

FILE

3

Butler, Matthew

From: Kevin Ledet <kaledet1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2014 2:32 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB
Subject: Exhibit P Shadow Flicker Report
Attachments: OPSB flicker.docx

Mr. Irwin, concerning Case No. 13-0990-EL-BGN, would you please see that the voting and nonvoting members of the OPSB as well as the public comments section receive this information. Thank you Kevin Ledet

RECEIVED-SOCKETING DIV
2014 SEP 17 PM 2:11
PUCO

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 SM Date Processed SEP 17 2014

The following images were scanned as received

to the greater than 30 hour maximum for exposure to flicker. This home is occupied by an elderly couple and the man has had a stroke. This part of the area I am familiar with and I know this to be true because I live on Omega Rd. I don't know how many other properties aren't accounted for in this report but there probably are more if they missed these.

On pg. 5 of Exhibit P under Modeling results they make a statement that there are 298 residential structures located within 1170m of a proposed turbine and all this data is included in Appendix D. If there are 298 residential structures why is there 314 House ID numbers in Appendix D? The 298 residential structures count is already wrong by not including the 14 houses from Omega Rd. and SR 13 and now adding another 16 residences, who is doing the math?

On pg. 6 of Exhibit P section 4.1 House 272, this is a very interesting read. Even though this house is an involved landowner, (leased) Windlab states that it has the potential of experiencing 63 hours of flicker per year. This is the results of 4 turbines 17, 18, 20 and 21. The report goes into a lengthy discussion of winter solstice and which of these 4 turbines will impact this house and when and for how long. My big problem with this data is, how did they come to this conclusion:

Turbine 17 is approximately 1.5 miles NNE of this residence.

Turbine 18 is approximately 2 miles almost due north of this residence.

Turbine 20 is approximately 2.2 miles NNE of this residence.

Turbine 21 is approximately 2.3 miles NNE of this residence.

None of these turbines will ever have any flicker impact on this residence. The question needs to be asked, how did Windlab's computer model come up with this data? How many other mistakes are in this report?

This is, at least to me, something that should not be overlooked. In the green highlighted area, the applicant (Windlab) has stated that any turbine forecasted prior to construction to create in excess of 30 hours per year of shadow flicker at a non- participating receptor will be subject to mitigation or minimization. The staff recommends no more than 30 hours flicker at any non-participating receptor, with a complaint resolution process being established. With the above listed examples of corrupted data, should this flicker report be trusted? Could you please direct me to anyone who has authority to review this type of information and has authority to bring it to a proper resolution?

Sincerely Kevin Ledet
Chairman Greenwich Neighbors United