

**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of :  
Republic Wind, LLC, for a Certificate to : Case No. 17-2295-EL-BGN  
Site Wind Powered Electric Generating :  
Facilities in Seneca and Sandusky :  
Counties, Ohio.

---

**STAFF SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

---

**Dave Yost**  
Ohio Attorney General

**John H. Jones**  
Section Chief

**Jodi J. Bair**  
**Robert Eubanks**  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Public Utilities Section  
30 East Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614.644.8599 (Bair telephone)  
614.644.8669 (Eubanks telephone)  
866.388.1479 (Bair fax)  
jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

**On behalf of the Staff of  
The Ohio Power Siting Board**

November 13, 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	1
I.    AVIATION .....	1
II.   BALD EAGLE MITIGATION .....	7
CONCLUSION .....	9
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	11

**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of :  
Republic Wind, LLC, for a Certificate to : Case No. 17-2295-EL-BGN  
Site Wind Powered Electric Generating :  
Facilities in Seneca and Sandusky :  
Counties, Ohio.

---

**STAFF SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Initial Supplemental Briefs were filed on November 6, 2020 by the Ohio Power Siting Board Staff (“Staff”), Republic Wind LLC (“Applicant” or “Republic”), the Local Resident Intervenors (“Local Residents”), and Seneca County, Seneca County Park District, Adams Township, Reed Township, and Scipio Township (“Seneca County”) initial briefs. Staff continues to support the recommendations made in its Supplemental Initial Brief filed in this case on November 6, 2020.

**ARGUMENT**

**I. AVIATION**

Republic argues in its Supplemental brief that the ALJ erred in denying Republic’s Motion to Strike the prior Ohio Department of Transportation (“ODOT”) determination letters and the testimony of ODOT witness Stains and the testimony of Staff witness

Conway that supported the earlier determination letters. Republic Supp. Brief at. 13. Republic claims that the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas *One Energy* decision supports Republic's Motion to Strike. The Board is not bound by the decisions of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas. A decision to approve or reject the construction of fifty wind turbines, exceeding 400 feet in height must be thoroughly considered by the Board and the Board is entitled to receive relevant testimony that assists it in reaching a decision regarding an application to build generation in Ohio. The statute, R.C. 4905.10(A)(5) requires that the Board consult with ODOT Office of Aviation when considering a power siting application. The Staff of the Board consulted with ODOT and the ODOT letters of determination and the ODOT witness Stains' testimony and staff witness Conway's testimony provide record support of this statutory duty.

In addition, the ALJ already ruled upon this Motion and denied Republic's Motion to Strike this evidence. Transcript Vol. IX, at 1617, 1650. Staff again asserts that R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) requires that the Board not grant a certificate for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a major utility facility unless it finds and determines that the facility will, among other things, comply with R.C 4561.32 ODOT's authority to adopt rules regarding regulation of the airspace around airports. "In determining whether the facility will comply with all rules and standards adopted under 4561.32 \*\*\* the board *shall* consult with the office of aviation of the division of multi-modal planning and programs of the department of transportation[.]" R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) (emphasis added). This statute cannot be waived by the Board. Revised Code 4906.10 requires that the

Board make a determination regarding eight areas codified in Ohio's law. As seen in one of these requirements, the Board shall consult with ODOT. This consultation with ODOT is not optional. If the Board were to strike the earlier ODOT determination letters and the testimony supporting those letters, there would be no evidence that the Board followed the requirements of R.C. 4906.10(A)(5).

Interestingly, Republic wants to strike ODOT's letters of determination and the testimony of ODOT and the Board staff's testimony that support the letters; however, Republic's own aviation expert witness Doyle refers to ODOT's letters of determination throughout his supplemental testimony. Republic witness Doyle has pages of discussion about the ODOT letters of determination contained in his October 28, 2019 Supplemental Testimony. See App. Ex. 29 at 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, Doyle Supp. Test at 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 (Oct. 28, 2019). So, in addition to the reasons mentioned above, the ODOT letter of determination and the testimony of ODOT witness Stains and staff witness Conway must remain in the record to give meaning to the testimony of Republic's own aviation witness Doyle. Maintaining the record as it relates to aviation creates a clearer understanding of the facts of the case. If the determination letters and testimony in support of those letters were stricken, the record would not fully reflect Staff's consultation with ODOT. Transcript Vol. VI at 1279:11-13. If the determination letters and testimony in support of those letters were stricken, the record would not create the clear chronological and legal case that now exists in this case.

Seneca County and the Local Intervenors also raised aviation issues in their Supplemental briefs. These parties recommended that the Board adopt the aviation

conditions provided in the October 18, 2019 report and disregard the *One Energy* decision. Local Intervenor Supp. Brief at 6, Seneca County Supp. Brief at 1.

The safety of the airports and economic viability will be maintained if the Board adopts the aviation related conditions as proposed by Staff. This is because the FAA's determination of no hazard to air navigation letter, after a full aeronautical study, stated "The FAA has determined the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the conditions set forth in this determination are met." *See* App. Ex. 42 at 19. Staff emphasized this statement by FAA with condition 52, which states "The Applicant shall meet all recommended and prescribed Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements to construct an object that may affect navigable airspace." App. Ex. 19 at 4. This condition also aligns with ODOT's recommendation in its March 1, 2020 and September 27, 2019 letter that state that for all other structures the obstruction standards may be waived as long as the conditions of the FAA are complied with. *See* App. Ex. 42 at 5, Staff Ex. 4 at 3. Staff witness Conway outlined that changes to the flight procedures and altitudes had been analyzed by the FAA and determined to be of no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on operation of air navigation facilities. Transcript Vol. IX at 1651:16-18, App. Ex. 42 at 8. Also, Staff witness Conway found that the Seneca County Airport's non-directional navigational system can continue to be utilized. Staff Ex. 18 at 3, Staff Ex. 19 at 4, Transcript Vol. VI at 1242:15-23, Transcript Vol. VIII at 1569:7-16. The aviation related conditions as

recommended by Staff minimize the adverse environmental impact from the proposed Republic Wind Farm and allow preservation of the safety and economic viability of the nearby airports.

As explained by staff witness Conway, after the Franklin County Common Pleas Court issued the *One Energy* decision, ODOT issued a modified determination letter pursuant to R.C. 4561.341. ODOT witness Stains explained that after the *One Energy* decision, ODOT applied a conservative legal approach as to its own interpretation of the extent of its jurisdiction pertaining to R.C. 4561.32. And ODOT began to immediately implement this approach with respect to R.C. 4561.341 which states that when consulting with the Power Siting Board regarding an application for certification, the ODOT Office of Aviation shall review the application to determine whether the facility will constitute an obstruction to air navigation based upon the rules adopted under R.C. 4561.32. App. Ex. 35. As a result, ODOT needed to immediately issue a modified determination reflective of the decision guidance from the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas. Staff Ex. 17 at 3, Lines 12-19. R.C. 4561.341 prescribes the manner in which ODOT is to consult with OPSB and how to provide this determination to OPSB. Specifically, ODOT is to provide, in writing, this determination and either the terms, conditions, and modifications that are necessary for the applicant to eliminate the obstruction or a statement that compliance with the obstruction standards may be waived. ODOT did not provide any terms, conditions, or modifications in its March 10, 2020 determination letter, because none of the proposed wind turbine structures impact the clear zone,

horizontal, conical, primary, approach and transitional surfaces of airports that have been issued a commercial operating certificate. App. Ex. 42 at 1.

The Board staff is required by R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) to consult with ODOT and in keeping with the statute, staff's consultation with ODOT changed over time. As a result, ODOT modified its letter of determination in the manner prescribed by R.C. 4651.341. Staff cannot ignore ODOT's recommendations as they relate to aviation, and, as such, witness Conway recommended the modification of condition 52 and the elimination of conditions 56, 57, and 59.

Upon receipt of ODOT's March 10, 2020 determination letter, Staff re-evaluated the aviation impacts for compliance with R.C. 4906.10(A)(5). Additionally, Staff wanted to assure the Board, with respect to aviation related impacts, that the facility represents the minimum adverse environmental impact, considering the state of available technology and the nature and economics of the various alternatives, and other pertinent considerations pursuant to R.C. 4906.10 (A)(3). Staff also needed to investigate whether the facility will serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity pursuant to R.C. 4906.10(A)(6). Subsequent to the ODOT determination letter, Staff contacted the FAA and the BGSU Flight Center. The results of this investigation culminated in the Second Supplement to the Staff Report of Investigation dated May 4, 2020. From that subsequent investigation, Staff recommended that the Board adopt condition 60, which states that at least 30 days prior to the preconstruction conference, Republic shall hold a training session to inform local aviation stakeholders of the changes to flight procedures



outlined in the Federal Aviation Administration determination of no hazard letters. Staff Ex.18 at 6.

