

BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Angelina Solar I, LLC)	
for a Certificate of Environmental)	Case No. 18-1579-EL-BGN
Compatibility and Public Need)	

SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW ROBINSON

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

2 **A.1.** My name is Matthew Robinson. I am a Visualization Project Manager at
3 Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering &
4 Environmental Services, D.P.C (“EDR”). My business address is 217 Montgomery
5 Street, Suite 1000, Syracuse, New York 13202.

6 **Q.2. On whose behalf are you offering testimony?**

7 **A.2.** I am testifying on behalf of the Applicant, Angelina Solar I, LLC.

8 **Q.3. Did you previously file direct testimony on behalf of the Applicant?**

9 **A.3.** Yes, on May 3, 2019.

10 **Q.4. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?**

11 **A.4.** To address Condition 3 in the Joint Stipulation filed on June 14, 2019.

12 **Q.5. Have you reviewed the Joint Stipulation?**

13 **A.5.** Yes.

14 **Q.6. Do you support Condition 3 in the Joint Stipulation?**

15 **A.6.** Yes. The Joint Stipulation revised Staff’s recommended Condition 3 so that project
16 setbacks from adjacent public roads are measured from the edge of the road rights-of-way
17 rather than the edge of the travel surface of the roadways. This will result in larger
18 setbacks, because the right-of-way is wider than the actual road surface.

1 **Q.7. How will Condition 3 in the Joint Stipulation affect the visual impact of the Project?**

2 **A.7.** Adding additional distance between the above-ground components of the Project
3 and a viewer decreases the perceived scale of the Project and improves the screening
4 effectiveness of any roadside vegetation. Adding additional setback distance also improves
5 the options for additional screening that could be provided as visual mitigation by the
6 Applicant, because it allows for the use of taller growing vegetation (without adverse
7 shadow effects) and increases the available vegetation choice that can be used to better
8 blend the Project into the existing landscape.

9 **Q.8. How does the additional distance make screening or mitigation more effective?**

10 **A.8.** The goal of visual screening or mitigation is not to prevent a project from being
11 seen entirely. The use of an opaque “green wall” approach is generally not desirable or
12 effective, because it tends to contrast with the existing visual character of the surrounding
13 area and actually draws viewer attention because it looks out of place. Instead, the goal is
14 to soften the appearance of the project so that it blends more effectively into the
15 background. At EDR, we have developed various visual screening modules including
16 those that provide, as appropriate: 1) roadside pollinator habitat by utilizing native seed, 2)
17 vertical softening of views through clustered arrangements of native shrubs and trees, or 3)
18 adjacent resource screening that creates a hedgerow of mixed deciduous and evergreen
19 native material, depending on the character and sensitivity of the adjacent land use.
20 Additional setback distance allows more space install these modules and gives the
21 vegetation more room to grow and become an established component of the landscape
22 thereby improving screening. Increased distance between the plantings and the project
23 allows shorter vegetation to provide more effective screening.

1 **Q.9. Will there be other benefits from Condition 3 in the Joint Stipulation?**

2 **A.9.** Yes. Although the setback distances in the Application, if measured from the edge
3 of the roadway, would provide adequate distance for motorist visibility at road intersections
4 at the edges of the Project Area, additional setback distance will serve to further improve
5 motorist visibility at those intersections, while maintaining effective screening.

6 **Q.10. Is Condition 3 in the Joint Stipulation in the public interest?**

7 **A.10.** Yes. Condition 3 benefits the public interest by improving the Applicant's ability
8 to effectively screen the Project and integrate it into the landscape, thereby lowering the
9 visual impact, as well as improving motorist visibility.

10 **Q.11. Does this conclude your supplemental direct testimony?**

11 **A.11.** 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 28th day of June 2019.

/s/ MacDonald W. Taylor

Jodi Bair
Jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Dylan Borchers
dborchers@bricker.com

Kathryn West
kwest@prebco.org

W. Joseph Scholler
jscholler@fblaw.com

Thaddeus Boggs
tboggs@fblaw.com

Chad Endsley
cendsley@ofbf.org

Leah Curtis
lcurtis@ofbf.org

Amy Milam
amilam@ofbf.org

Jack Van Kley
jvankley@vankleywalker.com

Chris Walker
cwalker@vankleywalker.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/28/2019 3:51:07 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-1579-EL-BGN

Summary: Testimony Supplemental Direct Testimony of Matthew Robinson electronically filed by Mr. MacDonald W Taylor on behalf of Angelina Solar I, LLC