

OFFICIAL COPY

INFORMATION SHEET

PRESIDING: Brown-Bland, Patterson and Gray
PLACE: Dobbs Building, Raleigh, NC
DATE: Wednesday, April 11, 2018
TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.
DOCKET NO.: EMP-93, Sub 0
COMPANY: Wilkinson Solar, LLC
DESCRIPTION: Application of Wilkinson Solar LLC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct a 74-MW Solar Facility in Beaufort County, North Carolina
VOLUME: 5

APPEARANCES

FOR WILKINSON SOLAR LLC:
Henry C. Campen, Jr., Esq.
Merrick Parrott, Esq.

FOR MARSHALL AND JOANN LILLEY AND DEB VAN STAALDUINEN, THE INTERVENORS:
Brady Allen, Esq.
Britton Allen, Esq.

FOR THE USING AND CONSUMING PUBLIC:
Dianna W. Downey, Esq.

WITNESSES

Prefiled Testimony of Evan D. Lawrence (excused witness)
Joe von Wahlde
Paul Thienpont
John Barefoot
April Montgomery

EXHIBITS

- ✓ Wilkinson von Wahlde Confidential Hearing Exhibit 1 (I/A)
- ✓ von Wahlde Supplemental Exhibits 1 & 2 (I/A)
- ✓ Thienpont Supplemental Exhibit 1 (I/A)
- ✓ Thienpont Intervenor Cross Exhibit 1 (I/A)
- ✓ Barefoot Supplemental Exhibit 1 (I/--)
- ✓ Amendment Exhibit 1 (I/A)

COPIES ORDERED: Email: Campen – 1; Downey - 1
REPORTED BY: Kim Mitchell
TRANSCRIBED BY: Kim Mitchell
DATE TRANSCRIBED: April 27, 2018

TRANSCRIPT PAGES: 117
PREFILED PAGES: 30
TOTAL: 147

FILED

APR 30 2018

**Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission**

I/A

OFFICIAL COPY

APR 05 2018



April 10, 2017

Cardno GS, Inc.

Bill Biddlecome
Washington Field Office Regulatory Chief
Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District
CESAW-RG-W
2407 West 5th Street
Washington, NC 27889

501 Butler Farm Road
Hampton, VA 23666

Phone +1 757 594 1465
Fax +1 757 594 1469
www.cardno.com

www.cardno.com

**Subject: Wilkinson Solar, Invenergy LLC
Town of Pantego, Beaufort County, NC
Jurisdictional Wetland Delineation**

Dear Mr Biddlecome:

Cardno as agent for Invenergy, is under contract to conduct a jurisdictional wetland delineation of an approximately 717 acre site in Beaufort County, NC and requests a pre-jurisdictional determination meeting to discuss the methodology to be utilized to delineate the project area. The project limits are illustrated on the attached exhibit and are primarily agricultural fields and support facilities.

As you know, the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain (2010) identifies the delineation methodology for agricultural lands that are being converted to other uses as a "Difficult Wetland Situation". Cardno would like to discuss our proposed methodology and get any feedback from you and your staff ahead of time to allow the delineation effort to move forward as smoothly as possible.

We appreciate your time and attention to this effort and look forward to hearing back from you or one of your staff to schedule this meeting.

Sincerely,

John M. Lowenthal, PWS, PWD
Associate/Senior Biologist
Cardno
John.lowenthal@cardno-gs.com

Encl: Figure 1: Proposed Project Limits

cc: Andrea Giampoli, Invenergy
Joe von Wahide, Cardno

Australia • Belgium • Canada • Ecuador • Germany • Indonesia • Italy • Kenya •
New Zealand • Papua New Guinea • Peru • Tanzania • United Arab Emirates •
United Kingdom • United States • Operations in 85 countries

von Wahlde Supplemental Exhibit 2 I/A



500 0 500 Feet

Legend

- Amended Additional Project Area
- Parcel boundary
- Road**
- US/State Route
- Local Road
- Dirt/Unpaved Road

Wilkinson Amended Application Exhibit A

Wilkinson Solar Energy Center | Beaufort County, North Carolina

Rev.05
April 04, 2018

Invenergy

I/A



April 4, 2018

OFFICIAL COPY

Paul Thienpont
Manager, Renewable Engineering
Invenergy
One South Wacker Drive, Suite 1800, Chicago, IL 60606

RE: Jinko Solar Photovoltaic Modules and Dupont GenX chemical

Dear Mr. Paul Thienpont,

Jinko Solar, a solar panel manufacturer and part of the Jinko Solar Holding Co., Ltd. (NYSE: JKS), a vertically-integrated solar power solar photovoltaic module manufacturer, hereby confirms that neither the Gen X or PFAS chemical compounds are used in any of the materials used to manufacturer Jinko Solar photovoltaic modules. The Gen X and PFAS compound is not used in any of the Dupont supplied materials for the Jinko Solar photovoltaic module and the letter attached from Dupont can provide further confirmation.

We at Jinko Solar are committed to the highest standards of business ethics and always conduct business in accordance with applicable laws, rules and regulations. Jinko Solar's corporate governance policies are designed to protect the interests of its shareholders, and promote responsible business practices and corporate citizenship.

Sincerely,

Daniel Chang
Technical Director – North America
Jinko Solar U.S. Inc
595 Market St. ST 2200
San Francisco, CA 94105



Apr 05 2018

Statement



WILMINGTON, Delaware, April 4, 2018 – As the industry leader in solar solutions that delivers proven power and lasting value for the solar industry, DuPont Photovoltaic Solutions does not use Gen X or PFAS compounds in the production or processing of Tedlar® polyvinyl fluoride films, which are widely used in backsheets for solar panels.

Teflon® PTFE is not sold into PV module applications. DuPont does not currently market or sell FEP for PV applications, and has not marketed or sold FEP in the past three years. JinkoSolar is only a customer for Tedlar®.

DuPont Photovoltaic Solutions (DPVS) is the leading supplier of specialty materials to the solar energy industry. Since 1975 more than half of the world's 900 million installed solar panels contain DuPont materials. The DPVS portfolio, including Solamet® photovoltaic metallization pastes and DuPont™ Tedlar® polyvinyl fluoride films, is the established benchmark of the industry, delivering lifelong value through proven performance, reliability, efficiency and best return on investment. To learn more, please visit <http://photovoltaics.dupont.com>.

#

Contact: Tara Stewart
302-650-3063
Tara.c.stewart@dupont.com

OFFICIAL COPY

APR 05 2018

Thierpont Cross Ev. #1
I/A

Pay off your mortgage faster with a 15-year fixed loan

Select remaining balance

\$225,000

Terms & Conditions apply. NMLS#1136

ENVIRONMENT JULY 31, 2014 / 12:27 PM / 4 YEARS AGO

China's JinkoSolar must face U.S. lawsuit over pollution, protests

Jonathan Stempel

3 MIN READ



NEW YORK (Reuters) - JinkoSolar Holding Co must face a shareholder lawsuit accusing the Chinese solar panel maker of concealing that one of its factories was dumping toxic waste into a nearby river, a U.S. appeals court ruled on Thursday.

