BEFORE
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the Application of Kingwood Solar I LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need	**)** **)** **)** **)**	**Case No. 21-0117-EL-BGN**

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF LYNN GRESOCK

Q.1. Please state your name, title and business address.

A.1. My name is Lynn Gresock. I am a Principal Consultant with Haley & Aldrich, Inc. ("Haley & Aldrich"). My business address is 3 Bedford Farms Drive, Suite 301, Bedford, NH 03110.

Q.2. What are your duties as a Principal Consultant with Haley & Aldrich?

A.2. Haley & Aldrich is a provider of engineering and environmental consulting services. As a Principal Consultant, I am focused on providing consulting services for energy projects, including providing permitting support for solar energy facilities. I have provided or am providing Ohio Power Siting Board permitting support for four solar energy facilities, 14 natural-gas-fired generating facilities, and four wind energy facilities. I have also supported numerous other projects throughout the United States. I frequently conduct and support visual impact assessments and other types of planning review (e.g., socioeconomics, planning, zoning) for projects. As a Principal Consultant, I also engage with stakeholders, such as developers, landowners, and other members of the community; coordinate with state and federal agencies in relation to cultural resources, wildlife, and other state or federal permits or consultations; and supervise, coordinate, and assist with technical reports to support different projects. My years of

participation on multidisciplinary projects has provided me with broad experience across a range of disciplines such that I have gained knowledge that can be applied to developing study programs and providing meaningful review for analyses.

Q.3. What is your educational and professional background?

A.3. I have a B.S. degree from the University of Massachusetts in Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, and over 37 years of professional experience providing environmental permitting and compliance services. I have supported a wide range of projects nationwide, including permitting almost 30,000 megawatts of energy facilities of various types, including solar. Through this work, I have gained a strong knowledge of the range of related issues and work closely in directing technical experts to provide strategic, technical, and regulatory support for facility development and operations.

My work includes Ohio Power Siting Board permitting for a number of generating facilities, which were either successfully approved or currently in process. Projects I have supported in Ohio that have been approved include: Fremont Energy Center, Washington Energy Facility, Madison Generating Station, Oregon Clean Energy Center, Carroll County Energy, Middletown Energy Center, Lordstown Energy Center, Guernsey Power Station, South Field Energy, Trumbull Energy Center, Oregon Energy Center, Long Ridge Energy Center, and Nestlewood Solar. I have also supported successful projects and testified in siting board processes in Massachusetts, New York, Maine, and Connecticut, and am currently working on an application for a solar energy facility before the Kentucky Siting Board.

My resume is also attached for reference as Exhibit A.

Q.4. On whose behalf are you offering testimony?

A.4. I am testifying on behalf of the Applicant, Kingwood Solar I LLC in support of its application filed in Case No. 21-0117-EL-BGN.

Q.5. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A.5. The purpose of my testimony is to describe certain studies that support the Application and summarize the results of those studies. I will also provide my overall assessment of the potential environmental and visual impacts of the Project.

Q.6. What studies did you and your firm undertake and direct on behalf of the Applicant to support the Application identified as Kingwood Exhibit 1?

A.6. Haley & Aldrich is the lead environmental consultant on the Kingwood Solar Project, which includes the approximately 1,500-acre project site ("Project Area"), within which solar panels, pilings, racking, buried electrical lines, inverters, roads, meteorological stations, a project substation, and other ancillary facilities ("Project") will be located. I have managed, been directly involved in coordinating, and am familiar with the full range of environmental and cultural assessments completed for the Project.

Haley & Aldrich coordinated technical experts for the following studies: the economic impact study, completed by Silverlode Consulting; the noise evaluation, completed by Acentech; and the cultural resource assessment, completed by Weller & Associates, Inc. ("Weller") for the archaeological investigations and by Kramb Consulting LLC ("Kramb") for the architectural history investigations. In each instance, I or one of my staff was involved in selecting the specific contractor, reviewing their scope of work, coordinating access for field efforts as appropriate and conducting safety checks throughout; following up to review collected field data; and reviewing reports. In the

case of Acentech, field support was provided by Haley & Aldrich for implementing the ambient monitoring set up given the status of the pandemic at that time. In the case of the archaeological and historical work by Weller and Kramb, I was directly engaged in agency coordination regarding their efforts.

Specific appended reports completed by Haley & Aldrich include:

- Wetland and stream delineations – Haley & Aldrich staff completed field delineations in accordance with accepted practices and documented the findings in a report (Application Appendix M).
- Federal and State rare, threatened and endangered ("RTE") species review – Haley & Aldrich corresponded with both the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") and Ohio Department of Natural Resources ("ODNR") to identify RTE species with the potential to be present; observed habitat characteristics during wetland and stream delineation efforts; and conducted additional correspondence to confirm which species would require seasonal restrictions or other protective measures (see Application Appendix N for species consultations).
- Preliminary evaluation for preparation of a Transportation Management Plan – Haley & Aldrich staff researched roadways (examining the likely road network to be traveled in the area, considering general conditions of the roads, and identifying further, more detailed studies in future) in the vicinity of the Project and documented the findings in a report that will be updated prior to Project construction (Application Appendix H).
- Visual impact analysis – Haley & Aldrich evaluated the characteristics of the

Project surroundings (topography, vegetation, visually sensitive resources, identification of likely typical viewers, etc.), conducted modeling to identify locations from which views of the Project might be possible; prepared photographic visual simulations; and identified locations where landscaping was proposed for the Project (Application Appendix Q).

Haley & Aldrich also prepared information to meet other Ohio Power Siting Board requirements for narrative and graphics, coordinating as appropriate with other team members to provide the necessary information.

Q.7. Please describe and summarize the study of wetland, streams, and other waters within the Project Area as presented in the Application.

A.7. Under my direction, Haley & Aldrich conducted a detailed study, including a field delineation, to determine the boundaries of wetlands and other aquatic resources for the Project Area, which I have reviewed and which is attached to the Application as Appendix M. The field work for this study was performed October 13-21, 2020; November 17-18, 2020; and March 8-11, 2021. Per the study report, wetland areas and other waters, including streams and agricultural ditches, were delineated on site using methodology enumerated in the 1987 United States Army Corps of Engineers ("USACE") Wetland Delineation Manual; the 2010 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (Version 2.0); and relevant vegetation and hydric soil sources. Wetland classification was completed in accordance with the commonly-used Cowardin classification system as well as the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method ("ORAM") for Wetlands (Version 5.0). Streams were characterized using Haley & Aldrich's Stream Inventory Data Form and the Ohio-

specified Stream Primary Headwater Habitat Evaluation Form and Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index and Use Assessment Field Sheet, as appropriate to the particular stream. These completed forms are included as attachments in the Aquatic Resource Report.

Prior to the field investigations, Haley & Aldrich reviewed secondary literature sources (such as topographic and aerial maps as well as National Wetland Inventory ("NWI") and Ohio Wetland Inventory ("OWI") wetland and stream mapping) to evaluate the presence of mapped wetlands and streams within the Project Area. A field inspection was then conducted to identify potential wetlands and other waters. Wetlands and other waters were surveyed using a global positioning system ("GPS") unit. Note that delineated wetlands and streams were generally in agreement with what is shown on NWI mapping, topographic mapping, and aerial imagery. OWI mapping tended to overstate the extent of wetlands found on-site. Particularly in the agricultural areas, OWI mapping shows some wetlands that, if they ever existed, are not currently present. Within the Project Area, Haley & Aldrich identified six wetlands, five Palustrine Emergent ("PEM") wetlands and one Palustrine Forested ("PFO") wetland. Each wetland was less than one acre and, the Project Area contained 1.52 acres of wetlands total. These wetlands consisted of both ORAM Category 1 and 2 wetlands. The study did not identify any Category 3 wetlands (the highest quality classification for wetlands) within the Project Area. No impacts are proposed to any delineated wetlands.

A total of 27 stream segments (including four different segments of Clark Run) were also identified during field investigations within the Project Area, totaling 18,287 linear feet of waterway. Of these 27 segments, 14 stream segments were considered

ephemeral, nine stream segments were considered intermittent, and each of the four segments of Clark Run were considered perennial. Note that perennial streams are generally identified as solid blue lines on the U.S. Geological Survey ("USGS") topographic maps and typically have water flowing year-round. An intermittent stream has flowing water during certain times of the year when groundwater provides water for stream flow; during dry periods, intermittent streams may not have flowing water. Intermittent streams are generally identified as dashed blue lines on the USGS topographic maps. An ephemeral drain has flowing water only during and for a short duration after precipitation events in a typical year. Ephemeral drains are not identified on USGS topographic maps. This is the standard typically followed, as adjusted to allow for observed field conditions (e.g., an unmapped steam that is flowing when there has been no recent rainfall may be classified as intermittent rather than ephemeral).

