

May 26, 2022

Ms. Tanowa Troupe, Secretary
Ohio Power Siting Board
Docketing Division
180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3797

Re: Case No. 20-417-EL-BGN

In the Matter of the Application of Grover Hill Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Wind-Powered Electric Generation Facility in Paulding County, Ohio.

Fourth Supplement to Application – Turbines T26, T31, T34, T43 and Turbine Model Capacity

Dear Ms. Troupe:

On March 3, 2021, as supplemented on June 7 and December 21, 2021, and January 24, 2022, Grover Hill Wind, LLC, filed an application with the Ohio Power Siting Board for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Wind-Powered Electric Generation Facility in Paulding County, Ohio (“Application”).

Attached please find the Fourth Supplement to the Application, regarding turbines T26, T31, T34, T42 and the capacity for the Siemens Gamesa and Vestas turbine models.

We are available, at your convenience, to answer any questions you may have.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christine M.T. Pirik

Christine M.T. Pirik (0029759)
Terrence O'Donnell (0074213)
William V. Vorys (0093479)
Matthew C. McDonnell (0090164)
Dickinson Wright PLLC
150 East Gay Street, Suite 2400
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 591-5461
cpirik@dickinsonwright.com
todonnell@dickinsonwright.com
wvorys@dickinsonwright.com
mmcdonnell@dickinsonwright.com
Attorneys for Grover Hill Wind, LLC

Enclosure

CC: Jim O'Dell
Theresa White
Randall Schumacher
Jon Pawley
Grant Zeto

Ms. Tanowa Troupe
Grover Hill Wind, LLC
Case No. 20-417-EL-BGN
Page 2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Ohio Power Siting Board's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on the parties referenced in the service list of the docket card who have electronically subscribed to these cases. In addition, the undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing document is also being served upon the persons below the 26th day of May, 2022.

/s/ Christine M.T. Pirik

Christine M.T. Pirik (0029759)

Counsel via email:

werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Administrative Law Judges via email:

greta.see@puco.ohio.gov

david.hicks@puco.ohio.gov

4869-4063-3122 v1 [73809-23]

**BEFORE
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of Grover Hill)
Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Environmental)
Compatibility and Public Need to Construct a Wind-) Case No. 20-417-EL-BGN
Powered Electric Generation Facility in Paulding)
County, Ohio.)

**FOURTH SUPPLEMENT
TO APPLICATION
TURBINES T26, T31, T34, T43 AND
TURBINE MODEL CAPACITY**

I. BACKGROUND

Grover Hill Wind, LLC (“Grover Hill” or “Applicant”), a Delaware limited liability company, is proposing to construct an up to 150-megawatt (“MW”) alternating current wind-powered electric generating facility in Paulding County, Ohio (“Project” or “Facility”) (see Figure 1). On May 3, 2021, as supplemented on June 7 and December 21, 2021, and January 24, 2022, Grover Hill filed an Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (“Application”) with the Ohio Power Siting Board (“Board”). On January 24, 2022, the Board’s Staff (“Staff”) issued its Staff Report of Investigation (“Staff Report”). Construction of the Project is expected to begin as early as the First Quarter of 2023, and commercial operation is planned for the Fourth Quarter of 2023.

The purpose of this Fourth Supplement is twofold: (1) to document the slight relocation within the Project Area of turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43; and (2) to increase the capacity of two of the turbine models proposed in the Application that was recommended for approval in the Staff Report (Siemens Gamesa turbine model (“SG”) from the SG 5.0-145 set forth in the Application to the SG 5.2-145; the Vestas turbine model from the V162-6.0 set forth in the Application to the V162-6.2).¹

¹ The Applicant notes that several times in the Application, the V162-6.0 was erroneously referred to as V165-6.0. This was a typographical error in the Application, as a V165-6.0 turbine model does not exist. The Applicant notes, however, that all studies supporting the Application were conducted based on the V162-6.0 model.

Grover Hill Fourth Supplement to Application

This Fourth Supplement does not change the documentation that was provided by the Applicant in support of the Application, including, but not limited to:

- General purpose of the Facility
- Applicant information
- Area of all owned and leased properties
- Description of the proposed Facility
- Construction methods, sequence, and impact on critical delays on the in-service date
- Project Area selection and site determination
- Electric grid interconnection
- Ownership of the Facility
- Capital and intangible costs, operation and maintenance (“O&M”) expenses, and cost of delays
- Compliance with air and water quality regulations and solid waste regulations
- Economic impact and public interaction
- Decommissioning
- Location of private or public use airports, helicopter pads, or landing strips
- Equipment safety and reliability
- Construction sound levels
- Location of sound-sensitive areas within 1 mile of the Facility
- Mitigation of sound emissions during construction and operation
- Water impacts
- Geotechnical impacts
- Wind velocity and blade shear
- Radio and television reception, military and civilian radar systems, navigable airspace, and microwave communications paths and systems
- Ecological resources surveys and information
- Procedures to avoid/minimize/mitigate O&M impacts
- Post-construction monitoring of wildlife impacts
- Structures removed or relocated
- Land use plans, impacts to recreational areas, and visual impacts
- Cultural archaeological and architectural resources
- Potential impacts and proposed mitigation for agricultural district land, and agricultural facilities and practices; and
- The Applicant’s commitment to comply with the regulations associated with wind farms set forth in Ohio Administrative Code (“O.A.C.”) Section 4906-4-09.

II. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

A. Turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43

Beginning in 2017, the Applicant hired a contractor to perform preliminary activities at the locations for turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43. These activities were performed to allow the Project to qualify for Federal Production Tax Credits (“PTC”), which allows developers to “safe harbor” wind projects several years in advance of their commercial operation date. In the Staff Report, the

Staff recommended Grover Hill be issued a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (“Certificate”) subject to 51 conditions. Staff Report Condition 1 recommended that the Applicant not be permitted to construct turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43 because the PTC efforts had prevented Staff from assessing the environmental impacts associated with these sites.

In order to maintain sufficient production capacity of the proposed Facility, the Applicant proposes in this Fourth Supplement that turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43 be relocated to sites immediately adjacent to the originally proposed turbine sites at a sufficient distance from any previously disturbed areas. The proposed turbine relocation sites are designated T26a, T31a, T34a, and T43a herein. All of the turbine relocation sites are located within the previously evaluated construction survey corridors, as presented in the Application. See Figures 2 and 3 for the updated Project Area map and Facility layout map, respectively, on a scale of at least 1:12,000, which includes the four turbine relocations and associated Project infrastructure.

The Applicant evaluated the impacts from the proposed turbine relocation sites for T26a, T31a, T34a, and T43a and provides the results of that evaluation through this Fourth Supplement to the Application. A complete set of updated Figures 1 through 13 have been compiled to represent the four turbine relocation sites for T26a, T31a, T34a, and T43a, as well as associated Project infrastructure and environmental features, which are attached hereto. Supplemental technical information has been updated and the associated reports are attached. Sections II.A.1 through 8 below reflect the updates to the Application as a result of the relocation of the four turbines. As stated previously, all other information provided in the Application remains unchanged.

1. Locations of Turbines T26a, T31a, T34a, and T43a

The Applicant proposes to relocate turbines T26, T31, T34, and T43 to sites immediately adjacent to the sites proposed in the initial Application. As shown in the aerial maps contained in Attachment A, relocated turbines T26a, T34a, and T43a will be outside of the disturbance areas caused by the previous excavation activities. The new locations will permit a radius of 120 feet (“ft”) around turbines T26a, T34a, and T43a, which will provide sufficient space for the excavation of the new locations and allow for the deposit of the soils from such excavation to be placed outside of the previously disturbed locations.

While the new location for relocated turbine T31 is outside of the disturbance area caused by the previous excavation activities, the disturbed area around T31a is necessarily somewhat irregular and non-circular around the newly excavated area in order to ensure minimal impacts to setbacks and wetlands. Thus, the soils from the excavation of T31a will need to be deposited primarily to the

west of the T31a site. Importantly, the Applicant commits to securing the wetland area just north of the T31a site to ensure no impact on wetlands will occur. The Applicant will utilize and maintain a natural buffer to secure the wetland area from a potential disturbance in accordance with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (“Ohio EPA”) Permit OHC000005 (“General Permit”).

