

**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of the :  
Yellowbud Solar Project for a Certificate :  
of Environmental Compatibility and : Case No. 20-0972-EL-BGN  
Public Need to Construct an Electric :  
Generation Facility in Pickaway County :  
and Ross County, Ohio :

**PREFILED TESTIMONY  
OF  
Mark Bellamy  
ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF THE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO  
POWER SITING DEPARTMENT**

**STAFF EX. \_\_\_\_**

**January 8, 2021**

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

2 A. My name is Mark C. Bellamy. My business address is 180 East Broad  
3 Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

4  
5 2. Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?

6 A. I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) as a  
7 Utility Specialist in the Facility Review and Compliance Division of the  
8 Power Siting Department.

9  
10 3. Q. Please summarize your educational background.

11 A. My education includes earning a Bachelor of Science in Education degree in  
12 Chemistry from Arkansas State University.

13  
14 4. Q. Please summarize your work experience.

15 A. Prior to my employment with the PUCO, I served six years in the U.S. Navy  
16 as a Machinist's Mate on a submarine. I operated and maintained  
17 atmosphere control equipment, as well as performed duties as a quality  
18 assurance inspector. After the Navy, I was employed as a high school  
19 science teacher. I joined the staff of the PUCO in 2009. My duties include  
20 review and analysis of power siting cases.

1 5. Q. Have you testified in prior proceedings before the Ohio Power Siting Board?

2 A. Yes.

3

4 6. Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

5 A. I am testifying in support of the Staff Report of Investigation and the  
6 stipulation in this case. Specifically, the Noise, Agricultural District, and  
7 Air, Water and Solid Waste sections of each of those documents.

8

9 7. Q. Are you testifying to any specific conditions? If so, what are they?

10 A. I am testifying to stipulation conditions 14, 15, and 16.

11

12 8. Q. Why is Staff recommending condition 14?

13 A. While Staff acknowledges that some construction noise impacts are  
14 inevitable, Staff recommends that most construction activities that can result  
15 in noise impacts to the public be limited to hours when the majority of people  
16 in the vicinity of the project are awake. Impact pile driving, hoe ram  
17 operations, rock drilling and blasting, which are very loud construction  
18 activities, would be limited to shorter windows of daytime hours than that  
19 allowed for general construction activities.

1 9. Q. Why is Staff recommending condition 15?

2 A. Agricultural crop fields make up most of the project and adjacent areas.  
3 Functioning drain tiles are important to the continued operation of the  
4 agricultural crop fields. Staff recommends through condition 15 that the  
5 applicant avoid drain tiles when possible and that any drain tiles that are  
6 damaged are repaired.

7

8 10. Q. Why is Staff recommending condition 16?

9 A. The noise report in the application modeled operational noise impacts using  
10 noise data from representative inverters and substation transformers.  
11 Condition 16 requires the applicant to show that the chosen inverters and  
12 substation transformers for the project will not exceed the daytime ambient  
13 level plus five dBA at any non-participating sensitive receptor.

14

15 11. Q. Why is Staff, via the stipulation, recommending a different project area  
16 daytime average ambient level than the project area daytime average  
17 ambient level presented in the application?

18 A. Ambient monitoring location D was located on SR-104, which is the most  
19 heavily traveled road in the project area. According to the maps in the Noise  
20 Report in the application, there appear to be 25 non-participating residences  
21 within 500 feet of the project fence line. Only two of these non-participating  
22 residences are on the eastern part of the project area close to monitoring

1 location D. The other 23 non-participating residences are on the western part  
2 of the project area close to monitoring locations A, B, and C. Because the  
3 non-participating residences close to monitoring location D account for 8%  
4 of the non-participating residences within 500 feet of the project fence line  
5 and monitoring location D accounts for 25% of the project area daytime  
6 average ambient level, it is Staff's opinion that the project area daytime  
7 ambient level should be weighted accordingly.

8  
9 12. Q. What project area average daytime ambient level does Staff recommend?

10 A. If monitoring locations D is weighted 8% and monitoring locations A, B,  
11 and C are weighted 30.7%, the project area average daytime ambient level is  
12 41.3 dBA. This is the project area average daytime ambient level that Staff  
13 recommends and is reflected in condition 16 of the stipulation.

14  
15 13. Q. With the recommended operational noise limit in condition 16 of the  
16 stipulation, that sound levels will not exceed the daytime ambient level plus  
17 five dBA at any non-participating sensitive receptor, do the operational  
18 noise impacts presented in the noise report exceed the noise limit of  
19 condition 16 of the stipulation by using either the project area average  
20 ambient level presented in the application or the level recommended by  
21 Staff?

1           A.    No, both are below the limit. The largest operational noise impact to a non-  
2                    participating sensitive receptor is 42.6 dBA. The noise limits presented in  
3                    the application and recommended by Staff via the stipulation are 48.4 dBA  
4                    and 46.3 dBA respectively.

5

6   14.   Q.    Does this conclude your testimony?

7           A.    Yes, it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testimony,  
8                    as new information subsequently becomes available or in response to  
9                    positions taken by other parties.

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **Prefiled Testimony of Mark Bellamy**, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Power Siting Department, was served via electronic mail, upon the following parties of record, this 8<sup>th</sup> day of January 2021.

*/s/ Werner L. Margard*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Werner L. Margard**  
Assistant Attorney General

### Parties of Record:

**Michael J. Settineri** (0073369)  
**Gretchen L. Petrucci** (0046608)  
**Mark A. Hylton** (0088384)  
**Anna Sanyal** (0089269)  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[mjsettineri@vorys.com](mailto:mjsettineri@vorys.com)  
[glpetrucci@vorys.com](mailto:glpetrucci@vorys.com)  
[mahylton@vorys.com](mailto:mahylton@vorys.com)  
[aasanyal@vorys.com](mailto:aasanyal@vorys.com)

*Attorneys for Yellowbud Solar, LLC*

**Chad A. Endsley** (0080648)  
**Leah F. Curtis** (0086257)  
**Amy M. Milam** (0082375)  
Ohio Farm Bureau Federation  
280 North High Street, P.O. Box 182383  
Columbus, OH 43218-2383  
[cendsley@ofbf.org](mailto:cendsley@ofbf.org)  
[lcurtis@ofbf.org](mailto:lcurtis@ofbf.org)  
[amilam@ofbf.org](mailto:amilam@ofbf.org)

*Attorneys for Ohio Farm Bureau  
Federation*

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**1/8/2021 10:55:52 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 20-0972-EL-BGN**

Summary: Testimony Prefiled Testimony of Mark Bellamy on Behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Power Siting Department electronically filed by Mrs. Kimberly M Naeder on behalf of OPSB