

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: FW: 16-1871-EL-BGN Icebreaker Offshore Wind
Date: Friday, March 31, 2017 9:11:50 AM

From: seabird1 [mailto:seabird1@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 8:20 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: 16-1871-EL-BGN Icebreaker Offshore Wind

Dear Members of the Ohio Power Siting Board,

I am writing in opposition to Project Icebreaker, the LeedCo and Fred Olson Renewables venture, whose sole interests lie in profiting from placing wind turbines in Lake Erie at the expense of taxpayers, electric rate payers, and the environment. A lease of the lakebed seems to be in violation of the public trust doctrine and this project is not in the best interests of Ohio citizens.

Lake Erie is part of the Great Lakes and is part of an important corridor hosting millions of migratory birds each year. It has been documented that the Cleveland area is part of this migratory corridor. It is also well documented that bats and birds are negatively affected by wind turbines. In addition, any take of an endangered species would violate the Endangered Species Act. Monitoring of migratory birds performed pre-construction is not sufficient to make conclusions regarding bird and bat mortality, but you can be certain that birds would fly within the rotor sweep. Likewise, conclusory references to studies done elsewhere are not evidence to support this project. Lake Erie provides fresh water to millions of residents and alteration or disturbance of sediments on the lake bottom could have a disastrous effect on our fresh water.

Apart from birds and bats, Lake Erie's shallow depth provides a unique habitat for freshwater species and it should not be altered nor used as an experiment. Recreational fishing and boating are important to Ohio residents and tourists. Sunsets over Lake Erie and unobstructed views of the horizon are taken for granted by northeast Ohio residents. Cluttering the view shed with spinning blades and flashing lights would cause harm to northeast Ohio residents and property owners along Lake Erie. Actions taken to block access to any open lake waters or changes to these freshwater habitats and fish viability should not be considered.

The economics of this project do not make sense for Ohio residents, either. The maintenance costs associated with these wind turbines will be higher than those inland resulting in unnecessary excess charges to Ohio electric consumers. According to starbeacon.com, a recent lighting strike in Conneaut Ohio, caused approximately \$250,000 in damage to a single smaller turbine located on land. The company who constructed the turbine is demanding a contract extension in order to justify the repairs. Does the Ohio Power Siting Board guarantee that this will not happen to Ohio electric consumers as a result of this project? The electricity generated will be at a higher cost than conventional sources. With regards to efficiency, wind turbines typically generate 1/3 of their nameplate capacity when the wind is blowing. Their output cannot be scheduled to meet consumer demand or provide baseload power. Their footprint when compared to the same amount of electricity generated by conventional sources, along with additional transmission lines necessary,

should be considered by the Ohio Power Siting Board. LeedCo is asking the public to support this project, but suppresses data needed by the public while using public funding and increasing electric costs.

With the proposed federal funding cuts to the restoration of Lake Erie, would the funding be available to carry out the proposed ongoing monitoring of public trust resources without an undue burden on Ohio electric rate payers? I ask that the Ohio Power Siting Board deny this request in the interest of electric reliability, costs to Ohio residents, mortality of public trust resources and the unknown effects of alteration of the Lake Erie ecosystem.

Thank you for your consideration.

Vicci Weeks

Parma, OH

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/31/2017 4:24:26 PM

in

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

Summary: Public Comment in opposition filed on behalf of concerned consumer, Vicci Weeks
electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing