

BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the Applications of)	
Paulding Wind Farm LLC and)	
Paulding Wind Farm III LLC for)	Case No. 15-2030-EL-BGA
Amendments to their Certificates to)	Case No. 15-2031-EL-BGA
Install and Operate Wind Powered)	
Electric Generations Facilities in)	
Paulding County, Ohio)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ERIN BOWSER

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

A.1. My name is Erin Bowser. I am the Director of Project Management for EDP Renewables North America (“EDPR NA”), which is the parent company of Applicant, Paulding Wind Farm III LLC. My business address is 155 East Market Street, Suite 307, Indianapolis, IN 46204.

Q.2. What are your duties as Director of Project Management?

A.2. As Director of Project Management I am responsible for wind farm development activities for several projects in Ohio and throughout the Eastern Region of the United States. My responsibilities include establishing and managing relationships with elected officials, regulators, and community opinion leaders to support project development; identifying prospective projects with suitable wind resources and electric transmission access; developing and managing project budgets and schedules; managing environmental study and permitting processes, managing third party consultants; and supporting financial analysis and modeling of the project economics, among other duties. I have also represented EDPR NA in various public hearings.

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

A.3. I graduated from Clarion University with a BA in History and Political Science in 1997 and from Ohio University in 1998 where I obtained a Masters Degree in Political Science. From 1998 - 2008 I worked for various non-profit public policy advocacy organizations including Environment Ohio where I was the Executive Director from 2003 - 2008. I started as a Project Manager for EDPR NA (then known as Horizon Wind Energy) in 2008 and was promoted to Project Management Director in 2011.

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

A.4. I am testifying on behalf of the Applicants, Paulding Wind Farm LLC and Paulding Wind Farm III LLC.

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

A.5. The purpose of my testimony is to explain the proposed amendments to the certificate for the Timber Road I Wind Farm, issued on August 23, 2010 in Case No. 09-0980-EL-BGN, and the certificate for the Timber Road II Wind Farm, issued on November 18, 2010 in Case No. 10-0369-EL-BGN, as amended on February 28, 2011 in Case No. 10-3128-EL-BGA (hereinafter, "Timber Road III"), which the Administrative Law Judge determined to be a substantial changes in the location of portions of the certified facilities. The proposed amendments to the certificate for the Timber Road I Wind Farm are the subject of the application proceeding in Case No. 15-2031-EL-BGA, and the proposed amendments to the certificate for the Timber Road III Wind Farm are the subject of the application proceeding in Case No. 15-2030-EL-BGA. I will also sponsor the admission of the amendment applications into evidence, along with the

exhibits and proofs of publication, and the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation filed in this proceeding.

Q.6. Please provide an overview of each of the project changes in the applications that are the subject of this hearing.

A.6. The proposed changes to the Timber Road I Wind Farm include: (i) modifying 12 access road locations by eliminating four, adding seven, and shifting one; (ii) modifying 19 collection line locations by eliminating seven, adding two, and shifting ten; (iii) relocating the collection substation onto a parcel centrally located to both the Timber Road I and Timber Road III projects; and (iv) changing the proposed transmission line interconnection point from the Hicksville-Payne 69 kV transmission line to the Lincoln-Sterling 138 kV transmission line.

The proposed changes to the Timber Road III Wind Farm include: (i) modifying 13 access road locations by eliminating three, adding five, and shifting five; (ii) modifying 27 collection line locations by eliminating four, adding six, and shifting 17; and (iii) changing the proposed transmission line interconnection point from the Haviland-Milan 138 kV transmission line to the Lincoln-Sterling 138 kV transmission line. Paulding Wind Farm III LLC is proposing these changes in order to reduce environmental impacts, provide additional options during construction, and respond to landowner requests.

Q.7. Please explain the proposal to relocate certain access roads and addition of access roads.

A.7. With respect to the Timber Road I Wind Farm, 12 access road locations will be modified by eliminating four, adding seven, and shifting one. This will result in a net

decrease in 0.2 miles of access road from the Timber Road I Wind Farm. All relocated and new access roads are on leased lands.

With respect to the Timber Road III Wind Farm, 13 access road locations will be modified by eliminating three, adding five, and shifting five. This will result in a net increase of approximately 3,508 feet (0.7 miles) of access road from the Timber Road III Wind Farm. All relocated and new access roads are on leased lands.

Q.8. Please describe the proposed changes to the collection line system.

A.8. The permitted Timber Road I Wind Farm included approximately 16.9 miles of underground collection lines, and the permitted Timber Road III Wind Farm included approximately 28 miles of underground collection lines. The proposed changes to the collection line system will result in a total decrease of approximately 13,389 feet (2.5 miles) of collection line for the Timber Road I Wind Farm, and a total decrease of 11,392 feet (2.1 miles) of collections line for the Timber Road III Wind Farm.

Q.9. Why does the application propose relocating the collector substation?

A.9. The application proposes to relocate the collector substation onto a parcel that is centrally located to the Timber Road I Wind Farm and the Timber Road III Wind Farm. In other words, one substation will be used for both the Timber Road I Wind Farm and the Timber Road III Wind Farm thereby reducing temporary and permanent impacts that would have been necessary for the construction and operation of two collector substations.

Q.10. Why does the application propose the change in location of the point of interconnection?

A.10. As noted above, one collector substation will be used for the Timber Road I Wind Farm and the Timber Road III Wind Farm. Because the Applicant is now utilizing one collector for both projects, a new point of interconnection is required to allow for the aggregate injection into the grid.

Q.11 Are there any environmental concerns with the proposals which are the subject of this hearing?