The Board has a statutory obligation to consult with ODOT according to R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) and the Board staff fulfilled that obligation. It is the Board's job to consider the record created in this case in deciding whether to grant a certificate to Republic to build this wind turbine project. In making its determination, the Board has obligations beyond R.C. 4906.10(A)(5). There is another the consideration of R.C. 4906.10(A)(6) and this requires that the Board find that the facility will serve the public convenience and necessity. As demonstrated by the public input and the record in this case, the Board has a broad range of interests to consider that goes further than consultation with ODOT'S Office of Aviation division. Maintaining the entirety of the record regarding aviation must be provided to the Board to enable it to make its findings according to R.C. 4906.10

## **II. BALD EAGLE MITIGATION**

In its Supplemental Brief Republic argue about the use of the half-mean inter-nest test and its application to the Republic turbine project. Republic Supp. Brief at 19. As previously argued in staff's Supplemental Initial Brief, the USFWS no longer uses the half-mean inter-nest distance as a measure, but the agency does consider any nest within two miles of a turbine to be at risk and considered for further investigation to determine the extent of the risk. Staff Supp Brief at 9. Staff continues to believe that condition 40 adequately protects the impacts to bald eagles and the Board should adopt condition 40.

What is concerning to staff is that in Republic's Initial Brief, filed on December 23, 2019, it suggested that "the Board not adopt Staff recommended Condition No. 40, which addresses preconstruction eagle use surveys and the development of an Eagle Conservation Plan ("ECP")." Republic Initial Brief at 43 (Dec. 23, 2019).

Republic objected to the staff's condition 40, which provides that Republic shall coordinate with the USFWS to determine the adequacy of preconstruction eagle use surveys and assure that impacts to bald eagles are minimized. If recommended by the USFWS, Republic shall implement an Eagle Conservation Plan and the Plan shall be developed in coordination with the USFWS and the USFWS's Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance document and the 2016 Revised Eagle Take Permit Regulations. Staff Ex. 20 at 8. The correspondence with the USFWS shall be provided to Staff thirty days prior to turbine construction to confirm compliance. *Id.*

The Local Intervenor argues that because there is a discovery of a new bald eagle nest near the project area that the Board should not approve Republic's application. Local Intervenor Supp. Brief at 2. Seneca County simply states in its Supplemental Brief that because there is another eagle nest located just outside the project area, the nest could be impacted and the Board should not approve the project. Seneca County at 3.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt condition 40. If adopted, this condition will mitigate the concerns raised by the Local Intervenor and Seneca County because the area will be surveyed in accordance with United States Fish and Wildlife Service's surveys. The intent of the survey is to obtain information to determine if there is a need for an Eagle Conservation. The applicant has not completed a bald eagle survey since

2012 and a new survey must be completed. Staff Ex. 1 at 31, Re. VI at 1349. Condition 40 requires Republic to seek the opinion of the USFW to determine if there is a need for more surveys or if there is a need for an Eagle conservation Plan. Staff urges the Board to adopt condition 40.

## **CONCLUSION**

Staff recommends changes regarding the aviation issues since the first staff report dated July 25, 2019. Due to the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas *One Energy* decision, ODOT modified its determination letter. Staff no longer recommends conditions 56, 57, or 59. Staff recommended a modification to condition 52 and also recommends the addition of condition 60. Condition 60 will require that a training session be held to inform local aviation stakeholders the changes in flight procedures outlined in the FAA's determination of no hazard to air navigation letters.

Staff continues to support condition 40 of the July 25, 2019 staff report. This condition will satisfy the concerns of the Local Intervenors and Seneca County. Condition 40 also assures the public that an updated eagle survey will be performed and reviewed by USFW.

Respectfully submitted,

**Dave Yost**  
Ohio Attorney General

**John H. Jones**  
Section Chief

*/s/ Jodi J. Bair*

---

**Jodi J. Bair**

**Robert Eubanks**

Assistant Attorneys General

Public Utilities Section

30 East Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

614.644.8599 (Bair telephone)

614.644.8669 (Eubanks telephone)

866.388.1479 (Bair fax)

jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

**On behalf of the Staff of  
The Ohio Power Siting Board**

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **Staff Reply Brief**, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board, was served via electronic mail upon the following parties of record, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of November 2020.

*/s/ Jodi J. Bair*

**Jodi J. Bair**

Assistant Attorney General

### **PARTIES OF RECORD:**

**Sally W. Bloomfield**  
**Dylan F. Borchers**  
**Devin D. Parram**  
**Dane Stinson**  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
614.227.2300 (telephone)  
614.227.2390 (facsimile)  
sbloomfield@bricker.com  
dborchers@bricker.com  
dparram@bricker.com  
dstinson@bricker.com

*Counsel for Republic Wind, LLC*

**Dennis & Leslie Hackenburg**  
6015 County Road 191  
Bellevue OH 44811  
dennyh7@frontier.com

*Pro Se Counsel*

**Jack Van Kley**  
**Christopher A. Walker**  
Van Kley & Walker LLC  
120 West Second Street, Ste 1700  
Dayton, OH 45402  
937.226.9000 (telephone)  
937.226.9002 (facsimile)  
jvankley@vankleywalker.com  
cwalker@vankleywalker.com

*Counsel for Local Resident Intervenors*

**Michael & Tiffany Kessler**  
4133 N Township Road  
Republic Oh 44867  
mkessler7@gmail.com

*Pro Se Counsel*

**Miranda R. Leppla**

**Trent A. Dougherty**

**Christopher D. Tavenor**

The Ohio Environmental Council

1145 Chesapeake Avenue, Suite I

Columbus OH 43212

614.487.7506 (telephone)

614.487.7510 (facsimile)

mleppla@theoec.org

tdougherty@theoec.org

ctavenor@theoec.org

*Counsel for Ohio Environmental Council  
and Environmental Defense Fund*

**Chad A. Endsley**

**Leah F. Curtis**

**Amy M. Milam**

Ohio Farm Bureau Federation 280 North

High Street, P.O. Box 182383 Columbus,

OH 43218-2383

614.246.8256 (telephone)

614.246.8656 (facsimile)

cendsley@ofbf.org

lcurtis@ofbf.org

amilam@ofbf.org

*Counsel for Ohio Farm Bureau  
Federation*

**Mark E. Mulligan**

Sandusky County Prosecutor's Office

100 North Park Avenues Suite 220

Fremont, OH 43420

419.334.6221 (telephone)

419.334.6232 (facsimile)

mulligan\_mark@co.sandusky.oh.us

*Counsel for Petitioner the Board of  
Trustees of York Township, Sandusky  
County, Ohio*

**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of :  
Republic Wind, LLC, for a Certificate to : Case No. 17-2295-EL-BGN  
Site Wind Powered Electric Generating :  
Facilities in Seneca and Sandusky :  
Counties, Ohio. :

---

**STAFF REPLY BRIEF  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

---

**Dave Yost**  
Ohio Attorney General

**John H. Jones**  
Section Chief

**Jodi J. Bair**  
**Robert Eubanks**  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Public Utilities Section  
30 East Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614.644.8599 (Bair telephone)  
614.644.8669 (Eubanks telephone)  
866.388.1479 (Bair fax)  
jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

**On behalf of the Staff of  
The Ohio Power Siting Board**

January 13, 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	1
I. SETBACKS.....	1
II. AVIATION .....	3
III. NOISE .....	5
IV. AESTHETICS.....	8
V. KARST.....	9
VI. ECOLOGICAL CONDITIONS.....	10
CONCLUSION .....	13
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	15



**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of :  
Republic Wind, LLC, for a Certificate to : Case No. 17-2295-EL-BGN  
Site Wind Powered Electric Generating :  
Facilities in Seneca and Sandusky :  
Counties, Ohio.

---

**STAFF REPLY BRIEF  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Initial Briefs were filed on December 23, 2019 by the Ohio Power Siting Board Staff (“Staff”), the Ohio Environmental Council and Environmental Defense Fund (“Environmental Group”), Republic Wind LLC (“Applicant” or “Republic”), the Local Resident Intervenors (“Local Residents”), and Seneca County, Adams Township, Reed Township, and Scipio Township (“Seneca County”), and Seneca County Park District (“Park District”). This Brief responds to several of the issues raised in those initial briefs. Staff continues to support all recommendations made in its Initial Brief.

**ARGUMENT**

**I. SETBACKS**

The Power Siting Board should follow its own rules when determining if the minimum setback requirements will be met by the proposed wind facility. The Applicant

and Staff agree that turbine 42 cannot be constructed as planned because it does not meet the minimum setback requirement to a gas pipeline. Appellant's Brief at 16, Staff Brief at 23. However, Republic claims in its brief that all other turbines meet the minimum setback requirements. Applicant's Brief at 15. But Turbines 10, 38, and 43 should not be constructed as proposed because they are too close to highways. Republic and Staff agree that the setback, defined in Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-08(C)(2)(b) is 1,125 feet plus the horizontal distance from the tip of the turbine's nearest blade at ninety degrees to the property line of the nearest adjacent property, including a state or federal highway. Turbines 10, 38, and 43 are too close and cannot pass this standard. The old standard was 1.1 x total hub height setback from the state or federal highways. Turbines 10, 38, and 43 comply with the old standard, but not with the new – 1,125 feet plus – setback. Turbine 10 is less than that distance to State Route 19 and Turbines 38 and 43 are less than that distance to State Route 18. Staff Ex. 5 at 9, Appellant's Brief at 15.

Republic argues that it filed its application before the new setback language became effective for Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-08(C)(2)(b). Applicant's Brief at 15. These sections of the Code became effective April 26, 2018 and Republic filed the amended application for locations for turbines 10, 38, and 43 on December 26, 2018, eight months after the effective date of the setback rule. The original application was filed on February 2, 2018 before the new setback rule was in place; however, Republic filed a Motion to Suspend the procedural schedule and stay discovery on August 29, 2018. On December 26, 2019, Republic filed its amended application, which consisted of over five thousand

pages. It was a new “amended application” and Turbines 10, 38, and 43 were new locations. The effective date for the rules was April 26, 2018 and this amended filing was made eight months later in December 2018.

In addition, the safety manual for these turbines state that a safety area of 1,640 feet around the turbine must be maintained if something malfunctions. A safety area this size would require State Routes 18 and 19 to be closed because the state routes are less than 1,640 feet away from these turbines. Staff Ex. 5 at 10. This is further rational why turbines 10, 38, and 43 should not be constructed as proposed.

## **II. AVIATION**

Another inaccuracy in Republic’s brief is that Republic ignores Ohio power siting law as it relates to aviation. In particular, Republic states throughout its brief that the FAA found that none of the turbines would constitute a hazard to air navigation and that all of the turbines can be constructed up to 606 feet above ground level with no threat to safety. Applicant’s Brief at 26. However, Republic conveniently ignores the language in the FAA’s determination of no hazard that states “this determination ...does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body” as well as Ohio’s law governing power siting in Ohio.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) requires that the Board not grant a certificate for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a major utility facility

---

<sup>1</sup> Republic recognizes that consulting with ODOT is required before the Board issues a certificate in its Standard of Review section of its Initial Brief; however, makes no arguments nor points out any facts that support the mandatory ODOT consultation. *See* Republic Brief at 4.

unless it finds and determines that the facility will, among other things, comply with R.C. 4561.32 (Ohio Department of Transportation's ("ODOT") authority to adopt rules regarding regulation of the airspace around airports). "In determining whether the facility will comply with all rules and standards adopted under 4561.32 \*\*\* the board *shall* consult with the office of aviation of the division of multi-modal planning and programs of the department of transportation[.]" R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) (emphasis added). ~~When the Staff consulted with ODOT, ODOT unequivocally determined that several airports near the project would be negatively impacted if the project was constructed as proposed.~~

Republic's brief makes no mention of the FAA deference to State laws and no mention of this section of R.C. 4906.10 regarding consultation with ODOT. This statute cannot be waived by the Board. Revised Code 4906.10 requires that the Board make a determination regarding eight areas codified in Ohio's law. As seen in one of these requirements, the Board shall consult with ODOT. This consultation with ODOT is not optional.

ODOT reviewed the FAA's determination and also performed a separate and independent analysis based on the same obstruction criteria described in 14 C.F.R. Part 77, which is the same criteria the FAA used. Staff Ex. 3 at 4. ODOT and the FAA both determined that all 50 turbines would exceed obstruction standards. However, the FAA issued a determination of no hazard for these turbines because it determined that existing flight procedures could be modified and that with the implementation of these modified procedures, the obstructions would not constitute a hazard. In order to make that

determination, new flight procedures for the Seneca County Airport, Sandusky County Regional Airport and Fostoria Metropolitan Airport and measures for the Ohio National Guard 179<sup>th</sup> Airlift Wing would need to be implemented. App. Ex. 29 at Att. 11, Staff Ex. 1 at 51 – 53. ODOT may include in its determination a statement that compliance with obstruction standards may be waived, ~~however, ODOT will only consider this option if the local airport is willing to give up the utility of its navigable airspace. None of the airports affected by the Republic project agree to forfeit their current navigable airspace. Staff Ex. 3 at 17.~~

~~Staff properly translated ODOT Office of Aviation's determination/consultation into appropriate conditions for Board consideration.~~ Staff's recommendations regarding aviation seek to minimize the adverse impacts from the Republic Wind farm. These negative aviation impacts will go beyond the project's footprints and affect multiple airports. ~~Staff recommends that Conditions 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 59 of the Staff Report and Supplemental Staff Report be adopted and made part of the certificate in this case.~~

### **III. NOISE**

Republic agrees with the Staff's findings that 46 dBA adequately addresses potential concerns for noise impacts on sensitive receptors. Republic Brief at 21. In Staff's Initial Brief, and in its Supplemental Staff Report, Staff noted that new evidence was raised at the hearing revealing the fact that Republic, in a separate case pending

before the Board, had performed a sound study that was done in an area well within the Republic Wind Farm Project area. The noise study was admitted into the record in this case.<sup>2</sup> Staff witness Bellamy recommended using the new sound data as an “eighth monitoring point” for evaluating the ambient nighttime noise in this case. Staff Ex. 16 at 2. The new noise data presented study results from the western area of the Project.

Witness Bellamy justified its inclusion as the data provides a “more complete picture of the wind generation project area,” and there were no data samples from the western part of the Project. Staff Ex. 16 at 2. The results of this additional study were admitted into this case. With the inclusion of this new data point, the project area ambient nighttime noise changes to approximately 40.5 dBA, placing the noise limit at 45.5 dBA instead of 46.<sup>3</sup> Staff Ex. 16 at 3. Staff encourages the Board to adopt Conditions 44, 58, and 60. Condition 44 is identical to Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-09(F)(2) and was used by Applicant in designing and analyzing the project. Its application in this case is not contested by Staff nor the Applicant, thus the Board should approve the condition.

An additional error in the noise study was discovered at the public hearing. At that hearing, Staff learned that the study failed to include at least one residence on the noise study map. Further investigation by Staff revealed that there were an additional nine residences not modeled in the noise study. Staff Ex. 15 at 4. Although the new data did not alter the overall noise impact limit, Staff recommends that the Board prohibit

---

<sup>2</sup> These sound monitoring values were obtained as part of the related case, Case No. 19-1066-EL-BTX, the Republic Wind transmission line case, Tr. II at 325, and allowed in to cross-examine Applicant’s expert. Tr. II at 333.

<sup>3</sup> The actual calculated ambient nighttime  $L_{eq}$  with the eight data point is 40.42, but Staff recommends rounding up to 40.5. Staff Ex. 16, at 3.

construction of any turbine that is modeled to impact a previously non-modeled receptor (residence) above the ambient level of the project area. Staff Ex. 15 at 4. Condition 58 prohibits the use of certain turbine models at location 37 due to Applicant's failure to fully disclose the sound data for the location in a timely manner. Applicant failed to provide the data until after it was pointed out to Staff by concerned citizens. Staff believes that the non-participants should have been provided the information sooner, and, as a result of the surprise, Staff believes it is fair to use turbines that will not raise the sound levels above the current ambient level at the site. Applicant's witness agrees that such a result would be possible and does not pose a problem for the Applicant's plan. App. Ex. 18 at 4. Thus, in the interest of fairness and to protect the interests of the public, Condition 58 should be adopted.

Condition 60 requires the Applicant to submit a noise study 30 days prior to the construction of the facility. This condition should also be approved. According to the Board's rules, the Applicant must "submit a preconstruction background noise study of the project area that includes measurements taken under both day and nighttime conditions." Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-08(A)(3)(e). Given that the modeling is likely different based on the inclusion of the eighth data point, a second submission of the ambient sound levels within the project area is essential to determine whether the project still meets the requirements of  $L_{eq}$  plus 5 dBA before the project is begun. Condition 60 satisfies the Board's rule both in letter and spirit.

Thus, the Board should accept Staff's three conditions regarding noise as found in the Staff Report, Supplement to the Staff Report, and the Supplemental Prefiled Testimony of Mark Bellamy.

Staff's report indicated that the Republic project's nature of the probable environmental impact had satisfied R.C. 4906.10(A)(2), provided that the Board include Staff's recommended conditions.

#### **IV. AESTHETICS**

Aesthetics comes into consideration when the Board determines the nature of the probable environmental impact that the proposed facility may have. R.C. 4906(A)(2). Both Seneca County and the Park District claim that the Bowen Nature Preserve was ignored by Staff. Seneca County Brief at 8, Seneca Park District Brief at 1. They complain that Staff did not visit Bowen Park. Seneca County at 9, Seneca Park District Brief at 2. However, Staff did visit the Project area five or six times and spent 40 hours in the Project area. Seneca County Brief at 9, Seneca Park District at 2. The fact that Staff did not physically visit every parcel of land does not demonstrate that visual impacts of the proposed facility were not taken into consideration by the Staff. In fact, the opposite is true. It would be unreasonable to require that every single parcel of land (comprised of 19,000 acres involving approximately 440 properties) be inspected.

As noted in the Staff Report "[d]ue to the height of turbines in a wind farm, it is impractical to directly screen them from view." Staff Ex. 1 at 23. The turbines will be painted a neutral light color and existing woodlots offer additional natural screening or



portions of the facility. Staff Ex. 1 at 23. There will be impacts and the Staff's responsibilities in performing its investigations are to achieve a result "that the facility represents the minimum adverse environmental impact, considering the state of available technology and the nature and economics of various alternatives, and other pertinent considerations." R.C. 4906.10(A)(3). The law does not establish an absolute value of no effects. The law charges the Board with minimizing the impacts of the proposed project. The wind farm may be seen at Bowen Park; however, the addition of the wind farm does not preclude or alter the continuation of existing recreational, institutional, commercial, industrial, residential or agricultural land uses. The use of the park will continue as it is today. Staff considered the visual impact that the project would have and recommends the conditions in the Staff Report and its Supplement be adopted as part of any certificate issued in this case.

## **V. KARST**

Local Intervenors discuss concerns regarding the existence of Karst topography in the Project area. See Local Residents' Brief 32 – 40. Staff recognizes the possibility of the existence of Karst in the area. Staff witness Collins confirmed that currently 27 of the proposed 50 wind turbines are situated in areas exhibiting karst features (Tr. Vol. VII at 1413). Staff witness Collins also found that it would be more prudent if the Applicant avoid "the karst features, in the most severe cases." (Tr. Vol. VII at 1416). Staff expects the Applicant to further continue site-specific geotechnical exploration work to wholly

define the nature/extent of the karst features at all of the proposed 50 wind turbines and most specifically those 27 proposed wind turbines noted by Staff. (Tr. Vol. VII at 1414).

Staff witness Conway noted that because there is Karst topography in the project area it requires avoidance and special consideration during foundation design and installation. Staff Ex. 5 at 8 -9. Staff agrees with Applicant witness McGee, a registered professional engineer, that the Applicant should implement proper mitigation measures (such as grouting) where appropriate and feasible. (Applicant Ex. 27 at page 6). Staff expects that the Applicant's final detailed engineering plans will properly use best engineering practices, identify and account for any karst formations at each proposed wind turbine location, and implement proper mitigation measures, or avoid non-feasible wind turbine locations. Staff recommends that the Board include in any approval for this Project the requirement that Applicant provide detailed engineering drawings of the final project design and foundation design which properly take into consideration karst features. These detailed engineering drawings must also identify the registered professional engineers and structural engineers that are licensed to practice engineering in the state of Ohio. Staff Ex. 4 at 9.

## **VI. ECOLOGICAL CONDITIONS**

Conditions 22, 25, 26, and 29 should be approved without modification. The ecological conditions were thoughtfully designed by Staff in coordination with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Ohio Department of Health, Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), Ohio Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service (USFW) for the protection of the ecology impacted by the project. Staff Ex. 1 at ii.

Condition 22 should continue to protect against impacts to all sensitive plant species. The purpose of the condition was not, as proposed in the Applicant Brief, to just protect against impacts to threatened species. Tr. VI at 1357-1358. Instead, the purpose was to protect against impacts for all listed species that are identified during the project. *Id.* Listed species include not only threatened species, but other categories such as endangered and potentially threatened species. *Id.* at 1358.

Condition 26 should be adopted without modification for the reasons stated in Staff's Initial Closing Brief and for the reasons stated in the Staff Report. The Staff Report explains why additional measures, above and beyond what is contained in the Applicant's current technical assistance letter, are needed at this project to protect the northern long-eared bat. The Staff Report, on page 29, states as follows:

The project site and adjacent parcels encompass habitat with confirmed use by listed species. The Applicant stated that it expects collision risk to bats in the project area to be consistent with other wind energy projects in agricultural landscapes in the Midwestern U.S. and estimates 980 to 2,200 bat deaths per year. However, the ODNR anticipates the mortality rate may be greater as this site has approximately five to eight times the amount of forested area as other operating projects in agricultural landscapes in Ohio. Additionally, active roost trees for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat have been documented in and adjacent to the project area during surveys.

In order to protect against higher than usual mortality rates for the northern long-eared bat, Condition 26 should be approved without modification.

Condition 25 and 29 are consistent with the rules found in Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(1), (2), and (6) and should, therefore, be adopted. The first two sentences of Condition 25<sup>4</sup> are essentially a replica of Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(2)<sup>5</sup>. And the last sentence of Condition 25 reasonably extends the Applicant's responsibility under Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(2) to mitigate when listed species are encountered during construction into a responsibility to also mitigate when listed species are encountered prior to construction. To the contrary, the adoption of the Applicant's proposed changes to Condition 25 would lower the standards required under the Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(2) by 1) limiting protection to endangered and threatened species, as opposed to all listed species, and 2) only preventing injuries, harm, and kills rather than preventing all adverse impacts. Tr. VI at 1361, 1362. And while Condition 29<sup>6</sup> is not a replica of Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(1) and (6)<sup>7</sup>, both the rule provisions and condition outline what

---

<sup>4</sup> Condition 25 states, "The Applicant shall contact Staff, the ODNR, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) within 24 hours if state or federal listed species are encountered during construction, operation, or monitoring activities. Activities that could adversely impact the identified plants or animals shall be immediately halted until an appropriate course of action has been agreed upon by the Applicant, Staff and the appropriate agencies. If the Applicant encounters any listed plant or animal species prior to construction, the Applicant notify Staff of the location and how impacts would be avoided during construction."

<sup>5</sup> Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(2) states, "The applicant shall contact board staff within twenty-four hours if federal or state listed species are encountered during construction activities. Construction activities that could adversely impact the identified plants or animals shall be halted until an appropriate course of action has been agreed upon by the applicant, board staff, and other applicable administrative agencies."

