

FILE

2

Irwin, Steven

From: Puco ContactOPSB
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Tom Stacy
Cc: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: RE: Public Comment for Case # 09-0479-EL-BGN

Mr. Stacy,

Thank you for contacting the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) regarding the Hardin Wind Energy Project.

Public comment on matters before the OPSB are always welcome, regardless of the case's status in the siting process. The OPSB regularly reviews public comments before a project is certificated, after a Board decision, and during the construction and operation of a project. As such, your comments will be docketed in the public comment sections of the case file under OPSB Case Number 09-479-EL-BGN.

Again, thank you for your interest in the case.

Sincerely,

Steve

Steve Irwin
Public Outreach Coordinator
Ohio Power Siting Board
614.466.2871
OPSB.ohio.gov



RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
AUG -5 PM 4:08
PUCO

From: Tom Stacy [<mailto:tfstacy@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 5:26 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB
Cc: Keith Faber; Bill Seitz; Strigari, Frank
Subject: Public Comment for Case # 09-0479-EL-BGN

To: Director, Ohio Power Siting Board

Cc: Ohio Senator, William Seitz

Ohio Senate Council, Frank Strigari

Senate President, Keith Faber

Date: August 4th, 2014

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 IVN Date Processed AUG 05 2014

From: Thomas F. Stacy, II
6628 County Road 10
Zanesfield, OH 43360
Mobile: (937) 407-6258

Regarding: Case No: 09-0479-EL-BGN

I am writing to request the motion in lieu of an application amendment to extend the expiration date of the certificate to construct the Hardin Wind project be denied by your board. Granting a motion rather than allowing public participation in an application revision hearing would breach due process and constitute serious regulatory/administrative overreach, and in fact work counter to the intent of passed legislation.

Unlike citizens, groups and local governing bodies in other areas targeted for wind energy projects, the citizens and governing bodies in and near the approved Hardin Wind Energy project area were not aware of or actively engaged in the process at the time of the original application. But these entities do still deserve an opportunity to consider the facts and reasoning behind Invenenergy's motion request and to make their wishes known at this time by requiring a application amendment hearing.

Furthermore, approving a motion for permit expiration extension for the Hardin Wind Energy case would set a precedent which might impede due process in other cases where there is active participation in the application process. I feel that would be a travesty.

Thank you for considering these comments and I look forward to your reply.

Respectfully,

Thomas F. Stacy, II