BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the : Application of Kingwood:

Solar I LLC for a :
Certificate of : Case No. 21-117-EL-BGN Certificate of Environmental

Compatibility and Public : Need.

PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Michael Williams and Mr. David Hicks, Administrative Law Judges, at the Ohio Power Siting Board, via Webex, called at 10:08 a.m. on Monday, March 7, 2022.

VOLUME I

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, Second Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201 (614) 224-9481

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
            Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP
            By Mr. Michael J. Settineri,
 3
            Ms. Anna Sanyal,
            Mr. Jonathan K. Stock,
 4
            and Mr. Nathaniel B. Morse
            52 East Gay Street
 5
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
 6
                 On behalf of the Applicant.
 7
            Van Kley & Walker, LLC
            By Mr. Jack A. Van Kley
            132 Northwoods Boulevard, Suite C-1
 8
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
 9
                 On behalf of the Citizens for Greene
                 Acres and Individual Intervenors.
10
            Cedarville University
11
            By Mr. John E. Hart
12
            251 North Main Street
            Cedarville, Ohio 45314
13
                 On behalf of In Progress LLC.
14
            Ohio Farm Bureau Federation
15
            By Ms. Amy Milam
            280 North High Street, 6th Floor
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
16
                 On behalf of the Ohio Farm Bureau
17
                 Federation.
18
            Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
19
            By Mr. Lee A. Slone
            One South Main Street, Suite 1300
20
            Dayton, Ohio 45402
21
                 On behalf of the Miami Township Board of
                 Trustees, Greene County, Ohio.
22
23
2.4
25
```

```
3
 1
     APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2.
            Brown Law Office LLC
            By Mr. Daniel A. Brown
 3
            204 South Ludlow Street, Suite 300
            Dayton, Ohio 45402
 4
                 On behalf of the Cedarville Township
 5
                 Trustees.
            Plank Law Firm, LPA
 6
            By Mr. David Watkins
 7
            and Mr. Kevin Dunn
            411 East Town Street, Floor 2
 8
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
 9
                 On behalf of the Xenia Township Board of
                 Trustees.
10
            Frost Brown Todd LLC
11
            By Mr. Thaddeus M. Boggs
            and Mr. Jesse J. Shamp
12
            10 West Broad Street, Suite 2300
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
13
                 On behalf of the Greene County Board of
14
                 Commissioners.
15
            Mr. Charles D. Swaney
            515 North Fountain Avenue
            Springfield, Ohio 45504
16
17
                 On behalf of the Tecumseh Land
                 Preservation Association.
18
            Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General
19
            Mr. John Jones, Section Chief
            By Mr. Werner L. Margard, III,
20
            Ms. Jodi Bair,
            and Mr. Shaun Lyons
21
            Assistant Attorneys General
            Public Utilities Section
            30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
22
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
23
                 On behalf of the Staff of the OPSB.
24
25
```

				4	ļ	
1		INDEX				
2						
3	1TIW	WITNESS				
4	Dyla					
5	C	Direct Examination by Mr. Settineri Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley				
6	Re	Cross-Examination by Mr. Brown Redirect Examination by Mr. Settineri				
7		Recross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley Recross-Examination by Mr. Brown				
8						
9	KINO	GWOOD EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED		
10	1	Application	15	235		
11	1C	Confidential Portions	15	235		
12		of the Application (Confidential)				
13 14	2	Compilation of Responses to Staff Data Requests by the Applicant	16	235		
15	2C	Archaeological Report (Confidential)	16	236		
16	3	Proof of Service of Application	on 17	236		
1718	4	Compilation of Various Notices Relating to Landowner Mailings		236		
19	5	Various Proofs of Publication	17	236		
20	6	Direct Testimony of	17	236		
21		Dylan Stickney				
22	7	Supplemental Testimony of Dylan Stickney	18	236		
23						
24						
25						

				5
1		INDEX (Continued	d)	
2				
3	CIT	IZENS EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
4	13	<u> </u>	140	
5		Interrogatories and Requests for Documents from Citizens for Greene Acres		
6	16	Greene County Ohio Public		
7	10	Opinion Strategies Pole	221	237
8				
9	JOI	NT EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
10	1	±	18	237
11		Recommendation		
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Monday Morning Session,

March 7, 2022.

3 | - -

2.1

ALJ HICKS: Let's go ahead and go on the record.

The Ohio Power Siting Board has set for hearing at this time and place Case No. 21-117-EL-BGN which is captioned in the Matter of the Application of Kingwood Solar I LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Solar-Powered Electric Generation Facility in Greene County, Ohio.

Good morning to everyone. My name is
David Hicks, and with me is Mike William. And we are
the Administrative Law Judges in the Legal Department
of the Ohio Power Siting Board and have been assigned
by the Board to hear this case.

I will first note that this hearing is reconvened via Webex in accordance with the scheduling entry issued on December 22, 2021, and we are reconvening this morning after opening the hearing on December 13, 2021.

At this time we will go ahead and kick things off by taking appearances of counsel of the parties in this case, and I am just going to go down

Proceedings - Volume I

7 like a roll call here calling out folks starting with 1 2 the Applicant. 3 MR. SETTINERI: Yes, good morning, your Honors. On behalf of Kingwood Solar I LLC, Michael 4 5 Settineri, Jonathan Stock, Anna Sanyal, and Nathaniel 6 Morse with the law firm Vorys, Sater, Seymour and 7 Pease, LLP, 52 East Gay Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. 8 Thank you. 9 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. 10 And on behalf of Board Staff. 11 ALJ WILLIAMS: Jodi, are you speaking? 12 MS. BAIR: Wow. I did my whole 13 appearance on mute. Sorry. Okay. On behalf of the 14 Board Staff, Jodi Bair, Werner Margard, Shaun Lyons, 15 Assistant Attorneys General, 30 East Broad Street, 16 26th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215. 17 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. 18 And on behalf of the Ohio Farm Bureau 19 Federation. 20 MS. MILAM: Good morning, your Honors. 2.1 Amy Milam on behalf of Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, 22 280 North High Street, 6th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 23 43215.

ALJ HICKS: Thank you. On behalf of the 25 Board of Trustees of Cedarville Township.

```
1
                 MR. BROWN: Good morning, your Honors.
 2
     This is Daniel Brown and I am at 204 South Ludlow
     Street, Dayton, Ohio, representing the Cedarville
 3
     Township Board of Trustees.
 4
 5
                 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. And on behalf of
 6
     the Board of Trustees of Xenia Township.
 7
                 MR. WATKINS: Good morning, your Honor.
     This is David Watkins and Kevin Dunn with Plank Law
 8
9
     Firm, 411 East Town Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215
10
     representing Xenia Township Board of Trustees.
11
                 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. On behalf of the
12
     Board of Trustees of Miami Township.
13
                 MR. SLONE: Good morning. Lee Slone with
14
     Dinsmore & Shohl, One South Main Street, Suite 1300,
15
     Dayton, Ohio 45402, appearing on behalf of Miami
16
     Township Board of Trustees. Thanks.
17
                 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. And on behalf of
18
     In Progress LLC.
19
                 MR. HART: Good morning. Good morning,
20
     your Honor. John Hart, attorney for In Progress LLC,
2.1
     251 North Main Street, Cedarville, Ohio 45314.
22
                 ALJ HICKS: Thank you. And on behalf of
     the Tecumseh Land Preservation Association.
23
24
                 MR. SWANEY: Good morning, your Honor.
25
     Charles Swaney on behalf of Tecumseh Land
```

Preservation Association, I'm at 515 North Foundation Avenue, Springfield, Ohio. And I apologize for calling in late.

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Swaney, while we have you, because we understand you might be coming and going during the course of the hearing, to the extent you would intend to participate in cross-examination of any witness, we would expect you to be on camera. So I understand your intention off the record was that your participation would be rather passive, but I just wanted to remind you of that fact on the record while you were still connected telephonic this morning. So any questions regarding that, sir?

MR. SWANEY: No. Thank you very much.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Swaney.

ALJ HICKS: Thank you. And on behalf of the Citizens for Greene Acres and the associated Intervenors.

MR. VAN KLEY: Good morning. This is Jack Van Kley, Van Kley & Walker, 132 Northwoods Boulevard, Suite C-1, Columbus, Ohio 43235.

ALJ HICKS: Thank you. And on behalf of the Greene County Board of Commissioners.

MR. BOGGS: Good morning. Thad Boggs and Jesse Shamp with Frost Brown Todd LLC, 10 West Broad

Street, 23rd Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215, for the Greene County Board of Commissioners.

2.1

ALJ HICKS: Thank you. I believe that is all of our parties.

I just have a few preliminary remarks here before we officially dive into the hearing. Due to issues surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, this hearing is being held via Webex which enables parties to participate by video conference while also affording the public access to the hearing by telephone or video over the internet.

Before we call our first witness, just to address a few preliminary matters, if counsel or witnesses experience any technical difficulties during the hearing, please do your best to immediately let Judge Williams or I know by phone or e-mail. You can also contact our event host, Micha is helping us on this, Micha Schmidt. The number for that is (614) 466-6843.

There's also a chat function in Webex that you may be able to get a message to either of us Judges or to Micha. Just be aware that those chats are recorded and should not be considered private but they are also not a part of the official record of the case.

For folks that are just listening or watching as an attendee, you can obviously observe and listen to the hearing, but your microphones and cameras will be muted and turned off while you are still an attendee.

2.1

In terms of how the hearing will be conducted, in many respects it will proceed much the same way as an in person hearing before the Board. However, due to the remote nature of the hearing, just a few general ground rules and reminders. First, to avoid any unnecessary background noise, we would -- we would ask that counsel keep their microphones on mute unless they are speaking or are prepared to speak quickly or need to respond to something quickly such as raising objections or things of that nature during cross-examination.

As I said earlier, microphones of witnesses will be kept on mute until it is their time to testify. With respect to video, counsel should have their cameras on at all times except during breaks. You may turn your video off if you need to step away from the hearing or when your co-counsel is taking the lead. Just remember to turn your camera back on when you return. And then obviously witnesses will need to turn on their cameras and

microphones once they begin to testify.

2.1

2.2

Please also be mindful of the court reporter. I mean, as always, speak clearly and at a reasonable pace so the court reporter can accurately transcribe the hearing. The remote nature makes talking over each other a little bit more of an issue, even more so than it is in person. So just allow for that. Perhaps take -- you know, intentionally taking a pause at the end of questions or slowing down in general just to allow for what could be a little bit of lag time over this virtual hearing.

During their testimony, witnesses will have access only to the filings in the case docket as well as other documents that have been identified as potential exhibits and previously exchanged among the parties and shared with the Bench. Witnesses should not access or seek other information in documents while testifying nor should they communicate through any means with anyone privately during their testimony.

Exhibits admitted into the record which have not previously been docketed in this case docket will need to be e-mailed by the next day to the court reporter. That e-mail address is KSpencer@aando.com.

I will assume that we will repeat that e-mail address numerous times throughout the day and the rest of the week, so if you didn't get it, just ask and we can repeat it for everyone. But again, to the extent any exhibits admitted are not already on the docket, they will need to be sent directly to the court reporter.

2.1

Before we begin with testimony, we've discussed there are some preliminary matters that will need to be addressed. And to handle those, I am going to turn it over to Judge Williams to lead those considerations.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, David. Let's go ahead and go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Go back on the record.

We spoke for a few minutes regarding some preliminary matters, issues regarding the presentation of witnesses and how we would arrange for witness presentation on an ongoing basis throughout this hearing.

There was a request for a clarification regarding submitting an updated testimony document that was imaged in a manner that was a little unorthodox and there was some discussion regarding changes in testimony that derive as a result of the

Stipulations that's been filed in this case. All of those will be addressed in due course throughout this hearing.

2.1

Finally, there was a request for clarification regarding the process for considering and ruling on the motion for subpoenas of Staff witnesses that was filed by Applicant in this case. It's noted that Staff filed its response on Friday. Applicant has requested or indicated that it's going to file its reply by end of business tomorrow, March 8. The Bench is aware and accepting of that. It's likely then the Bench will engage in some brief oral argument relative to that motion at the start of the hearing on Wednesday, March 9, and we will reserve any ruling until that time.

Anything else preliminarily on the record that I have missed?

Seeing nothing, Mr. Settineri, I will invite Applicant to call its first witness.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honors.

At this time Kingwood Solar I LLC will call Mr. Dylan Stickney to the stand.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Stickney, you've been promoted. If you can enable your audio and video.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Good morning,

```
15
 1
    Mr. Stickney.
 2
                 MR. STICKNEY: Good morning.
 3
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: We can see you and hear
     you fine. I assume you have the same connection?
 4
                 MR. STICKNEY: I do. Yeah. You guys can
 5
 6
     all hear me okay?
 7
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. Would you raise
 8
     your right hand.
 9
                 (Witness sworn.)
10
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. Please
11
    proceed, Mr. Settineri.
12
                 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor.
13
     And I have a number of exhibits to mark which will
14
     take a few minutes, if I may.
15
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Please.
16
                 MR. SETTINERI: All right. I will start
17
     first with Kingwood Exhibit 1. That is the
18
     application that was filed in this proceeding.
19
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked.
20
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
21
                 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you. Next I will
22
     mark as Kingwood Exhibit 1C, this is a confidential
     portion of the application that was filed under seal.
23
24
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked.
25
                 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
```

1 MR. SETTINERI: Next I will mark as 2 Kingwood Exhibit 2, this is a compilation of 3 responses to Staff data requests by the Applicant that are also on the docket, but it is a compilation 4 document, so Kingwood Exhibit 2 will be submitted 5 6 separately to the court reporter. So I would like to 7 mark that. ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 8 9 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 10 MR. SETTINERI: Next is Kingwood -- I 11 would like to mark as Kingwood Exhibit 2, this is a 12 phase I archaeological investigation report. 13 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Settineri, I marked 14 the compilation document as 2. 15 MR. SETTINERI: I'm sorry. I may have 16 misspoken. This should be -- I would like as 17 Kingwood Exhibit 2C. 18 ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. 19 MR. SETTINERI: This is a archaeological 20 survey report that was filed under seal and that was 2.1 referenced in one of the Staff data responses. So 22 again, Kingwood Exhibit 2C was filed under seal. 23 It's an archaeological report. 24 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 25 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

1 MR. SETTINERI: Next as Kingwood Exhibit 2 3, this is a proof of service of the application. ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 3 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 4 5 MR. SETTINERI: That was publicly filed 6 on the docket. Next we would like to mark as 7 Kingwood Exhibit 4, this is a compilation of various 8 notices relating to landowner mailings. 9 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 10 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 11 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you. Next we would 12 like to mark as Kingwood Exhibit 5, this is a 13 compilation of various proofs of publication that are 14 also filed on the docket. 15 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 16 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 17 MR. SETTINERI: Next I would like to mark 18 as Kingwood Exhibit 6, this is the direct testimony 19 of Dylan Stickney. 20 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 2.1 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 2.2 MR. SETTINERI: Okay. And I would note 23 for the record at this time we mentioned earlier an 24 exhibit that was -- that had a scanning issue. 25 would be Attachment C to Mr. Stickney's testimony and what we will do is provide an updated -- we would like, with the Bench's permission, we would provide a corrected copy to the court reporter for filing on the docket and that simply would simply take the last page of a letter that was attached as Attachment C that was scanned as landscape when it should have been portrait. It's just a minor correction, but it ensures a precise record.

2.1

2.2

ALJ WILLIAMS: We talked about that off the record and there were no objections noted, but on the record I will offer the parties an opportunity. Seeing no one reach for their mute buttons or wave their hands so that is also indicated in -- that will be what the expectation is.

MR. SETTINERI: Okay. And next -- did you mark Kingwood Exhibit 6 just to make sure?

ALJ WILLIAMS: We did.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you. Next is
Kingwood Exhibit 7. We would like to mark as
Kingwood Exhibit 7 the supplemental testimony of
Mr. Dylan Stickney filed on March 4.

ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. SETTINERI: And last as Joint Exhibit 1 would be the Joint Stipulation and

Recommendation as to certificate conditions also

filed on the docket as of March -- on March 4, 2022.

ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- - -

DYLAN STICKNEY

MR. SETTINERI: All right.

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 By Mr. Settineri:

5

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Stickney.
- A. Good morning.
 - Q. Can you please state your name and business address for the record, please.
- A. My name is Dylan Stickney. Business

 address is 125 East John Carpenter Freeway, Suite 525

 in Irving, Texas.
 - Q. Okay. I want -- we've marked a number of exhibits, and now I would like to go through those exhibits and have you identify those for the record, please.

And starting first with Exhibit 1, can you identify that for the record, please.

A. The Kingwood application.

- Q. Okay. And was that prepared by you or at your direction?
 - A. Yes, it was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

- Q. Okay. If you could turn to what's been marked as Kingwood Exhibit 1C and could you identify that for the record, please.
- A. That would be the confidential portion of the application submitted to the OPSB for Kingwood Solar.
- Q. Okay. Next if you could turn to what's been marked as Kingwood Exhibit 2 and could you identify that for the record.
 - A. Exhibit 2 would be our compilation of responses to Staff Data Requests for Kingwood Solar.
 - Q. Okay. And were those prepared by you or at your direction?
- 17 A. Yes, they were.
- Q. And then if you could turn to Kingwood
 Exhibit 2C. Could you identify that for the record,
 please.
- A. Exhibit 2C would be the confidential portions of the responses to Staff Data Requests.
- Q. And specifically what is Exhibit -
 Kingwood Exhibit 2C, please?
- 25 A. I'm sorry?

Q. Could you -- specifically what is Kingwood Exhibit 2C for the record?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- A. Sure. So those are the confidential portions of our responses to Staff Data Requests.
- Q. Okay. And would that be archaeological survey results?
- A. Oh, correct, cultural survey results, specifically archaeological.
- Q. Okay. Then if you could turn to Kingwood Exhibit 3, please. And if you have that in front of you, could you please identify that for the record, please.
 - A. Yes, sir. Proof of service, so this is proof of public notices or in person informational meetings and initial public notice for --
- Q. Mr. Stickney, I want to make sure, do you have Kingwood Exhibit 3 in front of you?
 - A. I do. Yep.
- Q. Okay. And is that the proof of service of the application, sir?
- A. That's right. I'm sorry, of the application.
- Q. Right. Now turn to Kingwood Exhibit 4, please.
- 25 A. There it is.

- Q. Okay. And can you identify Kingwood Exhibit 4 for the record, please.
- A. So that would be proof of public notice regarding the public information meetings.
- Q. Okay. Did this exhibit include proof of landowner mailings?
 - A. It does, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. If you could turn then to Kingwood Exhibit 5, please, and identify that for the record.
- A. So this would be the proof of notice of the public information meeting.
- Q. Okay. Would this consist -- include newspaper publications?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Okay. And now could you identify
 Kingwood Exhibit 6 for the record, please.
- A. Exhibit 6 would be my direct testimony,

 18 Dylan Stickney, filed on February 24.
- Q. And that was prepared by you or at your direction?
- 21 A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Okay. And could you identify Kingwood Exhibit 7 for the record, please.
- A. That would be supplemental testimony of myself, Dylan Stickney, filed on March -- March 4.

- Q. Okay. And was that supplemental testimony prepared by you or at your direction?

 A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Okay. And then, lastly, do you have Joint Exhibit 1 before you?
- A. I do, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

- 7 Q. And can you identify that for the record, 8 please.
- 9 A. That would be the Joint Stipulation and 10 Recommendation as to certificate conditions.
- 11 Q. Okay. And were you involved in the 12 negotiations of that Stipulation?
- 13 A. Yes, I was.
- Q. All right. Turning back to Kingwood
 Exhibit 6, which is your direct testimony, do you
 have that before you?
- 17 A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Now, again, that was prepared you or at your direction, correct?
- 20 A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any changes or revisions to that testimony today?
- 23 A. I do.
- Q. Okay. If you can carefully walk through those for the court reporter, please.

I would be happy to. Turning first to 1 Α. 2 page 2 at line 13, I would like to replace the number "1,200" with the number "1,500," 1-5-0-0. 3 Next, turning to page 5 at line 20, I 4 would like to strike starting with the comma in the 5 6 middle of the line there and then following "US Army 7 Corps of Engineers (USACE)." Turning next to page 8, line No. 8, I 8 would like to replace the No. "5" with "6." 9 10 And turning to page 12, line 17 and 18, I would like to strike inside those parentheses there, 11 12 "(i.e., to the horizontal)." 13 Turning next to page 17, just a minor correction, line 19, the word "project" should have a 14 15 capital P. 16 And next turning to page 22 and line 22, 17 I would like to strike beginning with the word 18 "generally," the phrase "generally agrees with Staff's recommended conditions -- recommended 19 20 conditions but does." So starting with the word 2.1 "generally" and striking the rest of that line. 22 ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. So you would 23 leave "Yes, the Applicant"? 24 THE WITNESS: Correct. And then -- I'm

sorry. Then a correction on line 23 should read

"recommends" instead of "recommend." So that full response should read "Yes, the Applicant recommends some revisions as explained below."

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: Please proceed.

A. On page 23, following page, just a minor typo at line 14, strike the word "to," one of the words "to."

And turning next to page 22, this is in line 7 through 13. This is just a typo. That should read "Condition No. 22" so striking everywhere where it says "23" and replacing with "22" starting at line 7.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I have to interrupt. I'm sorry. You indicated at page 22. I assume that was incorrect.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, your Honor?

ALJ WILLIAMS: You indicated you went
back to page 22. What page are you on?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. This is 26.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Go ahead and go through the amendment again.

THE WITNESS: Page 26, starting at line 7, the Condition number should read "22" instead of "23." That was just a typo. So on line 7, line 8, line 11, and line 13, all of those number "23s"

should be replaced with "22."

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.

A. Next turning to page 28 at line 21, I would like to strike the words at the very beginning, "the same," replace that with the word "similar."

Next turning to page 31 at line 31, a format and correction here. The words "and that are marked" should also be underlined as a revision.

Just a few more here. Turning to page 37, starting with the line 5 -- or only in line 5, I would like to strike the first part of that sentence "of the 1,200 acre," replace that with "the" and after the word "project" insert "will include."

And then further in that line, line 5, after the word "acres" insert the word "that." So the beginning of that sentence should read "That project will include approximately 1,027 acres that will be located."

And then to page 39 in line 5, after the word "agrees" I would like to insert the words "or disagrees." And that's all I have got.

Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stickney. If I asked you the questions in your testimony as written today, would your answers be the same as you have revised today?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. If you could now turn to what's been marked as Kingwood Exhibit 7, your supplemental testimony, please.
 - A. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. And again, was that prepared by you or at your direction?
 - A. Yes, it was.
 - Q. Do you have any revisions to that or changes to that testimony today?
- 11 A. Just a few as well.
 - Q. If you could again -- you did a good job the first time. If you could slowly walk through for the court reporter, please.
 - A. Sure. So starting right on page 1 in line 16 inserting the word "Federation" after the word "Bureau." It should read the "Ohio Farm Bureau Federation."
- Q. Okay. Any other revisions, Mr. Stickney?
- A. There is a revision on page 11 at line
 21 28. After -- after the name "Mr. Finley's" striking
 22 the word "testimony" and replacing it with "will
 23 testify."
- 24 And next turning to page 15 in line 6 25 just a typo here, striking the word "to" after the

word "Applicant."

2.1

And same page 15 in line No. 9 towards the end of that line, "I do not believe that is" inserting the word "an," A-N, that "that is an appropriate."

Next to page 17, this is in line 5, again similar to the direct testimony, just formatting error, the words "and that are" should be underlined as a revision.

Next to page 22 in line No. 8, before the acronym "OFBF" insert the word "the."

And then same, page 22, line No. 9, striking the word "it" after "Stipulation."

Next to page 23 in line 14, after the phrase "As I explained in my direct testimony," insert the words "the project as demonstrated by."

Same line strike the word "and" at the very end of that line and replacing it with the word "the."

And the next line on the same page, 23, line No. 15, after the phrase "responses to Staff's data requests inserting the "and the Applicant's testimony."

And then last change here on page 24, from lines 1 to 3, I would like to strike starting

with the word "Applicant's" and continuing,

"Applicant's commitment to provide annual training to
the local emergency response service -- services
shows the Applicant's commitment to safety. The,"
striking all of those. So it should read from 1 to 3

"Similarly, the Joint Stipulation also provides for."
And those are all my changes.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Stickney.

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Stickney, can we go back to the page on 23 and have him read what the testimony is with his modifications.

MR. SETTINERI: Yeah. That would be page 23, your Honor, lines 14, 15, and 16, correct?

ALJ WILLIAMS: I believe so.

THE WITNESS: So in line 14 starting at the beginning of that answer "In my opinion, yes. As I explained in my direct testimony, the Project as demonstrated by the Application, the Applicant's responses to the Staff's data requests and the Applicant's testimony satisfies the statutory criteria for certificate of environmental compatibility and public need."

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you for the clarification.

Q. (By Mr. Settineri) Again, thank you,

Mr. Stickney. Regarding Kingwood Exhibit 7, your supplemental testimony, if I asked you the questions in that testimony today, would your answers be the same as written, subject to your revisions?

A. Yes, sir.

2.1

2.2

MR. SETTINERI: All right. Thank you, Mr. Stickney.

And, your Honor, the witness is available for cross-examination.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Settineri.
Let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: We were off the record for just a minute. We were discussing the priority of cross-examination. Obviously with the number of parties here, there would be quite a bit of cross-examination from multiple parties. We wanted to make sure the parties were comfortable with the order the Bench intended to proceed with, and then we also wanted to confirm, at least initially, what parties were expecting to cross-examination -- to cross-examine this witness.

With that we've determined that the Ohio Farm Bureau will be invited to cross-examination -- cross-examine witnesses that are proffered by the

31 1 Applicant in regard to issues that would not be 2 deemed friendly cross, so we will offer that first. Ms. Milam, any cross on behalf of the Farm Bureau? 3 MS. MILAM: No cross, your Honor. 4 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Ms. Milam. 6 With that then our next cross-examining 7 parties would be Citizens for Greene Acres. Yes, 8 Mr. Van Kley. 9 MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, thank you, your 10 Honor. 11 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 By Mr. Van Kley: 14 Ο. Good morning, Mr. Stickney. 15 Α. Good morning. I am going to generally follow the 16 Ο. 17 outline you provided in your direct testimony, both 18 your original direct testimony and your supplemental 19 direct testimony. So why don't we start there and 20 first with your original direct testimony which has 2.1 been marked as Kingwood Exhibit No. 6. Do you have 22 that in front of you? 23 Α. I do. 24 All right. And we are going to generally Ο.

follow the order of the questions and answers in your

direct testimony, perhaps with a few changes here and there. So why don't we start then on page 1 of your direct testimony and I would like to direct you to your answer to question 3. My first question has to do with line 11 of your answer 3 where you state that you obtained a BS in business administration. Would you tell me generally what kind of studies you had to obtain that B.S. degree.

- A. Sure. Be happy to. So Bachelor of Science in business administration from the University of New Hampshire, as it states, includes general business course work including finance, economics, management, marketing, et cetera. My particular focus was in international business and economics, included some extra course work in international course work and whatnot, international economics, finance, and whatnot, but pretty standard business administration course work.
- Q. Okay. To obtain that degree, did you have any course work in designing solar facilities?
 - A. I did not.

2.1

Q. Then let's go to line 12 where you state that you have worked in the industry -- the energy industry since 2013, with more than five years of experience in renewable and sustainable energy

development and technologies. So there you had a period of time where you state that you had more than five years of experience in renewable and sustainable energy development and technologies. During which years did you have that more than five years of experience?

2.1

2.2

- A. Those would be the more recent years so beginning in 2016 to current.
- Q. Okay. So what did you do for your career between 2013 and 2016?
- A. Starting in 2013, I worked as a technical recruiter and management consultant for a company called the Bradsby Group based out of Denver,

 Colorado. I was primarily tasked with recruiting and consulting with technical firms, technical companies in the energy energy industry including renewables, oil, gas, chemicals, various different heavy industrial industries. Primarily my focus was recruiting engineers in those disciplines.
- Q. Okay. Did any of the experience during that time involve the design of solar facilities?
- A. Me personally I was not involved in designing solar facilities. I did have quite a bit of interaction with candidates and job responsibilities for some of the clients that I

worked for in renewables and project management of similar -- similar responsibilities.

2.1

- Q. Okay. What did those responsibilities entail concerning solar?
- A. It was generally associated with assessing the candidates' qualifications in performing those types of responsibilities.
- Q. Okay. Then starting in line 14, your testimony states that you worked as a senior manager of business development for a utility-scale solar development company. What did those duties entail?
- A. So I was responsible for originating new utility-scale solar project sites, assessing those sites, negotiating land agreements with landowners of various different ownership structures, assessing properties specifically as to their suitability for potentially hosting a utility-scale solar facility.

You know, supporting various other aspects of the business like, you know, mergers and acquisitions of solar development projects, you know, for mid-stage as we call it or late-stage development task work like interconnection submissions, reviews, navigating the study process with various different transmission organizations, and quite a bit of -- of, like I said, landowner but also community engagement

talking with various different authorities that have jurisdiction in certain areas where those project sites were located, understanding zoning ordinances, planning guidelines, you know, how a community may already have restrictions or guidelines for utility-scale solar projects, or if not, how they may consider implementing or at the very least what questions they may have for a large-scale solar installation to come into their community.

- Q. Now, let's go to the second page of your direct testimony.
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. Lines 1 to 3 where you state that you joined Vesper in January 2021. What have your duties been for Vesper?
- A. Yes. So since joining Vesper Energy in 2021 in January, my responsibility has been primarily managing early, mid, and late stage, as we call it, of development work for large-scale solar projects, specifically almost entirely in the PJM market so that would include Ohio. Managing the Kingwood project and being involved with, you know, some other potential development pursuits of Vesper Energy within the State of Ohio but more broadly mostly in the PJM market.

- Q. Have you ever developed a solar project from beginning to end?
- A. I'm not sure what you mean beginning to end.
- Q. Have you ever -- have you ever managed the -- the entire development of a solar project starting at the beginning of the development and concluding at the end of the development?
- A. I personally have not managed the same project from conception to completion of construction and beginning of operation, if that's what you mean.
- Q. Yes. Have you ever operated or been involved in the operation of a solar facility?
 - A. I have not, no.

2.1

2.2

- Q. With respect to the Kingwood project, what was the status of the project when you started working on it?
- A. Could you -- could you elaborate on what you mean by status of the project?
- Q. Sure. At what stage in the development was the Kingwood project when you started to work on it? What had been finished and what remained to be done?
- A. Sure. So Kingwood was -- was fairly advanced as far as the development work that had been

completed. We technically as Vesper would classify it was a mid-stage project. We had already secured a PJM Interconnection new services queue identification number, had already been through the system impact study phase. We had successfully received that report, and the facility study phase of the PJM Interconnection process had already been initiated.

2.1

There were at that time more than

1,500 acres under lease or similar land agreement

for -- for potential use and consideration for the

Kingwood project and the project site. There had

already been several public meetings held with public

invite to community members to learn more about the

project, how the development worked, the design at

that time of what the project could look like.

There had been, of course, a number of engagements with not just the landowners that had elected to participate and sign an agreement, be a part of the Kingwood Solar project, but a number of discussions with various other landowners in exploring and -- and considering other properties to include in the Kingwood Solar project.

There were a number of field surveys and studies that had already been conducted both from the desktop level all the way to, you know, on the ground

field activity, whether it be very technical geotechnical type of work, environmental type of work, ecological surveys and whatnot.

2.1

And in January of 2021 when I joined Vesper Energy, the intent was to compile and plan to submit an application to the Ohio Power Siting Board very soon after that, after January of 2021.

- Q. So did Kingwood enter into any new leases for land to be included in the project after you came onboard?
 - A. I believe so to a minimal extent.
- Q. Now, are you generally familiar with what had been done on the project prior to the time that you joined Vesper from looking at records or any other means?
 - A. I would say generally, yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you know when Kingwood started to negotiate leases from landowners for the project?
- A. If my memory serves me correctly, that would have started in 2017.
- Q. And do you know when the last lease that you -- that Vesper entered into was concluded?
- A. Well, none of the leases have concluded at this point. The last lease agreement that was executed and signed both by our company

representatives and the landowner himself would have been in the first quarter of 2021.

2.1

- Q. What -- were those not leases or options to lease or something different?
- A. They would have been either a lease and easement agreement, lease and/or easement agreement, or option to lease or option for easement.
- Q. Okay. Did any of those leases or options signed by the participating landowners prohibit those landowners from discussing the leases or options with persons who are not party to the lease or option?

MR. SETTINERI: I will object at this time as seeking confidential information, your Honor.

MR. VAN KLEY: I don't think there is any trade secret involved in answering whether there's a confidentiality or -- yeah, confidentiality provision in the lease. Mr. Settineri's objection, in fact, appears to admit that there was so.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I will just say that every document -- every contract is different, and I think we can let Mr. Stickney answer whether those would be subject to confidentiality. But to inquire as to the terms of a lease, if it is subject to confidentiality, that would be a confidential disclosure that should be discussed and

at a minimum would be -- it would have to be discussed before we agree to put that in the record in any form. That's standard.

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: There is nothing confidential -- there is nothing that constitutes a trade secret that can harm Vesper if there's a term in it that prevents a landowner from discussing the lease with the public. There's no trade secret status for that -- that information.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I agree. There is nothing trade secret about whether there's some leases out there that have confidentiality provisions so we will let him answer generally. As we proceed, if there is more detailed objections regarding some of the specific lease questions, we will further engage.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, if I may.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Settineri.

MR. SETTINERI: Again, you know, violating a lease's terms as to confidentiality can be an issue.

ALJ WILLIAMS: The question posed is were any of the leases issued subject to confidentiality provisions. To the extent that question exists in a global basis, he is allowed to answer.

MR. SETTINERI: And, your Honor, the

question asked related to whether the leases provided specific questions about, you know, what -- what the lease -- lessor could do. So as to whether the -- and I will let Mr. Stickney answer as to whether he has any concerns, but as to the question of whether leases contain confidentiality provisions, you know, that's a general statement, question.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, do you want to reask the question?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.

2.1

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, do any of the leases signed with the landowners for the Kingwood project contain confidentiality provisions that would prohibit the landowner from revealing anything about the lease to --

MR. SETTINERI: Same objection, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Overruled.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, if I may, he is asking specific terms. He is not asking if they have confidentiality. He follows it up with his question that he's asking for specific terms as to whether they contain provisions that would prohibit them from opposing the project.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Again, he is not asking

specific leaseholders. He is asking about whether any of the leases have confidentiality provisions, and he is defining what confidentiality provisions are. The objection is overruled. The witness can answer.

MR. SETTINERI: Okay.

2.1

A. So what I will say is, as is very common with real estate agreements in specifically the solar development industry in my experience, there was a general confidentiality provision in -- in the agreements associated with Kingwood Solar specific to trying to keep confidential any proprietary or, you know, commercial perhaps or provisions of the lease with any of those agreements and agreement landowners.

However, in my experience, I have never seen that type of confidentiality provision enforced nor have we enforced that with any of the landowners with the Kingwood project. I know this has been a common topic of conversation, and I know that many of those landowners have shared with family members or friends or farm tenants just generally the lease may exist.

Q. Let's go to answer 4 of your direct testimony on page 2. And there you are asked to

describe Vesper Energy and I have a few questions about that answer.

A. Yes, sir.

2.

2.1

- Q. Yes. Look at line 7, please, of that answer where it's stated that "Since its founding, Vesper Energy has commercialized more than 680 megawatts of solar projects in the United States."

 Do you see that?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Has Vesper -- what do you mean by "commercialized"?
- A. In my understanding, again, as I was not a part of Vesper Energy prior to January of 2021, my understanding commercialized would mean either successfully constructed and in operation, successfully financed and sold to then be as a fully approved and ready for construction asset. Many of those projects, many of that 680 megawatts of projects, I do know has been successfully constructed and in operation today.
- Q. Okay. So were those projects sold to a different company then for operation?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Does Vesper operate any of the solar projects that it develops?

Energy, yes. Those -- those projects that may have been sold since its -- since the founding of Vesper Energy in 2015, formerly known as Lendlease Energy Development. The business model of Lendlease Energy Development was purely the development of solar project assets, not the operation of solar project assets. Since Vesper Energy -- since the I will say creation but rebranding as Vesper Energy, the business model today is to develop, own, and operate solar projects that we work on.

2.1

- Q. How many similar projects does Vesper operate?
- A. There are a number of projects in the Vesper portfolio that are either in development, in pre-construction planning in that they received all necessary permits for construction to commence, or are in the early stages of construction. There are no Vesper projects today that are fully operational that are owned by Vesper Energy.
- Q. Okay. And it sounds like Vesper hasn't completed the construction of any projects yet; is that true?
- A. Not since January of 2021 when I joined the Company.

Q. Okay. Do you know -- do you know whether Vesper completed the construction of any solar projects prior to the time that you joined the Company?

2.1

2.2

- A. I wouldn't be able to speak with certainty about what happened prior to when I joined the Company as to whether Vesper and Vesper representatives or Company members specifically completed construction or navigated into operations of certain projects.
- Q. When you state in your testimony that Vesper has commercialized more than 680 megawatts of solar projects in the US, can you tell me the number of solar projects that that represents?
- A. That's a good question. I don't recall the specific number of those projects. There were -- if I had to estimate, about a handful.
 - Q. Somewhere around five?
 - A. Five or six, I would say, yes.
- Q. Do you know how many acres of developed solar projects are included in that 680 megawatts?
 - A. I don't know specifically, no.
- Q. For comparison purposes though, the
 Kingwood project is anticipated to produce
 175 megawatts?

A. Correct.

2.1

Q. When you say that this is the number of megawatts of solar projects commercialized by Vesper since its founding, are you treating its founding as the time that Lendlease was rebranded as Vesper?

MR. SETTINERI: I would just object as to mischaracterizing the testimony as to the number of projects in his testimony. He lists the megawatts.

MR. VAN KLEY: I think that's what I said, but I will ask the question again to make sure.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) With regard to your sentence on -- starting on line 7 about where you say that "Since its founding, Vesper Energy has commercialized more than 680 megawatts of solar projects," are you treating its founding as the date when Lendlease was rebranded as Vesper?
- A. No, sir. That would be -- I would be treating the date as referenced in line 5 of that answer 4, founded in 2015.
- Q. Okay. Then starting at line 7 where you say that "Vesper Energy's current development pipeline represents 3 gigawatts of renewable energy and energy storage projects across the country," that represents the amount of renewable energy projects that are under development; is that correct?

- A. I'm sorry, Mr. Van Kley. I don't see that in line 7.
 - Q. Line 10. Line 10.

2.1

- A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
- Q. Yeah, sure. In lines 10 and 11 where you state that "Vesper Energy's current development pipeline represents 3 gigawatts of renewable energy and energy storage projects across the country," I take it that these are the projects that are currently being development -- being developed prior to construction; is that correct?
- A. That's generally correct, yes. Vesper generally has approximately 3 megawatts of projects in various different stages of development, not yet in construction.
- Q. Are all of those projects solar facilities?
- A. As it states right there, would be either renewable energy or referring to solar facilities, predominantly solar facilities, and a portion of that would represent energy storage facilities as well.
- Q. How is Vesper Energy related to Kingwood Solar I LLC?
- A. Kingwood Solar I LLC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Vesper Energy.

- Q. So Vesper Energy is a member of Kingwood Solar I LLC?
 - A. Correct, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Are there any other members of Kingwood Solar I LLC?
- 6 MR. SETTINERI: Just object as to ambiguity as to member.

ALJ WILLIAMS: To the extent the witness understands the question, we will let him answer. If he needs clarification, he will let us know.

- A. Yeah. I'm -- I don't believe so. And I
 am not sure if I understand what you mean by "member"
 but.
 - Q. Okay. Well, perhaps I should explain it because it's kind of a legal term. Are you -- do you know that the owners of a limited liability company are -- are referred to as members?
 - A. I do, yeah.

MR. SETTINERI: O -- okay.

- Q. So in light of that understanding then, are there any other members of Kingwood Solar LLC besides Vesper Energy?
- A. To my understanding Vesper Energy is the sole member of Kingwood Solar I LLC.
 - Q. Okay. And is Vesper Energy owned by --

let me see, what's the -- is Vesper Energy a
corporation or a different kind of entity?

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: I am just going to object at this time as to lack of foundation as to whether this witness is familiar with the corporate structure of, you know, any entity here.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We will let the witness answer what he is aware of. Thank you,
Mr. Settineri.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you.

- A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat your question, Mr. Van Kley?
- Q. Yeah. Let me ask a different question.

 It's kind of a setup of what I am requesting here.

 Is -- is Vesper Energy owned by any other company?
 - A. My understanding Vesper Energy is owned by a firm called Magnetar Capital and that's really the extent to my knowledge of that ownership structure or agreement or what may be in place regarding that relationship.
 - Q. Okay. Is Magnetar Capital a company that was founded in the United States or in a different country?
- 24 MR. SETTINERI: Object, compound 25 question.

MR. VAN KLEY: No. It's either/or.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Stickney, are you

3 aware of that answer to that question?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- A. I don't know as to the founding of that company.
- Q. Yeah. Well, do you know whether -- whether that company is a foreign company as opposed to a US company?
- A. I believe that company is a US-based company.
- Q. Okay. And what about Vesper, is it a
 US-based company or foreign company?
 - A. Yes, sir, US-based company.
 - Q. Okay. Let's go to your answer to question 5 on page 2 of your testimony. Starting on line 14, there is a statement that the project area is characterized by gently rolling topography with elevations ranging between 920 and 1,080 feet above mean sea level. Do you see that?
 - A. I do.
 - Q. Where did you obtain those elevations?
 - A. Well, one of the -- one of the activities that is always conducted by our team when considering a project is a topography survey. We conducted a topography survey, collected all that data and have

continuously used it to analyze and design this project, would include elevations above mean sea level.

- Q. Okay. How were those elevations calculated for this project, Kingwood project?
- A. You know, I don't know the specifics of exactly how they calculate the elevations. This is a fairly technical survey that takes place and we contracted that out.
- Q. Do you know whether these elevations were calculated as a result of fieldwork done on behalf of Kingwood?
- A. It was to my understanding a combination of fieldwork as well as aerial lidar imagery.
- Q. What do you mean by that last term? Aerial what was it again?
- A. Lidar imagery. That's a technology used to assess topography and ground elevations.
- Q. Let's go to page 3 of your testimony starting with line 3 where you state that "the specific module has not yet been selected." Do you see that?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

Q. I take it then that the application does not anywhere identify the specific module that will

be used?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- A. That's correct. Our application does not specify exactly which module or manufacturer would be used for this project. However, we do provide representative module manufacturers and specifications of certain modules that are available on market today.
- Q. All right. Let's go further down on page 3 to line 18 where you state that "The Project is expected to operate with an annual capacity factor of up to 23 percent." Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Does that mean that for 77 percent of the time the project will not produce energy?
- A. I don't believe that's what that means, no.
 - Q. What does it mean then?
- 18 My understanding of capacity factor is Α. 19 that a project can produce electricity for up to a 20 certain percent of its nameplate capacity so up to 2.1 23 percent of the total electricity production. For 22 instance, if a solar panel were exposed to direct 23 unobstructed sunlight generating maximum output of 24 capacity for 24 hours a day, that would be a 25 100 percent capacity factor.

Q. Okay. I am not sure I understood the answer. I am sure it was correct, but I want to make sure I understand it. So does that -- that mean that a solar project of 175 megawatts would produce 23 percent of the 175 megawatts per day?

2.1

- A. To my understanding, capacity factor is in relation to the energy that is produced, not the maximum capacity of power able to be produced, able to be generated. So it's -- a capacity factor is related to a measure of how much electricity over a period of time that you can produce based on solar irradiance, exposure to sunlight, and how a project is -- is engineered and designed.
- Q. All right. So given that the Kingwood project is anticipated to produce 175 megawatts -- first of all, is that daily?
- A. 175 megawatts would be the design capacity of the Kingwood Solar project so that would be the maximum capacity, and power generation capacity in my understanding can be defined as an instantaneous maximum output of power. So if you are referring to a day's worth of energy production, the more accurate terminology to use would be megawatt-hours of electricity.
 - Q. Okay. Based on your understanding of how

solar projects work, during what percentage of the year would you expect the solar project at Kingwood to produce electricity?

2.1

- A. I wouldn't be able to give a specific number to that as far as percentage of the year in total.
- Q. Okay. Do you know generally for the solar industry what percentage of the time solar power ordinarily produces electricity?
- A. I guess that's a tough question to answer. It varies greatly depending on exposure to sunlight, weather conditions, and also specifically how each project is designed and constructed, what technologies are being used.

I do know that, you know, solar technology is -- is certainly rapidly improving and can produce electricity even without direct and unobstructed exposure to sunlight and -- and clear daytime conditions which is really what's -- what's helped to make these projects feasible in certain climates.

- Q. Well, for Kingwood Solar, what percentage of the time do you expect that the project will produce electricity?
 - A. Again, I don't know a specific number as

to what percentage of the time throughout the year that a project would be producing any electricity.

2.1

- Q. With respect to Kingwood Solar specifically, will that project be able to produce electricity only when the sun is shining?
- A. I -- I suppose that's a subjective opinion on -- on if the sun is shining or not shining on any particular day, right? I do know that I would say that in daylight conditions and daylight hours, then solar technology is able to produce electricity regardless of a cloudless blue sky day. Daylight conditions solar technology today can produce electricity.
- Q. Okay. Will Kingwood be able to produce electricity during darkness?
- A. The -- the solar modules themselves in my understanding would not produce electricity during nighttime and dark hours of the day.
- Q. Will Kingwood have inverters that will be able to conduct any activity at night?
- A. They will have that ability, yes, as would any inverter.
- Q. Okay. What's the purpose of those activities that are conducted at night by the inverters?

A. There is a -- in my understanding there is a term used called reactive power and this is something that helps to, again in how I understand it, not having a technical background myself, that this helps to improve local grid reliability in nighttime hours where a project like Kingwood Solar could have the ability to, I guess, produce or at least participate in reactive power activities because of the way that inverters are connected to the transmission system and how they can operate.

2.1

- Q. Okay. So at Kingwood, it is anticipated that the inverters will operate at night?
- A. They may. I can't say for certain if they will every night of the year.
 - Q. Do you anticipate that Kingwood's inverters will contain transformers?
 - A. You know, I don't know. That's a technical question above -- above my level of expertise.
 - Q. Yeah. If the inverters do operate at night as you and I have been discussing, will those inverters produce sound at night?
- A. If the inverters are dispatched to
 operate at night, I believe they would produce a
 limited level of sound.

- Q. Let's go to page 7 of your direct testimony, answer 10.
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

2.2

- Q. Let's look at lines 15 through 17 where you talk -- you testify about meeting with the Little Miami Conservancy about the project. How many times did you meet with the Little Miami Conservancy?
- A. Well, we met with them I guess as it's referenced in my direct testimony once in February of 2022. And to this point we have met with them several times both in person and telephonic or virtually.
- Q. Can you give me the names of the person or persons from the Little Miami Conservancy you've met with?
 - A. Their Executive Director whose name is Jason Brownknight and the President of their Board whose name is Rhett Rohrer.
 - Q. Do you have any written documentation from the Little Miami Conservancy stating that the Conservancy didn't have a concern about the project?
 - A. I guess we don't have any written documentation. It would be -- there may be some e-mail communication referring to that.
 - Q. Did you turn over that written

documentation, that is, the e-mails to your counsel for production to the other parties in this case?

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: I will just object to the extent you are going into discovery, any kind of discovery dispute that may be subject to objections.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will note the objection.

I will let him answer to the extent he understands
the question did you turn over any e-mail
communications between the Little Miami Conservancy
and the Applicant.

- A. You know, I am not sure. I don't know if we turned it over for the purpose of producing to parties for this case.
- Q. Let's go to page 9 of your direct testimony, answer 11. Directing you first to line 9, there is sentence starting there that says "Public meetings were held by the Applicant on October 26, 2020." Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Was that the first outreach that Kingwood made to the public to educate the public about this project?
- A. I can't say for certain that was the first or not as I was not a participant in that meeting itself or the planning or arranging for that

1 meeting.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Are you aware of any communications that Kingwood made to the public prior to the time of October 26, 2020?
- A. I believe there were several conversations held with members of the public and members of the local community that were not affiliated or engaged or a participant in the Kingwood Solar project.
 - O. With whom did those discussions occur?
- A. I can't recall exact names off the top of my head right now.
 - Q. Well, can you tell me whether or not
 Kingwood made any outreach to the general community
 to educate them about this project prior to
 October 26, 2020?
 - A. I can't say. Again, I was not employed or affiliated with Kingwood at that time.
 - Q. Does Kingwood Solar have a website?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you know when that website started operation?
- A. Generally I believe it was around that same time, October or fourth quarter of 2020.
- Q. What is the status of Kingwood's leases

with the participating landowners as of October 26, 2020? For example, do you know whether most of the acreage in today's project area was signed up by that time?

2.1

- A. There were -- to my understanding at that time there were a number of lease easement or similar agreements executed at the time of that October 2020 meeting.
- Q. Do you know how much of the current acreage had been leased or was the subject of options to lease by that time?
- A. I don't know exactly how many -- how many acres or how many agreements specifically were imposed at that time.
- Q. Can you provide me with an estimate of how much had been signed up by that time?
- MR. SETTINERI: Just object. Asked and answered.
- ALJ WILLIAMS: He is asking a different question, whether he has an estimate or not.
- A. I don't have an estimate would be -- with any level of certainty as to its accuracy.
- Q. Yeah. I am not asking you for a certain number. I am asking you for an estimate.
 - A. At that time I would estimate more than a

thousand acres.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. Your testimony mentioned some good neighbor agreements. Let's see if we can find that. I think you indicated corrections you made today on page 8 of your testimony that the Applicant has entered into six good neighbor agreements; is that an accurate statement?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. When did Kingwood Solar first start to offer good neighbor agreements to members of the community?
 - A. That would be in August of 2021.
- Q. Are you familiar with the design of the project area for the Kingwood project?
 - A. I am, yes.
- Q. Why don't we turn to the application and I would like you to take a look at Figure 03-3. I believe that there is an update to that figure.
- MR. SETTINERI: Mr. Van Kley, what number exhibit are you on now?
- MR. VAN KLEY: Just give me a moment. I am trying to find the number.
- MR. SETTINERI: Thank you.
- MR. VAN KLEY: This would be Kingwood
- 25 | Exhibit No. 2.

- A. Okay. I'm sorry. Which figure are you referring to?
 - Q. That's 03-3.
 - A. Give me a moment to find it here.
- 5 Q. Just give me a moment. I will give 6 everybody the PDF page number.

7 MR. SETTINERI: And, Mr. Van Kley,

8 Mr. Stickney has a paper copy.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay.

10 A. Okay.

3

4

9

11 Q. All right. Did you find it?

MR. VAN KLEY: For everybody using an

electronic copy from the Board's website you can find

14 that on PDF page 26 of 198. Actually that's the last

page. It looks like it is a three-page document that

- 16 starts at page 24 of 198.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right.
- 18 Mr. Stickney, have you found it?
- 19 A. Yes, sir. Figure 03-3?
- Q. Yes. And this is an updated version of
- 21 that figure; is that right?
- 22 A. I'm not sure what you mean by updated.
- 23 This was up to date as of the filing of the
- 24 application, yes.
- Q. Okay. I am looking at the legend for the

figure in the lower right-hand corner where it says "Updated Figure 03-3 Project Layout." Do you see that?

A. I don't see the word "Updated."

MR. SETTINERI: Mr. Van Kley, can you ascertain that Mr. Stickney has the right exhibit? I think you are referring to Kingwood Exhibit 2, is that right, not the Kingwood Exhibit 1, the application?

MR. VAN KLEY: That's correct.

MR. SETTINERI: Okay. Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, are you on Exhibit No. 2?
- A. I'm sorry. I was in the wrong exhibit there.

MR. SETTINERI: Mr. Van Kley, for the record did you want to identify what -- the date of that response? Because that exhibit does have a compilation of responses.

- A. Okay. My apologies. I have it up.
- Q. Did you find it?
- A. I did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Q. Okay. Good. All right. So do you see in the lower right-hand corner where it states that the figure is "Updated Figure 03-3"? A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. All right. And is that a figure that was changed from the time that Figure 03-3 was originally included in the application?
- A. Mr. Van Kley, it appears to me that very minor either formatting or changes were made to identify certain features of the project in the project facilities.
- Q. Okay. So the -- the outline of the project area did not change in the updated figure; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct from what I can see.
- Q. Okay. Now, if you would look at sheet 1 of 3 on Updated Figure 03-3 in Kingwood Exhibit 2, I would like to ask you a question about the sheet's index at the bottom of the page. If you could find that for me, please.
 - A. I can see it, yes.
- Q. Okay. The sheet index shows the entire outline of the Kingwood project; is that correct?
 - A. It appears so.
- Q. Okay. Now, when Kingwood started to
 negotiate for leases with participating landowners,
 did Kingwood have a specific area in mind that it
 wanted to develop the project on?

- A. I mean, you know, again, I wasn't an employee of Vesper or affiliated with Kingwood at the time it originally began negotiating lease agreements and pursuing development of the Kingwood project. I can't say for certain if it had a specific area or specific properties that it wanted to develop this project on.
- Q. But do you see the shape of the project area in that sheet index?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you know whether Kingwood had that particular shape in mind for its project at the time it started to negotiate with landowners?
- MR. SETTINERI: Object, asked and answered.
- 16 ALJ WILLIAMS: It's a different question.
- MR. SETTINERI: He stated he wasn't aware
- 18 of it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2.1

22

- ALJ WILLIAMS: It's a different question.

 I will let him answer.
 - A. I don't think anybody had any particular shape in mind for this project at the beginning of its development.
- Q. Based on what you know, if anything, from people you talked to at Kingwood or records that you

reviewed or any other source of information, can you explain how the project came to have this shape that you see in this sheet index?

2.1

- A. My understanding is -- is it was a combination of which of the landowners in this area were interested to participate, the subsequent field studies and surveys that were conducted to assess the suitability of those properties for potentially hosting the Kingwood Solar project, and, you know, likely a number of other considerations that helped to define the shape of the project area as you see it on that sheet index today.
- Q. Can you tell me the number -- the approximate number of miles is between the southwest boundary of the project area and northeast boundary of the project area?
- A. I believe it's about, you know, give or take a few miles, if my memory serves me. I don't know exactly what that number is.
- Q. Are you aware of any disadvantages that a shape of this nature has for a solar project as opposed to a project that is -- is more closely compacted in its parcels?
- A. I'm not aware of any specific disadvantages.

- Q. Well, can you tell me the number of miles that are in the boundaries of the project that interface with the properties of nonparticipating landowners?
- A. I -- excuse me. I don't know what that number is.
 - Q. How many landowners have agreed to lease land for the project area?
 - A. I believe there were 17 different landowner or landowner entities that agreed to enter into an agreement to participate in the Kingwood project.
 - Q. Let's go to page 11 of your direct testimony. Starting at the top with the heading of "Property values," you had made some statements about property values in lines 1 to 8. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. Do you have any license to appraise the value of properties?
 - A. I do not.
 - Q. So you are not an expert in the evaluation of property values.
- A. I'm not an expert in evaluating property
 values. That's why we commission and rely on the
 experts to conduct that study for us. I have got

full confidence in their results and conclusions.

Q. So in lines 1 through 8 where you discuss the property values, you are just summarizing what your property valuation expert testified about, right?

MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object as mischaracterizing the testimony in lines 1 to 8.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Objection noted. He can answer the question.

- A. In that section of my testimony, I am referencing these study -- the outside study that Kingwood Solar commissioned to assess impacts and potential impacts to property values.
- Q. Okay. So you are just summarizing that study.

MR. SCHMIDT: This is Micah.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Yes, Micah.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, yes, I am.

19 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

21 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on the

22 record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

20

Mr. Van Kley, do you need the question

24 reread?

MR. VAN KLEY: No. I will just reask it.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Please.

2.1

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, on page 11 from lines 1 through 8, you were just summarizing the information you received from your property valuation expert, correct?

MR. SETTINERI: Yeah, and just for the record, I will note an objection as to mischaracterizing the testimony in 1 through 8. Thank you.

ALJ WILLIAMS: So noted. Please answer.

- A. So on page 11 in lines 1 through 8, it looks like I reference the study that we commissioned from an outside consultant in the first few lines referenced and summarized how the study was conducted and then summarized the conclusion of that study and then also referenced Mr. Andrew Lines from CohnReznick, who will also be providing testimony, can speak to that study in particular in a lot more detail.
- Q. On lines 9 through 19 on page 11 entitled "Groundwater Contamination," that -- that is also information that you received from somebody else who is testifying?
- A. No, sir, not -- not entirely. I do reference Dr. Brent Finley who will also be serving

- testimony, providing testimony in this case. But there is a lot more information in that section than just what he will be providing or information that was given to me.
 - Q. Are you a hydrogeologist?
- A. No, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Are you an expert in groundwater contamination?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Is there anything in lines 9 through 19 that you have the expertise to provide an expert opinion on?
- MR. SETTINERI: I will just object.

 Calling for a legal conclusion.
 - ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, can you ask it with a little bit more specificity, please?

 MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.
 - Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Do you believe that you are qualified to provide any of the statements in lines 9 through 19?
 - A. I believe as the Development Project

 Manager for the Kingwood project, I am qualified to

 offer that we will implement best management

 practices in accordance with the Ohio EPA's

 construction general permit in relation to stormwater

and groundwater management procedures.

2.1

Also as the Development Manager, I think
I am qualified to offer that we voluntarily, as a
response to one of Staff's Data Requests, will offer
to test all active drinking wells within 100 feet of
the project area. Nowhere in that section do I claim
to be an expert hydrogeologist or expert in
groundwater contamination.

Q. Okay. Yeah, that's a very good answer. Thank you. So in the last sentence of those lines, which would be lines 18 and 19, you don't have any training or experience that would allow you to state that solar panels are not a threat to groundwater contamination.

MR. SETTINERI: Just object as to mischaracterizing the testimony in the last sentence as to what it says.

ALJ WILLIAMS: He didn't ask what the last sentence says. He asked for clarification regarding whether his -- he had expertise as to solar panel groundwater contamination. He can ask -- he can answer the question.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, can I have that question reread, please?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Sure. Ms. Gibson.

(Record read.)

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: I will withdraw my objection, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Settineri.
Mr. Stickney.

- A. I personally do not have the expertise to claim whether or why solar panels are not a threat to groundwater contamination, simply referencing

 Dr. Brent Finley's testimony that's been provided.
- Q. Then on the same page, page 11 of your testimony, starting on line 20 with the words
 "Wildlife impacts" and going through page 12, line
 14, do you have any training or expertise on wildlife impacts?
- A. Yeah, to the extent they relate to development of solar projects?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. A nominal level of wildlife impacts as it relates to solar development and solar projects. You know, again, I reference in this testimony I reference Ms. Gresock's testimony that can speak to how that survey was conducted, the coordination that happened in relation to assessing potential impacts to wildlife. But me personally I am not a wildlife expert, if that's what you are asking.

- Q. Yes, sir. Thank you. Go to page 13 of your testimony. Starting on line 1 with the heading "Construction impacts," are you a transportation engineer?
 - A. I am not a transportation engineer, no.
- Q. Let's go to page 14 starting with line 4 entitled "Drain tile impacts and surface runoff."

 You are not a drainage expert, are you?
- A. I would not consider myself a drainage expert. I have learned a tremendous amount about agricultural drain tile in my past five or six years of working in the solar development industry and field.
- Q. Let's go to page 15. There is a heading on line 1 for "Project lighting." Are you an expert in project lighting?
- A. I am not sure if that field of expertise actually exists.
 - Q. Uh-huh. Are you an electrician?
 - A. No, sir.

2.1

- Q. Okay. Is there a final design showing locations of lights in the project area anywhere to be found in your application?
- A. There is not. As typically happens in a development of these projects, that's something that

occurs closer to the start of construction of the project.

- Q. Is there anything in Kingwood's responses to Staff's Data Requests providing the locations of the lights for the project?
- A. There is not in the Staff's Data Requests and our responses to those requests. Again, lighting locations is something that typically happens much closer to the start of construction.
- Q. Go to line 19 of page 15 where you see the heading "Hazardous chemicals from solar panels." You are not an environmental scientist, correct?
 - A. I am not.

2.1

2.2

- Q. You don't have any expertise in determining whether panels exhibit characteristics of toxicity?
- A. I personally do not which is why I reference the United States EPA's procedure for testing for any toxicity in solar panels.
- Q. Let's go to page 16 of your testimony, line 5, and there you state that there will be an additional 20 feet minimum distance between the fence line and any panels. Do you see that?
- A. I do.
 - Q. Okay. Would you turn to the narrative of

the application for this case.

- A. Do you have a specific page number?
- Q. Yes, there is. That would be page 118.

 And tell me when you have found that page.
- 5 A. I have, yep.

1

2

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. All right. Go to the last paragraph on that page under the heading "Proposed Mitigation Measures."
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. This is a paragraph that provides some setbacks for the project, correct?
 - A. As a part of proposed mitigation measures, yes.
 - Q. All right. And it's stated in the first part of that paragraph that "The Project has been designed with at least a 25-foot setback from adjacent roads and non-participating properties." Do you see that?
 - A. I do see that.
 - Q. And then if you work your way down to the fifth line of that paragraph, there is a sentence that says "An additional setback distance of approximately 20 feet is anticipated between the fence line and the arrays." Do you see that?
- 25 A. I do see that.

Q. All right. So here in the application it's stated that the additional setback distance will be approximately 20 feet, but in your testimony on page 16, line 5, you state that there will be an additional 20 feet minimum distance between the fence line and any solar panels. So my question to you is which is -- which is accurate? Your testimony or what's stated in the application?

2.1

A. In my mind those read almost identical or very, very similar referencing the same number of 20 feet between the fence and the solar panels. I think, you know, I would recommend that at a minimum there would be 20 feet between the fence, the project fence, and the panels.

And you mentioned in that section on page 118 of the application narrative, and I will note that that first line of that paragraph where it says the Project has been designed with at least a 25-foot setback from adjacent roads and non-participating residences -- or properties. That's been significantly increased as you will see in my supplemental testimony in Exhibit 7.

Q. So are you saying then that by the word approximately on page 118 of the application, the -- Kingwood meant at least 20 feet?

- A. Sure. I think that's fair to say.
- 2 Q. Going back to your testimony page 16,
 3 line 9, "Tourism impacts."
 - A. Yes, sir.

4

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. You are not an expert in tourism, are you?
 - A. I am an avid tourist.
 - Q. Answering the question are you an expert in tourism?
- 10 A. I am not sure how you would define that term.
 - Q. Are you in the business of selling tourism opportunities to people, for example?
 - A. No, I am not.
- MR. SETTINERI: Object just in terms of tourism and activities.
 - ALJ WILLIAMS: He asked him if he was an expert. There was some confusion or need for clarification regarding what an expert on tourism is, and Attorney Van Kley was pressing forward to provide that level of detail in his questions.

MR. SETTINERI: I would just object.

- So, Mr. Van Kley, I am going to let you repeat the question.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Yeah. Are you in the

business of selling tourism opportunities to customers?

A. No, sir.

1

2.

3

4

5

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Q. Are you an expert with regard to offering recreational activities at parks?

6 MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object to form 7 of question.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will let him answer it to the extent he understands the question.

- 10 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that,
 11 please?
- Q. Yeah. Are you in the business of offering recreational opportunities to customers?
 - A. No, I am not.
 - Q. All right. So your only expertise in tourism is that -- is that sometimes you are a tourist.
 - A. If -- I suppose you could -- you could characterize it that way.
 - Q. Are you an expert on visual impact assessments?
 - A. I am not, no.
- Q. Go to page 17, line 2. And the sentence that starts here reads as follows: "The only views of the Project would be from drivers from the road as

they travel to enter the preserve from the south."

And the preserve that you are referring to is identified in the prior sentence, right, which would be the Clifton Gorge Nature Preserve?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- A. Yes, sir. That's where it's referencing.
- Q. Okay. And in the sentence on lines 2 and 3 on page 17 of your testimony, what is the entrance to the preserve from the south? Can you identify the road where that entrance occurs?
- A. I believe that the entrance to what they call 4-H Camp Clifton is either inside or directly adjacent to the boundaries of the Clifton Gorge Nature Preserve. That entrance is off of Clifton Road.
- Q. Okay. So the entrance you are talking about is -- is where there is a connection between Camp Clifton and the Preserve.
- A. That would be the only defined entrance that I am referring to.
 - Q. And that entrance is a walking entrance; is that correct?
 - A. I don't know for sure.
- Q. Do you know how many persons patronize
 Camp Clifton per year?
- 25 A. I do not, not specifically.

- Q. Did Kingwood Solar investigate to find out how many people patronage Camp Clifton?
 - A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- Q. Going back to page 17 of your written testimony, line 22 starts a paragraph labeled "Permanent impacts to farmland." Are you an expert on farmland preservation?
- A. I am not an expert, no. I've learned a lot from the landowners that we're working with on the Kingwood project who I would say certainly categorize themselves as experts in farmland and the longevity -- in usefulness of their farmland specifically.
 - Q. Is that because they are farmers?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

- Q. Okay. You are not a farmer.
- 17 A. I am not a farmer.
 - Q. You have never been a farmer.
 - A. I have never been a farmer, correct.
- Q. Go to page 18 of your testimony. And on
 line 5 you would see a paragraph that starts with the
 words "Operational Noise Impacts."
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. You are not an acoustical engineer?

I am not. 1 Α. 2 You don't have any expertise in Q. 3 acoustics? Α. I personally do not have any expertise in 4 5 acoustics. We did commission a -- an outside company who specialized and does have expertise in acoustics, 6 7 testimony that will be provided for this case at the 8 Department's hearing. 9 Ο. All right. We are going to go on to page 10 19 of your testimony. 11 MR. VAN KLEY: And, your Honors, if you 12 are thinking about taking a break now, this would be 13 a good time for that because we are going to start a 14 topic where we are going to have quite a bit of 15 discussion. 16 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go off the record. 17

(Discussion off the record.)

(Thereupon, at 12:22 p.m., a lunch recess was taken.)

20

2.1

18

19

22

23

24

82 1 Monday Afternoon Session, 2 March 7, 2022. 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: We are back on the record. 4 5 Mr. Van Kley, I will invite you to return to your cross. 6 7 MR. VAN KLEY: Very good. 8 9 DYLAN STICKNEY 10 being previously duly sworn, as prescribed by law, 11 was examined and testified further as follows: 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 13 By Mr. Van Kley: 14 Mr. Stickney, can you turn to Appendix P Q. 15 of the application. 16 Α. That's P as in Paul, Mr. Van Kley? 17 That's correct. Q. 18 A. Yes, sir. 19 All right. Can you tell me what this is? Ο. 20 Α. This is a list of structures within 21 proximity to the project area. 22 Looking at this document, this is part of Q. 23 the application, correct? 24 Appendix P, yes, sir. Α.

Okay. Now, this -- this Appendix P shows

25

Q.

the differences between -- or shows the distances between structures outside of the project area and the project area, correct?

2.1

- A. Yes, sir. It shows the distance, the structure type, and the parcel status and whether those structures are owned by a participating or non-participating parcel landowner.
- Q. Does the application or any of its appendices provide the distances between the project area and neighboring property lines?
- A. In the application the project area is referenced as a minimum of 25 feet setback from adjacent property lines and public roadways as well. And in addition to that, in our Joint Stipulation and my supplemental testimony today, that setback has been increased to 50 feet from public roadways and then also references an increase in setbacks from the residential structures themselves, non-participating residential structures an increase to 250 feet of a minimum setback from the project fence line and project components.
- Q. Now, if you look at Appendix P and specifically look at the first page of Table 1.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. What's the closest -- what's the smallest

- distance between the project area and the nearest house owned by a non-participating landowner?
- A. There is a -- in Table 1 there is a house owned by a non-participating landowner listed at 32 feet from the project area.
 - Q. Do you know who owns that house?
- 7 A. I do not know who owns that specific 8 house, no.
 - Q. And you can't tell from Appendix C who owns that house, can you?
- 11 A. I have to turn to Appendix C.
- 12 Q. Well, is there -- is there any information in --
- MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I'm sorry,

 but can the witness finish his answer?
- MR. VAN KLEY: I thought he had.
- 17 ALJ WILLIAMS: Sure. Attorney Van Kley,
- 18 | did you mean Appendix C?

2

3

4

5

6

9

- MR. VAN KLEY: B -- I mean Appendix P.
- 20 We are talking about Appendix P.
- 21 ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. The record is
- 22 kind of a little bit cluttered here. You actually
- 23 referenced Appendix C. Can you reask the question so
- 24 we have a clean record?
- MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, absolutely.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, is there anything in Appendix P that identifies the persons who own the structures referred to in Appendix P?

2.1

- A. I don't believe there is anything in the application that specifically assigns which structures are owned by which landowners. My personal opinion I don't think that would be, you know, an appropriate thing for us to do, to list non-participating landowners and folks by name as to what properties they own.
 - Q. Why don't you think that's appropriate?
- A. They're not a participant in the project, you know, have no engagement or agreement with Kingwood Solar.
- Q. Well, is there any information in the application that informs adjacent non-participating landowners what the distance is between the structures they own and the project area?
- A. I do believe there is a map with a scale showing the boundaries of the project area and identifying participating and non-participating structures, or at the very least residences around and within a certain proximity to that project area. So it would be reasonable to say that somebody could approximate the distance of any particular structure

from the project area boundary.

- Q. All right. Do you still have Updated Figure 03-3 in front of you from Kingwood Exhibit 2?
 - A. I don't still have it in front of me, no.
 - Q. Can you access it?
 - A. I can. Okay.
 - Q. All right.
 - A. Figure --
 - O. Go ahead.
- 10 A. Updated Figure 03-3 of Exhibit 2,
- 11 Kingwood Exhibit 2.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Yes. Now, this map has a scale on it in the legend, right?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. It's a scale from 0 to 2,000 feet?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Given that scale how precise of a
 measurement do you think that a neighboring landowner
 can make about the distance between that landowner's
 structure and the project area?
 - A. Well, this scale specifically is broken down to increments of 500 feet, and more so than that, I look at maps all day every day, so I feel as though I could approximate distances using this scale, this scale in particular, fairly reasonably

and at the very least, you know -- yeah, I mean, like I said, this scale in particular is broken down into increments of 500 feet.

2.1

- Q. Well, what about -- what about a distance of 32 feet? Do you think somebody could tell that their property, structure was 32 feet from the project area using this scale?
- A. I think the map showing non-participating structures and residences would probably be the appropriate figure to reference. And I can't recall exactly what that scale shows or what the scale of that map is.
 - Q. And tell me again what that map is.
- A. I'll have to find it to accurately reference that figure number.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We will go off the record while the witness looks for the exhibit.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: We are back on.

Attorney Van Kley.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Yeah. Mr. Stickney, which information in the application do you believe best shows the public how far their structures are from the project area?
- 25 A. So in the Kingwood Exhibit 2,

supplemental data responses to Staff requests, there is a map titled "Figure 08-11" titled "Land Use within One Mile."

- Q. Okay.
- A. And it identifies all residences.

 ALJ WILLIAMS: You can't talk over each other.
 - Q. Yeah, I'm sorry. Could you give us a moment to find that, and then you can continue your answer. How far into the document Exhibit 2 is it?
- 11 A. Maybe a third.
- MR. SETTINERI: For the record,
- 13 Mr. Van Kley, and I will let the witness confirm,
- 14 | just to help you identify the location, it's, I
- 15 believe, June 8, 2021, responses. There is a series
- of maps, Mr. Van Kley. I believe that is what
- 17 Mr. Stickney is referencing, I believe.
- 18 MR. VAN KLEY: Can you give me a PDF
- 19 page?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- MR. SETTINERI: I cannot unfortunately.
- 21 It is probably 20 pages in.
- Mr. Stickney, if you can help
- 23 Mr. Van Kley, that would be good.
- A. This is -- this is the tile map,
- 25 Mr. Van Kley, with various different color codings.

```
There is quite a bit of yellow coloring on there
1
2
     showing agricultural areas, if that helps.
     figure within the June 8, 2021, responses to Staff's
 3
     June 1 and June 3 Data Requests.
 4
 5
                 MR. SLONE: This is Lee Slone.
                                                 Which
 6
     figure number is it, please?
7
                 THE WITNESS: Figure 08-11.
                 MR. SLONE: Jack, I think that starts on
8
9
     about page 36 of the PDF, Exhibit 2.
10
                 MR. VAN KLEY: Okay.
11
            Ο.
                 (By Mr. Van Kley) So -- all right.
12
     Figure 08-11. And are you looking at sheet 1,
    Mr. Stickney?
13
14
                 Sure, yeah. I mean, I guess generally
15
     referencing that entire figure. Starting with sheet
16
     1 through sheet 29, this identifies all -- including
17
     all residences and residential structures within 1
18
    mile of the project area boundary as a scale from 0
19
     to 1,000 feet broken down into increments of
20
     250 feet. I think that would be a good resource for
2.1
     non-participating homeowners and residential
```

I'll note in addition, I believe it was

June of 2021, we held an in person public information

structure owners to identify where in proximity to

the project boundary those structures are located.

22

23

24

meeting local to the area at the Greene County

Fairgrounds. We had a 24 by 36 -- several 24 by 36

project layout maps on display for folks. And a

number of folks, more than I can count, came up to

the maps and found their residences. I can't

remember exactly what the scale was on those maps.

- Q. So -- I'm sorry. I thought you were done. Using the scale on Figure 08-11, do you think that that scale is adequate to tell people that their properties, for example, are 25 feet away from the project area versus, let's say, 50 feet away from the project area?
 - A. I personally do, yes.
- Q. Going back to Appendix P, I would like to direct your attention back to Table 1 and the fourth page of Table 1, which would be the fifth page of the PDF.
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. All right. Now, looking towards about -- about three-quarters of the way down on the page, do you see a reference to 4-H Camp Clifton?
 - A. I do.
- Q. And the distance to project area from that camp is stated to be 231 feet; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.

Q. Do you know what kind of structure in Camp Clifton is referenced here?

2.1

A. I do not know exactly what type of structure that is. I believe we classified it as, you know, a camp or, you know, I don't know that we did classify it, per se, but any of the structures on that. The nearest structure on that 4-H Camp Clifton was measured at 238 feet.

I will note in the Joint Stipulation and my supplemental testimony, our -- our fence line setback from Clifton Road closest to the entrance to 4-H Camp Clifton has been increased by 300 feet, so I would say that number has materially changed since this application was filed.

- Q. Well, has the number in Appendix P changed or just the road -- the difference between Camp Clifton and -- and the project area?
- A. The anticipated distance between Camp Clifton and the project -- project facilities.
- Q. Well, there's -- there's part -- part of the project area located near Camp Clifton is not across the road. It's not across Clifton Road, isn't it -- is it? Isn't it on the same side as Clifton Road?
 - A. There are -- there are no parts of the

- project area on the same side of Clifton Road as 4-H Camp Clifton. They are all on the south side of Clifton Road. 4-H Camp Clifton is on the north side of Clifton Road.
 - Q. Okay. Would you keep going back into Appendix P and find the page that starts with an entry for 4-H camp 544.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. All right. And you will see a number of structures for the 4-H camp listed on this page, right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. And in -- can you tell me what any of the structures are that are listed on this page?
 - A. If you will give me a moment just to reference other parts of this application, I can direct you when I get there.
- Q. Sure.
- 19 ALJ WILLIAMS: Karen, let's go off.
- 20 Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 21 (Discussion off the record.)
- 22 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on the
- 23 record.
- 24 While we were off the record, the witness
- 25 located the exhibit that he believed responded to the

question. He's provided us guidance as to where that exhibit is. And, Attorney Van Kley, I will let you proceed with your cross.

MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, we are now looking at Figure 08-12 of the application, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. And I believe you were going to use that figure to provide us with more information about the structures in Camp Clifton, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Would you first tell us where to look in Figure 8-12, and then you can proceed with your answer as to what kind of structures are in the camp.
- A. So if you direct your eyes to the northern -- northern part of this page, probably a third of the way from the very right boundary of this map, that's a good set of directions but. For those familiar with the area, north of Clifton Road right at the -- just north of the entrance of 4-H Camp Clifton. You'll see a cluster of, as the legend identifies them, 4-H camp just the same as they are identified in Appendix P in that table of structures.

And, Mr. Van Kley, I believe those are -- those kind of light purple circles with the star inside of them are identifying the structures identified as 4-H Camp in the table in Appendix P., again, all on the opposite side of Clifton Road.

2.1

And again, me personally I have never been on the 4-H camp property specifically. I have had a chance to visit, you know, the surrounding area, Clifton Gorge Nature Preserve, but I haven't identified exactly what types of structures those are. I would imagine they're, you know, some sort of, you know, structure improvements that are used in the day camp facility there, but I don't believe that they're inhabited full-time residences.

- Q. Do you know whether the camp contains structures that are used for social events?
- A. Could you clarify what you mean by "social events"?
- Q. Any kind of social event, whether it's a wedding or a meeting or -- or crafts or any -- anything social.
- A. Yeah. I understand the 4-H Camp Clifton is a -- you know, a nice -- a nice place for folks to visit, or they have regular camp programs or otherwise. I am not too familiar with exactly --

exactly the activities that are held there, and it's pretty well -- driving -- driving down Clifton Road as I have done, you know, more times than I can count, you can't really see into the Camp Clifton property because of the wooded vegetation along the road; but, yeah, I understand it's a recreational establishment of some sort.

2.1

- Q. Do you know whether Camp Clifton entertains people who come in from out of the county?
- A. You know, out of the county specifically, I'm not sure.
- Q. To your knowledge did anybody from

 Kingwood or its contractors interview the owners or

 operators of Camp Clifton to find out how the project
 might affect them?
- A. I personally, and I do know that other representatives from my company and representatives of Kingwood Solar, have, you know, discussed Camp Clifton with, for instance, the Greene County Board of Commissioners, with Greene County Planning and Development representatives in that it is a recreational resource of the local area within proximity to our project area.
- Q. But did you or anybody else from Kingwood or its contractors talk to the owners or operators of

Camp Clifton itself to find out how the project may affect them?

2.

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object, your Honor. There has been no foundation laid that he knows who the owners and operators of Camp Clifton are.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We will let him answer to the extent he is aware of the nature of the question.

- A. Yeah. Mr. Van Kley, I -- I don't -- to my knowledge at this point I don't know who the owners of that camp property are.
- Q. Okay. And if that's the case, then you don't know whether anybody from Kingwood or its contractors talked to anybody from Camp Clifton about the project.

MR. SETTINERI: Just object. Calls for speculation as to the contractors. He can speak as to Kingwood but not the contractors.

MR. VAN KLEY: I was asking him whether he knows.

ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. The objection is overruled. He's going to tell us what he knows.

- A. I do not know if anyone has met with the owners, whoever that may be, of Camp Clifton.
 - Q. To your knowledge, has anybody performed

an economics study to figure out what, if any, impact the project is going to have on Camp Clifton?

- A. On Camp Clifton specifically?
- O. Yes.

2.1

- A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Let's go back to your direct testimony, page 19, answer 14.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. All right. And we are talking about economic impact in this answer, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. All right. Let's start with the sentence that starts on page -- line 12 of that answer on line 19. And you state there that there will be an estimated 180 Ohio construction workers working on the construction of the project, right?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. Can you tell me the approximate number of construction workers that will be hired from Greene County?
- A. I would hope it's as close to that 180 number as possible, if not the 225 total construction jobs that we've estimated that would be needed for Kingwood Solar in a project of this size. I've had a great opportunity to meet with a lot of Greene County

residents that are seemingly qualified and have experience constructing solar projects, for instance, the folks from Local 82 that local International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers expressed great interest in helping construct Kingwood Solar if and when it's approved. So again, I hope it's as many as possible.

2.1

2.2

I guess to answer your question directly,

I don't know how many workers are -- that may be

qualified or available to help with the constructing

of Kingwood Solar reside in Greene County at this

time or on our anticipated construction schedule.

- Q. When you refer to the union, you are talking about the union with the acronym IBEW?
- A. That's right, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
- Q. Do you know how many members of the IBEW currently reside in Greene County?
- A. I don't know that number off the top of my head. Like I said, I have had a chance to meet with a number of those folks. I don't know exactly what that total is right now.
- Q. How did you come up with the estimate of 180 Ohio construction workers as you've stated it in your testimony on line 13 on page 19 of your

testimony?

2.1

- A. That number is a result of approximately 80 percent of the estimated total 225 construction jobs and workers that we anticipate for this project.
- Q. And where did you get the 80 percent figure?
- A. That is -- that's a figure that's referenced in the PILOT statute in Ohio, PILOT meaning Payment in Lieu of Taxes, and that program from -- in Ohio specific to large-scale solar projects.
- Q. So you haven't identified 180 people at this time who you would hire if the project was being constructed.
 - A. No. Not by name, no.
- Q. Now moving on to the next paragraph of answer 14 on page 19 of your testimony, we talk about four permanent full-time equivalent jobs for Ohio workers to maintain and operate the project.
 - A. I do.
- Q. Where will these employees live while they are operating the project? Will it be in Greene County, or will it be elsewhere?
- A. I can't say for certain. I don't know
 that there would be a requirement of exactly where an

employee could or would live. I would expect that a 1 full-time employee for the Kingwood Solar project 2 for, you know, project operations and maintenance 3 would be -- you know, at least a portion of those 4 5 four employees would be within commuting distance to 6 the project area. So that -- I would assume that 7 that would be -- it could certainly be in Greene 8 County.

Q. Are any of the duties of these operators conducted from a remote access point?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- A. From my understanding, yes, there is some remote monitoring work and responsibility that's included for projects like Kingwood Solar.
- Q. Uh-huh. And where are those remote operational facilities located?

MR. SETTINERI: Just object as mischaracterizing the testimony as to the operating facilities. I don't believe the witness testified there were operating facilities.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley, would you rephrase?

MR. VAN KLEY: I will rephrase.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) If this project is

built and starts operating, where will the remote facilities be located that will be used to operate this facility?

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: And again, I have to object. There has been no foundation laid that the -- a project like this would have a remote facility.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll sustain the objection.

Attorney Van Kley, you need to lay a foundation as to what remote work you are contemplating.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, going back to your statement you believe that there will be some remote activities performed for this project, can you describe those activities that may be performed remotely.
- A. Sure. So with any -- with any large-scale solar project of this type, there would be monitoring of project performance operations and performance using a SCADA system that's housed at the point of interconnection typically in the interconnection facilities monitoring a number of different things including power generation, energy

produced throughout certain interval periods of time, daily, monthly, and annually, monitoring signals of weather events, and any potential repair or ongoing maintenance that may be needed.

2.1

what's referred to as an operations and maintenance contractor, companies that are in operation today solely for the purpose of contracting to operate and, you know, having responsibility of maintaining these types of facilities so, you know, that type of -- of work of monitoring some of the automated signals that are coming from the facility based on some of the equipment and sensors and whatnot, you know, would be an example of a remotely conducted or remote employee, I suppose you could say.

- Q. Did you say that these facilities are typically located at the point of connection or something along those lines? I didn't quite catch that.
- A. That's right. So a SCADA system which I -- the -- what that acronym is escapes me right now but a SCADA system is typically housed at the project substation and housed at a substation or nearby the interconnection facility, so in this instance where it connects to the FirstEnergy transmission line,

monitoring, you know, the energy production profile throughout certain periods of time.

- Q. Let's move on to line 23 at the bottom of page 19 of your testimony. I am looking at the sentence that starts at the bottom of that page and goes to the next page where it states that "The project will also generate an estimated \$1.90 million in state and local taxes for the life of the Project." Do you see that sentence?
 - A. I do.

2.1

- Q. Is that \$1.90 million a figure that will occur every year, or is that the total of the taxes paid over the life of the project?
- A. That's an estimate of the annual taxes created for the life of the project which is expected to be approximately 35 years.
- Q. Do you know at this point whether the solar panels used in this project, if it's built, will be manufactured in part or in whole in Ohio?
- A. I cannot say. Like mentioned earlier, the specific module and manufacturer for this project has not been finally selected yet. I do know that Ohio has a strong solar manufacturing industry in the state and which I think is fantastic, and I think that the -- you know, the solar development activity

as of late has certainly helped to encourage that.

- Q. Can you name any facilities in Ohio that manufacture solar panels?
- A. If I am not mistaken, I believe First Solar is an Ohio company that manufacturers in Ohio.
- Q. That manufactures -- that plant is located in northwest Ohio; is that right?
- A. Where in Ohio specifically I don't recall.
- Q. Do you know what percentage of the components used by that facility are actually manufactured outside of the United States?
- A. I don't know specifically. I know that it's a highly technical electronic product oftentimes made up of components that are manufactured all over the world.
- Q. So as you sit here today, you can't tell us what percentage of the components or even the value of the solar panels sold by that facility are actually made in the United States?
- MR. SETTINERI: I would object to the form of the question regarding the reference to value.
- 24 ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll sustain the objection.

Can you rephrase, Attorney Van Kley?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.

2.1

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Well, let's just break it down. Can you tell me what percentage of the cost of manufacturing the solar panels is actually spent outside of the United States for panels coming from the facility in Ohio that you've just mentioned?
- A. I could not even pose an estimation as to what percentage of those components or the cost of those components are -- are or are not manufactured in the United States or in the state of Ohio. I can only imagine it's no different than the computers that we are all using today or any other electronic product that's available on the market.
- Q. Does Vesper have a policy that guarantees that it will purchase solar panels from a facility in the United States?
- A. Vesper has a policy that we will purchase panels that are on the Tier 1 list that are proven to be the highest rated and tested panels available for projects like this. You know, we -- I suppose said another way we don't discriminate who the manufacturers of those proven and tested panels are. It comes down to a number of different things including economics and, you know, probably some

other policies as far as, you know, procurement and selection of equipment for our projects as well.

- Q. So Vesper does purchase panels made outside of the country for its projects?
- A. You know, I don't -- myself I don't oversee the procurement of equipment for Vesper's projects. I would lend an assumption that's true. We do not exclusively purchase American made panels or equipment, and as you mentioned, oftentimes even American made panels are made up of components that are sourced from outside the US.
- Q. Would you go to the narrative of the application page 106. If you were using a PDF copy, it would be PDF page 118. Let me know when you found that page.
 - A. 106?

2.1

- Q. Yes, sir. I would like to direct your attention to the second paragraph on that page starting with the words "Workers will commute."
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. It states workers will commute to the project area daily during construction with only limited visits to the project area by operational workers throughout the year. Do you see that sentence?

A. I do.

2.1

- Q. What would be the purpose of the limited visits made by the operational workers for the project?
- A. So -- oh, to clarify, that would be workers during operation of the project post-construction. Purposes could include landscape or vegetation maintenance or project facility standard maintenance or repair as needed.
- Q. Can you give me an estimate of the number of days on which operational employees would visit the project during the year?
- A. I mean, I couldn't give an exact estimate at this point until project construction has completed and until we've got to a point of, you know, what the -- what the regulatory or otherwise requirements are of -- of this project in particular. Typically for utility-scale solar projects similar to Kingwood Solar, I would say fairly limited, probably less than -- less than 10 visits per year for all things operations and maintenance related.
- Q. So going back to the statements that we were looking at earlier that four operational employees would be hired, what do those employees do, if anything, other than the monitoring that you

already testified about that they would be doing, or are all of them just involved in monitoring?

- A. Well, I mean, project monitoring certainly, again, that would be through our operations and maintenance contractor. You know, a -- from a Vesper standpoint, an asset management type of employee, you know, could be an example of a full-time employee hired specifically and dedicated to the Kingwood Solar project. You know, not -- not exactly my -- again, my responsibility when it comes to these projects or outline full-time employees post-construction or what their responsibilities might be.
- Q. Would you go to Appendix D of the application, please.
 - A. Appendix D?
- 17 Q. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 18 A. Is that D as in Dylan?
- 19 O. Yes.
- 20 A. Yes, sir, I'm there.
- 21 Q. Go to page 4.
- 22 A. Okay.
- Q. And I would like to direct your attention to the second to the last paragraph.
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

Q. You see where it says there -- it is estimated that there will be 23 permanent direct, indirect, and induced jobs supported by ongoing operations?

A. I do.

2.1

- Q. Now, is that based on the fact that there would be four workers employed directly by the project?
 - A. That would be included in the 23.
- Q. Okay. Maybe I should ask the question more clearly, let's start with a little bit of background. How did you -- or how was this figure of 23 permanent direct, indirect, and induced jobs estimated?
- A. Well, as -- you know, again, we commissioned this economic impact study from an Ohio-based company, in fact. I understand they used a model called the IMPLAN model for modeling economic impact of these types of scenarios. I understand that's a very commonly used model for these types of studies. You know, these were the results from that study. And based on the economic activity and output resulting in the, you know, \$196 million that we are proposing to spend on developing and constructing Kingwood Solar.

So that's how I understand -- I think that's what your question was, how was the study conducted. So again, this is their field of specialty and we asked them to conduct these studies specifically for Kingwood.

2.1

- Q. Uh-huh. The 23 jobs that you are talking about in this paragraph are not based on the money spent on construction, correct?
- A. Correct. That would be supported -- as it says in that -- in that study in that paragraph you are referring to as supported by ongoing operations.
- Q. Uh-huh. And what -- what kind of spending are included in -- what kind of jobs are being supported in the 23 jobs described here other than the four direct employees?
- A. Yeah. That's a great question. You know, it's -- a good example would be landscaping companies in the area that may be contracted for a project like this. Vegetating -- vegetation companies. I talked to a number of seed companies that we've, you know, discussed, and as you will read in our application proposed for seeding and vegetating this entire site with native and pollinator-friendly grasses and whatnot. You know,

had a chance to meet a number of folks at a community open house that we held just a few weeks ago, actually February 9. It was at the Greene County Career Center. Met a CEO of a seed company actually local to Ohio and has interest in coming in and working with Kingwood Solar, a number of folks that are either independent or work for local landscaping companies that could help with mowing and whatnot.

2.1

You know, we recently retained a landscape architect out of the Columbus area that's going to help with the added landscaping around the parameters of the project and ongoing maintenance of that landscaping. You know, again, a lot of it has to do with, you know, the site itself, the land itself, maintaining the land and the vegetation that we have proposed to either preserve or add to the site.

And surely there's more than I am speaking to right now or that I can reference off the top of my head at this point but I do trust this -- you know, this study that was conducted for the project and the model and methodology that was used to do so.

Q. Uh-huh. You didn't conduct a study yourself?

- A. We did not, no. Silverlode Consulting out of Cleveland, I believe it is.
- Q. Did you personally oversee the performance of this study?

2.1

- A. I'm not sure -- I'm not sure what you mean by performance.
- Q. Well, did you supervise the performance of the study?
- A. I was directly involved in -- directly involved in commissioning this study and discussing the scope and framework of the study to be conducted.
- Q. Okay. So the people that were conducting the study reported to you?
 - A. This was through our principal consultant Haley & Aldrich, in collaboration with them. They were -- they were directly -- let's say the main point of contact for the folks at Silverlode Consulting.
 - Q. Uh-huh. Do you know whether anybody has checked with the participating landowners to find out whether they plan to move out of Greene County as a result of leasing their property to Kingwood?
 - A. I personally have had numerous conversations with each participating landowner in the Kingwood Solar project. None of those folks have

expressed to me their intent of moving out of Greene County period, let alone as a result or in relation to their activity or their involvement with Kingwood.

- Q. Do you know how many of the participating landowners currently live outside of Greene County?
 - A. I can think of one.
 - O. Who is that?

2.1

- A. I guess, you know, hesitant to reference folks by name quite frankly. You know, it's been a pretty contentious issue, but I can think of one property owner, still a taxpaying property owner of one piece of land in Greene County. She does -- full-time lives in Florida.
 - Q. She does what again?
- A. Full-time her residence is in Florida. She's retired as many folks do.
- Q. Did the economic impact study determine how much income from crop production would be lost as the result of the project construction?
- A. That's a good question. I would have to go back and look at the study. I'm not sure if it specifically accounts for the losses or reduction in crop production revenue on the 1,500-acre approximately project area. I do know that every one of those landowners that owns parts of that

1,500-acre property and the approximately, you know,
10 or 11 hundred acres that are in agricultural
production today would be earning significantly more
than what they are today in crop production.

2.1

- Q. Uh-huh. Well, when you say you are not sure whether the application contains the ratio I just requested, would it be in Appendix D, the economic impact study, if it -- if it has been included in the application?
- A. I suppose that's one area of the application that may be included.
- Q. Well, where else might it be included in the application?
- A. Yeah. I can't say if it were referenced anywhere else. To my knowledge, the reduction in revenues associated by crop production was not something that was included in this application or any of the appendices.
- Q. Now, you are aware even though you are not a farmer that farmers have to buy seed and fertilizer and other products to grow their crops; is that right?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. Did Kingwood's economic impact
 study evaluate the amount of revenues that would be

lost for businesses that supply seed and fertilizer to the farmers in the project area?

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: I will just object that there has been no foundation laid that seed companies will lose revenue as to the farmers in the project area. You can't assume facts not in evidence.

ALJ WILLIAMS: The question goes toward the impact to the economics of the project associated with the change in farming, from farming operations to solar operations. If the witness needs the question to be restated, please let us know.

THE WITNESS: That would be great. Yeah. Could you repeat that for me?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah, sure.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. So if -- if the farmers in the project area are buying seed and fertilizer, somebody's going to lose that income if the farm fields in the project area are turned into solar panels, correct?

- A. I can't say for certain, but I suppose that -- that would be a reasonable assumption.
- Q. All right. So did Kingwood's economic impact study evaluate the potential loss of income to the persons who are currently selling seed, corn or

soy -- any kind of seed or fertilizer for use on the fields in the project area?

2.1

A. Yeah. I would direct you to in this

Appendix D at the third page -- first page after the

table of contents in the overview -- let me see here,

it's the third paragraph where it outlines about

this -- this study and why it was conducted or how it

was conducted saying that the economic impacts of

alternative uses of the project site including its

current agricultural use were outside the scope of

this report.

So I think that somewhat answers your question. I mean, I will say, you know, again referencing those numerous conversations I had with every single one of the landowners, many of them who are currently, they or their families are operating and farming these properties specifically.

Specific to your question about seed and fertilizer, I understand that that's becoming more and more expensive, especially lately and, you know, unfortunately has been harder and harder to maintain the economics of their farming operations. So we are certainly excited that, you know, we can provide an alternative use to the current agricultural production that can, like I mentioned earlier,

significantly increase the revenues that these landowners and these farmers are earning from this project site and the land within that project area.

2.1

- Q. Are you aware of whether there are businesses that provide custom application services to -- for the fields in the project area such as the application of fertilizer or herbicides?
- A. I personally am not aware of companies that provide custom application services of fertilizer or herbicides. I know of several of our landowners that handle that type of application themselves.
- Q. You don't know of any farm fields in the project area that utilize custom application services?
- MR. SETTINERI: Just object. Asked and answered, same question.
 - ALJ WILLIAMS: I will let him respond.
- A. Is that a company name you are referring to, Mr. Van Kley?
 - Q. No, I am talking about the custom applicators in the general sense, not a specific name of a custom applicator.
- A. I am not aware to that level of detail of the operations on each of these properties and the

farmers that are overseeing it.

2.1

- Q. Are you aware that some of the fields in the project area are leased out to farmers who don't own that land?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Do you know how many farmers rent land in the project area?
- A. Off the top of my head, I can think of four or five landowners that are Kingwood participants.
 - Q. That are Kingwood participants?
- A. That are Kingwood project area landowners, I can think of four or five of those landowners that currently lease their land to be farmed by other people.
- Q. Okay. Has any effort to your knowledge been made to figure out how much income those farmers who are being rented the land will loss as a result of building the project?
- MR. SETTINERI: I just want for the record to be clear and object for that form of question in terms of income versus revenue. You don't know whether the income is positive or negative for the farmer, but revenue is probably a better way to form it, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley, would you acquiesce in that framing?

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: Sure. Let me reask the question.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Has Kingwood Solar made any effort to figure out how much revenue will be lost by the people who are farming rented land as a result of the project being built?
- A. In a related capacity, yes. So, for instance, one of our project landowners, leased landowners, has a family member, a next generation family member, if you will, son that actually leases some of the properties from other folks throughout the Kingwood project area. Spoken to this gentleman several times. He does stand to lose, if you will, revenues from -- if the Kingwood Solar project is built and certain acreage he is currently leasing would be taken out of production.

As a result of those conversations, we were happy to hire that young gentleman and have him conduct some fieldwork and have him help us with some of the studies and whatnot that were conducted on the project site. That's brand new revenue for him in the year of 2021. He was supremely grateful. It's been, you know, certainly my privilege to orchestrate

that, figure out how we could keep it in the local area at the very least as opposed to bringing somebody in from out of state, or out of Greene County at least, to do some of those activities. But to eliminate capacity, I have had conversations and I have come to understand certain people in this community that may be farming through a lease some of the up to 1,500-acre project area and who may stand to lose revenues if and when this project is built.

2.1

2.2

- Q. Uh-huh. With regard to the one person that you just mentioned, was that -- was that a job given to that person by Kingwood, or was it a contract arrangement?
 - A. It was a contract arrangement.
- Q. And did that contract arrangement entail 40 hours of work per week?
 - A. For a period of time, yes.
 - Q. For how long of a period of time?
 - A. Probably about two to three weeks.
- Q. Oh, okay. So that person hasn't been hired full-time by Kingwood.
 - A. That's right. Contract like I said.
- Q. Okay. And what about the rest of the farmers who currently lease land in the project area?

 Did you offer them any employment or contracts to

work for Kingwood?

2.1

A. Not as of yet to my knowledge. Like I said, I can think of probably four or five of the landowners that we have signed agreements with that are currently leasing their properties. Again, some of those are to this gentleman that we engaged with and we are happy to contract with for some work that was to be done on the project site.

I do understand there are other folks that lease other farm fields within the project area. We have not at this point, you know, signed any agreements or employment arrangements with any of the other folks. As I mentioned before, we did — we did advertise in the newspaper and advertise for a contractor and supplier open house that was on February 9 at the Greene County Career Center. I had a chance to meet with, you know, a number of folks that I imagine are either farmers or, you know, service providers in the area. So we have certainly taken — taken initiative and taken steps to invite local folks that may have interest in employment opportunities with Kingwood and to come out and engage in conversation about that.

Q. Do you know how many farmers rent land in the project area currently?

- A. I don't know specifically, no.
- Q. Do you know how many acres those farmers rent in the project area?
 - A. Not specifically.

2.1

- Q. Did Kingwood or any of its consultants interview anybody associated with the ownership or operations of any recreational facilities in Greene County to find out whether the project would harm them economically?
- A. Could you tell me what you mean by recreational facilities?
- Q. Well, any facility that offers recreation such as a park or wedding venue or a social venue of some sort.
- A. Sure, yeah. Like I mentioned before, we did -- had a meeting, an arranged meeting and one or two follow-up conversations with Greene County

 Planning and Development, which I understand oversees or has -- has involvement in planning and managing the recreational resources in the county.

I personally initiated and proposed and had a meeting with the folks at the Glen Helen Nature Preserve which is nearby the project area. I had a great opportunity to learn about that organization, the land that they occupy, the educational and

recreational facilities that they employ or offer, if you will. I understand that they are, you know, recently under new ownership, I believe it is, and looking for creative ways of helping to get them -- their operations back on their feet and their funding increased.

2.1

And also had a chance to meet -- I don't know if you classify this as a recreational facility but had a chance to meet with a gentleman who sits on the Clifton Village Council, also owns the historical Clifton Mill, met him virtually and in person a couple times. Great way for us to learn about the historic and recreational resource of the Clifton Mill and what they do around Christmastime which was pretty fascinating. But we were certainly happy to answer a lot of his questions and share a lot more information about the project being as close as it is to that facility, to that structure.

I am trying to think. Off the top of my head, that's all that I can recall as far as recreational facilities in the project area at this point.

Q. Is there anything in your economic impact study included in the application that discusses the results of the interactions you've just described?

A. I don't believe our economic impact study references recreational facilities or resources in or near the project area to the best of my knowledge. I will say that I personally feel that a project like Kingwood has a substantial amount to offer to an educational and potentially recreational standpoint, especially for -- in the school programs or otherwise.

2.1

2.2

Specifically I have mentioned the career center a couple of times. I have had a chance to meet myself a number of students from that career center and students in either the construction trades or the electrical trades, students that are certainly interested in renewables and renewable energy. And as I think you could expect, any of those students from the career center would be interested in job opportunities like those that we are referencing in this economic study.

But I -- to answer your question again directly, I don't believe our economic study specifically references economic impact to nearby recreational facilities or services.

Q. Does your study analyze the potential economic impact to businesses other than recreational facilities located in Greene County?

A. I believe it does, yes, through the indirect and induced impacts from Kingwood Solar defined and referenced in that study, Appendix D, specifically to lodging, meals, and services for construction workers in particular.

2.1

- Q. But there is nothing in your economic impact study that -- that discusses whether or not the project will harm any of the businesses in Greene County, correct?
- A. I -- our -- the economic study does not reference if or how this project would harm businesses in Greene County. And, in fact, I personally believe and fundamentally believe there would certainly be a net benefit, if not an outright benefit to the businesses in Greene County as a result of Kingwood.
- Q. Uh-huh. But that topic is not addressed by your study, is it? Your study doesn't -- your study doesn't quantify the benefits versus the detriments economically to the county.
- A. Our study addresses and I think it implies to the benefits that local businesses could realize. I suppose you're right it doesn't address the detriments because, again, in my mind I don't see very many detriments to local businesses as a result

of Kingwood Solar's construction and operations.

2.1

Q. Uh-huh. Go back to the narrative of the application page 9, PDF page 21. Tell me when you have arrived at that location.

MR. SETTINERI: And, Mr. Van Kley, what was that, please?

MR. VAN KLEY: Page 9.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you.

MR. VAN KLEY: PDF 21.

- A. Yes, sir. Page 9.
- Q. Yeah. I would like to direct your attention to the last sentence on that page, and you tell me whether I have read this correctly. It says "The exact placement of Project components is subject to change prior to construction." And then the next sentence says "Final engineering efforts will determine exact location of all equipment, based on the final equipment model selection and additional geotechnical studies." Did I read those sentences correctly?
 - A. You did.
- Q. Okay. So the design of the project as contained in the application is a preliminary design, correct?
- A. As it's labeled, yes, it is.

Q. And so the design can be changed after and if the certificate is issued, correct?

2.1

- A. My understanding of the Ohio Power Siting Board process is that within the confines of the property area boundary, a project design as long as it complies with certificate conditions to certain extents could be slightly revised.
- Q. Was there anything in the application that says that it would only be slightly revised?
- A. I suppose that depends on your definition of revised, slightly revised, or significantly revised.
- Q. So where, if anywhere, does it say that you only make slight revisions to the design after the certificate is issued?
- A. I think you just read it on page 9. I suppose it doesn't contain the word "slightly." But in my definition of slight revisions would be the exact location of equipment and equipment types that have been proposed for the project, specific equipment -- representative equipment specifications that have been provided. I want to say that was Appendix J perhaps. And numerous references to the types of equipment and facilities and types of structures, if you will, that would be installed on

the Kingwood site.

2.1

- Q. Was there anything in this language we've been reading at the bottom of page 9 of the narrative of the application that provides any limitations on how far you can move the solar panels, for example, from locations that are currently found in the application?
- A. Well, at the beginning of that paragraph, "the Project Area," capital P, capital A, I think that has a definition, and when it comes to this application, the second sentence begins with the exact placement of project components. In my eyes that represents, you know, small or slight relocations of certain pieces of the project components and project facilities, for example, fencing, racking, inverters, access roads, et cetera.

I'll mention that this is, in my experience, very common for any of these projects to, you know, to select final equipment based on a final engineering and design schematic which I will note is one of our revised conditions to provide those engineering drawings to the Board as well as I believe many of the parties to this case.

But it's very common for that final engineering not to occur until a construction

timeline has been definitively determined or as close to it as possible. And there is a number of reasons for doing that. One of them and maybe most of which is to ensure that the most current and efficient and safe equipment is procured and utilized for a project in particular.

- Q. So is it your position that you can move the solar panels to any location as long as it stays within the boundaries of the project area that's been designated by your application?
 - A. No, it's not.

2.1

2.2

- Q. Okay. And what, if anything, in the application would prevent you from moving the solar panels anywhere you want within the project area?
- A. I would specifically reference -- well, starting in the application, throughout the application we referenced setbacks from property lines and public roads. In the application we designate certain areas of different types of project facilities and components, for instance, solar arrays and inverter stations and substations and access roads.

More so than that, I would reference my supplemental testimony, the Joint Stipulation that was filed on Friday, and specific reference to the

significantly increased setbacks across the site.

We've committed ourselves to reducing a number of acres from aboveground project components, setbacks from, again, as we were talking about Clifton Road across the street from Camp Clifton increased to 300 feet. All along Ohio Route 72 increased to 300 feet. I think those are both restrictions as to where solar panels or other pieces of project equipment may be revised to be located in the final engineering design.

2.1

Again, these were all changes that we made in the stipulation process based on very direct feedback that we gained by the before and after the application was submitted back in April. Many of that -- much of that feedback was from local government officials, in fact. And even in reference to recreational resources and facilities in the area or tourism, traffic, and whatnot, tourism and attractions in the area.

So I think that there is throughout the application, my testimony, the Stipulation, I think that there is a number of -- of areas that restrict how and where the project components may be revised to be located prior to project construction.

Q. Okay. So other than restrictions from

setbacks contained in the application over any stipulation that is adopted, can you point me to the -- can you point me to any language in the application that would prevent you from moving the locations of the solar panels to wherever you want to put them inside of the project area?

2.1

A. It's a lengthy application. Give me a minute to think about whether there are any of those references made, but I suppose I -- yeah, I suppose I don't believe so. I do know that there are some areas within the project area that may suggest adverse impacts based on environmental factors or ecological factors, perennial wetlands, if you will, or 100-year floodplain designated areas by FEMA.

I would say those areas are maybe not restrictions but those are -- you know, those are areas we have voluntarily chosen to avoid inside of the project area.

But I suppose as far as language regarding exactly where panels may be placed in a final engineering drawing and design, I can't think of anywhere in the application where it does specifically say that.

Q. Okay. Would you go back to Exhibit 2. That's Kingwood Exhibit 2.

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Q. And go back to Updated Figure 03-3.

MR. VAN KLEY: For those of you who have a PDF copy that would be PDF page 24 where it starts that figure.

- A. Yep. I am looking at it.
- Q. All right. Looking at the legend on the left side at the bottom of the page, it states that the line shown there is for the potential solar array, correct?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. So that means that the actual locations of the solar arrays after final design could change from what's shown in this figure, correct?
 - A. As is very common in this type of project and its development, yes, that may change in a final design.
 - Q. Okay. And continuing down that legend, you will see a statement for potential transformer -- I can't read the next word.
 - A. Pad I believe it is.
- Q. Okay. So again, that's a potential location.
- A. As -- as it's drawn and displayed in this Figure 03-3, those are potential locations for

transformer pads, also known as inverters. 1 I will 2 mention that in supplemental testimony and the Stipulation that was filed on Friday, we have 3 committed to and increased the minimum setback of 4 5 those inverters, central inverters, to no less than 6 500 feet from any non-participating residential 7 structure which is -- may not be demonstrated in this Figure 03-3 that we are looking at right here. 8

That was a commitment we made in an effort to further mitigate any noise impacts and I suppose further mitigate any virtual impacts based on proximity of inverters to residents in the surrounding project area.

- Q. And then we have the next part of that legend referring to potential collection line. Do you see that?
 - A. I do.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

2.1

22

- Q. And then we have potential gravel roads.

 Do you see that?
 - A. I do.
 - Q. Same thing apply to those references, that those are not set in -- in their firm locations at this point in time, right?
- A. That's correct. Again, as is very common in these projects, a preliminary design or

preliminary project layout, as it was labeled and included in the application, is oftentimes revised numerous times in efforts to improve a variety of different things including efficiency, reduced impacts to nearby landowners or adjacent properties. And again, you know, referencing the Stipulation we've made considerable improvement to the project area and project layout.

2.1

Q. The locations of these components could be moved to a location that's more harmful to the adjacent landowners, right?

MR. SETTINERI: Just object. No foundation in terms of more harmful, form of question.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will sustain the objection.

MR. VAN KLEY: I will reask.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So you mean -- you've made a point of saying that the component locations could change in order to reduce the impact to offsite properties, and I am paraphrasing there. Isn't it true also there is nothing in the application that would prevent you from moving a component in an area that -- where it might have more impact on a neighbor?

A. Could you give me an example of a worse or -- I didn't quite hear what you said there but a negative impact on a neighbor.

2.1

- Q. Well, for example, the location of the solar panels where you've shown them on the -- on the Figure 03-3, as long as you are observing the setbacks required by the certificate in the application, you can move those closer to somebody else's property, couldn't you?
- A. As long as it's outside of the minimum setbacks we have committed to and signed in the Stipulation, I suppose you're right, could potentially, as it's compared to this map, move closer to a specific residence. I think that the Stipulation conditions, not just the setbacks but, you know, multiple of those other Stipulation and Recommendation conditions would significantly help to prevent adverse impacts on neighboring landowners over and above, you know, a potential relocation of a solar panel and subjectively worse visual impact from a specific neighboring landowner.
- Q. Thank you. Let's go to page 20 of your direct testimony, answer 15.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Now, in the first sentence you refer to a

solar facility owned by Cedarville University, correct?

- A. That's right.
- Q. And you refer to that solar facility as a large array of solar panels. Do you see that?
 - A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. And then in the next sentence you state that the facility has 8,792 modules, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. How does that compare to the number of modules that your project is projected to contain?
- 12 A. That number is less than the anticipated number of modules for Kingwood Solar.
- Q. Kingwood Solar, in fact, is projecting 410,000 modules?
- A. As written in the application, that's right.
 - Q. So doing the math, the Cedarville
 University modules are about 2 percent of what the
 Kingwood project is anticipated to contain?
 - A. If you say so.
- Q. And then if you look down in the answer, you'll see that the Village of Yellow Springs has an array of about 3,024 solar panels? Do you see that?
- 25 A. I do.

- Q. Is that the same thing? Is solar panels the same thing as a solar module?
 - A. That's right, interchangeable.
- Q. And then you'll see further in your answer Antioch College has about 3,300 solar panels, right?
 - A. That's right.

2.1

- Q. And that again would be contrasted to the 410,000 in your project.
- A. They are -- they are different than our estimated anticipated number of solar panels for Kingwood Solar. I would say purely reason being different apples and oranges when it comes to project type and their purpose in energy generation and in the energy markets.

Personally I have visited all three of those pro -- or those solar arrays and solar facilities that are referenced in that response in my testimony. Some of them, in fact, built on what looked like previously agricultural land, some of them certainly in very close proximity to residential homes that in -- in any information that I could find had no affiliation with those projects or their project owners.

But, yes, the number of panels are very

different. I think that certain communities in this
Greene County area have done a great job in
harnessing and encouraging renewable energy around
solar specifically. We certainly saw that as an
attractor for this community and a potential
community for one of Vesper's project sites in
Kingwood Solar.

Q. Do you know which of these projects that you mention in your answer 15 were built on farmland?

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

- A. This was an assumption that I made but would be the Village of Yellow Springs solar array on the 6-1/2 acres at the end of Ridgecrest Drive.
- Q. Would it surprise you to find out that -that solar array was not built on farmland?
 - A. That would be information that I didn't have previously.
 - Q. Okay. At the end of this answer 15, you noted that the Cedarville University array has fencing and an inverter next to a residential house on a residential street. Do you see that?
 - A. I do. There was a photo attached as an exhibit as well.
 - Q. Do you know whether that house is occupied by a person employed by the University who may be charged with being --

ALJ WILLIAMS: We are getting some bleed through on the audio.

2.1

MR. SETTINERI: Mr. Hart, do you want to mute yourself unless you are objecting?

MR. HART: No. Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Okay. Let me start over, Mr. Stickney. Do you know whether the -- any of the people in that house operate that facility?
- A. I've come to learn that Cedarville
 University owns and has arrangements with, I believe,
 if my memory serves me correctly, local companies
 that help to operate that facility.
- Q. Uh-huh. But you don't know whether an employee of one of those companies occupies that house you mentioned in the last sentence of answer 15?
- A. I don't in particular. I do know that in visiting that solar project and that solar facility there are a number of houses on that street within viewshed and earshot and proximity to that solar facility. I do not know if any of them are involved with the operations and maintenance and management of the facility itself.
- Q. All right. Do you have access to Citizens Exhibit 13?

A. I believe so.

2.1

2.2

- Q. All right. Do you recognize Citizens
 Exhibit 13 as a copy of Kingwood Solar's responses to
 interrogatories and requests for documents from
 Citizens for Greene Acres?
 - A. That appears to be how it's labeled, yes.
- Q. All right. And would you go to the fourth page of that document.

MR. SETTINERI: Yeah, Mr. Van Kley. If I could just object, your Honor. There is no question pending but I don't believe we've laid a foundation that the witness is familiar with this document. We just identified what it says. And also for the record in terms of being interrogatories, I do not see a verification attached to these as well that was provided with them.

MR. VAN KLEY: It was not provided, Mike. I searched last night. You never provided it and that's why I need to ask him whether he recognizes these as something he worked on.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Continue, Mr. Van Kley.
MR. VAN KLEY: Okay.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, were you involved in preparing answers to the interrogatories in Citizens Exhibit 13?

- A. I was involved in preparing responses to the interrogatories of the first request for production of documents from CGA, Inc., yes.
- Q. Okay. So, for example, on page 4 of Citizens Exhibit 13, did you work on the responses to -- or to -- or the responses to Interrogatory 1?
 - A. Yes, I did.

2.1

- Q. Okay. Did you provide the information in the answer to Interrogatory 1?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Okay. So with regard to that answer, it states that "the fee paid to PJM Interconnection LLC for the PJM facility study for this project was \$100,000." Do you see that?
- MR. SETTINERI: And I will just object. That was not a true reading of the answer. There were objections there. If we are going to read the whole response, we should read the whole response.
- MR. VAN KLEY: I don't need to read the objections. I can read the response without reading the objections.
- MR. SETTINERI: When you start with the word without.
- 24 ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Let's ask him the salient points of the question, namely, the PJM fee.

Mr. Van Kley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I thought that's what I just did.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, let me ask you my -- my question here. Is it true that the fee paid to PJM Interconnection LLC for the PJM facility study for this project was \$100,000?
 - A. To my knowledge, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now moving to the second interrogatory on that page, did you provide the information in that answer to Interrogatory 2?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Okay. And is it true that the fee for the PJM facility study for this project was paid prior to October 12, 2021?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Okay.

2021.

- 18 A. Well --
- 19 O. Go ahead.
- A. Sorry. Just well before October 12,
- Q. Okay. Was the entirety of the \$100,000 you referred to in the answer to Interrogatory 1 paid
- 24 | before October 12, 2021?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. In addition to that \$100,000, did PJM charge any other fees for the facility study?
- A. Not to my knowledge, no, not in addition to the \$100,000 that was paid.
- Q. Did you do any -- did you review any records to determine whether that's the case?
- A. I believe we provided them as attachments.

2.1

- Q. Going to the answer to Interrogatory 3, looking at the end of it, is it true that no new PJM service requests for the project have been submitted to PJM Interconnection LLC after October 12, '21; 2021?
- A. Well, I -- I suppose I will note that the question was a little bit confusing when we received this interrogatory. I think we deduced in what you meant by asking the question that Kingwood Solar or our facility or our company did not submit any new service requests to PJM in which we answered, no, we have not.
- Q. Okay. I am not understanding how that's different -- how what you just said is different from the question. Can you explain that to me?
- A. Sure. If I can -- if I can read this question, Interrogatory No. 3, "State whether or not

1 PJM submitted any new service requests to PJM for the 2 project."

- Q. Okay. Yeah, I see what you are saying. That's obviously a typo. So did Kingwood Solar as of today submit any new service requests to PJM for the project after October 12, 2021?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Let's go to page 36 of your direct testimony. Let me know when you are there.
- A. Page 36?
- 11 Q. Yes, sir.
- 12 A. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. All right. Let's go down to lines 8, 9,
 and 10 where you state "I agree with the Chamber's
 position in the letter that failing to provide
 renewable energy will hinder similar economic
 development opportunities in Ohio." Do you see that?
- 18 A. I do.
- 19 Q. Are you an economist?
- 20 A. I studied economics in college.
- Q. Yeah? How many courses did you have in economics?
- 23 A. I'm sorry?
- Q. How many courses did you have in economics?

- A. Several. If I had to guess, probably six or seven.
 - Q. Does that make you an economist?
- A. I don't consider myself a practicing economist, no.
 - Q. Okay.

2.1

- A. I think -- if I might add, I think what that's referencing is very relevant to what's included above on that same page of 36.
- MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I move to strike that last addition. There was no question pending that called for that answer.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll strike that. I will instruct the witness if you could respond directly to the questions as they are presented and try to avoid any surplus, that will make this a little faster and also keep the transcript more clean.

THE WITNESS: Understood.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go to page 37.

Let's start at line 11. And here you make the statement that "the land supporting the solar arrays will be fallow for the Project duration, which will allow the restoration of nutrients in the soil, which would not occur during active agricultural usage."

Do you see that?

A. I do.

2.1

- Q. You are not a soil scientist, are you?
- A. I am not. However, we've consulted and incorporated a number of public information and consultants that have reviewed our proposed activities and vegetative practices for the Kingwood Solar site which is where that information came from.
- Q. Okay. So you base this on something you read.
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. I said you based the statement I just read to you on something you read.
- A. I couldn't hear the last part of what you said.
 - Q. Yeah. You based the sentence I read from your testimony on something that you read that was written by somebody else, correct?
 - A. It was based on information that I read that was written and/or published in and/or told to me by other folks including people that are either soil scientists themselves or affiliated with.
 - Q. Can you identify any solar projects that have been decommissioned and placed back into farming?
- 25 A. Off the top of my head, I cannot. Solar

at this scale, and specifically in the midwest, meaning on agricultural land, commonly on agricultural land, is a fairly new growth industry, if you will. And as you know, we propose Kingwood to have a lifespan of 35 years. I think it could even have a -- you know, a project like this could have a lifespan of even more than that.

2.1

So we are starting to get to the point where projects and facilities like this are being decommissioned that may have been built on agricultural land. I will say that as I just mentioned in response to your last question, some of the information that we gathered was from studies and/or pilot projects, pilot not related to the tax exemption but pilot projects conducted by the Federal Government studying the impact of fallow land, native grass, pollinary habitat under these solar projects.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. Your Honor, could I have that answer struck other than his answer that he's not aware of any such solar facilities?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, he was explaining the context of his answer. I am going to leave it in the record.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go to page 38 of your testimony.

A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. All right. At the top of that page line 1 and 2.
 - A. Sorry.
- Q. Going back to page 38 of your direct testimony, lines 1 and 2 and 3, you state that "As noted in the Application, construction and operation of the Project is only expected to utilize a minimal amount of water for occasional cleaning of panels if necessary and watering of vegetative screening as it becomes established." Do you see that sentence?
- 12 A. I do.
 - Q. With respect to the cleaning of panels, how often is occasional as anticipated for the Kingwood Solar project?
 - A. Well, it states there only if necessary.

 It's been my understanding that in a state and climate like Ohio, oftentimes manual cleaning of solar panels is oftentimes not necessary based on precipitation and the occurrence of rain and whatnot. I suppose occasional in this context would be defined as really only as needed and in an instance of limited precipitation or natural washing or cleaning of those panels, if you will.
 - Q. Can you give me an estimate of how many

times per year you would anticipate Kingwood would be cleaning its panels?

- A. I would estimate 0 to 1.
- Q. Would you go back to Kingwood Exhibit 2. And I would like you to go back to the 11th page of that document.
- A. Sorry. I don't have page numbers on this exhibit, Mr. Van Kley.
 - Q. Well, I was hoping you would count in from the top but that's fine. I will see if I can -- it's question 36 if you can find that and probably in the first document of the compilation that's in Kingwood Exhibit 2.
 - A. Okay.

2.1

2.2

- Q. All right. It says here Kingwood is expected to require panel cleaning between 1 and 2 times per year. The frequency would be assessed in better precision throughout the first year of operations, in accordance with local weather conditions, dust control, and facility production. Do you see that?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. And then in the answer to question
 37 it states "Kingwood Solar is expected to use an
 annual average of approximately 775 gallons per day

for routine cleaning." Do you see that?

A. I do.

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, for the record, if we can, as we go through this, it would be -- reading responses to Staff Data Requests, I think for the record it would be helpful to have the Data Request read in as well from Staff.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I mean, that's very difficult to do how this exhibit is organized.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, you might just begin with the answer you are seeking instead of the context of how the response was provided.

MR. VAN KLEY: I'm sorry, your Honor. I am not sure I understood what you were suggesting there.

ALJ WILLIAMS: You are asking -- let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

20 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on the record.

22 Mr. Van Kley.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. So I think he's already answered the question that I posed to him on the -- on question 36 and 37. So let me move on to

the next question.

2.1

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's move next -- in the same Exhibit 2 to PDF page 167. Let me see if I can figure out which document that belongs to. It appears that this page is part of the Notice of Responses to Data Requests from the Staff of the Ohio Power Siting Board. And that document starts with the sentence "On April 16, 2021, Kenwood Solar I LLC filed an application for a certificate," et cetera.
 - A. Okay. I think I am following it.
- Q. Okay. Now actually there's another one right after that. All right. So the next one is Kingwood Solar's October 12, 2021, Responses to Staff's September 29, 2021, Data Requests. I think that's probably the document we are in.

All right. So I'm looking at the questions and answers 16 and 17 where it's stated that the maximum total volume of water anticipated for Kingwood Solar is 282,875 gallons per year. And my question to you is how much of that gallonage does it take for one panel -- one cleaning of all the panels in the project?

- A. How much water gallonage does it take to clean one panel in the project was your question?
 - Q. No. How much water does it take to clean

all of the panels in the project once?

2.1

A. Got it. That's a good question. So I guess it -- if we were to require manual cleaning using water of the Kingwood Solar project, again as necessary, as was stated in testimony in the application, if necessary outside of normal climate and precipitation, we would expect a maximum total volume of water of approximately 282,000 gallons during the year. If that were between, you know, let's say once or twice per year, that would put that number at about 100 to 140 thousand gallons of water.

However, again, as stated in our application originally, and to my understanding, you know, Ohio manual cleaning of solar panels is oftentimes unnecessary, and I do believe that for whatever further context it may be worth, the Staff Report that was issued for Kingwood Solar was, you know, found to be in compliance of the requirement of water conservation regarding this question and part of the application itself.

- Q. So let me make sure I am understanding your answer. Is it your answer that you believe it will take a hundred thousand to 140,000 gallons for one cleaning of all the panels in the project?
 - A. Just purely based on doing the math of

the numbers that are in front of me, that seems to be 1 2 the conclusion that we can arrive at. Again, 3 operations and maintenance of our projects for solar facilities in general is not something that I'm 4 5 intimately familiar with. And again, what 6 Kingwood -- we would expect and anticipate that it 7 may not be required to manually clean these panels at 8 all. In fact, that would be our goal is to in an 9 effort to conserve water use to not need to go out 10 and manually clean the panels, if at all possible.

Q. Let's go to the narrative of the application page 10.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SETTINERI: Yeah. And briefly I know we've been going over a couple hours now.

Mr. Van Kley -- can we go off the record, your Honor, please?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Back on the record.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right.

Mr. Stickney, we're back in the narrative of the application page 10 which is at PDF page 22. All right. Directing your attention to D on page 10 which is entitled "Water Supply and Discharge" where it states in that first sentence that "the Project

will use only a limited amount of water, likely from an existing source within the project area." And my question is have you identified a source within the project area that will be utilized for water to clean the panels?

- A. We have not identified a specific source that will be used to clean the panels. Again, as mentioned, our goal is that added water usage for manual cleaning would not be necessary for this project.
- Q. Okay. And are there any sources of groundwater inside the project area other than groundwater?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand your question.
 - Q. My question is are there any sources of water inside the project area other than wells that utilize groundwater?
 - A. I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

- Q. So potentially Kingwood would be using groundwater from a well inside the project area to supply its water for cleaning panels; isn't that correct?
 - A. I suppose that's a fair assumption.
- Q. Has Kingwood commissioned any hydrogeology study to determine whether the use of

100,000 to 140,000 gallons of water from the wells or -- a well or wells in the project area would draw down the water in wells owned by adjacent landowners?

2.1

A. Kingwood has commissioned a preliminary hydrogeology study for us to better understand the flow of water, whether it be stormwater drainage or otherwise, on the project site and surrounding areas. I believe that study was provided recently. That was a recently conducted study. That's a standard step in Vesper's development procedures leading into the construction time frame, again, to better understand stormwater flow patterns, flooding, potential for flooding and whatnot.

I didn't personally oversee that study, and I cannot say whether it spoke to the potential for -- for -- or the potential for groundwater sources to be decreased as -- for any reason affiliated with Kingwood.

Q. Okay. So going back to my question, I want to make sure I actually got an answer to it, and that question was very simply, has Kingwood Solar done any hydrogeology studies to determine whether the water used for cleaning panels will draw down the water level in the wells owned by adjacent landowners?

A. I don't know. I don't know if that's included in the hydrogeology study that was commissioned for Kingwood Solar.

2.1

- Q. You mention in one of your prior answers water conservation measures. Can you tell me what water conservation measures have been identified in the application?
- A. Well, I suppose the sections you had pointed to, maybe not this one we were just looking at, but where it mentions "Kingwood Solar anticipates using minimal water or requiring minimal water usage for panel cleaning." Again, that's our goal and my understanding is a very feasible goal in this part of the country. In addition, I will reference what came up earlier this morning in my conversations with the Little Miami Conservancy in conserving the aquifers that are connected to the Little Miami River close to this project area.

Those are -- have been some very educational conversations for me in particular and personally but certainly helpful conversations for us to have regarding Kingwood Solar and any potential impact to groundwater and groundwater sources.

Q. How are your conversations with the Conservancy related to conserving water?

- A. The Little Miami Conservancy's primary mission is water conservation and preservation of the Little Miami River which is connected to an aquifer that is within proximity to the Kingwood Solar project area.
- Q. Well, what, if any, measures are contained in Kingwood Solar's application that would conserve the water of the Little Miami?
- A. Nothing specifically to the Little Miami River.
- MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. All right. Your
 Honor, I think this is a good time to take a break.
- 13 ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. We are off the record.
- 15 (Recess taken.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

2.2

- ALJ WILLIAMS: We are back on the record after a break.
- 18 Mr. Van Kley.
- MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, we are on page 38 of your direct testimony, answer 26 now.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Let's go down to line 18 where you refer to "local public hearings." Now, keep your finger there and go to answer 11 in your direct testimony.

- 1 That's on page 9 of your testimony. Answer 11 talks
- 2 about public meetings held on October 26, 2020;
- 3 | November 19, 2020; March 30, 2021; and June 29, '21.
- 4 Do you see that?
- 5 A. I do. Those are -- just to clarify,
- 6 those are in reference to the public meetings that
- 7 | were held by the Applicant as stated there?
- 8 Q. Well, whatever your -- whatever your
- 9 answer says, that's what it appears to be or it looks
- 10 | like -- yeah, I think it probably looks like your
- 11 | meetings. And then we go to the second paragraph of
- 12 | answer 11 talking about an April 6, 2021, town hall
- 13 | meeting organized by the Board of Greene County
- 14 | Commissioners. Do you see that?
- 15 A. I do.
- 16 Q. And you also see the reference to the
- 17 | Board of Greene County Commissioners work session on
- 18 | May 2021 -- May 20, 2021. Do you see that?
- 19 A. I do. I remember it fondly.
- Q. Now, the Staff Report came out according
- 21 to answer 26 on October 29, 2020 -- I'm sorry,
- 22 October 29, 2021, correct?
- 23 A. October 29, 2021. I believe that's
- 24 correct.
- Q. Okay. And that would be after the town

hall meeting of the Board of County Commissioners on April 6, 2021, correct?

2.1

- A. The town hall meeting organized by the Board of the Greene County Commissioners was held on April 6, which I attended, of 2021. That was -- that was prior to when the Staff Report was issued on October 29, however, prior to the Power Siting Board local public hearing that took place on November 15.
- Q. And the Board of Greene County

 Commissioners work session on May 20, 2021, preceded

 the issuance of the Staff Report as well, correct?
- A. That is correct. And if my memory serves me, that Board of County Commissioners work session was not a public hearing or did not invite public participation.
- Q. Well, what in your view makes a -- a session a public hearing versus something else?
- A. Generally in my view a public hearing is where any members of a community or attendees of a hearing are invited to speak for any limited or otherwise capacity period of time. In this context I reference public hearing with the OPSB statutory requirement of having a local public hearing with ALJs and whatnot present.
 - Q. But your quote about a local public --

about local public hearings on line 18 of answer 26 on page 38 is not your language, but it's the language of the Staff of the Power Siting Board in its Staff Report, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. So the question here is how did the Staff intend to use its statement about local public hearings, not how you intend to use that term, correct?
- 10 A. Are you asking me if that's the question 11 you are asking?
- Q. Yeah. That's the question I asked you.

 MR. SETTINERI: Just object as to form of
 question.
- 15 ALJ WILLIAMS: I will sustain the objection.
- Attorney Van Kley, I got a little twisted on that. Could you start over?
- MR. VAN KLEY: Sure. No problem.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) In answer 26 on page
 38, you quoted the term "local public hearings" from
 the Staff Report, correct?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So the question here is how did the Staff use that term in its Staff Report, correct?

MR. SETTINERI: I'll object as to -- I don't think -- I guess I will just object to the question as it calls for speculation. He is not a member of the Staff.

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: Well, of course not, and I think that's exactly the point.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. -- Mr. Stickney, aren't you attributing your interpretation of the term public hearing to the Board's usage of that term when you say that the Board's statement was incorrect?

MR. SETTINERI: I will just object again. He's mischaracterizing his testimony. He didn't say the Board's statement was incorrect. He is just citing -- quoting to the Staff Report, so I don't know where in his testimony he said the Board's statement was not correct.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll sustain the objection.

Attorney Van Kley.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's just read from that answer. Mr. Stickney, starting on line 28, do you see the language where it says in your answer "But the public hearing for the Project had not occurred when the Report was issued." Do you see

that?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- A. That's line 18; is that right?
- Q. Yeah.
- A. I do.
 - Q. Okay. So aren't you saying there that the Staff's statement that "opposition expressed at the 'local public hearings'" was incorrect because no local public hearings had been held?

MR. SETTINERI: I would just object again. Mischaracterizes the testimony. If we are going to look at the Staff Report, we can, but the record here is going to read as if he is reading from the Staff Report. That's just mischaracterizing the testimony.

MR. VAN KLEY: I am reading from his testimony.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will overrule the objection. He's actually now asking the witness to explain the context of his testimony there at page 38 regarding the interface with local public hearings and the interpretation of Board Staff. So the question can stand.

Do you need it reread?

THE WITNESS: I think I got it.

A. So the context behind this response to

the question in my testimony is that my understanding of this process and this procedure of having an application under review with the Ohio Power Siting Board, during the period of the Staff investigation, a big part of that is the OPSB organized public hearing event, in this case which was held on November 15, 2021, after that Staff Report had been issued.

2.1

In the Staff Report, I particularly found it interesting where, as I quoted there, Staff characterized the local opposition and that it considered the opposition expressed at the local public hearings. When I first read that Staff Report, that term to me means the Power Siting Board-organized public hearing event that is a major piece and scheduled event of this process. However, that had not happened yet.

Prior to that, to be a little more detail oriented, there was only one public hearing organized specifically for the Kingwood Solar project that had occurred which was organized by the Greene County Board of Commissioners. And I'm not sure -- I am not aware if -- I am not saying that there were not, but I am not aware of whether or not there was Staff members in attendance of that one public hearing that

I am aware of.

2.1

- Q. Well, going back to your definition of a public hearing, and the way I understand it is that you regard a public hearing as a hearing in which the public has the opportunity to participate; is that your definition?
- A. My -- yes. My understanding is that a public hearing offers the public and attendees an opportunity to speak and express their opinion.
- Q. Uh-huh. Did the public have the opportunity to speak at all in the Board of Greene County Commissioners' work session on May 20, 2021?
- A. The Board of County Commissioners -- no, they didn't. They were not offered the opportunity to express their opinion and speak during that work session. However, it did happen out of turn, and I believe several members of the audience that day were reprimanded by the -- certain members of that Board of County Commissioners for doing so.
- Q. The April 6, 2021, town hall meeting organized by the Commissioners did provide for public participation, correct?
- A. Each attendee was offered 3 minutes to speak aloud to the Board of Commissioners and the County Administrator that were present.

- Q. Okay. So the answer to my question is yes, right?
 - A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And what about the public meeting held by the Applicant on October 26, 2020? Would -- was the public allowed to speak during that meeting?
- A. That was a virtual meeting held during the time of the pandemic via Zoom. The Kingwood Solar team, John Soininen, who was my predecessor that I worked for for a number of months, managed and ran that meeting so that public attendees were able to submit questions through a chat function.
- Q. Okay. So again, the answer to my question is yes, correct?
- MR. SETTINERI: Objection, asked and answered.
 - MR. VAN KLEY: Well, I think I deserve a yes or no answer at least. If he wants to go on after that and explain it, that's fine but I at least need a yes or no answer.
 - ALJ WILLIAMS: To the extent there was some unorthodox nature of that meeting given that it was virtual and the responses were to chat or otherwise type messages, that you are entitled to a more concrete answer. So I will let the witness

1 | answer the question in a yes or no fashion.

MR. SETTINERI: And, your Honor, to be fair to the witness, can we have that question reread then, please?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Sure. Ms. Gibson.

(Record read.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

ALJ WILLIAMS: Can you provide a yes or no answer to that, Mr. Stickney?

- A. No, the public was not allowed to speak during that meeting.
- Q. But they were allowed to participate virtually by submitting comments or questions in writing, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. All right. So with regard to the dial in phone conference on November 19, 2020, was the public allowed to make statements or ask questions virtually or verbally?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Same question about the conference on March 30, 2021.
- A. There were two sessions on March 30,
 23 2021. The first was a Zoom presentation similar to
 24 the October public information meeting. Attendees
 25 were not able to speak. They were able to submit

questions via a chat function. Later that evening there was a telephonic presentation and attendees were able to ask questions verbally after that session concluded.

2.1

- Q. And with respect to the in person session on June 29, 2021, was the public allowed to ask questions or submit comments virtually or verbally?
- A. There was no -- during that meeting, there was no -- how do I frame it? There was no audience speaking arrangement or presentation type of format. It was an open house format. So it was all individual conversations with the presenters and the attendees, so I suppose attendees were able to ask questions and make comments verbally to individual members, myself included or other folks on our team. I do believe there were members of Power Siting Board Staff in attendance at that meeting.
- Q. So in summary then in all of the meetings held on October 26, 2020; November 19, 2020; March 30, 2021; and June 29, 2021, the public was able to either virtually or verbally submit comments indicating whether they were opposed to the project, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. All right. Let's go to your supplemental

1 testimony. And this has been marked as Kingwood

2 | Exhibit 7. Let's go to answer 8 which starts at the

3 | bottom of page 3 and I would like to ask you about

4 the second sentence of that answer which reads "this

5 | 250-foot setback is a substantial increase over the

6 25-foot setback commitment in the application."

Now, isn't it true that the 25-foot setback in the application consists of a distance of 25 feet between the solar fence and the neighboring property line?

- A. That's right. That's how it's characterized in the application.
- Q. And the 250-foot setback you were referencing earlier in answer 8 is a setback between the project fence and a neighboring house, correct?
 - A. That's right.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. So when you say the 250-foot setback is a substantial increase over the 25-foot setback in the application, you're comparing a setback from the house to a setback from the property line, correct?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. So in order for there to be any improvement in a 200 -- in a setback that is 250 feet away from a neighboring house, the yard of that house would have to be less than 225 feet away from the

property line, correct?

2.1

- A. Could you repeat that, please?
- Q. Yeah. In order for the 250-foot setback for -- from the house to provide a longer distance from that house than the 25-foot setback from the property line, the distance between the house and the property line would have to be less than 225 feet, correct?
- A. So that is correct. However, I do

 believe one of Staff's recommended conditions was

 that our property line setback be increased to at

 least 30 feet, and I would like to take a look and

 see if we voluntarily increased that property line

 setback as well, in which case your calculation there

 wouldn't exactly be accurate.

So, Mr. Van Kley, to answer your question, in the instances where a property line between two properties does not include a public road, your calculation would be right. It would need to be 225 feet from the property line to the residence from the neighboring property line of the project area for that setback to increase. Our increased setback from public roads is now 50 feet, so in those instances, it would be -- a setback would be greater, I suppose.

- Do you have any idea how many of the Q. adjoining property owners' land is separated from the project area by a road instead of directly adjoining the project area?
 - There are quite a few.
- Quite a few going the other way too, Ο. right, where there's properties adjoining the project area without a road in between them?
- Α. There are properties without a road in between their property and the project area.
- Ο. Okay. Let's go to page 6 of your testimony.
 - Α. Yep.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- I would like to take a look at Condition Ο. 16 as you have suggested it be modified on page 6 of your supplemental testimony. And directing your attention to the new sentence that you have proposed, that condition which is underlined. And the beginning of that sentence states "Subject to any project area reductions." Do you see that?
 - Α. T do.
 - Q. What did you mean by that?
- Well, in my experience there are a number Α. of different things that can reduce a project area or 25 a project size or design capacity as you move through

different stages of development. Although it does get more and more certain at the later you get and closer to construction as to the project size and layout. If we were to, for instance, eliminate a certain field or property from consideration to include in the Kingwood project, I would hope that our minimum landscaping would also adjust accordingly.

- Q. In that same sentence you referred to the attached screening plan and that's a reference to Figure 1 of the Stipulation; is that right?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. And then you refer to identified levels of screening from the landscaping plan attached to the Applicant's application. Does that refer to Appendix Q, Part 2, Attachment C?
- A. That I believe so. Appendix Q sounds right. There were a lot of appendices. I think you got it right there.

And just to clarify, yes, you're right.

Appendix Q, the visual impact analysis, our

landscaping plan was a portion, a part of that visual

impact analysis and entire appendix. Just to clarify

regarding the revision to Condition 16 on page 6 of

supplemental testimony, this is referencing

identified levels of screening from the landscape plan in Appendix Q.

2.1

- Q. Uh-huh. Does that refer to the modules, the module 1, 2, and 3, that are in the landscaping plan?
- A. I believe we refer to them as light, medium, and tall.
 - Q. And the landscaping plan identifies which of those levels will apply to specific areas around the project area?
 - A. As is color coded in the landscaping maps that are provided, yes.
 - Q. And those landscaping maps that identify the areas in which each type of screening will be provided are all in the landscaping plan in Appendix Q?
 - A. And Figure 1 of the supplemental testimony.
 - Q. So, for example, if the -- if Figure 1 and the maps and landscaping plan designate light screening to be placed along a neighbor's property, then your proposed change to Condition 16 would provide for that level of screening for that neighbor's property, right?
 - A. Just to clarify, we are not proposing any

landscaping on any neighbor's properties. These are all on project leased parcels. But you are correct, we are -- where it indicates light screening along the boundary of the project area, that's what we are proposing in this condition, that at a minimum that's what would be installed in those locations.

- Q. Okay. Let's go to page 7 of your supplemental testimony. And looking at your proposed language for Condition 17, as proposed -- well, let me ask a preliminary question. Are you aware of a list of species put together by the Department of Natural Resources for what are called the RTE species, rare, threatened, and endangered?
- A. I'm aware of a list, I believe, with that classification.
- Q. Uh-huh. And are you aware of a classification of wildlife species that ODNR has that are referred to as species of concern?
 - A. I'm not, no.

2.1

- Q. Go to page 8, please, of your supplemental testimony. And I would like to direct your attention to Condition 19 as you propose to revise it.
- MR. SETTINERI: Just for the record, if
 we could be clear that the conditions in the

174 supplemental testimony are from the Joint 1 2 Stipulation. 3 MR. VAN KLEY: That's fine. 4 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you. 5 MR. VAN KLEY: Make that clear. 6 Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, is that correct? 7 8 Α. That the conditions in the supplemental 9 testimony are from the Joint Stipulation? 10 Q. Yes. 11 Α. Yes. 12 Okay. And then the proposed language for Q. 13 Condition 19 on page 8 of your supplemental 14 testimony, I would like to direct your attention to 15 the 6th line where we start with the sentence, the 16 first of which is "following." And there is a reference in that sentence to "pre- and 17 18 post-construction stormwater calculations." Do you see that? 19 20 Α. Is this line 17 of the page, Mr. Van 2.1 Kley? 2.2 It starts -- yeah, it's on line 17. Q.

- 23 I do, yep. Α.
- 24 Would you describe what those Ο. 25 calculations are.

- A. You know, this was input from our engineering procurement and construction team as to how this condition could be revised. So I couldn't give a good explanation of what those calculations are or how they are arrived at.
- Q. All right. Let's go to page 10 of your supplemental testimony, answer 18 on the top of that page.
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. With respect to proposed Condition 23, are you aware that there's a classification of weeds in ODNR's regulations that are referred to as invasive species?
- MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object to the form of the question. Asking and assuming facts not in the record or evidence.
- ALJ WILLIAMS: He is just laying a foundation. I will let the question stand.
- MR. SETTINERI: Okay.
- A. I'm aware of the term "invasive species."

 I am not aware of a specific ODNR classification of

 such species.
- Q. Are you aware of any regulation issued by ODNR for invasive species?
- 25 A. I am not personally.

Q. Let's go to page 15 of your supplemental testimony, answer 24. Is there anything in proposed Condition 34 that you would interpret to protect surface waterways on adjoining fields?

2.1

A. My -- my limited understanding of field drainage and tiling is that it is connected to surface waterways, but I really don't have any more detailed understanding of surface waterways specifically than that.

MR. VAN KLEY: Give me just a moment, your Honor, if you wouldn't mind. I think I am finished.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We will go off the record while Mr. Van Kley reviews his notes.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Back on the record.

Mr. Van Kley.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, go back to your first testimony, Exhibit 6, page 12, lines 17 and 18 where you struck the language "(i.e., to the horizontal)," if I am reading this accurately. Tell me why you struck that language.

MR. SETTINERI: I would just object.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Settineri, go ahead.

MR. SETTINERI: Go ahead, Mr. Stickney.

2.1

A. Yes. So my -- my nontechnical understanding of racking systems that are currently offered for solar facilities like Kingwood Solar on the market today was that stow mode as it's referred to. It stows the panels in a horizontal fashion.

However, come to learn recently, as you will find in Mr. Roedel's testimony later this week, it's -- it's much more technical and much more detailed than that, than my understanding of it. So I didn't want to mis -- misrepresent that it would be horizontal or of a certain degree and thought that I would leave that up to his expertise.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. I have no more questions, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Van Kley.

Next we have Miami Township. Attorney

Slone.

MR. SLONE: Thank you, your Honor. Miami Township doesn't have any questions at this time for this witness.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Next we have the Greene County Board County Commissioners.

MR. BOGGS: Thank you, your Honor. At

Proceedings - Volume I 178 this time the Greene County Board of Commissioners 1 2 does not have any questions for this witness. 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 4 Next we have Xenia Township. 5 MR. WATKINS: Thank you, your Honor. 6 Xenia Township has no questions for this witness. 7 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 8 Cedarville Township. 9 MR. BROWN: Thank you, your Honor. 10 to get off of mute. I do have a few questions that I 11

would like to go through.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Please proceed.

13

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 By Mr. Brown:

12

16

2.1

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Stickney.
- 17 Α. Mr. Brown.
- 18 I would like to focus on your direct Q. 19 testimony, Exhibit 6, and direct your attention to 20 page 7 to start with.
 - Α. Yes, sir.
- 22 On page 7 there is question No. 10. Q. 23 says "Did the Applicant engage in any community 24 outreach about the Project," and your answer was 25 "Yes"; is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. All right. You list a bunch of entities in which you had direct contact; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. So I just want to go through a couple of these. It says that you had meetings with Cedarville Township Board of Trustees; is that correct?
- A. I personally did not. A Kingwood Solar representative did, in fact.
- Q. Okay. When did that meeting with the Cedarville Township Board of Trustees occur?
- A. Sure. And sorry. Maybe I should correct that. The -- as it's referenced in this response, I personally did not have the initial engagement and outreach and meeting that was conducted.

To answer your question, I believe that was in the late fall or winter of 2020 into 2021.

And so it could have been December or January. I since then, you know, have spoken with representatives from Cedarville Township.

- Q. Okay. Who did you speak with at Cedarville Township?
- A. Me personally and this was a -- as part
 of stipulation discussions was Mr. Jeff Ewry, if I am

pronouncing his name correctly. I believe the meeting that occurred in the winter of 2020-2021 included a number of trustees. I believe

Ms. Krajicek was included in that meeting as I'm told. Again, I was not a participant.

2.1

- Q. So in the fall of 2021, you are saying that a representative of Kingwood met with all of the township trustees for Cedarville?
- A. I can't say if it was all of the trustees or just some of them.
- Q. And do you know where that meeting took place?
 - A. I believe it was virtual.
 - Q. A virtual meeting. Can you tell us what was discussed at that meeting?
 - A. Similar to most of the other meetings in response to this question in my testimony, it was a general introduction of the Kingwood Solar project, general introduction of utility-scale solar development, the energy market referred to as the PJM Interconnection, the Kingwood -- you know, the general Kingwood Solar project site, I believe.

Again, this was a similar presentation that was given to many of these entities. And then just, you know, kind of general conversation,

question and answer about the project or the process in particular.

2.1

- Q. All right. And you said it wasn't you personally. Do you know from Kingwood who conducted that meeting?
 - A. It would have been John Soininen.
 - Q. I'm sorry. What was the last name?
 - A. Soininen, S-O-I-N-E-N-E-N.
- Q. Okay. Did anyone from Kingwood ever attend a Cedarville Township Trustees' meeting, regularly-scheduled meeting?
- A. Not to my knowledge. In fact, I -- yeah, not to my knowledge.
 - Q. All right. Thank you for clarifying.

 Just following up then on the other two townships,

 are you saying that Cedarville -- that Kingwood had

 virtual meetings with both Xenia Township and Miami

 Township as well?
 - A. Virtual meetings. I personally have had -- had a virtual meeting with the Board of Trustees of Xenia Township had an in-person meeting with representatives from Xenia Township, Xenia Township Administrator to discuss the Kingwood Solar project and the opinions or -- once again, feedback from the trustees of the Xenia Township. Those were

in-person meetings.

2.1

- Q. And how about Miami Township?
- A. I'm -- I met Mr. Hollister, a Miami

 Township Trustee, in person one time. I believe that was not in a formal meeting, but I want to say it was at the April 6 County Commissioners' town hall.

 There was an introductory meeting and, again, similar general introduction presentation of the Kingwood Solar project given to the Miami Township Board of Trustees. I believe that was around the same time frame as the Cedarville meeting, again, orchestrated and narrated from John Soininen, my predecessor as Project Manager for the Kingwood project.
 - Q. Thank you. I would like to move on to page -- let's see, actually on page 8, the paragraph that spans line 3 through line 9.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Yeah. Talked about the good neighbor agreements offered to 65 non-participating landowners.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I notice how you changed the last sentence from the Applicant has entered into six instead of five agreements with landowners; is that right?

A. That's right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. All right. And you gave us a total amount of offered payments at 822,500.
- A. Yes, sir, among those 65 offers that were extended.
- Q. Yeah. So 65 offers, you know, add up to, you know, 822,5. How much does the six accepted offers add up to?
- That's -- I don't have that number at 9 Α. 10 hand. The payments as referenced in line 5, they 11 ranged from \$7,500 to \$25,000 per landowner that was 12 offered. There were four tiers in that structure 13 7,5100, 10,000, 15,000, 25,000 dollars. I don't know 14 exact -- you know, the six is a mixture of those 15 tiers. I don't know exactly what that total is 16 today.
 - But I will note, you know, 65 were mailed. Six have been signed. There are 59 letters still on the table, if you will. We haven't retracted any of those offers.
 - Q. But if you had to estimate what the total is of what has been accepted, is that in your -- is that in your knowledge?
- A. I could estimate. I mean, we've -- you know, \$6,000 in payment consideration, and it may be

- 5,000 with a thousand due, if you will, given that 1 2 that 5 was recently changed to 6 just within the last week. So \$6,000 in payment consideration and then 3 one time future payment at -- at startup of 4 5 construction, I would estimate that to be about --6 probably about \$100,000.
 - Ο. For all of the six.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- For all of the six. Α.
- Ο. All right. Good. All right. So in your knowledge, is there an estimated or projected annual profit for the project?
- Α. I don't know. For profit for these landowners?
- No, the projected annual profit for Ο. Kingwood for the project.
- Oh, I don't know that number. It's above 16 Α. 17 my pay grade.
- Okay. Well, the idea is just to try to Q. 19 figure out what the percentage of these good neighbor 20 agreement payments are compared to the total annual 2.1 profit. Any idea?
- 2.2 Α. Yeah. I don't know.
- 23 All right. At the bottom of this same Q. 24 page, it talks about a community fund. Are you 25 familiar with that community benefit fund?

A. I am.

2.1

2.2

- Q. All right. Can you explain what the community benefit fund is?
- A. So this is an effort that we like to -like to advance and formalize. This was extended
 throughout stipulation discussions since -- I guess
 since last fall with the townships specifically as
 intervening parties.

As a result of feedback that we have received from, you know -- I am not sure if it was first received from the County and the County Commissioners but certainly feedback that I received from the County Commissioners and feedback that was relayed to me from either Township residents or Township as an entity themselves trying to understand or figure out how the Townships could see more direct benefit from the Kingwood Solar project over and above the taxes from what we represented as more than \$1-1/2 million a year paid from the Kingwood project over and above how much of that \$1-1/2 million a year would be allocated to each Township.

You know, the feedback that was related to me was how can we find a way to create more direct benefit for the townships specifically. So last fall -- and this began actually last summer as I was,

you know, engaging and talking with various different 1 2 members of the community to -- to propose this internally within the Vesper organization to allocate 3 this budget from the Kingwood Solar project to 4 5 basically create a fund that the Townships can 6 receive financial incentive directly. So we've 7 budgeted a \$225,000 per year fund for 35 years. That's more than \$7.8 million for the Townships to 8 9 collect on directly should they choose to accept it. 10 And I would imagine that, you know, that would be, 11 you know, the use of those dollars would be purely at 12 the Township Trustees' discretion or however, you 13 know, that process within each Township is managed 14 for allocating funds.

You know, I understand that -- and I received feedback from at least one of the Townships that's a fairly substantial amount of funding when compared to an annual budget.

Q. So can you tell me how the \$225,000 number was arrived at?

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

A. It was -- that's a good -- it was a collaborative effort between, you know, myself, my finance team, our management team in looking at, you know, the financial model that we have in place for this project, continuous working document of costs

and projected revenues and whatnot and how much -how much budget, you know, may be available but maybe
more so how much might be impactful and would be
substantial in what we've learned to each of these
Townships so 75,000 -- given that there are three
Townships, the \$75,000 per Township per year.

But to clarify, the total fund is available and on the table for whether it be 0, 1, 2, or 3 Townships that may choose to engage and collect any of those funds. Now, I imagine that would be a -- a side agreement of some sort or something that needs to be put in place for how a Township receives that kind of revenue. To that I'm not really sure. I would look to, you know, each individual township how to structure that.

- Q. Let me -- let me ask you with regard to that community benefit fund, would you say it was created to mitigate or offset the damages done to the Township by the project?
 - A. No, sir.

2.1

Q. Okay. Would you say that it's to replace revenues lost by the Township related to the project?

MR. SETTINERI: Just have to object.

There's no foundation laid but the question has been answered.

MR. BROWN: Well, actually he didn't -- he couldn't answer the question of how the \$225,000 number was created.

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll let the question stand.

- Q. (By Mr. Brown) What I am going at is typically a number is created for a reason. It's either to offset damages or if it's some other reason. So you said not to offset or mitigate damages done and not to replace revenues lost. So is it just a reward for withdrawing the objection or for the Township to withdraw its objection? Is that what this is for?
- A. You know, in my experience community benefit is a -- community benefit fund is a very common practice for any type of large development project and especially for any type of large development project that is unfamiliar to a certain community.

In this instance we felt that it was an appropriate time to introduce that fund, again, due to, you know, feedback that was related to me and our team that the townships don't see the benefit of Kingwood Solar, not because of lost revenues or not because of any type of damages but just don't see how

it would benefit those Townships directly, you know, aside from the landowners and the citizens of each of those townships that would be earning revenues from the leases.

2.1

So I guess, you know, maybe to more directly answer the question, it was -- it was, you know, substantially a budgeting exercise on our part of, you know, where can we -- where can we rearrange some of our costs or predicted costs for the project, to reallocate those as financial incentives for directly to those Townships specifically.

- Q. All right. Thank you. So following up on that then, do you have any idea what the \$225,000 in annual payments, what percentage of the project's annual expected profits, what would that percentage be? I mean, are you talking about is this 1 percent? Is this 7 percent? Any idea?
- A. I have no idea what the expected profits of Kingwood Solar would be.
- Q. And then on page 9, at the top of page 9, it says "the community benefit fund would not be part of a Certificate condition and is not a commitment by Applicant at this time." Is that still your testimony? That's lines 2 and 3.
 - A. Yep. So it's not -- not a part of

certificate condition frankly because when offered and followed up upon, none of the Townships were interested and declined the offer. So my understanding of a certificate condition in a joint stipulation process is both of those parties are typically a signatory or engaged in that suggestion. So for that reason we moved it from the certificate conditions. It was never inserted in the first place.

2.1

Q. All right. So just to be very clear then, the \$225,000 community benefit fund, that will not need to be paid to anyone if -- if one of the three Townships, if at least -- if none of the three Townships drop -- let me rephrase. I'm sorry. Let me go back.

That community benefit fund of \$225,000 will not be paid by Kingwood if all three Townships remain opposed to the application.

A. That's -- that's a possibility, yes. I suppose, you know, to put it another way, right, the reason for extending that offer was to try and initiate and support engagement from the Townships to work together with us on the Joint Stipulation document, the recommended conditions in some way, shape, or form for Kingwood Solar to co-habitate with

1 the local communities of those three Townships. 2 Nobody knows better than them. We tried to encourage that as much as possible. The interest wasn't there.

- Thank you. I would like to move on to Ο. page 36, an area that Jack has already discussed but I have a couple additional questions.
 - Α. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Ο. All right. Near the bottom starting at about line 16, your testimony is that you reviewed the public comments on the docket. Can you explain which public comments you reviewed before making these statements?
- Α. Sure. So this -- this testimony was filed on February 24, if I remember correctly. I reviewed the public comments on the case docket in the public comment section prior to that, I want to say maybe the cutoff date was February 20 or sometime in that range.

You know, I continuously reviewed those comments as a way for me to gather and pass on feedback to my company and our team about folks that are expressing opinions and sharing feedback about any of the work that we are doing for anticipation of the Kingwood project.

> Okay. Can you tell me -- I understand Q.

the docket has public comments that are filed. Did you also review the transcript of the November 15 public meeting where public comments were -- were given?

2.1

2.2

- A. I was in attendance at that meeting. Since then I have not reviewed the transcript in detail.
- Q. All right. So your -- your calculation of the number of comments in favor versus the number of comments opposing does not include any of the testimony at the November 15 public hearing, correct?
- A. To my knowledge, as far as the numbers in this section of my testimony, that's right. It does not include a calculation. Many of the folks that expressed their opinions at that public hearing on November 15 were some of the same people that had filed comments on the case record.
- Q. Okay. So you know that there is some crossover between the November 15 verbal public hearing expressions and some of the filed written comments.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you know -- do you know if all of the people who spoke at the public meeting filed written comments on the docket?

- A. I don't know if all of them did, no.
- Q. All right. So when you say that the total comments in support for the project number 45, those expressing concern or opposition total 83, I want to know how did you compile these statistics?
- A. So from the case record in the public comment section, opening and reading each of those filed comments, letters, e-mails, the various different formats in which they were submitted and using our judgment as to whether they were supportive outwardly or stated I am supportive or in opposition, oftentimes stating explicitly being in opposition.
- Q. All right. Did you prepare any supplemental materials that organized your review of all of the comments?
 - A. No, sir.

2.1

- Q. So, I mean, when you wrote this and said 45 versus 83, where did that number come from? Did you tally that up on the side and then create your testimony, or do you have some kind of an outline where all of those numbers can be double-checked?
- A. Yeah. It was -- it was pretty -- a pretty informal tally. Yeah, there was -- there was no specific kind of report or formalized documentation for it.

- Q. All right. Thanks. Did you attempt to distinguish comments that are on the record based on the residence of the commenter?
 - A. I didn't get that far, nope.

2.1

- Q. All right. So you can't tell which of the commenters reside in the three affected Townships, correct?
- A. I did recognize a number of residents' names in those records, but I can't attest to out of those numbers that were provided how many were residents of the Townships or were not.
- Q. So you have -- you have some kind of an idea based on names of people that you've interacted with, but you don't have a tally of commenters opposing and supporting based on the townships that they reside in, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And how about did you look at this with -- with respect to how many commenters reside in Greene County, not necessarily the three affected Townships but Greene County versus any other place on the planet?
- A. You know, I don't know that that was -the County or the Townships was necessarily possible,
 not all of those comments stated names even, let

alone addresses or places of residence.

2.1

2.2

- Q. All right. Did you do any tally on the number of leaseholders that were in opposition versus in support that were in the public record?
- A. It was from my recollection. I didn't do any formal tally. From my recollection it was -- they were less than a handful.
- Q. And then did you do any analysis on the number of commenters that were related in some way, had a family relationship to leaseholders?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Do you think that kind of information would be helpful in any way?
- A. I suppose that's subjective to anyone's opinion. I think that there could be a way to view that as helpful information just like repeated comments from opposition members, repeated comments from Intervenors in the case that were filed on that case docket as well. I did notice a number of those that were tabulated in these figures and also calculated in the Staff Report that was received in October.
- Q. All right. I want to move on to the bottom of page 36 where you reference "76 letters of support from members of the International Brotherhood

- of Electrical Workers." And I think that you mentioned that all of those letters of support were filed at one time in one submission to the docket; is that right?
- A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

9

14

15

16

22

- Q. All right. Did you personally review all of those I'm just going to call them the IBEW letters?
 - A. I did.
- Q. Okay. Did you see any similarities in those letters?
- A. I believe I see what you are getting at and, yes, there was.
 - Q. Okay. What kind of similarities do you think -- would you say there were in the 76 letters of support from the union workers?
- A. They were -- similarities would probably include it was a short statement vocalizing support for the Kingwood Solar project, and they were all similarly signed by hand by 76 different members of the IBEW.
 - Q. So are you saying it was a form letter signed by different people?
- A. It could be interpreted that way.
- Q. So with regard to Revised Code

- 4906.10(A), when we talk about -- I'm sorry,
 10(A)(6), the public interest, convenience, and
 necessity criteria, you made some statements in your
 direct about, you know, if you include the union
 member statements, then the statements in support are
 actually more numerous than the statements against;
 is that correct?
 - A. On the case record, that's right.
 - Q. All right. Do you think that the -- do you think that the statements from -- well, first of all, do you know where the IBE -- IBEW members reside?
 - A. Not every single one of them. I know some of them in particular as Greene County residents, most of them, if not all, as Ohio residents.
 - Q. Right. Do you know if any of them are Township residents of the three Intervenor Townships?
 - A. I do not.

2.1

Q. All right. So my question is with regard to your statement on page 38 when you said the Staff failed to account for a number of the support letters, such as 76 separate letters in support from -- from the IBEW, my question is do you think that the union members' support letters should have

equal weight to residents of the three affected Townships?

A. Absolutely. I think --

2.1

- Q. They should have equal weight if one-on-one?
- A. I think every comment or opinion about a project like Kingwood Solar that is cited and permitted at the state level in Ohio should be considered equally, absolutely. And the reason for that being, you know, in my opinion the reason that these projects are permitted at the state level is because it is larger than a Township issue.

I understand that Township residents may see a greater impact, you know, physically from these types of projects, but I do believe that the overall impact is much greater than just to the residents of the Township where it may sit. For instance, the 76 IBEW members that would be looking for high paying full-time employment from this project being constructed or any other of the dozens of solar projects that are proposed to be constructed in Ohio.

Q. So what you are saying is that a person who hopes to get employment at the project and may not live or experience any of the detrimental effects of the project, they should have equal weight to the

people who live in the area and are expressing their concerns about the detrimental effects?

- A. I personally don't see many detrimental effects, if any. But to answer your question, I do believe that every -- especially every Ohio resident that has an opinion about a project that is under review for certificate through the OPSB should be considered just as any other comment that's filed on that case record.
- Q. All right. On page 39, one of -- let's see, starting on line No. 7, you state that "While the interests of the township and the county are certainly relevant and those interests can properly be expressed by participating in a proceeding, the public interest, convenience, and necessity criteria should not be based on whether local governmental bodies oppose a project." Do you agree with that statement today?
 - A. I do.

2.1

Q. All right. So with regard to tabulating all of the comments, if you were to be -- if you were -- if you had the information available to know the residential location of each commenter, is there an opposition percentage that would be high enough for Kingwood to say, you know, the public just

doesn't want this; we should withdraw the application?

- A. When it comes to filed and expressed public comments, no, I don't. I do not think that there is a percentage that's high enough for the Power Siting Board to say we should not award this project. And the reason being is because the people that are ready and willing to file a comment, send communication to the Board, or send a letter, an e-mail, or make a phone call does not represent the opinion of the entire population of the three Townships that we are talking about or Greene County as a whole. And, in fact, a pole that was conducted from a -- a conservative polling organization just last week 350 registered voters --
- Q. Wait a second. Let me stop you there. I don't know that -- is that pole --
- MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, I would like him to be able to answer his question.
- Q. Is that pole in the answer?

 MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, we would like
 him to be able to finish his answer, and then

 Mr. Brown can comment.
- MR. BROWN: I didn't ask about any pole.
- MR. SETTINERI: You interrupted his

answer.

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: The protocol is the witness answers, and you can move to strike. We will let him conclude his answer, and you can move to strike as you feel necessary.

Mr. Stickney.

A. The pole that was conducted in Greene County 350 registered voters showed that at least 2 to 1 residents and taxpayers of Greene County support the transition to renewable energy and support the Kingwood Solar project.

So to go back to my original point there is no percentage of comments expressed or filed in a Power Siting Board review proceeding that would convince me that the public doesn't want this project because the term, in my opinion, vocal minority is extremely relevant here, that it does not represent the feeling and the public opinion of all registered residents, taxpayers, and community members where a project might sit.

And over and above that, I think that the en -- the whole reason these projects are cited at the state level in Ohio is because it's a matter of public need as the statute reads. And a neighboring resident's opinion of whether it's unsightly does not

- speak to does this accomplish public need in the State of Ohio.
- MR. BROWN: That's all the questions I have, Mr. Stickney. Thank you.
- 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Brown. In
- 6 Progress.
- 7 MR. HART: Thank you, your Honor. No 8 further questions.
- ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. I note that

 Attorney Swaney has not participated. I don't see

 him here on the screen so cross from Tecumseh.
- 12 Staff.
- MS. BAIR: Staff has no questions. Thank you, your Honor.
- 15 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Ms. Bair.
- Mr. Settineri, I assume you want a few minutes to confer before you decide on redirect?
- MR. SETTINERI: Yeah. I appreciate it,

 your Honor. You tell me. In addition to a few other
- 20 things, if we could come back at 5:30, that would be
- 21 great. Is that too long?
- 22 ALJ WILLIAMS: It seems a little long.
- 23 Why don't we give you 10 minutes, 5:22.
- MR. SETTINERI: Yeah. If you make it
- 25 | 5:25, I would appreciate it because I have something

```
1 else to attend to quickly.
```

2 ALJ WILLIAMS: 5:25.

3 MR. SETTINERI: It's called the restroom.

4 Thanks.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

5 ALJ WILLIAMS: We're off the record.

6 (Recess taken.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Back on the record.

Any redirect?

MR. VAN KLEY: Your Honor, before

Mr. Settineri starts his redirect, I would like to

move to strike the portion of the witness's last

answer concerning his interpretation of a public

opinion pole. That -- that testimony is -- is not

reliable and it's based purely on hearsay.

We have not seen either through discovery or in this hearing any written record of such an opinion pole, so we don't have any -- any information other than the witness's self-interested testimony about what the questions were that were asked, how they were worded so that we can see whether the wording of the questions in the opinion pole were skewed to obtain the results that the witness said that they obtained.

So in light of that, we would move to strike that as -- as hearsay and also violative of

the best evidence rule.

2.1

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Settineri, response?

MR. SETTINERI: Yeah. Well, your Honor,

I think that question and answer is over. We've

moved on. So it's been a bit since the question was

asked and the answer given. I would note that a

public opinion pole was provided in discovery. It

was sent out. It was supplemental discovery. And I

would note for the record I believe it went out

yesterday is when it went out. And I can represent

for the record I believe it was a very recent

document, created document so that was produced to

all the parties.

And in regards to his answer, again, it's been some time since the question was asked, your Honor, so we are at a bit of a disadvantage here, but it was about the percentage, if I recall, of the population and certainly this witness's knowledge of an opinion pole that was done is certainly relevant to that answer and it was -- if I had to guess, the question was properly broad ranging as well.

But certainly counsel could have asked and -- asked the opportunity to mark an exhibit and present it and ask the witness questions. That didn't happen so we moved on from it. So, no, I

don't believe the motion to strike should be granted, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MR. VAN KLEY: If I could respond, the fact that we took a break after the last answer doesn't mean that it's too late to insert an objection or motion to strike. We're still in the process of examining this witness, and Mr. Settineri has not started his redirect yet.

As to any document that could have been marked from supplemental discovery, why would we mark a document like that which is not responsive to his -- or which was not included in his direct testimony? There's no need to -- to cross-examine a witness about a public opinion pole that they didn't bother to put into their direct testimony so there was no occasion to do that.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Karen, are you able to get to that question relatively efficiently?

MR. SETTINERI: I'm sorry. Your Honor, I couldn't hear.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I have Karen going back into the record. I believe it was the last question before we broke.

(Record read.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: And, in fact, I am going

to strike after "In fact." We will let the rest of the answer stay on the record.

Mr. Settineri, you can proceed with redirect with that information in hand. We've stricken the rest of that answer.

MR. SETTINERI: And could you read that answer as it stands then.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Ms. Gibson, please.

(Record read.)

10 MR. SETTINERI: All right. Thank you,

11 your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

12

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Settineri:

- Q. Mr. Stickney, you were asked some questions about the opinion of the Township, whether there was a percentage high enough where Vesper -- of opposition against the project where Vesper would withdraw the project. Has Vesper taken any steps to gauge the opinions of residents in the County as to the project?
 - A. Yes, we have.
- Q. And what steps has Vesper taken to do that?
- 25 A. In addition to all the public meetings

that were held just last week, we commissioned a pole to be conducted. It was 350 registered voters in Greene County that were surveyed, I believe the margin of error was about 5 percent or so, asking a number of questions regarding their feelings toward renewable energy, their feelings toward agricultural farmland preservation, and specifically their feelings about the Kingwood Solar project.

Q. Okay.

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: Your Honor, in practice -keeping with your practice to allow the witness to
answer the question and then if necessary to move to
strike, I would move to strike that answer as well.
Again, we're running into hearsay issues here that we
now know from the last answer which was not revealed
in the witness's prior answer that was struck was a
pole commissioned by the solar company itself. So
again, this is rank hearsay and that answer should
not stand.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I am going to overrule the objection. The witness has testified regarding a pole that was conducted by his company, so I don't see how the answer is hearsay. You will certainly be entitled to recross regarding your interpretation of the quality of the pole, but the answer will stay.

Mr. Settineri.

MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. (By Mr. Settineri) Mr. Stickney, you were asked some questions about the projects in Vesper's developer pipeline. Is one of those projects the Nestlewood project?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. And is that an Ohio project?
- A. Yes, it is. It's in Brown and Clermont Counties.
- Q. And what's the status of that project currently?
 - A. It's preparing to go into construction activity any time now.
 - Q. Okay. And there was some questions or discussion about reactive power. At a high level, what is reactive power?
 - A. Reactive power would be engagement through PJM and they award revenues for participation in this program, if you will. It helps to regulate frequency of power flow on the transmission system utilizing different alternating current facilities and connection points on their system.
- So in this instance the inverters associated with Kingwood Solar project would be

dispatched in the reactive power program to help regulate frequency and the flow of power on the system.

- Q. Is reactive power a form of grid reliability?
- A. It's certainly -- that's the intent and certainly helps to support grid reliability.
- Q. And if the project is engaged in reactive power, would all of the inverters be operating?
- A. I believe we specced to a 60 percent participation rate. So it's not yet determined whether it would be all inverters operating at 60 percent capacity or only 60 percent of the total inverters on the project site.
- Q. And you were asked some questions about Appendix I believe it's P. If you could turn to that, please, in the application. Well -- I'm sorry. It's -- actually I am going to refer you to the economic development study which I believe is E. Let's see if I am right. Nope.
- 21 A. D.

- Q. D, thank you. Let me know when you are there, Mr. Stickney.
 - A. Yep, I'm here.
- Q. Okay. If you could turn to page 5,

- "Fiscal Impacts," please.
- 2 A. Yep.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- Q. And then I am going to follow

 Mr. Van Kley's lead on using multiple fingers here.

 If you could then at the same time, if you have a copy of your direct testimony, I believe.
 - A. I do.
 - Q. And it would be -- if you could put your finger at page 19, last sentence, line 23 that starts the Project will also generate an estimated \$1.9 million in state and federal [sic] taxes for the life of the project.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And turning back -- so the \$1.9 million in state and local taxes, is that an annual amount?
- 17 A. It is.
- Q. Okay. And so in your testimony how should that read to reflect the annual dollar amount for the 1.9 million?
- A. In the testimony starting on page 19,
 line 23, "The Project will also generate an estimated
 \$1.9 million annually in state and local taxes for
 the life of the Project."
- Q. You were also asked some questions about

Kingwood Solar's ownership structure. Do you remember that?

A. I do.

2.1

- Q. And you -- I believe in your answers you referenced Vesper. Specifically, you know, what is the name of the Vesper Energy that owns Kingwood Solar?
- A. It would be Vesper Energy Finance LLC which is an entity that's owned wholly by Vesper Energy Portfolio I LLC previously named Lendlease Energy Development and that entity is wholly owned by Vesper Energy Development LLC.
- Q. You were asked about layout Figure 03-3, and I know there were -- I think we looked at the updated figure in Kingwood Exhibit 2. But does that figure show the proposed project substation location?
 - A. It does.
- Q. And does it also show the switchyard location?
 - A. It does.
- Q. And just for the record, can you just explain the relationship between the project substation and the switchyard?
- A. The project substation is where all of the power is collected, all of the collection lines

- in the solar modules and the inverters are collected 1 2 into. That power is stepped up to an appropriate voltage level, in this case it would be 3 138,000 volts, 138 kV volts, kV to match the 4 5 transmission line that it's interconnected to. 6 substation with a gen-tie, then transmit that --7 transmits that power to the interconnection facility that would be looped into that FirstEnergy 8 9 transmission line that we are connecting to.
 - Q. When you say interconnection facility, is that the utility switchyard?
 - A. Correct, the switchyard.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Now, in final -- after final engineering is done for this project, would you expect that the project substation location would change from what's been shown in the application drawings?
 - A. No. It will not change.
- Q. And the same question as to the switchyard, would that be expected to change after final engineering?
 - A. It is not expected to change, no.
- Q. And for both of those facilities, why do you not expect those locations to change?
- A. Those are coordinates of a location that are required to be provided to PJM before -- before a

facility's study can be completed and a report can be issued and certainly before an interconnection services agreement can be signed which we have done already for Kingwood Solar.

- Q. You were asked some questions about the various meetings that you cite in your testimony.

 And one of them was, I believe, a town hall meeting.

 Did you attend the April 6, 2021, town hall meeting that was held by the Board of Commissioners for Greene County?
 - A. I did.

2.1

- Q. Okay. Did you attend all the meetings?
- A. I did.
- Q. Okay. Now, you were asked some questions about your -- in your direct testimony about your public comment tally as I think the words were. Do you recall a number of questions about that?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. And sitting here now, do you recall whether you -- what did you use to check those numbers?
- A. I do recall, yeah. It was a tally that I kept while reviewing those comments filed on the public docket, and after tallying, I moved those into an Excel spreadsheet to warehouse that information

- tallying support, opposition, and, in fact, there was a neutral column as well.
- Q. And do you know whether those were produced to parties through -- that spreadsheet was produced to parties through discovery?
 - A. I do believe they were, yes.
- Q. All right. And you were asked some questions about the Joint Stipulation, and we are going to do a couple of things. If you could turn to what's been marked as Joint Exhibit 1 which is the Joint Stipulation.
- 12 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. And I just need to find mine. Bear with me. While I am doing that if you could also then go to the landscaping plan which I believe is in Appendix Q of the application. Tell me when you're there.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. All right. Let's start first with the landscape plan. And I will turn your attention again it's Appendix Q of the application. It's titled "Visual Impact Analysis." Is a landscaping plan -- plan included in that Appendix Q?
 - A. It is. Very, very end.
- Q. Okay. And the landscape plan that's

attached is not just a drawing; is that right?

- A. It is not.
- Q. Okay.

2.1

- A. Correct.
- Q. Can you describe it at a high level, please?
- A. Yeah. So there is a few pages that outline the design methodology for how this landscape plan was put together with a goal of visual screening and mitigation. There is a section outlining how we would intend to select certain vegetative materials included in that landscape plan, three different planting options or levels for different types of planting categories, if you will. I think those were referenced earlier as light, medium, and tall. And then it references the location of our proposed planting options with a selection of maps and figures attached to it.
- Q. Okay. Now, you were asked questions about Condition 16 in Joint Exhibit 1 -- actually it was your direct testimony, but if you could turn to Joint Exhibit 1, Condition 16, please.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And I am just going to direct your attention to the sentence close to the bottom, last

full sentence, bottom of page 5, "Subject to any project area reductions, vegetative screening shall at a minimum consist of screening in the locations shown in the attached screening plan using the identified levels of screening from the Landscape Plan attached" -- sorry, "Landscaping Plan attached to the Applicant's application in this proceeding." And then is the -- the document that's attached to the Joint Exhibit 1, is that the screening plan?

2.1

- A. That's right. That's the updated screening plant.
- Q. All right. Can you just walk us through for the record how the screening plan -- how Condition 16 -- let me think. Strike that.

Can you walk us through how the additional language in Condition 16, specifically referencing Attachment 1, how will that role be used by the project in design?

A. So specific to Attachment 1, the Joint Stipulation, showing an updated -- an updated layout and proposed screening levels, if you will, or screening categories, again, light, medium, and tall and their locations as we've proposed them through the Stipulation process so this is updated from Appendix Q of the application. And this is, again,

as referenced in that Condition 16, subject to any project area reductions. This would be at a minimum what we are proposing for new added landscaping for visual mitigation for this project.

- Q. Okay. So in regards to Attachment 1, what is shown here for the locations of the screening and the levels of screening as to light, medium, and tall, would this document I'll just say trump any other contrary screening layout in the Appendix Q?
 - A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And in terms of the modules, are -- does Appendix Q designate what is light screening, medium screening, and tall screening?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Okay. And could you point that out for the record, please, where that is?
- A. So that starts at Figure 2 of Appendix Q, Attachment C. There is a rendering of light screening, simulation of light screening followed by a light screening planting plan showing example types of vegetative material. It's showing an example of how those plantings would be arranged and then continues with the simulation of medium and the same for medium plantings, example of the materials and example plantings plan, and the same for tall in

Figure 6 and 7.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

- Q. Okay. So then turning back to Attachment 1 to the Joint Stipulation, for example, if I go to the very far north where there is a blue line on that drawing, do you see that by Clifton Road?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. What I guess level of screening would apply at that location?
- A. That blue is associated in the screening key, as you can see, with tall screening.
- Q. Okay. And then the tall screening, where is that -- would that be Figure 6?
 - A. That would be Figure 6 rendering and Figure 7 the planting plan.
 - Q. So does Appendix Q provide the -- the type of screening that would then be used at the locations designated on Attachment 1? When I say "type," the plantings themselves.
 - A. That's right. These are -- these are example types of plantings themselves of similar size, shape, and type, I suppose you could say.
 - Q. You were also asked some questions about the community fund. Do you recall those questions?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Okay. And I believe it's Kingwood

Exhibit 7 maybe. Let me see. Maybe I can do this without finding the exact location. Is your -- is the intent of Kingwood Solar to continue to pursue the community fund with the Townships?

A. Absolutely.

2.2

- Q. And if a certificate is issued, would Kingwood Solar continue to pursue implementing a community fund with the Townships?
- A. That's right. We hope to obtain a certificate and continue to pursue that community fund work together with all three of those Townships in a way that satisfies their concerns about construction or operation of Kingwood Solar.
- Q. Okay. And in the event a community fund is implemented with the Townships, would you expect that the Township that receives community fund would not oppose the project going forward and through any appeals or anything like that?
 - A. Yes.

20 MR. SETTINERI: Okay. If I may just have 21 a quick moment.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: You want to indicate that on the record, please.

MR. SETTINERI: Oh, sorry. Yes, thank you, your Honor. We have no further questions at this time for Mr. Stickney.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Settineri.

I will entertain recross beginning with Citizens for Greene Acres, CGS.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, your Honor.

_ _

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:

2.1

- Q. Mr. Stickney, with respect to the opinion pole that your company commissioned, isn't it true that 60 percent of the people poled had not heard anything at all about the Kingwood project prior to your pole?
- A. I -- I don't have that pole in front of me, and I believe that is correct.
- Q. And isn't it also true that an additional 13 percent of the people poled have not heard very much about the Kingwood project before the opinion pole?

MR. SETTINERI: Your Honor, at this time I would just object. If we are going to read off a document, we should just put it in the record. We are going to have a very cloudy record.

1 MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. I'm game for that. 2 Give me just a moment to mark it and e-mail it out. 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: Karen, we can go off. (Discussion off the record.) 4 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: Let's go back on. 6 All right. We were off the record for a 7 plus or minus 5 minutes. We have marked as Citizens' 8 Exhibit 16 Greene County Ohio Public Opinion 9 Strategies Pole that was apparently commissioned by 10 Vesper. 11 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 12 ALJ WILLIAMS: With that please proceed, 13 Mr. Van Kley. 14 MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 15 Ο. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Stickney, you have 16 in front of you what's been marked as Citizens 16 17 which is a document labeled on the top "Public 18 Opinion Strategies Turning Questions into Answers." 19 Do you have that document in front of you? 20 Α. Yes, I do. 2.1 Ο. This was, going to the first page, was a 22 pole conducted on March 2 to 3, 2022; is that 23 correct? 24 Yes, sir. Α. 25 Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to page 6 of

this document. Before I ask any questions about this document, have you -- have you seen this document before?

A. I have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

2.2

- Q. All right. And can you identify this document?
- A. This is a public opinion strategies conducted -- public survey conducted in Greene County, Ohio, March 2 to 3 of 2022.
- Q. And this is a document related to the public opinion pole that you've been discussing in your testimony?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And this document contains the questions that were asked in that opinion pole?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. So now let's go to paragraph
 6 -- I mean page 6. The top of that page it says
 "There is a significant sentiment that more economic
 and job opportunities are needed in the county." Do
 you see that?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Is that a question that was asked of the -- of the participants in the pole?
- A. It's not. That's a summary of the

results based on the responses to a question that was asked.

- Q. And does this document contain that question?
- A. The question is at the bottom in italics, "Thinking just about Greene County, do you believe that Greene County is doing well economically, or do you believe that more economic and job opportunities are needed?"
- Q. Okay. Is that the first question asked in the pole?
 - A. I don't know which order this question was asked.
 - Q. Let's go to the seventh page. And there it says "And do you generally support or oppose gradually transitioning the country's energy supply from fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, and coal more toward renewable energy sources like wind and solar power?" Do you see that?
 - A. I do.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. Is that another question asked in this pole?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. Then we go to page 8. And reading from the top "How much have you seen, read, or heard about

the Kingwood Solar plan to build a utility-scale solar farm here in Greene County?" Do you see that?

A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. And that's another question asked in the pole?
- A. That's right.
 - Q. And according to page 8 of this document, 60 percent of the people poled had heard nothing at all prior to this pole about the Kingwood Solar project?
- 11 A. That's what it says.
- Q. Okay. And only 13 had -- and 13 percent had not heard very much; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And 19 percent had heard some about the Kingwood Solar project prior to the pole?

MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object.

It's -- it's not -- I don't know if it's form or question, but it's not addressing the question in the pole, so you are mischaracterizing the question in the pole.

MR. VAN KLEY: I don't think I did.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) I mean, here the question says "Have you seen, read, or heard about the Kingwood Solar plan to build a utility-scale

solar farm here in Greene County," and 8 percent of the people poled said "Some," right?

2.1

- A. No. 8 percent said a lot, responded with a lot. 19 percent responded with some.
- Q. Yeah. Isn't that the question I just asked you?
- A. You said 8 percent responded with some which is incorrect.
- Q. Oh, okay. Thank you for correcting me.

 All right. Then we go to page 9 and tell me if this is the -- a question asked of the people poled, "As you may know, Kingwood Solar has proposed a solar project that consists of 1,200 acres of private leased land in Xenia, Cedarville, and Miami Townships. It is projected to provide \$1.5 million annually to the local communities in Greene County with the largest beneficiary being the schools. Do you support or oppose this proposed Kingwood Solar farm?" Is that the question that was asked?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. And that's the question that produced the results that you characterized in your testimony as favoring the solar project, right?
- MR. SETTINERI: I just object.
- 25 Mischaracterizes his testimony. Are we citing

1 | supplemental testimony? Direct testimony?

2.1

2 MR. VAN KLEY: No, his testimony today on 3 redirect.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will overruled the objection. He can explain his interpretation of this. He did testify along this line.

MR. SETTINERI: Yes. Thank you.

ALJ WILLIAMS: You're welcome. Please proceed.

- A. The results to that question are one of the pieces of information that I was referring to in categorizing the pole that was conducted and the response to that pole whether supporting or opposing the Kingwood Solar project.
- Q. Okay. Where's the rest of the information you used to support your testimony in that regard?
- A. Well, there is another question in this document. If you turn to page 18, when asked again at the end of the pole after learning a little bit of information about Kingwood Solar through the questions that were asked, that that support increases from 63 percent to 68 percent in support and decreases in opposition from 23 to 21 percent.
 - Q. Okay. Does this exhibit show us what

additional questions were asked that produced the increase to 68 percent?

A. Sure.

2.1

- Q. Where do -- where do I find those questions in this document?
- A. You can find those on page 15, 16, and 7 17.
 - Q. Okay. Looking at page 15, tell me if this is one of the questions that you were asked to produce the 68 percent favorable opinion of the project, "If you knew that this facility would not only help farmers preserve their farmland for future generations but also help southwest Ohio contribute to the critical transition to clean energy generation, then would you favor or oppose this project?" So is that one of the questions that was asked?
 - A. I believe so, yes.
 - Q. All right. And let's go to page 16. And here reading "And if you knew that the 1,200 acres of land that will be used by this solar project comprises less than 1 percent of all agricultural land in the county, then would you favor or oppose this project?" Did I read that right?
- 25 A. You read it correctly, yeah.

- Q. Okay. And that's another question that was asked?
 - A. I believe so, yes.

2.1

- Q. And then we go to page 17, and it looks like there is another question there which states "As you may know, a number of Greene County residents have agreed to lease their land to Vesper Energy for the Kingwood Solar project. Do you believe that these property owners should have the right to lease their land to whomever they want and that the state and local governments should not interfere?" Is that another question asked?
- A. That's right. Pretty overwhelming response in support of that question.
- Q. Yeah. So do you think -- do you actually think that the question asked in this opinion pole produced impartial answers based on the people's actual knowledge about this project?
 - A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. Oh, you do, okay. And so given that
 73 percent of the people poled knew nothing or not
 very much about the project before this opinion pole,
 do you think that the kinds of questions you asked
 which produce only favorable information about the
 solar project are likely to produce an accurate pole

of people who are actually informed about the project?

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. SETTINERI: I'll just object in that. The question mischaracterizes the contents of the document. If I could register that for the record, please.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Noted. Overruled. He can answer.

A. Could you repeat that question, please?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. Could we have that reread, your Honor?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Karen, please.

(Record read.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Stickney.

- A. Yes, I do. Mr. Van Kley, in particular the fact that the question was asked initially without suggesting any what you called favorable attributes, what I call factual attributes with Kingwood Solar and it was still approximately 2 to 1 in favor of supporting the Kingwood Solar project.
- Q. Which of these questions are you referring to in that answer?
- A. I am looking at page 10 where the question is stated in larger text on page 9.
- Q. So you are talking about the question

that was asked in page -- on page 9?

A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And that's the question that is prefaced by the statement that "The project's projected to provide \$1-1/2 million to local communities with the largest beneficiary being the schools"?
 - A. That's a fact.
- Q. Uh-huh. And do you think a question worded like this with a preface like this is likely to produce an accurate opinion pole of people that knew nothing else about this project?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Isn't this question tantamount to asking the people poled whether they favor giving -- having money given to the local communities and schools?
- A. I'm not sure I understand one of the terms you used there.
 - O. Which term is that? Tantamount?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Well, let me reask it then. With the preface to this question being that the solar project is projected to provide \$1-1/2 million annually to the communities and the schools, isn't that a preface that is designed to produce a yes answer?

A. I don't believe so, no.

2.1

2.2

Q. So you think somebody who has never heard anything about the project prior to your opinion pole and then is told only that the project is going to give money to the community is likely to say that they don't favor a project?

MR. SETTINERI: Just object, argumentative. And he's already asked and answered. That's basically the same question, but it's argumentative.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Overrule the objection. He is allowed to press on the basis of the answer. Please continue.

A. I personally would hope that nobody would answer this question in opposing a project like the Kingwood Solar farm, whether it was prefaced with how much money it is expected to provide to the local community or not. I think it has more to do with the responders' previously conceived opinions about solar project development regardless of whether they knew about Kingwood and the specifics about Kingwood or not.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. That's a very helpful answer. I don't think I have any better follow-up than that. Thank you very much. I have no

further questions.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Van Kley.

I believe we also heard from Cedarville

Township. Any recross?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I just have one additional question.

2.1

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Brown:

- Q. Mr. Stickney, you said that you produced the tally sheet of the commenters in discovery. Can you tell me when that was done so that I can find it?
- A. I would defer to Mr. Settineri on when exactly that was produced. I am not sure if I have a date myself here.
- Q. Well, I'm confused because when I asked the question the first time, you said you didn't have one, and then you said you had one, but it's been produced. I need to know where I can find it. In response to what discovery did you produce it?
- A. I believe discovery -- discovery was served upon us by Citizens for Greene Acres, if I remember correctly, as to any documentation used in relation to, you know, our activities with this project. So I do apologize. My memory served me

incorrectly when you originally asked the question, but I did tally the answers. After tallying those answers, I input them into an Excel spreadsheet, shared that with our team, and do believe it was produced as a response to one of those discovery requests. I don't know the date to which exactly when it was produced.

2.1

- Q. Can you explain a little bit about what the sheet looks like so when I am looking for it, I can determine that I found it?
- A. Sure, yeah. It's an Excel spreadsheet.

 It -- it has three columns as supportive, opposing,
 or neutral. And I believe there's a fourth column.

 I want to say that it copies the text from the public comments section of the case record. Up until the date that it was an -- assessed or analyzed, right?

 Again, I think that was around February 20 or so,
 maybe a little earlier than that.

MR. SETTINERI: I'll -- for the record I will just represent I believe, subject to check,
Mr. Brown, that was produced February 26, 2022. And it would have been like either a first or second supplemental response.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. SETTINERI: You're welcome.

234 1 MR. BROWN: 26th. Thank you. That's all 2 I need. 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Mr. Settineri, do you have any redirect? 4 5 MR. SETTINERI: One question. Well, 6 yeah. 7 ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, Mr. Van Kley. 8 MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah, your Honor. He's 9 already done redirect. What we did was recross. 10 ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. I'm accepting 11 of that. 12 We will excuse the witness at this stage, 13 and we will take up the matter of the exhibits. 14 Thank you, Mr. Stickney. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Settineri. 17 MR. SETTINERI: Yes, your Honor. 18 time I will move for the admission of a number of 19 exhibits, and I will just do the numbers. Kingwood 20 Exhibit 1 which is the application, Kingwood 1C which 2.1 is confidential portion of the application, Kingwood Exhibit 2 which is compilation of various responses 22

Kingwood Exhibit 3 proofs of services of application,

confidential portion of parts of those responses;

to Staff Data Requests, Kingwood Exhibit 2C

23

24

```
Kingwood Exhibit 4 various public notices related to
1
2
     landowner mailings, Kingwood Exhibit 5 again related
     to proofs of publications, Kingwood Exhibit 6 which
 3
     is a direct testimony of Dylan Stickney, Kingwood
 4
 5
     Exhibit 7 which will be the supplemental testimony of
 6
     Dylan Stickney, as well as I would move for the
7
     admission in addition Joint Exhibit 1 which is the
     Joint Stipulation and Recommendation as to
8
9
     certificate conditions that's been filed in this
10
     proceeding, and, lastly, we would move for the
11
     admission of Citizens Exhibit 16, your Honor.
12
                                Thank you, Mr. Settineri.
                 ALJ WILLIAMS:
13
     So let's do these one at a time. Give the parties a
14
     chance to object to each of them individually.
15
                 Any objections to the admission of
16
     Exhibit 1?
17
                 Hearing none, that's admitted.
18
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
19
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Objections to Exhibit 1C?
20
                 Hearing none, that's also deemed
2.1
     admitted.
2.2
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
23
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Any objection to the
24
     admission of Exhibit 2?
25
                 Hearing none, that's admitted.
```

(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

```
237
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Any objections to the
 1
 2
     admission of Joint Exhibit 1?
 3
                 Hearing none, that's admitted.
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
 4
 5
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Any objection to the
     admission of Citizens Exhibit 16?
 6
 7
                 Hearing none, that's admitted as well.
 8
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
9
                 ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. For the last of the
10
     record purposes, we will go off record, and then we
11
     will just adjourn straight from there.
12
                 Karen, we will reconvene tomorrow morning
13
     at 9:00 a.m., so we are off the record.
14
                 (Thereupon, at 6:28 p.m., the hearing was
15
     adjourned.)
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Monday, March 7, 2022, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-7244)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/14/2022 9:03:32 AM

in

Case No(s). 21-0117-EL-BGN

Summary: Transcript in the matter of the Kingwood Solar I, LLC hearing held on 03/07/22 - Volume I electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.