PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO Consumer Service Division Memorandum

CASE ID: 00221822

COMPANY:

CUSTOMER: Kraig Lease

ADDRESS: , ,

SERVICE ADDRESS:,,

AIQ: NON-JURISDICTIONAL

NIQ:

DOCKETING CASE #: 18-0488-EL-BGN

SUBJECT: Seneca Wind LLC - Regarding PUCO

Please docket the following comments in the case number above.

Hi I oppose all Industrial wind turbines in Seneca County! They have no place in rural Seneca County

Please file this email and the attachments in case number 18-0488-EL-BGN.

From: Charles Groth [mailto:cpgroth@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 6:04 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB < contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>

Subject: 18-0488-EL-BGN: Seneca Wind Farm

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed Seneca Wind turbine project.

My wife and I purchased our 1840's stone house in the middle of a peaceful, quiet, and picturesque section of Seneca County in 2009. Surrounded by farm land, trees, and a creek, our home is a truly relaxing and peaceful refuge, and a life-long dream come true for my wife. Our children are free to play outside, with only the sound of birds chirping and the knocking of the wood pecker tapping in the trees. Our house is located on a quiet road with little traffic. We enjoy opening the windows in the evening to let in the cool night air. Ours is the middle of three properties in a row all identified by the Ohio Historic Inventory as being eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The attached OHI listings for these properties state that this entire area is eligible for historic district status as shown in boxes 12 and 14. We have spent countless hours in the process of restoring our property, and were recognized by the Tiffin Historic Trust with a historic preservation award in 2013.

So much of what we chose this property for will be lost if this project is allowed to be built. No longer will we have the quiet countryside, but the sound of rotating turbines. Our starry night skies will become a sea of blinking red lights. Our property has also been home to a large colony of bats for at least the last 50 years. The effects of the turbines will be devastating for these creatures that are as much a part of the property as our house. We will effectively be thrust out of a rural historic landscape and dropped in the middle of industrial factories that tower in the sky. Our quiet setting will be replaced by heavy machinery tearing up our surroundings, leaving behind industrial machines standing 648 feet at full height, making them the 5th largest buildings in the state of Ohio. While a few will receive compensation for hosting them on their lands, the rest of us will be paying the cost. We will pay with the cost of effects that the wind company have required lease holders to waive rights upon which to sue, such as noise pollution, infrasound, shadow flicker, destruction of wildlife, and decreased home values.

I worry particularly about the safety of my family and property should these industrial machines be installed. We are not permitted to see any information that can objectively tell us what is a safe distance from these turbines as they are hidden behind "trade secrets". The purpose of the government is to protect citizens, which cannot be accomplished when such vital information is withheld. The only reference we have available is a manual that was submitted for the Greenwich wind project on 3-22-16, which Vestas recommends 1300 feet between turbines and people, and Nordex micro siting guide says there should be at least 1640 feet. Those turbines are significantly smaller than the proposed 648 feet models. It is only logical to believe that as they have grown taller, that distance could not be anything but much

farther, however, as of the documents submitted by July 16 show, the Seneca Wind project would average ONLY 1180 FEET! This is fundamentally unsafe for all involved!

As years have passed, the truth about these projects becomes clearer and clearer. The people who would be most affected by these machines have resoundingly responded that we do not want them in our county. The growth and collective voice here in Seneca County is evidence. There are even a growing number of lease holders and "good neighbors" that now regret their decision to participate and now want this project put to a halt. I urge you to respect our petition and deny this application.

