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RHETT GOOD
being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
By Mr. Secrest:
Q. Would you please state your full name for the record.
A. My name is Rhett Good.
Q. By whom are you employed and what is your business address?
A. I'm employed by Western EcoSystems Technologies, Incorporated. Our address is 408 West 6th Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47403.
Q. Do you have in front of you what's been marked as Exhibit 32 -- Applicant's Exhibit 32, your prefiled direct testimony?
A. I do.
Q. And is that a true and accurate copy of your direct testimony that was prefiled in this case?
A. It is, although I have one change.
Q. So what change do you have?
A. Yes. On page 24, line 17, through page 25, line 1, I would like to change that -- the paragraph there and replace it with the following:
"The Project has obtained a Technical Assistance Letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildife Service that outlines the measures the Project will use to avoid the potential take of the Indiana and northern long-eared bat. These measures include feathering blades of all turbines below 6.9 meters per second at night during the spring and fall migration periods, and during the summer maternity period turbines located within $2-1 / 2$ miles of an Indiana bat roost. The Project's implementation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommended measures will also reduce potential impacts of the Project to other bat species. The Project may also elect to develop a Habitat Conservation Plan in the future and obtain an Incidental Take Permit which would require measures to minimize impacts to listed bat species, and mitigation for the impacts. Options exist for reducing bat mortality under a Habitat Conservation Plan, including feathering turbine blades during low wind speeds or use of acoustic deterrents, which also significantly reduces bat mortality. Minimization measures within a Habitat Conservation Plan would require U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service review and approval, and will significantly reduce mortality of other bat species."
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Q. Thank you, Mr. Good. Do you have any other revisions to your testimony?
A. I do not.

MR. SECREST: Thank you. Your Honors, I tender Mr. Good for cross-examination.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Mr. Van Kley.
MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor, and good morning, Mr. Good.

THE WITNESS: Good morning.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
By Mr. Van Kley:
Q. I'll be asking you some questions today on behalf of the Black Swamp Bird Observatory and the local resident intervenors.

Let's start by discussing your personal involvement in the formation of the Application that Firelands has filed with the Board for the Emerson Creek wind project. Can you tell me which, if any, of the reports included in this application were prepared by you?
A. Yes. Give me a second. I am listed as a coauthor on a few of those. I'll have to look those up to make sure I get those correct. I thought I had
a copy of my testimony in front of me but $I$ don't. Can you hand me one of those, Chris? Thank you.

MR. SECREST: For the record, the witness has been handed his direct testimony.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Attorney
Secrest.
MR. SECREST: You're welcome, your Honor.
THE WITNESS: I apologize. I am having trouble finding the exhibits associated with the Application. Give me a second. Can I ask for some help from my counsel here?

MR. VAN KLEY: That would be fine.
THE WITNESS: Sure. Chris, which one of those would be the exhibit?

MR. SECREST: If I may direct Mr. Good to Application Exhibits $R$, $S$, and $T$.

THE WITNESS: This one, thank you.
MR. VAN KLEY: I would note that part of Exhibit 2 is in Applicant's Exhibit 6 so that document should be provided to the witness as well since I have some questions about it.

THE WITNESS: I believe I was listed as coauthor on one of these and I am having trouble finding it right now.

MR. SECREST: Attorney Van Kley, maybe we
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could proceed with the questions as to the exhibits and then, after a break, the witness could confirm that that's the entirety of the exhibits. Would that help you?

MR. VAN KLEY: That would be fine.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go ahead and have him wait to confirm any other information outside your line of questioning under oath after a break, but for now we can maybe dive in and direct him as to questions you have.

THE WITNESS: And I can say I indeed have all the reports but I -- yeah, as far as which ones I am listed as coauthor on, yeah, I can go back through those and get back to you on that.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Have you visited the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project?
A. I have.
Q. Okay. On how many occasions?
A. I believe I was at the project in 2010 during some initial site visit with Fish and Wildlife Service and ODNR, and then I was -- I also visited the site in March of this year to familiarize myself with the final project boundary.
Q. During any of these visits did you
conduct any bird surveys?
A. We -- we did look -- we did examine some of the existing records of bald eagles' nests while we visited the site this spring. I don't know if I would call that an official survey but we did look for eagle nests during our visit.
Q. So you were not personally involved in any of the counting of bird individuals or identification of bird species that were included in the reports for the Application?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you have any supervisory role over the people who did conduct those activities?
A. For some of the reports, yes.
Q. What was that role?
A. Some of the passerine migration surveys, large bird surveys, raptor nest surveys, were completed by members of my team so I reviewed many of the reports and I was -- they work for me as part of my office.
Q. How long was your visit when you went to the project area to meet with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
A. I think we were there a half day or so.
Q. And how long was your visit when you went
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there in March of this year?
A. We visited the site over the course of two days. We were on site probably a total of 8 to 10 hours.
Q. During that visit, what did you do with respect to the eagle nests?
A. We visited the nest records that were available. Within a mile or two of the project.
Q. Did you make observations of the occupation or lack of occupation for those nests during that visit?
A. We did, yes. Chris Farmer was leading that effort. I was present. I was driving. I was helping look for nests. Chris was keeping the records of the nests which were occupied.
Q. You said Mr. Farmer. Who else was with you on that visit?
A. Dan Kramer. He is one of our field biologists that completed many of the surveys in the project.
Q. Let's go to your written direct testimony which has been identified as Applicant's Exhibit 32.
A. Yes, I have that one.
Q. And I would like to direct you to page 4 of that testimony.
A. I have that.
Q. Let's take a look at paragraph 7b.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Directing your attention to the last sentence, that sentence reads as follows: "Surveys were completed March 12 to 15, prior to leaf out, to increase the observer's ability to find nest structures." Do you see that sentence?
A. Yes, I see that sentence.
Q. Okay. And to put this in context, these were surveys being conducted for raptors, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you refer to your -- in your testimony to raptors, did that -- did that term include eagles?
A. Not -- not for the purpose of my testimony but certainly eagles are a raptor and they were recorded during these surveys. Chris Farmer is testifying today regarding the eagle surveys specifically.
Q. So with respect to the raptor nest surveys that are referenced in this paragraph of your testimony, did those raptor surveys look for eagles as well as other types of raptors?
A. Correct.
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Q. It says here that the surveys were completed from March 12 to 15, correct?
A. Yes, that's what it says, yes.
Q. At that time of the year, which species of raptors do you expect would have been occupying their nests?
A. By mid March definitely eagles would be on the nest. You know, I would say red-tails are starting to occupy nests at that time. But definitely eagles would be on the nest. Red-shouldered hawks are probably starting at that time. Cooper's hawks and sharp-shinned hawks are probably starting at that time as well.
Q. Now, when you say those species are probably starting by that time, do you mean that some of them may be incubating by that time and not others or do you mean that all of them start occupying their nests by that time?
A. I would say the majority should be starting to build nests, either they've arrived at their territory or will soon be. So that period would overlap the majority of time when most raptors would be on their nest.
Q. Well, during -- at that period of time, which of those species would you expect to actually
be incubating eggs on their nest?
A. Bald eagles, and, again, I would say the majority of red-tailed hawks, and many of the other species should be -- well, yeah, they should be egg laying and some will be incubating.
Q. Are there some species of raptors you would expect in Ohio that would not be occupying a nest by March 15?
A. It's certainly possible that some late arrivers may not be on the nest at that time. The majority should be.
Q. Going to page 5 of your testimony, the first paragraph. I would like to direct your attention to the last sentence of that paragraph which states as follows: "Eleven active red-tailed hawk nests, one active great-horned owl nest, and 21 unoccupied non-eagle raptor nests were found within the 2018 Project area and a one mile buffer." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Now, when this sentence refers to unoccupied raptor nests, did that mean that no activity -- does this mean that the activity -- that the nests had not yet been occupied to any extent by the raptors?

## 144

A. What that means at that time we did not observe signs of activity during the survey so there were no birds on the nest. We didn't observe, you know, feathers, birds around the nest, or signs of greenery that would suggest the nest was occupied.
Q. So the survey found 32 non-eagle raptor nests; is that correct?
A. Non-raptors. So there was 11 active red-tailed nests, one great-horned owl nest, and 21 other nests that were empty but were consistent structure with a raptor, but were too small, they didn't have characteristics to be consistent with an eagle.
Q. So there were 33 non-eagle raptor nests found total, correct?
A. $\quad 11$ plus 21 which would be 32, and then if you count the great-horned owl, that would be 33.
Q. Yeah. And of that number, 21 were not occupied.
A. Yes.
Q. Were there any signs that those non-occupied raptor nests had deteriorated?
A. I would need to go back to the report. We do often record condition. I don't remember off the top of my head.
Q. Are you aware of any rule of thumb or other information that would indicate what percentage of raptor nests are expected to be unoccupied in an area?
A. Yeah, I am not. In my experience it's quite variable. Raptors will maintain multiple nests in each of their territory so you certainly do expect empty nests -- empty stick nests during a typical survey.
Q. Would you refer down to page 5 of your testimony, go to the paragraph that has the date of June 13, 2018 on it. And I would like to direct your attention to the second paragraph under June 13, 2018. And looking at the second paragraph, the second paragraph, second sentence, that sentence reads as follows: "Six active red-tailed hawk nests, two active great-horned owl nests, and 12 unoccupied, unknown raptor nests were found within the revised Project area and one mile buffer." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. So here we have 12 unoccupied raptor nests other than eagle nests and we have 8 occupied non-eagle raptor nests, correct?
A. Yes. We have got 8 occupied active
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nests, 12 unoccupied unknown.
Q. Now, let's go to page 6 of your testimony. And I would like to direct you to the bullet point paragraph that has the date of May 6, 2011, Spring 2011, on it.
A. Line 24?
Q. Yes, sir. And this paragraph discusses the results of another raptor test -- or another raptor survey included in the Application, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's go to page 7 under the same date. Going to the first full paragraph on that page, I would like to direct your attention to the second sentence which states: "Seven active red-tailed hawk nests and nine inactive, unknown species raptor nests were found within the 2011 Project area." Do you see that sentence?
A. Yes, the very last sentence of that statement.
Q. So that survey found that 9 out of 16 non-eagle raptor nests were inactive at that time. I'm talking about just in the project area as discussed by this second sentence of that paragraph.
A. Right. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And then the third sentence of that
paragraph states that "Seven active red-tailed hawk nests, and six inactive unknown species raptor nests were found within one mile of the 2011 Project area," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So there at that location there were 6 out of 13 nests were not occupied at the time, correct?
A. Well, within the project it was 7 out of 16. Outside the project it was 7 out of 13 were active.
Q. Let's go to page 10 of your testimony. I would like to direct your attention to the largest paragraph which is in the middle of the page and specifically let's look at the second-to-the-last sentence of that paragraph which discusses tundra swans.
A. I see that.
Q. All right. It states there that "100 tundra swans were recorded on one occasion during the spring, and likely occurred in the Project periodically during the spring migration period." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Have you done any investigation to
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determine whether tundra swans are present in the project area at times of the year other than spring?
A. We have. There were a couple of year-long surveys in which tundra swans were observed during winter. So they are certainly migrant but they also occur here during migration -- or during winter.
Q. Uh-huh. Were the report -- were the results of the winter survey included in the Application?
A. They're included in my testimony. I'm not sure if they are included in the Application or not. I can go back through and check if you would like.
Q. Yeah. Well, let's first ask a few introductory questions to see where you might find that information in the Application. During what year or years were those winter surveys conducted?
A. You have to give me a second to look that up. 2018 and 2019 .
Q. And can you identify the report in which the results of these winter surveys were contained?
A. There is a report that was cited in my testimony and I believe it's included as an attachment in Chris Farmer's testimony that describes
those February 2018 to April 23, 2019, surveys.
Q. Okay. Would you give me the dates of those surveys again, please.
A. Yeah. My testimony says surveys were completed February 8, 2018 to April 23, 2019 -- 2019.
Q. And where do you see that in your testimony?
A. It's Question 9, line 13.
Q. What page of the testimony?
A. Page 18 .
Q. So going to page 18 of the testimony, Answer 9, it appears that the surveys that you have been referring to were surveys for large birds and eagles, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Did Firelands do any winter surveys for other types of birds?
A. Firelands did, I believe, some passerine migration and bird surveys.
Q. They didn't do those during the winter, did they?
A. No. I'm sorry I didn't know -- I thought you were referring in general.
Q. No. My question was, has Firelands conducted any bird surveys during the winter for
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species other than the large birds and eagles that were surveyed and described in Answer 9 of your testimony.
A. So your question is did they do any -any surveys, other than large bird or raptor surveys, did Firelands, in winter.
Q. During the winter, yes.
A. Are you referring to the previous surveys by other consultants or are you referring to more-recent surveys we did within the current boundary which did include Firelands?
Q. I'm -- I'm asking about any surveys that were included in the Application regardless of which consultants did them.
A. I believe Firelands did complete some year-long surveys for eagles that did include the winter. I think that's part of Chris Farmer's testimony.
Q. Yeah. Well, my question was whether -whether, other than the large birds and eagles that were surveyed during the winter as stated in Answer 9 in your testimony, were there any surveys done of other bird species during the winter?
A. Yes. Well, the owl surveys were part of the breeding season; they were probably on the edge
of winter. Otherwise, no, I'm not aware of any.
Q. With respect to the owls that were surveyed for this project, the species that were surveyed were limited to just three species of owls, correct?
A. Yes. That's all the ODNR requested surveys for.
Q. And those surveys were done for the screech owl, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the great-horned owl?
A. Correct.
Q. And the barn owl?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, are you aware that there are other species of owls present in this area of Ohio besides those three species during the winter?

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague as to "area of Ohio."

MR. VAN KLEY: Oh, I can rephrase it.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Are you aware there are other species of owls present in the counties in -in which the project area is located, besides the three species of owls that were surveyed?
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A. Yeah, I would expect northern saw-whet potentially to be present. I wouldn't be surprised if there are records in the project.
Q. What about short-eared owls, would you expect those to be present in that area?
A. Short-eared and snowy could occur irregularly during the winter. I suppose you could rarely have observations of something like northern hawk-owl. Those are three others that could be present.
Q. Would you expect the long-eared owl to be present?
A. Yeah, that one could potentially be present.
Q. But there were no surveys done during the winter to try to find the owls that might be present in the project area other than the three species that you've already indicated were surveyed, correct?
A. That's right. There were no targeted owl surveys. Now, we did do general large bird surveys so if one of those species was flying during the day, we would have seen it if it occurred in our point counts during the time we did surveys, but no targeted owl surveys.
Q. Uh-huh. During those large bird surveys
that were conducted during the winter, was there any efforts made to specifically look for owls that were visiting from up north?
A. That's one of the general purposes of the general large bird survey is to get a sample of the use of all large birds flying during the day. So something like a snowy owl would certainly be visible. Short-eared owl less so. They're probably more active in the very late, early morning periods.
Q. And the northern -- or the saw-whet owl doesn't usually fly during the daytime, does it?
A. Correct.
Q. And the long-eared owl doesn't usually fly during the daytime?
A. Yeah, you're right, usually not.
Q. Are you aware that there are species of passerines that may be present in the project area during the winter that would not be found there during the other seasons of the year?
A. Certainly there could be -- there are a few species that come down in winter, yes.
Q. It's more than a few species, isn't it?
A. Yeah. I don't have the number off the top of my head but there's a few that come to mind.
Q. Isn't it common for some species of birds
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that breed in Canada to then migrate to Northern Ohio during the wintertime?
A. Yeah, certainly some of those species do.
Q. For example, some species of finches will come down to Northern Ohio from Canada during the winter?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Let's go to page 11 of your testimony. Actually we'll start on page 9 to set the context of these questions. And I would like to direct your attention to the bullet point before the July 20, 2012, Avian Survey Report, prepared by Tetra Tech.
A. I see that.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go to page 11. On the top of the page, the paragraph starting with the word "Twelve." That paragraph contains information from the July 20, 2012, Avian Survey Report by Tetra Tech, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I would like to direct your attention to the last two sentences of that paragraph which states as follows: "The authors concluded that the project does not appear to be of great importance to special status or migratory birds. The Project does receive use by migrant -- migrating and nesting birds; I
agree with the conclusion that the Project does not appear to be located in a concentrated migration corridor based on the survey results." Do you see those two sentences of your testimony?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Would you go to this Tetra Tech report in the Application because I have a few questions about it.
A. Okay. Exhibit S?
Q. Yes. It should be in Exhibit $S$. For those of you who are using an online version of Exhibit $S$, you will find this report starting at PDF page 186.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, I'm sorry. I have got S1, 2, 3, and 4. S4 for the 2011 -July 20, 2012, Tetra Tech report?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. It's the July 20, 2012 .

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Report to Jennifer Norris of ODNR. It's S4 in whatever I just opened electronically.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I have that now.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Good, have you found that report in your packet?
A. Yes, I have it now.

156
Q. Okay. Great. All right. Can you point out to me where in this report you found the conclusion that the project does not appear to be located in a concentrated migration corridor based on the survey reports?
A. They referred to migration when they address raptor -- raptor migration rates during the raptor migration surveys. And then they refer to areas of -- what was the term -- of great importance to special status or migratory birds. I don't see the term "concentrated migration corridor" in here. I believe that might be my term.
Q. Yeah. All right. Well, let's start with your observation about what the report states about raptor migration. Where do you find that information in the Tetra Tech report?
A. Well, let's see here, I'll find the page for you. If you go to section 4.2, page 13. They describe the Diurnal Raptor and Bird Migration Survey.

ALJ WILLIAMS: That's 5.2, correct?
THE WITNESS: Page 13, section 4.2 is where -- it begins with the survey results.

ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you.
Q. Which language in section 4.2 of the

Tetra Tech report provide you with any information concerning your conclusion that the project does not appear to be located in a concentrated migration corridor?
A. Section 4.2.3 describes encounter rates and raptor species abundance.

Section 4.2.4 describes the raptor species encounter rates. Those encounter rates are quite low compared to the number of raptors typically observed at well-known hawk migration count stations which are located in concentrated migratory corridors.
Q. With respect to bird species other than the raptors, what, if any, information were you relying on from the Tetra Tech report of July 2012 to form your conclusion that the project does not appear to be located in a concentrated migration corridor?
A. So the Greater Sandhill Crane Migration Survey is another one that was focused on sandhill crane and the observed sandhill crane use.

And if you -- the other section, 4.2.7, where they address other large birds.
Q. Did you rely on any other information from the Tetra Tech report to make your conclusion that the project does not appear to be located in a
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concentration -- in a concentrated migration corridor?
A. Those are the main areas where we -- I reviewed and came to the same conclusion the authors did.
Q. So the information that you relied on for the conclusion was limited to the survey on large birds or surveys on large birds.

MR. SECREST: Objection to the extent it mischaracterizes his testimony.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Sustain the objection. If you could please rephrase.

MR. VAN KLEY: I am asking him whether that is true or not. I am not characterizing his testimony.

THE WITNESS: Am I supposed to answer that one?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Can we have the question
reread?
THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question, please?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I can repeat the question.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So the information that
you used -- that you relied on for your conclusion that the project does not appear to be located in a concentrated migration corridor was limited to information that you had about large birds.
A. That's correct. Yeah, yes, that's correct. If you are just referring to this report, yes. Now, if you are talking about the overall conclusion for the risk assessment for the entire project, that's a different question.
Q. Let's go to page 5 of this report. That is the Tetra Tech report that we've been discussing.
A. Yeah. Go ahead.
Q. All right. I would like to refer you to section 3.2 which is entitled "Diurnal Raptor \& Bird Migration Survey."
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. All right. Now, this pair -- this section identifies the dates in which the Diurnal Raptor and Bird Migration Survey was performed as reflected in the first paragraph under the heading or section 3.2 , correct?
A. If your question is does this paragraph describe when the survey was completed, it does.
Q. Yes. Thank you. The survey was performed from March 15 to April 28, 2011, and from
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September 1 to October 28, 2011, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. There were no days of that survey that were performed in May of the year?
A. Not according to this paragraph. For that survey.
Q. Yeah. Are you aware of any other information in the Tetra Tech report that we're looking at that indicates that any surveys were done for the purpose of evaluating bird migration during May of any year?
A. Not in this report. I believe they did some breeding bird surveys. They did refer to some bald eagle specific surveys that would have included May. But those results aren't presented here.
Q. In the area of Ohio in which the project is located, what is the peak time of migration for passerines? Meaning you would expect to find the most species of passerines.
A. Is that related to this large bird question or were you on a separate line here?
Q. No, it's not related to large birds. Let me reask the question.

You are aware, are you not, that passerines -- that many passerines migrate through
the counties in which the project area is located during the month of May?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, during May is the time period in which there are more species of passerines migrating through that area than any other time of the spring?
A. There is a large number that come through in May. You know, again, if you are referring to this diurnal raptor survey, that was targeted at a different group of birds that are largely done by May. So I don't know -- are you referring to this or just in general passerine migration rates?
Q. Well, I'm referring to what is characterized in section 3.2 as the "bird migration survey efforts."
A. Right. Okay. So in 3.2, the Diurnal Raptor and Bird Migration Survey, that is a survey targeted largely for raptors which have a different migration period generally than passerines.
Q. Just to make sure that the record contains this information, let me ask you to provide us with a definition of what a passerine is.
A. A passerine is a small, generally considered a small songbird. It does include a wide
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variety of species.
Q. It includes the family of birds known as the wood warblers?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of the reputation of Erie County for the presence of wood warblers during the spring migration?
A. I am aware of -- yeah, I am aware that the shoreline along Lake Erie is a well-known bird-watching area where a large number of migrating songbirds will concentrate at times or migrate around the lake or concentrate before they cross the lake.
Q. Are you aware of what counties those areas are found in?
A. I would say the entire lake shore of Lake Erie is a good spot to go watch warblers if you want to watch.
Q. And that includes areas in Erie County?
A. Certainly, yeah.
Q. Have you heard of a wildlife area known as Marsh?
A. I have heard of Magee Marsh.
Q. Have you --

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. We are breaking up a little bit on the question. Is it wet
marsh?
MR. VAN KLEY: Magee, M-a-g-e-e.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. I wanted to make sure that was on the record.
Q. Have you ever visited Magee Marsh?
A. I have not.
Q. Are you aware of the reputation of Magee Marsh in bird-watching circles?
A. I am aware of it, yes.
Q. And what have you heard about it?
A. Like I said previously, it's a -- it's a spot where a lot of bird watchers go. They can watch migrating songbirds, passerines, that are stopping over. It's a place for them to get their eyes on them pretty easily. It sounds like it is a pretty neat experience.
Q. Do you know how -- what the distance between Magee Marsh and the closest part of the project area is?
A. Oh, I want to say it's 10 to 20 miles. It might be further. I think it's over 10. I think it's 15 to 20 plus.
Q. How long does it take a passerine to fly 15 to 20 miles?
A. That depends on wind speeds. 15 to
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20 miles. Oh, if they are flying 5 to 15 miles an hour, you know, it could take an hour at the quickest.
Q. Let's talk a little bit more about migration for passerines. During the migration periods of the year, do passerines fly through a particular area of migration on a steady basis or does migration usually occur in spurts or pulses?
A. I would say generally for -- are you referring to passerines?
Q. Yes.
A. Pulses.
Q. And what is a pulse?
A. A pulse is a time period when conditions are favorable and a larger number of passerines will migrate.
Q. During a typical migration period, how many pulses of passerines would you expect to occur?
A. Good question. Roughly, you know, it will depend on the year and the weather conditions. You know, if you have got a long spate of bad weather that's holding up birds, it could occur in a few pulses. If you have got more favorable conditions of the year, it will occur more frequently. Off-the-cuff, 20 percent of the days, 25 , but, again,
that's quite variable.
Q. So if a -- if bird surveys during the migration period are not conducted during any of the pulses, then those surveys wouldn't list the majority of the passerines going through the surveyed area, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. With respect to the migratory bird surveys for passerines contained in the Application -- were those surveys conducted continuously through the migration period or were they less than continuous?

THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Van Kley.
Mr. Van Kley. Wait, wait. Wait.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Hold on a second.
THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Van Kley, I didn't --

ALJ WILLIAMS: Ms. Gibson, I think you lost part of the question?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, would you reask it?

MR. VAN KLEY: Sure.
ALJ WILLIAMS: While you are searching for it, Mr. Van Kley, there is a little bit of a lag
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in the pickup when you start to ask questions when it transitions back from the witness to you, so I don't know, it's fine, it's very workable, but just so you know that when we missed "Magee Marsh" there was like a half-second lag in the microphone going back to you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) With respect to the migratory bird surveys for passerines contained in the Application for Emerson Creek wind, were those surveys conducted for the entirety of the migration season or were they conducted for less than 100 percent of the migration season?
A. So the survey period does cover the vast majority of the migration period. Within that migration period, the protocol is to sample days which are prescribed as once weekly.
Q. So if I'm understanding your answer correctly, the surveys were done once per week during the migratory bird season for passerines?
A. Correct. It is a common technique in the wildlife field to sample and so many times you don't survey every single day a certain species could be present. So the ODNR protocol, like virtually every wildlife protocol out there, is set up to sample a portion of those days when those species are present.
Q. And during the day of the week in which the passerine migration was surveyed, how much of that day was used for the surveys?
A. So the protocol is set up to sample birds during the day for 10 minutes at each point that are surveyed once per week and they're designed to sample those birds that are stopping over and obtain a relative estimate of species-use of those birds that are stopping over.
Q. And during how many hours of that day was the survey conducted?
A. You were cutting out there again.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. There is a noise that -- that I am hearing continually through these discussions which I think may be causing the problem. It's kind of a scraping noise, it sounds like --

ALJ WILLIAMS: It sounds like that right there. Like jet engines. Yeah, I mean, it seems to correlate with the microphone transfer as you begin to ask the next question. It bleeds through a little bit. I'm certainly by no means an IT expert being able to diagnose or repair. It's very workable absent the transitions but we can certainly try to work through logging on, re-logging on, or taking a break if you would like, Mr. Van Kley, but it appears
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to be really limited to when you start to ask the next question.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I was noticing it yesterday at other times as well. And I was not talking and other people were talking and sometimes even when nobody was talking.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Yeah, I'm not sure. Again, the Bench is certainly able to follow along. We've been running lockstep with the questions and answers. If we want to try to have the witness and yourself log off and re-log back on during the break, we can try that.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I don't think that's going to make any difference, but let's just proceed.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Yeah, I think where I was at was asking you during how -- to tell me how many hours a day that the passerine bird migration survey was performed during the days that it was performed.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. I have lost all volume. I'm sorry. Heather, are we still -- I see lips moving but $I$ cannot hear anything right now.

MS. CHILCOTE: Mike, I can hear you okay.

Can you hear me at all?
ALJ AGRANOFF: I can hear both of you.
ALJ WILLIAMS: You can hear? I've lost.
Please hold while I try to figure out why I'm not -do you want to try to demote and re-elevate me?

MR. VAN KLEY: I just heard that scraping noise again too.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Jay, you still hear them?
ALJ AGRANOFF: Yeah. I'm good.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Heather, can they hear me?
Can they hear me through their microphones?
ALJ AGRANOFF: Yes, I do.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Heather, you are on mute still. Can you hear me?

MS. CHILCOTE: I can hear you, Mike. Can you hear me? You can't hear me. Jay, can you let him know $I$ am coming down to check his settings.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Why don't we take a 10-minute break.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. Why don't we take a 10-minute break and see whether or not we can resolve Judge Williams's technical difficulties and it's probably a decent breaking point anyway so. We'll come back at about 10:40, 10:45. Thank you.
(Recess taken.)
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ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on the record.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. Mr. Good, can you hear me okay now?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I got you.
ALJ WILLIAMS: A lot of echo.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go back to our discussion about the raptor nests and pick up a loose end there before $I$ resume my discussion about passerine migration.

We had been talking about a number of unoccupied non-eagle raptor nests during our discussion with you this morning and I wanted to ask you to explain the significance of the term "unoccupied" as used in the reports concerning the raptor nests.
A. Can you tell me more about what you mean by significance of that? Are you referring to the significance to the risk assessment or are you referring to the significance of -- what the definition is? Can you tell me more about that?
Q. I'm simply asking you what the definition is.
A. Okay. Yeah. So the definition of an unoccupied nest is there were no birds on the nest or
we didn't observe any other signs of activity during the survey such as like, you know, the nest didn't look like it had been well maintained. There was no birds in the vicinity. There was no decoration on the nest.
Q. Does the fact that a nest was unoccupied at the time the survey was done mean that the nest would no longer be used in the future?
A. If your definition of "future" is future years, no. Certainly nests could be occupied in the future or become unoccupied in the future. They will reuse nests from previous years.
Q. All right. So let's resume our discussion about passerine migration. If I recall, the question that was on the table when we took our break was this: Can you tell me the number of hours during the day that the passerine migration surveys were conducted on the day -- on the one day per week that those surveys occurred?
A. So that would depend on the number of counts or surveys that day given that we have got a four-hour window. If you do 3 points per hour, 2 or 3 points per hour, 12, up to 10,12 points at the maximum per day. 12 times 10 is 120 minutes so that's two hours max. That's on a single day.
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I was -- I was curious so I went back and reviewed all of the survey work that had been done and tallied up the total number of hours across all the surveys, you know, this is not just passerines but all the breeding bird, all of the large bird, all of the passerine surveys, and the totals of hours for all of that effort was, $I$ was impressed, it was over 2,300 hours, over 2,300 hours of survey effort that went into the Application.
Q. And that includes surveys of every type of bird that was surveyed in the reports included in the Application.
A. Yeah, that's inclusive of all types of surveys; that's not just passerine. All types of surveys except the eagle nests.
Q. So with respect to the surveys of passerine migration, those surveys were conducted during no more than 120 minutes per day on the one day per week of the migratory period covered by the surveys.
A. No. That's the max that it could be surveyed in a day by a single observer. So the total number of hours in a week would depend on the number of surveys and so $I$ believe there were upwards of 50 -some points that were surveyed in different years
so it depends on the number of points surveyed in a given year.

THE COURT REPORTER: I don't know why but Mr. Good is cutting out. He's cutting in and out.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm hearing that as well, Ms. Gibson.

If you could amplify your microphone or talk more directly into it.

THE WITNESS: Is this better if I scoot closer to the microphone?

ALJ WILLIAMS: It seems to be, yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, if you don't mind a very close facial view for the next hour and a half, I will scoot closer.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) The majority of passerine birds migrate during the night; is that correct?
A. Yes. For most species, yes.
Q. There were no bird surveys conducted at night for passerine migration; is that correct?
A. Correct. Yeah. So, you know, this project falls within an area the ODNR felt was low enough risk that it didn't merit nocturnal surveys for migrating passerines. The ODNR has gone to great
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effort to map areas in this state they feel are higher survey effort areas. This project falls outside of that area; therefore, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the ODNR, and the various consultants that have been involved didn't conduct any nocturnal surveys because of that low -- lower risk determination.
Q. And what was the -- that determination of lower risk based on?
A. So the ODNR, I believe, has, you know, mapped -- yeah, they use their collective knowledge to map areas they feel like were potentially higher risk. I think a lot of it factored into was based on presence of topography, water -- things like the lake shore, forest underpinning corridors, presence of species records. There's a number of different factors ODNR used to map that effort.
Q. Are you familiar with the term "stopover" as related to bird migration?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. And how would you define that term?
A. It's a -- stopover is a term used to describe when a bird stops migrating, descends an elevation, you know, feeds or rests the habitat on
the ground.
Q. Uh-huh. To put it simply, it means the bird stops flying, comes to the ground, and feeds and rests, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is there any tendency by migrating birds to stop over in a particular type of habitat?

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague. Birds in general?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll let him answer.
A. Well, it depends on the species, so are there certain species you are interested in knowing more about? Are you referring to passerines?
Q. Well, we can break it down and talk about passerines. Is there a particular type of habitat that a passerine is more likely to use in a stopover?
A. Yeah, the ODNR guidance did address this, and so they recommend we survey forested areas or shrubbery areas, areas with woody structure basically for -- for -- to measure stopover use by migrating passerines.
Q. And relatively speaking, how much of the project area contains habitats or contains habitat features that are more than likely to be used by

## 176

passerines for stopovers?
A. I would -- well, based on turbine location, zero, so all turbines will be located outside of a forest, but $I$ am assuming you are referring to kind of the official project boundary that was submitted as part of the Application, and I believe the forest covers roughly 7 percent in that boundary.
Q. Uh-huh. All right. So given -- given the amount of habitat conducive for stopover by passerines, would you expect most of the passerines to fly over the project area instead of using it for a stopover?
A. No. I mean, certainly it depends on the time of night where that bird is in its migration. If it's over the project and the sun is coming up, it's going to try and find suitable stopover habitat in the project area. So, yeah, it depends on the time when that bird -- whenever the sun is coming up.
Q. Uh-huh. If the bird is flying during the night before the sun is coming up, is it more likely to fly through the project area instead of stopping over in the project area?
A. So I think you are asking -- could you repeat that question? I'm sorry, I didn't quite
follow you there.
Q. If a passerine is flying through the project area at night before the sun starts to arise, is it more likely to keep flying, rather than stopping in the project area?
A. Correct.
Q. How far do passerines typically fly between stopovers?
A. You know, it depends on wind speed and where they are at as far as their migration occurs. I don't know the exact number off the top of my head. I would guess it's, you know, if they are flying 15 to 20 miles an hour and you've got, you know, four to five hours, or seven or eight hours, again, it could be 20 , it could be a hundred miles. It really depends on the species. It depends on the wind direction, the wind speed. They will fly even further, you know, if they are crossing large bodies of water.
Q. A stopover can occur sooner if the bird is flying during bad weather than otherwise would occur during nice weather?
A. Yes. During certain unfavorable conditions, birds will choose not to migrate.
Q. Would you agree that the majority of bird
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fatalities are nocturnal migrants? That is -- let me start over. I didn't ask that very well.

Would you agree that the majority of bird fatalities from collisions with wind turbines are nocturnal migrants?
A. Yeah, I believe most studies have documented that. I would say over half of the species and mortalities of the birds that you find are likely migrants.
Q. Let's go back to your testimony which was identified as Applicant Exhibit 32. I would like -okay. I would like you to go to page 18. And we are going to look at the last paragraph on that page.
A. I have that.
Q. All right. I would like to refer you to the second-to-the-last sentence on that page which reads: "Raptor use was low relative to many wind-energy facilities." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do see that sentence.
Q. Can you tell us the number of other wind-energy facilities you reviewed for the purpose of making this statement?
A. I can bring up that report if you would like a very specific number. It will take me a few minutes.
Q. Why don't you give me a general number first and then we can decide whether we want specifics.
A. I believe -- I would guess there's over -- across the nation, I believe that graph probably has over 20 to 30 plus facilities in that graph.
Q. Okay. And can you tell me how many of those facilities have raptor use that was higher than the figure you are using for Emerson Creek wind?
A. I will need to pull up that report to give you a very specific number, but I can say that compared to facilities across the nation, most facilities have low -- or higher raptor rates of use, especially those facilities in the western U.S. where raptor mortality is highest, you know, the raptor use recorded at the site was quite -- quite lower than those facilities that had higher mortality.
Q. Why don't we go to that report and take a look. If you could tell us where -- where to find that report, I would appreciate it.

MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I hand the witness a copy of Dr. Farmer's testimony?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Yes, please.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.
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THE WITNESS: Okay. I have that report up.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Can you list which attachment you are looking at?

THE WITNESS: Attachment CF-4 of Chris Farmer's testimony.

ALJ WILLIAMS: So I've got the electronic. It's on page 56 of 116 ; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I don't have the PDF in front of me. I can't answer that one.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm reasonably confident it's Attachment CF-4 to Mr. Farmer's testimony.

THE WITNESS: The report is dated
April 3. It covers the survey period I referenced.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Attorney Van Kley.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. Mr. Good, I have that in front of me. Could you point out where in that document we can find the information about raptor use at other wind projects that we've been discussing?
A. Yes. Give me a minute.

Yeah, 48 other publicly-available wind energy facilities compared to this one.
Q. Okay. Do you find that in the report?
A. See page 15.
ALJ WILLIAMS: So we are on PDF page 78 of 116 .
Q. All right. I believe I see the reference that you have identified. That would be contained in the second paragraph under the heading "Diurnal Raptors" on page 15 of the report.
A. That's correct. And you can find it in graphical form in Appendix D.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Appendix D?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, $D$ as in dog.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. Let's go to that appendix then. And it looks like that appendix starts on PDF page 103.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Got it. Thank you.
MR. VAN KLEY: I don't see a report page number there.

THE WITNESS: That's right. It doesn't have a report page number.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. So Appendix D is a graphic portrayal of the other wind farms that you consulted in order to come up with the statement that raptor use was low in the Emerson Creek wind project area compared to many other wind energy facilities, correct?
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A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Do you know approximately how many wind farms exist in the United States?
A. I would guess over 300 , but I don't know -- I don't know the exact number.
Q. If there were 300 wind farms --
A. So this is a graph of the publicly available -- all of the publicly-available data we can get our hands on are the actual pre-construction use estimates and so many of the midwestern and eastern facilities, while that data hasn't -- isn't available publicly, and $I$ think one of the main reasons is initially there was a large focus on raptor mortality, much of that occurred in the western U.S.

As, you know, as researchers and others started looking at raptor fatalities in the midwest and east, those fatalities rates are very low so most people stopped reporting them because, you know, most of the fatality rates are very low in the midwest and eastern U.S.

But the interesting part you can see when you look at this graph, those facilities with the highest raptor fatality rates are generally here on the far left here, High Winds, Diablo, Altamont Pass,
and many of those western projects out west, they have much higher raptor fatality rates than projects in the midwest and eastern U.S. So from that perspective we can look at this figure and say all right, compared to those facilities where we know raptor mortality rates are very high, our use rate here was very low.
Q. So the raptor fatality rates -- let me start over.

So the raptor mortality rates for wind farms that have the lower such rates are less likely to be reported publicly.
A. I think we are -- what was happening was those, you know, a lot of those researchers stopped putting those estimates in the post-construction monitoring reports because it became -- it wasn't a focus. It's not a real issue for the midwest or eastern U.S. Raptor mortality rates are just generally low, so most researchers stopped really focusing on that question.
Q. Let's go to page 24 of your written testimony identified as Applicant's Exhibit 32. And we are going to talk about bats for a little while. With regard to page 24 of your written testimony, I would like to refer you to the sentence starting at
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line 9. And that sentence reads as follows:
"Mortalities of all of these species have been documented at wind-energy facilities, although typically in much lower numbers than eastern red, hoary bat, and silver-haired bat." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Are the three species of bats named in this sentence larger than the species of bats listed in or referenced in the prior sentence of this testimony?
A. Yes. They are larger in size.
Q. If a bat is larger, is its carcass easier to find during post-construction mortality surveys? MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation. ALJ WILLIAMS: I will let him answer and explain.
A. So the answer is it depends, and so it depends on the substrate you're searching and the type of search you are doing, and so yeah, the answer is it depends.
Q. Okay. So let's break that down a little bit. What do you mean by substrate that's being searched?
A. Yeah. So many searches in the midwest
and the eastern U.S. occur on the gravel road and pad around the turbine. The rock is very white and so any bat carcass that shows up is highly visible.

Searcher-efficiency rates on roads and pads are typically 90, close to 100 percent. On roads and pads there, you know, should -- you know, I would not expect any sort of detection difference between those three species you mentioned and a Myotis or a tricolored bat. Tricolored bat is a bit smaller. It's probably closer in size to eastern red. They are fairly close but the little browns are -- they are smaller.

If you do a dog base search -- so I guess I'll back up there.

In my experience, when they do road and pad surveys, $I$ find the same pattern. And there's been road and pad surveys completed at 1,500 different projects. I see the same pattern. The Myotis are rare fatalities at most projects.

If we want to break that down further, you know, in a cleared plot situation where you are searching for carcasses in a corn and soybean field that's been cleared, it increases searcher efficiency.

You know, there's a -- there is a --
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there is -- a very large hoary bat probably is easier to detect than a little brown bat. However, most -I would say, you know, most of the carcass searcher-efficiency trials that are completed they don't use a hoary bat. In fact, it's kind of rare to use a hoary bat. Most of those carcasses are, you know, anymore, are saved for research purposes.

So it's a mix. It's a mix of the silver-haired and eastern-reds which are quite a bit smaller than the hoary bat so in those situations you would expect a difference. I would not expect a huge difference.

And so, you know, if you are driving at the idea that Myotis is a common fatality is just not -- I think the road and pad data make that clear. The surveys that have completed carcass surveys with dogs are also bearing that out. You know, a dog has more of a scent-based detection and, you know, carcass size will -- will have an effect, you know, there should be a bigger scent and all, but probably less on a visual basis.

So just based on the sheer, you know, numbers, it's clear that, you know, Myotis are killed less often but they certainly do occur.

ALJ WILLIAMS: You are cutting out a
little bit. I don't know if there is a way to increase your amplification or just try to focus on projecting.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah, I'll project better. Sorry about that.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
A. So based on the raw numbers found, as well as, you know, the detection rates I cited for different substrates, you know, Myotis certainly do occur as fatalities at projects but in lower numbers.
Q. How far from the base of the turbine tower do you expect a bat to travel before hitting the ground after it has collided with a turbine?
A. Unlike birds, bats -- the majority of bats fall closer to turbines. You know, most of the studies are finding that 70,80 percent are falling, you know, 40 to 60 meters depending on the size of the project curtailment that's happening at the project. The size of the turbine, not the project. The size of the turbine.
Q. Does the size of the bat cause the bat to fall any closer to the turbine than it otherwise would if it was a larger species of bat?

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague.
ALJ WILLIAMS: I will let him answer.
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A. I think what you are trying to ask is Myotis, because they are smaller, do they fall further or closer.
Q. Yes.
A. That's a physics-based question. I don't believe there's any empirical -- I know that people have completed some modeling how far carcasses will fall based on the size of the carcass. I can't remember off the top of my head what those values were for different values of small versus large bats. I can say based on the empirical data that $I$ have looked at with Myotis fall distributions, it's -it's definitely similar, I would say, but that dataset is smaller than the bat fatalities because Myotis is the rarest fatality.
Q. What is the size of the Indiana bat?
A. Oh, roughly a couple, 3, 4 inches in
length. It depends on what you mean by "size." You know, I don't know the weights off the top of my head but I will say that 3 to 4 inches is probably the body length. If their wings are out, they are going to be longer width -- width-wise.
Q. Are you familiar with the Fowler Ridge wind project in Indiana?
A. I am familiar with that project.
Q. How did you become familiar with that project?
A. I -- I completed most of the monitoring at Fowler Ridge -- I won't say I completed. I -- I served as project manager for much of the monitoring that was completed. I did some of the field work supported by the --

ALJ WILLIAMS: You're trailing off, Mr. Good.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I was just saying yeah, I was -- I served as project manager for many of the monitoring studies that have been completed at Fowler Ridge.
Q. And do those monitoring studies include the study of bat mortalities?
A. Yes.
Q. During those surveys did you find or did your crew find dead Indiana bats?
A. Yes.
Q. How many have been found there to your knowledge?
A. So I believe it was 2 or 3 total relative to thousands and thousands of other bat carcasses that have been picked up over the years.
Q. Now, did you come to any conclusions as
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to the number of Indiana bat mortalities that were estimated per year based on the number of Indiana bat mortalities that were found during the searches?
A. We -- my study, I did not, no. We -- the Fowler Ridge Habitat Conservation Plan did come up with -- well, I guess we did. So in my studies we have estimated mortality rates for the Indiana bats based on the level of overall bat mortality and the relative species composition that Indiana bats comprise of the total mortality.
Q. And what was the result of those estimates?
A. Off the top of my head, I think it was like 9 to 12 per year depending on -- I mean, I can't remember the exact number.
Q. Okay.
A. It was in that ballpark for the year.
Q. And that's for Indiana bats.
A. Yes. That's for Indiana bats, that's right.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I have no further questions at this time.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Attorney Van Kley.

Any redirect?

MR. SECREST: I do, your Honor. However, may I request about a 10 -minute break or so in order to get my documents together?

ALJ WILLIAMS: That would be fine. We will reconvene at 11:45.

MR. SECREST: Great. Thank you, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
(Recess taken.)
ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on the record.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
Prior to examining Mr. Good, I did have a question that was raised yesterday. There are a couple exhibits I would like to introduce on Mr. Good's redirect. Those are referenced in his direct testimony; however, they were not previously circulated to the Bench and counsel.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Can you distribute those via e-mail so that all the parties will have access to them as part of the redirect?

MR. SECREST: Yes, your Honor. Let me confer with my co-counsel as to how long that may take. One moment, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.
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MR. SECREST: Thank you.
Apologies, your Honor. I know we just came back from a break. However, it wasn't determined until that break that we would actually use some of these exhibits, and I do think it's going to take 10 minutes or so to distribute those to everybody.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley, are you okay if we go ahead and take lunch now and we will come back and finish?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. I would suggest that so we can take a look at the exhibits during the break and that will speed up the -- our recross certainly when we come back.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Secrest, if you could send those before you get your lunch, that would be great. If you do have exhibits that are going to be used on redirect, that would be the plan, distribute those electronically maybe after a short break but before redirect. So, and then obviously follow up with the court reporter as appropriate at the end of the day's business.

MR. SECREST: Very well, your Honor. Thank you.

One other question, at least from our
end, I have not heard any of the feedback that $I$ was previously hearing, so is anybody else hearing it now?

ALJ WILLIAMS: The feedback is gone. I got to tell, it is very faint, so if you guys are able at lunch to find a way to get the microphone closer, to amplify the microphone. Attorney Van Kley was loud and clear. I had him about as loud as I could handle on my headset. I could barely hear the witness. So just really focus on trying to -- and I could tell he was trying to amplify so try to get him closer to the microphone or try to further amplify.

MR. SECREST: Okay. We will do that.
ALJ WILLIAMS: The screeching now is definitely gone. And I think before we break I know we had tasked -- I don't want your question to be lost, Attorney Van Kley, the number of articles that might have been coauthored by the witness, so I think you are still entitled to that question. So if we could spend some time in the break to get that information as well, that would be appreciated, Attorney Secrest.

MR. SECREST: Certainly. Thank you, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. It's 12:51 now.

## 194

Why don't we go ahead and reconvene -- we'll just reconvene at 1 o'clock.

Thank you. We are off the record. Thank you.
(Thereupon, at 11:51 a.m., a lunch recess was taken.)
$\qquad$

Armstrong \& Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481
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MR. MARGARD: Try again. Testing, one two.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Jay, you can hear everybody?

ALJ AGRANOFF: I can.
ALJ WILLIAMS: I am going to plug my microphone back in and see if I can get a better connection.

MR. VAN KLEY: Does the State have a limit on the amount of size you can receive in an e-mail, Vern?

MR. MARGARD: It does. Yeah, it does.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Both Judge Williams and I received the copy.

MR. MARGARD: Yeah. My office probably has different limits than yours.

ALJ AGRANOFF: That's true.
MR. VAN KLEY: It's 15 megabytes.
MR. MARGARD: Mr. Williams, can you hear me now?

ALJ WILLIAMS: I can. Yes, it's the old school, turn it off, turn it back on. I unplugged my cord and plugged it back in, and you are all loud and clear now.

MR. MARGARD: Figure out which button you
leaned on this time. I was saying that the Company has e-mailed things to me before that I have not received. I know that, and the problem may well be on my end. And I would just ask if they would please resend it so.

MR. SECREST: Ms. Pirik did just resend.
MR. MARGARD: Thank you, sir.
MR. SECREST: Certainly.
ALJ AGRANOFF: I believe, Ms. Walker, you indicated as well you didn't receive it?

MS. WALKER: That's right. I did not receive it.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Ms. Pirik, can you send it to her as well?

MR. SECREST: It already has been. Thank you.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. I am going to forward the one $I$ got on the chance it will survive spam from me, as well from Applicant.

MR. SECREST: Mr. Margard's just bounced back.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Which e-mail address do you have for Mr. Margard? I've had problems with Mr. Eubanks where there are two different e-mails
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that were being used. Which one should he be using, Vern?

MR. MARGARD: It's Werner, $W-E-R-N-E-R$ dot Margard, M-A-R-G-A-R-D, at Ohio Attorney General, all one word, dot gov. That's the e-mail the Company has been using. I have no reason to believe it's not an issue on my end. I certainly don't want to hold up the proceedings. I am sure we can arrange for delivery of those exhibits later if there's an issue, perhaps we can deal with it as a one-off, but $I$ don't anticipate there being an issue.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. If it becomes an issue as redirect or recross is occurring, let us know.

Karen, are we on the record?
To clarify on the record, $I$ did forward only to Attorneys Margard and Walker, the message is simply forwarded, so that was Ms. Pirik's e-mail along with instructions, verbiage from the Bench, was forwarded, so you may receive it as well.

So again, unless we hear objections from counsel Margard or Walker, we'll proceed through redirect, recross, and so on. So there are no objections to what's going on, okay? Head nods from both counsel.

With that, we will redirect. Attorney Secrest.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. - - -

RHETT GOOD
being previously duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and further testified as follows: REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Secrest:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Good.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. How many Ohio wind projects have you worked on?

ALJ WILLIAMS: You're muted, Mr. Good. THE WITNESS: Can you hear me now? ALJ WILLIAMS: We can.
A. Okay. Great. I think -- the total number is over 10, but those that have been filed through OPSB are, I believe, five different ones. Timber Road, Hog Creek, Blue Creek, Icebreaker, Hardin.
Q. And in what year was the first project that you worked on in Ohio?
A. That would have been the Blue Creek project which I believe was 2009, '10ish. In that
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time frame.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good. Based on your experience in Ohio, you're familiar with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources pre- and post-construction monitoring protocols?
A. Yes. I've implemented those protocols on a number of different projects in Ohio.
Q. And for the projects that you worked on in Ohio, have you worked with ODNR?
A. Yes. Every project I'm involved with, I recommend to the clients that we include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the ODNR on the survey protocols and survey results.
Q. Great. Thank you.

MR. SECREST: Your Honor, I had -- we had previously identified the ODNR On-Shore Bird and Bat Pre- and Post-Construction Monitoring Protocols as Applicant's Exhibit 47. May I have it marked as such?

ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked.
(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Secrest, you are getting some feedback on your end.

MR. SECREST: Okay. Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good, did you testify you're familiar with these protocols?
A. Yes, yes, I'm familiar with those.
Q. And do you see on the first page of Applicant's Exhibit 47 there is two bullet points, Minimum and Moderate?
A. Yes, I see those.
Q. What do those refer to?
A. Those refer to the level of survey effort that the ODNR recommends that the project proponents use to assess the risk at projects. Minimum and moderate -- and they're cumulative. So certain surveys require for minimum and moderate and extensive.
Q. And did you testify on cross-examination that the level of survey for the Emerson Creek project was moderate?
A. I did, yes, so the -- the moderate category includes a number of different surveys that were completed at this project. Passerine migration surveys, bat acoustic and bat mist nest surveys, raptor migration surveys, breeding bird surveys, those were all completed at this site.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

And you referenced the survey effort
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being cumulative. By that do you mean that the Applicant, because it was classified as moderate, had to complete the minimum survey efforts as well?
A. Correct.
Q. And based upon your familiarity with the project, did the Applicant, in fact, complete all surveys set forth in the ODNR protocols under the minimum survey effort and moderate survey effort?
A. Yes. In fact, they completed more than what was recommended by the ODNR. So in addition to the surveys within the protocol they recommended for the moderate category, they also completed three different years of large bird use surveys that also included a winter period which are not included in the ODNR protocols.

They also exceeded the protocols in a number of different ways including the total number of survey points that are recommended by the ODNR within the project were exceeded for a number of different survey categories, surveys were conducted under multiple years and -- yes, those are the two ways in which the surveys were exceeded, the guidance were exceeded.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good. And if you would please refer to page 8
of Applicant's Exhibit 47.
A. Okay.
Q. Is radar monitoring included as a survey necessary for the moderate level?
A. It is not. And so, you know, some of the original correspondence on the project did recommend that the project complete radar monitoring. There were some initial forested and riparian areas within the initial versions of the project that were -- were slated within the protocol for completing radar monitoring.

However, during a site visit and further review of the project with both ODNR and the Fish and Wildlife Service, we visited those sites and came to agreement, you know, the Fish and Wildlife Service and ODNR looked at the area and indicated this is not the type of area we're concerned about as far as passerine migration goes and, therefore, radar monitoring was not recommended at this site.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

May I direct your attention to
Applicant's Exhibit 1, specifically $K$, Attachment $K$ to the Application.
A. Which Exhibit is K? Are you referring to a certain type of report?

MR. SECREST: May I present the witness with the exhibit, your Honor?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Please.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Secrest, I have K1
through 12. Are you in a certain segment?
MR. SECREST: I am, your Honor. I'm in K6.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good --
A. Okay.
Q. -- once you are on $K 6$, will you please go to the thirteenth page.
A. $K$, are you referring to the December 19, '17 survey recommendations? I'm not sure if I am on the right page.
Q. I am not. We are on Exhibit K, Attachment 6.
A. Attachment 6.
Q. There's a June 9, 2010, letter, from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources.
A. No. 6. Give me a second.

ALJ WILLIAMS: For those who are following along electronically, it's PDF page 14.

MR. VAN KLEY: What was that PDF number again?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Page 14 of 18.
MR. VAN KLEY: Page 14 of 18.
ALJ WILLIAMS: Within K6.
MR. VAN KLEY: I must be in the wrong document. Exhibit $K$ of the Application.

ALJ WILLIAMS: $K$ should be separated into 12 different subparts. We're in K6.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I better find it online then.

MR. SECREST: In the exhibits we circulated, the Section $K$ was broken out into 6 -- or 12 different attachments, $I$ believe all labeled as such.

THE WITNESS: I do have the June 9, 2010, letter, is that what you are referring to?

MR. SECREST: That is.
Mr. Van Kley, do you want us to wait a moment?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah, if you could. I am trying to find that document.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Secrest, is there any way -- there's a bit of reverb. I don't know if there is a way to back further away from the
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microphone or lower your volume.
MR. SECREST: Mr. Good, will you mute when not speaking. Is that better, your Honor?

ALJ WILLIAMS: It is.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.
MR. VAN KLEY: In the copies of the Application that were distributed as exhibits, which folder or which page?

ALJ WILLIAMS: K6.
MR. SECREST: Mr. Van Kley, if you look under -- it's Exhibit 1 to Nate Pedder's testimony and then you should see it broken up by Exhibit letter and number.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. Okay. Yes, I see that. Thank you.

MR. SECREST: Certainly.
MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. And which PDF page on K6 are we looking at?

ALJ WILLIAMS: 14 of 18.
MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. I'm there. Thank you.

MR. SECREST: Certainly.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good, may I direct your attention to the second paragraph of this letter in which it states "Though this project area
encompasses portions of Slate Run, which has previously been identified as a potential migratory corridor (Figure 1), the habitat within the proposed project would not be what the DOW considers high quality stopover habitat." Do you see that, Mr. Good?
A. I do.
Q. Mr. Good, despite the project boundary having moved since 2010, based upon your experience and your review of the project area, is it still your opinion that it does not present high quality stopover habitat?
A. Yes, that is my opinion. I believe it's also the opinion of both wildlife agencies as well. They reviewed all the studies and came to the conclusion no further studies are needed for this project.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

Reaching that conclusion that no additional studies were necessary for this project, are you aware whether ODNR concluded that the level of survey or the survey effort was sufficient for this project to establish risk for the wildlife that was surveyed?
A. Yes, I am. So all the surveys completed
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to date were reviewed with the ODNR in various meetings, and the ODNR agreed no further surveys were needed for this project.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good. While we are on the topic of surveys, you were asked on cross-examination to identify any surveys for which you were the author or the coauthor that accompanied the Application. Have you now done so?
A. I have, and I apologize there are a number of reports there and $I$ was having trouble locating those initially. So I was listed as a coauthor on Exhibit S, No. 3; Exhibit R, No. 4; Exhibit V, No. 2; and Exhibit X, No. 2.
Q. Thank you.

On cross-examination you were asked questions related to bats and carcass surveys. Please tell us, what are bias trials?
A. Bias trials are surveys completed during post-construction monitoring surveys to estimate how many carcasses are missed because a searcher just didn't detect them, and also how many are either removed by scavengers before someone could have a chance to detect it or were otherwise rendered undetectable by, say, farming activities or
decomposition.
Q. With regard to carcass persistence rates, do those differ by region?
A. They certainly do. And they can be quite variable. I have been involved in projects where the persistence rate for bats was 15 to 30 days. I've been involved in projects where bats were removed within a couple of days of being placed. Similar for birds. I would say the one area where it's less variable would be for raptors. Raptors tend to remain on the landscape quite a long time.
Q. And with regard to -- will you mute, please. Thank you.

With regard to bias trials and searcher efficiency and scavenger rate, is it standard practice in the industry to apply adjustment factors to post-construction monitoring to account for missed carcasses and scavenged carcasses?
A. Yes. In fact, that's a requirement for most post-construction monitoring protocols. It's -it's very important to have an estimate not only of how many you found but how many you missed. So that is the standard for virtually every study I've been involved in.
Q. And with regard to these
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post-construction monitoring surveys, are there conservative estimates associated with them as well?
A. Yes, there are. There are some conservative assumptions built into post-construction monitoring surveys. A couple of those include, one we do, every carcass we find within the search plot died due to collision with turbines and so we know that's an overestimate because, you know, especially in the case of birds, you know, bird mortality occurs in nature through predation, disease, various factors. The few studies that have measured background mortality have estimated upwards of 20 , 30 percent of birds found on the landscape could be a result of background mortality.

You know, for a number of our surveys we -- we will also find a feather spot and so especially with a feather spot in which we find a pile of feathers, we have no idea if that bird died due to collision, if it was killed by a raptor or a -- or a fox or -- we just don't know but those are conservatively included in those fatality estimates.

Some of the other -- other conservative, I think, methods that are included in a lot of these analyses would be, you know, I think a lot of times whenever humans are checking the status of a -- of a
carcass during a persistence trial, sometimes the carcass can be moved within the plot but not removed from the plot. So this came to light when we started using dogs for carcass searches and the dogs are able to detect that it had moved but a human would not, and so for the vast majority of studies that have been conducted we're probably estimating carcass persistence would be quicker than it really is based on some of those results.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I am afraid -- I am the tech police here. It looks like your microphone is now probably hanging off of your shirt collar and it's kind of bouncing around on your shirt collar there to the left. So try to keep that steady, that would help us.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good, you were asked some questions on cross-examination about tundra swans. Do you recall those?
A. I do.
Q. And have you reviewed mortality studies or literature related to the susceptibility of waterfowl, including swans, to wind turbine fatalities?
A. Yes. I'm familiar with those and I have completed a few of those as well.
Q. And what do those studies tell you about waterfowl susceptibility to wind turbine fatalities?
A. Yes. The waterfowl are interesting. They are often one of the most commonly-observed species at most wind energy projects in the midwest and east.

For example, Canada geese are often observed in large numbers flying right at the same height as turbine blades, yet waterfowl and waterbirds are rarely found as fatalities at wind projects. They comprise a very, very small number relative to their abundance at wind projects.

Top of Iowa was a case where a master's student did a study. There's a wind project located in the middle of three wildlife management areas and those -- those wildlife management areas held tens of thousands of geese, yet not a single fatality of Canada geese occurred at that project.

Tundra swans are closely related to
geese. One particular example involving tundra swans involves, I believe, some of the testimony cited by Dr. Smallwood. That's a project, the study he is referring to is called the Wolfe Island project.

There's a series of post-construction monitoring reports in his testimony that illustrate how tundra swans are not susceptible to wind turbine mortality. At Wolfe Island there is thousands of tundra swans that winter and fly through that project area and as well as during migration. Yet, I believe there might have been close to 500 carcasses picked up and not a single tundra swan fatality occurred which further illustrates the low susceptibility of waterfowl to mortality and this -- it's a common finding among all post-construction monitoring projects.

Now, that's not to say a few waterfowl don't incur fatalities so the risk isn't zero but the numbers found are very, very small relative to waterfowl abundance at wind projects.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I present Mr. Good with one of the exhibits we circulated -will you mute, please? It was cited from his testimony. It's titled "A Comprehensive Analysis of Small-Passerine Fatalities from Collision with Turbines at Wind Energy Facilities."

ALJ WILLIAMS: You may.
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. May
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I also have that marked as Applicant's Exhibit 84. ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) MR. SECREST: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good, do you have the document I'm referencing in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. Please tell me a little bit about this study.
A. Yes. This is a study that was basically a meta-analysis that reviewed all the existing wind energy post-construction monitoring reports that were publicly available at the time. The purpose was to estimate passerine mortality across all those facilities and compare the level of mortality occurring to population sizes of passerines and other sources of bird mortality.

So the -- you know, the project involved adjustments to some of the estimates from existing facilities. There was efforts to try to make the estimates more comparable particularly through making adjustments for the type of statistical analysis that was completed at each of the studies in order to make sure those estimates were comparable. They also only included projects that, you know, were monitored
during spring and fall migration periods which are the highest periods of risk for migrating passerines.

The survey -- or the estimate found that, you know, at the time the estimated overall passerine mortality, the cumulative mortality of all wind projects in the U.S. was estimated to be within 134- to 230,000 at the time. Those estimates ended up being pretty close to some other estimates that were calculated later by Dr. Loss which are used now by the Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies to compare sources of mortality for birds, and direct conservation efforts.

The study found that, you know, for basically almost all the passerines involved, the mortality occurring was less than .01 percent, I believe, of the total population size and that's from the cumulative mortality of all wind projects at the time.

You know, wind energy development has increased since that time but, you know, since 2013, the number of installed capacity has probably increased 30 to 50 percent, but even if you double some of these estimates, you would come to the same conclusion, the level of mortality occurring at this -- at -- the cumulative mortality occurring from
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wind energy to passerines is very, very low, orders of magnitude lower, than other sources of bird mortality.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

If $I$ can direct you to page 5. Under the
"Results" heading, there is a "Fatality Rate Estimates for Small Birds" and a "Bias-Corrected Estimates of Fatality Rates for Small Birds." Do you see that?
A. Which section on page 5 are you at?
Q. Under the "Results" section.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Good. Thank you.

With regard to the results and the estimates of bird fatalities per megawatt per year, are those consistent with what your studies have determined and your general understanding of small bird fatality?
A. Yes. Those values are similar to what I see at even newer wind generation projects in the midwest. Generally, most fatal -- most projects are in the range of 2 to 4 birds per megawatt per year with, you know, some being lower and higher. That's certainly consistent with my experience as well.
Q. And is that what you would anticipate for
the Emerson Creek wind project?
A. Yes. You know, based on 2,300 hours of surveys that have been completed at the project, as well as over 300 post-construction monitoring studies at wind energy facilities across the nation, and the fact that this project is located in a tilled, agriculture-dominated landscape, located outside known migration corridors, located outside of IBAs, I would anticipate the bird mortality rate to be within the range of other midwest projects here.
Q. Thank you. Excuse me.

Also under the "Results" section, specifically the heading "Composition of Fatalities by Bird Type, Passerine Family, and Small-passerine Species," it states: "Small passerines accounted for 62.5 percent of the 4,975 observed fatalities at wind energy facilities; this included birds found incidentally, outside of standardized surveys. Upland game birds (8.2 percent) and diurnal raptors (7.8 percent) were the next most commonly found bird types."

With regard to diurnal raptors making up 7.8 percent of the fatalities, is that consistent with your research as well and the studies you have performed on wind projects?
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A. Yes, although I would say it's probably a bit high. These are raw numbers compared to basic raw numbers of raptors found which are quite large and much more easily detected than a passerine would be. So I think those are probably on the high side but definitely within the range of what $I$ viewed.
Q. And you had -- in your testimony you referenced the overall continent-wide effects on small bird populations. Does this report address those effects on pages 8 and 9?
A. Yes. Page 8 is a summary of the composition of fatalities at projects. As well as page 9. Page -- page 10 and 11 -- page 11 is the beginning of the summary of how those nationwide estimates compare to the pop -- population sizes.
Q. Great. Thank you, Mr. Good. You may put that aside.

MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I direct Mr. Good's attention to what we have premarked and what I will ask formally be marked as Exhibit 85. It's titled "Issues in Ecology."

ALJ WILLIAMS: You may.
(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
ALJ WILLIAMS: We will mark it
accordingly.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Mr. Good, are you familiar with this document?
A. I am.
Q. What is it?
A. This is a summary of the -- you know, the latest in what's known regarding wind energy impacts to birds and bats. It was published in fall of 2019 by some of the leading researchers in the field of wind and wildlife interactions from University professors to consultants to USGS.
Q. If I may direct you to page 6. Specifically looking at the first sentence in the second column. It states: "National average adjusted fatality rates (as defined in Box 2) reported in recent peer-reviewed national reviews vary from approximately three to six birds and four to seven bats per megawatt of installed wind energy capacity per year." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Are those numbers and figures consistent with your research as well as your studies you performed?
A. Yes. Those numbers are accurate and
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consistent with all the post-construction monitoring studies I have been a part of. Yes, for birds. The bat numbers, those are -- bat numbers are more variable but for the bird numbers those numbers are quite consistently in that range.
Q. If I may direct you to page 8 of Applicant's Exhibit 85. Under the heading "Birds," I am looking at the third sentence. It states: "Diurnal raptors constitute about 9 percent of total observed fatalities, and these percentages are higher in the western U.S. where these species are more abundant." Is that consistent with your understanding and research?
A. Yes, that's correct. So there is a number of studies that $I$ have been a part of where no raptor fatalities are found or just a handful. So, yes, that is -- that is consistent with my understanding as well.
Q. Mr. Good, if we could, just quickly back to the bias trial issues. We had discussed carcass persistence rates being site specific. Are bias trial estimates, in general, project or site specific?
A. They should be for a good study. So a standard recommendation for most wildlife agencies
and the USGS, so searcher efficiency can vary depending on the substrate or the type of search you are completing, as well as scavenging rates, so it's really important when you got a fatality rate that they use site-specific estimates of those biases. Otherwise you could run the risk of greatly underestimating or overestimating the fatality rate.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

What specific measures has this project used to reduce potential mortality to both birds and bats?
A. Yeah. So there have been a number of characteristics of this project that $I$ think minimize impacts to both species or both types of animals. For birds, you know, a couple of the larger ones are: It's not located within a known migration corridor; the project is not located in any known important bird areas; it's located in tilled agriculture. And, you know, that's a consistent recommendation from the Fish and Wildlife Service and the ODNR. They're like, when possible, if it's at all possible, site wind turbines in tilled agriculture. These are disturbed landscapes, disturbed habitats.

