BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the Application of The :

Ohio State University for a Certificate of : Case No. 19-1641-EL-BGN

Environmental Compatibility and Public :

Need for the Combined Heat and Power : Facility Project in Franklin County, Ohio. :

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF

Andrew Conway

ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO POWER SITING DEPARTMENT

Staff Exhibit ____

- 1 1. Q. Please state your name and your business address.
- A. My name is Andrew Conway. My business address is 180 E. Broad Street,
- 3 Columbus, Ohio 43215.

- 5 2. Q. By whom are you employed?
- A. I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Commission).

7

8 3. Q. Please describe your job title and duties.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

I am employed as an Engineering Specialist in the Facility Review and Compliance Division of the Power Siting Department. In this position, I review technical issues associated with energy efficiency applications (including for combined heat and power projects), renewable energy applications, assigned areas or case lead in Applications for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to construct major utility facilities and economically significant wind farms, and other duties.

17

- 18 4. Q. Would you briefly state your educational background and work history?
- 19 A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering and minor in 20 Chemistry from the University of Toledo. I am also a registered professional 21 engineer in the State of Ohio.

To maintain registration as a professional engineer I have taken continuing 1 2 education courses relevant to the practice of engineering that include 3 technical, ethical or managerial material. I have taken courses specific to natural gas fired power plants, wind farms, geotechnical exploration, 4 5 renewable energy installation, air permitting, and safety. 6 7 From 2001 to 2009, I was employed by the Ohio Environmental Protection 8 Agency as an environmental specialist. From 2009 to present, I have been 9 employed in my current position at the Commission. 10 11 I have provided analysis on multiple projects, including wind farms, solar 12 farms, and natural gas combined cycle power plants submitted to the Ohio 13 Power Siting Board (OPSB). I have also inspected and visited numerous 14 power plants in various stages of design, construction, and operation. 15 16 Have you previously testified before the OPSB? 5. Q. 17 A. Yes. I previously testified in cases before the OPSB. 18 19 6. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding? Q. I am sponsoring portions of the Staff Report of Investigation (Staff Report). 20 A. Specifically, I was the primary analyst for portions of the Staff Report 21

22

pertaining to the Project Description (on pages 6-9), Wind Velocity (on page

| 1 | 20), Public Safety (on page 30), Fire Protection System (on page 30), the Air, |
|---|--|
| 2 | Water, Solid Waste, and Aviation section (on pages 25-29), and the Water |
| 3 | Conservation Practice section (on page 33). I am also sponsoring Conditions |
| 4 | to the Staff Report, specifically Conditions 5 and 6. |

- Q. Why are those particular Staff Report sections (Project Description, Wind
 Velocity, Public Safety, Fire Protection System, Air, Water, Solid Waste, and
 Aviation, and the Water Conservation Practice) important?
 - A. These topics are generally outlined in R.C. 4906.10 and Ohio Adm.Code 4906-4 as relevant factors to the proper siting and location review for major utility facilities.

12

11

9

10

Also, R.C. 4906.10(A)(5) obligates the OPSB to consult with the Ohio

Department of Transportation Office of Aviation (ODOT-OA).

- 16 8. Q. Did Staff consult the ODOT-OA regarding the Ohio State University
 17 Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility project (Application)?
- A. Yes. Initially, I consulted by sending an email on 12/13/27/2019 to the ODOT-OA. That email had a link to the Application docket, Aviation related excerpts from the Application, a Google Earth file of the proposed facility, and anticipated staff report filing timeframe. During the course of the

