From: Barbara Altenburg
To: Puco Docketing

 Subject:
 Comment re: Case 16-1871-EL-BGN

 Date:
 Friday, August 21, 2020 11:25:31 AM

Dear Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board:

As an Ohioan, I am proud to support the letter sent by a group of state legislators to Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) Chair Sam Randazzo calling for reconsideration of the feathering condition included in its approval of the Icebreaker Windpower project.

As noted in the letter, this condition—added to the approval of the project—amounts to a "poison pill" and ultimately kills this innovative project. Why would the Board reverse its decision on the feathering condition at the last minute?

As a state committed to promoting an "all of the above" energy approach, the unreasonable action taken against this thoroughly vetted and strongly supported renewable energy project is out of line. I ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for reconsideration of the project and remove the poison pill.

The Icebreaker Wind project would result in a strong win for our environment and our economy, helping us combat air pollution and climate change while also creating more than 500 jobs and injecting \$253 million into the local economy. Furthermore, it would put Ohio on the map as a leader in renewable energy technologies as this project would be the first freshwater offshore wind farm in North America. I hope you will support such an important investment in Ohio's future.

Sincerely, Barbara Altenburg 340 Stonewall Ct Dublin, OH 43017

From: <u>Curtis Lehr</u>
To: <u>Puco Docketing</u>

 Subject:
 Comment re: Case 16-1871-EL-BGN

 Date:
 Friday, August 21, 2020 9:43:19 AM

Dear Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board:

As an Ohioan, I am proud to support the letter sent by a group of state legislators to Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) Chair Sam Randazzo calling for reconsideration of the feathering condition included in its approval of the Icebreaker Windpower project.

As noted in the letter, this condition—added to the approval of the project—amounts to a "poison pill" and ultimately kills this innovative project. Why would the Board reverse its decision on the feathering condition at the last minute?

As a state committed to promoting an "all of the above" energy approach, the unreasonable action taken against this thoroughly vetted and strongly supported renewable energy project is out of line. I ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for reconsideration of the project and remove the poison pill.

The Icebreaker Wind project would result in a strong win for our environment and our economy, helping us combat air pollution and climate change while also creating more than 500 jobs and injecting \$253 million into the local economy. Furthermore, it would put Ohio on the map as a leader in renewable energy technologies as this project would be the first freshwater offshore wind farm in North America. I hope you will support such an important investment in Ohio's future.

Sincerely, Curtis Lehr 14353 Thompson Boulevard Brook Park, OH 44142

From: Daniel Squeri
To: Puco Docketing

Subject: Comment re: Case 16-1871-EL-BGN

Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 10:01:57 AM

Dear Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board:

As an Ohioan, I am proud to support the letter sent by a group of state legislators to Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) Chair Sam Randazzo calling for reconsideration of the feathering condition included in its approval of the Icebreaker Windpower project.

As noted in the letter, this condition—added to the approval of the project—amounts to a "poison pill" and ultimately kills this innovative project. Why would the Board reverse its decision on the feathering condition at the last minute?

As a state committed to promoting an "all of the above" energy approach, the unreasonable action taken against this thoroughly vetted and strongly supported renewable energy project is out of line. I ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for reconsideration of the project and remove the poison pill.

The Icebreaker Wind project would result in a strong win for our environment and our economy, helping us combat air pollution and climate change while also creating more than 500 jobs and injecting \$253 million into the local economy. Furthermore, it would put Ohio on the map as a leader in renewable energy technologies as this project would be the first freshwater offshore wind farm in North America. I hope you will support such an important investment in Ohio's future.

Sincerely, Daniel Squeri 14600 Detroit Ave Lakewood, OH 44107

From: Deborah Van Kleef

To: Puco Docketing

 Subject:
 Comment re: Case 16-1871-EL-BGN

 Date:
 Friday, August 21, 2020 11:59:13 AM

Dear Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board:

As an Ohioan, I am proud to support the letter sent by a group of state legislators to Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) Chair Sam Randazzo calling for reconsideration of the feathering condition included in its approval of the Icebreaker Windpower project.

As noted in the letter, this condition—added to the approval of the project—amounts to a "poison pill" and ultimately kills this innovative project. Why would the Board reverse its decision on the feathering condition at the last minute?

As a state committed to promoting an "all of the above" energy approach, the unreasonable action taken against this thoroughly vetted and strongly supported renewable energy project is out of line. I ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for reconsideration of the project and remove the poison pill.

