

FILE

2

Butler, Matthew

From: Julia Hicks <julia.j.hicks@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:45 PM
To: PucO ContactOPSB
Subject: Case # 13-0990-EL-BGN

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2014 AUG 22 PM 5:00

PUCO

Ohio Power Siting Board Members, Case# 13-0990-EL-BGN

I am an adjacent property owner to the proposed Greenwich Windpark. Case

I have been attempting to read through some of the info on the OPSB website. The Case Documents filed 6/03/2014 titled Exhibit: Company2-5 and Staff Exhibits 1 & 2 are very confusing.

Site Selection: On page numbered 41 one of the pertinent considerations is "limited population" yet there are 12 turbines with over 100 homes within 1.5 mile radius. Turbine 14 has 550 homes within 1.5 mile radius. The trailer park is .7 mile from turbine 22. How many total homes are within 1.5 miles of the project area? This is "limited population" area?

Construction Noise: On page numbered 35 "The adverse impact of construction noise would be minimal, because construction activities would be temporary and intermittent, would primarily occur away from most residential structures, and would generally be limited to normal daytime working hours." However, on page numbered 57 "Impact pile driving, hoe ram, and blasting operations, if required, shall be limited to the hours between 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m." I did read somewhere in this report that construction would last 4 to 6 months if everything stays on schedule with a proposed start date in August. This is north central Ohio. By the middle of October our foliage is gone. There will be nothing to buffer the construction noises. With homes in such close proximity, there will be mothers putting their children down for a nap, people that worked the night shift trying to sleep and the school is 1.9 miles from turbine 14. Will this construction noise be considered "minimal" by the lives that have been impacted?

Operational Noise and Infrasound : Wind-turbine syndrome The commercial wind companies say it does not exist. Many people living close to wind turbines believe there is an issue. To the wind companies it is a money issue. To the people affected, it is their life. As with asbestos and lead paint the truth about the harmful effects of wind turbines may take years of research. Quick fix. Do not intentionally place families in harms' way. Place wind turbines in unpopulated areas.

I have another concern about the possible blasting. We have a well. The last earthquake changed our water quality. We are .6 mile from the closest proposed turbine. Could blasting effect our well?

Communications: Recently I read an article written by people that live with wind turbines. They were discussing the loss of cell phone and GPS signals. Our community depends on cell phones. GPS systems are everywhere. Farmers, Fire Dept., Police, monitoring devices on predators. Cell phones and GPS are our life lines. Maybe the contract needs to state if this is an issue Turn off turbines until the problem is resolved not to just "mitigate". The health and safety of the community is top priority.

Setbacks: On page numbered 30 "Assuming a maximum turbine height of 490.5 feet as proposed in the application, this minimum property line setback equates to a distance of 539.55 feet." On page numbered 34 Ice Throw: "The maximum throw distance would be approximately 853 feet from a turbine base." With a property line setback of 539.55 and a maximum ice throw of 853 feet the wind company is taking an additional 313.45 feet of

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 TC Date Processed AUG 22 2014

adjacent property. That 313.45 feet could be trees, structures or fields that would not be safe. That 313.45 feet at that point would be of no value to the property owner. Gov. Kasich stated Tuesday July 15 at an area chambers of commerce meeting in Mansfield, "Private property rights are important. People choose to live somewhere. You just don't go in there and disrupt their life." *The Columbus Dispatch*

I have just brushed the surface of the many documents filed by Windlab. The one common factor throughout is: **Commercial Wind Farms are NOT meant for populated areas.**

The Ohio General Assembly recently passed SB 310 which sets up a study committee called, the Energy Mandates Study Committee, to review issues related to renewable energy. The report will be issued Sept, 2015. Greenwich Neighbors United recommends that the issues regarding the negative impacts of wind turbines be addressed by the committee, and the Greenwich Wind Park be put on hold until this study is completed. Also recently passed HB 483 contains new setback requirements. Due to the safety concerns listed above these new setback requirements must be applied to this and any future project.

According to the Windlab website, they are a development company not a construction and long term maintenance ownership company. By the time issues arise, Windlab will have sold Greenwich Windpark to the highest bidder. No guarantees it will be an American company. Please take that into consideration when deciding the fate of this project in our community.

We ask for your help and assistance in supporting another public hearing and an opportunity to research the impact of these wind turbines on the Greenwich community.

Adjacent property owner,
Julia Hicks
3221 Plymouth East Road
Greenwich, Ohio 44837