The decision by the 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New York overturned a lower court's January 2013 dismissal of the case against JinkoSolar and its underwriters, sending the lawsuit back to U.S. District Judge Paul Oetken.

The appeals court said JinkoSolar's failure to disclose "ongoing, serious pollution problems" in prospectuses for two stock offerings in 2010 "rendered misleading" statements about its other efforts to comply with Chinese environmental laws.

JinkoSolar's share price fell 40 percent over three trading days in September 2011 after hundreds of people gathered at its plant on the outskirts of Haining, in China's Zhejiang province, whose pollution they claimed was killing fish in a nearby river.

Some protesters overturned vehicles and damaged nearby buildings before riot police dispersed the group.

JinkoSolar's American depository shares were down \$1.08, or 4.1 percent, at \$25.17 in morning trading. The company and its law firm did not immediately respond to requests for comment.

About Cookies on this site



Our site uses cookies and other technologies so that we, and our partners, can remember you and understand how you use our site. Access our Cookie Consent Tool, as seen on every page, to see a complete list of these technologies and to tell us whether they can be used on your device. Further use of this site will be considered consent.

In a prospectus for its May 2010 initial public offering, JinkoSolar had described having installed equipment at its plants to lower pollution, and hired 24-hour-a-day environmental monitoring teams to ensure compliance with Chinese standards.

But shareholders said JinkoSolar's failure to reveal the pollution it was creating made its other statements misleading, constituting securities fraud.

Writing for a three-judge 2nd Circuit panel, Circuit Judge Ralph Winter said JinkoSolar could have disclosed more, even if its prospectuses "gave comfort" to investors that it was trying to comply with environmental regulations.

"These descriptions did not guarantee 100% compliance 100% of the time," Winter wrote. "Such compliance may often be unobtainable, and reasonable investors may be deemed to know that. However, investors would be misled ... if in fact the equipment and 24-hour team were then failing to prevent substantial violations of the Chinese regulations."

Michael Bigin, a lawyer for the shareholders, said his clients are pleased, and look forward to pursuing their case, which seeks class-action status.

The case, which spells the company's name differently, is Meyer et al v. JinkoSolar Holdings Co et al, 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 13-616.

Editing by Grant McCool

Our Standards: The Thomson Reuters Trust Principles.

H/

Kimley»»Horn

OFFICIAL COPY

JUN 22 2017
APR 05 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Ryan Van Portfliet, Invenergy, LLC
 From: John Barefoot, P.E.
 Date: June 20, 2017
 Subject: Proposed Wilkinson Solar Facility
 Washington, NC
 Preliminary Stormwater Memo

This memorandum details a preliminary review of stormwater requirements, anticipated stormwater management design, and steps for future in-depth stormwater analysis in regards to the development of the proposed Wilkinson Solar Facility.

Project Understanding

The proposed Wilkinson Solar Facility is located on an ±717 acre site located at the intersection of Terra Ceia Road (SR 1612) and Christian School Road (SR 1619) to the east of the City of Washington in Beaufort County, North Carolina. The proposed site occupies land on eight separate parcels, some being north and some being south of Terra Ceia Road.

A site visit was conducted on 6/19/2017 by a Kimley-Horn representative to review the existing conditions of the proposed project area. The site's current use is cultivated farm land. The existing topography is very flat and drainage relief is provided by existing ditches which transverse the fields at regular intervals. These drainage ditches convey runoff out of the fields and into larger canals along the adjacent roads. The large canals route stormwater runoff into tributaries of the Pamlico Sound. While it was evident by swept vegetation that the canals have experienced large rain events in the past, they were heavily vegetated and stabilized at the time of the site visit. Images of the existing conditions taken at the subject site visit are included as Attachment A.

It is our understanding that the construction of the proposed solar facility will consist of the following:

- Ground-mounted arrays of photovoltaic panels arranged in rows and mounted on single-axis trackers;
- Inverters, combiners, and transformers;
- Substation and battery storage facility;
- Buried electrical conduits;
- Onsite unpaved access roads and interior access paths;
- Chain link security fencing located along the site perimeter; and
- Gravel-surfaced access driveways from the adjacent roadways

The proposed construction will require the disturbance of approximately 560 acres of land based on preliminary site layouts. This disturbed land currently does not appear to contain impervious area. It is anticipated that approximately three acres of impervious surface will be added to this area which include new access roads and equipment pads. This would be an impervious area increase of approximately 0.5%. The proposed solar panels on site are viewed as pervious as detailed in the following section.

Stormwater Management Rules and Regulations

The North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) has stormwater and erosion control permitting authority for the proposed project site. With the proposed site being located in a coastal county and adding over 10,000 square feet of built upon area, it is anticipated that a stormwater permit will be required. To receive a stormwater permit, the site design will need to meet the requirements of the NCDEQ stormwater design manual, specifically the low density chapter and new Solar Farm chapter. Based on the preliminary site layout, it is anticipated the project will be considered low density by NCDEQ as it should meet the built upon area requirements and utilizes vegetative conveyances.

As mentioned above, a new Solar Farm chapter in the NCDEQ stormwater design manual was added in 2016 and last updated in April of 2017. This chapter gives specific guidance for solar sites. The NCDEQ stormwater manual list requirements for all accepted stormwater control measures and their design criteria which must be met in order to receive a stormwater permit through NCDEQ. In short, the new chapter explains that as long as the panels are disconnected they are not classified as built upon area and sheet flow should be maintained. NCDEQ defines disconnected as the width between the rows of panels being greater than or equal to the panel width. The chapter also contains other recommendations for design practices. The solar farm chapter of the NCDEQ stormwater design manual is included for reference as Attachment B.

This understanding is further reinforced by a report in the Journal of Hydrologic Engineering titled "Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms" dated May 2013. The conclusion of this report after various testing procedures were carried out is the addition of solar panels over a grassy field has very little effect on the volume of runoff, the peak discharge, and the time to peak. With each analysis, the runoff volume increased slightly but not enough to require storm-water management facilities. The Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms report is included for reference as Attachment C.

An erosion and sediment control permit will be needed as the site disturbs over one acre. The proposed temporary erosion control measures on site will need to be in compliance with the NCDEQ Sediment and Erosion Control Manual in order to receive an erosion and sediment control permit through NCDEQ.

If the proposed design impacts any wetlands or streams that may be present on site, permitting through the Army Corps of Engineers will be required.

Anticipated Stormwater Management Design

The goal for the proposed Wilkinson facility will be to maintain natural drainage patterns to the maximum extent possible. As with all development, grading construction activities are cost-adders to the facility,

and thus, developers are incentivized to minimize the need for those activities in their designs. This approach pairs well with the low-density nature of solar facilities and with less grading comes less potential for erosion. Where an access road or path must cross a drainage ditch, an appropriately sized culvert will be placed to make the crossing. Due to the alignment of the solar panel rows not matching the alignment of existing ditches, panels will need to cross over existing ditches. This layout and approach has worked on other nearby solar sites in Shawboro and Beaufort, NC, that Kimley-Horn has designed recently. These sites were very similar to the proposed Wilkinson solar site as they also had 2-3 foot deep drainage ditches traversing relatively flat fields. The panels were able to cross the ditches without the need for grading or realignment. Please see image below for one example of this low-impact design. Please be aware that when rows of panels cross existing field ditches, there will likely be increased cost for long term ditch maintenance that should be taken into consideration by the owner/developer.



Recent Solar Facility Design, Shawboro, NC

During the civil design process, existing culverts, new culverts, and ditch cross sections within the project area will be checked to confirm they are adequately sized to convey runoff from their respective drainage areas.

Further, the current cultivated agricultural land use has a higher curve number than the managed open space that the site will be classified as under the proposed solar use. The curve number is a way to relate site rainfall to site runoff and is based on soils, plant cover, amount of impervious areas, interception, and surface storage. A higher curve number means more rainfall becomes runoff. In summary, the stabilized grassy meadow condition of the solar use is expected to retain more rainfall from becoming runoff than the currently planted crops. Additionally, in the current use, the site is tilled and disturbed typically on an annual basis which increases the potential for erosion and maintenance concerns. The proposed use once constructed is expected to remain stabilized over the life of the facility.

Steps for Future In-Depth Stormwater Analysis

To further confirm that the design approach described above will be sufficient and result in minimal impact to the existing drainage patterns, Invenergy can acquire topographical data from a field survey to include all culvert and ditch sizing. Kimley-Horn will use this data to ensure that existing and proposed site drainage features are adequately sized to convey design stormwater flows.

Other services that are recommended prior to civil design are as follows:

- Storm surge analysis due to proximity to coast line
- Flood elevation study to determine maximum water elevations on the project site
- Wetland and Stream delineation

Conclusions

Based on the site visit, NCDEQ's stormwater permitting requirements, and the anticipated stormwater design approach, Kimley Horn believes the proposed development's impact to existing drainage patterns and flows will be negligible, or more likely, the proposed solar use will provide a reduction in runoff from the site. In the event that the final design results in a different conclusion, additional measures can be implemented on the subject site to address stormwater concerns.

Attachment A - Site Photos



Photo 1: Looking east from Christian School Road at typical existing drainage ditches on parcels north of Terra Ceia Road.



Photo 2: Looking south from Terra Ceia Christian School Driveway at small canal that intercepts field drainage ditches.



Photo 3: Looking east from intersection of Terra Ceia Road and Christian School Road at large canal that intercepts small canals. All project drainage exits to this tributary.




Photo 4: Looking northwest from Terra Ceia Road at project area. Large canal in foreground.



Photo 5: Looking west from intersection of Terra Ceia Road and Lovich Lane at project area.




Photo 6: Looking south from Terra Ceia Road at typical existing drainage ditches on parcels south of Terra Ceia Road.




Photo 7: Looking southeast from Terra Ceia Road at project area.




Photo 8: Looking southwest from Terra Ceia Road at project area.

E-6. Solar Farms




Image SAS, Cary, NC

Design Objective

Solar farms consisting of large arrays of ground-mounted photovoltaic systems are becoming increasingly common in North Carolina. Responsible development of solar farms must balance the growth of this valuable industry with the need to protect our natural resources, including addressing issues related to stormwater runoff. Solar farms that use traditional elevated solar panels are unique because they contain an impervious surface (elevated solar panel) that often have a pervious surface (vegetation) underneath the panel. Stormwater management may be achieved in a cost-effective manner by disconnecting rows of solar panels and directing runoff over the vegetated areas between the rows.

Regulatory Requirements

Currently, the State allows solar panels associated with ground-mounted solar farms to be considered pervious if configured such that they promote sheet flow of stormwater from the panels and natural infiltration of stormwater into the ground beneath the panels. Other structures associated with the solar farm such as buildings, entrance roads, transformers, and footings would still be considered impervious.

Important Links

N.C.G.S. 143-214.7(b2): "For purposes of implementing stormwater programs, "built-upon area" means impervious surface and partially impervious surface to the extent that the partially impervious surface does not allow water to infiltrate through the surface and into the subsoil."


RECOMMENDATION 1: AVOID COMPACTION OF SUBSOIL

Subsoil compaction should be minimized during and after installation of solar arrays to allow the maximum amount of natural infiltration. If compaction occurs during construction, subsoil should be tilled and amended to return the soil to its pre-compaction condition.

RECOMMENDATION 2: DISCONNECT RUNOFF FROM SOLAR PANEL ARRAYS

Solar arrays should be designed and installed to allow growth of vegetation under and between the solar arrays. Rows of panels should be installed with sufficient distance between rows to allow for capture of rainfall from at least 1.0 inch of rain (Figure 1). Where installed on slopes greater than 8%, consider options for maintaining sheet flow and dissipating energy at the drip edge of each row of panels.

Figure 1: Disconnection of flow path between solar panels when average slope is less than 8%.



RECOMMENDATION 3: AVOID CONCENTRATION OF STORMWATER

Panels should be positioned to allow stormwater to run off their surfaces; however, collection and concentration of stormwater flow is to be avoided. Arrays should be installed on a uniform plane such that stormwater will sheet-flow off the panels and remain unconcentrated. When considering a potential build site, it's a good idea to consider the slope of the land in the areas of the site where the solar arrays are most likely to be installed. Areas with steep slopes may not be suitable or may require considerable grading.

RECOMMENDATION 4: MINIMIZE USE OF HERBICIDES AND FERTILIZERS

Weed control and vegetation management is particularly important for ground-mounted solar systems. Overuse of herbicides and fertilizers can contribute to degraded water quality. Limit

the use of fertilizers to that necessary to maintain vegetation. Use mowing for vegetation control instead of herbicides.

RECOMMENDATION 5: PLANT MIX OF WARM- & COOL-SEASON GRASSES

Large solar arrays can have the effect of creating microclimates under the panels. To help account for this, plant a mixture of warm-season and cool-season grasses to account for differences in temperature and shading created from the installation of large solar arrays. In addition, use low-growing, low-maintenance grass mixtures. Planting mixtures can also include low-growing wildflowers such as white clover and other types of vegetation that can be attractive to pollinators. A win-win for the grass and the bees!

RECOMMENDATION 6: LIMIT VERTICAL CLEARANCE TO ≤ 10 FEET

Stormwater runoff falling from solar panels can cause scouring and erosion at the driplines. Limiting the lowest vertical clearance to no greater than 10 feet will help prevent erosion and scouring along the dripline.

Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms

Lauren M. Cook, S.M.ASCE¹; and Richard H. McCuen, M.ASCE²

Abstract: Because of the benefits of solar energy, the number of solar farms is increasing; however, their hydrologic impacts have not been studied. The goal of this study was to determine the hydrologic effects of solar farms and examine whether or not storm-water management is needed to control runoff volumes and rates. A model of a solar farm was used to simulate runoff for two conditions: the pre- and postpaneled conditions. Using sensitivity analyses, modeling showed that the solar panels themselves did not have a significant effect on the runoff volumes, peaks, or times to peak. However, if the ground cover under the panels is gravel or bare ground, owing to design decisions or lack of maintenance, the peak discharge may increase significantly with storm-water management needed. In addition, the kinetic energy of the flow that drains from the panels was found to be greater than that of the rainfall, which could cause erosion at the base of the panels. Thus, it is recommended that the grass beneath the panels be well maintained or that a buffer strip be placed after the most downgradient row of panels. This study, along with design recommendations, can be used as a guide for the future design of solar farms. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0000530. © 2013 American Society of Civil Engineers.

CE Database subject headings: Hydrology; Land use; Solar power; Floods; Surface water; Runoff; Stormwater management.

Author keywords: Hydrology; Land use change; Solar energy; Flooding; Surface water runoff; Storm-water management.

Introduction

Storm-water management practices are generally implemented to reverse the effects of land-cover changes that cause increases in volumes and rates of runoff. This is a concern posed for new types of land-cover change such as the solar farm. Solar energy is a renewable energy source that is expected to increase in importance in the near future. Because solar farms require considerable land, it is necessary to understand the design of solar farms and their potential effect on erosion rates and storm runoff, especially the impact on offsite properties and receiving streams. These farms can vary in size from 8 ha (20 acres) in residential areas to 250 ha (600 acres) in areas where land is abundant.

The solar panels are impervious to rain water; however, they are mounted on metal rods and placed over pervious land. In some cases, the area below the panel is paved or covered with gravel. Service roads are generally located between rows of panels. Although some panels are stationary, others are designed to move so that the angle of the panel varies with the angle of the sun. The angle can range, depending on the latitude, from 22° during the summer months to 74° during the winter months. In addition, the angle and direction can also change throughout the day. The issue posed is whether or not these rows of impervious panels will change the runoff characteristics of the site, specifically increase runoff volumes or peak discharge rates. If the increases are hydrologically significant, storm-water management facilities may be needed. Additionally, it is possible that the velocity of water

draining from the edge of the panels is sufficient to cause erosion of the soil below the panels, especially where the maintenance roadways are bare ground.

The outcome of this study provides guidance for assessing the hydrologic effects of solar farms, which is important to those who plan, design, and install arrays of solar panels. Those who design solar farms may need to provide for storm-water management. This study investigated the hydrologic effects of solar farms, assessed whether or not storm-water management might be needed, and if the velocity of the runoff from the panels could be sufficient to cause erosion of the soil below the panels.

Model Development

Solar farms are generally designed to maximize the amount of energy produced per unit of land area, while still allowing space for maintenance. The hydrologic response of solar farms is not usually considered in design. Typically, the panels will be arrayed in long rows with separations between the rows to allow for maintenance vehicles. To model a typical layout, a unit width of one panel was assumed; with the length of the downgradient strip depending on the size of the farm. For example, a solar farm with 30 rows of 200 panels each could be modeled as a strip of 30 panels with space between the panels for maintenance vehicles. Rainwater that drains from the upper panel onto the ground will flow over the land under the 29 panels on the downgradient strip. Depending on the land cover, infiltration losses would be expected as the runoff flows to the bottom of the slope.

To determine the effects that the solar panels have on runoff characteristics, a model of a solar farm was developed. Runoff in the form of sheet flow without the addition of the solar panels served as the prepaneled condition. The paneled condition assumed a downgradient series of cells with one solar panel per ground cell. Each cell was separated into three sections: wet, dry, and spacer.

The dry section is that portion directly underneath the solar panel, unexposed directly to the rainfall. As the angle of the panel from the horizontal increases, more of the rain will fall directly onto

¹Research Assistant, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-3021.

²The Ben Dyer Professor, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-3021 (corresponding author). E-mail: rhmccuen@eng.umd.edu

Note. This manuscript was submitted on August 12, 2010; approved on October 20, 2011; published online on October 24, 2011. Discussion period open until October 1, 2013; separate discussions must be submitted for individual papers. This paper is part of the *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, Vol. 18, No. 5, May 1, 2013. © ASCE, ISSN 1084-0699/2013/5-536-541/\$25.00.

the ground; this section of the cell is referred to as the wet section. The spacer section is the area between the rows of panels used by maintenance vehicles. Fig. 1 is an image of two solar panels and the spacer section allotted for maintenance vehicles. Fig. 2 is a schematic of the wet, dry, and spacer sections with their respective dimensions. In Fig. 1, tracks from the vehicles are visible on what is modeled within as the spacer section. When the solar panel is horizontal, then the length longitudinal to the direction that runoff will occur is the length of the dry and wet sections combined. Runoff from a dry section drains onto the downgradient spacer section. Runoff from the spacer section flows to the wet section of the next downgradient cell. Water that drains from a solar panel falls directly onto the spacer section of that cell.

The length of the spacer section is constant. During a storm event, the loss rate was assumed constant for the 24-h storm because a wet antecedent condition was assumed. The lengths of the wet and dry sections changed depending on the angle of the solar panel. The total length of the wet and dry sections was set




Fig. 1. Maintenance or "spacer" section between two rows of solar panels (photo by John E. Showler, reprinted with permission)




Fig. 2. Wet, dry, and spacer sections of a single cell with lengths L_w , L_s , and L_d with the solar panel covering the dry section

equal to the length of one horizontal solar panel, which was assumed to be 3.5 m. When a solar panel is horizontal, the dry section length would equal 3.5 m and the wet section length would be zero. In the paneled condition, the dry section does not receive direct rainfall because the rain first falls onto the solar panel then drains onto the spacer section. However, the dry section does infiltrate some of the runoff that comes from the upgradient wet section. The wet section was modeled similar to the spacer section with rain falling directly onto the section and assuming a constant loss rate.

For the presolar panel condition, the spacer and wet sections are modeled the same as in the paneled condition; however, the cell does not include a dry section. In the prepaneled condition, rain falls directly onto the entire cell. When modeling the prepaneled condition, all cells receive rainfall at the same rate and are subject to losses. All other conditions were assumed to remain the same such that the prepaneled and paneled conditions can be compared.

Rainfall was modeled after a natural resources conservation service (NRCS) Type II Storm (McCuen 2005) because it is an accurate representation of actual storms of varying characteristics that are imbedded in intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves. For each duration of interest, a dimensionless hyetograph was developed using a time increment of 12 s over the duration of the storm (see Fig. 3). The depth of rainfall that corresponds to each storm magnitude was then multiplied by the dimensionless hyetograph. For a 2-h storm duration, depths of 40.6, 76.2, and 101.6 mm were used for the 2-, 25-, and 100-year events. The 2- and 6-h duration hyetographs were developed using the center portion of the 24-h storm, with the rainfall depths established with the Baltimore IDF curve. The corresponding depths for a 6-h duration were 53.3, 106.7, and 132.1 mm, respectively. These magnitudes were chosen to give a range of storm conditions.

During each time increment, the depth of rain is multiplied by the cell area to determine the volume of rain added to each section of each cell. This volume becomes the storage in each cell. Depending on the soil group, a constant volume of losses was subtracted from the storage. The runoff velocity from a solar panel was calculated using Manning's equation, with the hydraulic radius for sheet flow assumed to equal the depth of the storage on the panel (Bedient and Huber 2002). Similar assumptions were made to compute the velocities in each section of the surface sections.




Fig. 3. Dimensionless hyetograph of 2-h Type II storm

Runoff from one section to the next and then to the next downgradient cell was routed using the continuity of mass. The routing coefficient depended on the depth of flow in storage and the velocity of runoff. Flow was routed from the wet section to the dry section to the spacer section, with flow from the spacer section draining to the wet section of the next cell. Flow from the most downgradient cell was assumed to be the outflow. Discharge rates and volumes from the most downgradient cell were used for comparisons between the prepaneled and paneled conditions.

Alternative Model Scenarios

To assess the effects of the different variables, a section of 30 cells, each with a solar panel, was assumed for the base model. Each cell was separated individually into wet, dry, and spacer sections. The area had a total ground length of 225 m with a ground slope of 1% and width of 5 m, which was the width of an average solar panel. The roughness coefficient (Engman 1986) for the silicon solar panel was assumed to be that of glass, 0.01. Roughness coefficients of 0.15 for grass and 0.02 for bare ground were also assumed. Loss rates of 0.5715 cm/h (0.225 in./h) and 0.254 cm/h (0.1 in./h) for B and C soils, respectively, were assumed.

The prepaneled condition using the 2-h, 25-year rainfall was assumed for the base condition, with each cell assumed to have a good grass cover condition. All other analyses were made assuming a paneled condition. For most scenarios, the runoff volumes and peak discharge rates from the paneled model were not significantly greater than those for the prepaneled condition. Over a total length of 225 m with 30 solar panels, the runoff increased by 0.26 m³, which was a difference of only 0.35%. The slight increase in runoff volume reflects the slightly higher velocities for the paneled condition. The peak discharge increased by 0.0013 m³, a change of only 0.31%. The time to peak was delayed by one time increment, i.e., 12 s. Inclusion of the panels did not have a significant hydrologic impact.

Storm Magnitude

The effect of storm magnitude was investigated by changing the magnitude from a 25-year storm to a 2-year storm. For the 2-year storm, the rainfall and runoff volumes decreased by approximately 50%. However, the runoff from the paneled watershed condition increased compared to the prepaneled condition by approximately the same volume as for the 25-year analysis, 0.26 m³. This increase represents only a 0.78% increase in volume. The peak discharge and the time to peak did not change significantly. These results reflect runoff from a good grass cover condition and indicated that the general conclusion of very minimal impacts was the same for different storm magnitudes.

Ground Slope

The effect of the downgradient ground slope of the solar farm was also examined. The angle of the solar panels would influence the velocity of flows from the panels. As the ground slope was increased, the velocity of flow over the ground surface would be closer to that on the panels. This could cause an overall increase in discharge rates. The ground slope was changed from 1 to 5%, with all other conditions remaining the same as the base conditions.

With the steeper incline, the volume of losses decreased from that for the 1% slope, which is to be expected because the faster velocity of the runoff would provide less opportunity for infiltration. However, between the prepaneled and paneled conditions, the increase in runoff volume was less than 1%. The peak discharge

and the time to peak did not change. Therefore, the greater ground slope did not significantly influence the response of the solar farm.

Soil Type

The effect of soil type on the runoff was also examined. The soil group was changed from B soil to C soil by varying the loss rate. As expected, owing to the higher loss rate for the C soil, the depths of runoff increased by approximately 7.5% with the C soil when compared with the volume for B soils. However, the runoff volume for the C soil condition only increased by 0.17% from the prepaneled condition to the paneled condition. In comparison with the B soil, a difference of 0.35% in volume resulted between the two conditions. Therefore, the soil group influenced the actual volumes and rates, but not the relative effect of the paneled condition when compared to the prepaneled condition.

Panel Angle

Because runoff velocities increase with slope, the effect of the angle of the solar panel on the hydrologic response was examined. Analyses were made for angles of 30° and 70° to test an average range from winter to summer. The hydrologic response for these angles was compared to that of the base condition angle of 45°. The other site conditions remained the same. The analyses showed that the angle of the panel had only a slight effect on runoff volumes and discharge rates. The lower angle of 30° was associated with an increased runoff volume, whereas the runoff volume decreased for the steeper angle of 70° when compared with the base condition of 45°. However, the differences (~0.5%) were very slight. Nevertheless, these results indicate that, when the solar panel was closer to horizontal, i.e., at a lower angle, a larger difference in runoff volume occurred between the prepaneled and paneled conditions. These differences in the response result are from differences in loss rates.

The peak discharge was also lower at the lower angle. At an angle of 30°, the peak discharge was slightly lower than at the higher angle of 70°. For the 2-h storm duration, the time to peak of the 30° angle was 2 min delayed from the time to peak of when the panel was positioned at a 70° angle, which reflects the longer travel times across the solar panels.

Storm Duration

To assess the effect of storm duration, analyses were made for 6-h storms, testing magnitudes for 2-, 25-, and 100-year return periods, with the results compared with those for the 2-h rainfall events. The longer storm duration was tested to determine whether a longer duration storm would produce a different ratio of increase in runoff between the prepaneled and paneled conditions. When compared to runoff volumes from the 2-h storm, those for the 6-h storm were 34% greater in both the paneled and prepaneled cases. However, when comparing the prepaneled to the paneled condition, the increase in the runoff volume with the 6-h storm was less than 1% regardless of the return period. The peak discharge and the time-to-peak did not differ significantly between the two conditions. The trends in the hydrologic response of the solar farm did not vary with storm duration.

Ground Cover

The ground cover under the panels was assumed to be a native grass that received little maintenance. For some solar farms, the area beneath the panel is covered in gravel or partially paved because the panels prevent the grass from receiving sunlight. Depending on the

volume of traffic, the spacer cell could be grass, patches of grass, or bare ground. Thus, it was necessary to determine whether or not these alternative ground-cover conditions would affect the runoff characteristics. This was accomplished by changing the Manning's n for the ground beneath the panels. The value of n under the panels, i.e., the dry section, was set to 0.015 for gravel, with the value for the spacer or maintenance section set to 0.02, i.e., bare ground. These can be compared to the base condition of a native grass ($n = 0.15$). A good cover should promote losses and delay the runoff.

For the smoother surfaces, the velocity of the runoff increased and the losses decreased, which resulted in increasing runoff volumes. This occurred both when the ground cover under the panels was changed to gravel and when the cover in the spacer section was changed to bare ground. Owing to the higher velocities of the flow, runoff rates from the cells increased significantly such that it was necessary to reduce the computational time increment. Fig. 4(a) shows the hydrograph from a 30-panel area with a time increment of 12 s. With a time increment of 12 s, the water in each cell is discharged at the end of every time increment, which results in no attenuation of the flow; thus, the undulations shown in Fig. 4(a) result. The time increment was reduced to 3 s for the 2-h storm, which resulted in watershed smoothing and a rational hydrograph shape [Fig. 4(b)]. The results showed that the storm runoff





Fig. 4. Hydrograph with time increment of (a) 12 s; (b) 3 s with Manning's n for bare ground

increased by 7% from the grass-covered scenario to the scenario with gravel under the panel. The peak discharge increased by 73% for the gravel ground cover when compared with the grass cover without the panels. The time to peak was 10 min less with the gravel than with the grass, which reflects the effect of differences in surface roughness and the resulting velocities.

If maintenance vehicles used the spacer section regularly and the grass cover was not adequately maintained, the soil in the spacer section would be compacted and potentially the runoff volumes and rates would increase. Grass that is not maintained has the potential to become patchy and turn to bare ground. The grass under the panel may not get enough sunlight and die. Fig. 1 shows the result of the maintenance trucks frequently driving in the spacer section, which diminished the grass cover.

The effect of the lack of solar farm maintenance on runoff characteristics was modeled by changing the Manning's n to a value of 0.02 for bare ground. In this scenario, the roughness coefficient for the ground under the panels, i.e., the dry section, as well as in the spacer cell was changed from grass covered to bare ground ($n = 0.02$). The effects were nearly identical to that of the gravel. The runoff volume increased by 7% from the grass-covered to the bare-ground condition. The peak discharge increased by 72% when compared with the grass-covered condition. The runoff for the bare-ground condition also resulted in an earlier time to peak by approximately 10 min. Two other conditions were also modeled, showing similar results. In the first scenario, gravel was placed directly under the panel, and healthy grass was placed in the spacer section, which mimics a possible design decision. Under these conditions, the peak discharge increased by 42%, and the volume of runoff increased by 4%, which suggests that storm-water management would be necessary if gravel is placed anywhere.

Fig. 5 shows two solar panels from a solar farm in New Jersey. The bare ground between the panels can cause increased runoff rates and reductions in time of concentration, both of which could necessitate storm-water management. The final condition modeled involved the assumption of healthy grass beneath the panels and bare ground in the spacer section, which would simulate the condition of unmaintained grass resulting from vehicles that drive over the spacer section. Because the spacer section is 53% of the cell, the change in land cover to bare ground would reduce losses and decrease runoff travel times, which would cause runoff to amass as it




Fig. 5. Site showing the initiation of bare ground below the panels, which increases the potential for erosion (photo by John Showler, reprinted with permission)

moves downgradient. With the spacer section as bare ground, the peak discharge increased by 100%, which reflected the increases in volume and decrease in timing. These results illustrate the need for maintenance of the grass below and between the panels.

Design Suggestions

With well-maintained grass underneath the panels, the solar panels themselves do not have much effect on total volumes of the runoff or peak discharge rates. Although the panels are impervious, the rainwater that drains from the panels appears as runoff over the downgradient cells. Some of the runoff infiltrates. If the grass cover of a solar farm is not maintained, it can deteriorate either because of a lack of sunlight or maintenance vehicle traffic. In this case, the runoff characteristics can change significantly with both runoff rates and volumes increasing by significant amounts. In addition, if gravel or pavement is placed underneath the panels, this can also contribute to a significant increase in the hydrologic response.

If bare ground is foreseen to be a problem or gravel is to be placed under the panels to prevent erosion, it is necessary to counteract the excess runoff using some form of storm-water management. A simple practice that can be implemented is a buffer strip (Dabney et al. 2006) at the downgradient end of the solar farm. The buffer strip length must be sufficient to return the runoff characteristics with the panels to those of runoff experienced before the gravel and panels were installed. Alternatively, a detention basin can be installed.

A buffer strip was modeled along with the panels. For approximately every 200 m of panels, or 29 cells, the buffer must be 5 cells long (or 35 m) to reduce the runoff volume to that which occurred before the panels were added. Even if a gravel base is not placed under the panels, the inclusion of a buffer strip may be a good practice when grass maintenance is not a top funding priority. Fig. 6 shows the peak discharge from the graveled surface versus the length of the buffer needed to keep the discharge to prepaneled peak rate.

Water draining from a solar panel can increase the potential for erosion of the spacer section. If the spacer section is bare ground, the high kinetic energy of water draining from the panel can cause soil detachment and transport (Garde and Raju 1977; Beuselinck et al. 2002). The amount and risk of erosion was modeled using the velocity of water coming off a solar panel compared with the velocity and intensity of the rainwater. The velocity of panel




Fig. 6. Peak discharge over gravel compared with buffer length

runoff was calculated using Manning's equation, and the velocity of falling rainwater was calculated using the following:

$$V_r = 120 d_r^{0.35} \quad (1)$$

where d_r = diameter of a raindrop, assumed to be 1 mm. The relationship between kinetic energy and rainfall intensity is

$$K_e = 916 + 330 \log_{10} i \quad (2)$$

where i = rainfall intensity (in./h) and K_e = kinetic energy (ft-tons per ac-in. of rain) of rain falling onto the wet section and the panel, as well as the water flowing off of the end of the panel (Wischmeier and Smith 1978). The kinetic energy (Salles et al. 2002) of the rainfall was greater than that coming off the panel, but the area under the panel (i.e., the product of the length, width, and cosine of the panel angle) is greater than the area under the edge of the panel where the water drains from the panel onto the ground. Thus, dividing the kinetic energy by the respective areas gives a more accurate representation of the kinetic energy experienced by the soil. The energy of the water draining from the panel onto the ground can be nearly 10 times greater than the rain itself falling onto the ground area. If the solar panel runoff falls onto an unsealed soil, considerable detachment can result (Motha et al. 2004). Thus, because of the increased kinetic energy, it is possible that the soil is much more prone to erosion with the panels than without. Where panels are installed, methods of erosion control should be included in the design.

Conclusions

Solar farms are the energy generators of the future; thus, it is important to determine the environmental and hydrologic effects of these farms, both existing and proposed. A model was created to simulate storm-water runoff over a land surface without panels and then with solar panels added. Various sensitivity analyses were conducted including changing the storm duration and volume, soil type, ground slope, panel angle, and ground cover to determine the effect that each of these factors would have on the volumes and peak discharge rates of the runoff.

The addition of solar panels over a grassy field does not have much of an effect on the volume of runoff, the peak discharge, nor the time to peak. With each analysis, the runoff volume increased slightly but not enough to require storm-water management facilities. However, when the land-cover type was changed under the panels, the hydrologic response changed significantly. When gravel or pavement was placed under the panels, with the spacer section left as patchy grass or bare ground, the volume of the runoff increased significantly and the peak discharge increased by approximately 100%. This was also the result when the entire cell was assumed to be bare ground.

The potential for erosion of the soil at the base of the solar panels was also studied. It was determined that the kinetic energy of the water draining from the solar panel could be as much as 10 times greater than that of rainfall. Thus, because the energy of the water draining from the panels is much higher, it is very possible that soil below the base of the solar panel could erode owing to the concentrated flow of water off the panel, especially if there is bare ground in the spacer section of the cell. If necessary, erosion control methods should be used.

Bare ground beneath the panels and in the spacer section is a realistic possibility (see Figs. 1 and 5). Thus, a good, well-maintained grass cover beneath the panels and in the spacer section is highly recommended. If gravel, pavement, or bare ground is

deemed unavoidable below the panels or in the spacer section, it may necessary to add a buffer section to control the excess runoff volume and ensure adequate losses. If these simple measures are taken, solar farms will not have an adverse hydrologic impact from excess runoff or contribute eroded soil particles to receiving streams and waterways.

Acknowledgments

The authors appreciate the photographs (Figs. 1 and 5) of Ortho Clinical Diagnostics, 1001 Route 202, North Raritan, New Jersey, 08869, provided by John E. Showler, Environmental Scientist, New Jersey Department of Agriculture. The extensive comments of reviewers resulted in an improved paper.

References

- Bedient, P. B., and Huber, W. C. (2002). *Hydrology and floodplain analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Beuselinck, L., Govers, G., Hairsine, P. B., Sander, G. C., and Breynart, M. (2002). "The influence of rainfall on sediment transport by overland flow over areas of net deposition." *J. Hydrol.*, 257(1-4), 145-163.
- Dabney, S. M., Moore, M. T., and Locke, M. A. (2006). "Integrated management of in-field, edge-of-field, and after-field buffers." *J. Amer. Water Resour. Assoc.*, 42(1), 15-24.
- Engman, E. T. (1986). "Roughness coefficients for routing surface runoff." *J. Irrig. Drain. Eng.*, 112(1), 39-53.
- Garde, R. I., and Raju, K. G. (1977). *Mechanics of sediment transportation and alluvial stream problems*, Wiley, New York.
- McCuen, R. H. (2005). *Hydrologic analysis and design*, 3rd Ed., Pearson/Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B., and Grayson, R. B. (2004). "Unsealed roads as suspended sediment sources in agricultural catchment in south-eastern Australia." *J. Hydrol.*, 286(1-4), 1-18.
- Salles, C., Poesen, J., and Sempere-Torres, D. (2002). "Kinetic energy of rain and its functional relationship with intensity." *J. Hydrol.*, 257(1-4), 256-270.
- Wischmeier, W. H., and Smith, D. D. (1978). *Predicting rainfall erosion losses: A guide to conservation planning*, USDA Handbook 537, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

I/A

Agents Copy

OFFICIAL COPY

Feb 16 2018

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION | | N.C. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | |
| Driveway Permit No. | Date of Application | STREET AND DRIVEWAY ACCESS PERMIT APPLICATION | |
| County: Beaufort County | RECEIVED AUG 4 2017 | | |
| Development Name: Wilkinson Solar Farm | | LOCATION OF PROPERTY: | |
| Route/Road: Terra Cela Road | | SR 161C | |
| Exact Distance 2,300 | <input type="checkbox"/> Miles | N | S |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Feet | <input type="checkbox"/> E | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> W |
| From the Intersection of Route No. Terra Cela Road and Route No. Christian School Road Toward Vreugdenhil Road | | | |
| Property Will Be Used For: <input type="checkbox"/> Residential /Subdivision <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Facilities <input type="checkbox"/> TND <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Services <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| Property: <input type="checkbox"/> Is <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is not within Pantego City Zoning Area. | | | |
| AGREEMENT | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I, the undersigned property owner, request access and permission to construct driveway(s) or street(s) on public right-of-way at the above location. • I agree to construct and maintain driveway(s) or street entrance(s) in absolute conformance with the current "Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways" as adopted by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. • I agree that no signs or objects will be placed on or over the public right-of-way other than those approved by NCDOT. • I agree that the driveway(s) or street(s) will be constructed as shown on the attached plans. • I agree that that driveway(s) or street(s) as used in this agreement include any approach tapers, storage lanes or speed change lanes as deemed necessary. • I agree that if any future Improvements to the roadway become necessary, the portion of driveway(s) or street(s) located on public right-of-way will be considered the property of the North Carolina Department of Transportation, and I will not be entitled to reimbursement or have any claim for present expenditures for driveway or street construction. • I agree that this permit becomes void if construction of driveway(s) or street(s) is not completed within the time specified by the "Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways". • I agree to pay a \$50 construction inspection fee. Make checks payable to NCDOT. This fee will be reimbursed if application is denied. • I agree to construct and maintain the driveway(s) or street(s) in a safe manner so as not to interfere with or endanger the public travel. • I agree to provide during and following construction proper signs, signal lights, flaggers and other warning devices for the protection of traffic in conformance with the current "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" and Amendments or Supplements thereto. Information as to the above rules and regulations may be obtained from the District Engineer. • I agree to indemnify and save harmless the North Carolina Department of Transportation from all damages and claims for damage that may arise by reason of this construction. • I agree that the North Carolina Department of Transportation will assume no responsibility for any damages that may be caused to such facilities, within the highway right-of-way limits, in carrying out its construction. • I agree to provide a Performance and Indemnity Bond in the amount specified by the Division of Highways for any construction proposed on the State Highway system. • The granting of this permit is subject to the regulatory powers of the NC Department of Transportation as provided by law and as set forth in the N.C. Policy on Driveways and shall not be construed as a contract access point. • I agree that the entire cost of constructing and maintaining an approved private street or driveway access connection and conditions of this permit will be borne by the property owner, the applicant, and their grantees, successors, and assignees. • I AGREE TO NOTIFY THE DISTRICT ENGINEER WHEN THE PROPOSED WORK BEGINS AND WHEN IT IS COMPLETED. | | | |
| | | <p>Prior to beginning work contact Gene Pittman at (252) 946-3689</p> | |
| 2004-07 | NOTE: Submit Four Copies of Application to Local District Engineer | | i-04rev. |
| | 61-03419 | | |

SIGNATURES OF APPLICANT

| PROPERTY OWNER (APPLICANT) | | WITNESS | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------|-------|
| COMPANY | <u>Theda Cooper Sawyer (aka Theda S. Stallings)</u> | NAME | _____ |
| SIGNATURE | _____ | SIGNATURE | _____ |
| ADDRESS | <u>498 Vickers Road</u> | ADDRESS | _____ |
| | <u>Chapel Hill, NC 27517 Phone No. 919-593-5750</u> | | _____ |

| AUTHORIZED AGENT | | WITNESS | |
|------------------|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| COMPANY | <u>Wilkinson Solar LLC</u> | NAME | <u>Ryan Upham</u> |
| SIGNATURE | <u>[Signature]</u> | SIGNATURE | <u>[Signature]</u> |
| ADDRESS | <u>1 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 1800</u> | ADDRESS | <u>2621 Ivory Run Way, Apt 102,</u> |
| | <u>Chicago, IL 60606 Phone No. 312-582-1208</u> | | <u>Raleigh, NC, 27603</u> |

APPROVALS

APPLICATION RECEIVED BY DISTRICT ENGINEER

Mary Beth Houston _____ DATE 2/4/17

SIGNATURE DATE

APPLICATION APPROVED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY (when required)

_____ TITLE _____ DATE _____

SIGNATURE TITLE DATE

APPLICATION APPROVED BY NCDOT

Mary Beth Houston _____ DATE 10/4/17

SIGNATURE TITLE DATE

INSPECTION BY NCDOT

_____ TITLE _____ DATE _____

SIGNATURE TITLE DATE

COMMENTS:

Agents Copy

OFFICIAL COPY
Feb 16 2018

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|
| APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION | | N.C. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | |
| Driveway Permit No. | Date of Application | August 4, 2017 | |
| County: Beaufort County | | STREET AND DRIVEWAY ACCESS PERMIT APPLICATION | |
| Development Name: Wilkinson Solar Farm | | AUG 4 2017 | |
| LOCATION OF PROPERTY | | | |
| Route/Road: | Lovlick Lane | SR 1613 | |
| Exact Distance | 295 | <input type="checkbox"/> Miles | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Feet |
| From the intersection of Route No. Lovlick Lane | | and Route No. Terra Cela Road Toward Old 97 Road | |
| Property Will Be Used For: <input type="checkbox"/> Residential /Subdivision <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Facilities <input type="checkbox"/> TND <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Services <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| Property: <input type="checkbox"/> is <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not within Pantego City Zoning Area. | | | |

AGREEMENT

- I, the undersigned property owner, request access and permission to construct driveway(s) or street(s) on public right-of-way at the above location.
- I agree to construct and maintain driveway(s) or street entrance(s) in absolute conformance with the current "Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways" as adopted by the North Carolina Department of Transportation.
- I agree that no signs or objects will be placed on or over the public right-of-way other than those approved by NCDOT.
- I agree that the driveway(s) or street(s) will be constructed as shown on the attached plans.
- I agree that that driveway(s) or street(s) as used in this agreement include any approach tapers, storage lanes or speed change lanes as deemed necessary.
- I agree that if any future improvements to the roadway become necessary, the portion of driveway(s) or street(s) located on public right-of-way will be considered the property of the North Carolina Department of Transportation, and I will not be entitled to reimbursement or have any claim for present expenditures for driveway or street construction.
- I agree that this permit becomes void if construction of driveway(s) or street(s) is not completed within the time specified by the "Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways".
- I agree to pay a \$50 construction inspection fee. Make checks payable to NCDOT. This fee will be reimbursed if application is denied.
- I agree to construct and maintain the driveway(s) or street(s) in a safe manner so as not to interfere with or endanger the public travel.
- I agree to provide during and following construction proper signs, signal lights, flaggers and other warning devices for the protection of traffic in conformance with the current "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" and Amendments or Supplements thereto. Information as to the above rules and regulations may be obtained from the District Engineer.
- I agree to indemnify and save harmless the North Carolina Department of Transportation from all damages and claims for damage that may arise by reason of this construction.
- I agree that the North Carolina Department of Transportation will assume no responsibility for any damages that may be caused to such facilities, within the highway right-of-way limits, in carrying out its construction.
- I agree to provide a Performance and Indemnity Bond in the amount specified by the Division of Highways for any construction proposed on the State Highway system.
- The granting of this permit is subject to the regulatory powers of the NC Department of Transportation as provided by law and as set forth in the N.C. Policy on Driveways and shall not be construed as a contract access point.
- I agree that the entire cost of constructing and maintaining an approved private street or driveway access connection and conditions of this permit will be borne by the property owner, the applicant, and their grantees, successors, and assignees.
- **I AGREE TO NOTIFY THE DISTRICT ENGINEER WHEN THE PROPOSED WORK BEGINS AND WHEN IT IS COMPLETED.**

Prior to beginning work contact Gene Pittman at (252) 946-3689

2004-07 NOTE: Submit Four Copies of Application to Local District Engineer, N.C. 61-03419

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION
APPEARANCE SLIP

DATE 4/11/18
DOCKET #: EnR-93
NAME OF ATTORNEY Henry Campen
TITLE Partner
FIRM NAME Parker Pie
ADDRESS 301 Fayetteville St
CITY D.C.
ZIP _____

APPEARING FOR: Wilkinson Solar

APPLICANT COMPLAINANT _____ INTERVENOR R _____
PROTESTANT _____ RESPONDENT _____ DEFENDANT _____

PLEASE NOTE: Electronic Copies of the regular transcript can be obtained from the NCUC website at [HTTP://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html](http://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html) under the respective docket number.

There will be a charge of \$5.00 for each emailed copy of transcript.


Please check for an electronic copy of the transcript.

1 # of Copies

Email: henrycampen@parkerpie.com
(Required for distribution)

Please check for the confidential portion of the transcript, only if a confidentiality agreement has been signed.

1 # of Copies

Signature: 
(Required for distribution)

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION
APPEARANCE SLIP

DATE 4/11/18
DOCKET #: EMP-93, Sub 0
NAME OF ATTORNEY Melrick Parrott
TITLE Attorney
FIRM NAME Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein LLP
ADDRESS 301 Fayetteville St., Ste. 1400
CITY Raleigh
ZIP 27601

APPEARING FOR: Wilkinson Solar LLC

APPLICANT COMPLAINANT _____ INTERVENOR R _____
PROTESTANT _____ RESPONDENT _____ DEFENDANT _____

PLEASE NOTE: Electronic Copies of the regular transcript can be obtained from the NCUC website at [HTTP://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html](http://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html) under the respective docket number.

There will be a charge of \$5.00 for each emailed copy of transcript.

Please check for an electronic copy of the transcript.
____ # of Copies

Email: _____
(Required for distribution)

Please check for the confidential portion of the transcript, only if a confidentiality agreement has been signed.
____ # of Copies

Signature: _____
(Required for distribution)

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION
APPEARANCE SLIP

DATE 4/11/2018
DOCKET #: EMP-93 sub D
NAME OF ATTORNEY Brady Allen and Britton Allen
TITLE attorney
FIRM NAME Allen Law Offices, PLLC
ADDRESS 1514 Glenwood Ave Suite 200
CITY Raleigh, NC
ZIP 27608

APPEARING FOR: Marshall & Joann Lilles & Deb
Van Staal/duinen

APPLICANT _____ COMPLAINANT _____ INTERVENOR
PROTESTANT _____ RESPONDENT _____ DEFENDANT _____

PLEASE NOTE: Electronic Copies of the regular transcript can be obtained from the NCUC website at [HTTP://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksr_ch.html](http://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksr_ch.html) under the respective docket number.

There will be a charge of \$5.00 for each emailed copy of transcript.

Please check for an electronic copy of the transcript.
____ # of Copies

Email: _____
(Required for distribution)

Please check for the confidential portion of the transcript, only if a confidentiality agreement has been signed.
____ # of Copies

Signature: _____
(Required for distribution)

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION
PUBLIC STAFF - APPEARANCE SLIP

DATE April 11, 2018 DOCKET #: EMP-93, Sub 0

PUBLIC STAFF MEMBER Dianna W. Downey

ORDER FOR TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY TO BE **EMAILED** TO THE PUBLIC STAFF - PLEASE INDICATE YOUR DIVISION AS WELL AS YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS BELOW:

ACCOUNTING _____

WATER _____

COMMUNICATIONS _____

ELECTRIC _____

GAS _____

TRANSPORTATION _____

ECONOMICS _____


LEGAL dianna.downey@psncuc.nc.gov

CONSUMER SERVICES _____

PLEASE NOTE: Electronic Copies of the regular transcript can be obtained from the NCUC web site at [HTTP://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html](http://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html) under the respective docket number.

_____ Number of copies of confidential portion of regular transcript (assuming a confidentiality agreement has been signed). Confidential pages will still be received in paper copies.

***PLEASE INDICATE BELOW WHO HAS SIGNED A CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT. IF YOU DO NOT SIGN, YOU WILL NOT RECEIVE THE CONFIDENTIAL PORTIONS!!!!



Signature of Public Staff Member