A.11. No. The proposed amendments which are the subject of this hearing will not result in any increased impact to environmentally sensitive resources. First, the proposed changes in location were made based on minimizing impacts to streams, wetlands, and forested areas. Second, although the proposed changes will result in a net increase of approximately 0.5 miles of access road, all new and reconfigured access roads are located entirely in active agricultural land. Third, the changes to the collection lines will result in a significant net decrease of approximately 4.6 miles of underground collection line.

Despite the fact that the proposed Timber Road III Transmission Line (Case No. 15-1737-EL-BTX) is effectively replacing the collection line eliminated by the amendments, there will be less ground disturbance which benefits landowners. In consultations with EDPR NA staff, landowners express overwhelming support for the above ground transmission line alternative, in part due to the amount of drainage tile that would be damaged by the underground lines. Similarly, the proposed use of a single collector substation and single point of interconnect will reduce impacts as compared to the impacts associated with the construction and operation of two collector substations and two points of interconnect. Finally, environmental data regarding air, water, and solid

waste remain as presented in the original applications for the Timber Road I Wind Farm and the Timber Road III Wind Farm.

Q.12. Are there any social or ecological concerns with the proposals in the applications?

A.12. No. In support of the original applications, environmental consultants from various firms made numerous site visits to the Timber Road I Wind Farm and Timber Road III Wind Farm project areas, with extensive on-site ecological surveys conducted during multiple growing seasons. Then, in support of the preparation of the amendment applications, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Planning, Environmental Services, Engineering and Surveying, D.P.C. (“EDR”) and the Mannik and Smith Group, Inc. (“MSG”) conducted on-site ecological investigations focused on wetlands and streams in the previously un-surveyed portions of the area affected by layout changes. For the most part, any social and ecological impacts remain the same as presented in the original applications. The proposed changes to the collection lines and access roads will result in impacts to delineated wetlands and streams different from what was presented in the original applications. However, it is anticipated that permanent wetland impacts for both the Timber Road I and Timber Road III Facilities will total less than 0.1 acre, and the Paulding Wind Farm III remains committed to the avoidance and mitigation measures as described in the original applications which will effectively minimize social and ecological impacts from the construction and operation of the Timber Road I Wind Farm and the Timber Road III Wind Farm.

Q.13. Are the applications filed on December 9, 2015, including all appendices and exhibits, true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?

A.13. Yes, subject to the revisions discussed today in my direct testimony, the supplemental information to the Application filed on January 19, 2016 (a true and accurate copy of which has been marked as Company Exhibit 1), and to the application supplement filed by the Joint Applicants on February 17, 2016 (a true and accurate copy of which has been marked as Company Exhibit 2).

Q.14. Have the Applicants made any changes to the project design since the filing of the December 8, 2015 applications?

A.14. Yes. As noted above the Applicants filed supplemental information on January 19, 2016, withdrawing their request for limited tree clearing. In addition, the Applicants filed a supplement to amendment application on February 17, 2016 regarding minor changes to access roads and collection lines. No other changes have been made to the applications. While the final turbine site locations have yet to be determined, the final wind farm will consist of 48 turbines resulting in an estimated reduction in access roads of about 10 miles and a reduction in underground collection line of about 14 miles.

Q. 15. Did Applicants have notices of the applications to amend published in a newspaper of general circulation in Paulding County?

A.15. Yes. Notice of the amendment applications was published on December 30, 2015 in the *Paulding Progress*, which is a newspaper of general circulation in Paulding County. A true and accurate copy of the notice and related affidavit of publication has been marked as Company Exhibit 3.

Q.16. Directing your attention to Joint Exhibit No. 1, is this the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation that was signed by Staff, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation and the Applicant and docketed on April 26, 2016?

A.16. Yes.

Q.17. Have you reviewed the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation?

A.17. Yes.

Q.18. Does the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation represent a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties in your view?

A.18. Yes. The parties in this proceeding engaged in settlement negotiations through an open process. The serious bargaining that took place is evident when comparing the initial recommendations by Staff in the Staff Report and the final conditions recommended in the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation. For example, Applicants requested revisions to certain Staff recommended conditions, and some but not all of the revisions were incorporated into the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation.

Q.19. Does the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation benefit the public interest?

A.19. Yes. When completed, the Timber Road I Wind Farm and Timber Road III Wind Farm projects will have a generation capacity of nearly 200 megawatts and an annual estimated output of 320,000 megawatt hours of clean energy each year. In addition, the projects will benefit the local economy through the addition of new jobs and payroll and tax revenue.

Q.20. Does the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation violate any important regulatory principle or practice in your view?

A.20. No.

Q.21. What do you recommend that the Ohio Power Siting Board do in this case?

A.21. I recommend that the Ohio Power Siting Board accept the recommended Joint Stipulation and Recommendation, including recommended conditions 1 through 3, and grant the Applications, as modified by the Applicants' supplemental filings.

Q.22. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A.22. Yes, it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Ohio Power Siting Board's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on the parties referenced in the service list of the docket card who have electronically subscribed to this case. In addition, the undersigned certifies that a courtesy copy of the foregoing document is also being served upon the persons below via electronic mail this 26th day of April 2016.

Chad A. Endsley, Chief Legal Counsel
Leah F. Curtis
Amy M. Milam
Ohio Farm Bureau Federation
280 North High Street
P.O. Box 182383
Columbus, OH 43218-2383
cendsley@ofbf.org
lcurtis@ofbf.org
amilam@ofbf.org

Thomas Lindgren
Ohio Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus OH 43215-3793
Thomas.lindgren@puc.state.oh.us



Michael J. Settineri

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/26/2016 5:16:59 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-2030-EL-BGA, 15-2031-EL-BGA

Summary: Testimony Direct testimony of Erin Bowser electronically filed by Mr. Ryan D. Elliott on behalf of Paulding Wind Farm LLC and Paulding Wind Farm III LLC