

Exhibit 16

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
v.	:	C.A. No. 1:90-cv-00229
	:	and
ROBERT BRACE, ROBERT BRACE	:	C.A. No. 1:17-CV-0006
FARMS, INC., and ROBERT	:	
BRACE and SONS, INC.,	:	
Defendants	:	

Deposition of SCOTT DUDZIC, taken before and
by Janis L. Ferguson, RPR, CRR, Notary Public in
and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on
Wednesday, February 14, 2018, commencing at 9:06
a.m., at Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, PC,
120 West 10th Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16501.

Reported by Janis L. Ferguson
Registered Professional Reporter
Certified Realtime Reporter

Ferguson & Holdnack Reporting, Inc.
333 State Street
Suite 105
Erie, Pennsylvania 16507
814-452-4556
contact@ferguson-holdnack.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2
3 For the Plaintiff:

4 Brian S. Uholik, Esquire
5 U.S. Department of Justice
6 Environment & Natural Resources Division
7 P.O. Box 7611
8 Washington, DC 20044
9 202-305-0733
10 brian.uholik@usdoj.gov

11
12 For the Defendants:

13 Lawrence A. Kogan, Esquire
14 Kogan Law Group, PC
15 100 United Nations Place
16 Suite 14F
17 New York, NY 10017
18 212-644-9240
19 lkogan@koganlawgroup.com

20 For the Witness Scott Dudzic:

21 Angela N. Erde, Esquire
22 Governor's Office of General Counsel
23 Office of Chief Counsel
24 Department of Environmental Protection
25 Northwest Regional Office
230 Chestnut Street
Meadville, PA 16335
814-322-6070
aerde@pa.gov

Also Present:

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Brace

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Okay. Are these issues relevant to -- would they
3 have been relevant to your determination?

4 MR. UHOLIK: Objection. Calls for speculation.

5 MR. KOGAN: That's not speculation.

6 Q. If there was a determination of prior converted
7 cropland, would that have been relevant to your
8 determinations made during those on-site visits?

9 MR. UHOLIK: Objection. Foundation.

10 MR. KOGAN: No. Foundation is already there.

11 Q. If there was a prior converted cropland
12 determination or commenced determination -- a commenced
13 conversion determination here, which is part of prior
14 converted cropland, same treatment in the statute.

15 MR. UHOLIK: Objection to counsel's testimony.
16 Mischaracterizes the statute.

17 MR. KOGAN: Okay. Well, if Mr. Dudzic was aware
18 of the statute, then I wouldn't have to -- I
19 wouldn't have to explain it to him. If he was
20 aware of the facts that the Federal Government
21 apparently withheld from him, apparently, and
22 intentionally held him --

23 MR. UHOLIK: It would probably help the witness if
24 you characterized the statute appropriately.

25 MR. KOGAN: Okay. It is.