2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121CASE 19-E-0121 Petition of Bluestone Wind, LLC for an Original Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity and for an Order Granting Lightened Regulation.

PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE

DATE: February 10, 2020

LOCATION: Third Floor Hearing Room Agency Building Three, Empire State Plaza

Albany, New York

ALJ SEAN MULLANY, DPS

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 coalition, Broome County Concerned Residents, and we want to play an active role in developing the record creating a win-win situation for all stakeholders involved, such as myself, living less than 2,000 feet away as well as residents down the valley and beyond.

Our home is right in the middle of the proposed project area, and we are concerned with health and safety issues as well as the environmental implications of this application for our natural environment and properties.

Now -- and I'm -- I guess my question is directed first and foremost to Mr. Wisniewski as counsel for B.C.C.R. As you -- you and I both know, I presided over the Article 10 proceeding with respect to Bluestone Wind, and B.C.C.R. was an active party in that case. The rules allow me to make a grant of party status under certain circumstances. And so I draw your attention to Rule 4.3 which says -- and this is Rule 4.3(c) sub 1, and it says any person may ask the presiding officer for permission to intervene.

Permission will be granted if the intervention is likely to contribute to the development of the complete record or is otherwise

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 fair and in the public interest. So based on the only requests in the docket for B.C.C.R., which is Ms. Lawrence's on behalf of B.C.C.R., that request does not contain enough information for me to make a finding that a grant of party status to B.C.C.R. would be likely to contribute to the development of the complete record or otherwise be fair and in the public interest. So I just want to flag that for you.

I don't know if you're prepared to speak to that and offer information that would help inform a decision on that particular standard that I need to apply.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: I am, your Honor, prepared to speak specifically to whether or not B.C.C.R. should be considered as a party pursuant to Rule 4.3 subsection C subsection 1. If, your Honor — I am not able to provide sufficient detail for you to make a determination today, I'd request an opportunity to file an additional written request within so many days of this conference after speaking more with my client.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Well, I understand your request. But let's hear what you have to say

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 today and I'll weigh that in evaluating your request for further opportunity to make a showing.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: All right. Your
Honor, so with regard to B.C.C.R.'s desire to
contribute to the record, when B.C.C.R. initially
filed this request, obviously, it raised a lot of
issues that would normally be litigated in the
Article 10 proceeding and not in this proceeding.
And therefore B.C.C. -- and since that time, B.C.C.R.
has retained counsel to have a better understanding
of this process and understands that there really
won't be many, if any, opportunities to litigate and
flesh out the record on the issues that you just read
about.

Therefore, if B.C.C.R. is granted party status, it intends to limit its contribution to the record to issues related to both the financial viability of Calpine and its ownership structure as both of these issues are expressly committed for review under Article 68 of the Public Service Law and have also been approved for litigation in this type of proceeding under the siting board's decision in Cassadaga Wind.

A.L.J. MULLANY: So you've explained

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121
to this particular record in light of the narrow -relatively narrow scope of a Section 68 proceeding.
And you mentioned financial viability, but I'm -- I'm
curious to know how is it that you might seek to add
to the record with respect to the financial viability
of the applicant?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Your Honor, as established in the manner of Cassadaga Wind, the C.P.C.N. proceeding associated with that case, in — in that case the — the judge did allow discovery on precisely the issues of financial viability and ownership structure. And here we believe we have an analogous proceeding where there's a petition that makes numerous conclusory statements but doesn't have, in our opinion, sufficient evidence to prove those conclusory statements.

So, you know, keeping in mind that there are two primary issues that we believe we are permitted to litigate, the first being financial viability and related -- relatedly the ability to construct and operate the project and the second being ownership structure, our review of the petition has identified a few statements that we believe do not pass scrutiny and are not supported by the

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 evidence in the record.

what those statements are from the petition itself which has already been filed in this case. First off on page 14 of the petition, Bluestone states that consistent with the discussion of Calpine and its parent companies above, the owners of the facility are financially viable and the facility itself is economically feasible. There's really no clear tie between this statement and the information above, in our opinion.

Second, once the project receives the permits and approvals, the financing needed to construct the facility will be obtained through balance sheet, construction loans or other financing mechanisms. B.C.C.R. believes that statement is very open ended and lacks any detail whatsoever.

Third, the petition states, the facility will realize income from the sale of energy pursuant to a long term off take agreement. And then in brackets with an unaffiliated third party question mark, close brackets, and the sale of green attributes.

Again, although this is an

aspirational statement and could explain in concept how this project is financially viable. We've taken a -- a closer look at what's available in the public domain that might conflict with those factual statements and have identified a series of factual issues that we would intend to engage in discovery on in order to address the issue of whether or not this project actually is financially viable, and whether or not the ownership structure has been adequately explained on the record.

A.L.J. MULLANY: So you -- you say you developed a series of questions related to these concerns?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Yes, your Honor.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Do you have anything that's you'd be prepared to share with the company today?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Your Honor, I can read through what I have in my notes. We do not have formal discovery demands. I can turn them around relatively quickly if needed.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: So I'll attempt to elucidate a bit more about what my client's concerns

_ _

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 are and types -- and there will be some questions in here that are similar to what ultimately we would serve on Calpine should we be granted the opportunity for discovery here.

So first and foremost, in Calpine's application it states that, quote, road construction and tree clearing must commence by November 1st, 2019 so that the projects can be completed and commence commercial operation by December 31st, 2020. If the project does not enter a commercial operation by the state it will lose its production tax credit thereby jeopardizing its economic viability, end quote.

Now obviously those dates have come and gone and this raises a series of questions that we would intend to obtain answers to. First and foremost, and I think we know the answer to this so we probably wouldn't answer it, but did road construction and tree clearing commence by November 1st, 2019. I think we all know that the answer to that is no.

A second question, when must construction commence in order to commence commercial operation by December 31st 2020?

Third, what is meant by the term

Ι/

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 commence commercial operation in this context?

Fourth, how will the project's economic viability be jeopardized by failure to commence commercial operation by December 31st, 2020. Fourth, if Calpine is unable to commence commercial operation by December 31st, 2020 and loses its production tax credits, what is Calpine's plan for economic viability?

question, are projection tax credits necessary for Calpine's financial viability in this case? Six, in the event construction commences and the project becomes no longer economically viable, what will Calpine do? So that's the first set of questions having to do with economic viability and the idea that the deadlines that were initially proposed in the petition have come and gone. And that would seem to cast over the assertion that we needed to have shovels in the ground by November in order to obtain production tax credits which are purportedly essential to the economic viability of this project.

Moving on to a second. Through our firm's own research, we've been able to review Calpine's third quarter 2019 financial reports.

NOCES VE

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 Pursuant to that port -- report, we have discovered that several power plants which provide energy and related projects through Calpine are actually under the Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation. So, in essence, we've determined that Calpine has multiple power agreements with PG&E.

As you may know, your Honor, PG&E filed for bankruptcy on January 14th, 2019. And so it -- the important thing here is there's now a question of fact over whether or not PG&E will be able to perform under its agreements with Calpine. And if not, how that might impact the financial viability of Calpine and therefore its ability to construct and operate.

So from those third-quarter financial reports, which I do not have with me but they are available online, a direct quote from PG&E is that we cannot predict the ultimate outcome of this matter, this matter being the bankruptcy, and continue to monitor bankruptcy proceedings. So with all this in mind and the uncertainty about where the bankruptcy is going, how PG&E comes out of it and how whatever the bankruptcy revolves -- resolves impacts the purchase agreements of Calpine, we have the following

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 questions that we'd like addressed in this proceeding.

First, in the event PG&E is unable to fulfill its obligations under the P.P.A., how will that impact Calpine's economic viability? Second, in the event PG&E is unable to fulfill its obligations under the P.P.A.s, how will that impact Calpine's ability to finance this project, Bluestone Wind? Third, as Calpine determined the amount of loss as a result -- it can sustain as a result of PG&E's bankruptcy before Calpine's ability to financing and construct this project would be impact -- impacted.

Fourth, we've determined that it's been publicly estimated that Calpine generates fifteen percent of its earnings before income taxes, appreciation, PG&E. What is the percentage of -- that's what I just defined earlier, that is from the P.P.A.s with PG&E? And then finally, and there's some sub questions here, in 2019 the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the northern district of California determined that the federal -- federal energy regulatory commission has no say in whether the utility PG&E may reject its P.P.A.s if it chooses -- if it chooses to while in bankruptcy.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121

Calpine filed a notice of appeal to this decision. Based on that, we would like to know what is the status of the appeal to the Ninth Circuit. Has PG&E rejected it's P.G. -- P.P.A.'s with Calpine, and what is Calpine's current exposure if PG&E rejects the P.P.A.s? So those are the second set of concerns. The second set of concerns have -have to do with Calpine's relationship with a now bankrupt company which is Pacific Gas and Electric.

The third set of concerns have to do with Calpine's express reliance on renewable energy credits or other green attributes to support the financial viability of the project. And, again, that assertion is specifically made on page 14 of the petition. I read it earlier.

In relation to that issue, we have the following questions. First, what valuation is Calpine using for its rec sales? How is this valuation calculated?

Second, has Calpine entered into agreements for the sale of its anticipated recs for other green attributes?

Third, if so, who has these contracts and what are they worth? We need to know more about

them.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121

Fourth, if so, are the agreements contingent on the operation day? And then finally, how is Calpine's financial viability impacted by failure to meet any operation dates that are included in rec contracts? For example, does Calpine have an existing rec contract with NYSERDA? If so, is there an operational date in that contract? If so, has it been met? If it has not, is Calpine required to pay additional financial security in order to protect NYSERDA in the event that Calpine is unable to perform as required by the contract. And if so, how would that payment of security or additional security later impact the financial viability of this case?

Moving on to a fourth issue. footnote 6 of the petition, this goes to ownership structure, as set forth. Footnote 6 in the petition indicates that Access Industries, Inc. which is a privately held multinational industrial group transferred its limited partnership interest and in both parent L.P. to A.I. International Holdings, L.L.C. and then to A.I. Holdings L.P.

A.I. Holdings L.P. is organized under the laws of the British Virgin Islands. According to

4 5

_

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 the petition, A.I. Holdings L.P. has no experience running or operating a power plant. This raises the following issues of fact. How was A.I. Holdings L.P. formed? Who is A.I. Holdings L.P.? Is A.I. Holdings L.P. financially viable?

Moving on to another issue, B.C.C.R. and our law firm's research has indicated that

Calpine recently became a privately held company and it was — when it was acquired by Energy Capital

Partners. Prior to the acquisition by Energy Capital

Partners, by all appearances, Calpine was deeply in debt. Calpine filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in 2008, and in 2017 they were over \$11.31 billion in debt.

On August 17th, 2018 Calpine entered into an agreement plan and merger plan with the affiliates of Energy Capital Partners. Capital Partners paid more than the market value for Calpine shares and assumed all of Calpine's debt. The transaction closed on March 18th, 2018. In relation to this transaction we have the following questions which we think are relevant to financial viability.

First, what are the details of Calpine's agreement and merger plan for the

acquisition?

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 affiliates of Energy Capital? How -- how did going private impact Calpine's finances and what are they now required to report pursuant to the merger? What are they required to disclose and how have their financial audits changed under that merger or

your Honor, that is -- that is a -- a sampling of the questions that we would intend to ask if discovery is granted. Again, we think the scope of these questions is narrow and falls squarely within the scope of issues that are relevant to this proceeding and that have not been supple -- or supplanted by the holding that already exists in the associated Article 10 case or Bluestone Wind.

Your Honor, we believe that by asking these questions and receiving answers, one of two things will happen. Either there will be sufficient evidence in the record as a result of this that will allow you to make a ruling granting certificate. Or it will raise additional questions and substantial issues of fact that will require further evidentiary proceedings in this matter.

Either way, we believe that B.C.C.R. will contribute to the record directly, and it's in

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 the public interest to have a party like Calpine asking these questions in this proceeding.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Thank you, Mr. Wisniewski. Anything in response Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: Yes, your Honor. I -well, first off and these are all new questions and
these -- this is the first time we're hearing of all
this -- all these lines of inquiry. I'd still
question though just because there's questions that
B.C.C.R. has -- has come up with with respect to
viability, I'm not sure that that still answers your
Honor's threshold question as to how B.C.C.R.'s
participation in this case will contribute to the
record.

So I -- I don't know, in other words,
I don't know the fact that they have questions -that they came up with questions that still shows or
demonstrates that they are going -- that they should
be granted party status in this proceeding. And, you
know, with respect to the rest of the questions,
we're not prepared to address or -- any of those at
this time.

 $\label{eq:But I also question, you know, the --} \\$ the relevancy of a lot of those questions. And I

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 don't think that your Honor should necessarily use -- use most, if not all, of those questions as a basis here for B.C.C.R.'s party status or for requiring discovery here. For example, the PG&E ties, Pacific Gas and Electric. I -- I don't see how that or any kind of dealings with PG&E bears on Calpine's ability to finance, own and operate the Bluestone project. You know, and I -- and I say the same for a lot of the other questions. But there's so many I can't address each one individually. That's our position on -- on what was just said.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay. If there's nothing further then I am going to rule on the threshold question about party status. I think Mr. Wisniewski's explanation of what he anticipates B.C.C.R. may contribute to the record, and also bearing in mind that there's a two-prong test for party status which is likelihood that they'll contribute to the record and likelihood that it would be fair and in the public interest.

I'm sufficiently persuaded to grant
B.C.C.R. party status, and in so doing, I'm not
offering any commentary on the legitimacy of the
questions that he might propound through discovery or

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 the legitimacy of any position you might seek to take in an evidentiary proceeding. This is for the limited purpose of allowing you to participate as a party which would give B.C.C.R. the right to engage in discovery in this case. Okay? Anything -- any questions?

Okay. So B.C.C.R. is granted party status in this proceeding. Now let's go on to the closely-related question of discovery. I heard what you said, Mr. Wilson. You said a moment ago that you didn't see how, for example, the questions related to PG&E were relevant and material to the application.

Discovery is allowed for the purpose of seeking information that might lead to relevant and material information. So it's a slightly lower threshold. You can propound information requests and discovery requests with respect to information that may not, in fact, be admissible, but it's a way of seeking out information to try and find out more about the application of the representations made in the petition.

So based on the questions I heard articulated by Mr. Wisniewski, I am sufficiently persuaded that discovery into these matters would be

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 allowable. But I don't want to spend a great deal of time on discovery. I think in the Cassadaga case they -- Judge Lecakes allowed a week to 10 days of discovery. I'm prepared to allow limited discovery to, you know, for the duration of 10 days. It sounds, Mr. Wisniewski, as though your inquiries are already pretty well formulated, and it's a matter of typing them up. Is that a fair characterization?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Yes, your Honor.

We'd -- we'd like to do -- if discovery is granted we would like to do a little bit more work on them.

But, yes. I could turn something around relatively quickly. If we were given 10 days to serve our request from now, that would be sufficient.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay.

MR. WILSON: Your Honor, I believe in Cassadaga they were allowed 3 days to serve discovery. And then responses were due 9 days later and the entire process was wrapped up in about 26 days. So 10 days -- if they're in sufficient form already, then I think 10 days is -- is a lot of time to -- to allow service and discovery.

A.L.J. MULLANY: So what I'm going to do is split the baby so to speak. I'm going to grant

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 all parties up to 5 business days starting as of tomorrow to serve discovery requests. And then the responses will be governed by the rules of procedure. And I think that fairly balances the interest articulated by the company and -- and by B.C.C.R. Okay?

I also want to note for the record that we don't have Ava Thorin participating. She's not on the call today, right? And we don't have Joni Riggi (phonetic spelling) on the call today. We also had party requests from both of these individuals but they're not represented today. Nobody has filed any objection to their request for party status.

However, because the requests of party status don't provide enough information to make a -- a decision as to whether or not their participation would contribute to the development of the record or would otherwise be fair and in the public interest, I'm going to deny the party status request of Joni Riggle and of Ava Thorin.

And the transcript of this procedural conference will serve as the documentation of that ruling. And for purposes of preserving the record, I -- I have before me -- the information I have before

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121
me is a request that was filed by Joni Riggle on
February 22nd, 2019. It's available on the Document
Matter Management System. And in that request, Ms.
Riggi articulates the nature of her -- of the party's
interest in the case as follows.

Quote, I believe it is extremely premature to be requesting a C.P.C.N. before a full Article 10 record is developed. I was a party to the Cassadaga Wind project, familiar with the C.P.C.N. and want to have the ability to add and contribute to the complete record. So I would note that -- end quote.

And so I would note that the record for the Bluestone Wind Article 10 proceeding has, in fact, been closed. So there's no basis for allowing Ms. Riggi to -- Riggle to participate in this case. It's a separate proceeding and I don't see that she's articulated a basis for a granting of party status. So Joni Riggle's request for party status is denied.

With respect to Ava C. Thorin, I'm looking at a document dated February 25th, 2019, three o five p.m. Again, this is available on the Document Matter Management System. Ms. Thorin says I own a cabin on Reservoir Road in Sanford. My home

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 borders on the Deposit Reservoir and encompasses -- encompasses approximately 12 acres, 4 acres of cleared land with a cabin and well, 4 acres of forest and 4 acres under the reservoir. I have been identified as a stakeholder in the Bluestone Wind project.

Reading the petition document posted on this page, I believe she's talking about the petition in Case 19-E-0121. Ms. -- Ms. Thorin says I realize that construction on this part of the project will block for a considerable period of time the only access road to my home. I'll be severely impacted by this project not only because Bluestone's map indicates that I will be surrounded by 4 turbines and a meteorological station. She shortens it to a met station, but I will also be denied access to my home.

Four turbines surrounding a small home and property will have significant impact on my health and that of my family, the reservoir, the various migratory birds and eagles that frequent the location and the magnificent wildlife in the area. Given that my first notification of this project came in December 2018 and that now there is a petition to fast track approval, I need to know what is going on

2.4

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 in a timely manner so that I can respond with the appropriate -- within the appropriate time frame.

Thank you for your consideration. And that's the end of Ms. Thorin's stated rationale for her request of party status.

I find that this stated rationale does not provide a sufficient basis to find that Ms.

Thorin's participation as an active party in this case would add to the record or be fair and in the public interest.

The concerns that Ms. Thorin

articulates fall within the scope of the related

Article 10 proceeding and are not within the scope of
this separate proceeding under Public Service Law

Section 68 which is before the Public Service

Commission rather than the New York State Board on

Electric Generation Siting and the Environment. For
these reasons, Ms. Thorin's request for party status
is denied.

Okay. Thank you for bearing with me during that dramatic reading. Is there anything further that parties would like to discuss today?

MR. WILSON: Yes, your Honor. We -- could we also set a schedule beyond the discovery for

4 5

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 submission of any kind of issue statements and then a response by the company so that we can have a schedule for that today too?

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay. Let's talk. I don't have a calendar in front of me. Let me go grab a calendar.

Okay. So I secured a calendar for purposes of reference. And, Mr. Wilson, you had made a request that we set some additional dates for schedule for closing off discovery and issue statements. And perhaps some other milestones as well. So we've just -- let's see, we're on the 10th and we've said 5 business days for propounding. That puts us to Tuesday the 18th I believe of February since Monday is President's Day.

And why don't we say issue statements

-- well, we're going to have to build in time for the company to respond. That is subject to a little bit of -- I mean, there's minimums under the rules. But if it turns out that these requests require additional time, I -- I understand the company's interest in moving forward in an expeditious way. So I trust the company is going to do its best to answer the -- the discovery requests as expeditiously as it

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 have a better sense as to how that's proceeding, and we can set a -- a deadline for issue statements because, of course, the responses are going to inform Mr. Wisniewski's articulation on his issue statements so he's going to need a little bit of time for that. It just seems a little bit premature for us to assess what that burden might be.

MR. WILSON: Okay. That's fine.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay?

MR. WILSON: Yes. And the only other thing that we would ask then because this is all dealing with financial information of Calpine or possibly its affiliates, and if -- you know, we provide that information I think we might need a protective order in place. So assuming that we are going to answer the questions within 10 days on -- or otherwise the 28th, I guess we would need a protective order then in place by that date.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay. That's a reasonable request. And I will set about putting together a ruling issuing or adopting a protective order --

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

A.L.J. MULLANY: -- that's going to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 obviously. But for the record there are procedures in place for challenging assertions of confidentiality. And, in fact, that's the purpose of a protective order is to allow the free exchange and allow parties to refine their case so that an actual ruling on whether something is confidential can be forestalled until a party decides to actually offer it into the record

So there's going to be information exchanged through discovery under the rubric of a protective order. And arguably objections to whether or not those assertions of confidentiality are, in fact, valid or premature unless and until you get to the point where you're proposing public disclosure of the information by offering that for admission into the record.

MS. SACCO: Your Honor, may I be heard? Cheryl Sacco.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor that was --

A.L.J. MULLANY: Ms. Sacco, do me a favor and just speak up if you could. That speaker is pretty mild.

MS. SACCO: Okay. I'll -- I'll speak

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121
up, your Honor. I apologize. I just would like to
be heard on the protective order for the Town of
Windsor. As the court is aware, no other parties are
aware, Town of Windsor is a municipality subject to a
FOIL. I believe in the other Article 10 certificate
proceeding the -- your Honor was able to address the
FOIL issues. And I would just ask that those -- that
-- that FOIL be addressed in this as well so that the
Town of Windsor is not balancing FOIL and your
Honor's protective order.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Yes, there were provisions in the protective order, if my memory serves me, in the Bluestone case that addressed --MS. SACCO: Yes, sir.

A.L.J. MULLANY: -- municipalities.

And it's my intention, Ms. Sacco, to incorporate those provisions in the protective order to be adopted in this case.

MS. SACCO: Thank you, sir.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Mr. Wisniewski, I -I'm not sure if you've had a chance to say anything
more. I'd -- I'd explain the procedures for
objecting to claims of confidentiality. And then Ms.
Sacco spoke up, so just wanted to make sure there

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121 wasn't something more that you had on that.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Your Honor, I -- I think your explanation is sufficient for now. Again, I'm just anticipating a potential problem in the future and we will do our best to work within the confines of the protective order.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Thank you, sir.

Which is the good practice of law, anticipating
problems and hoping they don't come up. And when
they do, trying to resolve them without involving me.

Okay. Is there anything further?
MR. WILSON: No, your Honor.

A.L.J. MULLANY: No, to -- Ms. Sacco, do you have anything further?

MS. SACCO: No, your Honor. I have -- no thank you.

A.L.J. MULLANY: Okay. Thank you all for taking time out of your day to come here and -- and participate in this proceeding. Again, if questions come up you can reach out to me. And appreciate it if you do so by e-mail. Just keeps things clean. Copy all the parties that you're communicating with with me. All right? Thank you. Again. We are adjourned.

2-10-2020 - Bluestone Wind, LLC - 19-E-0121STATE OF NEW YORK I, JANET WALLRAVIN, do hereby certify that the foregoing was reported by me, in the cause, at the time and place, as stated in the caption hereto, at Page 1 hereof; that the foregoing typewritten transcription consisting of pages 1 through 34, is a true record of all proceedings had at the hearing. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name, this the 14th day of February, 2020. JANET WALLRAVIN, Reporter