

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

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF FLEMING )  
SOLAR, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF )  
CONSTRUCTION FOR AN APPROXIMATELY )  
80 MEGAWATT MERCHANT ELECTRIC )  
SOLAR GENERATING FACILITY IN FLEMING )  
COUNTY, KENTUCKY PURSUANT TO )  
KRS 278.700 AND 807 KAR 5:110 )

Case No. 2020-00370

---

**CERTIFICATION**

---

This is to certify that I have prepared or supervised the preparation of the responses to the Siting Board Staff's Second Requests for Information for which I am identified as the witness on behalf of Fleming Solar, LLC and that the responses are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief after reasonable inquiry.

DATE: August 20, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dominic Salinas

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

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF FLEMING )  
SOLAR, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF )  
CONSTRUCTION FOR AN APPROXIMATELY )  
80 MEGAWATT MERCHANT ELECTRIC )  
SOLAR GENERATING FACILITY IN FLEMING )  
COUNTY, KENTUCKY PURSUANT TO )  
KRS 278.700 AND 807 KAR 5:110 )

Case No. 2020-00370

---

**CERTIFICATION**

---

This is to certify that I have prepared or supervised the preparation of the responses to the Siting Board Staff's Second Requests for Information for which I am identified as the witness on behalf of Fleming Solar, LLC and that the responses are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief after reasonable inquiry.

DATE: August 20, 2021



Randall Jenks

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**1. Refer to the Application, Exhibit H generally.**

- a. Confirm that the estimated economic impacts on jobs created, earnings, output value, and taxes are gross estimates and not net of the jobs, earnings, output value, and taxes produced from the property's existing economic activity.**

**Response:**

*The estimated economic impact on jobs created, earnings, and output value, are gross estimates. Property taxes, however, are net impacts.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

- b. If possible, provide estimates of the project's net economic impact on Fleming County and the State of Kentucky.**

**Response:**

*Fleming Solar has not estimated the Project's net economic impact on Fleming County and the State of Kentucky. As provided on page 13 of the Economic Impact Study, the latest data from the Census of Agriculture (2017) for Total Farm income (per farm) is \$9,279 and Net Cash income (without government payments) is \$6,862 for an average farm size of 169 acres.*

*We do not believe that calculating net economic impact based on Census data generalized for the County would result in an accurate estimate for this particular Site. A primary participating landowner for Fleming Solar provided a comment to the Siting Board on March 31, 2021 stating that he has been operating his farm at a loss since purchased in 2013.<sup>1</sup> An accurate estimate of net economic impact is only possible if all participating landowners provide detailed information on their finances, which is not available.*

*Fleming Solar plans to hire locally and will ensure that those currently working on farms within the Site will be given the opportunity to apply for the Project's construction or operation and maintenance jobs.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

---

<sup>1</sup> Fleming Solar reviewed the Public Comments section of the on-line case filings for this case and was unable to locate Mr. Wood's comment. Mr. Wood's comment was sent to [PSC.Info@ky.gov](mailto:PSC.Info@ky.gov). A copy of Mr. Wood's March 31, 2021 comment is included as [Exhibit A](#).

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

2. Refer to the Application, Exhibit H, Section VI. Section VI only discusses property tax payments to Fleming County. However, there will also be additional sales and income tax revenue generated from the increased earnings and any sales generated within the State of Kentucky. Provide an estimate of these additional tax revenues both during the construction and operational phases of the project.

**Response:**

*The Project will generate sales tax on tangible personal property, which includes the security fencing materials. Kentucky Enterprise Initiative Act incentivizes businesses to receive a refund of sales and use tax paid on qualifying materials. Fleming Solar plans to pursue approval and did not consider the State revenue in the Economic Impact Study. The amount of tax incentive under the Kentucky Enterprise Initiative Act is negotiated and authorized by the Cabinet for Economic Development, therefore an estimate cannot be provided at this time.*

*The Project will be subjected to the Kentucky State Income Tax, which will result in increased tax revenue generated from the Project. Because the Project has not established a contract for the sale of energy output which will determine Project cashflows and therefore income tax revenue, an estimate cannot be provided at this time.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**3. Confirm the total amount of the capital investment for the Fleming Solar Project.**

**Response:**

*At the time that the application and the economic study were completed, the capital investment for the Project was estimated to be approximately \$80 million, exclusive of interconnection costs paid to the utility. Due to recent and predicted significant supply chain constraints, and commodities and equipment price increases, the capital investment amount for the Project is expected increase by 10-20%.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

4. Refer to Exhibit D of the “Response to First DR – Exhibits A – J.” This document provides a Representative Construction Schedule. Provide an explanation of what the number 104.0 noted to the right of various activities represents.

**Response:**

*The construction schedule is based on a 104 MWdc system. The Fleming Solar Project is sized at 80MWac/104MWdc.*

*Witnesses: Dominic Salinas and Randall Jenks*

Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information

---

5. Refer to Exhibit D of the "Response to First DR – Exhibits A – J." Exhibit D also provides numbers during each week of construction for each activity. For example, in Week 8, there is a 3 in the Civil Works row and a 1 in the Foundations row. Provide an explanation of what those numbers represent.

**Response:**

*These numbers represent the "level of work" needed for each component of construction activity. Each component of the activity must be completed for the entire Project's 104MWdc prior to completion; this is reflected in the spreadsheet by the sum of the values for each row totaling 104MWdc. Therefore, the "level of work" values are correlated but not equivalent to headcounts. Headcount is provided in the third row from the bottom.*

*Witnesses: Dominic Salinas and Randall Jenks*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

- 6. Refer to Appendix B or the Site Assessment Report (SAR). Confirm that the legal boundary descriptions provided in Appendix B of the SAR describe the land within the Project Area and not the entirety of each parcel depicted in the Parcel Map (Figure 1).**

**Response:**

*Confirmed.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*



**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**7. Refer to Appendix B or the SAR. Confirm that Fleming Farms, LLC Parcel 030-00-00-017.01 is included in the estimated acreage (830 acres) identified as the Project Area.**

**a. If it is, provide the total acreage of that parcel since it is not described as a unique parcel in Appendix B of the SAR.**

**Response:**

*Parcel 030-00-00-017.01 is approximately 80 acres and was included in the estimated Project Area acreage (830 acres).*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**b. If it is, confirm that it is part of Fleming Farms LLC Parcel 030-00-00-017.00.**

**Response:**

*Parcel 030-00-00-017.01 is included in the estimated Project Area acreage (830 acres). Although not identified as a unique parcel in Appendix B of the SAR, the area is included in the legal description titled Tract 2: PID #030-00-00-017.00 Fleming Farms, LLC.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**c. If it was not included in the estimated acreage of the Project Area, but it should be, provide a revised estimate of the number of acres within the defined Project Area.**

**Response:**

*Not applicable, see above responses.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

- 8. If applicable, provide any instances of any property owners located along Old Convict Road that have brought up concerns regarding property values, specifically related to the location the Fleming Solar Project in combination with the AEUG Fleming Solar Project.**

**Response:**

*The majority of the landowners with adjacent properties to Fleming Solar along Old Convict Road are leasing their property (or portions of their property) to AEUG Fleming Solar. However, Fleming Solar is aware of two instances, both of which involved comments made to the Siting Board. Fleming Solar hosted an event at New Creation Praise and Worship Center off Helena Road, adjacent to Old Convict Road and invited all adjacent neighbors. During and subsequent to the event, Fleming Solar was not made aware of any other concerns from property owners located along Old Convict Road regarding property value impacts related to both projects.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

- 9. If any of the property owners located along Old Convict Road have brought up concerns regarding property values, specifically related to the location the Fleming Solar Project in combination with the AEUG Fleming Solar Project, provide details about how those concerns are being or have been addressed.**

**Response:**

*In the case of the two property owners who submitted comments to the Siting Board, neither reached out to Fleming Solar directly nor expressed concerns during public meetings. Once we became aware of their concerns, Fleming Solar promptly reached out and offered to discuss directly with the landowners. Only one of the landowners responded, and after speaking with him his concerns were alleviated.*

*Concerns such as those raised by these two landowners were addressed by sharing information about the Property Value Impact Study that was completed by a third party, professional appraisal company which concluded no potential negative impacts. We referenced that there are numerous similar studies that report similar findings of no impact. We described the methodology used and the low impact nature of the operating facility. When appropriate, we shared a site layout and discuss how their property relates to the Project's design and setbacks.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**10. Refer to Applicant Response V. A. 1. The applicant explains that they cannot provide estimated weights of the trucks for repairs that will/might be needed during the operational phase. Instead, provide a range of weights for those repair trucks.**

**Response:**

*Large deliveries may be required infrequently for repairs, and vehicle weights could range widely depending on the type of repair. A standard fully equipped truck could weigh 7,000 lbs, and in the unlikely event a major component needs to be replaced, like an inverter, the maximum weight of the truck could be around 30,000 lbs across four (4) axles.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**11. Refer to Applicant Response VII. A. 2. Confirm that no site-specific field studies have been performed at Fleming Solar that would adjust, up or down, the pile-driving noise generation at various receptor distances as set forth in Table 2.**

- a. If confirmed correct, provide any new justification for not assuming that the EPA and WHO noise thresholds for annoyance (55 dBA and 50 dBA, respectively) would not apply in the instance of Fleming Solar. Without additional information, we will assume worst case impacts.**

**Response:**

*There have been no site-specific noise studies performed for the Fleming Solar Project.*

*Regarding the EPA noise thresholds for annoyance, the EPA states that "These levels are not single event, or "peak" levels. Instead, they represent averages of acoustic energy over periods of time such as 8 hours or 24 hours, and over long periods of time such as years. For example, occasional higher noise levels would be consistent with a 24-hour energy average...so long as a sufficient amount of relative quiet is experienced for the remaining period of time." <sup>2</sup>*

*Fleming Solar's noise consultant GAI has opined that given the nature of the construction operations (that they are mobile and confined to normal working/daylight hours) that there will be sufficient time of relative quiet to be in line with the above guidance from the EPA.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

---

<sup>2</sup> Source: <https://archive.epa.gov/epa/aboutepa/epa-identifies-noise-levels-affecting-health-and-welfare.html#:~:text=The%20document%20identifies%20a%2024,preventing%20activity%20interference%20and%20annoyance.>

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**12. Confirm whether the applicant assumption of ambient noise in the range of 50–60 dBa stems from traffic on the most heavily trafficked road in the vicinity of the Project.**

**Response:**

*The traffic on nearby roadways is the predominant source of impact on the existing local sound environment. The ambient noise range assumption provided in the application considers all adjacent roadways. While there are portions of the Project that may be less impacted by traffic sounds, those areas are also in the middle of agricultural fields and generally remote from residences.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**13. Refer to Applicant Response VII. B. 6. The applicant appears to suggest that the noise for a 300-foot distant receptor generated by the HVAC units, the GSU transformer, and the tracking motors are less than the sound from the inverters but that the receptor will only be impacted by the inverters. This implies that there is no cumulative effect, only the sound impact from the loudest noise generator. Confirm or correct our understanding of the applicant response. If correct, site the study or scientific source which supports this assumption.**

**Response:**

*Table 7 of the Noise and Traffic Studies provides rules of thumb for how sound levels impact one another based on idealized, simplified, and worst-case scenarios. GAI's professional opinion is that the impact from the HVAC units and the tracking motors will be, essentially, zero for all intents and purposes of this discussion in that they are so far below a three decibel impact (the level generally accepted as the threshold for the typical human ear to differentiate a change in sound levels) that they will be imperceptible.*

*Referring to Tables 4 and 5 of the Noise and Traffic Studies, at 300 feet the sound level impact of the inverters is 45.6 dBA and the sound level impact of the HVAC units is 27.0 dBA. The sound levels from tracking motors are expected to be similar or less to those of the HVAC unit and intermittent in nature.*

*If the ambient sound level at 300 ft was 50 dBA, the impact of a 45.6 dBA equivalent sound level (at distance) from the inverters would be an approximate increase of 1 dBA, or 51.0 dBA total, due to the 4.4 dBA difference between the sound levels. See Table 7 of the Noise and Traffic Studies. The impact of a 27.0 dBA equivalent sound level at this same distance would be approximately 0 dBA when the background noise level was 50 dBA due to the <10 dBA difference between the sound levels. Hence this cumulative effective is negligible.*

*Table 7 was developed from the FHWA's Table 4: Rules for Combining Sound Levels by "Decibel Addition" as follows:*

<b>Table 4: Rules for Combining Sound Levels by "Decibel Addition"</b>	
<b>When two decibel values differ by</b>	<b>Add the following amount to the higher value</b>
0 or 1 dB	3 dB
2 or 3 dB	2 dB
4 to 9 dB	1 dB
10 dB or more	0 dB

*This table can be found in the Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance Noise Fundamentals Section  
([https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/regulations\\_and\\_guidance/polguide/polguide0](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/polguide/polguide0))*

**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

2.cfm ).

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*



**Case No. 2020-00370**  
**Fleming Solar LLC**  
**Responses to Siting Board Staffs' Second Request for Information**

---

**14. Confirm whether any screening of any type will be provided during construction. If yes, describe when, where, and how.**

**Response:**

*Consistent with the mitigation measures set forth by the Siting Board in other cases, if pile driving activity occurs within 1,500 feet of a residence or business, Fleming Solar will implement a construction method that is designed to suppress the noise generated during the pile driving process (i.e., semi-tractor and canvas method; sound blankets on security fencing; or any other comparable method).*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

15. Refer to SAR Appendix D. The Memo "Landscape Review and Recommendations for Fleming Solar Project" included in Appendix D (Visual Assessment) of the SAR states that the landscape design review took several factors into consideration when identifying where a vegetative screen would be needed. One of those factors was described as "site distances to facilities."

- a. Confirm that "site distance to facilities" is a measure of the distance between a residence, business, or road and Project solar panels.

**Response:**

*"Site distance to facilities" refers to the distances from the vantage point to the location of the Project's security fence. The same methodology for strategically locating vegetative screens will be applied to the Project's final design.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

- b. Provide the specific distance threshold for determining the need for a vegetative buffer.

**Response:**

*Fleming Solar would like to clarify the statement provided in Appendix D (Visual Assessment) referencing the site distance to facilities as a factor that was considered for placement of vegetative screening. There was no quantitative distance threshold for determining the need for a vegetative buffer and instead the distance to the Project was a component of the evaluation. From the vantage point of adjacent residences, businesses, and rights-of-ways, if there was any benefit to having a vegetative buffer in place given existing terrain and seasonal vegetation, it was recommended.*

*Witness: Dominic Salinas*

# EXHIBIT A

March 31, 2021 Comment from  
Andrew Wood

## Gish, Kenneth J.

---

**From:** Dominic Salinas <dominic@coresolar.energy>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 20, 2021 12:57 PM  
**To:** Gish, Kenneth J.  
**Subject:** FW: Case No. 2020-370

External Sender:

-----Original Message-----

From: awood@maysvilleky.net <awood@maysvilleky.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2021 9:05 AM  
To: PSC.Info@ky.gov  
Subject: Case No. 2020-370

I am writing to support Fleming Solar LLC's application to construct an 80 MW solar electric generating project in Fleming County.

First of all, I'd like to thank you for reading this comment and for your participation on such an important commission. I apologize for the length of this e-mail, but it is not easy to accurately address the concerns of the anti-solar commentators and to describe the awful state of the American farmer in a short e-mail. I'll be as succinct as possible.

My family and I own the limited liability company that is the major player participating in the proposed project (2020-370). This project is critical for the success of our company. We bought most of this land in 2013 thinking that the farming revenue would pay for the purchase and operation of the farm. Boy was I wrong. The revenue from the farm is not even enough to pay the interest on my loan. And this is even with historic low interest rates.

Since my purchase I have come to realize that America is a victim of its own success in regards to farming. We produce so much that corn and soybean prices have gone down and stayed down consistently. (This, even as Argentina and Russia ramp-up production in a major way) The only row-croppers who make money are those that rent other people's land. In Kentucky, we used to be able to make up for low crop prices with federally-supported programs like tobacco and dairy, which enjoyed price supports that would even-out the ups-and-downs of commodity prices. No more. The tobacco program is gone. Dairy farmers have bravely held-out, working their fingers to the bone. Now their biggest customers--Wal-Mart and Kroger have decided to build their own dairies. There is no way that they can hold out much longer against their former customers who are now competing against them. I am not a dairy owner but now I know why so many of them are begging to participate in these projects. I was in the room when Core handed a check to an Amish dairy farmer to use some of his land.

I thought he was going to cry when he held it in his hands.

This has left farmers with two choices: row-cropping and beef cattle.

Soon, meat will be grown in a lab. It probably won't replace fine cuts of meat, but it will replace hamburger. I know that sounds like science-fiction, but it is a fact that looms over beef cattle farmers. I suppose that we could develop poultry or hog production farms; But is that what the neighbors really want? There are no setbacks for those operations. That leaves small Kentucky farms to compete against mega operations in the mid-west. It will be impossible for us to compete especially as the EPA, Corps of Engineers and FDA continue to creep onto the farm. A friend of mine warned me about farming soon after I bought the farm: "Andrew, you only need three things if you want to be a successful

farmer: Free land, Free equipment and Free cattle." He was right. Unlike some of the complainers, I did not inherit any of these things. All of this land was financed with borrowed money--and it still is. Rising interest rates are happening now and they will be the death knell of many farming operations.

As I read the other public comments to this case and the other solar cases, several things strike me:

- 1) Claims about toxic materials are untrue and completely unsupported by the facts. The panels to be used on these projects are silicone-based. You can get more elaborate and efficient panels (from the United States ironically) that do have heavy metals in them, but those are for low-light situations. They are much more expensive and would not be financially feasible in the projects currently being proposed;
- 2) The claims that solar projects are objectionable because of the noise they create is completely unsupported by the facts. I live about three miles away from EKP's generating facility in Maysville. There is no way to compare the noise from a solar plant to a coal plant. That is just non-sensical. A few years ago while watching the Super Bowl my family and I heard a loud klaxon sound and an audible warning that ammonia had escaped from the plant. A friend of mine who constructs coal plants warned me that if I ever heard about an ammonia leak that I should drop everything and RUN. I immediately loaded up my family and drove away as fast as it could. It ended up being a test by the utility company but it is almost inconceivable that complaints are being lodged about the noise and environmental impact that solar projects would have. You'll notice that there is never any supporting documentation about alleged dangers of the proposed projects. Neighbors of these solar projects will never have to flee their houses in terror because of an ammonia leak or be awakened in the night because they are blowing the soot out of the smokestacks; Dozens of white strobe lights will not blink incessantly 24 hours per day.
- 3) Opponents refer to the "destruction of the land"; The farmland around here has been in production for 200 years. It would benefit it greatly to have a break. I'm going to make a guess here that in 35 years when my contract is ending that there will be an even more efficient way to produce electricity. The remediation bond will be called into play and my kids will be back wringing their hands over how they'll compete against mid-western, Argentinian and Russian farmers again. But in 35 years their land will be rested and ready to re-enter production; It will not be destroyed.
- 4) Almost all of the comments related to my project are made by people who live nowhere near my farm or the project. Some comments are left by people who live in different zip codes! One lady laments the loss of tobacco and dairy farms. Unfortunately, those ships have sailed for Kentucky--with or without solar. Other commentators refer to solar companies that are in no way associated with our project or with Core Solar.

After we bought the farm in 2013, the price of commodities went straight-downhill; Windstorms knocked roofs off and knocked over chimneys!

Rats infested a rental house on the property; Renters destroyed the house before the rats arrived; One thing after another for years. I found out the hard way why farmers are so frugal--it's because they don't have the money to spend in the first place. Almost all have second jobs to subsidize their farms. I finally picked up the phone and called the realtor who sold us the farm and BEGGED him to sell it for me. "Just get me out of this!" I said. THE NEXT DAY I received a letter from a solar developer. I had a friend who had experience in this business. I called him and he put me in-touch with Core Solar. He told me that his was the best solar company to deal with. So Core is not here exploiting us--they are here because I asked them to evaluate our farm. I invited them.

I have learned that there is so much farmland that is so productive in this country that the Federal Government has developed a program called CRP that pays farmers NOT TO FARM the land. This helps support commodity prices. They wouldn't be doing this if farming was profitable.

Taking the land out of production will have added benefits of eliminating the application of chemicals to the land. An 800 acre project will eliminate 400 gallons of RoundUp per year. 200,000 pounds of fertilizer will stay out of the soil and local waterways ANNUALLY. Not to mention the fungicide and other chemicals that are applied.

## REGARDING PROPERTY VALUES OF ADJACENT HOUSES

The farm that we own has a house on it that I rent out. I have had two offers to purchase the house since the solar project was proposed. I told both purchasers explicitly about the project and neither one cared in the slightest about being next to the project. I can provide both of their names if desired. Another neighbor who actually will be surrounded by the project on three sides has never complained. I have actually agreed to sell him 5-10 acres to give him some more buffer. Other neighbors have voiced their concerns and Core has agreed to adjust the set-backs (along Helena Road) to 300 feet. One of them has posted anti-solar comments on the PSC web site; But even HE admitted to Core that he would be unable to view the project panels with the way the fencing and vegetation would be arranged. (This modification and accommodation occurred AFTER he posted his anti-solar comments) I don't know that his opinion has changed, but Core has bent over backwards to accommodate all concerns that have been brought to their attention.

The anti-solar minority has its roots in the anti-wind movement from a few years ago. It is generally the same players with a different banner. They have articulated no good reason to stop these projects. They have recruited others by using false information and fear. One of them showed up to our last public meeting--she was from a DIFFERENT COUNTY--and proclaimed LOUDLY that "WE STOPPED WIND AND BY-GOD, WE ARE GOING TO STOP SOLAR!" No facts. No coherent argument. She is simply determined to stop all solar development here. They think that all the projects being proposed are part of one, big project and that if they can kill the first one that the rest of them will fail. That's why so many comments are being filed prior to April 1. One lady who spoke up was very nice. Her comments related to removing habitat for deer. But then she complained that her family would no longer be able to shoot them. Many anti-solar comments like this are just circular. She wanted to save the deer habitat on someone else's property so that her family could shoot them. How do you argue with this?

The anti-solar crowd is receiving professional advice from outsiders for how to kill solar projects. They are being advised to contact all of the relevant state officials who are asked to weigh-in on these projects. So if you get unusual interest from other state agencies, this is likely why.

## POSITIVES FOR LOCAL TAXING DISTRICTS

I can't say that I know what the exact impact will be because I'm not sure that the State and the Counties have reached any sort of agreement regarding revenue sharing, but I have heard that in other states, local taxing districts usually receive \$24,000.00 per 100 acres under development. So, by this measure, our 800 acre development would generate almost \$200,000.00 per year for local taxing districts annually. Multiply this times the four projects that are being proposed in Fleming County (the other projects are larger) and this could result in approximately \$1,400,000.00 annually just in tax revenue. Local taxing districts in Fleming County include Schools, Ambulance, Library, County, etc. Even if all of the proposed projects are approved, they will take up less than 2% of the tillable farmland in Fleming County.

It is a fact that the state statute that set established the setbacks of 1,000 feet and 2,000 feet was passed SPECIFICALLY to kill wind energy in Kentucky. It succeeded. And there is no truth to the assertion that the solar industry agreed to these setbacks. The existing setbacks are fatal to solar projects that have to make the numbers work. Only a large-scale utility has enough money to fund those types of money-losing projects. The setback in my opinion is completely inappropriate for solar. NONE of the drawbacks of wind towers are present with solar. If the setbacks are not allowed to be modified reasonably, then solar will die, too. It costs \$1,000,000.00 or more to get even a small project to the point of a hearing before the siting board. Companies will go elsewhere to states where solar has been welcomed instead of taking a chance that the angry mob will show up at the last second and offer-up lies and falsehoods to kill what is the cheapest, most economically sound and environmentally friendly electric generating method that the world has ever seen.

One commentator has decried the loss of "bucolic" farmland in Mason and Fleming Counties. I'll just close by saying that farming is no longer bucolic. Farming has turned into a bare-knuckled fight for survival.

Farmland might be bucolic, but it is kept that way by landowners who no longer have a viable business model. Solar developers have offered a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to salvage solvency for 35 years. Disapproving any one of these projects will send a warning to the other developers to take back the lifeline that has been extended. Please don't let this happen.

Andrew Wood