## BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Application of Firelands :
Wind, LLC, for a :
Certificate of :
Environmental :

Compatibility and Public : Case No. 18-1607-EL-BGN

Need to Construct a : Wind-Powered Electric : Generation Facility in : Huron and Erie Counties, : Ohio. :

- - -

## PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Jay S. Agranoff and Mr. Michael Williams, Administrative Law Judges, Ohio Power Siting Board, conducted via Webex, called at 9:03 a.m. on Wednesday, October 7, 2020.

- - -

## VOLUME III

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, Second Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481

- - -

```
311
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2.
             Dickinson Wright PLLC
             By Ms. Christine M.T. Pirik
             Mr. Jonathan R. Secrest
 3
             Mr. Terrence O'Donnell
             Mr. William Vorys
 4
             and Ms. Madeline Fleisher
 5
             150 East Gay Street, Suite 2400
             Columbus, Ohio 43215
 6
             and
 7
             K&L Gates LLP
             By Mr. James M. Lynch
 8
             Mr. Adam N. Tabor
             and Mr. Brian Knox
 9
             925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900
10
             Seattle, Washington 98104
11
                  On behalf of the Applicant.
12
             Van Kley & Walker, LLC
             By Mr. Jack A. Van Kley
13
             132 Northwoods Boulevard, Suite C-1
             Columbus, Ohio 43235
14
                  On behalf of the Intervenors Alvin and
15
                  Patricia Didion, Jane Fox, Marvin and
                  Theresa Hay, Patricia Olsen, Sheila and
16
                  Walt Poffenbaugh, Christina and John
                  Popa, Lori Riedy, Charles Rogers, Kenn
17
                  Rospert, Dennis and Sharon Schreiner,
                  Donna and William Seaman, Deborah and
18
                  Kenneth Weisenauer, Gerard Wensink,
                  and Black Swamp Bird Observatory.
19
             Sabin Center for Climate Change Law
2.0
             By Ms. Hillary W. Aidun
             Columbia Law School
21
             435 West 116th Street
             New York, New York 10027
2.2
                  On behalf of the Intervenors Tom Yingling
23
                  and Kevin Erf.
24
25
```

	312
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)
2	James Joel Sitterly, Huron County Prosecutor
3	By Mr. Jacob S. Stephens, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
4	Civil Division 12 East Main Street, 4th Floor
5	Norwalk, Ohio 44857
6	On behalf of Board of Trustees of Norwich Township, Huron County, Ohio, and Board
7	of Trustees of Richmond Township, Huron County, Ohio.
8	James Joel Sitterly,
9	Huron County Prosecutor By Mr. Randal L.Strickler,
10	Chief Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Civil Division
11	12 East Main Street, 4th Floor Norwalk, Ohio 44857
12	On behalf of the Board of Commissioners
13	of Huron County, Ohio.
14	City of Willard By Ms. Heather Niedermeier Heyman,
15	Law Director 111 South Myrtle Avenue
16	Willard, Ohio 44890
17	On behalf of the City of Willard.
18	Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General By Mr. Werner L. Margard, III
19	and Mr. Robert Eubanks, Assistant Attorneys General
20	30 East Broad Street 16th Floor
21	Columbus, Ohio 43215
22	On behalf of the Staff of the OPSB.
23	
24	
25	

```
313
 1
      APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
             Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General
             By Mr. Brett A. Kravitz
 3
             and Ms. Katherine A. Walker,
             Assistant Attorneys General
 4
             2045 Morse Road, Building A-3
             Columbus, Ohio 43229
 5
                   On behalf of the Staff of the ODNR.
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		314
1	INDEX TO WITNESSES	
2		
3	WITNESSES	PAGE
4	Chris Leftwich	217
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Secrest Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley Redirect Examination by Mr. Secrest	317 318 360
6	Recross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley Examination by ALJ Agranoff	362 363
7	John Kusnier	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Secrest Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	366 367
9	B. Benjamin Evans	
10	Direct Examination by Mr. Secrest  Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	374 375
11	Examination by MI. Van Micy  Examination by ALJ Williams  Redirect Examination by Mr. Secrest	427 433
12	Recross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	434
13	Mark Bellamy Direct Examination by Mr. Margard	439
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	442
15	Matt Butler Direct Examination by Mr. Margard	470
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley Redirect Examination by Mr. Margard	473 481
17	Recross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	482
18	Tyler Conklin Direct Examination by Mr. Margard	486
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Van Kley	489
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

				315
1		INDEX TO EXHIB	ITS	
2				
3	APP	LICANT EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
4	34	Chris Leftwich - Prefiled Direct Testimony	318	364
5 6	35	John Kusnier - Prefiled Direct Testimony	367	372
7	44	B. Benjamin Evans - Prefiled Direct Testimony	375	436
8				
9	LOC	AL RESIDENTS EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
10	13	Evans Engineering Web Page	378	437
12 13	STA	FF EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
14	1	Staff Report of Investigation	n 438	468
15	2	Prefiled Testimony of Mark Bellamy	438	468
16	3	Prefiled Testimony of Matthew Butler	470	484
17 18	4	Prefiled Testimony of Tyler Conklin	485	493
19		Tyter conking		
20	JOT.	NT EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
21	1	The September 11, 2020,	360	
22	_	Stipulation Signed on Behalf of the Applicant, the City	300	
23		of Willard, the Huron Commissioners, the Richmond		
24		Trustees, the Norwich Trustees, the Local Residents, and the Staff		
25		nostaches, and the Statt		

	316		
1	Wednesday Morning Session,		
2	October 7, 2020.		
3			
4	ALJ AGRANOFF: Are you ready to call your		
5	first witness, Mr. Secrest or Ms. Pirik?		
6	MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. May		
7	the Applicant call Mr. Chris Leftwich to the stand.		
8	ALJ AGRANOFF: And Kelli, if you could		
9	please promote Mr. Leftwich to a panelist.		
10	MS. KING: Mr. Leftwich, you have been		
11	unmuted and you are now in a panelist role.		
12	ALJ AGRANOFF: I am just looking for him		
13	on the screen. There he is.		
14	THE WITNESS: Thank you.		
15	ALJ AGRANOFF: Hello there. Good		
16	morning.		
17	THE WITNESS: Good morning.		
18	ALJ AGRANOFF: If you could please raise		
19	your right hand.		
20	(Witness sworn.)		
21	ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.		
22			
23			
24			
25			

CHRIS	LEFTWICH

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

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 By Mr. Secrest:

1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Leftwich. Would you please state your full name as well as your business address.
- A. My name is Chris Leftwich, and I am employed at 471 Main Street, Paint Lick, Kentucky.
  - Q. And by whom are you employed?
- A. Copperhead Environmental Consulting,

  Incorporated.
- Q. Thank you. Do you have in front of you a copy of your prefiled direct testimony?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of your prefiled testimony?
- 19 A. Yes. It appears to be.
- Q. Do you have any revisions or changes to that testimony?
- 22 A. I do not.
- MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I have
- 24 Mr. Leftwich's prefiled testimony marked as
- 25 Applicant's Exhibit 34.

318 ALJ AGRANOFF: So marked. 1 2 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 3 MR. SECREST: Thank you. I tender Mr. Leftwich for -- for cross-examination. 4 5 ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. 6 MR. SECREST: Sorry, we were conversing. 7 ALJ AGRANOFF: I knew what you meant. 8 Mr. Van Kley. 9 MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 10 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION 12 By Mr. Van Kley: 13 Q. Good morning, Mr. Leftwich. 14 A. Good morning. 15 Q. I am going to be asking you some 16 questions on behalf of the Black Swamp Bird 17 Observatory and the local resident intervenors. 18 Let's start off by asking you a few 19 questions about your background. On how many wind 20 projects have you testified? 2.1 Just one. Well, I guess including this 22 one would be two. Sorry. 23 Okay. I thought we've met three times Q. 24 including today.

A. No, sir.

- Q. Okay. All right. Very good thing. And in both these cases you've testified on behalf of the wind developer?
  - A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. In how many wind projects have you provided services related to bats?
- A. Man, I would say over a dozen. It's kind -- it's a pretty rough estimate. It dates back several years, but that's my best guess, about a dozen or more.
- Q. Okay. And in those cases, did you always work for the wind developer?
  - A. Directly -- indirectly, no, and directly, yes, I guess. It depends on how -- how you define work for the developer. The majority, yes.
  - Q. Okay. Well, in cases where you did not work directly for the wind developer, who did you work for?
- A. State DNR and it was -- yeah, so it was state.
- 21 ALJ AGRANOFF: Just so the record is 22 clear, when you use the acronym DNR.
- THE WITNESS: Okay. Department of
  Natural Resources.
- 25 ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So let's talk about bats for a while. Are bats important as a component of the environment?

A. I believe so.

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague.

MR. VAN KLEY: I think it's a pretty

7 clear question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

13

14

15

16

MR. SECREST: I think he answered anyways.

10 ALJ AGRANOFF: Please continue.

- 12 Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) What is the importance of bats in the environment?
  - A. To me personally, it's an intrinsic value. I think all plants and animals are important.
    - Q. Okay. And do -- what role does the bat play in the ecosystem?
- 17 A. Can you be more specific on what 18 ecosystem that you are speaking of?
- Q. Well, let's talk about the ecosystem in Ohio.
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. Fair question.
- 23 A. Sure.
- Q. In Ohio -- in this area of Ohio where the project area is, what role or roles do bats play in

the ecosystem?

2.2

- A. Well, they play a role as both a predator and prey.
  - Q. Okay. And what are they the prey of?
- A. You know, owls will -- will target bats. You know, snakes definitely will attack -- attack bats and roosts. There's, you know, a handful of predators of bats.
- Q. So they're the -- so they're a food source for other types of animals.
  - A. They can be, yes.
  - Q. And what are bats the predators of?
  - A. In Ohio, they're insectivores.
- Q. What types of insects do the bats eat in the area of the project area in Northern Ohio?
  - A. It varies by species.
- Q. Can you provide me with some of the species that are consumed by bats in the part of the state occupied by the project area?
- A. Sure. Sure. There are species of insects, I can't tell you the species, I am not an insect person, but there are various flying insects that are eaten by bats; beetles, moths, some mosquitoes but lots of beetles and moths.
  - Q. Do they eat mosquitoes?

- A. Yes, they will.
- Q. And do they eat insects that are considered to be agricultural pests?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do they eat insects that otherwise would eat farmers' crops?
  - A. That and other -- other plants.
- Q. Are bats known to collide with wind turbines?
- 10 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

- Q. Do you have any theory on why they collide with wind turbines?
  - A. I personally don't study that aspect of bats and wind. I know there are other publications out there that do discuss collisions and other fatality methods of wind and bats, but that is not a personal area of my expertise.
- Q. Based on your literature review, what are the leading theories as to why bats collide with turbines?
- MR. SECREST: Objection, outside the scope.
- 23 ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley?
- MR. VAN KLEY: I'm not limited to the
- 25 | scope of direct examination. This is -- this is

cross-examination of a witness for the first time.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I'll allow the question to the extent that the witness is familiar with the question that was asked of him.

- A. Can you please repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah. Based on your literature review, what are the leading theories as to why bats collide with wind turbines?
- A. For clarification, are you asking why they collide or how they are killed?
  - Q. Why they collide.
- A. I am aware of, you know, bats colliding with wind turbines during -- primarily during the spring and fall migration, you know. Why they collide, I think there is some published observational data out there that suggests that bats could be attracted to wind turbines, you know, those are observational -- an observational study. I still think there's -- I think the conclusions were that there's still research to be done on that hypothesis. I don't think there is a lot of -- of -- that I'm familiar with, a lot of empirical evidence as to why bats collide with turbines.
- Q. Are you familiar with what is known as white-nose syndrome?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Can you explain what that is?
- A. Sure. It is a -- it is a syndrome caused by a fungus, and I -- it's P. destructans. P is the genus; destructans is the species.

And it started in New York is where it was first detected in cave-dwelling bats. And since the discovery of it in New York, I believe in a cave, it has spread kind of through New York, Pennsylvania, south to the Appalachians. It stuck mostly in the cave areas of the Appalachians. It has spread further west. You know, Kentucky and Tennessee have a lot of cave habitat for bats. And it's pretty much spread kind of in the eastern karst area of the United States. And I believe it has also jumped over to Washington State and I think there's one other state in the west but I have not checked the most recent map of that — that disease.

- Q. Has it reached Ohio yet?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Is it present in northern Ohio?
- A. I don't know where the hibernacula are in Ohio other than the southern part of the United States -- sorry, southern part of Ohio. So I'm not familiar with the locations of hibernacula

specifically in northern Ohio and if there even are, so I don't know that answer.

- Q. Are you aware that there is karst in at least parts of the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. What has been happening to the populations of bats once white-nose syndrome has arrived in a location where they live?
- A. It has, in some species, it has shown very high mortality in certain species, so in those species the populations that are known to hibernate in certain caves have been infected with it have have declined significantly in some cases.
- Q. Can you tell me what species of bats are present in the area of the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project?
- A. Sure. There's nine species of bats that you would expect to find in Huron and Erie Counties and I'm basing this on records from ODNR, Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Big brown bats, little brown bats, tricolored bats, Indiana bats, red bats, hoary bats, silver-haired bats, evening bats, and I'm missing one, Indiana bat.
  - Q. Very good.

A. Oh, thanks.

- Q. Your memory is excellent.
  - A. Well, I hope.
- Q. Which of those species are cave-dwelling bats?
- A. All of them except the hoary bat, silver-haired bat, and the red bat.
  - Q. Are all of the cave-dwelling bats in the project area or this area of Ohio subject to white-nose syndrome if it arrives?
- A. I -- I know -- I can tell you what I -- what species I do know because I don't know if all of them have had any -- you know, I don't think big brown bats have shown any real issue but I'm not positive, but I know Indiana bats, northern long-eared bats, tricolored bats, and little brown bats are the most -- have been the most susceptible to it.
  - Q. Are you aware of bat surveys that were conducted in the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project and included in the Application for the project?
- A. I am.
- Q. Did you personally participate in any of those surveys?

1 A. I did.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. What was your role?
- A. For the three surveys completed by

  Copperhead, for these specific projects I served as

  project manager. I designed the presence/absence

  surveys that were conducted. I coordinated the study

  design with the resource agencies which would be U.S.

  Fish and Wildlife Service and Ohio Department of

  Natural Resources. I -- so I designed those studies,

  got them approved, made sure they were following

  established protocols.

And then I oversaw the field folks and served as project manager and participated on, you know, nightly phone calls, troubleshoot issues, catch up on results. And then I was involved in -- in drafting and seeing review of the final reports for these three studies.

- Q. Were any Indiana bats discovered during any of these surveys?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. How many were discovered?
- A. One.
- Q. The Indiana bat is a federal endangered species; is that correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

- Q. The Indiana bat is an insectivore?
- 2 A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. What kinds of insects do Indiana bats eat?
- A. I -- flying insects is probably as specific as I can get. I am not familiar with the species or types of insects but, you know, opportunistic and flying insects is a good general description.
  - Q. What do you mean by that term?
- 11 A. Flying?
- Q. Yes. Like can you explain what might be the flying insects you're talking about?
  - A. Sure. Flying insects will have wings and they will fly versus insects that are, you know -- and they'll also glean insects off of leaves but I'm not familiar with the exact species of insects that they will consume.
    - Q. Do you at least know that the Indiana bats consume mosquitoes?
      - A. Yes.
- Q. The Indiana bat flies oftentimes to catch insects?
  - A. Yes, that is how it feeds, correct.
- Q. In what types of habitat does the Indiana

bat fly in order to forage?

- A. They primarily forage in open forest areas. You know, they are often associated with riparian areas, water. It has to be open water, not real cluttered, cluttered by vegetation. You know, they will fly in open canopies, forest tops. They will forage on forest edge, along the edge of forests and, I guess in this part of Ohio, cropland. But primarily forested habitats is where they forage.
- Q. Uh-huh. They are also known to forage in open areas; isn't that true?
- A. Correct, yes, that's what I said, open areas, uh-huh.
  - O. And --
- A. Let me qualify. Open areas typically associated with forest edge or forest habitat.
- Q. The Indiana bats are known to cross open agricultural fields to commute from one place to another?
  - A. Yes, they are.
- Q. What is the typical range for an Indiana bat to travel during foraging?
- A. It can vary with -- with the season. Can we clarify what season we are speaking of?
  - Q. Yeah. Why don't you lead me through all

the seasons and answer the question with regard to each season.

- A. Well, during migration they will forage between migration ba -- oh, and, you know, studies that Copperhead has participated in show that, you know, foraging areas are usually relatively small compared to those of the foraging ranges in the summer. So in the summer, during the maternity season, two and a half miles is kind of considered the general foraging range of Indiana bats in the summer.
- Q. I believe the Indiana bat is also known to go as far as 5 miles for foraging?
- A. I am not aware of a study, a published study, but I do not know that answer.
- Q. With regard to the Indiana bat that was discovered during this survey for the Application for Emerson Creek wind farm, did you or your crew or anybody else on behalf of the developer track that bat?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And how was it tracked?
- A. Two different techniques. A radio transmitter was placed on its -- in the scapula of the bat after it was captured and that allowed the

tracking to occur. Technique-wise, the bat was tracked during the daytime to locate roost trees and it was also tracked, per ODNR protocol, to collect foraging data at night.

- Q. And what was the distance -- or what were the distances that this bat was traveling according to your tracking devices?
- A. I would have to reference -- there's a table in the report. May I reference the report?
- Q. Yeah, you sure can. And let us know which report you are looking at, please.
- A. Okay. Okay. I am looking at the report titled "2017 Emerson Creek Wind Project Bat Mist

  Netting Survey Report, Huron County, Ohio," and I believe it's Exhibit Y4 if I am understanding the labeling here.
- Q. Okay. Why don't you give us a moment to look for that.
- A. No, that's not Y4. I apologize. It is Y3.
- 21 Q. All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 22 ALJ AGRANOFF: So that would be Exhibit Y of the Application?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Correct.
- 25 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. If you could just

```
hold for a second.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

16

24

25

Okay. On -- do you want me to --ALJ WILLIAMS: Actually, while Judge

Agranoff is finding it in his files, could you tell us the PDF page number if you have it in front of you or what page you are working off of?

7 THE WITNESS: I am working off of a hard 8 сору.

ALJ WILLIAMS: What page are you on?

THE WITNESS: Page 8, Table 4.

11 ALJ WILLIAMS: PDF page 11 for those who 12 are watching along electronically.

13 ALJ AGRANOFF: So is there a specific 14 appendix that it is?

15 THE WITNESS: I just know it as Exhibit Y3.

17 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. I've got it. It's 18 Table 4, the foraging details for a radio-tagged

female? 19

20 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

21 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you.

22 (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. Does Q. 23 Table 4 provide you with the answer to my question?

> I believe it does, yes. Α.

Q. Okay. And would you tell me what that

answer is.

A. Sure. The female Indiana bat was tracked during the evening -- or during night to collect data on foraging, and we measured a distance from the roost tree and its foraging behavior that evening, and on the 27th, the furthest distance it moved in that night between foraging points was 1,500 meters. Which I believe is less than a mile.

On the 28th of June, the furthest it moved in that night during the time we were tracking it was 692 meters.

And on the 29th of June, we did not get a full -- a full evening of tracking in due to inclement weather so the limited data points on that bat showed it moved 1,200 meters was the furthest it moved in that night while we were tracking it.

And then on July -- the 30th of June, we did not track the bat, that's why there is a gap there, due to weather.

On July 1st, that is an interesting night. That bat moved, and let me refer you to page 10 of this report. This is a nice graphic that will show you all of the foraging data collected on this bat and put it all into context into what that bat was doing in the evening and kind of -- it just

shows its home-range areas calculated through a couple programs and statistical software.

But on the last night, it moved

14,000 meters. And if you look at page 10 on the

July 1st night which is the blue dots in the southern

area, those first -- first blue dots are pretty

representative of a typical foraging bout of an

Indiana bat and then you will see the dots start

trailing to the south and they end down near a town,

I think that's Tiro. I may be pronouncing that

incorrectly. That southward movement is not typical

of Indiana bat foraging.

That bat, I remember speaking with the project manager and a pilot that night, asking what in the world is going on. This bat is moving very far south. It is not really foraging and you can see that by the spacing of the blue dots. Compare that to the northern portion of the earlier sampling where those dots are tightly clustered; that's very representative of Indiana bat foraging in the summer by a female.

So these dots here on the south on the night of July 1st are atypical in my experience and is not foraging. That bat was doing something different. That bat appeared to be basically

commuting its way far south and we left it at that last point south. That bat just continued to go. It was not stopping. So that behavior is not indicative of foraging and that is what is resulting in the large number of distance moved on that night so it's not characteristic and it was not foraging.

- Q. Okay. So you tracked this bat for about 8 miles; is that correct?
- A. 14 kilometers is I think is where it went that night before we left it because it was just not stopping.
- Q. And you discontinued tracking it after it had gone that distance?
- A. Correct, yes. It was -- it had not stopped. We left it in mid-flight. It was flying and not stopping.
- Q. All right. So during the time that you were tracking this bat, the Indiana bats were in their nesting period?
- A. Yes. This was in the summer maternity season, yes.
- Q. Do Indiana bats typically nest in colonies?
  - A. They do roost in colonies, yes, they are colonial roosters.

Q. So if you find one Indiana bat, you are likely to have other Indiana bats in the same area during this time of the year?

2.2

MR. SECREST: Objection, vague as to "find." Are you talking about identified during flying or flying to a roost tree?

MR. VAN KLEY: It doesn't make any difference.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If the witness understands the context of the question, he can answer.

- A. Can you please repeat the question?
- Q. Sure. During the nesting period for the Indiana bat, if you find an Indiana bat, is it likely that other Indiana bats will be present in the same area?
- A. Can you please clarify what you mean by find? Because there is a different -- there is different answers, I suppose, to that question.

  Depending on what you are asking exactly.
- Q. Well, you explain to me what the different methods for finding an Indiana bat are.
- A. Okay. Well, I mean, so when you capture a bat, does that mean that you are going to capture two? No. So in that example, my answer to your question would be no.

- Q. Yeah. My question is a little different which is, if you find an Indiana bat during nesting season, is it likely that other Indiana bats are in the same area since they are colonial roosters?
- A. Okay. Yes. It's -- it's probably safe to assume in the summer maternity season that that bat is part of a colony, yes.
- Q. But Firelands didn't find any other Indiana bats besides this one.
- 10 A. That is the only one that was captured,
  11 correct.
  - Q. And you captured this Indiana bat in a mist net; is that correct?
    - A. A mist net, yes, sir.
- Q. You found three roost locations for the Indiana bat that you tracked?
- 17 A. Yes, I believe that is correct.
- Q. Were all of those roost locations located in the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project?
- A. No, none of them were located in the project area --
- Q. I thought --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

- 24 A. -- at that time.
- Q. I'm sorry. I cut off your answer. What

was the rest of your answer?

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

17

18

19

- A. That was my answer. They were not located in the project area.
- Q. All right. At the time that this Indiana bat was discovered, was the project area different than it is now?
- 7 A. I -- I believe it is. It was larger than 8 it is now.
  - Q. So how far are -- or how far were the three roost locations for this Indiana bat from the present-day boundary of the project area?
- 12 A. I have not -- I have not measured that.

  13 I do not know the answer.
- 14 ALJ AGRANOFF: What was the time frame
  15 for which those three first locations were
  16 identified?
  - THE WITNESS: The time frame? It was two, three days after it was captured, the first roost tree was located. Let's see, on page 7, if I can refer to the report.
- MR. SECREST: When you say "report," you mean Exhibit Y3?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- MR. SECREST: Thank you.
- 25 THE WITNESS: So it was late July was the

time frame.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

19

20

2 ALJ AGRANOFF: And what was the year?

THE WITNESS: 2017.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Did you say late July?
- A. Let's see, I'm sorry. I'm trying to reference the report here. Hold on, please. Yes. It was 20 -- 25 -- I'm sorry. Not July. Late June. Sorry.
- Q. Well, look back at Table 4 on page 8 of Exhibit Y3. According to this table, this Indiana bat was tracked between June 27 and July 1?
  - A. For foraging data, yes.
- Q. Okay. Was it tracked for any other time period?
- A. No. The daytime tracking that was done to locate roost trees would have been going simultaneously during the daytime.
  - Q. Okay. Now go to page 7 of Exhibit Y3 of the Application.
- 21 A. Okay.
- Q. Go to the heading for Diurnal Radio
  Telemetry.
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. So the first paragraph under that

heading refers to the Indiana bat that we've been discussing as bat 636; is that correct?

A. Correct.

- Q. Then the second paragraph under the heading of Diurnal Radio Telemetry, the first sentence says bat 636 did not immediately fly upon release, 25 July, and was placed on the bark of a live oak -- or live black oak tree near the capture site. Is the date of July 25 in that sentence an error?
  - A. Yes, sir, it is.
  - Q. What should it be?
  - A. Should be June.
- Q. The same would be true for all the other references to July in that paragraph?
- A. Yes. That paragraph, all the July -- the days of the week are -- are correct. The month is a typographic error. To clarify your question originally, late June was when this data was being collected.
- Q. Would you find Exhibit K2 of the

  Application which has been marked as Applicant's

  Exhibit No. 1.
- 24 ALJ AGRANOFF: One moment, Mr. Van Kley.
- 25 Is that the June 26, 2018?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, sir.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay.

2.2

MR. VAN KLEY: That's the date of the first e-mail that appears in that document.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's go to the second page of that PDF. So it would be the second page of the paper copy if you have a paper copy as well. And I'm referring you to an e-mail from Keith Lott of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Jennie Geiger of Apex Clean Energy dated June 11, 2018. Tell me when you've found that e-mail.
  - A. I found it.
- Q. I would like you to take a look at the third paragraph of that e-mail. And it reads as follows: "For Emerson North project, since I gave you recommendations prior to this clarification, I stand by my previous recommendations, but this option will not be available for other wind projects (unless the project overlaps with less than 123 acres of an Indiana bat buffer)." Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Do you know what is -- what was being discussed in this paragraph?
- MR. SECREST: Objection, foundation.

MR. VAN KLEY: I asked him whether he knew. I am asking him to establish whether he has a foundation for the e-mail. He was involved in the project, and chances are that he -- he did know about this topic.

2.2

MR. SECREST: Now counsel is speculating.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Leftwich, are you

familiar with the subject matter contained within this e-mail?

THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the reference to outer-tier buffers that they are referring to, yes. The outer-tier guidance, I am familiar with that.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Would you explain what that is?
- A. The outer-tier guidance, it is an addition to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Indiana bat summer survey guidance that refers to a Fish and Wildlife Service if -- let me back up.

If an Indiana bat is captured on a mist-net project and no roost trees are located, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will put a 5-mile buffer around the capture site as a precautionary measure assuming that that buffer will then cover the home range of that bat because no further information is

known. So no radio telemetry was conducted. If that's the case, they do that.

So the outer tier guidance was added to the Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines. I can't remember which year it was, but a few years ago, that allows project applicants to conduct further mist netting to try to refine -- redefine or I guess hone in and reanalyze the Indiana bat usage of the area so to -- to potentially with negative mist-net results can reduce that buffer from 5 miles down to 2-1/2 miles. That is what the outer tier guidance is all about.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. So in this particular project, the Emerson Creek wind project, was the outer-tier guidance used?
  - A. It was -- it was.
- Q. Okay. And what was the outcome of using that guidance?
  - A. Well, the -- there's a report. May I reference the report that discusses this process?
    - O. Sure.
- A. Sorry. These binders are heavy. They are on the floor.
- Okay. I believe -- let me find the correct exhibit. This will be in Exhibit Y of the

bat mist-netting reports. I believe it is -- yes, it would be Exhibit Y -- Y1.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Is that the document that would be identified as the final report?

THE WITNESS: Correct, final report 2018 bat mist-net survey for the north Wind Project."

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you.

- A. Can you repeat your specific question?
- Q. Yeah. I think I asked you to explain whether -- to explain what the outcome of the application of the outer-tier guidance was in this case.
- A. The outcome was a mist-net survey was conducted per the direction of Angela Boyer with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that that was to conduct a mist-net survey for the outer tier of an acoustic record that was located north of the project boundary at the time, that is an acoustic record and I don't know the history of that record, so an outer-tier mist-net survey was completed and it's really probably best represented in Figure -- I'm sorry, Figure 1 of that report, page 3.
- Q. How many mist nets were set up for this exercise to utilize the outer-tier guidance?
  - A. Three.

- Q. What was the territory, the amount of the territory covered by those three mist net locations?
- A. I'm referencing page 1, the Methodology, to be able to answer that question. So 539 acres of potential Indiana bat habitat. Hold on. I'm sorry. Let me back up. Let me back up.

I am back on the first paragraph, the

Project Background, because there's two -- there's

two tasks in this one report so I want to make sure I

split them up correctly.

So it was -- there is one mist net site for every 123 acres of potential Indiana bat habitat so take three times that and that's approximately the amount of acres. I think it's -- I would have to subtract 539 and 386 so it looks like a couple hundred acres of forested habitat was sampled. In the outer tier.

- Q. Let's go back to Exhibit K2 on the same page that we were examining earlier which is on the second page of that exhibit.
  - A. Are we back in the e-mail?
- Q. Yes, and we are back in the same paragraph.
- 24 A. Okay.

2.1

Q. Due to -- you were involved in the

Indiana bat surveys at the time this e-mail was written?

- A. I think these are post -- I would have to look at the exact dates. I think these are post completion of our surveys, so if that's the case, then no.
- Q. Based on any communications that you've had with Jennie Geiger or -- or anyone else, do you know what the recommendations are that were referred to in this paragraph?
- A. Can you clarify what recommendations you're speaking of? I'm not familiar -- I've never seen this e-mail specifically so what recommendations are you referring to, please?
- MR. SECREST: I'll renew my objection as to foundation.
- MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I am trying to establish a foundation here by finding out what the witness knows.
- Q. So let me ask you this, do you know whether the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has made any recommendations on this project with regard to the subject matter that we've been discussing?
- MR. SECREST: Objection, vague. We've been discussing a lot of subject matter.

Q. Let me reask the question.

We've been talking about the application of the outer-tier guidance, right?

A. Correct.

2.2

- Q. And if you look at the paragraph above the one that you and I have been discussing, you will see that there's a reference there to reducing the buffer size from 5 miles to 2.5 miles?
- A. Yeah. I'm not able to discern from this e-mail what buffer they're speaking of. I don't -- I don't know the context of -- of this and I'm thinking that, you know, the buffer survey that I referenced in -- that is part of the exhibit in our application, I -- I don't know if this e-mail -- what record this e-mail is specifically referring to now that I look at it closer and further. I'm not sure what this is in reference to specifically, what record it's referring to. Because -- sorry, go ahead.
- Q. Based on your knowledge about the outer-tier guidance, can you explain to me about the significance of having less than 123 acres of an Indiana bat buffer?
  - A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah. I'm looking at that third paragraph again.

A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Of Lott's e-mail and it states there that Mr. Lott stood by his previous recommendations but this option will not be available for other wind projects unless the project overlaps with less than 123 acres of an Indiana bat buffer. Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Can you tell me what -- what significance less than 123 acres of Indiana bat buffer has with respect to the application of this outer-tier guidance?
- A. I am not aware of what -- of that threshold and why -- what he is referring to. I'm not aware. I don't know the answer.
- Q. Do you know whether the outer-tier guidance applies to some wind projects but not others?
- MR. SECREST: Objection, vague.
- 19 ALJ AGRANOFF: Go ahead, Mr. Secrest.
- 20 MR. SECREST: I'm sorry. I objected
- 21 based on vagueness.
- 22 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. And Mr. Van Kley?
- MR. VAN KLEY: It's not vague. I'm
- asking a rather straightforward question.
- 25 ALJ AGRANOFF: I'll allow the question.

THE WITNESS: Can I ask you to repeat it, please?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. Could we have the court reporter repeat the question?

(Record read.)

- A. Yes. The guidance itself doesn't specify specific project types that it is -- can be used or not be used. It's -- from this e-mail this is my only -- this last paragraph, it says this option will not be -- will not be available to other wind projects unless with the caveat. So from this e-mail it sounds like it can be applied in certain situations to wind projects.
- Q. Where -- is there a document that lays out the outer-tier guidance that we've been discussing?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And what is that document?
- A. It would be the Indiana bat -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Indiana Bat Summer Guideline.

  And again, I don't remember -- they update that every year. That's a progressive document that changes with new data so I don't know when it was -- it was actually added. I can't remember the specific year but it's in the current one or at least it was in

this 2018 time frame.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- Q. Is the guidance you just referred to the same guidance we see referenced in the paragraph above the paragraph in Keith Lott's e-mail that we've been discussing?
- A. Are you -- where are you referring to in the e-mail again?
  - Q. Yeah. Let's go -- if you're in Exhibit K2 --
    - A. Okay.
- 11 Q. -- second page, Keith Lott's e-mail of 12 June 11, 2018.
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. And then look at the second paragraph of that e-mail and you'll see a reference to the Indiana bat Section 7 and Section 10 Guidance for Wind Energy Projects. And my question is whether the outer-tier guidance is found within that guidance.
- 19 A. No, sir.
  - Q. Okay. Can you identify the guidance that it's found in?
- A. Yes. The Indiana Bat Summer Survey

  Guidelines. The name has changed over the years but

  I believe U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Indiana Bat,

  yeah, Summer Guidelines, or Guidance, would be where

it would be located.

Q. Okay. We are going to move on for now. We may come back to that later after a break, perhaps we will look at that guidance document.

Let's go to Exhibit K4 of the

Application. Let me know when you have found it. It

should open with an e-mail from Erin Hazelton to

Jennie Geiger.

- A. What's the date of that e-mail, please?
- Q. December 19, 2017.
- A. Okay. I think I found it.
- Q. And that's the e-mail we are going to discuss here briefly.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. What is the time period in which you were involved in bat surveys in this project?
  - A. 2017 and 2018, I believe, are the dates.
- Q. So you were involved in the project at the time this e-mail was written on December 19, 2017?
- A. December 2017, I would have been finished with, I think, our bat surveys by this time. Yes, our summer surveys. I was only involved in the summer surveys that are in the reports that are in our exhibit as far as directly involved with.

- Q. Were you in communication with Apex Clean Energy concerning bat issues as of the time of December 19, 2017?
- A. No. I do not believe so. I would have to check the dates of our reports. If there is any December discussions with myself and Apex, it's regarding the subject of the mist net reports that were completed that summer.
- Q. Uh-huh. Have you seen this e-mail before today?
  - A. No, sir.

- Q. Have you had any communications with Apex Clean Energy or Firelands concerning updating the bat acoustic studies after December 19, 2017?
  - A. No.
- Q. Do you know whether the bat acoustic surveys were updated after December 19, 2017?
- A. I do not know that answer. I did not see the studies in my -- the studies that I am sponsoring, it's not in there.
- Q. You're not aware of any such additional studies contained in the Application for this project?
  - A. I am not aware of any, no.
    - Q. Let's go to Exhibit K7 of the

Application.

2.1

- A. Can you please tell me what that exhibit is? These -- they are not numbered so I'm having to --
- Q. Okay. We'll -- the first page of K7 has an e-mail dated November 7, 2016, from Kate Parsons to Jennie Geiger. If that doesn't help you, let me know. I will see if there is another way we can get you there. The K7 document is labeled as an exhibit pertaining to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ODNR Meeting summary, 2016-11-04.
- A. All right. I found K7 so let's go back to your specific -- okay, I am in K7.
- Q. Okay. Great. Go to the second page of K7 which has a meeting summary dated November 4, 2016.
  - A. Okay. I'm there.
- Q. I would like to refer you to the last paragraph and the sentence that starts with the word "Bats."
  - A. Okay.
- Q. And I would like to take a look at the second paragraph -- or the second sentence of that paragraph which reads as follows: "However, U.S.

  Fish and Wildlife Service noted that results of

mist-net surveys indicating negative presence/
probable absence of Indiana bat are only valid for

2 years and additional surveys are recommended to
confirm probable absence of IBAT." Do you see that
sentence?

A. Yes, I do.

2.2

Q. Do you agree with the statements in that sentence?

MR. SECREST: Objection, foundation.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley.

MR. VAN KLEY: He is a bat expert. He should know.

ALJ AGRANOFF: To the extent that the witness has the knowledge and expertise to respond to that question, he can certainly do so.

- A. Can you repeat the question, please?
- Q. Yes. I have asked whether you agree with this statement in the second sentence on the last paragraph of this page of K7.
- A. My recollection of -- of 2016 survey guidance that would dictate this statement is that, at the time, negative results were good for two years in 2016. It's different now. And --
  - Q. What's different about it now?
  - A. It's five years now. They've increased

it due to increased confidence in probable absence determinations from mist-net surveys.

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. Is that based on improvements in the techniques for taking or for conducting mist-net surveys?
- A. It is both a result of increased survey effort that is currently required and also just, again, these surveys have been going on for -- since the '80s. There's a lot of data that support presence/probable absence surveys and those determinations that are associated with it. So it's just a combination of more data and the increased survey level of effort that's currently required and that's due to white-nose syndrome.
  - Q. And what is the current level of effort that is required for mist-net surveys?
- A. It is nine net nights per 123 or per site.
  - Q. Okay. Would you give me that again, please.
- A. Nine net nights.
- Q. Nine net nights?
- A. Per site is what -- how we speak as far as level of effort.
- Q. When were the mist-net surveys you

conducted for the Emerson Creek wind project?

- A. 2017 and '18. Those are the most recent ones. There's earlier ones.
  - Q. When were the earlier ones conducted?
- A. 2011 and 2012.
- Q. For the 2017 mist-net surveys, how many net nights per site were utilized?
  - A. At that time of that survey, the guidelines stipulated nine net nights per site.
    - Q. And how many were conducted by Firelands?
- 11 A. Nine.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

- Q. How many were conducted by Firelands in 2018?
- 14 A. Nine.
- 15 ALJ AGRANOFF: Just for point of clarification, what exactly is a net night?
- THE WITNESS: Sure. A net night is one mist net placed for one night.
- 19 ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.
- THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. I think I
  am at a point where I need to check my notes to see
  if I have missed any of my questions, and I also
  wanted to take a look at that guidance that
- 25 Mr. Leftwich was describing in one of his answers to

expedite any questions I may have in that. So if we could take a 10-minute break, I would appreciate that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

24

ALJ WILLIAMS: Before we scramble off, where are we in terms of having a next witness electronically verified, Attorney Secrest?

7 MR. SECREST: I'm not sure, your Honor. 8 Perhaps Ms. King has some further information.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Kelli, do we have either Mr. Kusnier or Evans ready in the queue in case we have some time after 11 o'clock to get another witness started in?

MS. KING: We are working on Mr. Evans now in the background. He still is not able to be promoted. I believe Kusnier is. Let me check on that.

ALJ WILLIAMS: You can check when we are on break. So the plan will be, if Mr. Leftwich wraps up relatively quickly after break, we will head straight into our witness then before lunch.

MS. KING: Sure.

22 ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. See everybody 23 in 10 minutes. 10:30?

ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's say 10:30, yep.

25 ALJ WILLIAMS: Perfect. Thank you.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

(Recess taken.)

2.1

ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's go back on the record. And Mr. Van Kley, whenever you are ready. You need to unmute.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. Here I am.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Mr. Leftwich, I have a few more questions about mist netting. You earlier had mentioned the protocol for nine net nights per site. Does that protocol require those mist nets to be of a certain size in order to constitute the net night?
- A. There are standard sizes of mist nets. So the ranges that it refers to are typical sizes that you can purchase. The actual size of the net night -- I'm sorry. The actual size of the mist net is going to be dependent upon the area you are sampling. So a wider trail would require a wider mist net versus a smaller trail.
- Q. Uh-huh. Does the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service guideline that provides for nine net nights per site specify the wideness of the net?
- A. I mean, it may mention a range. Like your standard mist nets are typically from, you know, 3 meters to 18 meters. But, again, it's chosen by

the person on site to best cover the area being sampled.

2.2

counsel?

- Q. What was the size of the nets used in Firelands's mist-net surveys?
- A. I would have to go back into the report data sheets. That information is listed for every single site that is -- that is a piece of information that is written down on the data sheet, so I -- I don't know every single net size that was utilized. But all of that information is on record in the data sheet.
- Q. Okay. Well, if it's already in the record there, we won't need to look it up, and I have no further questions at this time.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

Any clarifying questions of any of

Okay. If not, redirect.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor, and again, I know we were just on a break, however may we take another 10 minutes?

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Why don't we do that and hopefully that will, in the long run, net out in our favor.

MR. SECREST: Well played. Thank you.

```
360
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll have Witness Kusnier
 1
 2
      ready to go at the close of this witness.
 3
                  MR. SECREST: Yes, we will.
 4
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.
 5
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: 10:45.
 6
                  (Recess taken.)
 7
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Redirect at this
 8
      time.
 9
                  MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
10
11
                       REDIRECT EXAMINATION
12
      By Mr. Secrest:
13
             Q.
                  Mr. Leftwich, do you have in front of you
14
      what is titled Joint Stipulation and Recommendation?
15
             Α.
                  I do.
16
             Ο.
                  Okay.
17
                  MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I move to
18
      have this marked as Joint Exhibit 1?
19
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: So marked.
20
                  (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
21
                  MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.
                  Mr. Leftwich, I am specifically looking
22
23
      at page 5 of the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation
24
      and paragraphs 20 and 21.
25
             Α.
                  Okay.
```

- Q. Do those provide measures to protect bats from mortality related to this wind project?
  - A. They do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. Strike that, but thank you.

Clarification, do these measures protect
Indiana bats specifically from potential fatalities
due to this wind project?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you.

With regard to the surveys that you are sponsoring, were those surveys accepted and approved by Fish and Wildlife Service?

- A. Yes, they were.
- Q. And to your knowledge, did ODNR send the results of the Applicant's bat surveys as having complied with its monitoring guidelines?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You were questioned quite a bit on cross-examination related to Indiana bat detected near the project area. Was Fish and Wildlife Service consulted related to that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is that typical that Fish and Wildlife Service would be consulted?
- A. Yes, it is.

Q. And the results of the studies related to the Indiana bat were shared with Fish and Wildlife Service?

A. Yes, they were.

MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. I have no further questions.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

Based on that limited redirect,

Mr. Van Kley, do you have anything?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah, just briefly.

11 | - - -

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Mr. Leftwich, with regard to the conditions in the Joint Stipulation that you have just discussed, those measures described in those paragraphs of the Joint Stipulation are not guaranteed to prevent 100 percent of the potential bat deaths, are they?
- 20 A. From my -- my knowledge and understanding 21 of literature on these methods, they do not remove 22 100 percent of the fatalities.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. No further questions.

25 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you.

1

2 EXAMINATION

By ALJ Agranoff:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. I do have just one quick clarification, Mr. Leftwich, if you could take a look at page 4 of your testimony.
  - A. Sure. Okay.
  - Q. And specifically down on line 25.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. There's reference to the Emerson North Wind Project.
- A. Correct.
- Q. Is there a difference between Emerson North versus Emerson Creek?
  - A. The -- this portion was just named differently at the time of the study. I believe that this -- from the information I have seen that this study is part of the current project boundary. It was just a name difference.
  - Q. Okay. And then if you take a look on page 5, line 15, there the reference is Emerson Creek North. That's again just a change in name at some point in time or?
- A. Correct. It's just the separation of the portions of the project area we surveyed.

364 1 Ο. Okay. But both of those references that 2 we were just discussing are now known as the Emerson Creek wind project. 3 Α. Correct. 4 5 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Thank you. 6 Based on my limited question, any 7 follow-up from counsel? 8 MR. SECREST: No, thank you, your Honor. 9 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. If not, thank you, 10 Mr. Leftwich. 11 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 12 MS. KING: Mr. Leftwich, I will demote 13 you and demote you to an attendee role at this time. 14 ALJ AGRANOFF: And Mr. Secrest, would you 15 care to make a motion? 16 MR. SECREST: I do, your Honor. May I 17 move for admission of Applicant's Exhibit 34. 18 ALJ AGRANOFF: Any objection? 19 There being none, it shall be admitted as 20 part of the record at this time. 2.1 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 22 ALJ AGRANOFF: And with respect to the 23 Joint Stipulation marked as Joint Exhibit 1, you are 24 going to hold off on that? 25 MR. SECREST: That's correct, your Honor.

365 1 Thank you. 2 ALJ AGRANOFF: No problem. And would you 3 like to call your next witness. 4 MR. SECREST: Please, your Honor. May 5 the Applicant call John Kusnier. ALJ AGRANOFF: And Judge Williams. 6 7 MS. KING: Okay. I will move him over. 8 Mr. Kusnier, you have been moved over to 9 panelist role. 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11 MS. KING: You are unmuted. Thank you. 12 THE WITNESS: There we go. 13 MS. KING: Thank you. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Kusnier, my name is 16 Mike Williams. I am one of the ALJs assigned to the 17 case. I am going to swear you in. THE WITNESS: Okay. 18 19 ALJ WILLIAMS: Would you raise your right 20 hand. 21 (Witness sworn.) 2.2 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 23 Please proceed, Attorney Secrest. 24 MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. 25

Firelands Volume III 366 1 JOHN KUSNIER 2 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 3 examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 By Mr. Secrest: Good morning, Mr. Kusnier. How are you? 6 Q. 7 Α. Fine. How are you?

- Q. I am doing well, thank you.
- 9 Α. Okay.

8

- 10 Will you please state your full name for Q. 11 the record, by whom you are employed, and your 12 business address.
- 13 Α. Yes. My name is John Kusnier, K-u-s-n-i-e-r. I am employed by The Mannik & Smith 14 Group at the address of 1800 Indian Wood Circle in 15 16 Maumee, Ohio 43551.
  - Q. Thank you.
- 18 Do you have in front of you your direct 19 prefiled testimony?
- 20 Α. I do.
- 21 Ο. Okay. Is that a true and accurate copy 22 of the prefiled direct testimony in this case?
- 23 Α. Yes, it is.
- 24 Do you have any changes or revisions to 25 that testimony?

367 1 Α. I do not. 2 MR. SECREST: Excellent. Your Honor, may 3 I have Mr. Kusnier's prefiled direct testimony marked as Applicant's Exhibit 35? 4 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 6 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 7 MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. 8 tender Mr. Kusnier for cross-examination. 9 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley. MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 10 11 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 By Mr. Van Kley: 14 Good morning, Mr. Kusnier. 15 Α. Good morning. 16 Have you personally made any visits to 0. 17 the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project? 18 Α. I have not. 19 All right. And as I talk to you about 20 the project area in later questions in the 2.1 cross-examination that will refer to the project area 22 for the Emerson Creek wind project. 23 Α. Okay. 24 So you are sponsoring a study for Emerson

Creek wind project that's related to the evaluation

of natural resources such as wetlands and surface water; is that correct?

A. Yes, it is.

- Q. And since you did not visit the project area, who did visit the project area for purposes of preparing that report?
- A. There were a number of individuals from our company in -- on the project team. Katie Simon, John Freeland, Claire Watts, Alex Peters, and Aaron Mondorf comprise the field team.
- Q. And what were their duties during their field visits for the purpose of obtaining information for this report?
- A. As a team with respect to surface waters and that evaluation, Katie Simon and John Freeland were the senior members of the project team and they were assisted by Claire Watts, Alex Peters, Aaron Mondorf in the identification and delineation of any wetlands and streams within the project area.
  - Q. Did they do anything else?
- A. They also as part of the environmental -- or ecological assessment, they -- in the field they made incidental observations, I believe, of wildlife that they may have seen; and then in the office, they comprised -- you know, summarized all the data,

prepared the report. Katie Simon would have been responsible for the quality of the document, and they were also assisted in the preparation of the data sheets from written documents to typed by a co-op named Ivy Martin.

- Q. Did these persons make any observations concerning the geology of the area that they were studying?
- A. Based on my assessment of the ecological assessment report, it was only through literature review where they did provide mapping for various geological substrata, drift thickness, and so on.
- Q. Uh-huh. Did that desktop review include any review of potential karst in the project area?
- A. Yes, there was a mention of karst area within a portion of the project area.
- Q. Uh-huh. Did these individuals make any effort to look for karst features in the project area?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Uh-huh. Did they make any observations of any karst features that they may have seen during their visits?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
  - Q. Did they see any caves in the project

area?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. I do not recall seeing any mention of caves in the report.
- Q. Did they make any observations in their field notes or other records about wildlife observations they made during their visits?
- A. I did not reveal -- review, excuse me, field notes, and I did not see any table of wildlife observations within the report.
- Q. Uh-huh. So you don't know whether they saw any eagles while they were there?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Uh-huh. You don't know whether they saw any eagle nests while they were there?
  - A. That is correct.
  - Q. So in preparation for your testimony today, you did not review the field notes of the individuals who provided the information for your report?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- Q. At any other time have you reviewed those field notes?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Who wrote the report that is included in the Application?

A. It would have been a team effort. I
think -- well, Katie Simon, John Freeland, Alex
Peters, and Aaron Mondorf would have had the bulk of
the responsibility in writing the report. But Katie
Simon would have been also responsible for quality
control. And then our project manager, Matt Pesci,
would have reviewed the documents once more for
clarity and consistency, grammatical errors, things
like that.

- Q. Did you write any of the report?
- A. I did not.
- Q. Did you have any role with respect to preparing the report before it was submitted to Firelands?
- A. I did not.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I have no further questions.

18 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Secrest, redirect.

MR. SECREST: No redirect on behalf of

Applicant. Thank you, your Honor.

21 ALJ WILLIAMS: Judge Agranoff, any

22 questions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

23 ALJ AGRANOFF: No, thank you.

24 ALJ WILLIAMS: I wouldn't expect any, but

25 I'll entertain if anyone wants to try to inquire from

372 1 counsel. If that's not the case, then take up the 2 exhibits. Mr. Secrest. 3 MR. SECREST: Yes, your Honor. May I move for the admission of Applicant's Exhibit 35. 4 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley? 5 6 MR. VAN KLEY: No objection. 7 ALJ WILLIAMS: It will be admitted. 8 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 9 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Kusnier, thank you for 10 your attendance today. You are excused. 11 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. Thank you. 12 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Margard. 13 By Mr. Van Kley: Yes, sir. 14 ALJ WILLIAMS: These things are a bit unpredictable. Do we have any of the Staff witnesses 15 16 ready to go to fill in? 17 MR. MARGARD: I understand they are all 18 available, all on standby, at least the best I know. 19 ALJ WILLIAMS: We will begin with Witness 20 Bellamy if we otherwise have our choice. 21 MR. MARGARD: I'm fine with that. 2.2 MS. KING: Your Honor. 23 ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll probably lead into

Witness Bellamy depending on how it's going and we

will take a break for lunch.

24

373 1 MR. MARGARD: Yep. 2 MS. KING: Your Honor, I apologize for 3 interrupting. We were able to connect Mr. Evans. 4 By Mr. Van Kley: Oh, there you go. 5 ALJ AGRANOFF: Pleasant surprise. 6 ALJ WILLIAMS: Rather than -- again, 7 Attorney Margard, please thank the witnesses for 8 their ever present willingness to accommodate. I 9 think if we have Witness Evans ready to go, let's go 10 ahead and get that while the technology is good. 11 Attorney Secrest, will you call him. 12 MR. SECREST: Yes. As soon as I come off 13 mute. Your Honor, may the Applicant please call 14 B. Benjamin Evans to the stand. 15 MS. KING: Mr. Evans, you have been 16 unmuted and you are now a panelist. 17 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you hear me 18 okay? 19 ALJ WILLIAMS: We can hear you. We are 20 looking for your audio. 2.1 ALU AGRANOFF: Video. 2.2 ALJ WILLIAMS: Video. 23 Mr. Evans, I can see you and I can hear 24 you. Good morning. Welcome. You are appearing 25 virtually as a witness in our Ohio Power Siting Board

374 case, and as we begin your testimony, I am going to 1 2 swear you in. Would you raise your right hand. 3 (Witness sworn.) ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 4 5 Attorney Secrest. 6 MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. 7 8 B. BENJAMIN EVANS 9 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 10 examined and testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 By Mr. Secrest: 13 Q. Good morning, Mr. Evans. 14 Α. Good morning. 15 Will you please state and spell your full Ο. 16 name for the record, provide us with whom you are 17 employed, as well as your business address. 18 Bryan Benjamin Evans. I'm president --Α. 19 president and owner of Evans Engineering located at 20 524 Alta Loma Drive, Thiensville, Wisconsin. 21 Ο. Thank you, Mr. Evans. 22 Do you have in front of you a copy of 23 your prefiled direct testimony?

And is the copy in front of you a true

I do.

Α.

Q.

24

375 1 and accurate copy? 2 Α. To the best -- to the best of my 3 knowledge, yes. Okay. Do you have any changes or 4 5 revisions to that testimony? 6 Α. No, I don't. 7 MR. SECREST: Your Honor, may I move to 8 have Mr. Evans' prefiled direct testimony marked as 9 Applicant's Exhibit 44? 10 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 11 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 12 MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor. I 13 tender Mr. Evans for cross-examination. 14 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 15 Attorney Van Kley. 16 MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 17 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 By Mr. Van Kley: 20 Q. Good morning, Mr. Evans. 21 Α. Good morning. 2.2 When were you hired to evaluate the Q. Emerson Creek wind project? 23 24 Could you repeat the question? Yes. When were -- when was your company 25 Q.

hired to evaluate the Emerson Creek wind project?

- A. I believe -- I believe it was in summer or fall of 2018.
- Q. At that time what was your mission with regard to what you were seeking to accomplish?
  - A. Why I was hired?

2.1

- Q. Yeah. What was the goal of your work?
- A. The goal of our work was to assist Apex in identifying a communications facility that transmitted over the air to identify particularly microwave lengths that would be crossing the project area, land mobile stations, transmitting stations in the area, and other communication to identify other communications towers in the area and also to do an assessment of broadcast stations, identifying those radio and broad radio and T.V. stations that were also in the area.
- Q. Have you prepared this type of work on other wind projects?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. On how many other wind projects have you performed this type of work?
- A. I don't know the exact -- I don't know the exact number. It would think they number in the hundreds.

- Q. And on all of those projects, have you done that work for the wind developer?
  - A. To my knowledge, yes.

- Q. Are you familiar with the current layout of the turbines proposed for the Emerson Creek wind project?
  - A. Not really familiar with it. I have it.
  - Q. You have a copy of the layout?
  - A. Yes. On my computer.
- Q. Uh-huh. Okay. Do you know whether the layout of the turbines in the current configuration for the wind project is the same as the layout of the project at the time you conducted your study?
- A. There have been different -- well, I wouldn't say different but there were -- there was some micro siting going on after my initial report in November of 2018. I was asked to revise the report according to the new revised turbine locations.
- Q. So you updated your report after the turbine layout was changed?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Has your report been updated since the time the current layout for the turbines was set up?
- A. I believe my report reflects the current layout.

- Q. Okay. During your study, did you provide Firelands with any advice on whether the Company could move any of its turbines in order to reduce impacts on communications in the area?
  - A. Actually I don't recall.

- Q. Did Firelands ever ask you to provide the Company with advice on whether turbine locations could be changed in order to reduce the potential impact on communications?
- A. Well, I'm not sure. Can you -- could you be more specific?
- Q. Uh-huh. Well, I'm not sure. I thought I was being pretty specific but why don't we go to an exhibit. If you would go to the document that has been identified as LR Exhibit 13, maybe this document will clarify my question. Let me know when you have that in front of you.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- A. What's --
- O. It is LR Exhibit 13.
- A. Okay. I don't know what that refers to.

  Can you give me a name of the document?
  - Q. Yes. It's a copy of some pages from your website. Your company's website.
    - A. Okay.

- Q. Have you found it now?
- A. I will get there in a minute. I am on the homepage.
  - Q. Okay. If you would go to the heading for Wind Energy Consulting.
    - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. I would like to direct your attention to the third paragraph under that heading which I believe reads as follows, will you tell whether I am reading correctly: "Microwave studies can be conducted in one of two ways. If your turbine layout is still in process, Evans Engineering will assist you by performing a 'black out' study, which will help you to determine where to place your turbines. Or, if your layout is complete, we will provide information on each turbine location to determine mitigation measures." Did I read that language correctly from your website?
  - A. Yes. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So my question has do with the first of the two ways your website states your company can assist its customers. That is, by performing a "black out" study which will help them to determine where to place the turbines. And my question is whether you performed such a study for

the Emerson Creek wind project.

A. We did perform the study. And I believe at that time when we were preparing our first -- well, when we were doing our studies for the first time, there was a layout that they submitted to us to the best of my recollection, it was not a "black out" study, it was a study -- it was a study that would -- where the report would include the turbine locations.

And so we -- we took consideration of that particular turbine layout and the first thing we do as far as feedback to the developer would be, and this is probably the most important thing that we look at, is to make sure that the turbines are not in the path of microwave lengths. If they are, we would -- we would advise the developer to move that location so that the turbine would be clear of the microwave path that would be interfering.

Interfering with it. And I believe -- well, that's my answer.

- Q. Okay. So with regard to the Emerson

  Creek wind project, did you provide any advice to the developer on where to locate its turbines in order to prevent interference with microwave communications?
  - A. Yes, I believe I did.
  - Q. And did the developer follow that advice

in all instances?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

- A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
- Q. Let's talk about T.V. reception for a few moments. If you would go to your report submitted as part of the Application, which I believe is Applicant Exhibit 45; is that correct? Let me just double-check.
  - A. Are you asking me?
  - Q. I will ask anybody who knows.
- MR. SECREST: Mr. Van Kley, his report or his testimony?
- MR. VAN KLEY: His report which is in the
  Application. I have it marked as Exhibit Q so maybe
  that's the best way to find it.
  - A. I have my report in front of me. It's January 14, 2019.
  - Q. Yeah. That's what I am looking for. Let me give everybody else a few moments to find it on their computers. We're looking for Exhibit Q of the Application.
- 21 ALU WILLIAMS: Of the PDF.
- Q. Let's start on the second page of your
  report, Exhibit Q, and look at the Introduction
  first. I would like to refer you to the third
  sentence of the third paragraph of that Introduction.

And specifically to the second sentence of that paragraph. Let me know when you find that. It starts with the words "The wind turbines."

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

- Q. That sentence states as follows: "The wind turbines being considered for the project will have a hub height of between 105 and 125 meters and a maximum rotor diameter of 150 meters."
- A. We're not reading from the same report apparently because that particular sentence reads differently.
- 12 ALJ WILLIAMS: Report dated January 14, 13 2019.
  - MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I am looking at Exhibit Q. And that was introduced into evidence with Mr. Pedder's testimony and it's the same one that I am reading from.
- 18 ALJ WILLIAMS: The Bench has it.
- MR. SECREST: Mr. Evans, are you perhaps
  looking at the original report as opposed to the
  revised?
- 22 THE WITNESS: I am looking at my report 23 from January 14, 2019.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Did you have more than one version of your report?

A. Yes, I did.

- Q. Okay. And do you know whether you're reading from the same version that is included in the Application for the Emerson Creek wind project?
- A. It would help me to know when that -- when the Application was filed.

MR. SECREST: Mr. Evans, what is the actual date of the report that you are looking at right now?

"Engineering Report Concerning the Effects Upon FCC
Licensed RF Facilities Due to Construction of the
Emerson Creek Wind Energy Project in Erie, Huron, and
Seneca Counties, Ohio."

MR. SECREST: The version I am looking at the title is exactly the same with the exception of the last part. It just states Erie and Huron Counties.

THE WITNESS: Okav.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Secrest, if we were in person, you could potentially hand it to him. Is there a way to send him an electronic copy?

MR. SECREST: Attorney Pirik is doing that right now, your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Van Kley, you are fine

1 | with that, I assume?

2 MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. I sure am.

THE WITNESS: Does your copy have a date

4 of the report as January 14, 2019?

5 MR. SECREST: It does.

6 THE WITNESS: Okay.

7 MR. VAN KLEY: The title you read to us 8 still had Seneca County in it so that appears to be 9 an earlier version of the report.

MR. SECREST: Mr. Evans, if you wouldn't mind checking your e-mail, you should have it in there.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Did you send it back to me?

MR. SECREST: It came -- it will have come from Christine Pirik.

17 THE WITNESS: Okay.

15

16

18

19

20

2.1

MR. SECREST: Mr. Van Kley, I believe I can right now, if it would help, I believe I can share my screen so that Mr. Evans can see what we are looking at.

MR. VAN KLEY: Uh-huh. That would be okay.

24 THE WITNESS: Or I could try to pull it 25 out. Do you know when and what day and what time --

385 ALJ WILLIAMS: Can you check your e-mail. 1 2 Ms. Pirik just sent it to your e-mail. 3 MR. SECREST: I misspoke. I cannot share it from my screen. I do not have that function right 4 5 now. 6 ALJ WILLIAMS: While we're recognizing 7 this might be an issue for future exhibits, do you 8 have other ones that Ms. Pirik can get started 9 queuing up? 10 MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. MS. KING: This is Kelli, the host. I am 11 12 looking for an option to enable screen sharing at the 13 moment. 14 ALJ WILLIAMS: I think we are going to be 15 okay, Kelli. Thank you. 16 MS. KING: Okay. 17 MR. VAN KLEY: We will also be discussing 18 with Mr. Evans' LR Exhibit 12 and the Joint 19 Stipulation. And I think that's it. 20 ALJ WILLIAMS: Ms. Pirik, if you could 21 please help us with putting those in as well. 2.2 Mr. Evans, is your e-mail working? Do

you have Ms. Pirik's last e-mail yet?

23

24

THE WITNESS: Her last e-mail?

last 5 minutes, a copy as well so we could all be on the same document.

MR. SECREST: Mr. Evans, the e-mail may note that it is permitting access to a kiteworks folder. Sorry. Ms. Pirik corrected me. It's directly from her.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay.

ALJ WILLIAMS: You have opened the e-mail and are able to see Exhibit LR12 -- LR13? Sorry.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, the engineering report of January 14, 2019.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. Mr. Van Kley, thank you for your patience. Get those last two and we'll proceed.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So you now have in front of you the engineering report that you prepared which is part of the Application as Exhibit Q; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, yeah. I have got it in front of me.
- Q. Now, let's go back to the second page then and take a look at the third paragraph on the second page of your report.
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And I would like to read to you the

second sentence of that paragraph. It states as follows: "The wind turbines being considered for the project will have a hub height of between 105 and 125 meters and a maximum rotor diameter of 150 meters." And then the next sentence states as follows: "For the purposes of these studies, the 105-meter hub height and 150-meter rotor diameter were assumed, since these dimensions would have the most potential impact on the microwave paths in the area." Did I read those sentences correctly?

A. Yes.

- Q. So my question then to you is -- is why is the 105-meter hub height considered to have the most potential impact on the microwave paths in the area?
- A. Because typically the microwave -- the microwave paths are -- when you measure the distance from the ground to where the center of the micro beam is, it's typically above -- it's typically above 50 meters. It -- so it's -- it's typically lower than the hub height of a typical wind turbine.
- Q. Why would a turbine of 105-meter hub height have more potential impact than a taller wind turbine?
  - A. Because -- because that would make it --

a higher hub height would make the rotor further above the microwave beam.

O. Uh-huh.

2.2

- A. So that's the answer to that question.
- Q. So typically how high above the ground are the microwave paths usually located?
- A. Well, there -- in any specific -- in any specific elevations, that depends on the specific requirements of the microwave operators.
- Q. Uh-huh. In the area around or inside of the project area for the Emerson Creek project, are there any microwave paths that are higher than 105 meters?
  - A. Not to my recollection.
- Q. And why is the 150-meter rotor diameter considered to have the most potential impact on microwave paths?
- A. Well, I wouldn't say that the rotor would have the most impact because the -- the spinning blade might have some amount of impact if the sweep of the blade is crossing the microwave beam.
- Q. Uh-huh. To your recollection, is

  150 meters the size of the largest rotor diameter for
  the turbine models being considered by Firelands for
  this project?

- A. I believe that's -- that's correct. To my recollection.
- Q. Go to page 45 and I'm not sure why the number on Exhibit Q has 5 on it, but just to be clear, it would be the fourth page of your report.
  - A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley, so on the PDF, page 4 is actually labeled page 4.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. I'm looking at it.

- Q. It should have the words starting "If the Emerson Creek Wind Project should cause disruptions..." 1, 2, 3 under that.
- A. No. Page 4 of my report, it doesn't start off that way.
  - Q. Okay. When you look at the pages of your report, are you including the title page and the numbers?
    - A. It should be at the bottom on the right.
  - Q. Uh-huh. Would you find the page that has 1, 2, 3 set out on it. 1 being "Relocation of the household antenna to receive a better signal."
    - A. That would be in the T.V. assessment.
  - Q. Correct.
    - A. Okay.
- 25 ALJ WILLIAMS: Are we on Exhibit Q? I'm

```
390
1
      sorry.
 2
                  MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, yes, we are.
 3
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Roughly where should I be
      within this exhibit?
 4
 5
                  MR. VAN KLEY: You should be on the
 6
      fourth PDF page.
7
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: That's labeled?
8
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: It's marked as page 45.
9
                  THE WITNESS: Yes. It's page 45. That's
10
     my page 45.
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: On my PDF page, I have
11
      "Important Note: Microwave path studies...."
12
13
                  MR. VAN KLEY: You know what, I think
14
     what I did, I probably just printed out the pages I
15
     had questions on. So that's my error. It should be
16
     page 45.
17
                  THE WITNESS: Yes.
18
                  MR. SECREST: It is, yes.
19
                  MR. VAN KLEY: Okav.
20
                  MR. SECREST: True pagination 45.
21
                  MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.
2.2
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. I'm with you now.
23
                  MR. VAN KLEY: Everybody is on the same
24
     page after the confusion I caused?
25
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Attorney Van
```

Kley.

2.2

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Let's ask questions about that page. I'm looking at the paragraph under 1, 2, and 3 which starts with the words "According to this engineer's calculations."
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. And it says there that "According to this engineer's calculations, there are approximately 7,780 households within an area most likely to be affected (approximately 228 square miles). It is conservatively estimated that 70 percent, or 5,446, of the households receive TV programming primarily by satellite dish or cable."

  Did I read those sentences, correctly?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. In regard to the first sentence where you refer to an area of approximately 228 miles -- or square miles.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know how many miles of land was included in this mileage outside of the project area?
- A. I don't know the square mileage but I can tell you we extend -- we took the wind farm footprint, the actual project area that Apex sent to us, you know, which was designated the project area

and we -- we took that as the footprint and then we extended out some distances beyond those project limits.

- Q. Uh-huh. And how many miles beyond the project limits did you include within your study area of 228 square males?
  - A. That's up to 2.5 miles.

2.2

- Q. How did you derive your estimate that 70 percent of the households receive T.V. programming primarily by satellite dish or cable?
- A. I relied on a statistic that -- the statistic was that, in 2017, 70 percent of households in the -- 73 percent of the households in the United States were getting their T.V. programming from cable and/or microwave dish.
  - O. Who made these estimates?
- A. That was from the NTIA, that's the National Telecommunications and Information

  Administration. It's a federal agency that assists the executive branch of the government as far as technology -- in technology issues.
- Q. Uh-huh. Is that -- was this information from a report prepared by the NTIA?
- A. I suppose. And I'm not sure where I got that. But in my notes that's -- that's what I have.

I wrote it down in my notes.

2.2

- Q. Did the NTIA have any estimates about the percentage of households that receive T.V. programming in rural areas?
- A. I don't -- I don't have any knowledge of that, no.
- Q. Uh-huh. Wouldn't you expect that that -that the percentage of households not -- not having
  satellite dish or cable would be higher in rural
  areas?

MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll let him answer.

- A. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah. Wouldn't you expect that the percentage of households not having satellite dish or cable would be higher in rural areas?
- A. Well, I'm not sure, you know, I'm not sure that would be the case. It might be higher. As far as users of satellite dish. In places where cable isn't available which is -- this happens to be in the rural areas where cable doesn't extend up to.
- Q. Yeah. Have you done any studies to determine approximately the percentage of households that do not have satellite dish or cable in rural areas?

A. I have not.

2.2

- Q. Have you done any surveys around the project area for the Emerson Creek wind project to find out how many of the households there utilize satellite dish or cable?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. So reading further into this paragraph that we've been discussing, let's go to the third sentence of that paragraph where you state: "This leaves an estimated 2,334 households relying on transmitted off-the-air TV signals." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. That's also known as analogue?
  - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Is that reference to "off-the-air TV signals" sometimes referred to as analogue?
  - A. Off-the-air could be -- could be analogue but not anymore because T.V. stations are not transmitting in analogue. They haven't been since about 2009. But off-the-air can be -- it could be digital. It could be any -- any video encoding that's out there.
  - Q. When you refer to "off-the-air TV signals," you are referring to signals other than

those that come from satellite dish or cable?

A. Yes. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And then in the next sentence on this page of Exhibit Q you state as follows: "Based on the 10 percent criteria described previously, up to 233 TV receiving locations may be affected to varying degrees in the worst-case." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So here you've taken 10 percent of the estimated 2,334 households that rely on transmitted off-the-air T.V. signals to come up with the figure of 233 T.V. receiving locations that may be affected; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, where did you come up with the 10 percent criteria?
  - A. That's based on our experience in -in -- in the development of wind projects over the
    years. 10 percent would represent the worst-case
    number, you know, it would be the wind projects
    that -- where they would -- where there was the most
    egregious level of T.V. interference. It's basically
    the worst that was ever encountered. As far as T.V.
    interference goes. And I think there was -- this

- was -- well, it actually was back in the analogue days, but we've never updated that figure.
- Q. And how did you -- how did you -- what were you doing that resulted in your study that came up with this figure?
- A. Well, we did -- our company did -- did some measurements near wind farms. And so it was -- so this figure represents the top tier of anything that we've encountered.
- Q. Uh-huh. Have you been involved in evaluating T.V. interference by operating wind projects?
  - A. Yes, I have.
  - Q. For how many wind projects have you conducted such an evaluation?
- A. By myself?

- Q. Well, you or your company.
- A. Well, there were two in my years of doing this.
  - Q. What were the names of those two wind projects?
- A. One of them was located in Maine. I
  think it was called the Evergreen Wind Project. I'm
  not sure. The other one was -- I can't say what
  project that was because the developer -- I have a

confidentiality agreement with the developer of that project.

- Q. Okay. So with regard to the Maine project, approximately what time frame in years -- the year did you conduct that evaluation?
- A. I believe it was in -- around -- I want to say around 2007.
- Q. And when did you conduct the other evaluation of the confidential wind farm?
  - A. That was in 2017.

2.2

- Q. And when did you say again that analogue was replaced?
- A. It was -- analogue -- all high-powered stations were required to -- for years they were transmitting in both analogue and digital in order to ensure a smooth transition to digital. And the FCC ordered all high-powered T.V. stations to cease the analogue transmission in 2009.
- Q. So was it the evaluation of the wind farm in Maine that produced the 10 percent figure that you used to estimate the number of households that would be -- that will have their T.V. programming affected?
- A. Well, I can't say because of that project. There were other projects that I was not personally involved in.

- Q. Okay. I'm sorry, I must have missed something in your answer. Could you repeat that?
- A. I said that's not necessarily -- that

  10 percent is not necessarily applying to the Maine
  project.
- Q. Well, what was the percentage of households affected by that project, if you know?
  - 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. You don't know?
- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Uh-huh. Well, what about the other project that you did in 2017 for the confidential client, what was the percentage of household -- households affected by that project if you know?
- A. I want to say there were -- there were 16 -- there were complaints of T.V. disruption from 16 households.
  - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. And I don't know what that comes out in percentage-wise but -- but that was, what, about 16 complaints.
- Q. Okay. So am I correctly understanding then that this 10 percent estimate that you utilized was not derived from either of these two studies?
  - A. No. Actually it's a fudge factor. Like

I said, it was the largest percentage that would have ever been encountered at any time.

O. Uh-huh.

2.2

- A. So really it's a worst-case scenario.
- Q. So that 10 percent figure did not come from the two studies that you performed on the two wind projects that we've been discussing?
- A. It might have come from something else.

  But this is -- this is the figure that we've used

  since we started doing T.V. interference assessments.
- Q. Well, if that figure didn't come from either of these two projects, then where did it come from?
  - A. I couldn't say. I don't know.
- Q. Reading further down into this paragraph on Exhibit Q, page 45, you state in the last sentence of that paragraph that "Mitigation costs would be approximately \$200 per location for an upgraded outdoor antenna, for \$450 per year per location for a satellite or cable subscription." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Where did you obtain these costs?
- A. I looked them up. I don't know

  exactly -- what I would do is check prices for a

high-quality outdoor antenna and I'm sure that's what I based my \$200 on. And the per year for satellite or cable, I think what -- what I might have done there was to look up the cable subscription plans and chose the, you know, the low tier subscription which would, at minimum, carry the local channels.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

- Q. How can an upgraded outdoor antenna improve T.V. reception if it is interfered with by a wind turbine?
- 10 Α. Because in most cases, why T.V. -- T.V. 11 reception is -- is disrupted is that there's not 12 enough available -- not enough available signal 13 being -- being pulled in by the antenna. If the 14 antenna is just like a rabbit ears on top of the T.V. 15 set, it's not going to do as good a job as a 16 high-quality antenna would do. So a high-quality 17 outdoor antenna would do a much better job of pulling 18 in -- pulling in the signal where the antenna is. 19 And if it's -- especially if it's outdoor, you know, 20 like on the roof or somewhere outdoors.
  - Q. If a wind turbine does interfere with T.V. reception, how would that evidence itself on the T.V.? On the T.V. picture?
  - A. When a -- when a T.V. channel is being disrupted, that manifests -- that manifests itself by

the picture -- and we are talking about a digital picture, manifests itself by a frozen picture, a frozen picture with a tear or tears in it in the picture, and often you'll have -- you have the picture that's pixelated, you know, pixel -- you can actually see little squares of picture. You could actually see those little squares. And ultimately a video failure, video failure would -- would end up as a blank screen or a blue picture, a blue screen.

- Q. Go to page 43 of your report.
- A. Okay.

- Q. And I would like to direct your attention to the second paragraph under the heading "4.1 TV Broadcast Facilities."
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And let's go to the fifth line of that paragraph starting with the word "Unusual."
  - A. "Usually"?
  - Q. Or "Usually," yes.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. That sentence states: "Usually, a rule of thumb is that approximately 10 percent of the receiver locations are affected to some extent within three miles of a large turbine when the -- when the turbine is between the TV station and the receiver."

Did I read that correctly?

2.2

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, I thought that earlier in your testimony you said that you went out to a distance of 2-1/2 miles from the project boundary in order to estimate the number of households that could be affected by interference with their T.V.; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. So if you went 3 miles beyond the project area, would that increase the number of households that would be potentially affected by interference with the T.V. reception?
- A. Well, I think I might have overestimated when -- well, this appears out of reports, all of our reports really, and -- up to 3 miles but lately, depending on the direction of the station --

ALJ WILLIAMS: I am sure you are having the same issue I am having, Mr. Evans, you are breaking up a little bit. Could you restate that answer.

A. Okay. That's the language that existed in our reports for years and years and I never gave thought to changing it. But when I -- when I looked at this case, particular project, I thought that

2-1/2 half miles was a good number to use based on the -- the directions from the station to the project.

- Q. Why would that make any difference with respect to the distance beyond the project area that could be -- that could have their T.V. reception interfered with?
- A. Well, in some cases the households are -the project area -- or the populations that you are
  considering would not -- would not be exactly in line
  between the station and the -- and the receipt of the
  transmission. In other words, turbines would not be
  in exactly colinear or on the line with the
  transmitter and the receivers.
- Q. How many transmitters of these T.V. communications are there in the area that's served around the project area?
  - A. Can you repeat that?
- Q. Yeah. How many sources of T.V. signals are there in the -- in this area?
  - A. The T.V. --

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Evans, I'm sorry.

It's inaudible now. I don't know if there is a way
to boost your signal but I didn't get any of that
answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, I just started talking. I wasn't in the middle of a sentence. Can you hear me --

ALJ WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE WITNESS: -- right now? Okay. I will lean further into the phone here.

- A. On page 44 is a list of stations which we've found that are -- which we found that are predicted to cover some or all of the project and beyond. And beyond the project, say a couple miles or so. And they are listed on page 44.
  - Q. Those are listed in Table 4?
  - A. Table 4, yes.
- Q. And those T.V. signals come to the project area from a variety of directions; isn't that correct?
- A. Mainly from two directions. From the east where the -- where the Cleveland T.V. stations are located and -- and from the -- and from -- and stations from the northwest in the Toledo area also serve the area.
  - Q. Well, you also have T.V. stations in Mansfield; isn't that correct?
- A. Yes.

Q. And that's from the south of the project

area, isn't it?

2.2

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And Canton is from the southeast of the project area?
  - A. Yes. East of the project area.
  - Q. So you have T.V. signals coming from three directions then, correct?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. So are you saying then that the turbines that are going to be erected are not in the direct line of the T.V. signal from any of the stations to the people using those T.V. stations?
  - A. Well, I'm not sure I understand that question. But -- but we -- we -- we extended the -- we extended the line a maximum of 2-1/2 and that seems to be the -- the most sort of prediction when we analyzed this.
  - Q. Well, I thought I had heard you say that you used a distance of 2-1/2 miles instead of 3 miles because you didn't believe the turbines were going to be located in a direct line between the T.V. signal and the household receiving it. Am I misunderstanding what you are saying?
- THE WITNESS: Could I request a break,

ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. 5 minutes. MR. VAN KLEY: If you want to, we can take a lunch break. I have maybe 15 minutes of questions left at this point. ALJ WILLIAMS: Okay. If everybody is okay with that, we will break until 1:15. MR. SECREST: Thank you. Well, thank you. ALJ WILLIAMS: We are off the record. Thank you. (Thereupon, at 12:07 p.m., a lunch recess was taken.) 

407 1 Wednesday Afternoon Session, 2 October 7, 2020. 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll go ahead and go back 4 5 on the record. Mr. Van Kley, we'll turn this back over 6 7 to you for your cross. 8 MR. VAN KLEY: All right. Thank you. 9 10 B. BENJAMIN EVANS being previously duly sworn, as prescribed by law, 11 12 was examined and testified further as follows: 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 14 By Mr. Van Klev: 15 Mr. Evans, let's go back to your 0. 16 testimony that has been marked as Applicant 17 Exhibit 44. And please go to page 4 of that 18 testimony. 19 Α. Yeah. My computer is very slow. I 20 apologize. I'm having a tough time. 21 Ο. No problems. Just let us know when you 22 get there. 23 Okay. What was that page number? Α. 24 4. We're going to go to Question and 0. 25 Answer No. 9.

- A. Oh, I'm sorry. Is this my testimony?
- Q. Yes.

- A. Okay. Okay.
  - Q. All right. Are you there?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. Good. All right. In the first paragraph of your answer to Question 9 of your testimony, in the first sentence, you state that you completed some research on RTK systems in 2017. Do you see that?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. All right. And RTK system is -- is an acronym for real-time kinematic GPS locator system?
    - A. Yes.
    - O. And what is that?
    - A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Yes. What is an RTK system?
  - A. It -- it's a system in which that enables farm equipment to do seed and other farm activities in a very accurate way. You have to be able to track the vehicle with -- within an inch of accuracy. A normal GPS is not that accurate. It's only accurate to within 15 feet, I think. What -- what the RTK system is it also integrates into the system the differential GPS correct -- GPS signals which are

generated by the system which, in effect, provides air correction in the location to get -- to get the accuracy that farm equipment needs to have.

2.2

- Q. And what kinds of farming activities utilize RTK systems?
- A. I'm not really familiar with farming equipment. I would think vehicles, harvesters, any equipment that does seeding and such.
- Q. Describe the research that you did on RTK systems in 2017.
- A. I -- I went online and read from a few websites. In fact, particularly there was information in the John Deere website. They are vendors of -- they are primary vendors of the RTK systems. And I went on other websites to read about RTK, but I don't recall what those were.
- Q. Why do you refer to that research in your testimony and in Answer 9?
  - A. Repeat that, please.
- Q. Why do you refer to that research in your answer to Question 9 of your testimony?
- A. Because I was made aware that there was a farmer who lives in the extreme northern part of the project area that had a GPS system.
  - O. Uh-huh. Is that farmer's name Gerard

Wensink?

2.2

- A. Yes.
- Q. What, if any, information did you find in your research about whether wind turbines can interfere with RTK systems?
- A. I wasn't able -- I wasn't able to find anything which said that RTK systems were adversely affected by wind turbines. I did read where they -- if there should be some sort of interruption of the vehicle's GPS tracking device, that the -- that the vehicle can continue to do its activities for a period of 15 minutes, whereas, meaning that they can continue on for 15 minutes and still be accurate in its tracking which in most cases I would think is enough time for the -- for the obstruction to pass by as the vehicle is traveling.
- Q. Did you find any research that specifically stated that wind turbines will not cause problems with the use of RTK systems?
- A. I didn't find anything that explicitly stated it that way, no.
- Q. What kind of communication pathway does an RTK system use? Is it a microwave, or is it something else?
  - A. The base station, if I understand

correctly, is the 450 and 900 megahertz bands.

- Q. And if there is interference by the wind turbine, would that be caused by the fact that the wind turbine blades are located in between the user of the RTK system and the RTK system itself?
- A. You mean between the vehicle with the system onboard and the base station?
  - Q. Yes, correct.

2.2

- A. If there -- if there is a problem, it's most likely that, yes.
- Q. Uh-huh. Okay. Have you seen a farmer working a field with planting or harvesting equipment?
  - A. I don't recall that I have.
- Q. Well, are you aware that typically in working a farm field that a farmer will drive equipment from one end of the field to another and then back again and then back again, back and forth across the field?
- A. That seems to be a reasonable way to do it, I would think.
- Q. All right. So if the turbine's blades are located between that field and the RTK base, then the farmer's equipment will not be traveling out of the range of the turbine blades, would it?

A. It depends which direction the vehicle is traveling in relation to the direction of where the turbine is.

2.2

Q. Uh-huh. Well, if the -- if the farmer's equipment is traveling in a vertical position between the base of the RTK system and the -- let me start that over.

If the farmer's equipment is traveling vertically away from the turbine instead of horizontally across the turbine, then it's most likely that the equipment would be -- will be traveling away from the interference; isn't that correct?

A. I think what you are trying to say is if the farmer is -- let's say the farmer is traveling in a north-south direction and -- and the turbine and the base station and the farmer are all along a line in north and south. Yeah. There's a potential for a problem but it's -- there are a lot of variables involved. What the elevation is at each point, the height of the base station antenna.

It all depends on -- you know, the base station has to have complete line of sight to the vehicle or should have line of sight. It -- in order to have a -- in order to be assured a clear signal.

Sometimes -- sometimes that line of sight is temporarily blocked. Sometimes there is something there that would not be moved out of the way because of a particular direction the farmer is going, the farmer with his vehicle is going. And it's not always the case that an obstruction between the base station and the end user would have an interference problem. Some radio systems do overcome very minor obstructions.

- Q. Did you visit the project area?
- A. No, I did not.

2.2

- Q. So you haven't seen the farm fields in the area of the project that's been proposed?
- A. No, I don't know where the fields are located.
- Q. And you wouldn't have any idea how long it would take a farmer to plant a field of the sizes that are contained in the vicinity of the project area?
- A. How long it would take a farmer to seed the farm, the fields?
  - Q. Yeah. How long would it take the farmer to seed a particular field of the size that is -- is found in the area of the project?
- A. I don't know.

- Q. How about harvesting, do you know how long it would take to harvest a typical field in that area?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Go to the second paragraph of Answer 9 on page 4 of your testimony marked as Exhibit 44. Let's look at the first sentence of that paragraph starting with the word "Specifically."
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. That sentence states as follows:

  "Specifically, because GPS receivers can generally lock onto up to 10 satellites in different directions at any one time when the sky is fairly unobstructed, the acquisition of GPS signals should be unencumbered by wind turbines." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Now, in this sentence, are you referring to the RTK system -- RTK systems that are used by farmers when you talk --
- A. I'm -- in that sentence I'm only referring to the GPS signals from the satellite.
- Q. So you're not talking about RTK systems there.
- A. Well, RTK systems do rely on GPS signals from the GPS satellite constellation.

Q. But they -- those GPS signals come only out of the base with RTK system?

2.1

A. They use -- RTK systems use the positional information from the GPS satellites and also the RTK system itself calculates the error between the -- what's the positional information from the satellite and the actual position that -- that a user is located in.

So -- so what -- what makes RTK unique -- unique is that it corrects the error that you get off of the GPS satellites because GPS signals come from satellites that are like 10,000 miles above the earth but when they go through the atmosphere, those signals are slightly bent and that results in the positional error that you get with raw GPS data and the error being like 15 feet or so.

What the RTK system is doing is using its computational powers to calculate the positional error. And -- and make it so that the -- that the farm vehicle is on track within an inch of accuracy.

Q. I'm not sure that I understand quite how the RTK systems work relative to the satellites so maybe you could explain that a little bit more. In particular, could you explain the relationship between the signal that the RTK base receives from

the satellite versus the signal that the RTK base sends to the farm equipment?

2.2

A. The base station has like an antenna which is kind of straight like a plate. It receives the signal from the satellites, the positional information from the satellites. When you establish a permanent base station, you have to have it accurately surveyed by a surveyor so that you know exactly where that -- where that antenna is, the base station antenna is.

What -- what the system does is that it compares -- the base station compares the positional information from the satellites with the known position of the base station which is accurately -- which was accurately determined. It calculates the signal delay between those two positions, the uncorrected position and the corrected position, and it calculates that positional error and in real time and it sends it to the end user driving the farm vehicle and it does this for every single satellite that the base station sees in the sky. So it transmits the correctional information to the end user in the vehicle.

Q. Okay. So let me make sure now I understand this accurately. The base station

receives a signal from the satellite in the sky; is that correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And then does the RTK base station send a signal to the farmer's equipment?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And does the RTK base station send that signal to the equipment by bouncing it off the satellite or is it sent directly between the base station and the equipment?
- A. It's sent by radio signal from the base station to the vehicle. Farm vehicle. The farm vehicle also has a GPS antenna onboard as well as an antenna to receive the signals from the base station because -- because the vehicle needs both -- both transmissions to establish its position accurately.
- Q. Let's go to page 5 of your testimony. I would like to talk about lines 4 through 9 on that page.
- A. Okay. This point -- this is Question and Answer No. 9?
- Q. Yeah, yes, it would be the last paragraph of Answer No. 9.
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Let's look at the last sentence of that

paragraph.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.2

A. Yes.

- Q. There you've stated as follows: "If the field is in the coverage area of another existing network base station, the solution could be as simple as switching the mobile unit to the other base station."
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So with respect to another existing network base station that you're referring to in this sentence, who would be the owner of that base station?
  - A. The other base station?
  - O. Yeah.
  - A. Some other farmer in the area or a co-op.
- Q. Have you done any investigation to determine how many RTK base stations are in existence in the project area or within 3 miles of the project area?
- A. I have not. Could I just add something
  here?
  - Q. Yeah. Sure. Go ahead.
- A. Okay. Switching to a different base

  station is not the only possible solution. I -- it

  was supposed to be in my testimony but I -- I

inadvertently, I guess, omitted it.

2.2

There are a couple ways you can get around any possible disruption of the RTK system.

One is to -- the set-up that Mr. Wensink has, he has, I believe, his base station on top of a grain elevator or a grain leg, I think, and it's up to -- it's something like 100 or so feet up in the air.

One -- one method of mitigating any potential disruption would be to increase that height or build a taller structure to get more saturation signal down into the farm field.

Another way would be to set up a repeater station and that's in my testimony. Set up a repeater station which takes -- if there is an obstruction directly between the base station and the farm vehicle, you might be able to set up a repeater station at a -- at a location that has a clear path from the repeater to the --

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Evans, we are losing your audio. We lost your audio. We lost part of that response.

A. For example, the -- the repeater -- what a repeater does is it takes the signal from the base station and sends it to the farm vehicle. I said that before. I'm repeating myself. So if that

repeater base station is set up on like a -- like a small rise in the -- in the terrain, it -- it sort of bends the signal around, around the obstruction, if you will. It takes the signals from the base station, they're operating on one particular frequency and usually what the repeater does is send it to the data board to the RTK system in the vehicle on another frequency, so.

Q. Going back to your mention of the alternative to build a higher base station. Would doing that subject to -- subject the base station to a more likelihood of damage from winds?

MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll allow him to answer.

- A. Are you talking about putting the base station on a taller structure?
- Q. Yeah. I'm talking about your observation that Mr. Wensink's base station could be built to a -- a higher elevation as a potential way of avoiding interference from the turbines. And my question is whether doing that would subject the system to a greater likelihood of damage from wind.
- A. I'm not a structural -- that's in the purview of a structural engineer which I am not.
  - Q. Directing your attention back to page 5

of your testimony in the last paragraph of Answer 9. We'll go back to that last sentence for a moment. There it's stated that another existing network base station could be used if it's in the same coverage area, right?

A. That's correct.

2.2

- Q. How much territory is encompassed in a coverage area for an RTK system?
- A. I don't know. The -- the vendors of the system claim 8 miles but I have no way of knowing if that's true or not.
- Q. So you don't know how close a second base station would have to be in order to utilize it during the time that a turbine might be interfering with RTK signals?
- A. No, I don't know how close they would have to be. It depends on -- well, not -- not all base stations necessarily cover the same area. There could be variations from one base station to another. It depends on how high the antenna is and how much power they are running.
- Q. Let's go to the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation which I believe has been marked as Joint Exhibit 1. Do you have that in front of you?
  - A. Yes, I do.

- Q. Go to page 8 of that document.
- A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

- Q. I would like to talk about paragraph 37a through d.
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. And you can see that there's a reference to a microwave path study in the introductory paragraph of paragraph 37, correct?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Does a microwave path study address potential interference with RTK systems?
- A. No, it does not. As far as I know, an RTK does not use microwave lengths or normally doesn't use it.
  - Q. So would there be any part of paragraph

    37 or subparts A through D of paragraph 37 that apply
    to RTK systems?
- 18 A. I don't think so.
- ALJ WILLIAMS: Can we get that answer again? It broke up.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I don't think -- I don't think RTK systems are applied to this 37.
- 23 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Okay. Do you need to refresh your memory of what paragraph 37 states in

order to answer that question with certainty?

A. I'll read it over.

- Q. Why don't you take a brief look at it. Let me know when you have satisfied yourself as to whether paragraph 37 applies to RTK systems.
- A. Our study addressed the fixed microwave systems, meaning you have a fixed point on one side, on one end, and a fixed point on the other end and -- and they transmit back and forth only to those endpoints. And that's the study we did in preparing that report. As far as that type of system, it only refers to fixed microwave systems. You have two -- two discrete end points communicating with each other in a very -- very discrete beam path.

So -- so I don't think this paragraph 37 addresses RTK systems. RTK is -- basically -- it's basically a base station and -- and the -- it's like a mobile base system because the other end of the communication path is -- is -- by design and by definition it's like a mobile operation.

- Q. All right. So your conclusion continues to be then that you do not believe that paragraph 37 including subparts A, B, C, and D address RTK systems, correct?
  - A. Correct.

- Q. All right. Let's go to paragraph 38 on page 9 of the Stipulation. Is there anything in this condition 38 that addresses RTK systems?
- A. It could possibly be covered under -- it says all -- all existing licensed microwave paths and licensed communication systems. You know, I am not a lawyer. My interpretation could be completely wrong but RTK might be included -- you could possibly, possibly consider 38 to cover RTK.
- Q. Well, RTK does not utilize microwave paths, correct?
  - A. To my knowledge, no.
- Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

23

- 14 ALJ WILLIAMS: Say again, I'm sorry.
- THE WITNESS: No, it does not.
- Q. All right -- go ahead. Okay. So the term "licensed microwave paths" in paragraph 38 does not apply to RT -- RTK systems, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. Do you know --
- A. It's fixed at both ends which does not describe RTK.
  - Q. Okay. Do you know whether an RTK system is a licensed communication system?
- 25 A. It can be, yes.

Q. Is it always licensed?

MR. SECREST: Objection. Asked and answered.

ALJ WILLIAMS: We'll let him explain.

- A. I don't know about always. It could be. For all I know it could be used on the -- on an unlicensed band.
- Q. Do you happen to know whether

  Mr. Wensink's RTK system is a licensed communication
  system?
- A. Yes. His base station is -- is licensed.

  He does have an FCC license for that facility.
  - Q. Look at the last sentence of condition 38 on page 9 of the Joint Stipulation, please.
    - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. That sentence reads as follows: "If interference with an omni-directional or multi-point system is observed after construction, mitigation would be required only for affected receptors." Can you interpret that sentence for me?
- A. I -- the first part of the sentence but I -- I don't know what the meaning is of "affected receptors."
- Q. What's the meaning of the first part of the sentence?

- A. Well, omni-directional stations or

  multi-point systems is -- it's -- is a radio station

  that's serving several points at a time.

  Omni-directional means the -- the coverage is

  approximately equal in all directions from the

  transmitter. A multi-point system, you have a main

  site and points that -- serves a discrete number of

  points that you want to communicate with.
  - Q. So does this sentence apply only to radio stations then?
  - A. No. It would apply to any station that's -- that transmits in all directions or in the three directions.
  - MR. VAN KLEY: All right. Mr. Evans, I think I have run out of questions for you at the present time. So we will turn it back over to His Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Secrest, before I let you redirect, I want to try to clarify my understanding of a couple of these issues. Maybe it will streamline your redirect or maybe it will help guide you in terms of some questions the Bench still has.

## EXAMINATION

By ALJ Williams:

2.2

- Q. Mr. Evans, you described at one point, I believe in my notes, the range of these RTK systems. I think you indicated it was 8 miles or up to 8 miles; is that correct?
- A. I may not remember that accurately but, yes, that's what I had said.
  - Q. So you're not sure if it's 8 miles or what distance it might be?
    - A. I'm not sure.
  - Q. Okay. Now, you described these base stations and the ability to potentially interface multiple base stations across one or more farmers' needs. Are these base stations purchased by individual farmers? Are they subscription services? Tell me about a base station and how a farmer comes to access that.
  - A. Well, a farmer can set up their own base station and own it and use it. A farmer can also subscribe to a service, to this RTK service, from someone who has built their own system.
- Q. How much would a base station transmitter cost?
- A. I don't know that.

- Q. Do you have an approximate? Is it 5,000? 500,000? 50? Do you have any idea?
  - A. 50,000, no. It might be in the ballpark.
- Q. How about a subscription service, how much might that run a farmer?
  - A. I have no idea.

- Q. You described the ability to potentially have farmers share data from these base stations.

  Does that mean you would have to communicate with your neighboring farmer, "Hey, I want to borrow a signal from your base station"? How would they coordinate that?
  - A. I'm -- I don't know.
- Q. What's the approximate dimensions and weight of a base station if I'm imagining it at some point in the air? How much does it weigh? How big is it?
  - A. Just the antenna system?
- Q. The base station I think is what you were testifying as to.
- A. Okay. I don't know the weight of the components of the system.
- Q. That's all the questions I have on the base station, the RTK system.
- I had a question on the television signal

testimony from earlier. I believe your testimony was that you modeled this based on the project area plus 2.5 miles, but otherwise in your testimony or your report I believe there is reference to the potential of up to 3 miles. Would 3 miles be a more appropriate buffer zone around the project area?

- A. Well, I wouldn't say that one is more appropriate than the other.
- Q. Your testimony, I believe in your report, referenced 3 miles as the standard that you would generally employ; is that correct?
  - A. That's right.

2.2

- Q. If your report indicated that 3 miles is the standard you usually work from, why would it be lesser in regard to this project?
- A. It's not necessarily a standard. It's what -- you know, what we estimate.
- Q. Why would the estimate be different in regard to this specific project?
- A. Well, it -- during the break I went back and looked at my Google map with the turbines plotted on it and the buffer zone as I explained before, the buffer zone up to 2.5 miles from the project boundary but that assumes that the entire area within the -- within the boundary is populated by turbines which is

not in most cases -- well, in almost all cases not true.

2.1

But in this particular project, I looked at the -- at my Google map with the turbine layout and the original project boundary that was given to me by Apex. And there are no turbines that would -- that are right on the border, right on the border of the turbine project area. The ones that are close are up to half a mile away inside the border.

- Q. Let me clarify. So the ones that are -I'm sorry because I think you are answering my
  question now. The turbines that are close to the
  edge of the project area are more than a half mile
  away such that the half mile that they are inside the
  area plus the 2-1/2 miles of buffer that you
  estimated gets you to the 3 miles; is that what you
  are trying to say?
- A. Yes, that's what I am trying to say. A few might be .4 miles away but generally close to a half a mile.
  - Q. So might some be .3 miles away?
  - A. Maybe one.
- Q. Last question I have. You talked about the research you have done regarding T.V.
- 25 interference. I know there was the one somewhat

older project from Maine that dealt with digital and analogue and there was a 2017 study that was done confidentially. You indicated you found interference with 16 -- potential interference with 16 consumers, for lack of a better term, in that project. How many consumers were in that project area?

- A. I'm sorry, how many consumers?
- Q. Yeah. You said there was interference with 16 consumers. I want to know what the denominator to that equation is.
- A. Okay. The context of your question is not quite right. I did not find 16 instances of interference. There was reported cases.
  - Q. 16 complaints is what my notes say.
  - A. 16 complaints, yes.

2.2

- Q. Out of how many consumers were in that area?
- A. I don't know. I don't think I calculated that.
  - Q. You don't have any idea if it was roughly a hundred, roughly a thousand? You don't have any recollection?
    - A. In the entire --
  - Q. We have 16 complaints out of a project area that you did research on, I am trying to figure

out how many consumers were impacted. I am trying to create a ratio to figure out the veracity of the percentage.

- A. Yeah, I don't -- I don't -- I don't think I calculated that.
- Q. No. My question is, how many consumers were in the project area?
- A. Well, I might have an answer to your question if you give me a few minutes to look up the document which might have that information. Am I allowed to?
  - Q. Of course.
- A. Okay. Okay. It turns out I did do a previous assessment and I did find that I calculated the potential -- in the designated area, there were 970 house -- households in the project area.
- Q. So 16 complaints, which it may be not all of those were verified, out of 970, would be roughly is 1.5 percent. Well below the 10 percent you had approximated.
- 21 A. Yeah.

- 22 ALJ WILLIAMS: That's all the questions I have.
- 24 Attorney Secrest, redirect.
- MR. SECREST: Thank you, your Honor.

433 1 2 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 3 By Mr. Secrest: 4 I have one question. Mr. Evans, are you 5 aware whether the developer, the Applicant, has committed to mitigating any interference or effects 6 of the turbines with cable T.V.? 7 8 I'm sorry. With -- oh, with -- yes, yes, Α. 9 yes, I am. 10 Q. And what are you aware of? I'm sorry? 11 Α. 12 Q. Let me rephrase that. 13 Are you aware that the developer has 14 committed to mitigating the costs of any interference 15 to cable T.V. reception? 16 Do you mean direct off-the-air reception? Α. 17 Q. Yes. 18 Α. Yes, yes, I am aware. 19 MR. SECREST: Okay. Thank you. That is 20 all, your Honor. Thank you. 21 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 22 Attorney Van Kley, any follow-up in 23 response to my or Attorney Secrest's questions? 24 MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, your Honor, briefly.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:

2.2

- Q. Mr. Evans, with regard to the project for which 16 complaints were received about T.V. reception, can you describe the process that was used there to learn about those complaints?
- A. Yes. I was actually hired by the developer to go out and do an assessment which included the taking of -- of signal measurements from the T.V -- from the T.V. stations. The nearest T.V. stations.

This -- this is not a perfect -- what we did is not a perfect study in the sense that when you do a study like this, when you actually go out and measure T.V. signals and then you want to know their -- how the turbines affected those T.V. signals, you -- you would first take measurements before the turbines go up, and then afterwards you go to those same measurement locations after the turbines are up and operating, and then you compare the after measurements to the before measurements.

In this particular project that I was hired to take a look at, we did not have that luxury. We didn't have the before measurements. The turbines were already up when we did the assessment, did

the -- when we did the on-site assessment. However,

I managed to get the operator to turn off some of the

wind turbines and then do the measurements with the

turbines in the nonrotating mode and turn them on

again and then I would take measurements which

represents when the turbines are operating and made

that comparison.

- Q. So to who were the 16 complaints about T.V. reception made? Were they made to you or somebody else?
- 11 A. It -- they were directed to the
  12 developer. And the developer sent that information
  13 to me.
  - Q. Okay.

- A. Where they were located.
- Q. Did you make any efforts to find out or did you make any effort to ask the other households in the area whether they also had T.V. reception problems?
- A. No. I didn't interact with the people living there.
- Q. Do you know whether the operator or owner of the wind project did that?
- A. I'm not aware if they did or not.

  MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. All right. I have

436 1 no further questions. 2 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Secrest, any more redirect? 3 4 MR. SECREST: No, your Honor. Thank you. 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: Do you want to take up the exhibits? 6 7 MR. SECREST: Please, your Honor. May 8 the Applicant move for the admission of Applicant's Exhibit 44. 9 10 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley? 11 MR. VAN KLEY: No objection. 12 ALJ WILLIAMS: Anyone else? Okay. 13 Applicant Exhibit 44 will be admitted. 14 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 15 ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Evans, thank you for 16 your testimony. 17 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 18 ALJ WILLIAMS: It's about 2:15. Do you 19 guys want to take a quick break and then put on our 20 next witness? 21 MR. VAN KLEY: Sure. Could I move my 2.2 exhibit first? 23 ALJ WILLIAMS: Oh, I am sorry, Attorney 24 Van Kley. 25 MR. VAN KLEY: I would like to admit LR

Firelands Volume III

```
437
      Exhibit 13.
 1
 2
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Any objections?
 3
                  MR. SECREST: No. No objection, your
      Honor.
 4
 5
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: It will be deemed
      admitted.
 6
 7
                  (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: I apologize, Mr. Van Kley.
 8
 9
                  MR. VAN KLEY: No problem.
10
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Any other matters before
11
      we all scatter? Why don't we come back at 2:30 with
12
      Witness Bellamy; is that okay, Judge Agranoff?
13
                  We will see everyone at 2:30. We are off
14
      the record.
15
                  (Recess taken.)
16
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's go back on the
17
      record at this time.
18
                  And, Mr. Margard, are you prepared to
19
      call your first witness?
                  MR. MARGARD: I am.
20
                                       Thank you, your
2.1
      Honor. Staff would call Mr. Mark Bellamy.
2.2
                  ALJ AGRANOFF: If you could please have
23
      Mr. Bellamy elevated to panelist status, please.
24
                  MS. KING: Mr. Bellamy, you have been
25
      elevated to panelist. We can see and hear you.
```

438 1 Thank you. 2 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. ALJ AGRANOFF: Hello, Mr. Bellamy. 3 4 THE WITNESS: Hello. 5 ALJ AGRANOFF: If you could please raise 6 your right hand. 7 (Witness sworn.) 8 ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. 9 Mr. Margard. 10 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. 11 So a preliminary matter, I would like to 12 request that the Staff Report of Investigation, filed 13 in this case on March 2, 2020, be marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit 1. 14 15 ALJ AGRANOFF: It shall be so marked. 16 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 17 MR. MARGARD: And that the prefiled 18 testimony of Mark Bellamy, filed in this matter on 19 September 21, 2020, be marked for purposes of 20 identification as Staff Exhibit 2. 21 ALJ AGRANOFF: It shall be so marked as 2.2 well. 23 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 24 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. 25

	439
1	MARK BELLAMY
2	being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
3	examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	By Mr. Margard:
6	Q. Mr. Bellamy, would you state your name
7	and business address, please.
8	A. Yes. My name is Mark Bellamy. My
9	business address is 180 East Broad Street, Columbus,
LO	Ohio 43215.
L1	Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
L2	capacity, please?
L3	A. I'm employed by the Public Utilities
L 4	Commission of Ohio as a Utility Specialist working
L 5	for the Power Siting Department.
L 6	Q. Mr. Bellamy, do you have before you
L 7	what's been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 2?
L 8	A. Yes.
L 9	Q. And can you identify that exhibit for us,
20	please.
21	A. That is my proof prefiled testimony.
22	Q. And was it prepared by you or at your
23	direction?
24	A. It was.
25	Q. And have you reviewed that document prior

440 to taking the stand today? 1 2 Α. Yes. Do you have any corrections or changes of 3 Ο. any kind to make to that document? 4 5 Α. No. And if I were to ask you the questions 6 7 contained in that document, would your answers be the 8 same? 9 Α. Yes. 10 And in your opinion and to the best of 11 your knowledge, are those answers true and 12 reasonable? 13 Α. They are. 14 Now, do you also have before you what's been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 1? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 And would you identify that exhibit, Q. please. 18 19 That is the Staff Report of Investigation 20 in this case. 21 Ο. Did you contribute to the preparation of 22 this report? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And can you please identify for us the

sections to which you were responsible.

- A. Yes. I wrote the sections for blade shear, ice throw, noise, and shadow flicker.
- Q. And have you reviewed this document prior to taking the stand today?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And do you have any corrections or changes to make to those sections of the Staff Report?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And what changes would those be, please?
- A. Yeah. I am looking at page 50 of the Staff Report.
  - Q. Give a moment, if you would, please, to allow others to be on the same page. Okay. Proceed.
  - A. I'm -- yeah, I'm sorry I am having trouble finding it but I thought that I had mentioned that in all nine -- yeah, I think that I said in nine models that were modeled for noise that none of them are above the ambient-plus-5 limit but it's actually eight, eight models, because the Applicant withdrew one so that there -- they put forth eight models. That's the only correction but I can't seem to find it.
  - Q. Let me direct you, sir, if I might, to, let's see, what is this, the first full paragraph on

442 1 that page, about four lines down, the sentence 2 beginning "The Applicant's analysis of noise impacts." 3 4 Oh, yeah, that's right. That's correct. 5 That's the line. Yes. Where it says: "The Applicant's analysis of noise impacts showed that for 6 the nine turbine models evaluated no 7 8 non-participating receptors had modeled sound impacts 9 in excess of 49.1 dBA." It should actually be eight 10 turbine models evaluated but that's my only correction. 11 12 MR. MARGARD: Very good. Thank you. 13 Your Honors, I respectfully move the 14 admission of Staff Exhibit No. 2, subject to 15 cross-examination, and tender the witness. 16 ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you. 17 Mr. Van Kley. 18 MR. VAN KLEY: Thank you, your Honor. 19 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 By Mr. Van Kley: 2.2 Q. Good after, Mr. Bellamy. 23 Α. Good afternoon. 24 How long have you been with the Ohio Ο. 25 Power Siting Board Staff?

A. 11 years.

2.1

- Q. And having been there for 11 years, has that caused you to be familiar with all of the wind projects in Ohio?
- A. Yes. I was involved in the review of all the wind projects that have come before the Ohio Power Siting Board except for Buckeye I.
- Q. How many operating wind projects are there in Ohio?

MR. MARGARD: Can we clarify, as regulated by the Power Siting Board, Mr. Van Kley?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yes, we can.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you.

- A. I would have to guess. We have a -- we have a map on the Ohio Power Siting Board website that lists them all but, if I had to guess, I would say five or six.
- Q. Do you know approximately how many wind turbines are operating under the Power Siting Board's jurisdiction at the current time?
- A. No. I don't know that. I could look it up but I don't have that readily available.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. With -- with the

Judge's permission, I would certainly be amenable to

him looking that up to answer the question.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If you have the ability to do so, Mr. Bellamy, go ahead and attempt to get that answer.

2.1

THE WITNESS: Okay. I apologize. I'm waiting for my e-mail to connect. Okay. It's in my e-mail but I am having trouble getting my e-mail to connect to the system. I can't -- I can't receive or send e-mail right now for some reason.

MS. KING: The host for Outlook appears to be down so we are not able to check e-mails at this time.

MR. MARGARD: Jack, I'm certainly willing to stipulate to the wind siting -- Power Siting wind case status document that's on the Board's webpage if that helps in any way.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. Well, it might.

Does Mr. Bellamy have access to the Power Siting

Board's website?

THE WITNESS: Let me try. Yes, I can access the Power Siting Board website.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right. And does the power -- does the Power Siting Board's website have the information that I requested?
- A. It does. It might take me a while to add everything up. Do you want me to take the time to --

I mean we have a map of operational wind farms and a list of the number of turbines per wind farm. Do you want me to add those up?

2.1

- Q. I don't think you need to add them but if you could just itemize them. I think we could all do our own addition. So why don't you just tell me the names of the OPSB-regulated wind farms that are under operation and the county in which the -- each farm is located and then the number of turbines in each farm.
- A. Okay. According to the website, the first operational wind farm listed is Blue Creek.

  It's located in Paulding and Van Wert Counties and it has 152 turbines.

The next one is Timber Road I. It's located in Paulding County. It has 18 turbines.

The next one is Timber Road II. It's also located in Paulding County. It has 55 turbines.

The next one is turbine -- I'm sorry.

Timber Road III, located in Paulding County, with 30 turbines.

And then is the combined Hog Creek I and II project which has a total of 30 turbines.

And then the next one is Northwest Ohio which has a total of 42 turbines.

And the last one is Timber Road IV which

has a total of 13 turbines.

2.2

- Q. Which county is -- are the Hog Creek?
- A. I'm sorry. The Hog Creek turbines are in Harding County.
  - Q. And what about the wind farm in Northwest Ohio?
  - A. I'm sorry, Northwest Ohio is Paulding County, and Timber Road IV is Paulding County.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Bellamy, that was updated as of what date?

THE WITNESS: As of August 26, 2020.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Have regulated wind farms gone into operation since that date?
- A. Yes. I believe on their approved wind farms is Timber Road IV with 24 turbines. I believe all of Timber Wood IV is online now. That's my understanding. So that would be the only change. So it looks like Timber Road IV should actually have 24 plus 13. What is that? 37? Yeah. Besides that, there are there are no other additions to get us up to date as far as I know.
- Q. Are any of the counties in which these regulated wind farms are located, counties that adjoin Lake Erie?
  - A. No, none of those counties adjoin Lake

Erie.

2.2

Q. Do you know whether any of the project areas for either of these regulated projects have eagle nests located within them?

MR. MARGARD: I'll object, your Honor.

It's beyond the scope of this witness's testimony.

MR. VAN KLEY: Well, it's -- as, your Honor knows, that's never a valid objection unless you are on recross or redirect. If the witness has information germane to the case, then that's fair game.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If the witness has familiarity with respect to any of the projects, then he can answer the question.

- A. I have not studied eagle populations on any of the wind projects.
- Q. So you don't know the answer to my question then?
  - A. Yes, I don't know.
- Q. Are you aware of any wind turbines in Ohio that are operating but which are not subject to Ohio Power Siting Board jurisdiction?
  - A. Yes, I am aware of some.
  - Q. How many of them are you aware of?
  - A. I don't know, maybe a dozen.

Q. In those projects, what's the range of the number of turbines that is included in each project?

2.2

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I'll object on relevance grounds at this point.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Van Kley?

MR. VAN KLEY: It's relevant to

Mr. Good's testimony yesterday where I asked him the same questions concerning his argument that the lack of eagle mortalities in Ohio, other than the one in Bowling Green, means that there's little threat to bald eagle mortality -- a bald eagle's mortality from wind turbines in Ohio. The size of the wind farms is relevant to that inquiry.

MR. MARGARD: That was an appropriate question for Mr. Good. Mr. Bellamy has already indicated he hasn't looked at eagle nests or eagles at all in relation to wind turbines.

MR. VAN KLEY: Well, I didn't ask him in this question anything about eagles. I am just asking him about the size of the wind projects that he's aware of that are not subject to Board jurisdiction and that's directly relevant to Mr. Good's testimony and is subject to examination if Mr. Bellamy knows the answer to that question.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Bellamy, do you have familiarity with the size of the non-jurisdictional wind farms?

2.2

THE WITNESS: As far as I know, all non -- non-jurisdictional wind farms or wind turbines are below 5 megawatts. House Bill 6, I think, has a caveat that allows a greater --

ALJ AGRANOFF: I think the question Mr. Van Kley was asking in terms of number of turbines, not necessarily capacity.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I guess I don't understand the question then.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) With respect to the nonregulated wind projects that you are aware of, how many wind turbines are included in those projects on a project-by-project basis range?

ALJ AGRANOFF: Let's ask him first whether he is familiar with the number of turbines located at those non-jurisdictional facilities.

- Q. Mr. Bellamy, do you know the answer to that question?
- A. No. I know that Whirlpool built a set of three turbines that were below 5 megawatts total.

  I'm not sure about the total megawatts of Bowling

  Green or even the total number, but I know there is

several turbines at Bowling Green. And then there are individual turbines throughout the state, but I don't really know much more on numbers on non-jurisdictional than that.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. Mr. Van Kley, please move on.

- Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) One of the topics that you evaluate for the Emerson Creek wind project is blade shear; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Just for the record, what is blade shear?
- A. Blade shear is when a part of a blade breaks off of a wind turbine and falls to the ground.
- Q. Uh-huh. Have you done any research to determine the distance that blades or parts of blades have traveled from the base of the turbine tower in incidents where blade shear has occurred as a general matter?
- A. Are you asking about reports of actual blade shear incidents and how far blades have gone or ballistic models that show how far a blade could go?
  - Q. The first part of that.
- A. I'm aware of individual news stories about blades breaking, but I'm not aware of a study that -- that breaks down various incidents and shows

how far the blade pieces have gone.

2.2

- Q. Uh-huh. Are you aware of anecdotal reports about how far the blades have gone, what blade parts have gone?
- A. I'm aware of some of the incidents that have happened in Ohio, to Ohio jurisdictional turbines.
- Q. Uh-huh. Are you aware of instances that have occurred outside of Ohio?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. In those instances about which you are aware, how far have those blade or blade parts have been -- been reported to have traveled?

  MR. MARGARD: Are you asking for a range or examples, or can you be more specific?
  - Q. What's the maximum distance?

    MR. MARGARD: Thank you.
- A. Yeah. I can't think of an example of an out-of-state distance. Usually news reports will simply state that a blade shear incident happened and the details on blade shear incidents are hard to find.
- Q. Are you aware of a collection of data known as the Caithness database?
  - A. Yes, I am aware.

- Q. Have you ever looked at that database?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And that database has reports about blade shear; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And, in fact, that report reports on the distances that those blades or pieces of blades have traveled as a result of blade shear; isn't that correct?
- A. I can't remember. It's been a while since I looked at the Caithness database. But from what I understand, the Caithness database is, you know, kind of a Wikipedia where anybody can edit it and I'm not sure that the data in the Caithness database has been verified scientifically.
- Q. Well, have you done anything else to research the distance at which blades or parts of blades have been known to travel as a result of blade shear?
- A. Yes. I have -- I have studied the incidences that have happened in Ohio to jurisdictional turbines.
  - Q. Anything else?
- A. I read industry literature on blade shear but I haven't seen a report that lists incidents and

blade shear distances and so forth that I believe you are trying to get at.

- Q. Are you aware of a -- an incident of blade shear that occurred in September 2020 at the Timber Road Wind Farm IV or I guess it's called the Paulding Wind Farm IV?
- A. Yes. I visited that site as soon as they notified the Board.
  - Q. And what were -- what did you do during that visit?
  - A. I observed the wind turbine and the wind turbine blade. I asked the operator questions about the turbine.
  - Q. Did you identify the cause of that blade shear?
  - A. The operator was not -- unsure of the cause, you know, which was just hours after it occurred. And the Applicant -- I'm sorry, the operator is going to submit a report on the cause soon, but I'm not aware of the cause yet.
  - Q. Did you see -- how many blades were broken?
- 23 A. One.

Q. And did you see the broken blade on the ground?

Α. Yes.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Uh-huh. Was it all in one piece, or was Ο. 3 it in more than one piece?
  - It appeared to be all in one piece, although they had a -- a safety distance cordoned, so I was not able to inspect the area, but it appeared that the blade had broken off and fell straight down at the base of the turbine.
  - Ο. Uh-huh. How many other incidents of blade shear from wind turbines in Ohio are you aware of?
  - Are you asking me jurisdictional or Α. total?
  - Ο. Total.
- 15 Α. I'm not sure.
- 16 Well, I am just asking how many you are Ο. 17 aware of.
- Five. I think four jurisdictional 18 Α. and one non-jurisdictional. 19
- 20 Where was the blade shear incident at the Ο. 21 non-jurisdictional wind farm?
- 2.2 I can't remember exactly. I believe it Α. 23 was at a school.
- 24 ALJ AGRANOFF: Mr. Bellamy, what is the 25 time frame for the number that you just gave?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what you mean by time frame.

ALJ AGRANOFF: You gave a certain number of incidents you could recall.

THE WITNESS: Right.

2.2

ALJ AGRANOFF: What period of time do you think that encompasses?

THE WITNESS: I would guess -- the first jurisdictional one I know of is 2012. I believe the school one happened -- I have no idea when the school one happened. It's been since I have been working at the Public Utilities Commission in 2009, but I don't remember exactly what year. But I do remember the years for the jurisdictional ones.

ALJ AGRANOFF: And could you just give us what those years were?

THE WITNESS: Oh, sure. 2012, I
believe -- yes, that project was called Timber Road
II. And then there was two in 2018, one in April
which was, I believe, Hog Creek and another in August
which was Blue Creek, but I might have -- I might
have those two dates mixed up. And then the
September 2020 incident in Timber Road IV.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Do you know the

distance that blades or blade parts traveled during the blade shear incident at Blue Creek in 2018?

- A. I believe there was a diagram that -- I'm sorry, counsel. You said Blue Creek. I was thinking Timber Road for a second. Okay. Blue Creek, I believe there was a piece that was found 250 feet from the turbine base, and the project developer stated that all of the -- there was several small pieces that were found, and they were all found within the safety setback which was tip height times 1.1.
- Q. How about the blade shear incident at Hog Creek during 2018?
- A. This Hog Creek, the report that I saw stated that the blade fell in one piece directly to the turbine base.
- Q. How about the incident at Timber Road II during 2012?
  - A. In Timber Road II, I believe the farthest piece was -- I believe there was a diagram that shows the farthest piece was 233 meters. And there were other pieces found, but I believe that's the farthest piece that was found.
  - Q. Now, in all of these incidents of blade shear at regulated wind farms, is the information

about the distance of the blade-part travel based on the wind company's representations?

A. Yes.

- Q. Would you go to page 49 of the Staff Report.
  - A. Okay. I'm there.
- Q. The first full sentence on the top of page 49 identifies some safety features to address blade shear from wind turbines, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Were those safety features all available in 2012 to the present?
- A. Yes. But I can explain how the blade shear incident happened in 2012.
  - Q. Go ahead since you brought it up.
- A. Okay. You know, it's -- it's interesting how -- the two incidents that we had parts thrown farther than from the base, those two incidents happened when the turbine was restarted after the wind turbine was damaged.

In 2012, in Timber Road II, the blade was found to have a manufacturer defect. Now, it appears that the blade, you know, had a manufacturer defect and must have broken enough to cause an imbalance and caused the turbine to shut down.

After it was shut down, it was inadvertently or mistakenly restarted by a remote operator in Oregon. And when it restarted, the blade with the manufacturer defect broke off and slammed into a second blade so that -- that turbine actually had two blades that were broken. And those were both caused -- or, I'm sorry, the second -- the blade being thrown was caused by the restart. That is farther than from the base of the turbine.

2.2

And similarly in Blue Creek, in Blue Creek the wind farm was shut down due to a thunderstorm and it appears that the turbine was struck by lightning and then the turbine was restarted. I don't believe the operator knew that it was struck by lighting, but the turbine was restarted. And when it was restarted, 6 minutes later, you know, someone on site noticed that there was a piece of a blade broken off, and then they shut the turbine down.

The other two incidents the blades fell straight to the base. In Hog Creek, that was caused by lightning strike. And when the blade broke off, it went straight to the base. We don't know the cause of Timber Road IV yet but that blade also went, you know, straight to the base. I am interested in

knowing, you know, the cause of that one because the operator told me that there were no storms in the area that -- that night. So apparently it wasn't due to lightning, but we don't know exactly what it is yet.

Q. All right. Thank you. That's helpful information.

Let's talk about ice throw starting on page 49 of the Staff Report that you are already at. I would like to direct your attention to the second sentence in the first paragraph under the heading of "Ice Throw" on that page which states as follows:

"The proposed turbine models have ice detection equipment and safety features that would shut down a turbine if the buildup of ice were to cause excess vibrations or the speed to power ratio were to become too high." You wrote this language, right?

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Does a wind turbine always vibrate when it has ice on it?
  - A. No.

- Q. Does a wind turbine always have a speed-to-power ratio that is too high when it has ice on it?
  - A. No. Ice has to accumulate on the blade

- enough in order to cause that to happen.
- Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to page 51 of the Staff Report.
  - A. I'm there.
  - Q. Yeah. We are going to talk about noise for a little bit. You wrote the noise discussion in the Staff Report, correct?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. But you're not an acoustician, are you?
- 10 A. No.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 11 Q. Does the Board have any acousticians on 12 staff?
  - A. No, it doesn't.
  - Q. Take a look at footnote 25 on page 51 of the Staff Report. Do you see there the wording of a regulation from the Power Siting Board that pertains to noise at wind turbines?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Let me just read the first sentence of that paragraph to you -- of that footnote to you. It says: "The facility shall be operated so that the facility noise contribution does not result in noise levels at any non-participating sensitive receptor within one mile of the project boundary that exceed the project area ambient nighttime average sound

level (Leq) by five A-weighted decibels." Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

- Q. And that is taken from the Board's rule on noise, right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Uh-huh. Do you know what the basis for the restriction for -- that is stated in that sentence where it says that the noise levels must not exceed the project area ambient nighttime average sound level by five A-weighted decibels?

MR. MARGARD: I'll object on relevance grounds. It doesn't matter what he understands the basis to be. The rule is what the rule is.

MR. VAN KLEY: Well, that's certainly true but there is a basis for the rule and it certainly pertains to -- to this proceeding because the rule must have some basis in terms of, for example, annoyance or other harm to the public, and I think we have a right to explore that.

MR. MARGARD: I think he has a right to explore annoyance to be certain. The rule is adopted by the Board. The order adopting the rule speaks for itself. The rule speaks for itself. What this witness understands to be the basis here is

irrelevant.

2.1

MR. VAN KLEY: I highly disagree. In fact, I've asked this question, I think, of Mr. Bellamy in a proceeding in the past where he has answered that question. I believe it was in Republic Wind. And my question simply is what's the -- what's the reason for the standard that to -- not to exceed five A-weighted decibels above the average project area Leg.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If Mr. Bellamy has any familiarity with the Commission's comments that may have been considered in their rule proceeding, you can speak to that.

- A. I can't remember the comments made during the rule proceeding that led to the rule.
- Q. Well, let me just cut right to it,
  Mr. Bellamy. See if you can give me an answer. You
  are aware that this standard is based on a standard
  in the state of New York?

MR. MARGARD: If you know.

A. Yes. The -- you know, before the rules, you know, went into effect, we recommended that ambient-plus-5 standard and that was partially based on -- on the New York study that said increases above 5 dBA cause complaints.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

Let's talk about shadow flicker. You authored the parts of the Staff Report discussing shadow flicker?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. You are aware of the Board's standard for the amount of shadow flicker that a wind project is allowed to expose a nonparticipating landowner to?
  - A. Yes.
  - O. What is that standard?
- A. The standard says that

  nonparticipating -- nonparticipating receptors are

  not supposed to receive more than 30 hours of shadow

  flicker per year.
- Q. Does the Emerson Creek wind project, as currently designed, achieve that standard?
  - A. No.
- Q. Does the -- are you familiar with the Joint Stipulation?
- A. Yes, but it's been a while since I read it, and I don't think that my sections were covered in it, at least not very thoroughly.
- Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you this, based on the Staff Report where the Staff has recommended conditions for this wind project, are there any such

conditions that apply to this project relative to shadow flicker?

A. Yes, yeah.

2.2

- Q. Do the Staff conditions, if they are adopted, require a wind developer in this case to submit a new plan or new model for shadow flicker once it has arrived at a final design?
  - A. Can I look up the conditions?
  - Q. Sure.

ALJ AGRANOFF: I think you might want to look at condition 34.

- A. Yes. Condition 34 said -- states "At least 30 days prior to construction, the Applicant shall docket a shadow flicker study showing that cumulative shadow flicker impacts will not exceed 30 hours per year at any non-participating sensitive receptor."
- Q. Now, has this condition been adopted for other regulated wind projects in Ohio?
- A. I believe that any project that -- that has a study similar to this one that shows that there are non-participators that are modeled to receive more than 30, we would generally put in a condition that says, okay, then you need to demonstrate by a final design that all non-participators are under 30

hours.

2.2

- Q. So you're aware of other wind farms that have been constructed maybe that have provided such a shadow flicker model prior to construction?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. In those cases did the Power Siting Board notify the public about the wind developer's submission of the shadow flicker model prior to construction?
- A. I can't remember if -- if the shadow flicker reports prior to construction have been docketed or not.
- Q. Do you expect that the shadow flicker modeling report that is being required by condition 34 will be subject to public notice in this case?
- A. Well, condition 34 says "shall docket" so that sounds like they have to file something with the docket.
- Q. Will Staff take public comments about that shadow flicker modeling report if you are approving or disapproving it?
- MR. MARGARD: Well, I'll object only to the extent we haven't established that Mr. Bellamy has any authority to make that decision.
- MR. VAN KLEY: I am just asking him if he

1 knows.

2.2

2 MR. MARGARD: If he knows.

ALJ AGRANOFF: If you know, Mr. Bellamy.

A. Yeah. I'm not aware whether the Board would have another public hearing after that report is issued.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I have no further comments -- or questions at this time.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Thank you.

Any clarifying questions from other counsel before we do redirect?

Okay. Mr. Margard, are you ready for redirect, or do you want to take a couple minutes to --

MR. MARGARD: No. I don't have any redirect, your Honor, but I think I would like at this time, if I could, to request that the Bench take administrative notice of the Power Siting wind project case status document that appears on the Power Siting Board's website that is the source of the turbine count, for example, I think that would be useful to include in this record.

MR. VAN KLEY: That would be okay with me.

MR. SECREST: Likewise. Thank you.

MR. VAN KLEY: Will we get a PDF copy of it uploaded to the record in this case?

2.1

MR. MARGARD: I will be happy to provide a copy of that to the court reporter, and I will be happy to circulate a copy of that to all of the parties at the end of the day here.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. Thank you.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Just so the record will be clear that this is simply being utilized for purposes of taking administrative notice and is not being marked as an exhibit in this record.

MR. MARGARD: Right. I would renew my motion to admit Mr. Bellamy's testimony.

ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. I just want to be clear that the document that you are going to be utilizing is the one we just discussed with the date, and I have it in my notes.

MR. MARGARD: August 26 of 2020. It's a two-page document showing -- it is a map, and the second page is a chart of the various projects.

ALJ AGRANOFF: And I believe you indicated, Mr. Margard, you would renew your motion for Staff Exhibit 1 and Staff Exhibit 2?

MR. MARGARD: Well, yes. I'm happy to wait until all of the Staff witnesses have testified

468 to admit Exhibit 1. 1 2 ALJ AGRANOFF: Okay. 3 MR. MARGARD: But certainly it's appropriate to admit that into the record at this 4 5 time as well. 6 MR. VAN KLEY: I would have no objection 7 to admitting both exhibits. It will save us a little 8 time in the rest of the hearing probably if we could 9 just get it over with now and that way we don't have 10 to discuss it again. 11 MR. MARGARD: So moved. 12 ALJ AGRANOFF: Any objection from any 13 other counsel? 14 There being none, Staff Exhibit 1 and 15 Staff Exhibit 2 shall be admitted as part of the 16 record at this time. 17 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 18 ALJ AGRANOFF: And at this time I believe 19 the next individual I had on my list is Staff Witness 20 Butler. 21 MR. MARGARD: I believe so. 2.2 ALJ WILLIAMS: Do you want to take a 23 little break and put Witness Butler on? 24 ALJ AGRANOFF: Yeah. Why don't we take a

25

10-minute break?

469 1 MR. MARGARD: That's fine. 2 ALJ AGRANOFF: And we will come back at about 3:40. 3 (Recess taken.) 4 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Margard, do you 6 want to call your next witness? 7 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. Staff calls Mr. Matthew Butler. 8 9 MS. KING: Mr. Butler, you've been 10 unmuted, and you are now a panelist. 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can everybody hear 12 me all right? 13 ALJ WILLIAMS: We can. 14 MS. KING: We can hear you but can't see 15 you. 16 THE WITNESS: Can you see me now? 17 ALJ WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Mr. Butler. How are you? 18 19 THE WITNESS: I am doing well. How are 20 you? 21 ALJ WILLIAMS: I'm well, thank you. 22 Would you please raise your right hand. 23 (Witness sworn.) 24 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 25 Please proceed, Mr. Margard.

Firelands Volume III 470 1 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. And 2 before I begin, I would like to mark as Staff Exhibit No. 3, the prefiled testimony of Matthew Butler, 3 filed in this case on September 21 of 2020. 4 5 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 6 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 7 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. 8 9 MATTHEW BUTLER 10 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 11 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 By Mr. Margard: 14 Please state your name and business 15 address. Matthew Butler, 180 East Broad Street, 16 17 Columbus, Ohio 43215.

- And by whom are you employed and in what Ο. capacity?
- Α. I'm employed as an Administrative Officer 2 by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.
- 2.2 Now, Mr. Butler, do you have before you Q. what's been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 3? 23
- 24 I do. Α.

18

19

20

21

25 Q. And can you identify that for us, please.

- A. I believe that is the Staff Report of Investigation.
- Q. Oh, we have got our numbers backwards.

  No. 3 would be your testimony, sir.
  - A. I'm sorry. My testimony.
- Q. Very good. And was that document prepared by you or at your direction?
  - A. Yes, it was.
  - Q. Okay. Have you reviewed that document prior to taking the stand today?
- 11 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

18

19

20

- Q. Do you have any corrections or changes to make to your testimony?
  - A. No.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the questions that are contained in your testimony today, would your answers be the same?
  - A. They would.
  - Q. And in your opinion and to the best of your knowledge, are those answers true and reasonable?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And do you also have in front of you the Staff Report which has been admitted as Staff Exhibit No. 1?

472 I do. 1 Α. 2 Okay. And did you contribute to the Q. 3 drafting of that document? Α. I did, yes. 4 5 And could you please identify the 6 sections in that document for which you were 7 responsible. 8 I wrote the section "Public Interaction Α. 9 and Participation." 10 And have you reviewed those sections 11 prior to testifying today? 12 Α. Yes. 13 And do you have any corrections or 14 changes to make to those sections of the Staff 15 Report? 16 I do not. Α. 17 MR. MARGARD: Okay. Thank you. 18 Your Honors, I respectfully move for the admission of Staff Exhibit No. 3 and tender 19 20 Mr. Butler for cross-examination. 2.1 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 2.2 Attorney Van Kley. 23 MR. VAN KLEY: Yes. 24

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Butler.
- A. Good afternoon.
- Q. Give me a general overview of your duties at the Ohio Power Siting Board.
- A. Sure. My role is in a public affairs capacity to field questions and inquiries from -- from members of the public with regard to power siting projects.
- Q. Do your duties include the submission of notices to newspapers or other news media for purposes of notifying the public about events occurring in the certification process for Board energy projects?
- A. Part of my role would be to publish news releases that would notify the public about hearings. So in that way, yes.
- Q. Do you submit notices to the news media concerning anything other than hearings?
- A. There would be other occasions

  potentially where -- when the Board takes action on a case at one of its Board meetings. We generally put out news releases. Our agendas are published to a list that's very much similar to our news release

- list. Occasionally in the past we've put out releases about other events and rulemakings, things of that nature.
- Q. Now, in the course of the Power Siting
  Board proceeding to consider an application for a
  certificate, you're aware that the Applicant is
  responsible for submitting public notices concerning
  that project to the news media?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And do you play any role in that regard such as issuing instructions or having somebody else issue instructions to the Applicant directing them to publish those notices?
  - A. I do not.
  - Q. Do you know who does?
- A. My understanding is that the Applicant would do that just by the fact that it's a rule requirement.
  - Q. Are you familiar in -- with the situations in which public notices from an Applicant are required?
    - A. In a general sense, yes.
- Q. Do you have in front of you Joint Exhibit
  No. 1 which is the Joint Stipulation and
  Recommendation?

A. Yes, I do.

2.2

- Q. I would like to go through a few of the recommended conditions that start on page 2 of this exhibit.
  - A. Okay. I'm on page 2.
- Q. All right. Now, let's go -- now go to, please, page 3, condition 7.
  - A. I see it.
- Q. All right. And this condition requires the Applicant to submit a set of detailed engineering drawings of the final project design, correct?
- A. It appears to, yes. I didn't write this condition but that's what it appears to say.
- Q. Yeah. Based on your general knowledge concerning public notices that are required for Board proceedings, do you expect that any public notice will be published in the news media at the time that the Board receives this set of detailed engineering drawings for the final project design?
- A. I am not aware of a requirement that would -- that would require the Applicant to notify the public when they file this.
- Q. Okay. And then the same question about the requirement in condition 8, about the submission of mapping in the form of PDF and geographically

referenced data.

2.2

- A. I am not aware of a requirement.
- Q. Go to page 4 of the Joint Stipulation, condition 9. Are you aware of any requirement for publication for the final delivery route plan?
  - A. I'm not aware.
- Q. And how about the results of any traffic studies referenced there?
  - A. No.
- Q. Go to condition 14 on page 4. I have the same question about the Programmatic Agreement to minimize impacts to cultural resources.
- A. I'm not aware of a notification requirement for that either.
  - Q. And then go to condition 22, starting on page 5. Are you aware of any such requirement for the post-construction avian and bat monitoring plan?
    - A. No.
  - Q. As the public relations official for the Power Siting Board, are you aware of whether bat and bird mortality data is made -- for wind farms in Ohio that are regulated by the Board is made public?

MR. SECREST: Objection, speculation to the extent it calls for speculating as to whether the developer makes that public.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I'll let the witness answer as to his familiarity with the release or publication of bat and bird mortality data.

- A. I am not aware -- I am not familiar with anything like that. That's beyond my area of expertise.
- Q. Would you know about it -- would you know whether any such data is placed on the public docket published -- that is contained on the Power Siting Board's website?

MR. MARGARD: Can we break this question up? You've asked both about the docket and about postings on the website.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I think his response was he was not aware of publication of that data. To the extent there might be a clarifying question, is that what you are asking, Attorney Van Kley?

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) Yeah. My question actually is a little different, and perhaps it wasn't expressed very clearly.

My question to you, Mr. Butler, is if anybody did submit post-construction mortality data for inclusion in the public docket, would you know that that had occurred?

A. I receive notifications, daily docket

notifications, so I would see it there.

- Q. Okay. And are you aware of any such docket notifications that have occurred in the past for other wind projects which -- with respect to mortality data?
- A. I personally am not aware of anything like that.
- Q. Go to condition 23 on page 6 of the Joint Stipulation. And you'll see a reference to the submission of a mitigation plan or adaptive management strategy in that condition. Let me know when you have found that.
  - A. Condition 23?
  - Q. Yes, sir.
- 15 A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. All right. Are you aware of any requirement to publish a notice publicly for that type of information?
- A. I am not.
- Q. Go to condition 27 on page 6 of the Stipulation.
- 22 A. I see it.
- Q. That condition refers to mapping of habitat areas for the upper -- for the upland sandpiper.

A. Uh-huh.

2.2

- Q. Do you know of any requirement that that information be public noticed?
  - A. No.
- Q. Same question with regard to the requirement in condition 28 on page 7 concerning the mapping of the northern -- northern harrier preferred nesting habitat sites.
  - A. I am not aware.
- Q. And then go to condition 34 on page 8 of the Stipulation which refers to the shadow flicker study. And I note that it does say here that the Applicant shall docket that study. So based on this information, would it be your expectation that the shadow flicker study would be published or a notice concerning that study would be published in the media?
- A. I would not be aware of any requirement that that would occur. It would be published on the docket based on this condition, and it would be then distributed via the docketing notification lists.
- Q. Then in paragraph 37, we have a requirement for a microwave path study. Do you expect that will be required to be public noticed?
  - A. I am not aware of a requirement.

Ο. With respect to the requirements to submit deliverables to the Power Siting Board Staff as required by this Joint Stipulation which would include those deliverables that we have discussed today, other than the shadow flicker study that will be docketed, do you see any requirement that any of those deliverables be docketed when you look at this Joint Stipulation?

- Without looking through the conditions one by one, I'm not comfortable giving a 100 percent answer on that. I looked to the two conditions that I did play a part in, conditions 10 and 11, which do regard notification to the public in terms of starting construction and start of facility operations so there would be those notices regarding, you know, the project.
- Q. Uh-huh. If there is any requirement that any of these deliverables be loaded to the public docket on the Power Siting Board's website -- well, let me start over with that.

Where this Joint Stipulation does not require the docketing of a deliverable, is there any other requirement that such a deliverable be docketed to your knowledge?

> Α. Not to my knowledge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I have no further questions at this time.

3 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Attorney Van Kley.

Mr. Margard, any redirect?

MR. MARGARD: Just very briefly. Thank you, your Honor.

\_ \_ .

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Margard:

- Q. Mr. Butler, you've indicated you are not aware of requirements that various plans, strategies, maps, and studies and so forth be publicly noticed. Are you aware whether any of these that are specified in the Stipulation might themselves contain terms that would require some kind of notice? You're just speaking about Board requirements; is that correct?
- A. That's the way I understood the question, yes.
  - O. Not --
- A. The requirements for, you know, rule requirements that the Board has that would require the Applicant to publish notice of one thing or another.
- Q. And you don't have any personal knowledge

or any specific knowledge of any publication or notice requirement that might be contained within any of these documents, correct?

A. I do not. I do not. Having not been involved in the review of those particular areas of the Staff investigation, I do not.

7 MR. MARGARD: That's all. Thank you, 8 your Honor.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley, any recross?

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.

12

## 13 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

14 By Mr. Van Kley:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. I guess I didn't understand the question -- or the last question or the answer,
Mr. Butler. Could you explain?

- A. I don't think I could -- I wouldn't explain the question.
- Q. Okay. What's the question you thought you were answering?
- A. Are -- would there be requirements outside of the Board rules somewhere contained in those documents that relate to those conditions that you discussed that would require notification to the

public of those subjects. Did I understand the question correctly?

Q. Yeah, I think you did, but I'm still not understanding what you are saying. So let me explore it a little bit. Can you give me an example to illustrate a type of report that would -- in itself would contain a requirement for public notice?

ALJ WILLIAMS: I am not trying to be difficult here, Attorney Van Kley. He was asked if he was aware of any other requirements besides the rule, the Board rule requirements, and he said no. So for him to try to provide examples of other potential requirements seems a little bit impossible or unreasonable in response to the question. I am giving you some latitude to ask the question. I am just not sure he has an answer as to what else might be required.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. I thought he was backtracking on that answer and that's why I wanted to explore it further.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I will give you some latitude. I am not sure that's what I am sensing but feel free to try to ask and make sure we are all on the same page.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah. Okay.

Q. (By Mr. Van Kley) So are you aware of any public notice requirements that may be contained in a deliverable itself?

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. All right. Very good then. I have nothing further.

7 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Margard, I assume 8 you are satisfied?

MR. MARGARD: I am. Thank you, your Honor, and would renew my motion for admission of Exhibit 3.

anybody is frantically wanting to ask questions. I see none. Attorney Van Kley, response to Exhibit 3.

MR. VAN KLEY: No objection.

ALJ WILLIAMS: It will be admitted.

(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

ALJ WILLIAMS: Mr. Butler, thank you for your testimony.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

21 ALJ WILLIAMS: All right. I will invite 22 Staff to call their next witness.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor.

24 Staff would call Mr. Tyler Conklin to the stand,

25 please.

485 MS. KING: Mr. Conklin, you've been made 1 2 a panelist, and you have been unmuted. THE WITNESS: Can everybody hear me? 3 ALJ WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, 4 5 Mr. Conklin. THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 6 ALJ WILLIAMS: You are the last witness 7 8 of the day in all likelihood so welcome to the 9 hearing. Thank you for your patience. I am going to 10 swear you as we begin here. Would you raise your 11 right hand. 12 (Witness sworn.) 13 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you. 14 Attorney Margard. 15 MR. MARGARD: Thank you. As a 16 preliminary matter, I would request the prefiled 17 testimony of Tyler Conklin, filed in this matter on 18 September 21, 2020, be marked as Staff Exhibit No. 4. 19 ALJ WILLIAMS: So marked. 20 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 21 22 23 24 25

	486
1	TYLER CONKLIN
2	being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
3	examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	By Mr. Margard:
6	Q. All right. Please state your name and
7	your business address.
8	A. My name is Tyler Conklin, and my business
9	address is 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
10	43215.
11	Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
12	capacity, please?
13	A. I am a Utility Specialist 1, employed by
14	the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio in the Office
15	of the Federal Energy Advocate.
16	Q. Mr. Conklin, do you have before you
17	what's been marked as Staff Exhibit 4?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And would you please identify that for
20	us.
21	A. My prefiled testimony.
22	Q. Yes, thank you. Was this document
23	prepared by you or at your direction?
24	A. Yes.
2.5	O. And have you reviewed that document prior

to taking the stand today?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. And as a result of that review, do you have any corrections or changes of any kind to make to your testimony?
  - A. No.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the questions contained in your testimony, would your responses be the same today?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And in your opinion and to the best of your knowledge, were those responses true and reasonable?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you.
  - Do you also have in front of you a copy of the Staff Report of Investigation which has previously been admitted as Staff Exhibit 1?
    - A. Yes, I do.
  - Q. And did you contribute to the drafting of that document?
    - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And would you help identify for us which sections you were responsible for.
- 25 A. I authored the economics section as well

as the decommissioning sections of the Staff Report.

- Q. And have you reviewed those sections prior to taking the stand today?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And do you have any changes or corrections to those sections of the Staff Report?
- A. Yes. On page 34 of the Staff Report, I believe I made a typo here where it says "based on a total nameplate capacity of 200 megawatts," that should be "300."
- 12 Q. Okay. Let's give folks a chance to get there, if you would, please.
  - A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. All right. Give us that correction again, please.
- A. Yes. It should say based on a nameplate -- total nameplate capacity of 300 megawatts, not 200.
- 19 Q. Okay. Any other changes or corrections?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 MR. MARGARD: Okay. Your Honor, I
  22 respectfully move for the admission of Staff
  23 Exhibit 4 and tender Mr. Conklin for
  24 cross-examination.
- 25 ALJ WILLIAMS: Thank you, Attorney

Margard.

2 Attorney Van Kley.

MR. VAN KLEY: All right.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Van Kley:

Q. Mr. Conklin, I can't resist asking you, what's entailed in your duties as a Federal Energy Advocate, or whatever it was you said you do?

ALJ WILLIAMS: Is anybody else a little faint?

- A. I actually started there three days ago so this is my third day on the job there. So as of right now, just looking at the federal -- the federal side of energy policy and how it affects Ohio.

  Haven't gotten too deep into it yet but I'm hoping to learn a lot and to do some good work there but, yeah.
- No, I just started, so I don't have too much.
  - Q. All right.

MR. VAN KLEY: Judge Williams, are you okay with the sound? I thought I heard you ask something about it.

ALJ WILLIAMS: I can hear the witness crystal clear. Attorney Margard was very faint, and you are also a little faint, so I'm not sure. Just

1 try to project into the microphone for me.

MR. VAN KLEY: Okay. It sounds like we have the scraping sound back too. And we were doing so well.

ALJ WILLIAMS: Indeed. Indeed. The witness is clear for me so hopefully a little more amplification, we can maybe get the guestion as well.

MR. VAN KLEY: Yeah.

- Ο. (By Mr. Van Kley) All right.
- 10 Mr. Conklin, let's go to the Staff Report, page 33.
  - Okay. I'm there. Α.
  - Q. And I see a heading labeled "Economics" on that page.
    - Α. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Did you author that section of the Staff 0. Report?
  - Yes, I did. Α.
- What did the Staff do to investigate the economic impacts of the -- what were the potential economic impacts of the Emerson wind -- Emerson Creek wind project?
- Well, I -- I evaluate all of the Α. Applicant's assertions or figures or estimated impacts as required by the statute. And I do my best 25 to verify or make sure that these impacts are

reasonable or appear to be reasonable.

- Q. What did you do to investigate whether the Applicant's conclusions on economic impacts were reasonable?
- A. Which -- which impacts do you mean? The jobs and earnings or costs or anything? I'm sorry. Could you be a little more specific?
- Q. Yeah. I could be more specific, but I'll need to break it down a little bit, I think.
  - A. Okay.

2.2

- Q. Which -- which types of information provided by the Applicant did you independently verify?
- A. Well, I tried to independently verify everything that the Applicant has submitted to the best of my ability, whether that be cost estimates or jobs earnings and output estimates, taxes and lease payments. And so I try and research everything that they submit and try and verify it as reasonable.
- Q. Where did you obtain the information to test the reasonableness of the Applicant's economic information?
- A. So, for example, the JEDI model. I download the JEDI model, the wind model from the NREL website, and I obtain the project inputs and I try to

upload those into the model and run the model for myself and see what the output is and compare it to the Applicant's proposed impacts.

- Q. Were you successful in performing that model?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And were the results of your modeled run identical to the results of the Applicant's modeling?
- A. I'm not sure if they were 100 percent identical, but I believe they were probably -- I think everything that I got from the model was -- was reflected from what the Applicant had put in or had reported. But I can't say for sure that every single number was -- was the same.
- Q. Did the Staff do its own independent investigation of the potential economic impacts of the facility?
  - A. No --
  - Q. Okay.
- A. -- other than running the JEDI model and comparing the results, no.
- MR. VAN KLEY: All right. I have no further questions.
- 24 ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Margard, any 25 redirect?

```
493
                  MR. MARGARD: No, thank you, your Honor.
 1
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: In the interest of -- I
 2
      don't see anyone else frantically waving, so we will
 3
 4
      pick up the exhibit.
 5
                  MR. MARGARD: I would renew my motion,
 6
      your Honor.
 7
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Attorney Van Kley.
 8
                  MR. VAN KLEY: No objection.
 9
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: Then Exhibit 4 is
      admitted.
10
11
                  (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
12
                  ALJ WILLIAMS: That concludes our
13
      schedule of witnesses for today. Let's go over as
14
      far as make sure -- we can go off the record, Karen.
15
                  (Discussion off the record.)
16
                   (Thereupon, at 4:17 p.m., the hearing was
17
      adjourned.)
18
19
20
21
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 Wednesday, October 7, 2020, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. Carolyn M. Burke, Registered Professional Reporter. (KSG-6970) 

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

10/21/2020 1:36:33 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-1607-EL-BGN

Summary: Transcript in the matter of the Firelands Wind, LLC hearing held on 10/07/20 - Volume III electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.