so radioactive and so destructive, that we're just being very privileged saying in Columbus we'll have natural clean gas, but in the communities

where they are fracking and they are destroying their well water, and where they have some pollutions and where their babies are born premature because of the chemicals in the air.

And then also that's the beginning of a life of fracking, but at the end of the life of fracking, after the fracked gas has burned clean, we have got the fracked waste, the water waste that they are dumping in Columbus' watershed. Upper Scioto watershed has 13 active injection wells taking this radioactive toxic fracked waste.

And the more we keep feeding these gas plants, the more we're committed to fracking and the more we're committed to putting this fracked gas waste in our watershed, so that's going to be leaking, seeping, and -- and spilling into our water supply.

Fracked gas has neurotoxins which messes with your brain, endocrine disruptors which mess with your reproductive hormones, and carcinogens, and then also the natural radionuclides from the actual shale. Radium 226, 228 causes leukemia, causes breast cancer, bone cancer.

So yes, oh, yes, natural gas burns clean, but come on, you're not looking at the

externalities. You're not looking at the birth and the death, the whole life cycle of fracking.

And natural gas, oh, yes, we all know that our society has been fossil fuel oriented. Sam Randazzo, he was a fossil fuel lobbyist. I mean, I really don't expect you to be open minded to what we're trying to say, but the people, the young people know.

We are concerned about climate, the climate change. We are concerned about our water, our soil, our air. And yes, it's easy to create another natural gas power plant, and it's hard to create sustainable solar, wind, geothermal, yes, but we are Ohio State, we have brilliant engineers.

In Stanford University, Mark Jacobson, he has mapped out how we can go 100 percent renewable with nontoxic power. So I'm here to say I am a concerned citizen, I'm a mom, I am a student, and I am a citizen, and I'm an activist, and I am -- I am imploring you to think beyond this clean burning natural gas and start thinking about the whole cycle of fracked waste.

And I don't know how this Siting Board works, and I quite frankly don't have much faith or trust that you will do the right thing for Ohio, but

I have to be clear that there are growing numbers of people in Ohio that will not stand for things to be just defaulted and just enacted because the fossil fuel industry is giving money so that you will create power plants to burn their fuel.

And by the way, I don't know if you know this, but there's a huge petrochemical hub in the eastern part of Ohio that is going to demand a lot of fracked gas to make plastic, and so Ohio -- a lot of Ohioans don't even know this is going on.

But you guys have been educated. You've been educated by all the people that are for it, and by all the people that are not for it, but you need to think about our water, you need to think about our soil and our air, and you need to think that we need to step forward, not backwards.

So I'm asking you to go beyond your prejudices and go beyond all your expectations and think of what we can do. We need a 21st century power. We don't need to go back to fossil fuels which is radioactive, toxic, and it's the wrong way for the climate change.

So this is what I have to say. I don't know what you're going to do with it. And I do know one thing, that I am hoping that everyone that is

listening, and all the students that are listening, will not take no for an answer, will not take -- and just turn over and accept this fossil fuel invasion of fractured gas. And we will stand up, we will fight back and we will demand truly sustainable clean energy.

And I hope you can hear this. I don't take it personally to any one of you, I just ask that you open up your minds and that you do the right thing for Ohio. Thank you.

ALJ PARROT: Any questions for Ms. Harding? Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. I believe that concludes the witnesses on our list. I have throughout the hearing been going through to see -- we have a handful of individuals who were not part of the Webex event at the time the name was called, but I don't believe throughout my monitoring -- and now I'm looking at it one last time -- I do not believe that we have anyone else.

So I think that wraps it up with our list of witnesses. So I would just say that again, thank you very much -- I'm sorry? I thought I heard Ms. Fischer there for a moment.

I thank everyone for your participation

for this evening. We have now concluded our public hearing and the transcript will be submitted to the Board for its consideration for its case. Thank you everyone, and have a good evening.

(Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 10:04 p.m.)

- - -

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Tuesday, August 4, 2020, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

_____

Valerie J. Grubaugh,
Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires August 11, 2021.

Summary: Transcript IMO: Application of The Ohio State University for a Combined Heat and Power Facility in Franklin County, Ohio. Hearing held on Aug 4th 2020 electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Grubaugh, Valerie