

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: FW: Lake Erie Industrial Wind Turbines
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 9:06:53 AM

From: Richard Roach [<mailto:dick@dickandbevroach.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 1:36 AM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: Lake Erie Industrial Wind Turbines

As a lifelong Great Lakes resident and conservation advocate I am greatly dismayed by the idea of putting windmills in Lake Erie. The environmental damage to everything from birds and bats to the release of years of dangerous sediments is too terrible to contemplate. If there were some underlying necessity for IWT in the lake it would be different, but there is not. It is very apparent that this is just a scam by people in power to send money to the millionaire CEOs of Big Wind who will then send some of that money back to the politicians when they seek reelection. This is a terrible idea that will put current and future generations at risk and ruin one of the world's true gems. I strongly urge you to stop this criminal blunder.

Sincerely,

Richard Roach
895 River Road
Youngstown, New York 14174

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: 16-1871-EL-BGN
Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 8:59:59 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Pat Hersch [<mailto:phersch@neo.rr.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:24 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: No turbines in Lake Erie

Ohio Power Siting Board
LEEDCO Icebreaker Comments
March 20, 2017

To all concerned:

I am strongly opposed to LEEDCO's proposed icebreaker project in Lake Erie.

Wind turbines in Lake Erie would be extremely destructive and would serve no purpose except to make subsidy sucking energy companies such as LEEDCO even richer. Wind energy cannot be stored or regulated and adds nothing to the electrical power grid that must run at one hundred percent capacity at all times. It cannot be dispatched when needed. I need my refrigerator to run 24/7, and my furnace to run 24/7 when it is freezing outside, and the machinery at local companies supporting the economy to run when needed. I cannot wait for the wind to blow at the exact speed to produce energy.

Studies have shown that turbines don't reduce fossil fuel emissions at all. On the contrary, turbines have to be backed up 100% of the time by traditional mostly fossil-fueled power plants because the wind must blow at the perfect speed for them to kick in - about 25% of the time. Would you buy a car that only works 25% of the time and you never knew when it would work or not?

LEEDCO has now become a subsidiary of Fred Olsen Renewables headquartered in Norway. They are licking their chops at the possibility of installing 3,000 turbines in Lake Erie starting with the Icebreaker project outside of Cleveland. They do not know or care about what Lake Erie means to the eleven million people who get their drinking water from the lake. The installation of these monstrous but ineffective energy sources on the lake floor would stir up now dormant layers of toxic substances from shipping lanes and past coastal industries. The vibration would ensure constant agitation of toxic settlements safely buried deep in a lake that was once called "dead" but is now thriving because of vigorous regulatory efforts.

Do not let Lake Erie be destroyed by useless turbines.

Pat Hersch
535 Hilltop Road
Erie, PA

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: 16-1871-EL-BGN
Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 8:59:45 AM

From: Pat Hersch [mailto:phersch@neo.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:44 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: No turbines in Lake Erie

Ohio Power Siting Board:

The idea of installing wind turbines in Lake Erie is appalling.

Turbines in Lake Erie would create a whole new environmental disaster in the lake as turbine blades wear out in less than twenty years, especially in shallow Lake Erie where they will be pummeled by high winds, waves, pounding rain, and thick ice in the winter. Exploding and burning IWTs are becoming more commonplace as the numbers of IWTs increase, and when this occurs, there is no way to reach and extinguish them on an iced-over lake. As turbine blades burn, they create toxic emissions and blade throw can be lethal and catastrophic. Large, sharp blade segments have been known to be thrown up to a mile, some still burning.

Fred Olsen Renewables from Norway has decided that Lake Erie could accommodate three thousand turbines!! What a nightmare from both an aesthetic and practical standpoint. The pounding waves from a shallow stormy lake will curtail the proposed 20 year life of these behemoths to only 14 or 15 years. And the truth of the matter is that they will never be removed from the lake once their "useful" life has expired. They will never be removed because at the present cost of \$200,000 to decommission a single turbine, it would be outrageously expensive. And who will admit to ownership after 15 years?

Three thousand turbines would produce nine thousand worn out and broken 250 foot blades that are too toxic to burn or recycle and will settle to the bottom of the lake creating an eco-junk disaster for generations to come.

