#### COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE KENTUCKY STATE BOARD ON ELECTRIC GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION SITING

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF ASHWOOD	)
SOLAR I, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF	)
CONSTRUCTION FOR AN APPROXIMATELY	)
86 MEGAWATT MERCHANT ELECTRIC	) Case No. 2020-00280
SOLAR GENERATING FACILITY IN LYON	)
COUNTY, KENTUCKY PURSUANT TO KRS	)
278.700 AND 807 KAR 5:110	)

### CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that I have supervised the preparation of Ashwood Solar I, LLC's responses to the Siting Board Staff's Second Request for Information and that the responses are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief after reasonable inquiry.

Date: <u>3/25/2021</u>

Edward D. Melton TV

Edward S. Shelton IV

1. In the table titled "Surrounding Uses" in Exhibit A of the Site Assessment Report (SAR), three residences identified as bordering the proposed site did not include distances to the closest solar panel. Provide the distances of these residences to the closest solar panel.

**Response:** See the enclose figure for distances from the residences closest to the project to the nearest solar panel.

Witness: Josh Adams



I-03-22 BV

Disclaimer: This document has been prepared based on information provided by others as cited in the Notes section. Stantec has not verified the accuracy and/or completeness of this information and shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions which may be incorporated herein as a result. Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format, and the recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data.

2. In the table titled "Surrounding Uses" in Exhibit A of the SAR, the closest residence to a solar panel is listed as being within 395 feet, but Exhibit C of the SAR (Noise and Traffic Studies) identifies the closest residence as being within 338 feet. Explain why the two estimates differ.

Response: Exhibit A was created using an older layout than the one used for the Noise and traffic studies. The layout used for the Noise and Traffic Studies is the same that was submitted with the application and has not changed since. The 338 feet identified in Exhibit C is actually the distance from the only neighborhood in the vicinity of the project to the nearest solar panel. Table 1 in Exhibit C has the closest residence to panels being 126 feet. Also see enclosed figure submitted in response to Item 1 above.

Туре	Direction from Project Site	Distance from Property Boundary	Distance from Nearest Solar Panel	Distance from Nearest Inverter or Transformer
Residences – Coleman Doles Road	Northwest of the property boundary	Within 87 ft	Within 300 ft	Within 1,448 ft
Residences – US 641	Along US 641 through the center of the project site	Within 62 ft	Within 126 ft	Within 395 ft
Residences – Breezy Loop Neighborhood	South of the project boundary	Within 35 ft	Within 338 ft	Within 1,482 ft
Residences – State Road 1943	Southwest of the property boundary	Within 63 ft	Within 627 ft	Within 1,937 ft
Place of Worship – New Bethel Baptist Church	South of the property boundary	Within 514 ft	Within 1,470 ft	Within 581 ft

 Table 1 Nearest Sensitive Receptor to the Site

Witness: Josh Adams

3. State whether the proposed substations will have their own fencing, and if so, state whether that fencing will conform to the National Electric Code requirements.

**Response:** Yes. A fence meeting National Electric Safety Code (NESC) requirements, typically a six-foot fence with three strings of barbed wire at the top, will enclose the proposed substation.

Witness: Josh McNeely

## CASE NO. 2020-00206 ASHWOOD SOLAR, LLC Responses to Siting Board's Second Request for Information

4. During the site visit in February 2021, Ashwood Solar representatives indicated there may be a maintenance building located near one of the proposed substation sites. Add the location of this proposed building to Exhibit E of the SAR, and provide estimates of how tall and wide this building would be and whether the building would require external utility services.

**Response:** Upon further evaluation Ashwood believes that the construction of a new/permanent building will not be required for ongoing project maintenance.

Witness: Josh McNeely

## CASE NO. 2020-00206 ASHWOOD SOLAR, LLC Responses to Siting Board's Second Request for Information

5. In response to the Siting Board Staff's First Request for Information, Item 19, Ashwood Solar stated that it expected the heaviest and largest equipment requiring transportation to the site would be substation transformer, weighing approximately 100 tons, including the weight of the delivery vehicle. Describe how the substation transformer will be transported to the site, the anticipated impacts, and the proposed mitigation measures.

a. State whether the substation transformer will be transported bybarge, rail, or another mode of transportation.

b. State how the substation transformer will be moved from the barge, railcar, or other mode of transportation to the site.

c. Describe the road equipment (type of truck) that will be used to move the substation transformer. How long will the truck and trailer be, how many axles, and how wide will the load be?

d. Specify the anticipated road route from the location the substation transform will be offloaded from its primary mode of transportation and trucked to the project site.

e. Describe how much time the road transportation of the substation transformer to the site will take, the anticipated effects on local traffic flow, and any plans to mitigate these effects.

f. Describe Ashwood Solar's current plans to avoid or mitigate damage to state highways and/or county roads from the transportation of the substation transformers.

Response: Because the point of origin for the substation transformer is not known at this time, Ashwood Solar does not know what mode(s) of transportation or routes

will be used to transport the substation transformer to the project site. Ashwood Solar will comply with all federal, state, and local regulations, which are designed to prevent or mitigate damage to roadways.

Witness: Josh McNeely

6. Refer to the map attached to the Appendix. There are four locations circled in this map, which reflects the southern portion of the proposed solar facility site. Property owners in these four locations have expressed concerns about the close proximity of the solar panels to their respective properties and have inquired whether the panels could be located further away from their property. With respect to these four areas, state the expected distance of these properties from the solar panels and whether the panels can be moved to mitigate any viewshed impacts to these four properties.

#### **Response:** The distances to these four areas are as follows:

- Residence on the southwestern edge of the project 217 feet from the nearest proposed panel
- Residence on the Northwestern edge of the project 300 feet from the nearest proposed panel
- Northern most residence on highway 641 327 feet from the nearest proposed panel
- Two residences in the middle of the project area are 126 and 219 feet from the nearest proposed panel

All of these distances are depicted in the enclosed map.

Since Ashwood has not finalized final engineering and design for the project portions of the panels located in close proximity to the four areas depicted in the map could be potentially relocated, dependent on constraints within the remainder of the site and if the relocation/removal of panels is practicable and economically viable. Further, to

mitigate viewshed issues all four of these areas, Ashwood has proposed vegetative screening which was noted in previous site plans provided to the Siting Board. In addition, Ashwood plans to limit the removal of any existing vegetation, to the extent practicable, along tree and fence lines that would be in direct viewshed to the proposed solar panels which should provide additional screening and help maintain pre-construction landscape.

Visual simulations will be provided for the areas depicting impact of vegetative screening at planting and maturity.

Witnesses: Josh McNeely and Josh Adams





VP01 - EAST | EXISTING



VP01 - EAST | PROPOSED



VP01 - EAST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP01 - EAST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP02 - NORTHWEST | EXISTING



VP02 - NORTHWEST | PROPOSED



VP03 - WEST | EXISTING



VP03 - WEST | PROPOSED



VP03 - WEST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP03 - WEST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP03A\_04 - NORTHWEST | EXISTING



VP03A\_04 - NORTHWEST | PROPOSED



VP03A\_04 - NORTHWEST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP03A\_04 - NORTHWEST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP05 - NORTHEAST | EXISTING



VP05 - NORTHEAST | PROPOSED



VP06 - WEST | EXISTING



VP06 - WEST | PROPOSED



VP06 - WEST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP06 - WEST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP07 - SOUTHWEST | EXISTING



VP07 - SOUTHWEST | PROPOSED



VP07 - SOUTHWEST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP07 - SOUTHWEST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP08 - NORTHEAST | EXISTING



VP08 - NORTHEAST | PROPOSED



VP08 - NORTHEAST | PROPOSED AT PLANTING



VP08 - NORTHEAST | PROPOSED AT 5 YEARS



VP09 - NORTH | EXISTING



VP09 - NORTH | PROPOSED