The largest source of bird population
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declines in the U.S. is loss of habitat, so siting a project in tilled agriculture is one of the most important aspects of reducing potential impacts to birds.

The project has also avoided -- as we've discussed earlier, there is some forest in the project. All turbines have been sited outside of forest for this project. Further reducing potential risks to birds.

The project has also minimized impacts to wetlands, another important bird habitat. For bats, you know, siting turbines in tilled agriculture is not necessarily a minimization measure for bats. Bat mortality rates can be higher in projects with or without forests. However, there are some tried-and-true measures that have been proposed for this project to reduce mortality that are recommended by both the ODNR and the Fish and Wildlife Service and that includes operating the project at 6.9 meters per second in an effort to avoid the take of listed bats which will also greatly reduce potential mortality rates for tree bats during the spring and fall migration periods.

The project has also gone to great
lengths to site turbines outside of known foraging ranges of Indiana and northern long-eared bats.

And the project has proposed not clearing any trees during the winter -- or during the summer period when bats could be present.

So those are the primary means by which the project has reduced its impact to both birds and bats.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Good.

How has the total survey effort for this project, how does that compare with other projects for which you worked on?
A. The total amount of survey effort at this project greatly exceeds just about any project I've been involved with. And so $I$ would say for a typical project you might have one to two years of pre-construction surveys probably in the neighborhood of four -- 200 to 400 plus hours of survey effort depending on -- of course, it really depends on the characteristics of the site, you could have a lot more but a typical Midwest ag project is probably in that range.

I totaled up the total survey effort for this project and I was kind of surprised to see there has been over 2,300 hours of different bird surveys
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at this project so it's more than a full year of someone standing on-site, all day, every day, looking for birds. That's a lot. There's surveys over multiple years.

The total survey effort, again, was exceeded over what the ODNR recommended for the project in both the number of points and the types of surveys for this project. So there is a -- there's plenty of information here to assess risk.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, Mr. Good.
Your Honor, may I have just a minute to confer with my counsel?

ALJ WILLIAMS: You may.
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
Thank you, your Honor, and thank you, Mr. Good. I have no further questions.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Mr. Van Kley, any recross?
MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, your Honor. Could you give me about 5 minutes or so to organize my notes to make it an efficient cross-examination?

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will. Why don't we go ahead and take 10 minutes. Give you ample time. We want to come back on at 1:55.

Karen, we are off the record. Thank you.
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have two different forms of microphone coming through.

THE WITNESS: There we go. Sorry about that.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I am not sure if they work
for service or not, but $I$ don't believe the others do.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I lost part of your answer. Can you repeat the answer?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. So I am looking at the author list, I don't recognize any Service personnel on there but there are a few people on there that I don't know who they work for.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: I can't say for certain none of them work for Fish and Wildlife.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) What's the origin of the mortality data that was used in the preparation of Applicant's Exhibit 85?
A. Okay. Remind me, Exhibit 85, is this the "Issues in Ecology"?
Q. Yes.

MR. SECREST: Mr. Good is trying to reestablish audio.

THE WITNESS: Can you guys hear me now?
ALJ WILLIAMS: We can. Any response to that last question?
A. Okay. So the sources of the post-construction monitoring data in this report was your question. I believe that the source of that information are post-construction monitoring studies that are required by state and federal agencies largely that are completed at wind energy projects.
Q. So these studies producing the data used in this paper were conducted by wind energy companies?
A. No. Hardly any of these studies are completed by wind energy companies.
Q. All right. Maybe you misunderstood my question. I better reask it. The mortality data used in Applicant's Exhibit 85, was it produced by the wind companies?
A. No. Those are post-construction monitoring -- I think you're referencing like what is the source of information that was used in this report to talk about levels of mortality. I think that's what you are trying to ask, correct?
Q. I believe so.
A. Okay. I am just trying to make sure I
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have the question correct. And then you asked these are all studies completed by wind energy companies and that's false. So these are -- almost all of these are studies that are completed by third parties, they are often paid for by the wind industry, required by state and federal wildlife agencies, following protocols that are typically reviewed and approved by state and federal wildlife agencies.
Q. Okay. I think you've perceived the reason for our confusion. The mortality data collected that ultimately made its -- ultimately was considered in the preparation of Applicant's Exhibit 85 was all collected by wind companies, correct?
A. No. So wind companies don't collect mortality data. They often hire consultants, sometimes universities, sometimes USGS and outside research organizations to collect the data and complete the studies.
Q. Okay. So the mortality monitoring that constitutes the basis for Applicant Exhibit 85 was conducted by people who contracted with the wind companies to collect the mortality data, correct?
A. That's right, including universities and
other third parties and consultants.
Q. How much of the mortality data utilized in Applicant's Exhibit 85 was collected by WEST?
A. I -- you know, I don't have a good -- a good estimate for you on that. If I looked through the citations here, you know, based on the citations that I'm seeing, I see two reports with WEST lead authors.
Q. Were any of the authors of Applicant's Exhibit 85 employees of WEST at the time this paper was prepared?
A. Yes. Dale Strickland is a senior ecologist with WEST. He is a coauthor on this report.
Q. Any others?
A. Yeah. I don't -- yeah. No. I see -yeah, I see -- I see Erin Baerwald, she's a professor. Amanda Hale is a university research professor. Cris Hein is the leader of Bat Conservation International at the time of the -- or one of the heads of the wind side of that organization. I see USGS, and I see one WEST author.
Q. Do you have any idea how many wind companies have been -- have contracted with WEST to conduct turbine mon -- turbine mortality monitoring?
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A. How many wind companies?
Q. Yes. Or how many different wind farms would be a better question.

MR. SECREST: Objection to relevance.
ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll let him answer and explain if he knows.
A. So we -- I think we completed post-construction monitoring at 2- to 300 different wind energy projects.
Q. Okay. How --
A. That's not an exact number obviously but it's a rough estimate.
Q. Okay. Have there been any projects in which to your knowledge WEST has worked for people opposed to wind projects?

MR. SECREST: Objection, outside the scope of redirect.

MR. VAN KLEY: No, it's really not, because one of the authors of the paper that we're talking about is employed by WEST, so the potential bias of the -- that author of the paper is in question here.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll allow the question. Please respond, Mr. Good.
A. Let me -- well, we have completed
contract work for the Fish and Wildlife Service, state and federal agencies, and NGOs which are environmental organizations. I don't -- you know, I guess I don't know the breadth of all the contracts we've done at WEST. So I can say I personally have not done any studies for a project opponent. Typically we're, you know -- yeah, no, I have not.
Q. Okay. And you are not aware of any other WEST employees who have worked for a wind power plant?
A. Well, I can say there are projects the Fish and Wildlife Service are opposed to, and we have contracts with the Fish and Wildife Service, so if you consider the -- I wouldn't consider the Service an opponent in this instance that you are thinking of them, but they certainly will express views that generally don't recommend developing projects. So if you think of them in that regard, we have done work for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
Q. Do you know how many projects have been conducted by WEST on behalf of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
A. Well, we -- I don't know the total number. I would say dozens. I know of five different contracts associated with estimating golden
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eagle population size in the western U.S. I know we've completed bat surveys for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We have developed migration models for bats for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We have -- I know there are statisticians that work with the Fish and Wildlife Service office in Alaska, analyzing data that's been collected.

So but, yeah, the exact number I don't have off the top of my head though.
Q. Would you go to page 3 of Exhibit 85. I would like to direct your attention to the last paragraph in the first column of that page. And the first sentence of that paragraph reads as follows: "Although some bat fatalities had been observed in early studies, research related to bat-wind interactions increased dramatically after 2003 when 1,400 to 4,000 bat fatalities were estimated to have occurred in a six-week period at the Mountaineer Wind Energy Center in West Virginia." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do see that sentence.
Q. Are you aware of the incident that occurred at the Mountaineer Wind Energy Center that is described in this sentence?
A. Yeah, I believe they are referring to one
of the first studies that documented higher-than-expected bat mortality rates at wind energy projects. That is a true and accurate statement. After that discovery, there has been a lot of research regarding bat and wind interactions.
Q. Now, with respect to the bat mortality data that was utilized in Exhibit 85, how much of that mortality data was collected prior to 2003?
A. You know, I think most of the citations in here are post-2003. So I would expect most of the studies in here are post-2003.
Q. Were any of the statistics on bat mortalities the product of averaging mortality statistics for bats prior to 2003?
A. You know, I can't answer that with -- you know, they did not list all of the studies that were used in here, but if $I$ look through the citation, I guess I am going to do a quick review of the citations and see what the dates are in here. Do I see any before 2003? I'm not really seeing any 2003 -- pre-2003 citations in the literature cited.
Q. Let's go to page 7 of Exhibit 85. I would like to refer you to the second full paragraph in the first column on that page.
A. What? I'm sorry. I wasn't catching up
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with you there. What page -- are you still on the same paper?
Q. Same paper, Exhibit 85, page 7.
A. Page 7. Okay. Gotcha.
Q. And looking at the first full paragraph in the left column, starting with the word "Using."
A. Okay.
Q. And that sentence states as follows: "Using adjusted fatality rate data from publicly available studies, estimates of average cumulative annual bird fatalities in the continental U.S. published in 2013 and 2014 ranged from approximately 230,000 to 600,000 birds per year, estimates of cumulative bat fatalities published during that same period ranged from 200,000 to 800,000 bats per year." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. So with respect to the data on birds referenced in this report, that data is limited to bird fatalities published in 2013 and 2014, correct?
A. No. I think that that statement refers to those -- either those -- that range of estimates from 230- to 630,000, but there is a number of other citations throughout this report that are post-2013.

But regarding that statement, yeah, that's what this statement says.
Q. Okay. And the data is limited to published reports, correct?
A. What data are you referring to?
Q. The data that $I$ referenced in this sentence with regard to the estimate of approximately 230,000 to 600,000 birds per year.
A. Oh, okay. Yes, so those are references for a couple of different published reports that rely on several post-construction monitoring studies. So they are like their cumulative reviews of several different monitoring reports.
Q. Uh-huh. Of all of the wind farms in the United States during 2013 and 2014, how many of those wind farms provided bird mortality data that was included in these published reports used for the estimate of bird mortalities in the subject?
A. I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head.
Q. Can you tell me whether it's less than half of the existing wind farms at that time?

MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation.
ALJ WILLIAMS: To the extent he has any information, he can then tell us what it is and
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explain.
A. You know, I don't know the exact number. I can say some of the latest summaries represent information from like 20 to 30 percent that were cited in my testimony. So if you assume a similar number of publicly -- percentage of publicly-available studies that are available, that's a wild guess. Again, I would have to go back to the studies if you want a more concrete answer than that.
Q. Yeah. Do you know how many new wind projects have been constructed and operated in the United States since 2014?
A. I believe that the installed capacity since 2015, I looked this up, I want to say it increased by like 30 to 40 percent, in that ballpark, approximately again.
Q. And then with regard to the statement in the sentence we've been discussing about bat fatalities, can you tell me the number of wind farms that produce the bat mortality information used for the estimated 200,000 to 800,000 bat mortalities per year?
A. Yeah. I don't know that number off the top of my head.
Q. Based on information you've seen on
studies of bat mortalities that have estimated the number of bat mortalities on a national basis, can you tell me how many of the wind farms in the United States have been utilized for that information?
A. I believe that number is in the ballpark of 20 to 30 percent. I will look up the exact number here for you, if you would like.
Q. Yes, please.

MR. SECREST: May I ask the witness to identify what he is looking at.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Please.
A. I want -- I am looking at the -MR. SECREST: I am going to ask you to not refer to that. That has not been introduced into evidence.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Good, with that instruction, if you could return to an estimate, if you have that, per Mr. Van Kley's question.
A. You know, my estimate is in the neighborhood of like 20 to 30 percent of facilities are represented in post-construction monitoring reports based on my recollection.
Q. Can you tell me the process by which the studies on bird and bat mortalities, that you are aware of, have obtained mortality data from
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post-construction mortality surveys at wind projects?
A. Yes, I can -- I can talk in general terms.

So, you know, the typical approach is first identify the question trying to be answered. Are you trying to estimate bird mortality? Are you trying to estimate bat mortality? Are you trying to estimate the number of rare events that is currently at a site?

So once those initial objectives are outlined, then you design the methods that are focused on best answering those questions. That can range from searching every turbine at a project to as few as 10 percent. I would say most of the studies I'm involved in are typically searching 50 to 75 percent of turbines that is part of the sample. Many are 100 percent.

So you do regular standardized searches with either trained human technicians or, in some cases, trained dog teams. You calculate the number of carcasses you find, and you adjust those numbers for bats that were -- based on your searcher efficiency and carcass persistence trials as well as bats and birds that are expected to occur within the search.
Q. And what is the typical area covered by the search plot for these mortality studies?
A. It depends on the -- on the question. It's hard to say what a typical number is. I guess I would say most have a plot radius of 60 to 100 meters. Some have plot radiuses lower than that. Typically those are older studies. Some have plot radiuses that are much bigger than that if the objective is to estimate something like an eagle mortality rate.
Q. And how large are those plot radiuses typically?
A. Typically 90 to 100 but sometimes they can be larger depending on the landscape and protocol.
Q. What is the range of distances from the turbine that carcasses from dead birds have been known to travel before landing on the ground?
A. What is the largest distance ever recorded? What's the -- that your -- is that what you are asking?
Q. Yeah. Give me a range that would include the shortest distance and longest distance recorded.
A. I would say -- you know, the shortest is, you know, around 0 to 1 and, you know, most -- the
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highest densities of carcasses are close to the turbines.

What's -- I mean that's a good question, what is the longest distance a carcass has been found during a carcass study? Probably 150 to 200 meters, in that ballpark, would be the longest. But those are kind of outliers, I would say, on the tail end of things that are quite unusual. Most of the estimates are, you know, most of the carcasses are falling much closer than that.
Q. So how -- how do the authors of studies on bat and bird mortalities at wind projects obtain the information that has been collected during the mortality surveys? In other words, how do they get the information? Where do -- who do they get it from? How is it made available to them?
A. I guess I don't know if I quite understand your question. Are you asking like when -- when I'm asked to do a carcass study, how do I obtain the data I collect?
Q. No. Let me try again. The mortality cup -- the mortality data collected on behalf of wind companies at wind projects typically is not published publicly on the internet; is that correct?
A. I think 20 to 30 percent of the studies
out there are public. And so -- and that's again -so it depends on what you mean is typical. I see that -- that's 20 to 30 percent of known fatalities. How many of those facilities actually did a study? It's less than 100 percent. So what is the actual number of facilities that have publicly-reported fatality data? It's higher than that. It's somewhere probably -- it's somewhere north of 20 to 30 percent.
Q. And is this information published publicly on a voluntary basis by these wind companies, or is it required by law in some instances?
A. Well, both. So there are a number of companies that publish their work voluntarily. There are organizations like the American Wind Wildife Institute who serve as a vehicle for those studies to be housed and for researchers to access that data and to answer questions that researchers might be interested in. So, you know, I think I answered your question. Or did I not hit the mark there?
Q. No. I think you answered the question.
A. And then I would say a number of those studies are posted publicly based on the resource agency they're submitted to.
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Q. So if you combine the mortality data that is posted by the wind companies with the mortality data that is made public by regulatory agencies, approximately how many wind projects have produced the data that has been made public through a combination of those two means of publication?

MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation. We are getting pretty far from the study for which Mr. Good is being questioned.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I am going to let him go ahead and answer to the extent he knows.
A. I believe I answered this already; but, you know, the latest summaries are -- you know, have publicly-available estimates, I think are in the neighborhood of 20 to 30 percent, but I don't have an exact number on -- in front of me.
Q. Okay. Let's go to page 9 of Applicant's Exhibit 85.
A. Okay.
Q. I would like to bring you to the second column on that page to the paragraph that starts with the words "Long-lived species."
A. Okay. Go ahead.
Q. All right. First sentence of that paragraph states as follows: "Long-lived species,
including most raptors, that have higher adult survival and fewer offspring each year, may be more susceptible than short-lived species to population-level effects from collisions with wind turbines." Do you agree with that statement?
A. Yeah, I guess I do agree with that statement in context to the previous paragraph which states that, you know, for most songbirds in the U.S. for which data are available, cumulative collision mortality at wind energy facilities has been estimated to represent less than .01 percent of population size, and those are species that also have higher reproductive potential.

So relative to the previous paragraph in context, I mean, yes, you know, wind energy would have potential to be more susceptible than those short-lived species regarding population-level effects if the mortality rates are high enough.
Q. And is that also true of bald eagles?
A. Bald eagles are a long-lived species and have higher adult survival so, yes, that would be true of bald eagles with one exception. Bald eagle populations are increasing dramatically, so an increasing population such as bald eagles are much less susceptible to any population effect.
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Q. The next sentence in that paragraph states as follows: "Few peer-reviewed studies in the U.S. have investigated population-level effects of wind energy on any raptor species." Would you agree with that statement?
A. Yes, I do. I also agree with the next statement.
Q. All right. I just asked you about the first statement. Let's go -MR. SECREST: If the witness could finish his answer.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will allow him to finish his answer. That will probably save us some time on redirect anyway.

Go ahead and finish your answer.
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
A. Yeah. I think it's important these statements be made in context and so the next statement, the sentence says "Studies of the unusually high fatalities of golden eagle at the Altamont wind facility in California indicated that increased mortality from collisions did not cause a decline of the local population although recent research indicates that these fatalities are offset by immigration of young eagles into the area."
studies that are mentioned in that sentence?
MR. SECREST: Objection, vague.
ALJ WILLIAMS: To the extent you can answer.
A. It cites No. 16. It cites one study by Todd Katzner of the USGS.
Q. So that sentence does not contradict the prior -- the statement in the prior sentence that few peer-reviewed studies in the U.S. have investigated population-level effects of wind energy on any raptor species, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct, with one caveat.

There have been a number of studies that have estimated raptor fatality rates and have compared those fatality rates to other sources of mortality, and those sorts of information is used to -- by wildlife agencies across the U.S.
Q. Would you go to page 16 of Exhibit 85.
A. Yes. Go ahead.
Q. All right. I would like to direct your attention to the last paragraph above the illustration in the right-hand column, starting with the words "Bat scientists."
A. The paragraph below the picture on
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page 16?
Q. The paragraph above the picture.
A. Although -- got you. Got it.
Q. That sentence states: "Bat scientists have hypothesized that broadcasting ultrasound from wind turbines may 'jam' a bat's ability to perceive its own echos and cause bats to avoid wind turbines." Do you agree with that statement?
A. I do agree. Many scientists have hypothesized that jamming those frequencies could work.
Q. Are you aware of any other theories on why bats collide with wind turbines?

MR. SECREST: Objection, outside the scope of redirect.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah, you're right. I'll withdraw that one.

MR. SECREST: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go to Applicant Exhibit 84.
A. And can you remind me what's the name of that report?
Q. It's the "Issues in Ecology" paper, entitled "A Comprehensive Analysis of Small-Passerine Fatalities from Collision with Turbines at Wind

Energy Facilities."
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. Let's start first by discussing the authors of this study. Are there -- are any authors -- or were any authors employees of WEST at the time this paper was authored?
A. Yes. The first three authors are scientists at WEST. Other authors on this paper include Doug Johnson, a noted statistician and researcher with the USGS, and Joelle Gehring, a researcher with FCC.
Q. So none of the authors of this paper were employed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at the time this paper was authored?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know how much, if any, of the mortality data used to prepare this paper had been obtained from WEST?
A. I don't know the percentage.
Q. Now, the date of this paper -- that is, the date the paper was received by the publisher was June 16, 2013; is that correct?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. So there's no post-2013 mortality data that was used in the preparation of this paper?
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A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Go to page 5 of Exhibit 84.
A. Go ahead.
Q. Go to the second column of that page under the heading of "Results."
A. Okay. Go ahead.
Q. Under "Results" it states that "Most of the 116 available monitoring studies that were appropriate for our analyses were conducted in the northern third of the contiguous United States." Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. Is that the total number of studies that were utilized for the preparation of Exhibit 84?
A. I believe they reviewed more studies than this, but they only included studies that I believe occurred during the migration seasons and met the minimum criteria for inclusion.
Q. Uh-huh. And those numbered 116 studies total?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Go to page 12. And I would like to direct you to the first column on that page under the heading "Other Analyses of Collisions with Turbines and Unknown Factors." Let me know when you've found
that.
A. Yeah, I'm here.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the first paragraph under that heading. You see in the first sentence of that paragraph that the authors state that they calculate about 214,000 to 368,000 turbine-related deaths that occur each year for all birds?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And then in the next sentence do you see the reference to values presented by Loss which averaged 234,000?
A. Yes, I do see that.
Q. Is that where you obtained your figure of about 230,000 bird mortalities per year that you mentioned in your redirect testimony?
A. Having trouble remembering, we talked a lot of numbers but that very well could be it. I would expect so; but, you know, I need to go back and see the exact reference if you would like.
Q. So you see the same sentence that has the reference to Loss, that there were numbers presented by Smallwood and Manville, 573,093 and 440,000 respectively, in bird mortalities per year?
A. Yes, I do see that.
Q. And let's look at the last sentence on --
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in that paragraph that starts on the bottom of the first column on page 12 which starts with the words "Our study differs." And let me know when you have found that sentence.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Okay. And it says there "Our study differs from that of Smallwood because we used the fatality rate provided in individual studies as opposed to independently recalculating these rates from the raw data using a single common estimator." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to the next column on page 12 of Exhibit 84. And we'll look at the first four -- the first full paragraph in that column. Let me know when you have found that.
A. Can you help me again? I am having trouble finding that.
Q. Yeah. Page 12, column 2, first -- first full paragraph in that column starting with the words "There are factors."
A. Correct. All right.
Q. Let me read the first two -- or first three sentences of that paragraph and tell me if $I$ have read them correctly. "There are factors that
may influence any per year estimate of bird fatalities. First, taller turbines may be related to an increase in bird mortality, as suggested by Loss, et al. We found no linear correlation between turbine tower height and the fatality rates we estimated, but other factors such as geographic location or turbine age may confound the effect of tower height." Did I read that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would you agree that generally wind turbines that are taller pose more risk of bird fatalities?

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague. Birds in total, regardless?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
A. The answer is it depends.
Q. What does it depend on?
A. It depends on the species you are talking about.
Q. Are there certain species that are more at risk from collisions with wind turbines that are taller?
A. I would say that, you know, taller turbines tend to occur, you know, closer to the air space where a lot of nocturnal migrants fly, although
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a lot of nocturnal migrants fly in the existing air space of existing wind turbines, smaller turbines. I believe that's what Loss -- I believe that's what their -- their study suggested as well.
Q. Since 2013 when this paper was presented, have the turbine models utilized in wind projects in the United States generally increased in height?
A. They have increased in height, yes. So, you know, machines now are able to generate more power at those greater heights which also means there's fewer turbines that are developed in a given project to meet the capacity requirements, so it is a tradeoff. There are some taller turbines but there's fewer of them.
Q. Going back to the first full paragraph in the second column on page 12 of Exhibit 84 , 1 would like to direct your attention to the -- the sentence after the sentences that $I$ read to you. It starts with the word "Second." Tell me when you have found that.
A. You are on the last paragraph on the left column on page 12?
Q. I'm on the second paragraph. I'm sorry. I am in the second column and the first full paragraph of that column.
A. You're in the right paragraph --

MR. SECREST: May I show the witness, your Honor?

ALJ WILLIAMS: You may.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. See if I got it somewhere.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Okay. So go back to the paragraph that I've already read a couple sentences to you which starts with the words "There are factors."
A. Yep.
Q. Okay. Now go down to the sixth line of that paragraph starting with the word "Second."
A. Yes.
Q. And that sentence reads as follows:
"Second, the size of the search plot may influence how many actual fatalities are found by searchers." Do you agree with that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, staying in the same paragraph, let's go down to the sentence that starts with the words "Not all plot sizes" which will be about seven lines below the sentence $I$ just read to you.
A. Okay.
Q. And that sentence reads: Not all plot sizes in studies for our analysis conformed to these guidelines, and some studies may underestimate the number of bird fatalities found to -- found due to the bird carcasses landing outside the search plot. Do you see that sentence?
A. I do see that sentence, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you agree with that statement?
A. So, yes. I mean, in this study they did not correct for birds that fell outside of the plots. However, Loss et al. did do so and their estimate was similar to ours. But, yes, you are correct, that is what the sentence says.
Q. You can put Exhibit 84 to the side for now.
A. The only thing I would add to that statement would be we certainly have looked at this and I guess based on the typical plot sizes and using some of the ballistics models that are out there, you know, those estimates are, you know, given the plot sizes that have been studied, you know, the percentage of birds nests are not -- you know, it's not a doubling of the estimate. These cases are
capturing most of the birds that are killed and some -- there is some adjustments made to it. These aren't continually large adjustments.
Q. Do you agree that wind projects in the midwest have had some of the highest fatality estimates for bats?
A. Yes, they have. The range is broad from 0 to, I believe, 60 bats per megawatt, but most being less than that, but that is the upper end of the reported range.
Q. And just for clarification, the figures that you just mentioned, up to 60 bats per megawatt, would be the estimated number of bat deaths per megawatt per year, correct?
A. Yes. That's reported megawatts for that study. The reported numbers per megawatt per I believe that number you're referencing -- I guess I need to go back and I would need to go back and see the study estimate to see if they reported per year or per study period. I can't remember off the top of my head.
Q. What do you need to do to confirm?
A. I would need to review the report where that estimate was provided. But in general if it's reported, it's going to encompass the majority, if
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not all of the time, when bats were present.
Q. During your redirect examination you mentioned the survey of mortalities at Wolfe Island. Do you recall that testimony?
A. I do.
Q. Now, the search radius for that study was 50 meters from the turbine tower, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You also mentioned a study in which -- a study on a wind project in which tundra swans were present. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. They were described within those Wolfe Island reports.
Q. Of the waterfowl studies that you mentioned in your redirect testimony that appears to conclude that the risk to waterfowl from wind turbines is low, in how many of those studies was it shown that tundra swans were present in the project area that was utilized in those studies?
A. The monitoring studies at Wolfe Island. I don't believe there is tundra swans present at the Top of Iowa study I mentioned. But they were present at the Wolfe Island study.
Q. And in how many of the studies at Wolfe Island were the tundra swans present?
A. I believe they were there every year at Wolfe Island, so I would assume they are present -- I need to go back and check, but during the majority of those studies, again, you mentioned the search radius was 50 meters. If that was the distance, we would expect if there were large numbers of tundra swans mortalities occurring, they would be detected within 50 meters.
Q. How many tundra swans were present during those studies?
A. The report referenced thousands. I would need to check the reports for that number.
Q. In your redirect you provided some testimony concerning the ODNR protocols for surveying birds and bats, correct?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Is there anything in that protocol that prohibits the wind developer from obtaining more information than is required by that protocol?
A. There is not. In fact, you know, in this case the Applicant, on their own, completed an additional three years of large bird surveys that are not required in the ODNR protocol.
Q. Uh-huh. And the reason that was done is primarily -- was primarily to look for bald eagles,
correct?
A. Bald eagles and other large birds so, yes, tundra swans.
Q. What were the years in which the large bird surveys were conducted for this project?
A. Okay. I believe I need to reference the --

MR. SECREST: If I may direct you to Exhibit S of the Application, not K.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
A. So there was one study in 2016 to 2017. Second survey in 2016 to 2017. 20 -- there's another survey in 2018 to 2019. And then I believe there was one more, the Tetra report for 2012 referenced another study completed -- migration survey in 2011. And I will be more specific. In 2011 to 2012 was the other.
Q. Say that again, please.
A. 2011 to 2012 .
Q. So in your testimony you stated that the Applicant here completed more bird surveys than required by ODNR. Did you include in that statement the surveys done from 2011 to 2012?
A. Yes. In general under the ODNR protocols, correct, that study would not have been
included. Also included in that statement were the breeding bird surveys, so the ODNR does not require breeding bird surveys unless turbines are located in bird habitats and there will be no turbines in bird habitats. So those are -- I guess that's -- you know, those are all the studies that were done in addition to what was asked for by the ODNR.

In addition, like, there were multiple years, so there is more effort in the project than would have been required under the survey effort letter, so more points. Even within surveys that were required, you know, even more points surveyed than would have been required in the ODNR survey.
Q. Uh-huh. With regard to the 2011-2012 eagle surveys, can you tell me your opinion with regard to whether those surveys are representative of the bald eagle populations found in the project area today?
A. Chris Farmer, who is up next, will be testifying to eagles. That was not the purpose of my testimony.
Q. Do you know the answer to the question?

MR. SECREST: Objection, outside the scope of redirect.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will give a small bit of
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latitude if he knows the answer.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I think you said go ahead?

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will give a small bit of latitude to answer, if you know.
A. Okay. Are they representative of -- I think they are in a lot of regards for -- with the caveat that eagle populations have increased which is why the Applicant decided to repeat a lot of those surveys throughout the new boundary.
Q. You made a statement in your redirect that some of the surveys were done outside of the foraging area for the Indiana bat; am I accurately restating your testimony?
A. No. What I said was the turbines were sited outside of established presence buffers for the Indiana bat based on the survey data prior.
Q. Were there any acoustic surveys for bats that covered those areas?

MR. SECREST: Objection. This is outside the scope of direct as well. MR. VAN KLEY: No, it's not. I specifically linked it to his testimony about the turbines being outside the foraging areas. I'm testing the accuracy of that statement.
answer.
A. There were acoustic surveys. Honestly I don't -- I don't remember if the met towers and the locations of those surveys were in or out of those presence buffers. I would need to go back and check the map layout compared to the acoustic survey report to give you an answer on that.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. All right. I have no further questions.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Any redirect?
MR. SECREST: Your Honor, I would enjoy more questions, but I believe I've exhausted mine.

ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. I don't expect anyone else, but $I$ will let people frantically wave if they think they have anything. I see no motion.

With that we will take up the exhibits, Mr. Secrest.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. May the Applicant move to admit Exhibits 32, 47, 84, and 85.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Any objection?
MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. Could I have that list again, please?

MR. SECREST: Certainly. It's 32 which
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was Mr. Good's prefiled testimony. It's 47 which is the ODNR pre- and post-construction monitoring protocol. It is 84 which is titled "Comprehensive Analysis of Small-Passerine Fatalities from Collision with Turbines at Wind Energy Facilities." And 85 which is the "Issues in Ecology, Impacts to Wildlife of Wind Energy Siting and Operation in the United States."

MR. VAN KLEY: Your Honor, I do not object to the admission of Exhibit 32 or Exhibit 47. I do object to the admission of Exhibits 84 and 85. First of all, the witness has provided us with a discussion about the information in those exhibits that on which he is relying for his testimony. So it's unnecessary to admit those papers in full on the docket.

Secondly, those papers include a lot of information and statements that was not subject to redirect examination and, thus, could not be subject to recross-examination. And, therefore, we shouldn't allow those papers to be admitted in whole on the docket to -- for possible use for purposes other than the ones that the witness employed in his testimony. ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Secrest, response?

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. Exhibits 84 and 85 were referenced, in fact, footnoted in Mr. Good's testimony. They were referenced in his testimony. Their inclusion in these proceedings should not come as a surprise.

And with regard to topics for -- that were not explored on redirect, Mr. Van Kley certainly explored a number of topics in each one of these exhibits that we did not touch on in redirect, so he had ample opportunity on recross, and the Bench provided him latitude to explore topics on recross that were not specifically addressed in redirect. And they are relevant to these proceedings, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I agree. I think they are relevant. I think that they presented a lot of opportunity for questioning regarding the exhibits.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Does anybody need a break before we proceed to the next witness? Let's go ahead and get started with the next witness and that will give us an opportunity for a break around the 4:30 hour. It doesn't look as though we are going to get to Witness Bellamy this afternoon, Attorney
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Margard, so if you want to let Mr. Bellamy know he will be postponed until tomorrow, that would be great.

MR. MARGARD: I will do so. That would be great, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Secrest, I am going to have you call your next witness, and Judge Agranoff will probably preside over the rest of the afternoon.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. May the Applicant call Dr. Christopher Farmer.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If you can please have Dr. Farmer come up on the screen.

MS. CHILCOTE: Mr. Farmer, you have been promoted to a panelist. You should be able to turn on your microphone and speak now.

THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm here.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Hello, Dr. Farmer. Please raise your right hand.
(Witness sworn.)
ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.
Mr. Secrest.
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
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MR. VAN KLEY: Not quite, your Honor. I am still pulling up the materials here. Give me a moment.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I would be a little bit surprised if you had said yes.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
By Mr. Van Kley:
Q. Mr. Farmer, I think I am more or less ready. First of all, where do you live?
A. I live in Pennsylvania.
Q. Have you ever lived in Ohio?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Other than working on the Emerson wind -or Emerson Creek wind project, have you done any other professional work related to birds in Ohio?
A. I worked on one other early-phase development wind project in Ohio in Crawford County back in the 2012 to '13 time frame.
Q. Uh-huh. Where is Crawford County relevant to the State of Ohio? Is it north? South? East? West?
A. I believe it's to the south of this project area.
Q. Do you know how far south?
A. I think it may be in an adjacent county, if $I$ recall correctly.
Q. Have you personally visited the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. On how many occasions?
A. I visited it just once this year.
Q. Have you visited that project area in any other areas besides this year?
A. Not deliberately.
Q. Just passing through perhaps?
A. I may have passed through including when

I was transiting to the other wind project $I$ worked on.
Q. When did you visit the project area in Emerson Creek wind project?
A. I went out there with Rhett Good on March 5 and 6 of this year to make a general reconnaissance of the area.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley?
MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.
ALJ AGRANOFF: If you could please make sure your video camera is on.

MR. VAN KLEY: Oh. Here I am.
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ALJ AGRANOFF: There you are.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go to your written direct testimony labeled as Applicant Exhibit 33. Let's go to page 14 of your testimony.
A. Okay. I'm on page 14.
Q. Okay. And we are going to talk briefly about the study that is labeled as $C$ on that page, "April 3, 2020, WEST, Large Bird and Eagle Use Surveys."
A. I see it.
Q. What is the nature of the surveys, that is, what was the procedure of the surveys used in the preparation of this report?
A. These are point count surveys that are conducted at a random sample of the project area. They consist of an observer staying at a fixed location and surveying for birds in an 800 meter radius around them for one hour at each point.
Q. So if a bald eagle traveled further than 800 meters, then its presence would no longer be recorded in this report?
A. The way that these are conducted, the answer to that is going to be a yes and a no. The data recording for purposes of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service records the eagle use within just
that 800 -meter radius around the point. However, to inform turbine siting and to inform other risk analyses in a qualitative fashion, what we typically do is we map that movement for as far as we can reliably follow it and map it. So if it were to move out of the 800 -meter plot but we could still see it, we could continue mapping the flight path.
Q. Yeah. Now, Firelands reported to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service what it referred to as eagle use minutes; is that correct?
A. Yes. There are eagle use minutes sometimes called eagle exposure minutes or eagle risk minutes also.
Q. Okay. Now, are the -- are the time periods in which the bald eagle traveled beyond 800 meters included in the eagle use minutes reported to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
A. No. Those are not included because they are outside of the sample frame of the survey. And that's important because when you take a representative sample of an area, if you use data outside of your sample frame, you do not have any estimate of the effort it required to get that.
Q. Let's go to page 19 of your testimony.
A. Okay. I have page 19.
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Q. With regard to the eagle use minutes reported to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, how much of that information was obtained using the procedure that we just described?
A. With regard to -- I'm sorry. I'm not sure I followed.
Q. Well, I will reword it. You described a procedure in which the observer will be situated in a location and record all eagle use activity within 800 meters; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the procedure that was used for -- to obtain all of the eagle use minutes for the project area that was reported to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
A. Yes, I believe it was in these recent reports based on the surveys that WEST did. And what I didn't mention before, that those are -- it's a cylinder, the plot. It has a top as well as sides. And the top of that cylinder is 200 meters in height. So minutes -- radius would not be recorded.
Q. Okay. You -- your voice disappeared there for a moment. Can you repeat the last part of your answer?
A. Yes. I will put the microphone closer in
case that was the issue. Is this better?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. In the data that goes to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, for their analysis there's also a top to the plot. It's a 200 -meter high plot. So it's an 800 -meter radius by 200 -meter height.
Q. Okay. And I think you also said something about if there was something and then you faded out, it would no longer be?
A. Yes. If there was an eagle observed within 800-meter -- 800 horizontal meters of the plot but it was above 200 meters vertically, it would not be included in those minutes.
Q. Let's go to Question and Answer 16 that starts on page 19 of your testimony.
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. The answer reads in part -- let me start with the question just to put it in context. The question is, "To your knowledge, has the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service collision risk model been applied to data from the Project?"

And the first part of your answer
states: "Yes. The Staff Report of Investigation for the Project states on page 43 that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 'determined the preliminary risk to
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eagles is about 2.5 eagles per year.' This appears to be derived from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service collision risk model prediction." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. What makes you think that the -- this estimate of preliminary risk to eagles was derived from the collision risk model prediction?
A. Two aspects, that it was provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and that it references a predicted fatality rate of 2.5 eagles per year. That's typically the type of output that you see from that collision risk model.
Q. What are the inputs for that model?
A. The inputs for the model consist of sort of three primary areas. One is an estimate of eagle exposure and that's what's derived from the point count survey sample that is done in the project area.

The next is what's called an expansion factor and that is derived from the physical components of the wind farm and the size of the rotor-swept area and what it does is it extrapolates from the sample taken on the point counts to all of the turbines in the wind farm and all of the daylight hours during which an eagle might fly for a year.

The third component is what's called a collision probability or collision frequency and that is derived from under -- our understanding of how much, unfortunately, a golden eagle collides with a wind turbine given a minute of exposure. We're currently stuck using golden-eagle-based information from older wind farms in order to populate that model but there are efforts underway to update those and it's hoped that the Fish and Wildlife Service will relatively soon have a bald-eagle-specific model that doesn't rely on golden eagle data.

The reason that's important is that although we call them both eagles, bald eagles and golden eagles are not closely related to one another. They have very different biologies and very different foraging ecologies that makes their collision-risk profiles appear to be different at wind farms.
Q. So the number of eagle use minutes that the wind company obtained for the Emerson Creek Wind Farm is utilized in a collision risk model?
A. Yes. The estimated exposure is those number of minutes with a denominator of how much survey effort went into measuring those -- those exposure minutes.
Q. In calculating those eagle use minutes
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for this project, did Firelands set up its count areas within a visible distance from the eagle nests?
A. I believe some of the earlier surveys did that which is those would not be good data to use for the collision risk model. What the collision risk model is trying to get at is what the typical exposure within the entire project is rather than what the extreme -- either extreme low or extreme high exposure would be. So the correct way to do it is to randomly distribute your sample locations throughout the project area.

What happens in practice is there's -there's always land that you can't access, so you end up with a sample that's a stratified random instead that you don't have a fully randomized spatial sample.
Q. Uh-huh. And which were the eagle surveys conducted for this project that you believe utilized the appropriate procedure?
A. Those would be the eagle use and large bird surveys that were conducted in 2016 and '17 and 2018 through '19.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Have those been
incorporated in exhibits that have already been marked in this case?

THE WITNESS: Yes. One of them was in an S exhibit that Mr. Good was referencing earlier. I don't recall which $S$ that was. And the 2018 to '19 has been attached as CF-4 to my testimony.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Okay. I think we can all find CF-4. Can you give us a clue as to how to find the other report that's in Exhibit $S$ ?
A. Yes. I have it electronically here. I can look up what the name is.
Q. Okay. And maybe the date as well of the report.
A. Yes. It is -- there are two of them, I'm sorry, Exhibit $S-1$ and Exhibit $S-2 . \quad S-1$ is May 8, 2018. S-2 is September 10, 2018.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Would you find what's been marked as LR Exhibit 16 in a folder that I believe you have been provided.
A. Yes. I have an electronic copy of that.
Q. Okay.

MR. VAN KLEY: At this time, your Honor, we would like to mark this as LR Exhibit 16.

ALJ AGRANOFF: It shall be so marked. (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. And just to
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identify the exhibit. This is a series of e-mails. The first e-mail on the first page is an e-mail from Margaret Rheude to Jennie Geiger dated March 12, 2020 .
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Farmer, is that the document you have in front of you?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

ALJ AGRANOFF: And just so that I know, Mr. Van Kley, this LR Exhibit 16 -- I'm trying to find it in the files that $I$ have here. Where would I be looking?

MR. VAN KLEY: You would be looking in the exhibits that $I$ circulated by e-mail.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Hold on for a second.

What was the date of the e-mail, Mr. Van Kley?

MR. VAN KLEY: Let me look. 10-1?
ALJ AGRANOFF: What was that date again? 10-1? October 1?

MR. VAN KLEY: That sounds correct. Let me find the e-mail.

ALJ AGRANOFF: It's an exhibit list.
MR. VAN KLEY: It was the -- it was in
the compilation of exhibits that I distributed through a share file which I believe you had downloaded by somebody else for distribution to you. Mr. Margard had downloaded them and I believe may have distributed them to you on a stick.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I only see LR Exhibit 15, 25. At least what I got loaded I have LR 15, 25, 26.

MR. SECREST: Your Honor, I have it up and the ability to e-mail rather quickly, if $I$ may do so.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I appreciate that, and also I think Judge Williams was looking for it. Yeah, if you can e-mail that to me, that would be great.

MR. SECREST: Certainly. This comes from Mr. Van Kley's e-mail.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. Okay. I do have it now. Thank you.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. Mr. Farmer, have you seen this document before today?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Uh-huh. When did you first see this document?
A. This was forwarded to me I think sometime
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in late spring or early summer.
Q. Do you recall who forwarded it to you?
A. Yes. Jennie Geiger.
Q. I would like to refer you to the second e-mail in the chain which starts about the middle of the first page of LR Exhibit 16 and which is an e-mail from Margaret Rheude to Robert Holderbaum dated February 27, 2020.
A. I have it.
Q. Yeah. Was this e-mail included in the e-mails that Jennie Geiger forwarded to you?
A. Yes. I think it was.
Q. All right. If you look at the last sentence of the second paragraph of that e-mail, that sentence starts with the words "I conducted."
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. Okay. Great. The sentence says "I conducted an initial model run on the summary data they provided me, using the following inputs: 71 turbines, Vesta 150-4.2 MW styles. 1212 hours of eagle use observations, with 125 eagle use minutes observed." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And the next sentence which is on the second page of LR Exhibit 16 states "Based on
these inputs, the preliminary risk to eagles is about 2.5 eagles per year." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And based on the vernacular that she uses there, do you understand that the 2.5 eagles per year referenced in that sentence refers to the expected mortality of eagles per year?
A. Yes. That would confirm what we stated earlier, that that is an output from the collision risk model that predicts annual fatalities based on eagle exposure.
Q. Uh-huh. And referring you back to the page of LR Exhibit 16 where Ms. Rheude lists 71 turbines for 1,212 hours of eagle use observations and 125 eagle use minutes, are those empirical inputs of the Fish and Wildlife Service collision model that you identified earlier in your testimony?
A. Yes. They need the number of turbines. They need the rotor radius of the turbines which you can usually find if you know the make and model. And they need the survey effort and the number of eagle exposure minutes.
Q. Why then is rotor size important in this calculation?
A. The collision risk model is based on the
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area of air that rotors pass through, and so, to determine that, they build a cylinder around the turbine that uses that radius to determine the radius of the cylinder.
Q. Uh-huh. And in the calculation of this collision risk model, does that model compare the number of eagle use minutes with the number of hours of eagle use observations?
A. Yes. In this case essentially the eagle use observation hours are the denominator, and the eagle exposure minutes are the enumerator.
Q. Looking again at the second paragraph of Ms. Rheude's e-mail of February 27, 2020, she states in the third sentence that "Emerson Creek seems to have a good amount of recent eagle use data, which conforms to the Fish and Wildlife Services' recommendations in the Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance." Do you see that sentence?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have any knowledge concerning which eagle studies performed by Firelands were used in her calculation?
A. I do not directly know, but I can surmise by looking at the data that it is from the 2016 through 2019 studies that we discussed earlier.
$\square$
Q. Uh-huh. Did those studies record 1,212 hours of eagle use observations collectively?
A. I believe they probably did. That's the -- although it's stated awkwardly in her e-mail. That's not hours of eagles using the project. That's hours of people looking for eagles.
Q. Based on your knowledge of the collision risk model used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, is there a -- a rule of thumb utilized for the purpose of calculating those models that requires the eagle use data to be no older than a specific age?
A. So there is -- there's no strict regulatory cutoff on that and often how old the data can be comes down to coordination between the individual project and the Fish and Wildlife Service, but typically for this kind of survey we start to think of them as stale if they are more than about five years old, and they are probably less applicable than they would be were they newer.

The -- in 2016 the Fish and Wildlife
Service promulgated some regulations that require certain data in order to apply for an eagle take permit. And one of those requirements was two years of eagle use data of this nature. However, it
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doesn't specify how recent they have to be.
Q. Uh-huh. If the amount of eagle use in a project area is increasing from year to year, does that affect the usefulness of the eagle use data in earlier years?
A. That is one of the considerations that the Fish and Wildlife Service took into account in creating the requirement for two years of surveys. We are all aware there is variation from year to year and also that bald eagle populations are increasing nationally and within Ohio.

And so what you want to do typically is get two consecutive years or two years with an intervening year so that you can get an estimate of how big that variation is between years in a quantitative sense for populating the model.

However, when you have an opportunity to get more older data such as this project has, that also allows you to see how that's changing over time and get sort of a qualitative feel for what the risk -- not only what the risk profile is but also what the risk trajectory looks like.

So it's kind of a -- it's a bifurcated answer. You want two recent years to populate the quantitative model, but if you have more data that
are older, that's actually very valuable in a qualitative sense in assessing risk overall.
Q. It is that -- is the data useful for qualitative purposes because it shows trends and population?
A. It's indicative of trends, but it's also indicative of how stable the use patterns you observe more recently are and also what some of the habitat drivers of use patterns might be.
Q. Directing your attention to the second page of LR Exhibit 16, I would like you to take a look at the third paragraph on that page.
A. Is that the paragraph that begins "Looking"?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Got it.
Q. I would like to refer you to the second sentence starting with the word "Additionally."
A. Yes.
Q. That sentence states as follows:
"Additionally, we (the Fish and Wildlife Service) expect the eagle population in this area to increase, including the number and density of eagle nests." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
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Q. Do you agree with the statement?
A. Yes, I do. And also that is true of most areas in the continental United States.
Q. Would you find what has been marked as LR Exhibit 15.
A. I have. It's opening very slowly. Yes, it's open now.
Q. Okay. Great. And is this a copy of e-mails between you and other persons?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. The first page of LR Exhibit 15, the top contains an e-mail from you to Rhett Good dated March 9, 2020; is that correct?
A. Yes.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Hold on, Mr. Van Kley. Maybe this is just my problem with the file $I$ have but what I have got marked as LR Exhibit 15, when I click on that it's the Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance Module 1.

MR. VAN KLEY: No. You are looking at the Republic Wind exhibits apparently.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I may have dragged the wrong file. You're right. Hold on.

Okay. Sorry about that.
MR. VAN KLEY: Okay.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Whenever you are ready, Mr. Van Kley.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So in the e-mail dated March 9, 2020, from you to Rhett Good, you state that you visited seven historic nest locations and found that five were occupied and active; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And in that sentence you were referring to bald eagle nests, correct?
A. Yes. It's an e-mail string about the bald eagle nests.
Q. And this e-mail string ensued after you did your site visit to the project area in March of 2020, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the information contained in the e-mails in LR Exhibit 15 are the results of the observations you made during that visit.
A. Yes.
Q. That visit occurred on March 5, 2020?
A. March 5 and March 6. But the nest locations $I$ believe we all -- visited all of them on the 5th.
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Q. At the end of this Exhibit LR 15, there's a map of the project area, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's some handwriting on this map. Does that belong to you?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And in the handwriting on the map you placed the locations of the bald eagle nests that you observed on March 5, 2020?
A. That's correct.
Q. So looking at this map, did you put circles around squares that represented active bald eagle nests on that date?
A. So I put circles around the squares that we visited and observed to be occupied. So there are some nests that have no circle and no notation next to them and those were not visited.
Q. Now, did you make an effort on this visit on March 5 and 6 to find every active bald eagle nest in the project area or within 2 miles around the project area?
A. No, we did not. The primary goal here was to familiarize me with the entire project area to inform my evaluation of what eagle-related risks would be like. And as part of that, we visited as
many of the known bald eagle nests locations as we could that were either in or very close to the project.
Q. Okay. And as shown by this map on March 5 and 6, you found six bald eagle nests that were occupied?
A. I believe we found five. One, two, three, four, five. Yeah, five existing and one new occupied nest for a total of six.
Q. And that new occupied nest has the word "new" next to it, right?
A. Yes, it does. It is not very legible, but it does say "new."
Q. Uh-huh. Is that an eagle nest that was found near the reservoir known as the Bellevue 5 Reservoir?
A. Yes, it is. It is just south of that.
Q. Uh-huh. Prior to March 5, 2020, were you aware of the existence of this nest?
A. No, we were not aware of that nest when we visited the project area. It was not previously recorded on the bald eagle nest surveys.
Q. How many of the six bald eagle nests were active in the 2016 to 2017 survey that you mentioned earlier in your testimony?
A. Those were eagle use surveys. I don't believe eagle nest surveys were included in those reports.
Q. Okay. Fair enough.
A. I think there are some other eagle use -or eagle nest surveys we could look at from that time frame.
Q. During what other years were eagle nest surveys conducted besides 2020?
A. Can we refer to Exhibit CF-2 to answer that?
Q. Sure. If that helps you.
A. Yes. CF-2 I compiled in order to help myself understand what the timeline looked like.
Q. Okay. Give us just a moment to find it.
A. I am looking for it too.
Q. Let me know when you have found it.
A. I have it in front of me.
Q. Okay.
A. So your question was how many years were surveys conducted for eagles nests?
Q. Yeah. First, let's talk about $\mathrm{CF}-2$ to make sure that the record reflects what it is.
A. Okay.
Q. And help me interpret it. Would you
describe CF-2.
A. Yes. $C F-2$ consists of a table and two maps that -- well, I put together the table, and I had a GIS technician put together the two maps at my direction to help me understand what the timeline of eagle nests detection and occupancy looked like for the project as a whole.
Q. Does this --
A. I'm sorry. I had another thought to help clarify that. The rationale for that is that because there are a number of different reports spanning a number of years, there was no single source to look at in order to have this all in front of you at once, and I found it difficult to track without this.
Q. Does Exhibit CF-2 reference all of the bald eagle nest surveys that were conducted for the Emerson Creek wind project?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And the years in which those surveys were conducted can be found in the first line of $\mathrm{CF}-2$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. There's a column, the first column from the left is labeled as "Nest ID." Is that an identification system for the bald eagle nests found during these surveys?
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A. Yes. That's identification information that I applied so that we could track a single nest through time. Unfortunately what happened through the reports was that each different consultant who did a survey used a different nomenclature for the nests, and I found without having an ID, just an objective ID applied to the nests, you really could not track it through time effectively.
Q. And looking at the first map following the table we've been discussing, that is a map of the Emerson Creek wind project and surrounding areas; is that correct?
A. Yes. That is the Emerson Creek wind project as it's currently configured and all of the bald eagle nests that were known within a 10-mile radius based on the surveys.
Q. And those bald eagle nests are numbered on the map?
A. Yes. The numbers on the map correspond to the ID number on the table.
Q. So based on the information in $\mathrm{CF}-2$, how many bald eagle nests were active in 2018?
A. I'm going to have to go through it and add those up if you'll bear with me.
Q. Yeah, sure.
A. And you'll see if you look at this table, a number of those are outside of the area that was searched or were not reported depending on which nest it is, so.
Q. Oh, okay. Yeah, that's a good point. So let me just modify the question based on that observation. How many bald eagle nests were known in 2018 that were located inside of the project area or within 2 miles of the project area boundary?
A. Okay. That's an easier question.
Q. Yes.
A. Inside or within 2 miles?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Would you like the ones that are inactive or just the ones that were occupied and active at the time?
Q. Just the ones that were occupied and active.
A. Okay. There were five reported as occupied and active within 2 miles in 2018.
Q. And prior to 2018, the most-recent eagle nest survey was in 2014 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And how many active and occupied eagle nests were found during that survey located in the
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project area within 2 miles of the project area?
A. This is where the search area becomes a little bit problematic because it was not a comprehensive search area for the entire project as is currently constituted in 2014. It looks like none of those were occupied and active at the time. However, one was detected as unoccupied in 2014.
Q. What area was encompassed in the 2014 survey?
A. If we look at the second map, it will show that survey area. 2014 is the forest green outline. Let's see, which I believe was the southern portion. No, that -- I may have misspoken. That may have actually joined the northern portion as well. I think we may need to look at the 2014 report to be definitive about the search area for that one.
Q. How many bald eagle nests are currently known to be in the project area or within 2 miles of the project area boundary?
A. There are eight.
Q. So that's one more bald eagle nest than was found in the 2020 survey that is listed under the 2020 status in your Exhibit CF-2?
A. I think I included one that was not occupied and active. Okay. I get six when I count
occupied and active only.
ALJ AGRANOFF: And which document, Dr. Farmer, are you looking at?

THE WITNESS: That is on the table in CF-2. So that's comparing the second-to-last column to the last column.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Okay. I think we may have miscounted. Did you include the -- did you include nest 25?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. So let's just go through these. Looking at the column for 2020 status, there's one nest ID 11 that's occupied and within 2-mile of the project area?
A. Yes.
Q. The same is true for nest 15?
A. Yes.
Q. The same is true for nest 19?
A. Yes.
Q. And 20?
A. Yes.
Q. 23?
A. Yes, 23.
Q. 24 ?
A. 24 is yes.
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Q. And 25?
A. And 25. So that's seven, yeah.
Q. Okay.
A. And if you would like, I can figure out which one I did not visit in March. That's probably what you want to do, right?
Q. No, I don't need to do that.
A. Okay.
Q. You don't need to do that either. So is the information in the column for the 2020 status of bald eagle nests in CF-2 the current knowledge that Emerson Creek wind has concerning the active and occupied bald eagle nests inside the project area within 2 miles of the project area boundary?
A. Yes, it is.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley, would this be a good time to take a break?

MR. VAN KLEY: Sure.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Why don't we take a
15-minute break and come back at 4:30. And we will go into the long stretch.
(Recess taken.)
ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's go back on the
record. And Mr. Van Kley.
MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Farmer, could you turn to page 20 of your written direct testimony identified as Applicant Exhibit 33.
A. Yes, I have it in front of me.
Q. And let's go to Question and Answer 18 there.
A. Yes.
Q. In the first paragraph -- in the first sentence of your answer to Question 18, you refer to one bald eagle fatality reported in the news in Ohio. And that this is the only publicly-available account you have found of a bald eagle fatality in the state. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you tell me what bald eagle fatality you found?
A. That was a fatality near Bowling Green, Ohio.
Q. And what did you do to search for eagle fatalities at wind energy projects throughout the State of Ohio?
A. I did an online search. I also had -WEST has a subdepartment that does literature searches for us. I had them run a literature search for me to see if there were any public records of
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bald eagle fatalities in the state and also searched our own fatality database to see if there were any that we had recorded.
Q. Do you know whether the mortality data for birds at Ohio wind projects are publicly available on the internet?

MR. SECREST: Objection to the extent birds outside of eagles is not within the scope of the testimony nor relevant.

MR. VAN KLEY: Well, I think the answer is the same, but I'll rephrase.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Do you know whether eagle mortality data at Ohio wind farms is publicly available on the internet?
A. If a facility has an eagle take permit and they record a fatality, that data will become public because there are reporting requirements to the Fish and Wildlife Service that then makes it public.

If the facility does not have an eagle take permit and an eagle fatality occurs, that goes into the Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement track and that may not become public right away because it's evidence at that point in a legal proceeding.

So I think the answer is mixed in that case.
Q. Are you aware of any Ohio wind projects that possess take permits for eagles?
A. I do not know of any in the State of Ohio yet.
Q. In the third sentence of Answer 18 in your testimony you state as follows: "For context, Ohio has 39 operating wind projects, with a total of 419 turbines producing 864 megawatts of power." Where did you obtain those statistics?
A. Those would come from the American Wind Energy Association database which contains all of the wind farm installations in the U.S.
Q. And does that database include wind turbines that are not regulated by the Ohio Power Siting Board in Ohio?
A. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Do you know how many wind projects are subject to Ohio Power Siting Board regulation?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you know that only wind power projects over a certain nameplate capacity in megawatts are subject to Ohio Power Siting Board regulation?
A. Yes; that's typical of most state Siting Boards.
Q. So what are the sizes or what is the range of -- the number of turbines that is within the 39 operating wind projects that you reference in your answer?
A. I did not research the range in size in terms of number of turbines.
Q. So one or more of these turbine projects may have no more than one wind turbine in them?
A. That is true. However, it would contribute to the 864 megawatts of installed capacity.
Q. Uh-huh. The next -(Dog barks.)
A. Remediating that.
Q. In the next sentence of your Answer 18, "The total number of projects in the state include 11 projects that are close to the shore of Lake Erie, where bald eagle population densities are highest." Where did you obtain this information?
A. The information regarding how many wind farms there are is also from that AWEA data base.
Q. How did you determine that 11 projects are close to the shore of Lake Erie?
A. I counted them, and I looked for those that were closer than the current project is sited.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Dr. Farmer, you used an acronym just a second ago. Just clarify what the acronym was.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. That was AWEA. That stands for American Wind Energy Association.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.
Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) With respect to these 11 projects that you state are close to the shore of Lake Erie, how many of those projects are large enough to be designated by the Ohio Power Siting Board?
A. I don't have an answer to that.
Q. Do you know what the sizes or the number -- do you know what the number of turbines are in any of these 11 projects?
A. No. The information is in the database, but I did not extract that information.
Q. Do you know how many megawatts of power are produced by these 11 projects?
A. I do not know.
Q. Do you know what counties of Ohio these 11 projects are located in?
A. I also do not record the counties. The context that is relevant here is that they're in a zone that's added in the most recent ODNR report as
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having the highest densities and that is really the only aspect that $I$ was looking at.
Q. And what zone is that where the bald eagles are of the highest densities according to the information you have?
A. That is in the counties that immediately abut the Lake.
Q. Do you know which counties those are?
A. I would have to have that report in front of me in order to name them for you, but it would include Sandusky County.
Q. Do you know what the sizes of those wind turbines in the 11 projects close to the shore of Lake Erie are in height?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you know what their sizes are in diameter?
A. No.
Q. Does -- does the AWEA database have any restriction on the wind turbine projects reported in its database related to the size of the turbines in those projects?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Do you know what the size of the smallest wind turbine in those 11 projects is?
A. No, I don't.
Q. With respect to wind projects that are not subject to Ohio Power Siting Board jurisdiction, are you aware of any eagle mortality monitoring requirements applicable to those projects?
A. No, I'm not.

MR. VAN KLEY: I have no further questions.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Any questions of other parties with respect to clarification, or in the case of Erie County, have any cross?

MS. ESPOSITO: None, your Honor.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Secrest?
MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I just have 2 minutes to confer with my co-counsel?

ALJ AGRANOFF: Certainly.
Karen, we're off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. I'm not good at estimating what 2 minutes is apparently.

ALJ AGRANOFF: It's an art which we are all learning in terms of time estimation.

MR. SECREST: That's right. If the witness is ready and everyone else is, may I proceed, your Honor?
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ALJ AGRANOFF: Absolutely.
MR. SECREST: Thank you.

-     -         - 

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
By Mr. Secrest:
Q. Dr. Farmer, in your cross-examination you were asked questions about collision frequency and the Service's collision prediction modeling. And when answering those questions you referred to the Service using data related to golden eagles, and you said "unfortunately." Why did you say "unfortunately"?
A. Well, as I said in part of my testimony too, it's a different species. It's not closely related to bald eagles, and it's -- it's unclear how representative those data may be of bald eagles, but it appears that the collision rate is much higher for golden eagles than it is for bald eagles.
Q. Thank you, Doctor.

Do you still have in front of you what was marked LR 16?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Looking at the second page of $L R$ 16, that says "Based on these inputs, the preliminary risk to eagles is about 2.5 eagles per year." Do you
see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that 2.5 eagles per year the 80 percent upper confidence rate?
A. Yes, that would be.
Q. And can you explain what that means?
A. Yeah. So the collision risk model outputs a probability distribution of predicted fatality rates. The average of that would be the 50th percentile. The Fish and Wildife Service chooses the 80 th percentile for management purposes. The rationale being that if the permit take at the 80 th percentile, then they have an 80 percent probability that the project will not exceed that number. So it's a conservative number. However, the Fish and Wildlife number does it on purpose in order to have conservative management.
Q. To put it another way, does the Fish and Wildlife Service overestimate the number for the collision -- or the fatality risk to eagles in this model?

MR. VAN KLEY: Objection, leading.
A. Yes.

ALJ AGRANOFF: One moment. Would you care to rephrase?

MR. SECREST: Sure. I'll rephrase, your Honor. Sorry. I was on mute.
Q. (By Mr. Secrest) Based upon your experience, does the Service overestimate the number that is outputted from its collision prediction modeling?
A. Yes. The numbers are always highly conservative, so they're overestimates, but they are deliberately so.
Q. And based on your experience, are you familiar with projects where the Service's risk number is greater than 2.5 eagles per year, yet there have been no eagle fatalities?
A. Yes. There are projects like that out there.

MR. SECREST: Okay. Thank you,
Dr. Farmer. I have nothing further.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley, based on the limited scope of redirect?

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:
Q. Are you aware of any -- any projects at which the number of bald eagle mortalities has exceeded the pre-construction estimate of the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service?
A. I'm aware of projects at which the model was run, and the fatality rate exceeded it. However, those were estimates from days before the Fish and Wildlife Service always ran the model itself. So, in other words, they were projects that had not applied for take permits.
Q. So who ran the models in those instances?
A. Typically it would be a skilled consultant that would run that. Most -- most people don't have the statistical ability to run the model. MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. Thank you. No further questions.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you, Dr. Farmer.
Mr. Secrest.
MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I move for the admission of Applicant's Exhibit 33.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Any objection? There being none, Applicant Exhibit 33 shall be admitted as part of the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley.
MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, I would like to move admission of LR Exhibit 15 and 16.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Any objection?

MR. SECREST: No, your Honor. Thank you.
ALJ AGRANOFF: There being none, the aforementioned exhibits shall be admitted as part of the record at this time.
(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
ALJ AGRANOFF: And let's go off the record for a moment.
(Discussion off the record.)
ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's go on the record. Thank you.

MS. PIRIK: Okay. Your Honor, with regard to the motions for protective order, we would like to revise the -- just in general let you know that the motions for protective order that are outstanding at this point is the one that was filed on January 31, 2019, with the Application. It references financial information in the Application as well as Exhibit $F$ which is the socioeconomic report as well as the manuals submitted with regard to the models in Exhibit $N$.

The next one is July 10, 2019. Those were manuals that were filed with the third supplemental submission. In addition on September 12, 2019, there were manuals information submitted with the fourth supplemental application.

Then on November 26, 2019, there were manual information submitted with the third response to a data request from the OPSB staff.

And, finally, with regard to motions for protective order on February 11, 2020, in response to the sixth data request to Staff's inquiries there were manual information as well as certain financial information that were submitted.

So those would be the five motions for protective order that are outstanding and then the document that we filed on September 24 , releasing some of the safety manual information would be revised to reflect that those are the five filings that we made.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. And then with respect to each of the motions that you just referenced that pertain to the turbine safety models -- manuals, I assume you're working off of the premise that those motions would be modified to the extent that Exhibit 82 releases some of that information that was previously requested protected treatment?

MS. PIRIK: Correct, your Honor.
ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. All right. And with respect to those motions, do any of the parties
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have objections?
Okay. If not, then the aforementioned motions shall be granted taking into account the filing of Exhibit 82 on the public record which would therefore negate some of the request for protective treatment relative to the safety manuals.

MS. PIRIK: Thank you, your Honor.
ALJ AGRANOFF: You're welcome.
All right. If there's nothing else, then we will reconvene tomorrow at 9 'clock consistent with the schedule we just discussed a little while ago.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Before we all hang up -we can do this off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
(Thereupon at 5:02 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)
$\qquad$
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