Ohio

Board Members

Scott Nally Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Christiane Schmenk Ohio Development Services Agency

Theodore E. Wymyslo, M.D. Ohio Department of Health

Jim Zehringer Ohio Department of Natural Resources

David Daniels Ohio Department of Agriculture

Jeffery J. Lechak, P.E. Public Member

Louis W. Blessing Jr. Ohio House of Representatives

Sandra Williams Ohio House of Representatives

Shannon Jones Ohio Senate

Tom Sawyer Ohio Senate Power Siting Board

John R. Kasich, Governor Todd A. Snitchler, Chairman

Mary Johnson 6451 Black Road Cable, Ohio 43009

Re: Buckeye II Wind Farm Case No. 12-0160-EL-BGN

Mrs. Mary Johnson,

Thank you for your input regarding the proposed Buckeye II Wind Farm. I have docketed your correspondence in the public comments section of the record in case number 12-0160-EL-BGN.

Ohio law establishes a minimum "setback" of wind turbines from habitable residences and property lines (Ohio Revised Code 4906-20). Turbines must be located at least 750 feet from the tip of the turbine's nearest blade to the exterior of the nearest residential structure located on adjacent property at the time of the application. Additionally, turbines must be located at least 1.1 times the total height of the turbine, from its base to the top of the blade at its highest point, from the wind facility's property line.

January 25, 2013

Before the Board makes a decision about the Buckeye II Wind Farm, it will consider the developer's application, OPSB staff report, public comments, and the records of the public and adjudicatory hearings. All of these materials are available on the Ohio Power Siting Board website, along with many other materials about wind development in the state: www.OPSB.ohio.gov.

Again, the Board thanks you for your continued public involvement and interest in this case.

Very truly yours,

in Millios ria

Kim Wissman, Executive Director Ohio Power Siting Board

KW: sai

180 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793 (866) 270-6772 www.OPSB.ohio.gov

3

2013 JAN 25 AM 10: 33 PUCO

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Irwin, Steven

From: Sent: To: Subject: Irwin, Steven Friday, January 25, 2013 9:37 AM Irwin, Steven Contact OPSB re: 12-0160-EL-BGN

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us To: ContactThePUCO Subject: 72225 Received: 1/23/2013 6:00:04 PM Message: WEB ID: 72225 AT:01-23-2013 at 05:59 PM

Related Case Number: 12-0160

TYPE: complaint

NAME: Mrs. Mary Johnson

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 6451 Black Road
- Cable , Ohio 43009
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 937-653-5109
- Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)
- Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: (no e-mail address provided)

INDUSTRY:Other

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: EverPower (Buckeye Wind)
- (no account name provided?)
- (no service address provided?)
- (no service phone number provided?)
- (no account number provided?)

COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

I'am a resident of Champaign County Ohio. My residence will be impacted by both phases of the Buckeye Wind project. After reading the Staff Report for the Buckeye Wind Project, I would like to submit a comment. The staff report states that the project is in the best interest of the public, stating that this is obvious from the amount of "local" support the project has received. Clearly basing this opinion off of the form letters received via public comments to the OPSB; however, it is apparent that either Staff did not actually read the letters or Staff has a VERY broad definition of the term "local". If Staff had read the form letters, they would have clearly seen that nearly 95% of the letters were received from those not residing in Champaign County, and in fact, many didn't reside in Ohio at all. I challenge the staff to do a true percentage calculation as I did. My thoughts are, if Staff were using this information to base an opinion as to "puble need" and/or "best interest" of the county, then Staff needs to determine that the true "local" public, which is that of Champaign County, are not in favor of the Buckeye Wind Project. The majority of Champaign County is AGAINST this project. The damage is done by the approval of the first phase. EverPower has already divided our community, our families and our friends. Don't allow them to further extend the pain they have caused. Be honest and take the blinders off. The second phase of this project will be too much for those already burdened by the first phase. In addition to the mess this has already created, lawsuits will spring up and further divide our community. I say this because there are covenants and restrictions being broken. Some rural residents have found that they have Protective Covenants and Restrictions that were written & recorded when their property was subdivided for residential development in the 70's. My daughter has this on her deed and they clearly state "No neighbor shall place anything on their property that is or may become a nuisance." And one of these neighbors just so happens to be the host of numerous turbines that will be surrounding her property. She has tried to resolve the issue, but the leaseholder only sees dollar signs. My daughter has obtained legal counsel. She is not the only person in that situation. There are small subdivisions, some with just a handful of houses, that are protected this very way. Please deny this project! We don't need it. These leaseholders have survived without the money in the past, and will survive just fine without it in the future!