2. Federal Aviation Administration

With regard to the status of the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) information, this Fourth Supplement updates the FAA filing status and potentially conflicting information as it was presented in the Application. The Applicant submitted completed Notices of Proposed Construction (“Form 7460-1”) to the FAA on March 24, 2022, for each of the proposed sites for the four relocated turbines. Upon receipt of these forms, the FAA obstruction group automatically notifies the Ohio Department of Transportation Office of Aviation (“ODOT-OA”), thereby fulfilling the state permit application requirements as set forth in O.A.C. Chapter 5501:1. The FAA and ODOT-OA will evaluate the proposed turbines and determine whether they are in compliance with the standards set forth in 14 Code of Federal Regulations (“CFR”) Part 77 and the Ohio Revised Code (“R.C.”). The FAA receipt for submittal of the Facility’s 7460-1 Forms is included in Attachment B. It is anticipated that the proposed turbine locations will be granted a Determination of No Hazard based on proximity and similarity to previous determinations. The Applicant will provide the results of the airport coordination with the FAA to the Board immediately upon receipt.

3. Operational Sound Levels at the Nearest Property Boundary

With regard to operational sound levels at the nearest property boundary, this Fourth Supplement updates the operational sound information as presented in the initial Application, the supplemental Noise Impact Assessment dated September 13, 2021, and the Operational Noise Limit Supplement dated January 5, 2022. The Applicant conducted a supplemental analysis to determine if the turbine relocation maintained compliance with noise limit regulations detailed in the original assessment.

To evaluate the turbine relocation, the Applicant analyzed the site specifics through a model built in WindPRO. Previous modeling assumptions, including the assumed turbine type and hub height, were maintained. The result of the analysis is that the noise reduction operation (“NRO”) mode required on specific project turbines will need to be modified to achieve compliance. The Addendum to Operational Noise Limit Supplement is provided as Attachment C.

4. Ice Throw and Shadow Flicker

This Fourth Supplement updates the findings regarding the Ice Throw Assessment submitted as Exhibit U to the Application. The Applicant conducted a supplemental analysis to determine if the turbine relocation sites for T26a, T31a, T34a, and T43a maintain compliance with the ice throw risk detailed in the original assessment. The risk to evaluated receptors is unchanged from the Application. The Addendum to Ice Throw Risk Assessment is provided as Attachment D to this Fourth Supplement.

Further, this Fourth Supplement does not alter the conclusions of the Shadow Impact Assessment submitted as Exhibit I with the Application. The turbine relocations were reviewed with the same modeling protocols, and there was no change to the cumulative annual shadow flicker for any of the receptors. An updated model summary is provided in Attachment E to this Fourth Supplement.

5. Potential Ecological Resource Impacts During Construction

This Fourth Supplement does not modify the potential ecological resource impacts during construction as presented in the original Application. Revised impacts to water resources were calculated with no change to the information presented in the Application.

6. Structures and Property Line Tables

The relocation of the four turbines did not result in the addition or subtraction of the number of structures located within 1,500 feet of the proposed turbine sites as presented in Table 13 of the initial Application.

There are 16 property lines within 1,500 feet of a proposed turbine relocation site. Table 1 below presents the distance to the nearest turbine and the lease status of the parcel (participating or non-participating) for each of these properties. These data represent the updated distances for the four turbine relocations. All other distances provided in Table 14 of the initial Application remain unchanged.

Table 1
Parcels Within 1,500 Feet of a Wind Turbine

Parcel ID	Distance to Nearest Wind Turbine (ft)	Nearest Wind Turbine	Lease Status¹
24-23S-002-00	0	T-26a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-013-00	0	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-35S-001-00	0	T-43a	Full Lease Signed
24-35S-010-00	101	T-43a	Full Lease Signed
24-25S-005-00	318.6	T-34a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-016-01	638.1	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-014-00	714.6	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-016-00	812.2	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-011-00	757.8	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-35S-009-00	890	T-43a	Full Lease Signed
24-36S-011-00	969.7	T-43a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-020-00	1005.6	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-23S-001-00	1102.2	T-26a	Full Lease Signed
24-26S-13-01	1400.9	T-31a	Full Lease Signed
24-36S-007-00	1427.2	T-43a	Full Lease Signed
24-36S-006-00	1492.5	T-43a	Full Lease Signed

The relocation of the four turbines did not result in the addition or subtraction of the number of structures located within 250 feet of an associated facility as presented in Table 15 of the initial Application. In addition, the relocation of the four turbines did not result in the addition or subtraction of the number of parcels located within 250 feet of an associated facility (i.e., a collection line, access road, O&M facility, meteorological tower, laydown yard, or collection substation) as presented in Table 16 of the initial Application.

7. Land Use Impacts

Table 2 below presents the revised totals of both temporary and permanent land-use impacts as illustrated in Figure 10, in total for each land-use type, and by Project component. The values that are shaded represent those values updated as a result of the turbine relocation. The values that are not shaded remain unchanged from those presented in the initial Application. Methods to calculate Facility-related impacts on land use in this Fourth Supplement are unchanged from the Initial Application.

Table 2²
Land Use Impacts

Land Use Type ¹	Temporary Impacts		Permanent Impacts	
	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent
Agricultural (100)				
Wind Turbines and Workspaces	23.8	16.7	1.5	8.0
Access Roads	26.7	18.7	13.3	71.1
Crane Paths	36.0	25.2	0.0	--
Buried Electrical Collection Cable ²	45.0	31.5	0.0	--
O&M Buildings	3.0	2.1	3.0	16.0
Laydown Yard	6.7	4.7	0.0	--
Collection Substation	0.6	0.4	0.6	3.2
Agricultural Total	141.8	99.3	18.5	98.3
Residential (500)				
Wind Turbines and Workspaces	0.0	--	0.0	--
Access Roads	0.6	0.4	0.3	1.6
Buried Electrical Collection Cable	0.3	0.2	0.0	--
O&M Buildings	0.0	--	0.0	--
Laydown Yards	0.0	--	0.0	--
Collection Substation	0.0	--	0.0	--
Residential Total	0.8	0.6	0.3	1.6
Grand Total	142.7	100.0	18.8	100.0
¹ O.A.C. Chapter 4906-4-08 (C)(1) refers to land use as the current economic use of each parcel that includes the following categories: residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, agricultural, and vacant, or as classified by the local land use authority. ² Of the 45.0 acres of Buried Electrical Collection Lines, approximately 1.5 acres occurs in Agricultural Vacant Land. Note: Due to rounding, some addends may be off by 0.1.				

² Table 2 herein replaces and supersedes Table 17 in the Application.

8. Acreage Impacted

Table 3 below presents the revised totals of both temporary and permanent impacts to agricultural land uses. The shaded values represent those values updated as a result of the turbine relocation. The values that are not shaded remain unchanged from those presented in the initial Application. Methods to calculate Facility-related impacts on land use in this Fourth Supplement are unchanged from the initial Application.

Table 3³
Impacts on Agricultural Land Uses

Agricultural Land Use	Temporary Impacts (acres)	Permanent Impacts (acres)
Agricultural Land ¹		
Turbines ²	23.8	1.5
Access Road ³	26.7	13.3
Crane Paths ⁴	36.0	0.0
Buried Electrical Collection Lines ⁵	45.0	0.0
O&M Facility	3.0	3.0
Laydown Yard	6.7	0.0
Collection Substation	0.6	0.6
Meteorological Towers		
Total	141.8	18.5
¹ Agricultural land use data obtained from Paulding County Auditor. ² Turbine temporary impacts were determined by using a 60-foot radius buffer. Permanent impacts were determined using the largest turbine model (Vestas V165-6.0) base (plus gravel pad) of 20-foot radius buffer. ³ Access road temporary impacts were determined by using a 32-foot wide buffer, and permanent impacts were determined by using a 16-foot road width. ⁴ Crane path temporary impacts were determined by using a 30-foot buffer. Crane paths will not result in permanent impacts because they will only be used to deliver equipment during construction. ⁵ Collection line temporary impacts were determined by using 25-foot buffer. Because the collection lines will be buried, there will be no permanent impacts to agricultural land. Note: Due to rounding, some addends may be off by 0.1.		

Table 4 below presents the revised totals of both temporary and permanent impacts to Agricultural District Lands. The shaded values represent those values updated as a result of the turbine relocation. The values that are not shaded remain unchanged from those presented in the

³ Table 3 herein replaces and supersedes Table 22 in the Application.

initial Application. Methods to calculate Facility-related impacts to land use in this Fourth Supplement are unchanged from the initial Application.

Table 4⁴
Impacts on Agricultural District Land

Agricultural District Land¹	Temporary Impacts (acres)	Permanent Impacts (acres)
Turbines and Workspaces ²	12.6	0.3
Access Road ³	15.8	7.9
Crane Paths ⁴	22.5	0.0
Buried Electrical Collection Lines ⁵	23.2	0.0
O&M Facility	N/A	N/A
Laydown Yard	N/A	N/A
Collection Substation	N/A	N/A
Meteorological Towers		
Total	74.1	8.3
¹ Agricultural District data was obtained from Paulding County. ² Turbine temporary impacts were determined by using a 120-foot radius buffer. Permanent impacts were determined using the largest turbine model (Vestas V165-6.0) base (plus gravel pad) of a 20-foot radius buffer. ³ Access road temporary impacts were determined by using a 32-foot buffer, and permanent impacts were determined by using a 16-foot road width. ⁴ Crane path temporary impacts were determined by using a 30-foot buffer. Crane paths will not result in permanent impacts because they will only be used to deliver equipment during construction. ⁵ Impacts for the 6 MW buried electrical collection lines which have the larger of the collection cable systems required for the turbine models under consideration for the Project. Note: The impacts presented in this table differ from those presented elsewhere in this Application because this table only includes impacts from Facility components located within designated Agricultural Districts. Due to rounding, some addends may be off by 0.1.		

Table 5 presents the revised totals of both temporary and permanent impacts to Current Agricultural Use Value (“CAUV”) lands. The shaded values represent those values updated as a result of the turbine relocation. The values that are not shaded remain unchanged from those presented in the initial Application. Methods to calculate Facility-related impacts to land use in this Fourth Supplement are unchanged from the initial Application.

⁴ Table 4 herein replaces and supersedes Table 23 in the Application.

Table 5⁵
Impacts on CAUV Land

Current Agricultural Use Value Lands¹	Temporary Impacts (acres)	Permanent Impacts (acres)
Turbines and Workspaces ²	23.8	0.7
Access Road ³	27.2	13.5
Crane Paths ⁴	36.0	0.0
Buried Electrical Collection Lines ⁵	45.1	0.0
O&M Building	3.0	3.0
Laydown Yard	6.7	0.0
Collection Substation	0.6	0.6
Meteorological Towers		
Total	142.5	17.7
¹ CAUV data was obtained from Paulding County. ² Turbine temporary impacts were determined by using a 120-foot radius buffer. Permanent impacts were determined using the largest turbine model (Vestas V165-6.0) base (plus gravel pad) of 20-foot radius buffer. ³ Access road temporary impacts were determined by using a 32-foot buffer, and permanent impacts were determined by using a 16-foot road width. ⁴ Crane path temporary impacts were determined by using a 30-foot buffer. Crane paths will not result in permanent impacts because they will only be used to deliver equipment during construction. ⁵ Impacts for the 6 MW buried electrical collection lines, which have the larger of the collection cable systems required for the turbine models under consideration for the Project. Note: The impacts presented in this table differ from those presented elsewhere in this Application because this table only includes impacts from Facility components located within CAUV-designated land. Due to rounding, some addends may be off by 0.1.		

B. Turbine Model Capacity

In this Fourth Supplement, the Applicant proposes to increase the capacity of two of the turbine models proposed in the Application and recommended for approval in the Staff Report. Since the filing of the Application in this case, Siemens Gamesa and Vestas have introduced new turbine models, the SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2, which may prove more efficient and cost-effective than the turbine models previously proposed in the Application. Therefore, the Applicant requests approval to include the new SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2 turbine models in the list of turbines authorized for this Project.

There are no physical differences between the Siemens Gamesa turbine model SG 5.0-145 set forth in the Application and the new SG 5.2-145 or the Vestas turbine model V162-6.0 set forth

⁵ Table 5 herein replaces and supersedes Table 24 in the Application.

in the Application and the new V162-6.2. The generators for the new models are the same as those of their predecessors that were proposed in the initial Application. Both of these turbines will be available for installation in 2023.

As shown in Table 6 below, like the SG 5.0-145 and V162-6.0 turbines set forth in the Application, because they have the same dimensions, the new SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2 turbines will satisfy the required setbacks. The information that is not shaded is information proposed in the initial Application, and the information that is shaded depicts new information, if any, associated with SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2.

Table 6⁶
Approximate Turbine Dimensions by Model

Turbine Model	Rated Power	Hub Height	Rotor Diameter	Blade Length	Tip Height
GE 3.03-140	3.0 MW	98.0 meters ("m") 321 ft	140.0 m 459 ft	70 m 230 ft	168.0 m 551 ft
Vestas V150-4.5	4.5 MW	105.0 m 344 ft	150.0 m 492 ft	75 m (246 ft)	180.0 m 590 ft
Vestas V150-4.5	4.5 MW	120.0 m 394 ft	150.0 m 492 ft	75 m 246 ft	195.0 m 640 ft
Siemens Gamesa SG 5.0-145 SG 5.2 - 145	5.0 MW 5.2 MW	102.5 m 335 ft	145.0 m 476 ft	72.5 m 238 ft	174.5 m 573 ft
Vestas V162-6.0 Vestas V162-6.2	6.0 MW 6.2 MW	119.0 m 390 ft	162.0m 531 ft	81 m 266 ft	200.0 m 656 ft

Table 7 below reflects the operation specifics for the turbine models proposed in the Application, as well as the new turbine models proposed herein. The information that is not shaded is information proposed in the initial Application and the information that is shaded depicts new information, if any, associated with SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2.

⁶ Table 6 herein replaces and supersedes Table 2 in the Application.

Table 7⁷
Turbine Operations Specifications by Model

Turbine Model	Cut-In Wind Speed	Cut-Out Wind Speed	Re-Cut-In Wind Speed	Min Temp	Max Temp
GE 3.03-140	NA	30m/second ("m/s")	27m/s	-4°F / -20°C	122°F / 50°C
Vestas V150-4.5 (105m Hub)	3m/sec	24.5m/s	22.5m/s	-22°F / -30°C	113°F / 45°C
Vestas V150-4.5 (120m Hub)	3m/sec	24.5m/s	22.5m/s	-22°F / -30°C	113°F / 45°C
Siemens Gamesa SG 5.0-145 SG 5.2 - 145	3m/sec	27m/s	24m/s	-4°F / -20°C	113°F / 45°C
Vestas V162-6.0 Vestas V162-6.2	3m/sec	24m/s 25 m/s	22m/s	-22°F / -30°C	122°F / 50°C

As set forth in the Application and reflected in Application Exhibits I and J and the noise studies for the Project, the studies were based on the General Electric ("GE") 3.03 turbine model, which is the worst-case scenario. Table 8 below sets forth the information reading the noise levels for the turbines proposed in the initial Application and new SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2. In light of the fact that the sound level for the SG 5.2-145 and V162-6.2 models is less than the worst-case scenario GE 3.03, there is no need for new noise modeling to introduce these two models. Grover Hill commits to comply with the noise requirements and recommendations in the Staff Report.

Table 8⁸
Maximum Turbine Sound Levels

Turbine Model	dB(A)
GE 3.03-140 3.0 MW (98-m hub height ("hub"), 140-m rotor diameter ("rd"))	108
Vestas V150-4.5 MW (105-m hub, 150-m rd)	104.9
Vestas V150-4.5 MW (120-m hub, 150-m rd)	104.9
Siemens Gamesa GS 5.0-145 5.0 MW (102-m hub, 145-m rd) and SG 5.2	106.3
Vestas V162-6.0 MW (119-m hub, 162-m rd)	104.3 ⁹
V162-6.2	104.8

⁷ Table 7 herein replaces and supersedes Table 3 in the Application.

⁸ Table 8 herein replaces and supersedes Table 8 in the Application.

⁹ The Applicant notes that on page 68 of the narrative to the Application, the dBA for the V162-6.0 MW turbine was noted as 102 dBA. This was a typographical error in the narrative to the Application, as the dBA for V162- is 104.3 as stated in Exhibit I to the Application.

Moreover, the Applicant affirms that, with the newly proposed turbine models, the total capacity of the Project will not exceed the 100 MW proposed in the initial Application and recommended by the Staff Report. The only change to the Project is the capacity increase for these turbine models.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully requests that the above detailed information be included in the Board's consideration of the Application in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Christine M.T. Pirik

Christine M.T. Pirik (0029759)

(Counsel of Record)

Terrence O'Donnell (0074213)

William V. Vorys (0093479)

Matthew C. McDonnell (0090164)

Dickinson Wright PLLC

150 East Gay Street, Suite 2400

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Phone: (614) 591-5461

cpirik@dickinsonwright.com

todonnell@dickinsonwright.com

wvorys@dickinsonwright.com

mmcdonnell@dickinsonwright.com

Attorneys for Grover Hill Wind, LLC

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

5/26/2022 3:05:57 PM

in

Case No(s). 20-0417-EL-BGN

Summary: Application - Part 1 of 7 Narrative - Fourth Supplement to Application
electronically filed by Christine M.T. Pirik on behalf of Grover Hill Wind, LLC