I am from Pennsylvania. Because LEEDCO has invited Erie County Executive Kathy Dahlkemper to sit on their board of directors, the implication is that turbines will be coming our way. That will not happen.

[Pennsylvania is one of only three U.S. States that places citizens' environmental rights on a par with their political rights. Our environmental rights are secured in Section 27 of Article 1 , the state Constitution's declaration of rights, which reads:](#)

"The people have a right to clean air, pure water, and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic, and esthetic values of the environment. Pennsylvania's public natural resources are the common property of all of the people, including generations to come. As trustee of these resources, the Commonwealth shall conserve and maintain them for the benefit of all the people." Adherence to this constitutional right has held up in court

against those who would exploit our land and water for personal financial gain.

That means that the 72-mile Pennsylvania shoreline is off limits to LEEDCO carpetbaggers. We Pennsylvanians have a constitutional right that our drinking water not be contaminated, that our millions of shorebirds and bats not be chopped to pieces by sharp blades, that our fish and waterbirds not be harmed by the noise, vibration, and pollution that would be caused by the underwater trenching necessary to set thousands of high-power electrical lines crisscrossing the lake floor. And that one of the most beautiful sunsets in the world be preserved for future generations.

Robert Hersch
535 Hilltop Road
Erie, PA 16509

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: FW: Comment file 16-1871-EL-BGN - Wind project Windbreaker
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 9:06:14 AM

From: Mark Duchamp [mailto:save.the.eagles2@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 10:19 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Cc: Joseph.w.krawczyk@usace.army.mil; liz.hartman@ee.doe.gov
Subject: Comment file 16-1871-EL-BGN - Wind project Windbreaker

Re: comment file number 16-1871-EL-BGN

Dear Sir or Madam,

The World Council for Nature opposes the erection of wind turbines in the Great Lakes, in view of the predictable contamination of their waters by oil leaks, oil spills and cleaning detergents from these machines and their maintenance crews and vessels. Upon request, we will provide you with documented evidence of pollution caused by wind turbines.

Wind turbines in the Great Lakes will also cause millions of migrating birds to die, many of them endangered, as per our open letter of 2016 “**Don’t Trash The Great Lakes**” published in the Daily Caller and other media: <http://dailycaller.com/2016/10/24/open-letter-to-the-doe-dont-trash-the-great-lakes/#ixzz4buhRLMBQ>


We reiterate our strong opposition to wind turbines, which cost billions of dollars in tax breaks while providing zero benefits to society (in view of their unpredictable intermittency). Jobs created are more than offset by jobs lost in other sectors.

Please confirm that our comments have been docketed.

Sincerely

Mark Duchamp +34 693 643 736
President, Save the Eagles International
www.SaveTheEaglesInternational.org
Chairman, World Council for Nature
www.wcfn.org



 Libre de virus. www.avast.com

Mr. Matthew Butler
Ohio Power Siting Board

March 20, 2017

Re: Icebreaker Wind Case #16-1871-EL-BNG

Good Afternoon,

As LEEDCo and Fred. Olsen Renewables further attempt to move forward, it is CRUCIAL for the OPSB, the USACE, USCG, USACE and the ODNR, as well as rate payers in the region and all U.S. taxpayers to understand the consequences of allowing Icebreaker Wind to be allowed. The eventual desecration of Lake Erie will negatively impact all who live in the Great Lakes watershed region. This is especially predictable given that as recently as November 3, 2016, an Icebreaker Wind, Inc. poster for the Lakewood Park Woman's Club presentation calls the project "a demonstration-scale offshore wind facility", supporting previous statements regarding plans to eventually erect thousands of these gargantuan machines in the Lake.

For those who believe this project would supply affordable, clean electricity, look at the evidence:

Published by the Institute for Energy Research, published December 27, 2016:

The Block Island Wind Farm, a [30 megawatt facility off the Rhode Island coast](#), went into operation on Monday, December 12. The project consists of five large offshore turbines supplied by GE Renewable Energy and operated by Deepwater Wind.¹ Electricity generated by the turbines is routed via submarine cables to the 1,000 full-time residents of Block Island. It took years of state and federal policy-making, environmental impact assessments and town hall meetings for the Block Island Wind Farm to come to fruition due to its cost and the damage to the view. It cost [\\$300 million](#)²—\$10,000 per kilowatt—over 10 times more than the cost of a new natural gas combined cycle unit. Further, it is 58 percent more costly than what the Energy Information Administration (EIA) expects a first-of-a-kind offshore wind unit to cost—[\\$6.331 per kilowatt](#). In fact, EIA's offshore wind costs are even higher than its advanced nuclear costs—by about 4 percent.

If this information is accurate, or even close to being accurate, there is **NOTHING** that justifies the cost for an add on, intermittent, unpredictable power source. The lack of reliable electricity generation is undeniable. In fact, this variation results in CONSTANT grid management to supply the demand for uninterrupted power generation. Conversely, on days with high winds, like winter nor'easters on Lake Erie, excess production must be dumped, or the turbines must be shut down to prevent spinning that results in fires or explosions. This ramping is **HIGHLY INEFFICIENT**, costly, and results in increased carbon dioxide production if fossil fuels provide the primary electricity source (keeping in mind that wind energy is merely additive).

Further, rate payers will also be paying for the coal, natural gas, nuclear, or whatever

traditional power source will be providing their primary (and reliable) electricity! There is no logical or reasonable explanation for doing this!

I will do anything that is basically covered by the law to reduce Berkshire's tax rate. For example, on wind energy, we get a tax credit if we build a lot of wind farms. That's the only reason to build them. They don't make sense without the tax credit. —Warren Buffett, [The Wall Street Journal, May 4, 2014](#)

According to Warren Buffet, perhaps there is! It is no wonder LEEDCo and Fred Olsen are developing this project and thus sacrificing rate payers and tax payers! And for what if not for personal gain?

No one can dispute the SHORT LIFESPAN of industrial wind turbines. Taken from an AP article by Dr. Larry Bell, endowed professor of space architecture at the University of Houston on March 6, 2017:

Short on Longevity. Long on Maintenance:

A major study of nearly 3,000 on-shore British wind farms found that the turbines have a very short 12 to 15 year operating life, not the 20 to 25 year lifespans applied in politicized government and industry projections. The report also concluded that a typical turbine generated more than twice as much electricity during its first year than upon reaching 15 years of use. Performance deterioration for off-shore installations is even far worse.

The author, an Edinburgh University economist and former World Bank energy advisor, estimated that routine wear and tear will more than double the cost of electricity produced by Britain's wind farms in the next decade in order for the government to meet present renewable energy targets.

So, what happens as these turbines face intense storms, mechanical problems, or simply age out? The CAITHNESS WINDFARM INFORMATION FORUM collects and publishes annual data regarding industrial wind turbine accidents, as well as other important turbine updates, but qualifies published data stating that not all accidents are reported. Therefore, these numbers from **2016 alone** are possibly low, but still significant:

- 20 blade failure reports (meaning broken blades, blade fires, blade throw)
- 27 fires (starting at any part of the turbine), the highest one year number since reporting was initiated in the 1990s
- 11 structural failures, primarily turbine collapse- "Major component failure under conditions which components should be designed to withstand"

In fact, it was reported on January 5, 2017 in a German article:

Credit: Deutsche Welle | 05.01.2017 | www.dw.com ~~

“In the past four weeks, four giant power-generating wind turbines in Germany have either toppled over or experienced broken rotary blades. Now the question is: How safe are wind turbines really?”

Try to imagine managing a turbine fire, explosion, or blade throw in the middle of the Lake. I cannot believe it is possible. In fact, onshore turbine accidents just burn and explode, as there is no current technique available to intervene in such an event. The Lake becomes a filthy industrial junkyard. Further, such an incident during recreational boating and fishing would pose a serious threat to human life.

Is this the future of Lake Erie? It most certainly will be if Icebreaker Wind is allowed to be built, ultimately followed by a gold rush type onslaught by other money hungry developers scrambling for a “piece of the pie”.

These Great Lakes are life sustaining for millions of mid Atlantic residents, not to mention the regional wildlife. The life and health of both American and Canadian regional citizens are at risk here. It is time to say no to Icebreaker, and ultimately enact legislation forbidding wind turbines in the Great Lakes.

Respectfully Submitted,

Suzanne Albright

Principal, Great Lakes Wind Truth

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/22/2017 2:44:50 PM

in

Case No(s). 16-1871-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment in opposition filed on behalf of various concerned consumers electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing