

**STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

Application of Deepwater Wind South Fork, LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction of Approximately 3.5 Miles of Submarine Export Cable from the New York State Territorial Waters Boundary to the South Shore of the Town of East Hampton in Suffolk County and Approximately 4.1 Miles of Terrestrial Export Cable from the South Shore of the Town of East Hampton to an Interconnection Facility with an Interconnection Cable Connecting to the Existing East Hampton Substation in the Town of East Hampton, Suffolk County.

Case No. 18-T-0604

**RESPONSE BY SIMON V. KINSELLA TO
MOTION OF SOUTH FORK WIND LLC
TO STRIKE TESTIMONY OF KINSELLA**

Preliminary Statement

I, Simon V. Kinsella, am a party intervenor who seeks to add to the presently incomplete record in this (above-captioned) proceeding the material, admissible evidence that is herein listed (see pages 29-31). The proffered evidence demonstrates –

- An unnecessary high price for delivered energy (double) that will be passed onto ratepayers (when compared to other similar renewable energy projects);
- That the company that administered the procurement, PSEG Long Island,

awarded a power purchase agreement to its business partner in an opaque procurement process;

- The Applicant was awarded a power purchase agreement in a non-competitive procurement process; and
- The Applicant has willfully ignored overwhelming evidence of extensive and pervasive PFAS contamination that exceeds New York State regulatory standards by one-hundred-times in the area where it proposes to construct underground its transmission infrastructure.

and compels the New York State Public Service Commission to deny the Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony in full. As detailed below, the public records I have offered are admissible and relevant in this proceeding on whether or not to grant the Applicant a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need pursuant to New York CLS Public Service Law § 126(1); I have standing as an intervenor to offer such admissible, factual evidence and the Applicant has failed to sustain its burden to show otherwise or to oppose admission of my testimony and exhibits and supporting documentation attesting the (aforementioned) evidence.

[left blank]

Intervenor Funding

New York State Public Service Commission (“Commission”) has not required South Fork Wind LLC (formerly Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC, the “Applicant”) to deposit funds on account for intervenors “to defray expenses incurred by ... parties to the proceeding ... for expert witness, consultant, administrative and legal fees”¹ in this proceeding. By denying funds to intervenors, the Commission, for whatever reason, has added to the burden of effective public participation. By so doing, the Commission stifled public participation to the benefit of the Applicant and the detriment of the public interest. To the extent that the Commission has denied me intervenor funds necessary to hire a lawyer, I respectfully request a degree of latitude regarding the submission of my testimony and supporting exhibits and my response to the Motion of South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony submitted by me in its entirety.

Background

During September and October 2020, I submitted to New York State Department of Public Service (“DPS”) testimony (of 113 pages) together with seventy-five (75) supporting exhibits containing eighty-six (86) source documents (of 4,743 pages) substantiating my testimony together with historic data of wind speeds and weather conditions provided by the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA (of 8,826 pages).

¹ NY CLS Pub Ser § 122(5)(a)

The Applicant does *not* dispute my testimony, its accuracy or the truthfulness of my testimony and has *not* found any errors of fact within it.

The Testimony submitted by me is herein listed (see below) –

Part 1-1	Re: PFAS Contamination	(Q1.01-22)	Sep 9, 2020	(37 pages)
Part 1-2	Re: PFAS Contamination	(Q1.23-27)	Oct 9, 2020	(11 pages)
Part 2	Re: Public Interest, Need & Price	(Q2.01-19)	Oct 9, 2020	(52 pages)
Part 3	Re: Rebuttal	(Q3.01-04)	Oct 30, 2020	<u>(13 pages)</u>
				Total 113 pages

In support of my testimony, I have submitted twenty three (23) source documents (of 9,023 pages) from United States federal agencies as follows: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and Energy Information Agency.

Furthermore, I have submitted thirty two (32) supporting documents (of 2,432 pages) from state agencies and authorities (primarily located in New York State) as follows: NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, Long Island Power Authority (LIPA including PSEG Long Island), Suffolk County Dept. of Health Services, New York Energy Research & Development Authority, Maryland Public Service Commission, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, NYS Office of the State Comptroller, NYS Office of Attorney General, NYS Executive (Office of Governor Cuomo), NYS Department of State, NYS Department of Public Service. (For a full list of testimony and supporting documentation, please see pages 29-31.)

The Applicant seeks to strike from the record in this proceeding my entire testimony and all supporting documentation.

On November 5, 2020, South Fork Wind LLC (the “Applicant” formerly known as Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC) served a motion to strike my testimony in its entirety (“Motion to Strike Testimony”). The Applicant seeks to exclude from the records my testimony as a whole and has *not* address individual questions and answers. My testimony was submitted in questions-and-answers form as required by 16 NYCRR § 4.5(3)(i) and as requested by the presiding officer, Administrative Law Judge Belsito.

On November 6, 2020, I filed minor typographical corrections to my rebuttal testimony (originally submitted October 30, 2020). In the accompanying cover-letter, I requested an extension of seven days (until November 20) to respond to Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony on the grounds that I needed an extra five (5) business days to seek expert witness review to approve/certify my testimony.

On November 10, 2020, Administrative Law Judge Belsito, Mr. Leonard Singer representing the Applicant, and myself held a brief conference call to discuss my request for an extension. During the call, I repeated my request for an extra five (5) business days. The presiding office, ALJ Belsito, denied the request on the grounds that “such a submission would amount to submission of additional testimony which is inappropriate at this stage of the proceeding.” ALJ Belsito granted me a three-day extension (over the weekend) until Monday, November 16 to file my Response to Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony.

On November 11, 2020, Administrative Law Judge Belsito invited (via email) other

parties who “wish to respond to the Applicant’s ... [Motion to Strike Testimony to] do so by close of business on November 16, 2020.”

Discussion

Motion to Strike Testimony seeks to remove from the record and from consideration by the Commission substantial evidence that contradicts the narrative upon which the Applicant relies for it to be issued a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (“Certificate”) by the Commission.

My testimony and exhibits when view in whole represent a significant body of knowledge and contribution to the completeness of the record in this proceeding. If the Commission grants the Applicant its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Commission will remove from the proceeding the entirety of my testimony (of 113 pages), seventy-five (75) supporting exhibits containing eighty-six (86) documents and historic data of wind speeds and weather conditions (that has been provided by a US agency, NOAA). Such indiscriminant across-the-board exclusion of testimony is contrary to the legislative “purpose of this act to provide a forum for the expeditious resolution of all matters concerning the location of electric ... transmission facilities [emphasis added].” See Laws 1970, ch 272, § 1 (eff April 29, 1970).

The Applicant’s Motion to Strike seeks to remove from consideration within this proceeding disturbing evidence of malfeasance together with documentary evidence that substantiates the following –

- a) The extremely high price of energy that will to be passed onto ratepayers living in Suffolk County. The *only* publicly disclosed price to be contractually agreed between the Applicant and Long Island Power Authority (“LIPA”) is twice the price of Sunrise Wind.² The price for energy from South Fork Wind LLC includes the cost its offshore wind power-generation facility that the Applicant plans to locate approximately sixty miles from the point of interconnection offshore on the Outer Continental Shelf together with new transmission lines and a new substation/interconnection facility. The high price of energy, still, has *not* been fully disclosed to ratepayers. Although the LIPA Board of Trustees authorized an amendment to the power purchase agreement (“PPA”) for additional capacity in November 2018, LIPA did *not* agree any amendment until nearly two years later³ and has disclosed *neither* the price for the incremental energy pursuant to the amendment *nor* the actual additional capacity which could be as much as one hundred and eighty megawatts (180 MW);
- b) PSEG Long Island awarding the contract to its business partner in an opaque procurement process. During the procurement process, the company administering the procurement, PSEG Long Island, was in a business relationship with the company to which it awarded the contract, Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC.⁴ On

² According to NYSERDA, the contract price for Sunrise Wind is approximately 8.3 cents/kWh whereas according to LIPA, the contract price for Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC is 16.3 cents/kWh. See Testimony, Part 2 – Public Interest & Price (at pp. 36-42).

³ On October 8, 2020, PSEG Long Island responded to IR Si Kinsella #29. That response reads as follows: “... the PPA Amendment between the Long Island Power Authority and South Fork Wind, LLC (f/k/a Deepwater Wind South Fork, LLC) was mutually executed recently.” See Testimony, Part 3 – Rebuttal (at p. 7, lines 2-10).

⁴ Indirectly through wholly-owned subsidiaries of its parent company, Public Service Enterprise Group Incorporated. See Testimony, Part 2 – Public Interest & Price (at pp. 42-50).

November 5, 2020, PSEG Long Island responded to an interrogatory⁵ in which it admitted to its conflict of interest (see Appendix A);

- c) Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC was awarded a contract in a non-competitive⁶ opaque procurement process administered by PSEG Long Island on behalf of LIPA;
- d) Extensive and ubiquitous PFAS contamination⁷ that is immediately adjacent to and upgradient from, and within one hundred feet (100 ft) of the Applicant's proposed construction corridor exceeds US EPA Health Advisory Levels by fourteen-times (14x) and New York State Maximum Contamination Levels by one-hundred-times (100x) and poses a risk to public health and the environment;⁸
- e) The owners of South Fork Wind LLC, Ørsted and Eversource, in a submission to NYSERDA recommend against buying energy from offshore wind power generation facilities of less than 400 megawatts because "diseconomies of scale" would mean that the "costs per unit of energy for projects of 100 MW and 200 MW in size are significantly higher[.]" Projects that delivery energy from small offshore wind power-generation facilities such as that being proposed by the Applicant in this proceeding "are not likely to deliver cost savings" according to the owners of the Applicant in this proceeding.

⁵ See Appendix A – Response by PSEG Long Island to IR Si Kinsella #019 dated Nov 5, 2020 (at p. 5)

⁶ According to NYS Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire submitted to State of New York, Office of the State Comptroller ("OSC") by bidders pursuant to the 2015 South Fork RFP. The Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire were provided by OSC in response to Freedom of Information Law Request #2020-0444 on October 1, 2020. See Testimony, Part 2 – Public Interest & Price (at pp. 15-21 and 34-35).

⁷ PFAS: poly-/perfluoroalkyl substance contamination that includes regulated contaminants PFOA and PFOS.

⁸ See Kinsella Testimony, Part 1-1 – PFAS Contamination (at pp. 15-24) & Part 3 – Rebuttal (at p. 9, lines 15-20)

Should the Commission grant the Applicant its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Commission would deny me “reasonable opportunity to present evidence and examine and cross-examine witnesses”⁹ and likewise deny me “the opportunity to participate fully in our proceedings ... [and] the opportunity to oppose the settlement by offering evidence in opposition to the proposed settlement and the opportunity to cross-examine proponents of the settlement.”¹⁰

Furthermore, by granting Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony, the Commission will be denying itself the opportunity and necessity “to have available for our review as complete a record as feasible, setting forth the positions of each major party, including the staff of the Department of Public Service.”¹¹

Response to Argument Point 1

Consideration of the Price (South Fork RFP and PPA)

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant alleges that I am “asking the Commission to go back in time and challenge the RFP process and the terms of the PPA.”¹² If this were true (it is *not* true), the Applicant would have provided a citation directing the reader to where I allegedly asked this of the Commission. The Applicant does *cannot* provide a citation

⁹ 16 NYCRR § 4.5(a)

¹⁰ See Procedural Guidelines for Settlements, 1992 (cases 90-M-0255 and 92-M-0138), Appendix B, Section E. Responsibility of the Parties to Develop the Record. (at p.6, paragraph 2)

¹¹ *Id.* (at p. 5-6, paragraph 1)

¹² Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony of Simon Kinsella filed Nov 5, 2020 (at pp. 3-4)

because none exists. The claim by the Applicant is unfounded.

Part 2 of my testimony outlines, clearly, the reason why the South Fork RFP and its subsequent PPA award are directly relevant to this proceeding and why they *must* be included in the record. The South Fork RFP and PPA are *necessary* contributions to the completeness of the record without which the Commission is prohibited by statute from issuing the Applicant a Certificate. The Commission “may not grant a certificate” to the Applicant “unless it shall find and determine: ... that the facility will serve the public interest”¹³ which requires the Commission to consider “the contract prices which would affect the pricing of utilities supplied to the general public[.]”¹⁴

Furthermore, the Commission is mandated to ensure “the facility represents the minimum adverse environmental impact, considering the state of available technology and the nature and *economics of the various alternatives*, and other pertinent considerations [emphasis added].”¹⁵ If the price of energy delivered by the subject transmission facility is excluded from the record in this proceeding, the Commission cannot possibly assess and compare the “economics” of alternatives. Such alternatives include those that utilize different technologies other than offshore wind to generate energy examples of which are included in my Testimony, Part 2 that this motion seeks to strike from the record.¹⁶

Part 2 of my Testimony opens with the most relevant of all mandates with which the Commission *must* comply which reads as follows –

¹³ NY CLS Pub Ser § 126(1)(h)

¹⁴ See *Simon V. Kinsella vs. Office of the New York State Comptroller*, NYSCEF index 904100-19 (Kinsella Testimony, Part 2 - Public Interest, Need and Price, Exhibit 2 at p. 2)

¹⁵ NY CLS Pub Ser § 126(1)(c)

¹⁶ Kinsella Testimony, Part 2 - Public Interest, Need and Price (at p. 18, lines 8-12)

Pursuant to § 126(1)(h), New York State Public Service Commission (the “Commission”) “may not grant a certificate ... unless it shall find and determine ... that the facility will serve the public interest[.]”¹⁷

PSL § 126(1)(h) (the “Public Interest Clause”) and what determines whether or not a project is in the public interest is relevant to the Commission and by extension, therefore, testimony that materially contributes to such a determination is likewise relevant to this proceeding.

Part 2 of my testimony proceeds with a discussion of the Public Interest Clause by introducing into the record a recent ruling in a New York State Article 78 case that concerns the subject transmission facility currently before the Commission. The ruling, by Hon. Richard Rivera, A.S.C.J., is directly relevant to this proceeding because it defines a key determinant that the Commission *must* consider when deciding whether or not a facility is in the public interest. The ruling settles the issue of whether or not contract prices that affect the pricing of utilities supplied to the general public are of interest to the general public: they are.

The ruling reads as follows –

The Court finds that the record requested was of significant interest to the general public as the records sought consisted of the contract prices which would affect the pricing of utilities supplied to the general public ...¹⁸

The purpose behind introducing the 2015 South Fork RFP and its subsequent PPA into

¹⁷ *Id.* (at p. 3, lines 6-8)

¹⁸ *Id.* (at pp. 3-4) citing *Simon V. Kinsella vs. Office of the New York State Comptroller*, NYSCEF index 904100-19 (see Exhibit 2 at p. 2)

this proceeding is to ensure that the contract prices the public will have to pay for energy delivered by subject transmission facility which will affect the pricing of utilities supplied to the general public are included in record and are correctly stated based on fact. By introducing the contract prices, my testimony makes a valuable contribution that “is necessary to have available for our review as complete a record as feasible”¹⁹ for the Commission to consider before making its determination pursuant to PSL § 126(1).

Part 2 of my testimony *neither* seeks to challenge *nor* undo either the 2015 South Fork RFP or its subsequent PPA, but merely seeks public disclosure of the contract prices and their inclusion into the record so the Commission can consider the price when making its determination as to Public Interest Clause. This is relevant to this proceeding because without introducing into the record the contract prices, the Commission cannot determine whether or not the subject transmission facility is in the public interest pursuant to PSL § 126(1)(h).

The contract prices are expressed in the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) that is born from the South Fork RFP process and influenced by it. These facts do *not* relieve the Commission of its statutory obligations to consider –

1. The “state of available technology and the nature and economics of the various alternatives” when making its determination as to whether or not “the facility represents the minimum adverse environmental impact” pursuant to PSL § 126(1)(c); and
2. The Applicant’s contract prices and how they “affect the pricing of utilities

¹⁹ See Procedural Guidelines for Settlements, 1992 (cases 90-M-0255 and 92-M-0138), Appendix B, Section E. Responsibility of the Parties to Develop the Record. (at p.6, paragraph 2)

supplied to the general public”²⁰ pursuant to PSL § 126(1)(h).

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant states that the “RFP process was approved by the LIPA Board in January 2017, and the PPA was approved by the New York State Comptroller’s Office and the New York State Attorney General prior to becoming effective. Therefore, the time for challenging those determinations has long passed [emphasis added].”²¹ The Applicant, again, is under the misconception that my testimony challenges the South Fork RFP and its subsequent PPA, but it does *not*. My testimony seeks to correct the record, ensure the record is based on fact and to include relevant information into the record such as contract prices. For example, the contract prices for the Applicant’s energy from the subject transmission facility as expressed in the PPA are a result of a *non-competitive* South Fork RFP process (as my testimony and exhibits prove) and only by looking to the true nature of the RFP process and including into the record the contract prices as expressed within the PPA that the Commission gain some insight into whether or not the subject transmission facility is in the public interest. This does *not* constitute a challenge or seek to undo either the South Fork RFP or its PPA, but merely adds to the completeness of the record information the Commission has a statutory obligation to consider. A complete record and transparent process are both necessary for effective public accountability in a democratic society.

The LIPA Act

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant appears to be arguing that the

²⁰ See Kinsella Testimony, Part 2 - Public Interest, Need and Price (at pp. 3-4) citing *Simon V. Kinsella vs. Office of the New York State Comptroller*, NYSCEF index 904100-19 (Exhibit 2 at p. 2)

²¹ Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony of Simon Kinsella filed Nov 5, 2020 (at p. 4)

Commission does *not* have authority to review rate increases by LIPA pursuant to the LIPA Act.²² Although interesting, the Applicant in this proceeding is *not* LIPA. The Applicant is South Fork Wind LLC (formerly Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC) and it is a merchant transmission operator. The LIPA Act applies specifically to LIPA and does *not* apply to a merchant transmission operator. Also, LIPA *cannot* confer its statutory powers, rights and obligations upon the Applicant. Furthermore, there is no exemption within Article VII that would relieve the Commission of its statutory obligations towards an Applicant were it and LIPA counterparts to each other in the same power purchase agreement. The Applicant is still obligated to file an application pursuant to Article VII and the Commission *must* determine whether or not to grant it a Certificate pursuant to PSL § 126(1).

NextEra Energy Transmission NY (case 18-T-0499)

The Applicant, in its Motion to Strike Testimony cites the application of NextEra Energy Transmission New York, Inc. (“NextEra Energy T014” case 18-T-0499) as an example where “the Commission determined that the need for the transmission line was demonstrated by the fact that the Project had been selected through the New York Independent System Operator, Inc.’s (“NYISO”) competitive Public Policy Transmission Planning Process [emphasis added]” and that “no additional inquiry by the Commission” was required.

The Applicant did *not* mention that it was the Commission, itself, that “issued an order on October 13, 2016, ... directing the NYISO to evaluate and select a transmission solution.”²³

²² NY CLS Pub A § 1020-f(u)(2)

²³ Case 18-T-0499, Application of NextEra Energy Transmission New York, Inc. for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need Pursuant to Article VII of the Public Service Law, Order Granting Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need issued June 16, 2020, Joint Proposal (at p. 9)

The NYISO then “identified 10 viable and sufficient projects as submitted by the following entities: NEETNY (two projects); North American Transmission (four projects); Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid (“National Grid”) (two projects); NYPA/NYSEG (one project); Exelon Transmission Company (one project).” NYISO “conducted a technical evaluation of the 10 project proposals. Each proposal was ranked according to several metrics, including capital costs, costs per MW, expandability, operability, performance, property rights and routing, and development schedule. Environmental permitting was also considered in the evaluation.”

The case of NextEra Energy T014 is distinguished from this proceeding as follows –

a) NextEra Energy T014 was selected as a result of a competitive bidding process.

By comparison, the Applicant was selected in a non-competitive procurement where there was *only one* large-scale energy generation facility which happened to be the facility proposed by the Applicant in this preceding.²⁴

f) After the preferred bidder was selected, the evaluation report was publicly released and available together with the names of the other bidders with their comparative evaluation metrics. By Comparison, the South Fork RFP was an opaque behind-closed-doors procurement process where the company administering the procurement, PSEG Long Island, has repeatedly refused to release all the names of the bidders (except for successful bids).

²⁴ According to NYS Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire submitted to State of New York, Office of the State Comptroller (“OSC”) by bidders pursuant to the 2015 South Fork RFP. The Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire were provided by OSC in response to Freedom of Information Law Request #2020-0444 on October 1, 2020. See Testimony, Part 2 – Public Interest & Price (at pp. 15-21 and 34-35).

g) Neither the company employed by NYISO to evaluate the projects (Substation Engineering Company), nor the procurement administrator (NYISO) were in business with the company (NextEra Energy Transmission New York, Inc.) that they selected as the preferred bidder. By comparison, in this proceeding the company that administered the South Fork RFP procurement process, PSEG Long Island, awarding the contract to its business partner, the Applicant in this proceeding (Deepwater Wind South Fork LLC).²⁵

NY Transco (case 19-T-0684)

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant cites the application of New York Transco LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need Pursuant to Article VII of the New York Public Service Law. This case is distinguished from the current proceeding insofar as there existed another venue, the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, where a party could challenge a project's cost-effectiveness. By comparison, the South Fork RFP did *not* provide an opportunity for parties to challenge the Selection Committee's final section(s) and the procurement administrator, PSEG Long Island, would *not* discuss other proposals or make comparative evaluations, making a challenge based on comparative costs impossible.

Furthermore (and at the risk of repeating myself), my testimony does *not* challenge and does *not* seek to undo either the South Fork RFP or PPA, and in any case, the Commission is *not* relieved of its statutory obligations pursuant to NY CLS Pub Ser § 126(1).

²⁵ Indirectly through wholly-owned subsidiaries of its parent company, Public Service Enterprise Group Incorporated. See Testimony, Part 2 – Public Interest & Price (at pp. 42-50).

Response to Argument Point 2

My testimony introduces into the recording of this proceeding evidence pertaining to genuine issues of inconsistency with the Applicant's proposed transmission facility. My testimony and exhibits present a serious critique of the Applicant's project and by so doing unavoidably raised issues with the surreptitious nature of the process by which the project was selected. The Motion to Strike Testimony is an example of how evidence has been kept out of this proceeding, out of the public domain and away from public scrutiny.

The testimony and exhibits submitted by me is evidence that is truthful, honest and accurate. It is substantiated with supporting documentation that can be verified. The Applicant neither questions the truthfulness nor accuracy of my testimony nor does the Applicant question my integrity.

My testimony and exhibits present facts that are contrary to the carefully constructed narrative proffered by the Applicant.

For these reasons, the only option available to the Applicant to suppress the evidence against its proposal is to attack the person presenting the information, *ad hominem*.

In an attempt to avoid the Applicant turning this proceeding into a hearing on my education and qualifications and prevent diverting the focus of the hearing away from an examination of the merits of the subject transmission facility, I objected to the following two information request submitted by the Applicant –

SFW-07-1 *Please state your educational experience, including any university-level degrees received and what you majored in; [and]*

SFW-07-2 *Please provide your work experience.*²⁶

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant asserts (falsely) that it “asked Mr. Kinsella to provide information about his qualifications to offer opinion testimony on PFAS issues [emphasis added].”²⁷ This is *not true*. The Applicant neither mentioned “opinion testimony” nor “PFAS issues” in its information requests. With regards to information request SFW-07-3, the Applicant asserts (again, falsely) that I “objected and refused to provide the information sought[.]”²⁸ This is *not true*. The information sought by the Applicant in information request SFW-07-3 already had been provided by me on my website.²⁹ In my response to information request SFW-07-3, I make this point, clearly.³⁰ My response to IR SFW 07-01-3 reads as follows –

The requested information has been provided, already, to the Applicant and is "duplicative" ... The requested information is available from www.Wainscott.Life [emphasis added]”

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant asserts (falsely) that “Mr. Kinsella admits that he is not an expert witness.”³¹ This is *not true*. The Applicant does *not* cite a reference of where I made this alleged admission.

²⁶ Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony of Simon Kinsella, Exhibit 1 (SFW-07-1 and SFW-07-02)

²⁷ *Id.* (at p. 7)

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ www.Wainscott.Life

³⁰ I also informed the Applicant of this fact during our telephone call.

³¹ Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony of Simon Kinsella (at p. 7)

In its Motion to Strike Testimony, the Applicant asserts (again, falsely) that –

*In claiming that his education and work experience are not relevant or material to this proceeding, Mr. Kinsella is admitting that he is not an expert in the field in which he is offering his opinion testimony.*³²

When the Applicant asked for my education and work experience (as mentioned above), the Applicant did *not* inform me of the context or that the information request related to “opinion testimony” or “PFAS issues” or any other issues (the Applicant is *not* telling the truth). By quoting my response in the false context of “opinion testimony” and “PFAS issues[,]” the Applicant takes my response out of the actual context in which it was asked and places in the context of a response to an information request that it did *not* ask. The Applicant then makes the following false allegation that: “Mr. Kinsella is admitting that he is not an expert in the field in which he is offering his opinion testimony.” I make no such admission. Furthermore, the Applicant does *not* cite a reference to where it alleges I made such admission.

Furthermore, the Applicant’s callous disregard to the existence in Wainscott of extensive PFAS contamination in soil and groundwater that is classified as hazardous waste in New York State³³ is very concerning. The Applicant refers to reports issued by US Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), US Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (“ATSDR”), NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (“DEC”) and Suffolk County Department of Health Services (“SCDHS”) as “a compilation of information collected by Mr.

³² *Id.* (at p. 8)

³³ DEC added PFOA-acid to New York State’s list of hazardous substances (6 NYCRR Section 597.3) on Jan 27, 2016, and added PFOA-salt, PFOS-acid, and PFOS-salt to the list on April 25, 2016, making them all hazardous wastes as defined by ECL Article 27, Title 13.

Kinsella with respect to alleged PFAS contamination in the Town of East Hampton [emphasis added]”³⁴ and “merely compiled information through Internet searches and Freedom of Information Law requests and provided [my] own speculative thoughts on them [emphasis added].”³⁵ Despite the overwhelming evidence, the Applicant does *not* admit to the existence in Wainscott of PFAS contamination whatsoever and refers to summaries and analysis of facts taken directly from reports provided by the aforementioned agencies dismissively as “alleged”³⁶ and “speculative[.]”³⁷ Given that the Applicant recently filed a Site Characterization Report of East Hampton Airport in Wainscott (of 268 pages)³⁸ on PFAS contamination, it is disingenuous for the Applicant, now, to use language deliberately designed to mislead the Commission into believing that PFAS contamination does *not* exist when it has filed documents to the contrary. Furthermore, the site of the characterization report, East Hampton Airport, is adjacent and upgradient from the Applicant’s proposed route for its new transmission line. Fact.

As the Applicant points out in its Motion to Strike Testimony, I have a disclaimer on my Internet site at www.Wainscott.Life that reads: “I am neither a scientist, lawyer nor do I have any medical qualifications [and any] conclusions or opinions presented in these reports and advertisements are not professional opinions”³⁹ This statement should be viewed and interpretation in context as follows –

- I am not a lawyer because I have not been admitted to the New York State Bar Association and, therefore, I am not a member of the legal profession.

³⁴ Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony of Kinsella (at p. 8)

³⁵ *Id.* (at p. 9)

³⁶ *Id.* (at p. 8)

³⁷ *Id.* (at p. 9)

³⁸ SFW Exhibit_(OWRP-2) -East Hampton Airport Site Characterization Report Final_Part1 to Part6

³⁹ Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony of Kinsella (at p. 8)

- I am not a scientist because I do not hold myself out to be a scientist and I do not have a university degree in any specific field of science; and
- I have no medical qualifications from university studies.

Professional vs. Expert

The Applicant provides two quotes from my online disclaimer that read: “Any conclusions or opinions presented in these reports and advertisements are not professional opinions” and that online “reports and advertisements do not purport to present professional opinions[.]”⁴⁰ The Applicant uses my description of “professional opinions” and makes the unfounded leap to conclude that this: “establishes that Mr. Kinsella is not an expert and is unqualified to provide expert testimony[.]” The Applicant switches the word I use, *professional*, with the word, *expert*, to justify its false narrative. To be a *professional* and to be an *expert* are very different from each other.

To be a member of the *professions* is to be either a lawyer (admitted to the bar), a chartered accountant, a medical doctor or an engineer. On the other hand, neither finance nor sales are traditionally considered to be *professions*. The word *expert* has a different meaning that is *not* defined on the basis of industry and professional association (typically with a code of ethics and annual membership with insurance requirements). An expert can be from *any* industry as the Applicant correctly points out in its Motion to Strike Testimony.⁴¹ The distinction is important because to be a member of a *profession* also means that there exists a higher degree of assumed knowledge and consequential higher liability risk (i.e. insurance). To

⁴⁰ Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony of Kinsella (at p. 8)

⁴¹ *Id.* (at p. 8) citing *Matott v. Ward*, 48 N.Y.2d 455, 459 (1979).

be an *expert* does not necessarily carry with it an increase in liability risk. It is for this reason that, on my disclaimer, I specifically use the term “professional opinions” which is distinct from being an *expert*. One can be an *expert* and not be a member of the *professions*, concurrently.

*The purpose of a disclaimer is
incompatible with its use as a résumé.*

The Applicant has been quick to jump at the opportunity to exploit my disclaimer for a purpose other than that for which it was written and to use it out of context. In context, the disclaimer should be interpreted as a disclaimer that is designed to limit rights and obligations related to information (albeit factual in nature), that I publish and make available online. The Applicant seeks to use this disclaimer out of context and apply it to a purpose which it does not satisfy. The Applicant has taken a disclaimer that limits rights and obligations and interpreted it as a curriculum vitae or résumé that defines a person’s body of knowledge, experience and level of expertise gained since adolescence. These two purposes are incompatible with each other. Based on a false premise that a *disclaimer* is the same as a *résumé*, the Applicant makes a misleading interpretation that does *not* take into consideration information that would typically be on a *résumé*. For example, a *résumé* would include my formal education (e.g. my bachelor’s degree), training (e.g. in financial, statistical analysis, etc.) and experience (e.g. scientific research), but my disclaimer has none of this. Based on this false premise, the Applicant then arrives at an equally false conclusion: “that Mr. Kinsella is not an expert and is unqualified to provide expert testimony and opinion testimony regarding PFAS issues.”⁴² The Applicant’s statement is *not* true.

⁴² Applicant’s Motion to Strike Testimony of Kinsella (at p. 8)

The Applicant, again, makes the (false) claim that: “he [Simon Kinsella] admits that he is not an expert[.]” I have *not* made such an admission and the Applicant has not been able to cite where I allegedly made such admission.⁴³

The Applicant provided in its Motion to Strike Testimony greater detail regarding its information requests SFW-07-1 and SFW-07-2 (originally, these information requests were only 21-words-long, combined). In response to Applicant providing further information, I have included herein a curriculum vitae for myself (see [Appendix B](#)).

In summary, I concluded my formal education nearly thirty years ago ten thousand miles away on a separate continent in the fields of accountancy, finance and law. My career took me from the professional services industry (KPMG Peat Marwick, twice), to finance (BNP, Deutsche Bank AG, *et al*) and then my own Internet company the sale of which enabled me to conclude twelve years ago a conventional career spanning four continents. Since 2016, I have spent most of my time conducting research into water quality issues related to sources of cyanobacteria and cyanotoxic contamination, PFAS contamination and research into the local hydrologic system in Wainscott (see Exhibit B for further details).

Lay Witness Testimony

The Applicant has gone to great lengths to in an attempt to disqualify me as an expert witness by, for example, alleging (falsely) that: “Mr. Kinsella admits that he is not

⁴³ *Id.* (at p. 9)

an expert witness.”⁴⁴ I have not made such admission and the Applicant does *not* cite a reference of where I made this alleged admission. Regardless, whether or not I qualify as an expert witness is moot as it does *not* disqualify me from being a lay witness.

The New York State Department of Civil Service’s Manual for Administrative Law Judges and Hearing Officers (“Manual”) stipulates provides that –

*A lay witness may give his/her opinion, based upon facts that the witness has personal knowledge of, provided that such opinion is based upon common ordinary knowledge, without special skill or background, and it is unreasonable to expect the witness to describe all the facts which would permit the trier of fact to draw the conclusion. The rule is liberally construed, and lay witnesses may give their opinion on a wide variety of subjects [emphasis added].*⁴⁵

The Manual expressly stipulates that an Administrative Law Judge should interpret the aforementioned rule “liberally” and, furthermore, it does *not* preclude permitting a lay witness from testifying so long as the lay witness’s “opinion is limited to one that is: (a) rationally based on the witness’s perception; [and] (b) helpful to clearly understanding the witness’s testimony or to determining a fact in issue[.]”⁴⁶

The Applicant further argues that the Manual “notes that where the opinion is not helpful, speculative or otherwise lacks a rational basis, it may be excluded.”⁴⁷ The

⁴⁴ Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony of Simon Kinsella (at p. 7)

⁴⁵ NYS Department of State, Manual for Administrative Law Judges And Hearing Officers, 2011 (at p. 250)

⁴⁶ LII Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 701. Opinion Testimony by Lay Witnesses Rule 701. Opinion Testimony by Lay Witnesses

⁴⁷ NYS Department of State, Manual for Administrative Law Judges And Hearing Officers, 2011 (at p. 258)

Applicant here appears to be clutching at straws. The whole point of the exhibits and why there are so many source documents is to show that the information is *not* “speculative or otherwise lacks a rational basis[.]”

The Applicant argues that I have “no personal knowledge of the information in [my] testimony” but ignores the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 701, that relies on a testimony that is “rationally based on the witness’s perception[.]”

Public Documents

New York Common Law Rule (see matter of Richards v. Robin,⁴⁸) succinctly defines the common law rule pertaining to public documents as follows –

[A]n official statement kept or prepared by or under the direction of a public officer, acting under his oath of office, either pursuant to a positive requirement of statute or in the discharge of a public duty, is competent prima facie evidence as against all the world of such facts therein stated as the official was required or authorized by law to state.⁴⁹

Please see (below) a list of Public Documents that have been submitted as exhibits from NYS Agencies –

<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Part 1-1	DECinfo Locator - Critical Environmental Areas	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 01)
Part 1-1	Groundwater Protection Area (CEA Map #6)	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 02)
Part 1-1	Water Recharge Overlay District (CEA)	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 03)

⁴⁸ 178 A.D. 535, 165 N.Y.S. 780 (1st Dep't 1917)

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 539, 165 N.Y.S. at 784. (Note: should the Commission require that public documents should be authenticated, I am willing to have the documents authenticated.)

Part 1-1	Site Characterization Report of East Hampton Airport	NYS DEC	Exhibit D (1-9)
Part 1-1	Site Characterization Report - Wainscott S&G	NYS DEC	Exhibit E
Part 1-1	Request for Information PFOA/PFOS Survey	NYS DEC	Exhibit H (p. 14-20)
Part 1-1	Art VII Case 10-T-0154 Submission	NYS DEC	Exhibit I-1
Part 1-2	Sand Pit' PFAS Results (SC Report Site 152254)	NYS DEC	Exhibit 1-1B
Part 1-2	Guidelines for Sampling and Analysis of PFAS	NYS DEC	Exhibit 1-1A
Part 1-1	Superfund Designation - Wainscott Sand & Gravel	NYS DEC	Exhibit L
Part 1-1	East Hampton Scenic Resources Protection Plan	NYS DOS	Exhibit A (p. 04)
Part 1-1	Staff Proposal "Outline of Issues"	NYS DPS	Exhibit I-2
Part 1-1	Release on Drinking Water Standard	NYS Exec.	Exhibit H (p. 10-13)
Part 3	NYSERDA OSW Policy Options Paper (Jan 29, 2018)	NYSERDA	Exhibit 3-7
Part 2	NY OSW Industry: Phase 1 Report - Sunrise & Equinor	NYSERDA	Exhibit F
Part 2	PPA Contract Price Table	OAG	Exhibit 06
Part 2	Letter Response to FOIL Request 2020-0444	OSC	Exhibit II
Part 2	Kinsella vs NYS OSC - Decision (index 904100-19)	Article 78	Exhibit 01
Part 2	Email Response to FOIL Request 2020-0444	OSC	Exhibit I
Part 3	Email from Deputy Commissioner to Town Supervisor	SCDHS	Exhibit 3-4
Part 3	PFAS Laboratory Reports of Private Wells in Wainscott	SCDHS	Exhibit 3-3

Please see (below) a list of Public Documents that have been submitted as exhibits from

US Agencies –

<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Part 1-1	FAQ PFAS	US ATSDR	Exhibit H (p. 06-09)
Part 2	OSW Tech Market Report Adj Strike Prices (Fig 32)	US DOE	Exhibit L
Part 2	Offshore Wind Technologies Market Report (2018)	US DOE	Exhibit K
Part 2	NREL Comparing Offshore Wind Energy Procurement	US DOE	Exhibit I
Part 2	Block Island Wind Farm - Generation & Capacity	US EIA	Exhibit 12 (p. 21-22)
Part 1-1	Shaw Aero - RCRA Hazardous Waste (1991 & 1993)	US EPA	Shaw Aero
Part 1-1	Shaw Aero - FRS Facility Detail Report	US EPA	Shaw Aero
Part 1-1	PFAS Contamination - Interim Recommendations	US EPA	Exhibit P
Part 1-1	PFAS Action Plan	US EPA	Exhibit J
Part 1-1	Fact Sheet, PFOA & PFOS Drinking Water Advisory	US EPA	Exhibit H (p. 01-05)

Part 2	Weather - South Fork (2000 to 2020)	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (m)
Part 2	Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data 2019	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (l)
Part 2	Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data 2018	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (k)
Part 2	Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data 2017	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (j)
Part 2	Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data 2016	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (i)
Part 2	Station: 44017 - Wind Data 2019	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (h)
Part 2	Station: 44017 - Wind Data 2018	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (g)
Part 2	Station: 44017 - Wind Data 2017	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (f)
Part 2	Station: 44017 - Wind Data 2016	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (e)
Part 2	Station: 44017 - Wind Data 2015	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (d)
Part 2	Station: 44008 - Wind Data 2017	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (c)
Part 2	Station: 44008 - Wind Data 2016	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (b)
Part 2	Station: 44008 - Wind Data 2015	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (a)
Part 2	Wind Speed 2003-2007, 2013 & 2016	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (p. 23-38)
Part 2	Wind: Nantucket, Montk & Buzz Bay	NOAA - Nat. Data Buoy Cnt	Exhibit 12 (p. 04-20)

Conclusion

South Fork Wind is relying on heavily curated information to support its application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need submitted to New York State Public Service Commission.

Testimony and exhibits submitted by me represents disturbing evidence of malfeasance.

Should the Commission permit the wholesales exclusion of material and relevant evidence pertaining to New York Public Service Law § 126(1) from contributing to a complete record in this proceeding so as to allow the Commission to properly consider all the evidence when making its determination as to certification, it would circumvent the purpose of an Article

VII review, circumvent judicial process, and circumvent US constitutional provisions requiring "due process of law."⁵⁰

For the aforementioned reasons, I respectfully request that New York State Public Service Commission to deny the Motion by South Fork Wind LLC to Strike Testimony in full.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Simon V. Kinsella", written over a horizontal line.

Simon V. Kinsella

Dated: November 16, 2020

Wainscott, New York

⁵⁰ 2. U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; N.Y. Const. Art. I, § 6.

The testimony herein listed together with supporting documentation has been filed with the New York State Department of Public Service (see Table 1, below).

Document Short Title	Author	Reference	No of Pages
Testimony Part 1 - PFAS Contamination	Si Kinsella (Q 1.01 to 22)	Testimony	37
Critical Environmental Areas	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 01)	1
Groundwater Protection (CEA Map #6)	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 02)	1
Water Recharge Overlay District (CEA)	NYS DEC	Exhibit A (p. 03)	1
Scenic Resources Protection Plan	NYS Department of State	Exhibit A (p. 04)	1
Summary PFAS Results - Heat Map	Si Kinsella (DEC & SCDHS)	Exhibit B	1
Report No. 3 - PFAS Contamination	Si Kinsella	Exhibit C	91
SC Report of East Hampton Airport	NYS DEC	Exhibit D (1-9)	269
SC Report - Wainscott S&G	NYS DEC	Exhibit E	631
Town Complaint (NYSED Case #20-1787)	Town of East Hampton	Exhibit F	30
Draft EIS - Wainscott S&G ('Pit')	Wainscott Commercial Center	Exhibit G	895
Fact Sheet, PFOA & PFOS Advisory	US EPA	Exhibit H (p. 01-05)	5
FAQ PFAS	US ATSDR	Exhibit H (p. 06-09)	4
Release on Drinking Water Standard	NYS Governor Cuomo	Exhibit H (p. 10-13)	4
RFI PFOA/PFOS Survey	NYS DEC	Exhibit H (p. 14-20)	7
Art VII Case 10-T-0154 Submission	NYS DEC	Exhibit I-1	10
Staff Proposal "Outline of Issues"	NYS DPS	Exhibit I-2	1
PFAS Action Plan	US EPA	Exhibit J	20
Cable Route (Fig 5, 2-2 w/ PFAS Notes)	Applicant (notes by Si Kinsella)	Exhibit K	1
Superfund Designation - Wainscott S&G	NYS DEC	Exhibit L	2
PFAS - Wells EH-1 (Airport) to S1 ('Pit')	Si Kinsella	Exhibit M	1
IRs - Si Kinsella #03-#10 to Applicant	Si Kinsella	Exhibit N	144
Article - West Gate Tunnel, PFAS	Australian Financial Review	Exhibit O	8
PFAS - Interim Recommendations	US EPA	Exhibit P	7
ASTSWMO PFC (PFAS Remediation)	Assoc of Solid Waste Mgt Officials	Exhibit Q	68
PFAS Standards	MA Depart of Environ'l Protection	Exhibit R	12
Shaw Aero - FRS Facility Detail Rpt	US EPA	Shaw Aero	1
Shaw Aero - RCRA Hazardous Waste	US EPA	Shaw Aero	10
Griffiths Carpet - "Teflon Treatment"	Griffiths Carpet	Griffiths Carpet	1
Griffiths Carpet - Online Map	Google Maps	Griffiths Carpet	1
Griffiths Carpet - Online Map	Mapquest	Griffiths Carpet	1
Testimony Pt 1-2 - PFAS Contamination	Si Kinsella (Q 1.23 to 27)	Testimony	11
PFAS Guidelines - Sampling and Analysis	NYS DEC	Exhibit 1-1A	29
'Pit' PFAS Results (SC Report Site 152254)	NYS DEC	Exhibit 1-1B	2
Summary PFAS Results - Heat Map	Si Kinsella (NYS DEC & SCDHS)	Exhibit 1-1C	1
Testimony Pt 1 - PFAS Contamination	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 1-1D	37

Document Short Title	Author	Reference	No of Pages
Testimony Pt 2 - Public Interest	Si Kinsella (Q 2.01 to 19)	Testimony	52
Kinsella vs OSC - Decision (904100-19)	Hon. Richard J. Rivera, A.S.C.J.	Exhibit 01	3
2015 South Fork RFP - June 24, 2015	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit 02	94
Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)	LIPA/PSEGLI/Applicant	Exhibit 03	139
PPA Amendment (additional capacity)	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit 04	50
Response to IR SK #29 - PPA Amendment	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit 05	1
PPA Contract Price Table	Office of Attorney General	Exhibit 06	9
IR - Kinsella #32 PSEGLI/LIPA Response	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 07	7
IR - Kinsella #32 - Emails	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 08	2
IR - Kinsella #32 - Motion to Compel	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 09	29
2015 South Fork RFP - June 24, 2015 (full)	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit A	94
IR - Kinsella #32 to PSEGLI/LIPA	Si Kinsella	Exhibit B	3
IR - Kinsella #32 to PSEGLI/LIPA - Response	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit C	4
IR - Kinsella #32 - Emails	Si Kinsella	Exhibit D	2
Kinsella vs OSC - Decision (index 904100-19)	Hon. Richard J. Rivera, A.S.C.J.	Exhibit E	3
NY OSW Industry (Sunrise & Equinor)	NYSERDA	Exhibit F	378
South Fork Wind - Press Release - Price 16.3¢	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit G	4
Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)	LIPA/PSEGLI/Applicant	Exhibit H	139
NREL Comparing OSW Energy Procurement	US Department of Energy	Exhibit I	66
IR Si Kinsella #29 - PSEGLI Response	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit J	1
OSW Technologies Market Report (2018)	US Department of Energy	Exhibit K	92
OSW Tech Market - Strike Prices (Fig 32)	US Department of Energy	Exhibit L	1
LIPA Trustee Board PPA Approval	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit M	7
Ørsted A/S - 2018 Annual Report	Ørsted A/S	Exhibit N	193
Ørsted A/S - 2019 Annual Report	Ørsted A/S	Exhibit O	183
N.J. Awards Grant for First OSW Project	Wall Street Journal	Exhibit P	3
Evaluation - US Wind & Skipjack	Maryland Public Svc Commission	Exhibit Q	210
Evaluation Committee Recommendation	NJ Board of Public Utilities	Exhibit R	16
IR Kinsella #19 - PSEGLI Conflicts of Interest	Si Kinsella	Exhibit S	104
IR Kinsella #19 - PSEGLI Response	Si Kinsella	Exhibit T	8
IR - Si Kinsella #32 - Supplemental Info	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 10	18
Email Response to FOIL #2020-0444	Office of the State Comptroller	Exhibit I	1
Letter Response to FOIL #2020-0444	Office of the State Comptroller	Exhibit II	2
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000883)	Deepwater Wind South Fork, LLC	Exhibit III	12
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000884)	EH Energy Storage Center	Exhibit IV	10
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000885)	EH Energy Storage Center	Exhibit V	12
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000885)	EH Energy Storage Center	Exhibit VI	10
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000883)	DWW, Halmar, Convergent, <i>et al</i>	Exhibit VII	136
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000884)	EH Energy Storage Center	Exhibit VIII	23

Document Short Title	Author	Reference	No of Pages
OSC - Vendor Questionnaires (C000885)	Montauk Energy Storage Center	Exhibit IX	54
OSC FOIL Request #2020-0444 VRQ	Si Kinsella	Exhibit X	3
Siemens-Gamesa (SG 8.0-167 DD) Specs	Wind Energy Mkt Intelligence	Exhibit XI	1
OSW Power VOID - Deepwater Wind	Si Kinsella	Exhibit XII	1
PSEG LI - Bridgehampton Substation Fire	The East Hampton Star	Exhibit XIII	2
LIPA Trustee Board PPA Approval	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit M	7
Siemens-Gamesa (SG 8.0-167 DD) Specs	Wind Energy Market Intelligence	Exhibit 11	1
Conditional award of order by Ørsted	Siemens Gamesa	Exhibit 11	4
Ørsted Selects Siemens Gamesa	Ørsted A/S	Exhibit 11	4
Wind Power VOID - South Fork Wind	Si Kinsella	Exhibit 12 (p. 01-02)	2
Average Temperature in East Hampton	Weather Atlas, Weather-US.com	Exhibit 12 (p. 03)	1
Wind Data: Nantucket, Montauk & BUZM3	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (p. 04-20)	17
Block Island Wind - Generation & Capacity	US Energy Information Agency	Exhibit 12 (p. 21-22)	2
Wind Speed (SSW Montauk)	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (p. 23-38)	16
Station: 44008 - Wind Data (10-min) 2015	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (a)	841
Station: 44008 - Wind Data (10-min) 2016	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (b)	655
Station: 44008 - Wind Data (10-min) 2017	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (c)	519
Station: 44017 - Wind Data (10-min) 2015	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (d)	596
Station: 44017 - Wind Data (10-min) 2016	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (e)	1,184
Station: 44017 - Wind Data (10-min) 2017	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (f)	141
Station: 44017 - Wind Data (10-min) 2018	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (g)	716
Station: 44017 - Wind Data (10-min) 2019	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (h)	304
Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data (10-min) 2016	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (i)	877
Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data (10-min) 2017	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (j)	873
Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data (10-min) 2018	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (k)	870
Station: BUZM3 - Wind Data (10-min) 2019	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (l)	549
Weather Data - South Fork - (2000 to 2020)	NOAA - National Data Buoy Center	Exhibit 12 (m)	668
Utility Pole Electrical Fire (Miller Ln)	Michael Heller	Exhibit 13	2
Testimony Part 3 - Rebuttal	Si Kinsella (Q 3.01 to 04)	Testimony	13
IR SK #29 - PSEGLI Supplemental Response	LIPA/PSEGLI	Exhibit 3-1	1
PFAS Heat Map & Wainscott S&G ('Pit')	Si Kinsella (NYS DEC & SCDHS)	Exhibit 3-2	3
PFAS Laboratory Reports of Wainscott Wells	Suffolk County Dept. of Health Svs	Exhibit 3-3	416
Email from SCDHS to Town Supervisor	Suffolk County Dept. of Health Svs	Exhibit 3-4	11
Rigano Presentation on DEC SC Report	Nicholas C. Rigano, Esq.	Exhibit 3-5	10
NYSERDA OSW RFI 2018, Ørsted/Eversource	Bat State Wind, LLC	Exhibit 3-6	15
NYSERDA OSW Policy Options Paper	NYSERDA	Exhibit 3-7	117
Newsday - LIPA to Spend \$109M	Newsday	Exhibit 3-8	2
Total Exhibits: 92	Total Documents: 105	Total Pages:	13,682

PSEG Long Island
Case Name: Application of Deepwater Wind South Fork, LLC
Docket No(s): 18-T-0604

Response to Discovery Request: PSEGLI Kinsella 019
Subject: Conflict of Interest
Date of Response: March 13, 2020 (Supplemented November 5, 2020)

Question:

1. Please provide a copy of the executed version of the Operations Services Agreement (“OSA”) between Long Island Lighting Company d/b/a LIPA and PSEG Long Island LLC dated as of December 31, 2013, and any changes, amendments and/or restatements through to the time of a reply being provided by Public Services Enterprise Group Incorporated (“PSEG”) to this interrogatory/document request.
2. Pursuant to OSA Section 4.17, please provide a copy of the System Policies and Procedures relating to unusual events in connection with the handling, transporting and/or disposing of hazardous waste.
3. Pursuant to OSA Section 4.18, has either Parties identified and/or attempted to resolve any conflict of interest at any time from December 31, 2013 through to the time of a reply being provided by PSEG to this interrogatory/document request? If yes, please provide all documentation pertaining to any such conflict of interest.
4. Please provide a copy of the Annual Report for PSEG pursuant to US securities exchange statutory regulations for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019.
5. Please provide a copy of PSEG’s definitive Proxy Statement as filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) for the Annual Meeting of Stockholders that were held in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019.
6. Please provide a copy of PSEG’s Standards of Integrity (“Standards”) and/or code of ethics that were in effect from January 1, 2015 through to the time of PSEG’s reply to this interrogatory/document request including any changes, amendments and/or restatements.
7. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in DONG Energy A/S (a company registered in Denmark) or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
8. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Ørsted A/S (a company registered in Denmark) or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?

9. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities engaged in negotiations with the view of investing in and/or maintaining a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Ørsted A/S (a company registered in Denmark) or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2016 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of these negotiations?
10. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in GSOE I, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
11. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Garden State Offshore Energy, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
12. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Ocean Wind LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
13. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities engaged in negotiations with the view of investing in and/or maintaining a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Ocean Wind LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of these negotiations?
14. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities engaged in negotiations with the view of investing in and/or maintaining a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Skipjack Offshore Energy, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of these negotiations?
15. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Skipjack Offshore Energy, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
16. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Deepwater Wind New York, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
17. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Deepwater Wind New Jersey, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?

18. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Ørsted U.S. Offshore Wind or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
19. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Eversource Energy or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
20. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Deepwater Wind, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
21. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in D. E. Shaw group or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
22. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in D. E. Shaw & Co, LP or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
23. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in D. E. Shaw Renewable Investments, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
24. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in First Wind Holdings, Inc or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
25. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in First Wind Holdings, LLC or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?
26. Has PSEG or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in SunEdison, Inc or any of its subsidiaries and/or related entities at any time from January 1, 2015 through to March 3, 2020? If yes, please describe the nature of the investment(s) and/or interest?

Attachments Provided Herewith: 22

Response:

1. Attached please find the following PDF attachments:
 - a. Amended and Restated Operations Services Agreement - Fully Executed;
 - b. Appendices 2 through 14;
 - c. Appendix 7;
 - d. Appendix 13 Letter - Fully Executed; and
 - e. Waiver Agreement - Fully Executed.

2. Attached please find the following PDF attachments:
 - a. Environmental Procedure No. 1, Waste Management, which provides information and direction on regulatory and company policy requirements for the management of waste material; and
 - b. Environmental Procedure No. 5, Release Response, which provides guidance to PSEG Long Island employees for notifications and response to sudden releases of oil or hazardous materials in accordance with regulatory and Company requirements.

Please note that the attached information in response to this question is proprietary to PSEG and is provided solely for your use. It should not be copied, reproduced, or shared with others without PSEG's prior written consent.

3. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. PSEG Long Island also objects to this request since it is overly broad.

4. Attached please find the following PDF attachments:
 - a. Form 10-K_2015 – which is a copy of the annual report pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2015;
 - b. Form 10-K_2016 – which is a copy of the annual report pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2016;
 - c. Form 10-K_2017 – which is a copy of the annual report pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2017;
 - d. Form 10-K_2018 – which is a copy of the annual report pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2018; and
 - e. Form 10-K_2019 – which is a copy of the annual report pursuant to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2019.

5. Attached please find the following PDF attachments:
 - a. 2014 Proxy Statement
 - b. 2015 Proxy Statement
 - c. 2016 Proxy Statement
 - d. 2017 Proxy Statement
 - e. 2018 Proxy Statement; and
 - f. 2019 Proxy Statement.

6. Attached please find the following PDF attachments:
 - a. Standards of Integrity 2013;
 - b. Standards of Integrity 2015;
 - c. Standards of Conduct - 2017; and
 - d. Standards of Conduct - 2019.

7. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, based solely on publicly available information, Ørsted A/S (formerly Dong Energy A/S) is the indirect parent company of Ørsted U.S. Offshore Wind; Deepwater Wind, LLC; Deepwater Wind New York, LLC; and Deepwater Wind New Jersey, LLC. Ørsted A/S publicly announced its acquisition of the Deepwater Wind, LLC and its subsidiaries in late 2018. Prior to its acquisition by Ørsted A/S, it is our understanding that Deepwater Wind, LLC and its subsidiaries was owned by D.E. Shaw & Co. LP.

PSEG Renewable Generation LLC, an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of Public Service Enterprise Group Incorporated and affiliate of PSEG Long Island LLC, owns 50% of the membership interests of Garden State Offshore Energy LLC (GSOE). Garden State Offshore Energy LLC was formed over 10 years ago, and is a joint venture between PSEG Renewable Generation LLC and Deepwater Wind New Jersey, LLC. Additionally, GSOE I, LLC is a direct, wholly-owned subsidiary of Garden State Offshore Energy LLC.

8. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.

9. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above. PSEG has publicly announced that in October 2019 it exercised its option on Ørsted's Ocean Wind project, resulting in a period of exclusive negotiation for PSEG to potentially acquire a 25% equity interest in the project, subject to negotiations toward a joint venture agreement, advanced due

diligence and any required regulatory approvals. See PSEG's 2019 Form 10-K, on pages 12-13.

10. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
11. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
12. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
13. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 9 above.
14. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 9 above.
15. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, in February 2017, GSOE agreed to subdivide and transfer a portion of its lease area to Skipjack Offshore Energy, LLC, an affiliate of Deepwater Wind New Jersey LLC and the other entities referenced in response to Question 7 above. None of PSEG or any of its subsidiaries or related entities has invested in or maintained a beneficial and/or ownership interest in Skipjack Offshore Energy, LLC or any of its subsidiaries. See also response to Question 7.
16. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
17. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible

evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.

18. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
19. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
20. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
21. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
22. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
23. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
24. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
25. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.
26. PSEG Long Island objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information that is neither relevant to, nor reasonably calculated to lead to, the discovery of admissible

evidence in this Article VII proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without waiving said objections, see response to Question 7 above.

Simon V. Kinsella

SK - Exhibit B (page 1 of 1)

Address: 100 Wainscott Main St #792, Wainscott, NY 11975
36 Gramercy Park East, Apt. 10N, New York, NY 10003
Email: Personal: Si@FinkKinsella.com Public: Si@Wainscott.Life

Mobile: +1-631-903-9154
DoB: October 31, 1970

Background in professional services, finance and technology industries
Bachelor's degree in commerce (BCom) from Bond University, Australia

USA 2008 – present

2008 Moved to USA permanently and in 2013 became a citizen (dual with Australian citizenship)

2016 Joined local Wainscott Citizens' Advisory Committee (Wainscott CAC)

2016 Investigated issues of water quality and contamination at the request of Wainscott CAC.
See www.Wainscott.Life for details on investigation into PFAS contamination

2017 Founded Wainscott Pond Project to investigate the nature and extent of cyanobacterial toxicity and other contaminants within Wainscott Pond with the goal of remediation

2017 Investigated probable impacts and viability of an offshore wind farm being proposed by Deepwater Water Wind South Fork LLC (now known as South Fork Wind LLC) at the request of Wainscott CAC

Reports: Sep. 2016 Testified before New York State Senate Hearing on Water Quality (Hannon Report)
Jan. 2017 Request for the Protection of the Hydrologic System within the Hamlet of Wainscott
Mar. 2018 Town Drinking Water Contamination – PFAS (poly-/perfluoroalkyl substances, PFOA/PFOS)
Jul. 2020 PFAS Contamination Wainscott, NY - Cover-up and Obstruction by Town of East Hampton
2017-2020 Numerous reports related to cyanobacterial and cyanotoxin contamination in Wainscott

My Tickets (Sydney) *Australia's largest Internet portal for ticketed events* 2008
Strategy and Business Development Advisor
• Formulated new business plan and advised internet start-up on company restructuring

Fig (UK) Ltd (London) *UK-based Internet retailer* 2000 – 2007
Founder/Managing Director
• Despatched goods to more than 75 countries worldwide • Average annual revenue growth 60%-75% (2003 to 2006)
• Developed and owned international Internet-based retail and logistics software • Sold 50% interest (Feb 2007)

KPMG (London) *Chartered Accounting Firm* 1999
Special Project Manager • Re-engineered centralized business critical financial systems into one national system

Deutsche Bank (London) *Europe's largest bank* 1997-98
Front Office EMU Co-ordinator
• Global head for Economic Monetary Union roll-out for OTC derivatives, fixed income and money markets (London AG)
• Co-ordinated front/middle offices, ICT and operations for Euro conversions and counterpart requests globally

BNP Paribas, Australasia (Sydney) *France's largest bank* 1995-96
Project Manager • Re-engineered accounting, management and European capital adequacy risk compliance systems

KPMG Peat Marwick (Sydney) *Chartered Accounting Firm* 1991 - 1994
Professional Accountant • Audit clients: QANTAS (merger, due diligence), National Australia Bank, AMP, Caltex, et al

Bond University (Queensland) *Australia's first private University* 1989 - 1992
• Inaugural student reading for bachelor's degree in commerce and business law (BCom/LLB) from Bond University

Saint Ignatius College (Sydney) *Jesuit boarding school* 1982 - 1988