The Icebreaker Wind project would result in a strong win for our environment and our economy, helping us combat air pollution and climate change while also creating more than 500 jobs and injecting \$253 million into the local economy. Furthermore, it would put Ohio on the map as a leader in renewable energy technologies as this project would be the first freshwater offshore wind farm in North America. I hope you will support such an important investment in Ohio's future.

Sincerely, Deborah Van Kleef 3251 Clarendon Road Cleveland Heights, OH 44118

 From:
 Puco ContactOPSB

 To:
 Puco Docketing

 Subject:
 comment 16-1871

Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:23:52 AM

Attachments: page1image4156854080.png

page2image4157777312.png page2image4157858112.png

From: George Hamilton < grhmkh@att.net>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:17 AM

To: Randazzo, Samuel < Samuel.Randazzo@puco.ohio.gov >

Subject: About the Icebreaker Project

August 21, 2020

Chairman Sam Randazzo Ohio Power Siting Board 180 E. Broad Street Columbus OH 43215 Re: Icebreaker - OPSB Case No. 16-1871-EL-BGN Dear Chairman Randazzo,

My wife and Lare writing to object to the Ohio Power Siting Board's recent Order in the

My wife and I are writing to object to the Ohio Power Siting Board's recent Order in the Icebreaker case. Unfortunately, the Order includes a last-minute "poison pill" provision that upended the agreement reached among LEEDCo and the technical staffs of the Board and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources over a period of many months— and renders the project commercially infeasible. As such, we ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for "reconsideration" and remove the poison pill.

Specifically, the Order requires Icebreaker's turbines to be indefinitely "feathered," (i.e., prohibited from rotating and producing any electricity) all night long for eight months of the year. This Shutdown Order and its resulting lost productivity deprives Icebreaker of the critical revenue stream required to repay a construction loan and is therefore a project-killer. We have reviewed the facts in the case, and we remain puzzled the Board would re-insert the evening Shutdown Order that its own technical staff had determined was not necessary to meet the statutory standard of "minimum adverse impact." We further believe the highly unusual Shutdown Order is unlawful for the following reasons.

- It contradicts the evidence on the record that led the technical staffs at both the Siting Board and the Department of Natural Resources to approve the project without the Shutdown Order in light of the extensive wildlife protections included.
- The Order offers no compelling evidence to override the technical staffs at OPSB and ODNR's favorable recommendation. It also contradicts the formal finding by the federal US Fish and Wildlife Service that the project is low risk.
- The Order essentially requires zero impact every night for 8 months, but the statutory standard is merely "minimum" impact, considering economics and technology.



• The Order unlawfully requires two separate approvals – one for construction and a separate subsequent approval to run at nighttime. But by law, the OPSB certificate is for both constructions and operations. The Board does not have authority to bifurcate the certificate. Our region of the state has patiently awaited approval of Icebreaker for over a decade. We believe the time is now for the Board to approve this innovative demonstration project without onerous, over-reaching regulatory conditions and allow us to reap the economic and environmental benefits.

Icebreaker is projected to deliver \$250 million to our local economy and create over 500 well-paying jobs in the burgeoning offshore wind industry. It would also serve the region's environmental interests, delivering 20 megawatts of clean power. In the spirit of an all-of-the-above energy policy encouraging in-state generation, we urge the Board to adopt the agreement reached among LEEDCo and the technical wildlife experts and allow Ohio to realize these benefits.

Thank you. Sincerely, G.R. & Mary K. Hamilton 3646 W. 148th St. Cleveland, OH 44111

From: Butler, Matthew Puco Docketing To:

Subject: Comment for Case No. 16-1871-EL-BGN Date: Thursday, August 20, 2020 4:24:18 PM

From: Kevin Cronin <kevin.cronin.ohio@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 1:42 PM

To: Randazzo, Samuel <Samuel.Randazzo@puco.ohio.gov>

Subject: Icebreaker Project Review, Wind Energy on Lake Erie (Case No. 16-1871-EL-BGN)

Please accept this letter, reflecting my personal views, for the review file for the icebreaker wind energy project on Lake Erie.

Thank you.

