FILE

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2010 JUN 23 AM 11:36
PUCO

5

Ed Rogers
9247 C. R. 130
Kenton, Ohio 43326

June 20th, 2010

Hardin Wind Energy LLC Case #09-479-el-bgn

Problems With Inverenergy

Ms. Wissman,

With this letter I wanted to address a letter Mr. Nezre/Inverenergy wrote to the sitting board, in care of Ms. Jenkins on your web site, dated April 27th, 2010 concerning my questions not being addressed by Inverenergy.

It appears Inverenergy suppresses negative information within a community, waits to establish the wind farms, and then tries to string out the people having the problems until they attempt to move out. This seems to be the growing trend with this company and the April 27th letter demonstrates this deceptive approach. (see attached articles Family Files Wind Farm Complaint/Inverenergy and Oregon Wind Farm Violates State Noise Regulations/Inverenergy)

Please read the portions of their letter from April 27th that I have pulled to help illustrate the above.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician ____ Date Processed JUN 23 2010

Statetment #1 "After over two years of working closely with land owners" (including my uncle) "and community members in developing the wind farm..."

Ms. Wissman, there are currently 531 owner occupied homes and 98 more renter occupied within Lynn Township alone.
(http://www.city-data.com/township/Lynn-Hardin-OH.html#ixzz0qxjR7GCQ) Mr. Adum and Inverenergy states in their letter that they sent out 225 newsletters to "local members". This working "closely" with local land owners as they put it has a 42% reach rate when using the 531 land owner number of people in Lynn Township alone, not to mention the other townships involved. An attempt such as this was always failing in my school. Is this working "closely?" I have lived in my current house since 2006 and I have never been approached, especially with information about possible ill-effects from Inverenergy. It was all I could do to get a written response from them.

My two boys will be fifth generation Hardin Countians. I believe most everyone in Hardin County believes, as I did some months ago, that there are no ill-effects or erosion of the quality of life if a wind farm is built. As the newsstories about these ill effects grow though, I have changed my mind.

Statement #2 "Mr. Rogers maintains in his letter that the questions are simple yes and no answers. Although Mr. Rogers' nine questions are questions that are common to *all* wind energy projects, they have been answered in various forms many times over..." (Adum Letter April 27th, 2010)

If this is true than why was it so hard for them to answer my simple questions? Shouldn't they have had something easily on hand to satisfy my needs and calm my fears with the nine questions I posed? Is this being "proactive to alleviate and resolve concerns" as they put it?

Upon seeing a cute dog which you wanted to pet, before you petted it you asked its owner if it bites, and its owner said that it wasn't sufficient to answer that in a yes or no fashion...would you pet the dog? Of course not.

Statement #3 "...Mr. Rogers made no effort to return our calls." (Adum Letter April 27th, 2010)

This is quite true. I sent them a letter to be returned as a letter. This company wants things to be kept unwritten, this is apparent. One would have to ask why they needed to be prodded by the sitting board to write me back? Did they lose my return address or did they want these easily answered questions to be fleetingly lost in open conversation and not written down?

I feel given this company's emerging track record (like missing the interruption of Mid-West Power's micro wave pattern) and mounting law suites, there is specific need for the Ohio Power Sitting Board to obtain all the current law suites pending and the ones which have been settled out of court from the various other states. Ohio need not be another state to place wind turbines where they enslave, needlessly, adjacent landowners. This needs to be done prior to construction. This company wants to iron out problems later when the turbines are in concrete so the company holds all the leverage and not the people who attempt to live within the wind farm.

I hope you and your board takes into consideration all of the law suites, complaints, and hardships being experienced within the other states where Inverenergy has wind farms coming into production.

We need to do this right and keep all of our individual rights and quality of living intact.

I do not want my family's health at risk, shadow flicker on my property, nor noise of any kind from this wind farm. It seems that a distance of 2500 feet from my property line should suffice after investigating the other states and their people.

Please make sure this is the case.

The good folks of Hardin County, who are going to be living in this wind farm, were not born with saddles upon their back to be booted and spurred by Inverenergy.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ed Rogers

Ed Rogers
Hardin County Citizen, Husband, and Father of Two

P.S. I did receive your booklet and I am reading through it....thank you!

Family files wind farm complaint with PSC

- Story
- Discussion

Font Size:
Default font size
Larger font size

By Megan Sheridan Staff Reporter | Posted: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:23 pm | (1) Comments

The Wirtzes' home on Highway YY in the town of LeRoy stands vacant after the family filed for bankruptcy and moved out in September 2009 due to health and financial hardship claimed to be caused by the nearby wind farm. The turbine behind the home stands 1250 feet away. Megan Sheridan

OAKFIELD - A former town of LeRoy family has filed a formal complaint, April 1, with the Wisconsin Public Service Commission against Invenergy, a Chicago based energy company that owns the Forward Wind Energy Center located in Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties.

Cases of this kind do not occur often for Invenergy.

"It's rare that we get that kind of complaint," Borders said.

The complaint is also unusual for the WPSC.

"Normally, complaints that come in to the PSC from the general public reflect water, electric, gas and/or telephone utility service problems," said Teresa Weidemann-Smith, communications specialist for the WPSC.

According to the WPSC's administration code, Invenergy has 20 days to respond to the complaint and the commission has 60 days to decide what to do with the complaint.

msheridan@captialnewspapers.com

Posted in Local on *Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:23 pm* Wind Farm, Invenergy, Wirtz

Oregon Wind Farm Violates State Noise Regulations

BY DAVID NOGUERAS

Bend, OR May 27, 2010 4:51 p.m.

Share
Discuss
listen
download

People living near the Willow Creek wind farm in Morrow Country felt the winds shift in their favor this week.

Tuesday night The Morrow County Planning Commission found the plant in violation of state noise regulations. OPB's David Nogueras has more.

The Willow Creek farm is made up of about 50 turbines. The project went online in January 2009, but the complaints began soon after the giant blades began to turn.

Dan Williams of Boardman told the Associated Press that the turbines made enough noise to keep him awake in bed at night.

Carla McLane is Planning Director for Morrow County. She says while the commission did rule the wind farm was violating state regulations, it found the turbines only crossed the noise threshold at certain times of day and under certain conditions.

Carla McLane: "Some would want to view it in black and white and if it's a violation then you have to shut them down. Others would want to view it in terms of shade of gray and say it's not an ongoing and continuous violation. It's an intermittent violation."

The wind farm is owned by Chicago based, Invenergy. The commission gave the company six months to comply with the regulations.

© 2010 OPB

http://news.opb.org/article/7457-oregon-wind-farm-violates-state-noise-regulations/