<sup>6</sup> Condition 29 states, "If Staff and the ODNR, in consultation with the USFWS, determine the project results in significant adverse impact to wild animals, the ODNR and Staff will notify the Applicant. As soon as possible and no longer than 30 days after receiving notification of the significant adverse impact, Applicant shall implement practices to rectify the significant adverse impact, which will include development and submission of a mitigation plan or adaptive management strategy to Staff and the ODNR for review to confirm compliance with this condition. Operation activities that could adversely impact the identified animals shall be modified to minimize risk until the mitigation plan or adaptive management strategy is agreed upon."

<sup>7</sup> Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(1) states, in part, "(1) \* \* \* If the United States fish and wildlife service, the Ohio department of natural resources division of wildlife, or board staff identify any recommendations for the avoidance of impacts to specific species, the applicant shall describe how it shall address all recommendations. \* \* \*

is required of the Applicant in the event that Staff, ODNR and USFW determine that the project results in adverse impacts to “federal or state listed and protected species or other species.” *See* Adm.Code 4906-4-09(D)(1), emphasis added. Condition 29 just outlines how the Applicant is supposed to interact with the various protection agencies with more needed specificity and replaces the phrase “other species” with the phrase “wild animals.” Conditions 25 and 29 should be adopted by the Commission.

## **CONCLUSION**

Staff respectfully requests that the Board condition any certificate issued in this case by adopting all the conditions set forth in that Staff Report, Supplement to the Staff Report, and Staff’s supporting testimony.

---

(6) If construction activities result in significant adverse impact to federal or state listed and protected species, the applicant will develop a mitigation plan or adaptive management strategy.”

Respectfully submitted,

**Dave Yost**

Ohio Attorney General

**John H. Jones**

Section Chief

*/s/ Jodi J. Bair*

---

**Jodi J. Bair**

**Robert Eubanks**

Assistant Attorneys General

Public Utilities Section

30 East Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

614.644.8599 (Bair telephone)

614.644.8669 (Eubanks telephone)

866.388.1479 (Bair fax)

jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

**On behalf of the Staff of**

**The Ohio Power Siting Board**

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **Staff Reply Brief**, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board, was served via electronic mail upon the following parties of record, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2020.

/s/ Jodi J. Bair

**Jodi J. Bair**

Assistant Attorney General

### **PARTIES OF RECORD:**

**Sally W. Bloomfield**

**Dylan F. Borchers**

**Devin D. Parram**

**Dane Stinson**

Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
614.227.2300 (telephone)  
614.227.2390 (facsimile)  
sbloomfield@bricker.com  
dborchers@bricker.com  
dparram@bricker.com  
dstinson@bricker.com

*Counsel for Republic Wind, LLC*

**Chad A. Endsley**

**Leah F. Curtis**

**Amy M. Milam**

Ohio Farm Bureau Federation 280 North  
High Street, P.O. Box 182383 Columbus,  
OH 43218-2383  
614.246.8256 (telephone)  
614.246.8656 (facsimile)  
cendsley@ofbf.org  
lcurtis@ofbf.org  
amilam@ofbf.org

**Jack Van Kley**

**Christopher A. Walker**

Van Kley & Walker LLC  
120 West Second Street, Ste 1700  
Dayton, OH 45402  
937.226.9000 (telephone)  
937.226.9002 (facsimile)  
jvankley@vankleywalker.com  
cwalker@vankleywalker.com

*Counsel for Local Resident Intervenors*

**Mark E. Mulligan**

Sandusky County Prosecutor's Office  
100 North Park Avenues Suite 220  
Fremont, OH 43420  
419.334.6221 (telephone)  
419.334.6232 (facsimile)  
mulligan\_mark@co.sandusky.oh.us

*Counsel for Petitioner the Board of  
Trustees of York Township, Sandusky  
County, Ohio*

*Counsel for Ohio Farm Bureau  
Federation*

**Miranda R. Leppla**

**Trent A. Dougherty**

**Christopher D. Tavenor**

The Ohio Environmental Council  
1145 Chesapeake Avenue, Suite I  
Columbus OH 43212

614.487.7506 (telephone)

614.487.7510 (facsimile)

mleppla@theoec.org

tdougherty@theoec.org

ctavenor@theoec.org

*Counsel for Ohio Environmental Council  
and Environmental Defense Fund*

**Dennis & Leslie Hackenburg**

6015 County Road 191

Bellevue OH 44811

dennyh7@frontier.com

*Pro Se Counsel*

**Michael & Tiffany Kessler**

4133 N Township Road

Republic Oh 44867

mkessler7@gmail.com

*Pro Se Counsel*



**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/13/2020 4:03:17 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 17-2295-EL-BGN**

Summary: Reply Staff Supplemental Reply Brief Submitted on Behalf of the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board electronically filed by Mrs. Kimberly M Naeder on behalf of OPSB