Based on the evaluation conducted, only two delineated segments, both segments of Clark Run identified as "MM1" and "MM21," were determined to be Class III waterbodies (the highest quality). Construction of the underground electrical collection lines will require several stream crossings. The crossing of all perennial streams, including the two Class III segments, will use horizontal directional drilling ("HDD") or similar methods (which would not impact in-water species). HDD or similar boring techniques will also be used for non-perennial crossings, unless the stream is dry, there are no trees to avoid at the crossing, and/or field conditions support open trenching.

Q.8. Please describe and summarize the study of endangered species in the Project Area.

A.8. The Project Area was also studied for suitable habitat for state and federal listed species. Field review was completed by a Haley & Aldrich professional who has

approximately 10 years of field experience observing and documenting habitat conditions on projects of similar scope and conveying accurate information to federal and state agencies for the purpose of assessing the potential presence of RTE species. This type of reconnaissance-level survey is performed during the wetland and stream delineations and includes general observations and documentation (e.g., photographs) of habitat types as well as observations of individual species or signs of RTE species presence. Prior to field work, agency correspondence was initiated in order to have lists of the particular RTE species of interest for this Project Area.

Prior to field review, consultation was undertaken with both the USFWS and ODNR. Both the USFWS and ODNR (in initial consultation letters dated May 4, 2020 and June 8, 2020, respectively) identified the Project Area as within the range of the federally listed, endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*). USFWS further identified the Project Area as within the range of the federally listed, threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis)*. The Project layout has been developed to avoid tree clearing to the maximum extent practicable, and will be limited to 25.5 acres of tree clearing within the 1,500-acre Project area, with the majority of that focused on scattered trees and hedgerows. In March 24, 2021 correspondence, the USFWS confirmed that the seasonal tree clearing restrictions appropriately minimize potential impacts from the Project on the two identified federally listed bat species. In a March 10, 2021 email (included in Appendix N of the Application), ODNR has also confirmed that if the tree clearing will occur during the winter tree clearing dates, no additional surveys or consultation with ODNR is necessary.

ODNR also noted in its initial consultation letter dated June 8, 2020 that the Project is

within the range of the Kirtland's snake and the spotted turtle, state-listed threatened species, as well as the eastern massasauga, state-listed as endangered. However, because of the location and type of habitat in the Project Area, ODNR concluded in its initial consultation letter that the Project is unlikely to impact these species. ODNR did not make any further recommendations regarding these species.

ODNR further noted in its initial consultation letter that the upland sandpiper, state-listed as endangered, has a range that includes the Project Area. However, this species tends to favor grasslands that are much larger than those observed within the Project Area. Based upon field review, it was determined that habitat present within the Project Area appears to be low quality, and adverse impacts to the upland sandpiper by Project activities appear unlikely, a conclusion supported by ODNR, who further concluded in a March 12, 2021 email that no restrictions associated with the upland sandpiper were necessary.

Similarly, ODNR noted in its initial consultation letter that the northern harrier, state-listed as endangered, is a common migrant and winter species in the Project Area and that they occasionally breed in large marshes and grasslands. However, no large marshes or natural grasslands will be impacted by the Project. Accordingly, adverse impacts to northern harrier by Project activities appear unlikely, a conclusion ODNR concurred with in the March 12, 2021 email; therefore, seasonal restrictions associated with the northern harrier are not necessary.

Q.9. Did you make any findings or observations related to birds or other wildlife?

A.9. Species observed or indicated by sign (e.g., tracks, scat, calls) as using the Project Area are those common throughout typical agricultural fields within Ohio, such as Eastern

cottontail, wild turkey, and American robin, as provided in Table 08-5 of the Application. Because similar habitat is available within the surroundings, the Project would not eliminate habitat types available for species use, nor would species be precluded from using the Project Area and surroundings once the Project is in place. The design of the Project allows for ongoing movement of large species through the Project Area and surroundings, as it consists of 17 individually fenced areas of solar arrays rather than encompassing the entire Project Area within a fence. The Project's commitment to use of wildlife permeable agricultural meshed fencing will provide habitat benefits and allow for access by smaller species. In addition, the exterior landscaping and interior maintenance of low-growing vegetation, including pollinator-friendly species, will provide more consistent and diverse habitat than species would have experienced with agricultural crops in place.

Q.10. What is your overall opinion regarding the environmental and ecological impact of the Project?

A.10. In my opinion, based on my experience and involvement with this Project (which has involved scoping and overseeing the natural resource review activities, as well as reviewing resulting reports relative to Project details), the environmental and ecological impact of the Project will be minimal. The Project has been intentionally sited to avoid and/or minimize impacts to wildlife by locating the majority of infrastructure within active agricultural land, which is lower quality habitat that does not support a diversity of species. The Applicant has also designed the Project to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands, waterbodies, woodlots, and aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species. On a landscape scale, there is abundant availability of similar agricultural fields within the Project Area and surrounding area that can be used as similar habitat. After construction,

the Project Area will be stabilized with permanent vegetation, an improvement from row crops that will provide potential foraging habitat for area birds and wildlife.

Q.11. Please describe the visual impact assessment that you and your firm undertook on behalf of the Applicant.

A.11. A Visual Impact Analysis ("VIA") was prepared for the Project that concluded that the Project will not be visible from any of the visually sensitive areas in its surroundings and that visibility of the Project will generally be concentrated within the Project Area itself and the open fields immediately adjacent to the Project. Visibility was found to be significantly limited at distances beyond 0.5-mile, given existing screening. Additional landscaping has been proposed to further reduce impact of closer views.

The VIA was prepared to satisfy those portions of the requirements of Ohio Administrative Code Chapter 4906-04-08(D)(4) that relate to the identification of visually sensitive sites and potential visual impacts. Visually sensitive resources are defined as any formally adopted areas of recreational, historic, religious, archaeological, scenic, natural, or other cultural significance. Examples of visually sensitive resources include properties on the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP"), State Parks, and cemeteries, among others. The VIA is attached to the Application as Appendix Q. A 10-mile radius was considered, resulting in selection of a 5-mile area for more detailed visual study. For that 5-mile radius, a desktop evaluation was conducted to identify the area from which any element of the Project has the potential to be visible both considering terrain only and then including the effect of large areas of trees. Research was conducted to identify visually sensitive locations, and field reconnaissance by Haley & Aldrich staff was undertaken to confirm characteristics of these locations; later confirmatory ground-truthing was conducted by

Kramb as a part of the historic architecture survey, discussed later. Maps of this information were presented, classifying visually sensitive locations by distance (using distance zones established by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Department of Transportation, which are commonly used to reflect the manner in which visual effect decreases with distance). Consideration was also given to the types of viewers expected in the area (e.g., local residents, through travelers, tourists and recreational users, and campus users) as well as existing land use characteristics. Representative visual simulations were prepared and described that showed views from seven locations toward the Project Area, presenting existing views without the Project as well as simulations of views from the same locations with the Project structures in place. A glare analysis was also completed that confirmed that, even without considering the effects of landscaping, the Project will not result in glare at any of the modeled locations. The VIA also provided information regarding plans for additional landscaping to be installed in order to screen and soften views of the Project from certain locations where visual mitigation was appropriate.

Q.12. What were the results of the VIA you performed?

A.12. The Visual Study Area ("VSA") consists of a total area of 94,229 acres. Conservative desktop models, which incorporate the screening effect of major forested areas, indicated the potential for visibility of some portion of the Project from 21.6% of the VSA. As would be expected, the modeled potential for visibility becomes greater the closer the viewer moves toward the Project Area, with the greatest modeled potential for visibility indicated in the Near-Foreground distance (0 – 0.5 miles from the Project Area).

Visible elements of the Project would largely be the solar arrays, which – at their maximum

tilted height – will be no more than 14 feet tall. This is considerably shorter than existing overhead electric transmission structures that extend throughout the Project Area.

A total of 62 public lands/recreational areas/trails; four designated scenic resources; 40 properties of historic significance; and 84 high-use public areas (e.g., churches, community buildings) were identified within the 5-mile radius and were evaluated. Of the identified visually sensitive areas, a total of 19 of the public lands/recreational areas/trails; three of the designated scenic resources; six of the properties of historic significance; and ten of the high-use public areas were identified in the desktop modeling as having the potential to have views of the Project. Additional analysis, including ground truthing was completed, and it was determined that the Project is not expected to alter the existing visual landscape of these resources due to intervening distance, structures, and vegetation.

The Project will be most visible within the Project Area itself and the open fields immediately adjacent to the Project, with visibility the greatest within 0.5 mile. The use of woven wire fencing, consistent with the agricultural character of the area, and installation of landscaping in certain areas and retention of existing woodlots, are expected to soften views of the Project As illustrated by the visual simulations incorporated in the analysis, even without the use of landscape screening, the Project's visibility decreases dramatically with distance.

Q.13. Are there planned mitigation and minimization measures to be put in effect to limit any potential impact on views from non-participating residences?

A.13. Yes. To offset visual impacts from individual non-participating residences and travelers along local roadways, a buffering and landscaping plan will be implemented. The use of woven wire fencing compatible with the agricultural character of the surrounding

area and the implementation of a landscaping plan will provide for softening of the horizontal lines to lessen potential impacts associated with near-foreground views. The Landscaping Plan is detailed in Attachment C to Appendix Q in the Application; this is intended as a preliminary guide, with ongoing adjustments based on coordination with non-participating landowners prior to construction. The VIA describes landscape screening proposed for visual mitigation of proximate viewers, with a goal of softening near views of the Project. This visual screening will introduce natural vertical elements that break up the horizontal lines created by the solar panel arrays to help dull the Project's visual impact. Specific locations were identified for which either light, medium, or tall landscaping is planned. Graphics, planting plans, and species were provided for each of three screening types identified. Selection of the locations for each landscape type considered distance from and number of viewers as well as Project shading issues.

Q.14. Did the Applicant consider the interests of nearby landowners when determining the landscape schemes to be used for the Project's facilities?

A.14. The goal of the landscape plan is to soften near views of the Project. The Applicant specifically considered the location of non-participating nearby landowners in identifying locations for proposed landscape screening. Kingwood intends to continue coordination with non-participating landowners to adjust buffers and landscaping as appropriate.

Q.15. Will the Project adversely impact cultural historic resources?

A.15. No. Detailed analysis and review by the Ohio SHPO have been completed to confirm that neither archaeological nor historic structure impacts will result from the Project.

Q.16. Please describe archaeological analyses and coordination completed for the Project.

A.16. Haley & Aldrich contracted with Weller to provide cultural resources consulting for the Project. Haley & Aldrich coordinated with Weller with regard to the scope of study, providing access to the site for conducting surveys (in consultation with Kingwood and landowners), reviewed reports, and supported coordination with the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office ("SHPO"). A work plan reflecting the plan to conduct archaeological investigations in accordance with Ohio SHPO standards for the Project Area was submitted by Weller to the Ohio SHPO on February 26, 2021. The Ohio SHPO responded, concurring with the work plan, on March 16, 2021.

A Weller report dated July 12, 2021 was submitted by Haley & Aldrich to the Ohio SHPO on July 15, 2021 that reflected completion of archaeological surveys for approximately 85% of the Project Area, as well as historical background information and literature review of resources available from the Ohio SHPO Online Mapping System. The database included review of the Ohio Archaeological Inventory, the Ohio History Inventory, NRHP files, the Historic Bridge Inventory, previous cultural resource surveys, and information on cemeteries maintained by the Ohio Genealogical Society. Based on the results of the records review, there are no NRHP Determination of Eligibility resources or other cultural resources within the Project Area. The Weller report concluded that, for the investigations completed to date, no significant sites were identified, no landmarks are present within the Project Area, and that a finding similar to "no historic properties affected" would be appropriate. Because the survey of the entire Project Area could not be completed at that time due to ground conditions and landowner scheduling issues, a draft Programmatic Agreement was submitted with the report. The Programmatic Agreement between Kingwood and the Ohio SHPO documented the intention to complete the survey, and laid

out the appropriate response should significant resources be encountered.

Based on review by the Ohio SHPO, a letter was sent to Haley & Aldrich on August 6, 2021 reflecting that the Ohio SHPO was in agreement with the proposed course of action to develop a Programmatic Agreement for completion of the remaining archaeological survey. Full execution of the Programmatic Agreement occurred on August 18, 2021.

Archaeological surveys were completed for the remainder of the Project Area, and an addendum report was submitted by Haley & Aldrich to the Ohio SHPO on December 15, 2021. The addendum report reflected that, for the remaining property, no sites were identified that were considered significant or eligible for the NRHP, and that no further cultural resource management work is considered necessary. A letter from the Ohio SHPO to Haley & Aldrich dated January 3, 2022 provided concurrence with the findings of the report, stating that no effect on historic properties would result from the Project and that no further coordination was warranted.

Q.17. Please describe analyses and coordination completed for the Project with regard to historic structures.

A.17. The work plan that was approved by Ohio SHPO on March 16, 2021 also reflected the scope of review for historic structures. Although the approved work plan had incorporated a review radius of 1 mile around the Project Area, additional coordination on April 27, 2021 between Haley & Aldrich and the Ohio SHPO confirmed that the historic structures report would include a literature review within 5 miles and evaluation of resources within a 2-mile radius, with supporting information provided. Kramb was contracted via Weller to perform this work. Haley & Aldrich directly coordinated with Kramb with regard to the scope of work and review of reporting.

On June 22, 2021, Haley & Aldrich submitted to SHPO its History/Architecture Reconnaissance Survey Report, completed by Kramb, along with a cover letter providing additional consideration of identified resources. The survey identified a total of eight resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP for which potential visibility of the Project Area was considered at least possible. The Survey evaluated all eight potentially eligible resources and concluded that, given the characteristics of each setting, the Project layout proximity, and proposed landscape screening, no adverse effect is anticipated due to the Project. In addition, of the 258 architectural locations identified for evaluation within the defined Area of Potential Effect, an additional 17 were considered to have some potential for a view of the Project Area from the resources' property but were unable to be evaluated from the ground due to distance, vegetation, obscured views or limited access. These resources are not necessarily eligible for NRHP listing, but the potential for visibility of the Project Area from some portion of the property could not be ruled out. These resources were evaluated using available aerial imagery, and it was determined that the majority of these structures are well buffered by existing vegetation and other features, and many are distant from the proposed solar arrays.

On July 23, 2021, SHPO responded and agreed with the survey's recommendations of eligibility for listing in the NRHP, that views to the Project from potentially eligible properties will be limited, that the proposed landscape plan would provide additional screening, and that, accordingly, no additional history/architecture investigations are necessary.

Q.18. What is your overall assessment of the potential visual impact of the Project?

A.18. Based upon the detailed analysis of both the VIA and the review of potential historic

structures in the vicinity, the Project is not expected to be visible from visually sensitive resources. The Project will be visible within the Project Area and from adjacent open fields and roads. However, the use of woven wire fencing, consistent with the agricultural character of the area, implementation of buffers, and planned installation of landscaping in select locations are expected to reduce the visual impact of the Project. As demonstrated in the VIA, visibility decreases considerably with distance. While landscaping mitigation is not expected to completely block views of the Project, it will soften the visual effect of the Project's horizontal components.

Q.19. Does this conclude your testimony?

A.19. Yes, but I reserve the right to present any additional testimony in support of any stipulation or rebuttal testimony.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon the following via email on this 23rd day of February, 2022.

Jodi J. Bair Werner L. Margard *Attorneys for Ohio Power Siting Board Staff*	Jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov Werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Daniel A. Brown *Attorney for Cedarville Township Trustees*	dbrown@brownlawdayton.com
David Watkins Kevin Dunn *Attorneys for Xenia Township Trustees*	dw@planklaw.com kdd@planklaw.com
Lee A. Slone *Attorney for Miami Township Board of Trustees*	lee.slone@dinsmore.com
John E. Hart *Attorney for In Progress LLC*	jehartlaw@gmail.com
Charles D. Swaney *Attorney for Tecumseh Land Preservation Association*	cswaney@woh.rr.com
Jack A. Van Kley *Attorney for Citizens for Greene Acres, Inc.*	jvankley@vankleywalker.com
Thaddeus M. Boggs *Attorney for the Greene County Commissioners*	tboggs@fbtlaw.com
Chad A. Endsley Leah F. Curtis Amy M. Milam *Attorneys for Ohio Farm Bureau Federation*	cendsley@ofbf.org lcurtis@ofbf.org amilam@ofbf.org

/s/ Michael J. Settineri
Michael J. Settineri

Summary: Testimony Direct Testimony of Lynn Gresock electronically filed by Mr. Michael J. Settineri on behalf of Kingwood Solar I LLC