| 1 | | | investigation and since that initial email, Staff then continued to consult with |
|----|----|----|--|
| 2 | | | ODOT-OA through email and phone. |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | Staff and ODOT-OA found that none of the proposed structures exceed 199 |
| 5 | | | feet above ground level and the project does not meet notification criteria and |
| 6 | | | does not require filing a Form 7460-1 with the FAA. |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | 9. | Q. | How did you analyze, evaluate, and investigate the proposed Application? |
| 9 | | A. | In order to learn about the project and its potential impacts, I attended the |
| 10 | | | pre-application meeting on December 19, 2018. Also, I attended a workshop |
| 11 | | | about the project from ENGIE North America on February 18, 2020. I also |
| 12 | | | performed a site inspection on February 20, 2020; and interacted with the |
| 13 | | | Applicant on at least March 9, 2020; May 20, 2020; and May 28, 2020. |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | Generally, I reviewed the Application submitted on November 6, 2019 and |
| 16 | | | subsequent supplements. I specifically read and focused on those sections |
| 17 | | | pertaining to the project summary, schedule, and description, wind velocity, |
| 18 | | | public safety, fire protection system, the air, water, solid waste, and aviation |
| 19 | | | section, and water conservation practices. |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | Specifically, Staff sent multiple data requests to the Applicant. I reviewed |
| 22 | | | the Applicant's replies to those data requests. |

Also, I reviewed and analyzed geographic information system data submitted by the Applicant that was transformed into a Google Earth map of the proposed CHP facility.

I contacted Columbia Gas of Ohio and received their input.

Largely, through this information I was able to glean the nature of the probable environmental impacts, determine if the Applicant minimized those adverse environmental impacts from the CHP facility, and whether the Applicant would likely comply with Ohio's air pollution, water pollution, solid waste, and aviation regulations. My analysis and recommendations to inform the OPSB are contained in the Staff Report and this testimony.

10.

Q.

- Condition 5 states that "The Applicant shall coordinate with local building code enforcement officials with regard to the construction of any new structures, or modification of any existing structures, not directly related to the operation of the generation facility." Why is this condition necessary?
- A. The university has extensive building design standards contained in Exhibit

 C of the Application. The Applicant indicated that the CHP building design

 will comply with those design standards and conform to the campus

 surroundings. This condition is typically recommended to assure the OPSB

that those structures not directly related to the operation of the generation facility can receive review by local building code enforcement officials. Also, that those portions of the facility, if and where subject to lawful local supervision or control, would not be exempt from any lawful local rules or regulations.

11.

Q.

- Condition 6 states that "At least 30 days prior to the preconstruction conference, the Applicant shall submit to Staff, for review and acceptance, one set of detailed engineering drawings of the final project design and mapping in the form of PDF, which the Applicant shall also file on the docket of this case, and geographically referenced data (such as shapefiles or KMZ files) based on final engineering drawings to confirm that the final design is in conformance with the certificate. Mapping shall include the limits of disturbance, permanent and temporary infrastructure locations, areas of vegetation removal and vegetative restoration as applicable, and specifically denote any adjustments made from the siting detailed in the application. All final geotechnical study results shall be included in this submission." Why is this condition necessary?
- A. This is a typically recommended condition to assure the OPSB that the detailed engineering drawings adhere to common engineering practices to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

| 1 | This condition also requires that the Applicant submit geographically |
|---|--|
| 2 | referenced data based on final engineering drawings so Staff can assure the |
| 3 | OPSB that the final design is in conformance with the certificate and that key |
| 4 | features are noted. |

- 6 12. Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- A. Yes, it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testimony
 as new information subsequently becomes available or in response to
 positions taken by other parties.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the Prefiled Testimony of Andrew Conway has been served upon the below-named counsel via electronic mail, this 9th day of July 2020.

/s/ Thomas G. Lindgren

Thomas G. Lindgren Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

N. Trevor Alexander
Steven D. Lesser
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
1200 Huntington Center
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
talexander@calfee.com
slesser@calfee.com

Counsel for The Ohio State University

Administrative Law Judge:

Sarah Parrot @puco.ohio.gov

Tony Mendoza

Senior Staff Attorney, Sierra Club 2101 Webster St., 13th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org

Richard C. Sahli 334 Evergreen Lane Yreka, CA 96097 rsahliattorney@columbus.rr

Counsel for Sierra Club

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/9/2020 4:37:46 PM

in

Case No(s). 19-1641-EL-BGN

Summary: Testimony Prefiled Testimony of Andrew Conway electronically filed by Mrs. Kimberly M Naeder on behalf of OPSB