Kevin Cronin, Attorney at Law The Brown Hoist Building 4403 Saint Clair Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103-1125

kevincronin.us

League of American Bicyclists -- League Certified Bicycling Instructor (LCI) #1448

Ph: 216.377.0615 or 216.374.7578

Fx: 216.881.3928

Kevin Cronin, Attorney at Law

Phone: 216.377.0615 or 216.374.7578

Fax: 216.881.3928

Email: Kevin@kevincronin.us

The Brown Hoist Building 4403 Saint Clair Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103- 1125

www.kevincronin.us

Sam Randazzo, Chairman
Ohio Power Siting Board
Continental Plaza
180 East Broad St.
Columbus, OH 43215

Delivery via Email: samuel.randazzo@puco.ohio.gov

August 21,2020 Icebreaker Review (Case No. 16-1871-EL-BGN)

Dear Chairman Randazzo:

I understand there is another review for the Windbreaker Project on Lake Erie. I am concerned that the earlier OPSB order lacked clarity on important points.

- 1. The order appears to exceed the legal requirement, which calls for minimal impact on the environment, considering other factors like economics and available technology. The evening shut down requirements, erring on the side of safety while gathering data, seem to exceed the legal requirement. More comprehensive documentation of the decision-making basis or presenting a less onerous option, may be able to address the requirement.
- 2. The evidentiary basis for overturning the staff findings seems to need to be more fully documented. If not available, I fear the issue will be resolved in Court, with unnecessary, but inevitable, delay.

Fully implemented, the project would be an important win for Northeast Ohio economy, perhaps, as advocates note, creating as many as 500 jobs and boosting the local economy by \$250 million or more.

Windbreaker has apparently satisfied OPSB requirements and only needs to provide verifying data to move forward and it is my view that it can, despite any limitation on hours of energy generation during a test period. However, I remain concerned that this wind project review at the state and federal level could be used to satisfy future power generation, or other commercial, applications. I understand each subsequent plan to deploy energy generation on the lake will need its own regulatory review to weigh direct, indirect and cumulative costs and environmental impact.

I am concerned that this project review, which relied on less stringent review, an Environmental Assessment rather than a full Environmental Impact Statement, could be used to permit less stringent review on subsequent projects, wind energy or otherwise, on Lake Erie. Icebreaker advocates acknowledge this turbine project is only the first of many in a wind energy plan for Lake Erie. I continue to believe the Icebreaker Project is sufficiently compelling that it could have met the challenges of full

Environmental Impact Statement to dispel any concern for the impact on the human environment. Lake Erie is undeniably vulnerable, as the shallowest and smallest by volume of the Great Lakes, an important source of drinking water and human health, sport and recreation activities, as well as the frequently-cited migratory bird routes, and commercial initiatives should be required to proceed carefully.

I am long-standing volunteer for the Icebreaker Project, twice recognized by Green Energy Ohio for volunteerism and the wind energy activity. I was on the runway at Burke Lakefront Airport when the wind testing equipment was deployed to the water intake crib. I was on the water intake crib as we gathered data and confirmed the power of wind energy on the lake, data so compelling that the testing was stopped ahead of schedule. By raising questions, I am no less committed to wind energy and Ohio's green energy future.

Thank you for your time and attention to these important matters.

Best Regards,

/S KC/

Kevin Cronin

From: Puco ContactOPSB
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: comment 16-1871

Date:Friday, August 21, 2020 11:25:00 AMAttachments:The Ohio Power Siting Board.docx

From: larryvthomas@aol.com <larryvthomas@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 9:18 PM

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

Subject: West Virginia Highlands Conservancy Submission to The Ohio Power Siting Board

Greetings:

The West Virginia Highlands Conservancy hereby submits the attached letter to The Ohio Power Siting Board requesting that no reconsideration be given to the Board's requirement of feathering the turbines at The Icebreaker Industrial Wind project.

Larry V. Thomas President



P.O. Box 306 Charleston, WV 25321

August 20, 2020

Chairman Randazzo and Board Members The Ohio Power Siting Board 180 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: The Icebreaker Industrial Wind project

Chairman Randazzo and Board Members:

The West Virginia Highlands Conservancy (WVHC) is writing to thank you for your decision to require feathering to protect migrating birds and bats at the Icebreaker Industrial Wind project. WVHC agrees with your decision in making this reasonable, commonsense requirement for project approval to protect migratory birds and bats.

WVHC promotes, encourages, and works for the conservation – including both preservation and wise management – and appreciation of the natural resources of West Virginia and the Nation. Our work is for the cultural, social, educational, physical health, spiritual and economic benefit of present and future generations, including supporting work that enhances habitat and protection for all wildlife species.

As the Board is aware, the project site is a National Audubon Society designated Globally Important Bird Area due to its use by millions of migrating birds during their migration. Unfortunately, the project developer has not yet provided a comprehensive plan to monitor bird kills at the project nor have we seen any evidence of mitigating such impacts through proposed conservation efforts. Certainly, the substantial risks and unknowns, associated with this project, are far too great in this area of significant importance to migrating birds and bats.

According to a recent study, published in the journal *Science*, North America has lost more than 2.9 billion birds since 1970. In less than half a century, the avian population of the continent has declined by some 29 percent, or more than one in four birds, even with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in place.

Certainly, we can do better and your requirement for feathering for this project should remain mandatory. We request that there should be no reconsideration of your decision. The initial six industrial turbines, as we understand, could mushroom to as many as 1,200 industrial turbines creating a risk that is far too great for our remaining migrating birds and bats.

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding our request.

Very truly yours,

Larry V. Thomas

Lang V. Thomas

President

From: Rick & Mary Hamilton
To: Puco Docketing

 Subject:
 Comment re: Case 16-1871-EL-BGN

 Date:
 Friday, August 21, 2020 11:12:27 AM

Dear Chairman Randazzo and members of the Ohio Power Siting Board:

As an Ohioan, I am proud to support the letter sent by a group of state legislators to Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) Chair Sam Randazzo calling for reconsideration of the feathering condition included in its approval of the Icebreaker Windpower project.

As noted in the letter, this condition—added to the approval of the project—amounts to a "poison pill" and ultimately kills this innovative project. Why would the Board reverse its decision on the feathering condition at the last minute?

As a state committed to promoting an "all of the above" energy approach, the unreasonable action taken against this thoroughly vetted and strongly supported renewable energy project is out of line. I ask that the Board immediately grant LEEDCo's request for reconsideration of the project and remove the poison pill.

The Icebreaker Wind project would result in a strong win for our environment and our economy, helping us combat air pollution and climate change while also creating more than 500 jobs and injecting \$253 million into the local economy. Furthermore, it would put Ohio on the map as a leader in renewable energy technologies as this project would be the first freshwater offshore wind farm in North America. I hope you will support such an important investment in Ohio's future.

Sincerely, Rick & Mary Hamilton 3646 W 148th St Cleveland, OH 44111

 From:
 Puco ContactOPSB

 To:
 Puco Docketing

 Subject:
 comment 16-1871

Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:24:50 AM

From: William Kurtz <wkurtz94@gmail.com> Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 10:12 PM

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

Subject: Icebreaker Wind Project

Dear Chairman Randazzo and Board Members:

I am writing to thank you for your decision to require feathering to protect birds at the Icebreaker Wind project. I support renewable energy development if it minimizes its impacts to wildlife. But with so many important promises left unfulfilled by the developer, I strongly believe you were right to take this commonsense step to protect migratory birds and bats.

As you know, the project site is in a National Audubon Society-designated Globally Important Bird Area due to its use by millions of birds. The project developers have yet to provide a plan for monitoring bird kills at the facility, and there has been no mention of mitigating these impacts through conservation actions. This leaves too much risk and too many unknowns in an area of great importance to birds.

Like millions of Americans, I value birds for their aesthetic, economic, and intrinsic value. I very much enjoyed my visit to northwest Ohio last year to take part in the large birding festival hosted by the Black Swamp Bird Observatory at Magee Marsh and see all of the wonderful migratory birds there. But a recent study shows that the United States and Canada lost nearly 3 billion birds — almost 30 percent of the total population — since 1970.

This is not the time to take chances with our declining bird populations. Thank you for your commonsense decision to require feathering to protect this diminishing public resource.

Sincerely,

William Kurtz Charlottesville, VA

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/21/2020 12:58:28 PM

in

Case No(s). 16-1871-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment of Barbara Altenburg, Curtis Lehr, Daniel Squeri, Deborah Van Kleef, G. R. & Mary K. Hamilton, Kevin Cronin, Larry V. Thomas and The West Virginia Highlands Conservancy, Rick & Mary Hamilton and William Kurtz, via website, electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing