

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of	:	
<b>KINGWOOD SOLAR I LLC</b> for a	:	CASE NO. 2023-1286
Certificate of Environmental Compatibility	:	
and Public Need for a Solar-Powered	:	On Appeal from The Ohio Power Siting
Electric Facility Located in Green County,	:	Board Case No. 21-0117-EL-BGN
Ohio.	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	

---

**BRIEF OF THE OHIO INDEPENDENT POWER PRODUCERS AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT KINGWOOD SOLAR I, LLC**

---

Dylan F. Borchers (0090690)  
Lila M. Appaya (0103440)  
BRICKER GRAYDON, LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
Telephone: (614) 227-2300  
Facsimile: (614) 227-2390  
Email: [dborchers@brickergraydon.com](mailto:dborchers@brickergraydon.com)  
[lappaya@brickergraydon.com](mailto:lappaya@brickergraydon.com)

*Attorney for Amicus Curiae The Ohio  
Independent Power Producers*

Michael J. Settineri (0073369)  
Anna Sanyal (0089269)  
Emily J. Taft (0098037)  
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR, AND PEASE, LLP  
52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Telephone: (614) 464-5462  
Facsimile: (614) 719-5146  
Email: [mjsettineri@vorys.com](mailto:mjsettineri@vorys.com)  
[aasanyal@vorys.com](mailto:aasanyal@vorys.com)  
[ejtaft@vorys.com](mailto:ejtaft@vorys.com)

*Counsel for Appellant Kingwood Solar I LLC*

David Yost (0056290)  
Attorney General of Ohio

John H. Jones (0018010)  
Section Chief

Werner Margard (0024858)  
Ambrosia Wilson  
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215-3793  
Telephone: (614)644-4397  
Facsimile: (614) 644-8764  
[john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)  
[werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)  
[ambrosia.wilson@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:ambrosia.wilson@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)

*Counsel for Appellee Ohio Power Siting Board*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST.....	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
III. ARGUMENT .....	2
Proposition of Law: The OPSB acted unlawfully and unreasonably by deferring to local governments’ view for its determination that the Project will not serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity. ....	2
a. The OPSB’s arbitrary decision undermines critical energy infrastructure development that is required to ensure the security of the electric grid for all Ohioans. ....	2
b. The OPSB’s deference to local government opposition to the Project is contrary to the statutory purpose and processes of the siting board established by the Ohio General Assembly and as set forth in regulation .....	7
IV. CONCLUSION .....	10

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page No.</b>
<hr/> <b>CASES</b> <hr/>	
<i>In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.</i> , 16-253-GA-BTX, Opinion and Order, OHIO PUC LEXIS 1497 November 21, 2019 .....	6
<i>In re Fireland Winds, LLC</i> , 18-1607-EL-BGN, Opinion and Order, June 24, 2021 .....	9
<i>In re Republic Wind, LLC</i> , 17-2295-EL-BGN, Opinion and Order, June 24, 2021 .....	9
<i>In the Matter of the Application of Champaign Wind, LLC</i> , 12-160-EL-BGN, Opinion and Certificate, 2013 WL 2446463, May 28, 2013.....	6
<i>Monongahela Power Co. v. Pub. Util. Comm.</i> , 2004-Ohio-6896.....	9
<i>State ex rel. State Edison Co. v. Parrott</i> (1995), 73 Ohio St.3d 705 .....	7
<hr/> <b>STATUTES</b> <hr/>	
Am. Sub. S.B. No. 3, 123 <sup>rd</sup> General Assembly (Ohio 1999) .....	3
R.C. 4906.10 .....	4, 8, 10
R.C. 4906.10(A)(6) .....	1, 4
R.C. 4906.13 .....	7, 10
R.C. Chapter 4906.....	7, 10
<hr/> <b>RULES</b> <hr/>	
Ohio Adm.Code 4906 .....	7, 10
S.Ct.Prac.R. 16.06.....	1
<hr/> <b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b> <hr/>	
PJM Interconnection, <i>Energy Transition in PJM: Resource Retirements, Replacements &amp; Risks</i> , <a href="https://www.pjm.com/-/media/library/reports-notices/special-reports/2023/energy-transition-in-pjm-resource-retirements-replacements-and-risks.ashx">https://www.pjm.com/-/media/library/reports-notices/special-reports/2023/energy-transition-in-pjm-resource-retirements-replacements-and-risks.ashx</a> (accessed Oct. 12, 2023)	4

## **I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

Pursuant to S. Ct. Prac. R. 16.06, the Ohio Independent Power Producers (“OIPP”) submits this brief as *amicus curiae* in support of Appellant Kingwood Solar I LLC (“Kingwood”). The Ohio Power Siting Board (“OPSB”) denied Kingwood’s application to construct and operate a 175 MW solar facility in Green County (“Project”) solely on the basis of its determination that the Project did not satisfy the “public interest” under R.C. 4906.10(A)(6) because local governments opposed the land use.

Members of OIPP develop, construct, and operate new natural-gas-fired power plants, representing billions of dollars of new private investment in Ohio and thousands of megawatts (MW) of new, efficient, and reliable energy, powered by Ohio natural gas. The OIPP members include Oregon Clean Energy Center (900MW), Middletown Energy Center (475 MW), South Field Energy (1,100MW), Carroll County Energy (742 MW), Guernsey Power Station (1650 MW), and the Trumbull Energy Center 950 MW). These projects represent over \$10 billion in private capital investment in new generating facilities in Ohio. OIPP members provide critical baseload generation to Ohio consumers.

The OPSB’s decision in *Kingwood* erodes a fair and predictable permitting process upon which new investment in power generating facilities in Ohio relies. The OPSB’s refusal to certificate Kingwood Solar’s Project was premised on a single reason: opposition by local governments. Two of those local governments filed resolutions that claim the Project is “incompatible with the general welfare, health, and safety of [their] residents,” and one local government submitted a resolution that simply stated it “opposed” the project. (Kingwood Ex. 68 at 4; Kingwood Ex. 63 at 3; Xenia Township Ex. 1 at Ex. A.) However, none of the Resolutions, nor the evidence offered by the local governments, provide any concrete basis to substantiate the claim that the Project is incompatible with the general welfare, health, or safety of these

communities. Rather, the local governments rely primarily on vague and unidentified comments from community members that oppose the Project. (See Jeff Ewry Testimony ¶¶ 38–57; Brandon Huddleson Testimony at 3; Don Hollister Testimony at 2–4; Stephen Combs Testimony at 1). The OPSB’s order itself, which found no deficiencies with the Project under R.C. 4906.10(A) other than local government opposition, proves that none of the substantive issues raised by the local governments had merit. Yet, despite the fact that the operative statutory scheme for the OPSB’s review of this Project does not give local governments the authority to restrict major utility facility development, the OPSB did just that. In other words, simply the *existence* of local government opposition—which the OPSB itself found substantively unconvincing—became outcome-determinative.

In delegating this kind of veto power to local governments, the OPSB disregarded the statutory purpose and framework of the state permitting framework. The OPSB also failed to “render a decision upon the record” as required by R.C. 4906.10(A). This precedent diminishes OIPP members’ confidence in Ohio’s energy regulatory environment and should be reversed by this Court.

## **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

OIPP defers to and incorporates the statement of facts included in the merit brief of Appellant Kingwood Solar I LLC.

## **III. ARGUMENT**

**Proposition of Law: The OPSB acted unlawfully and unreasonably by deferring to local governments’ view for its determination that the Project will not serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity.**

- a. The OPSB’s arbitrary decision undermines critical energy infrastructure development that is required to ensure the security of the electric grid for all Ohioans.**

In 1999, the Ohio General Assembly passed the Ohio Electric Restructuring Act, authorizing the restructuring of the electric industry in Ohio. Am. Sub. S.B. 3, 123<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly (Ohio 1999). This legislation, in part, unbundled the generation (or the supply) of electricity from regulated monopoly investor-owned utilities (“IOUs”) to the competitive market. Today, new power generation facilities in Ohio are developed, constructed, and operated by non-utility companies.

The development of new power generation facilities is a multi-year process, requiring significant investment of capital. Unlike capital spent by IOUs, which is ultimately collected from captive ratepayers, generating facilities in Ohio are privately financed. Development risk placed entirely on these private companies and their investors – not captive ratepayers.

New investment in power generating facilities can bring multiple benefits to the local communities and regions where they locate. The benefits include jobs and increased tax revenues for local governments and schools. New facilities support the broader growth of new and diverse industries locating in Ohio through infrastructure improvements and the increased supply of clean and affordable energy.

Importantly, new investment in generating facilities is critical to ensure that the electric grid has adequate resources to maintain reliability. Recent testimony from a Commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee stated the situation candidly:

[The power grid] is heading for a reliability crisis. I do not use the term “crisis” for melodrama, but because it is an accurate description of what we are facing. I think anyone would regard an increasing threat of system-wide, extensive power outages as a crisis.

*Full Committee Hearing to Conduct Oversight of FERC, Before the Senate Committee on Energy & Natural Resources, 118<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2023) (Opening Statement of Mark C. Christie, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Committee).*

Ohio is located within the PJM Interconnection regional transmission organization, the largest regional transmission system in the country in terms of customers. PJM has recently identified reliability concerns due to the ongoing retirement of older generating facilities and increases in demand. PJM Interconnection, *Energy Transition in PJM: Resource Retirements, Replacements & Risks*, <https://www.pjm.com/-/media/library/reports-notice/special-reports/2023/energy-transition-in-pjm-resource-retirements-replacements-and-risks.ashx> (accessed Oct. 12, 2023). Projections by PJM indicate that unless there is the quick integration of new generating facilities, there may be insufficient resources to cover peak demand requirements. *Id.*

Several factors can attract a developer and investment to a particular state or region, one being the predictability of the siting process. Adherence to statutory mandates is foundational for this predictability. For decades, the OPSB's siting process has encouraged electric generating facility investment in Ohio, including over \$10 billion in private investment in new power plants by OIPP members. The OPSB is staffed with capable technical experts who apply Ohio's rules for siting of large-scale generation facilities in a manner that is both demanding and fair. This includes ample opportunity for local input on potential projects.

The Ohio General Assembly defined the criteria by which the OPSB must base its decision when granting or denying a certificate application in R.C. 4906.10. Of these, the only criteria at issue in this case is whether the project is in the "public interest" under R.C. 4906.10(A)(6). In *Kingwood*, the OPSB deemed the local government opposition to land use for a major utility facility as dispositive for this determination. The Board's finding in that regard was unreasonable and unlawful because the inquiry under R.C. 4906.10(A)(6) does not turn on a project's local popularity.



The OPSB’s decision in *Kingwood* thus erodes fairness and predictability in the permitting process upon which new investment in power generating facilities relies. (*See* Opinion & Order.) Under the statutory framework in effect for the Board’s review of this Project (*i.e.*, Senate Bill 52 does not apply), local governments did not have any authority to prohibit or restrict major utility facility development. Still, the OPSB denied Kingwood Solar’s application for a single reason: opposition by local governments. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 146–51.) While it is important to begin by noting that local government preference is not the same as local impacts, which the OPSB should be examining under the public interest criterion, in this case, there is no evidence of verifiable local opposition *or* local impacts. The OPSB based its decision on what it deems “unanimous opposition” of the local governments bordering the project, but the local resolutions contain nothing but unsubstantiated claims about the possible effects of the Project and conclusory statements that the Project is “incompatible with the general welfare, health, and safety of [their] residents.” (*See* Opinion & Order, ¶ 144). Further, the issues raised by the alleged local opposition were found immaterial by the OPSB when it determined the project met all of the statutory requirements under RC 4906.10(A) except for the public interest factor. In other words, the OPSB negated the legitimacy of the very arguments it now relies on. For that reason, the *Kingwood* decision undermines the legitimacy, statutory authority, and technical expertise of the OPSB. This in turn will discourage investment in new energy projects necessary to support grid stability and promote economic development.

It is noteworthy that the cost of simply getting a new generating facility application to submittal to the OPSB is often millions of dollars of at-risk development capital. These costs include securing property (site control), obtaining grid interconnection agreements, conducting a myriad of environmental analyses, and significant preliminary engineering and design. The

OPSB's regulations demand high technical standards for applicants, requiring significant resources to prepare an application. In turn, applicants have traditionally been able to rely on a fair and evidence-based review of the proposed project.

The OPSB's decision to defer entirely to local government opposition when determining whether a project is in the public interest is an unlawful departure from precedent in cases where a project was opposed by the local government entity for land use/zoning/political reasons. Prior to *Kingwood*, the OPSB recognized that a project's benefits for reliability and electricity supply to the state, the public, and the grid outweigh local opposition for purposes of the "public interest" criterion in R.C. 4906.10(A). For example, in *In re Duke Energy Ohio*, the OPSB approved a project even though there were "thousands of comments from members of the general public, local organizations, and local officials" and unanimous opposing intervention from multiple local governments. *In re: Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case No. 16-253-GA-BTX, Opinion and Order, at 82-83, 2019 OHIO PUC LEXIS 1497 (Nov. 21, 2019). Similarly, in *In re Champaign Wind*, the OPSB ruled that a project benefited the public even though all local governments actively opposed the project. In that case, the OPSB correctly took a broad view and ruled "that, in considering whether the proposed project is in the public interest, convenience, and necessity, we have taken into account that the renewable energy generation by the proposed facility will benefit the environment and consumers." *In re: Application of Champaign Wind, LLC*, Case No. 12-160-EL-BGN, Opinion and Certificate at 3, 2013 WL 2446463, May 28, 2013. The OPSB's decision in *Kingwood* offered no basis or explanation for its departure from precedent whereby local opposition was weighed against the record evidence about the project. There was no operative change in statute or rulemaking to justify the OPSB's conclusion that local opposition controlled the outcome. The *Kingwood* decision was thus unlawful and unreasonable.

**b. The OPSB's deference to local government opposition to the Project is contrary to the statutory purpose and processes of the siting board established by the Ohio General Assembly and as set forth in regulation.**

The Ohio General Assembly granted the OPSB exclusive jurisdiction over “major utility facilities,” including power generating facilities with a capacity of 50 MW or greater. Chapter 4906 and associated promulgated rules establish an evidence-based siting process. This process includes Staff’s technical analysis of the application, intervention, discovery, hearings, and the opportunity to present witnesses and testimony, subject to cross examination. *See generally*, Ohio Adm.Code Chapter 4906-2. The OPSB’s decision in Kingwood, however, renders these parameters and procedures meaningless.

R.C. 4906.13 prohibits a “political subdivision of this state” from requiring “any approval, consent, permit, certificate, or other condition for the construction or operation of a major utility facility . . . authorized by a certificate issued pursuant to Chapter 4906 of the Revised Code.” The Ohio Supreme Court has succinctly noted that “power siting projects are exempt from local regulation.” *State ex rel. State Edison Co. v. Parrott* (1995), 73 Ohio St.3d 705, 707.

The *Kingwood* decision fundamentally contradicts R.C. 4906.13. The OPSB bases its decision to deny the Kingwood Solar application solely on local government opposition and the documents submitted by the local governments in support. But the local government opposition simply communicated their disapproval and alleged negative local impacts that have been addressed in Kingwood’s Application. without providing any supporting evidence that these alleged impacts will actually materialize. And still, the OPSB deferred. This outcome gravely concerns OIPP members, given their interest in developing and operating OPSB-jurisdictional electric generating facilities.

The projects developed and operated by OIPP members are state of the art combined cycle natural gas power plants that provide widespread benefits to Ohio. The facilities provide gigawatts

of efficient and reliable power to Ohio's grid. According to the Ohio EPA, "Ohio's generation mix is being positively influenced by shale gas, renewables and energy efficiency which is keeping costs low, as well as reducing emissions." New Source Performance Standards for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New and Reconstructed Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; Emissions Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Existing Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; and Repeal of the Affordable Clean Energy Rule, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0355; Ohio EPA Comments Proposed CAA Section 111(d)CO<sub>2</sub> for EGUs. In those same comments, the Ohio EPA also noted that carbon dioxide emissions from electric generation dropped by 38% since 2005. Each new combined cycle facility employs hundreds of construction workers and injects tens of millions of dollars into the local economy. The new natural gas power plants developed and operated by OIPP members promote grid stability and increase the generation supply available to support broader economic growth for all Ohioans. The public interest standard established in the OPSB's *Kingwood* decision means that all these local, regional, and statewide benefits enabled by investment in new generation could be subverted by political pressure and preferences of local governments, even for projects to which Senate Bill 52 does not apply.

In practice, the OPSB's decision also renders the evidentiary and hearing process established by statute and in the OPSB's rules effectively meaningless. Through statute and rule, siting decisions must be based on evidence developed through a uniform process. This process includes OPSB Staff technical analysis of the application, intervention, discovery, hearings, and the opportunity to present witnesses and testimony, subject to cross examination.

The evidentiary record in *Kingwood* is voluminous and overwhelmingly demonstrates that the application met the criteria established in R.C. 4906.10. To build this record, Kingwood submitted extensive technical reports and studies, all of which were supported by multiple expert

witnesses in the evidentiary hearing. The contents of the application and the supporting witnesses were all subject to cross examination. In contrast, of the opposing local governments relied upon by the Board, only some of them even intervened in the proceeding and none participated in the evidentiary hearing. The OPSB's decision is clearly against the manifest weight of the evidence and is unsupported by the evidence. *Monongahela Power Co. v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 2004-Ohio-6896, ¶ 29.

In addition, the consequence of the OPSB's decision is to render the investigation, intervention, and evidentiary process for siting under R.C. 4906 and O.A.C. 4906 functionally meaningless. The OPSB's decision extinguishes any obligation for local government intervenors to support their arguments with record evidence.

To be clear, OIPP recognizes the value of local government input as to local impacts or conditions that should be taken into account by the OPSB. OIPP's objection to the OPSB's decision in *Kingwood* is not that local governments' input should be dismissed or that the OPSB should approve every application presented to it. However, each application should be determined on the record established in the siting process, not unsupported opinion. If there is a compelling evidence-based concern with a proposed project that cannot be adequately addressed by modifications to the project or conditions to mitigate the concern, it is reasonable for the Board to deny the application. Compare, *In re Republic Wind, LLC*, Case No. 17-2295-EL-BGN, Opinion and Order at ¶ 68 (June 24, 2021) (denying a wind facility application on the basis of concerns related to underground karst formations and their impacts to groundwater that could not be satisfactorily mitigated by permit conditions contrast Republic denial due to technical karst issues vs. Firelands where the karst could be mitigated) and *In re Fireland Winds, LLC*, Case No. 18-1607-EL-BGN, Opinion and Order ¶ 83 (June 24, 2021) (approving a wind facility application despite opposition concerns about karst

formations because the impact could be mitigated by foundation grouting). The siting process established in R.C. Chapter 4906 and Ohio Adm.Code Chapter 4906 is a rigorous process with multiple opportunities for stakeholders to raise concerns and for those concerns to be investigated. However, this is not the process on which the Board relied in reaching its conclusion in *Kingwood*.

Because this Project was not subject to local government referendum or restriction, the OPSB's decision to delegate veto power to local governments was unlawful and unreasonable under R.C. 4906.10 and 4906.13. *Kingwood* also invalidates the evidentiary process established in the OPSB's rules. Further, this Court's reversing the OPSB's *Kingwood* decision will signal to developers of new generation resources that regulatory predictability in Ohio is a priority as well as that the OPSB will be held to task under the law as it is written.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, OIPP respectfully requests that the Court reverse the OPSB's denial of *Kingwood's* Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need because the Opinion and Order erodes a fair and predictable permitting process upon which new investment in power generating facilities in Ohio relies.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lila M. Appaya

Dylan F. Borchers (0090690)

Lila M. Appaya (0103440)

BRICKER GRAYDON, LLP

100 South Third Street

Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Telephone: (614) 227-2300

Facsimile: (614) 22-2390

[dborchers@brickergraydon.com](mailto:dborchers@brickergraydon.com)

[lappaya@brickergraydon.com](mailto:lappaya@brickergraydon.com)

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Amicus Curiae Brief in Support of Appellant Kingwood Solar I LLC was served upon the parties of record this 19<sup>th</sup> day of December 2023 via electronic transmission.

VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR, AND PEASE LLP  
Michael J. Settineri (0073369)  
Anna Sanyal (0089269)  
Emily J. Taft (0098037)  
52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43216-1008  
Telephone: (614) 464-5462  
Facsimile: (614) 719-5146  
Email: [mjsettineri@vorys.com](mailto:mjsettineri@vorys.com)  
[asanyal@vorys.com](mailto:asanyal@vorys.com)  
[ejtaft@vorys.com](mailto:ejtaft@vorys.com)

*Counsel for Appellant Kingwood Solar I LLC*

John H. Jones  
Section Chief  
Werner Margard  
Ambrosia Wilson  
Assistant Attorneys General  
30 East Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215-3793  
[john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)  
[werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:werner.margard@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)  
[ambrosia.wilson@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:ambrosia.wilson@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)

*/s/ Lila M. Appaya* \_\_\_\_\_  
Lila M. Appaya