Charles Groth	
Bloom Township	

Ohio Historic Preservation Office Ohio Historical Center Columbus, Ohio 43211

OHIO HISTORIC IN	VENTORY VENTORY	Ohio Historic Preservation Office Ohio Historical Center Columbus, Ohio 43211	
	esent Name(s) Huddle, Benjamin, House	River A	SEN-1
Seneca 5. O 3. Location of Negatives Heidelberg College	her Name(s)	SCANNED	SEN-1078-16
6. Specific Location 7240 S. CR 43, Section 30	16. Thematic Category C, I 17. Date(s) or Period	28. No. of Stories 21/5 29. Basement? Yes ⊠	ν _ε :
7. City or Town If Rural, Township & Vicinit	ca. 1830	partial in back No D 30. Foundation Material stone	Seveca
Bloom Twp.,vic.Bloomvill 8. Site Plan with North Arrow		31. Wall Construction	
3miles Imile	20. Contractor or Builder	32. Roof Type & Material gable/slate 33. No. of Bays	ļ.,
·	21. Original Use, if apparent residential 22. Present Use	Front 2 Side 4 34. Wall Treatment hewed log	
C.R. 43	23. Ownership Public	35. Plan Shape rectangular 36. Changes Addition ☑	五
Coordinates Lat. Long.	Private ⊠ 24. Owner's Name & Address, if known Harry Hoffert	(Explain Altered 🖟 in #42) Moved 🗇	HUDDLE, K
U.T.M. Reference 1 7 3 2 6 9 3 0 4 5 4 2 7 7 0	7240 S. CR 43 Bloomville, OH 44818	Interior_ Exterior_good	Benjamin,
Zone Easting Northing 10. Site □ Structure □ Building ☆ Object □		38. Preservation Yes ☐ Underway? No ☒ 39. Endangered? Yes ☐	
11. On National Yes ☐ 12. Is It Yes ☐ Register? No ☒ Eligible? No ☐	. 27. Other Surveys in Which Included	By What? No 豆	House
13. Part of Estab. Yes ☐ Hist. Dist.? No ☑ 14. District Yes ☑ Potent'l? No ☐ 15. Name of Established District		40. Visible from Yes ☐ No 및 41. Distance from and	
		Frontage on Road	
42. Further Description of Important Features Constructed with steeple notching, the log structure was originally covered with siding; vergeboard was added later along the gable; 6/6 windows; door surrounds are new, but it occupies the same area as the original door; side gables are still sided; one story stone rear addition.			o. Onlor Ivalinoto)
43. History and Significance Relieved to have been built by H	Senjamin Huddle, one of the early set	ttlers of Bloom Township,	
this log house is one of the few	remaining in Seneca County. It is ned in continuous use as the main ho	a rare example of a	
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings			
farm outbuildings near the hous of approximately 100 acres.	se; house sets back behind trees near	r a creek on a farm	
	and 1896 Seneca County Atlases; and Auditor's Office; U.S. Census	46. Prepared by Noreen Anne Frost 47. Organization RPO-4HA 48. Date 49. Revision Date(s)	
		8/81	

OTTIO THO			Cojdinuus, Ollo 43211	
1. No. SEN-1084-16	4. Pres	ent Name(s) Rinehart, Noah, House		SEN
2. County Seneca	5 Oth	er Name(s)	CANNED	SEN-1084-16
3. Location of Negatives	5. Oth	er Maine(5)	SCAIMINED	半
Heidelberg Colleg	ge			6
6. Specific Location		16. Thematic Category	28. No. of Stories 2	ľ
7245 S. CR 43, S	Section 29	C,I	29. Basement? Yes x	CA S
		17. Date(s) or Period	No □	e x
		ca. 1840- 50	30. Foundation Material	Senech
	al, Township & Vicinity	18. Style or Design	stone	P
	,vic.Bloomville	Greek Revival	31. Wall Construction	
8. Site Plan with North Ar	row	19. Architect or Engineer	stone	
	181	20. Contractor or Builder	32. Roof Type & Material gable/standing seam meta	l,
小	CR6	20. Contractor or Builder	33. No. of Bays	-
Imile	==Q ,20 m tes	21. Original Use, if apparent	Front 3 Side 2	
Imic		residential	34. Wall Treatment	- a
	TR44 1	22. Present Use	coursed ashlar	7, 0
		residential	35. Plan Shape T	6
) NI	23. Ownership Public □ Private ⊠	36. Changes Addition ☑ (Explain Altered ☑	Rine hART,
9. Coordinates		24. Owner's Name & Address,	in #42) Moved 🗀 🗋	100
Lat. Lon	ig.	if known	37. Condition	Q
U.T.M. Reference	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	Charles Hunsicker, estate	Interior	7
1 7 3 2 7 4 6 0	4 5 4 2 7 9 0		Exterior_poor	7
Zone Easting	Northing	25. Open to Yes Public? No 5	38. Preservation Yes □	Nonh, Hous
10. Site □ Building 🗵	Structure ☐ Object ☐	117.55	Underway? No ⊠	SC
		26. Local Contact Person or Organization	39. Endangered? Yes ⊠ By What? No □	
11. On National Yes ☐ Register? No ☒	12. Is It Yes ⊠ Eligible? No □	27 Other Supreys in Mikigh Included	By What? No deterioration	
13. Part of Estab. Yes	14. District Yes 🛭	27. Other Surveys in Which Included	40. Visible from Yes □	
Hist. Dist.? No 🖾	Potent'l? No □		Public Road? No 😡	
15. Name of Established D	District		41. Distance from and	
			Frontage on Road	
42. Further Description of	Important Features con	me altered 1/1 windows; most still		-
6/6 windows: flat	stone lintels:	gabled porch later added across		9
		4 part sidelights surround door;		Cine
wood frieze; two interior end chimneys; 1 story stone addition to			2	
back with recesse	ed porch; frame a	ddition to side of back stone		1
addition.	1			(0)
40 112-1			\vee	
43. History and Significant			ing arrample of a three	
		condition, this house still is a f		
		retaining some elements of the Gre ning in Seneca County. The stone		
		use was probably built by Noah Rin		
property in the m		abe was probably salle by wear half	chare and amount	
44. Description of Environ	ment and Outbuildings			
Set off the road	near a creek sur	rounded by trees, agricultural out	buildings near the house.	
Š.				
45. Sources of Information			Me Brongrad by	
1864 Seneca Count	y Map; 1874 and	1896 Seneca County Atlases;	46. Prepared by Noreen Anne Frost	
Seneca County Aud	litor's Office an	d Recorder's Office;	47. Organization	
U.S. Census Recor	cds	,	RPO-4HA	
			48. Date 49. Revision Date(s)	
			8/81	

Ohio Historic Preservation Office Ohio Historical Center Columbus, Ohio 43211

OHIO HISTORIC INV	/ENTORY CODED	Ohio Historic Preservation Office Ohio Historical Center Columbus, Ohio 43211	
	Beaver, George, House		SEN-
Complete Com	r Name(s)	SCANNED	SEN-1083-16
Heidelberg College			6
6. Specific Location	16. Thematic Category	28. No. of Stories 11, 29. Basement? Yes 🗵	S.
6840 S. CR 43, Section 19	17. Date(s) or Period	raised No □	Senech
	1848 and 1856	30. Foundation Material	S
7. City or Town If Rural, Township & Vicinity Bloom Twp., vic. Bloomville	18. Style or Design Greek Revival	stone 31. Wall Construction	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow	19. Architect or Engineer	stone	
1.1		32. Roof Type & Material	
t_r58	20. Contractor or Builder	gable/asphalt shingles	<u> </u>
	21. Original Use, if apparent	33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 4	
1 mile	residential	34. Wall Treatment	7
miles	22. Present Use	random ashlar	BEAVE
- CR6	residential	35. Plan Shape rectangular	P
12 7	23. Ownership Public □	36. Changes Addition ☑	000
9. Coordinates	Private 딮	(Explain Altered ☑	700
Lat. Long.	24. Owner's Name & Address, if known Core 1 d Chapter	in #42) Moved 🗆	5
U.T.M. Reference	Gerald Shock	37. Condition Interior	8
1 7 3 2 7 2 0 0 4 5 4 3 3 6 0	6840 S. CR 43	Exterior good	George,
1 7 3 2 7 2 0 0 4 5 4 3 3 6 0	Bloomville, OH 44818 25. Open to Yes □	The state of the s	7
10. Site □ Structure □	Public? No 🗊	38. Preservation Yes ☐ Underway? No ⊠	Hous
Building Object □ 11. On National Yes □ 12. Is It Yes	26. Local Contact Person or Organization	39. Endangered? Yes ☐ By What? No ☒	n
Register? No ⊠ Eligible? No □	27. Other Surveys in Which Included		
13. Part of Estab. Yes ☐ 14. District Yes ☒ Hist. Dist.? No ☒ Potent'l? No ☐	-	40. Visible from Yes ⊠ Public Road? No □	
15. Name of Established District		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road	
		ca. 150 feet	
42. Further Description of Important Features			
42. Further Description of Important Features Datestone in rear gable—"Built by	George Beaver in the Year of Our	1	
Lord 1848"; house built in two sec			
	gher than the newly altered porch;		
projecting gable pediment with new	rer front door; gable end-to-street		2
frieze windows; interior end brick			(e)a
to side; two one story additions	12 (a) (b)		
43. History and Significance			
	and prominent settler in Bloom Town	schip this house is the	
	ty with a projecting gable pedimen		
	owner's desires for a fashionable h		
rural areas of Seneca County. It	is a fine example of early Seneca		
George Beaver farmed his 160 acre	farm for over 50 years.		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings			
situated in a rural setting; st	fill on 80 acre farm.	*	
			<.
45. Sources of Information	1 1006 -	46. Prepared by	
1864 Map of Seneca County; 1874 a		Noreen Anne Frost	
Seneca County Auditor's Office and Recorder's Office; U. S. Census 47. Organization		47. Organization	
Records.		RPO-4HA	
		48. Date 49. Revision Date(s)	

----Original Message-----

From: Kelleymiller65@embarqmail.com [mailto:webmaster@puc.state.oh.us]

Sent: Thursday, August 2, 2018 9:31 PM

To: Puco ContactOPSB < contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>

Subject: OPSB-ContactUs

Submitted: Aug 2, 2018 9:30 PM

RENDER: server RESPONSECHART: 0

CONTACT_REASON: Comment,

TITLE: Not Selected FIRST_NAME: Steven LAST_NAME: Miller

EMAIL: Kelleymiller65@embarqmail.com

PHONE_NUMBER: 614-555-5555

ALTERNATIVE_PHONE_NUMBER: 614-555-5555 STREET_ADDRESS1: 7520 East State Route 19

STREET_ADDRESS2: CITY: Republic STATE: OH ZIP: 44867 COUNTY: Seneca

COUNTRY: USA

COMPANY_NAME: Seneca Wind Farm

CASE NUMBER:

COMMENTS: I absolutely oppose the overwhelming number of wind turbines that are being proposed.

As I listen to the ongoing wind turbine debate, I don't feel the problem is with the concerns of the adjacent landowners but rather the problem is with the Wind Developers and the wind lease holders. The developers recruit lease holders all based on the power and appeal of money. People talk about the environmental benefits that renewable wind power provides but at the end of the day it is all about the money. If the lease holders are so concerned about the environment, take away the financial benefits of the turbines and see how many landowners still sign up for the program. Two of Seneca County Commissioners and a few of the township trustees that are located in the wind farm footprints are also only interested in the money and are ignoring the negative effects that will be forced on their constituents. Are the economic benefits worth the cost that is to be paid? I think not! If the leaseholders want the turbines so much now and for the benefit of future generations, then locate the turbines near their own homes as opposed to imposing on the lives and properties of their neighbors. Since the leaseholders are compensated, have them deal directly with the negative side effects such as noise, shadow flicker, infrasound rather than inflicting these side effects on their non-compensated neighbors. Why should adjacent landowners be approached to sign the so called "good neighbor" contracts? In this context, "Good Neighbor" is an oxymoron in itself. Why is it that you as the adjacent landowner are being asked to sacrifice your property rights and quality of life and then be asked to be a "good neighbor" while the leaseholder financially benefits and screws up your life! If I'm to be the so called Good Neighbor, what term should I use to describe the leaseholder that is putting me in this position? Unfortunately I did sign a good neighbor contract to support the wishes of a family member which is something that I now regret.

Jim Hoffert

Concern regarding Blade Shear and Throw in area of two 42" compressed natural gas pipelines. I don't see a scientific model regarding the possibility and probability of pipeline puncture culminating in an explosion from severed blade and throw in Eden Twp, Seneca County, Ohio in affidavit filed July16, 2018 Page 93 & 94 paragraph 7. There is no mention of the results from a study on this possibility or what wide spread devastation it would create and what the setbacks need to be to reduce the possibility to zero percent. Please follow up on this concern as it does not seem to be addressed or maps showing how this pipeline lays in conjunction to the Seneca Wind Project Case No. 18-0488-EL-BGN.

Patricia J Pasko

Anti wind turbines

Sandra Nutter

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/13/2018 2:58:28 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-0488-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing.