

**BEFORE  
THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD**

In the Matter of the Application of	)	
Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC to	)	
Amend Its Certificate Issued in	)	Case No. 18-1346-EL-BGA
Case No. 10-2865-EL-BGN	)	

**PETITION TO INTERVENE OF ANDREW J. BIGLIN, MARCIA M. BIGLIN,  
GARY J. BIGLIN, KAREL A. DAVIS, BRETT A. HEFFNER, ALAN PRICE,  
CATHERINE PRICE, MARGARET RIETSCHLIN, AND JOHN WARRINGTON,**

Pursuant to R.C. 4906.08(A)(3) and O.A.C. 4906-2-12, Andrew J. Biglin, Marcia M. Biglin, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Alan Price, Catherine Price, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington (collectively, “Intervenors”) hereby petition the Ohio Power Siting Board for an order granting their intervention as parties in this proceeding.

This Petition to Intervene is supported by the Memorandum In Support set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John F. Stock  
John F. Stock (0004921)  
Mark D. Tucker (0036855)  
BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP  
41 S. High St., 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 223-9300  
FAX: (614) 223-9330

*Attorneys for Intervenors Andrew J. Biglin, Marcia M. Biglin, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Alan Price, Catherine Price, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington*

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF**  
**PETITION TO INTERVENE**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC (“Black Fork”) filed its application for a certificate to construct the Black Fork Wind Energy project in Crawford and Richland counties on March 10, 2011, Case No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (“Original Proceeding”). On August 30, 2011, the Board granted the motions to intervene of, *inter alia*, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Alan Price, Catherine Price, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2-4, ¶¶7, 9, 11-12 (Aug. 30, 2011).

The case proceeded to an adjudicatory hearing before the Board on September 19 and October 11-13, 2011. On January 23, 2012, the Board issued its Opinion, Order, and Certificate granting the requested certificate (the “Certificate”). *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (Jan. 23, 2012). The Certificate required Black Fork to commence “a continuous course of construction of the proposed facility within five years of the date of journalization of the certificate.” *Id.* at 50, ¶70. On December 18, 2013, the Ohio Supreme Court affirmed the Board’s Decision. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, L.C.C.*, 138 Ohio St.3d 43, 2013-Ohio-5478.

On September 12, 2014, Black Fork filed an application to amend its Certificate to add two new turbine models for use on the project, Case No. 14-1591-EL-BGA (“First Amendment Proceeding”). On August 27, 2015, the Board granted the motions to intervene of, *inter alia*, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington in the First Amendment Proceeding, and approved the application for amendment. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA (Aug. 27, 2015).

Also on September 12, 2014, Black Fork filed a document in the Original Proceeding, Case No. 10-2865-EL-BGN titled “Motion for Extension of Certificate” (“Motion”), requesting the Board to extend the term of its Certificate, *i.e.*, the time within which it must commence a continuous course of construction, from January 23, 2017 to January 23, 2019. The Board granted that motion, *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (March 24, 2016), and subsequently denied the Intervenor’s Application for Rehearing. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (Feb. 2, 2017). An appeal of that decision is currently pending before the Ohio Supreme Court, Case No. 17-0412.

On June 6, 2017, Black Fork filed another application for an amendment to the Certificate to permit the use a higher capacity turbine, and to extend the Certificate’s term by another year until January 23, 2020 (“Second Amendment Proceeding”). On December 7, 2017, the Board granted the motions to intervene of, *inter alia*, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Alan Price, Catherine Price, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington in the Second Amendment Proceeding, and approved Black Fork’s proposed amendments to its Certificate. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA (Dec. 7, 2017). The Board subsequently denied Intervenor’s application for rehearing. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA (June 21, 2018). An appeal of that decision is also currently pending before the Ohio Supreme Court, Case No. 18-1134.

On October 15, 2018, Black Fork filed yet another application to amend, commencing this, the “Third Amendment Proceeding.”

Through this application, Black Fork is requesting to add the Siemens G132 (3.55 MW) turbine as a turbine suitable for this project. The Siemens G132 model takes advantage of a larger turbine rotor and other advances in technology to produce significantly more power per turbine than the other turbine models currently approved.

Application to Amend at 4. Although Black Fork asserts that the hub height of the new turbine “will be at or below the maximum height of the tallest turbine currently approved,” *id.*, it acknowledges that “the Siemens G132 has a rotor diameter of 132 meters, which is a 22-meter increase from the current turbine model with the largest diameter of 110 meters (the Vestas V110).” *Id.* Thus, while it claims that the new turbine “will result in less [noise] impact compared to previously approved turbine models because of a combination of technological advances and the fact that less turbines will be required for the project,” *id.*,<sup>1</sup> it also concedes that “project shadow flicker will increase” because of the longer turbine rotor. *Id.*

The Intervenor—seven of whom sought and were granted intervention in the Original Proceeding, Case No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, and the Second Amendment Proceeding, Case No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, and five of whom sought and were granted intervention in the First Amendment Proceeding, Case No. 14-1591-EL-BGA—now ask the Board’s permission to intervene in this new “Third Amendment Proceeding,” Case No. 18-1346-EL-BGA.

## **II. ARGUMENT**

### **A. Intervenors’ Protected Interests**

Intervenor Gary J. Biglin is a non-participating landowner and family farmer in Richland County’s Sharon Township. His farm abuts property leased for the Project on three sides. Biglin sought intervention in the Original Proceeding (No. 10-2865-EL-BGN), the First Amendment Proceeding (No. 14-1591-EL-BGA), and the Second Amendment Proceeding (No. 17-1148-EL-BGA). He was granted intervention in all three proceedings. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 3-4, ¶11 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re*

---

<sup>1</sup>Black Fork notes that “[s]ound power levels for the Siemens G132 3.55 MW wind turbine is under restricted release by the manufacturer,” Application to Amend, Appendix B at 3, and is not, therefore, provided with its Application to Amend.

*Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017). With regard to Biglin, the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) in the Original Proceeding stated:

The nature and extent of Mr. Biglin's interest in this case is individual and direct. It is amply demonstrated by the facts that: he has been offered contract claims with regard to this project by Element Power; that the applicant has leased property on three sides of his farm; and that the application refers to a phase of the project that could entirely encompass his property. On this basis, the ALJ finds that Mr. Biglin meets the requirements for intervention and his motion to intervene shall be granted.

*In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 3-4, ¶11 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenor Karel A. Davis is a non-participating landowner in Richland County’s Plymouth Township, within the boundaries of the proposed project. Davis sought intervention in the Original Proceeding, the First Amendment Proceeding, and the Second Amendment Proceeding. She was granted intervention in all three proceedings. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 4, ¶12 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017). With regard to Davis, the ALJ in the Original Proceeding stated:

[S]he and her husband live within the boundaries of the proposed project, and that, as an intervenor, she wishes to represent the interests of “many non-contract land owners within the project area.” Based on the fact that she resides within the boundaries of the proposed project, which the company has failed to address in its response to Ms. Davis’ motion to intervene, the ALJ finds that Ms. Davis should be permitted to intervene on her own behalf; accordingly, her motion to intervene shall be granted.

*In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 4, ¶12 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenor Brett A. Heffner is a non-participating landowner in Richland County, near the proposed project. Heffner sought intervention in the Original Proceeding, the First Amendment Proceeding, and the Second Amendment Proceeding. He was granted intervention in all three proceedings. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 3, ¶9 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017). With regard to Heffner, the ALJ in the Original Proceeding stated that “Mr. Heffner's motion to intervene meets the requirements for intervention set forth in Section 4906.08(A)(2), Revised Code, and Rule 4906-7-04(A)(1), O.A.C [now, O.A.C. §4906-2-12].” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 3, ¶9 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenors Alan and Catherine Price are a non-participating residents and landowners in Crawford County’s Vernon Township, near the proposed project. The Prices sought intervention in both the Original Proceeding and the Second Amendment Proceeding. They were granted intervention in both cases. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2-3, ¶7 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017).<sup>2</sup> With regard to the Prices, the ALJ in the Original Proceeding stated that their motions “m[et] the requirements for intervention set forth in Section 4906.08, Revised Code, and Rule 4906-7-04(A)(2), O.A.C. [now, O.A.C. §4906-

---

<sup>2</sup>The Prices did not seek intervention in the First Amendment Proceeding, Case No. 14-1591-EL-BGA.

2-12].” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2, ¶7 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenor Margaret Rietschlin is a non-participating resident and landowner in Crawford County’s Vernon Township, near the proposed project. She is President of Rietschlin Construction, Inc., a family-owned construction company that is operated from facilities on her property near the proposed project. Rietschlin sought intervention in the Original Proceeding, the First Amendment Proceeding, and the Second Amendment Proceeding. She was granted intervention in all three proceedings. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2-3, ¶9 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017). With regard to Rietschlin, the ALJ in the Original Proceeding stated that her motion “m[et] the requirements for intervention set forth in Section 4906.08, Revised Code, and Rule 4906-7-04(A)(2), O.AC. [now, O.A.C. §4906-2-12].” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2, ¶7 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenor John Warrington is a non-participating resident and landowner in Crawford County’s Vernon Township, near the proposed project. His residence is located near the proposed placement of at least one turbine, and his property abuts property leased for the project to the north and west. Warrington sought intervention in the Original Proceeding, the First Amendment Proceeding, and the Second Amendment Proceeding. He was granted intervention in all three proceedings. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2-3, ¶9 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind*

*Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA, slip op. at 4, ¶17 (Dec. 7, 2017). With regard to Warrington, the ALJ in the Original Proceedings stated that his motion “m[et] the requirements for intervention set forth in Section 4906.08, Revised Code, and Rule 4906-7-04(A)(2), O.AC. [now, O.A.C. §4906-2-12].” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2, ¶7 (Aug. 30, 2011).

Intervenors Andrew J. and Marcia M. Biglin are non-participating residents and landowners in Crawford County’s Vernon Township, near the proposed project. They purchased their home this past summer from Bradley and Debra Bauer. The Bauers sought and were granted intervention in the Original Proceeding. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2-3, ¶9 (Aug. 30, 2011); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 3 (Aug. 27, 2015). With regard to the Bauers, the ALJ in the Original Proceedings stated that their motions “m[et] the requirements for intervention set forth in Section 4906.08, Revised Code, and Rule 4906-7-04(A)(2), O.AC. [now, O.A.C. §4906-2-12].” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2, ¶7 (Aug. 30, 2011).

## **B. Intervention Standard**

The Intervenors submit that they meet all requirements for intervention in these proceedings as set forth in R.C. 4903.08(A) and O.A.C. 4906-2-12(B)(1). The Board may consider the following when determining petitions to intervene:

- (a) The nature and extent of the person’s interest;
- (b) The extent to which the person’s interest is represented by existing parties;
- (c) The person’s potential contribution to a just and expeditious resolution of the issues involved in the proceeding; and



- (d) Whether granting the requested intervention would unduly delay the proceeding or unjustly prejudice an existing party.

O.A.C. 4906-2-12(B)(1). See also *In the Matter of the Application of Clean Energy Future—Lordstown, LLC*, No. 14-2322-EL-BGN, slip op. at 2, ¶5 (Ohio Power Siting Bd. July 28, 2015) (setting forth factors the Board considers in resolving motions to intervene); *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Co.*, No. 01-2153-EL-BTX, slip op. at 3, ¶8 (Ohio Power Siting Bd. Jan. 29, 2004) (same). The Ohio Supreme Court has interpreted this rule as providing that “[a]ll interested parties may intervene in [Board] proceedings upon a showing of good cause.” *State, ex rel. Ohio Edison Co. v. Parrott*, 73 Ohio St.3d 705, 708 (1995) (citation omitted).

**C. Intervenors Are Entitled To Intervene**

***1. Intervenors Have Real And Substantial Interests In This Matter***

Each of the Intervenors has a real and substantial interest in this matter. All reside within or near the project area, and most own and reside on property that abuts property on which turbines are proposed to be situated.<sup>3</sup> They have a real and substantial interest in ensuring that the proposed amendment—the substitution of a turbine with increased capacity over those previously specified in the Certificate and amendments thereto—does not have additional adverse impacts on their land, residences, roads, communities, and lives.

Black Fork has admitted in its Application to Amend that “project shadow flicker will increase if the Siemens G132 is used . . . .” Application to Amend at 4.

---

<sup>3</sup>Black Fork seeks the Board’s approval to use the Siemens G132 turbine model on the project. It has indicated that “*if* Black Fork utilizes the Siemens G132 model, the project would consist of only 56 turbines versus 91 turbines . . . .” Because Black Fork has not committed to actually using the Siemens G132 turbine model, the precise location of the “56 turbines versus 91 turbines” cannot definitely be established, and it must, therefore, be presumed that each of the Intervenors’ homes and properties will continue to be impacted by the presence of nearby turbines.

Due to the presence of additional nearby nonparticipating receptors since the previous modeling was conducted in support of the September 12, 2014 Amendment Application, as well as the increased rotor diameter of the Siemens G132, additional nonparticipating receptors are modeled to experience shadow flicker in excess of 30 hours per year . . . .

Application to Amend at 7.<sup>4</sup> Black Fork’s own data—Table 2 attached to the Application to Amend, entitled “Shadow Flicker Comparison”—shows a nearly three-fold increase in the number of residences that will experience 30 or more hours of shadow flicker per year (the standard requiring mitigation under the Condition 55 of the Certificate)<sup>5</sup> by using the Siemens G132 turbine (48 residences) over the highest number for an already approved turbine model—the Vestas V100 (17 residences). Indeed, Table 2 establishes a ten-fold increase in the number of non-participating residences (from 1 to 10) that will experience more than 50 hours of shadow flicker per year by using the Siemens G132 turbine model.

In addition, while Black Fork has acknowledged the increase in shadow flicker from the substantially longer turbine blades, it has completely failed to address the effects of such longer blades on expected bird and bat mortalities. Intervenors maintain that this factor must be considered when determining whether to approve the proposed amendment as it directly implicates the project’s environmental and ecological impact, one of the factors the Board is required to consider under R.C. 4906.10(A).

Intervenors also have an interest in ensuring the proper application of setback requirements made applicable to this project through Amended Substitute House Bill

---

<sup>4</sup>Black Fork notes that the Siemens G132 (3.55 MW) turbine model “has a rotor diameter of 132 meters, which is a 22-meter increase from the current turbine model with the largest diameter of 110 meters (the Vestas V110).” Application to Amend at 4.

<sup>5</sup>The Board has noted that “30 hours of shadow flicker per year [is] the threshold of significant impact, or the point at which shadow flicker is commonly perceived as an annoyance.” *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN, slip op. at 21 (Jan. 23, 2012).

(“Am.Sub.H.B.”) 483 (effective September 15, 2014). When first enacted as part of Am.Sub.H.B. 562, effective June 24, 2004, R.C. 4906.20 required the Board to adopt regulations governing the certification of “economically significant wind farms”—wind farms with a single interconnection to the electrical grid and capable of generating an aggregate of between five and fifty megawatts of electricity, see R.C. 4906.13(A). Those regulations were to include minimum setbacks as provided in the statute:

The rules also shall prescribe a minimum setback for a wind turbine of an economically significant wind farm. That minimum shall be equal to *a horizontal distance, from the turbine's base to the property line of the wind farm property, equal to one and one-tenth times the total height of the turbine structure* as measured from its base to the tip of its highest blade and be *at least seven hundred fifty feet in horizontal distance from the tip of the turbine's nearest blade at ninety degrees to the exterior of the nearest, habitable, residential structure, if any, located on adjacent property at the time of the certification application.*

R.C. 4906.20(B)(2) (as enacted in Am.Sub.H.B. 562, effective June 24, 2008) (emphasis added).

As noted in the Certificate, the Board, by rule, applied these setback requirements to all wind projects within its jurisdiction. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (Jan. 23, 2012) (citing former O.A.C. §4906-17-08(C)(1)(c)). These were the setback requirements in effect when the Board issued the original Certificate to Black Fork on January 23, 2012.

R.C. 4906.20 was amended in Am.Sub.H.B. 59, effective September 29, 2013, to increase the setback requirements:

That minimum shall be equal to a horizontal distance, from the turbine's base to the property line of the wind farm property, equal to one and one-tenth times the total height of the turbine structure as measured from its base to the tip of its highest blade and be *at least one thousand one hundred twenty-five feet* in horizontal distance from the tip of the turbine's nearest blade at ninety degrees to the exterior of the nearest, habitable, residential structure, if any, located on adjacent property at the time of the certification application.

R.C. 4906.20(B)(2) (as amended in Am.Sub.H.B. 59, effective Sep. 29, 2013) (emphasis added).

In addition, Am.Sub.H.B. 59 enacted new section R.C. 4906.201, which extended the setback requirements to wind farms generating fifty megawatts or more, such as the Black Fork wind farm certified by the Board:

An electric generating plant that consists of wind turbines and associated facilities with a single interconnection to the electrical grid that is designed for, or capable of, operation at an aggregate capacity of fifty megawatts or more is subject to the minimum setback requirements established in rules adopted by the power siting board under division (B)(2) of section 4906.20 of the Revised Code.

R.C. 4906.201(A) (as enacted in Am.Sub.H.B. 59, effective Sep. 29, 2013).

R.C. 4906.20 was amended once again by Am.Sub.H.B. 483, effective September 15, 2014. That section changed the setback requirements from the nearest habitable residence to the nearest adjacent property line:

That minimum shall be equal to a horizontal distance, from the turbine's base to the property line of the wind farm property, equal to one and one-tenth times the total height of the turbine structure as measured from its base to the tip of its highest blade and be at least one thousand one hundred twenty-five feet in horizontal distance from the tip of the turbine's nearest blade at ninety degrees *to property line of the nearest adjacent property* at the time of the certification application.

R.C. 4906.20(B)(2)(a) (as amended in Am.Sub.H.B. 483, effective Sep. 15, 2014) (emphasis added).

R.C. 4906.201 also was amended to expressly provide that Amended Substitute House Bill 483's new setback requirements apply to any amendments to existing certificates made after September 15, 2014 (the act's effective date):

*Any amendment made to an existing certificate after the effective date of the amendment of this section by H.B. 483 of the 130th general assembly, shall be subject to the setback provision of this section as amended by that act. The amendments to this section by that act shall not be construed to limit or abridge any rights or remedies in equity or under the common law.*

R.C. 4906.201(B)(2) (as amended in Am.Sub.H.B. 483, effective Sep. 15, 2014) (emphasis added). Accordingly, any amendment to Black Fork’s Certificate made after September 15, 2014 was subject to the new setback requirements of the act and each wind turbine was required to be setback at least 1,125 feet *from the property line of the nearest adjacent property*.

The Board has, on three prior occasions, impermissibly amended Black Fork’s Certificate after September 15, 2014, without requiring adherence to Am.Sub.H.B. 483’s setback requirements. *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LLC*, No. 14-1591-EL-BGA, slip op. at 7 (Aug. 27, 2015); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 10-2865-EL-BGN (March 24, 2016); *In re Application of Black Fork Wind Energy, LCC*, No. 17-1148-EL-BGA (Dec. 7, 2017). The Board is now being asked to approve yet another amendment, and to again do so without application of the new setback requirements of Am.Sub.H.B. 483.<sup>6</sup>

As noted above, with the exception of Andrew J. and Marcia M Biglin—who now own and occupy the residence formerly owned and occupied by prior intervenors Bradley and Debra Bauer—the Board has previously allowed each of the Intervenors in this case to intervene in the prior proceedings dealing with project. Those intervention rulings are entirely consistent with Board precedent. The Board has granted numerous petitions to intervene filed by property owners whose property would be affected by a proposed project. See, *e.g.*, *In the Matter of the Application of Buckeye Wind LLC*, No. 13-360-EL-BGA, slip op. at 5-6, ¶¶12-14 (Ohio Power Siting Bd. Nov. 21, 2013) (granting motion of proposed intervenors who claimed that the wind project would have “potential impacts” on “their residences, land, roads, and community”). See also *In the Matter of the Application of Champaign Wind, LLC*, No. 12-160-EL-BGN, slip op. 3-

---

<sup>6</sup>In its Application to Amend, Black Fork presupposes that “the approved project setbacks”—the setback requirements in effect at the time the original Certificate was issued—remain applicable to the project. Application to Amend at 5.

6, ¶¶19-23, 25 (Ohio Power Siting Bd. Aug. 2, 2012) (granting motion to intervene of “property owners who own real estate and reside within the footprint of the” wind turbine project and who “have a direct and substantial interest in [the] matter, in light of the potential visual, aesthetic, safety, and nuisance impacts of the wind project on their residences, land, and community”); *In the Matter of the Application of American Transmission Systems, Inc.*, No. 12-1636-EL-BTX, slip op. at 1-2, ¶¶3-6 (Ohio Power Siting Bd. May 21, 2014) (granting motions to intervene of property owner along the possible alternate route of a proposed transmission line).

**2. *Intervenors’ Interests Are Not Already Adequately Represented***

To Intervenors’ knowledge, no other non-participating residents and property owners have to date sought to intervene in these proceedings. The interests of such persons—and specifically, the interests of the individual Intervenors—is not, therefore, adequately represented in these proceedings.

**3. *Intervenors Will Contribute To A Just And Expeditious Resolution Of Issues***

Intervenors will contribute to a just and expeditious resolution of the issues in these proceedings. Intervenors have a unique, independent perspective on the issues outlined above to offer the Board. Their participation is crucial to an informed, balanced, and fair disposition of the interests of *all* parties who will be affected by the Board’s disposition of these proceedings. The Intervenors will abide by all determinations of the Board in this proceeding.

**4. *Intervenors’ Participation Will Neither Delay These Proceedings Nor Prejudice Parties***

Just as they have in prior proceedings dealing with this project, Intervenors will neither unduly delay these proceedings nor unjustly prejudice any party. The Intervenors will abide by all Board deadlines in these cases and present their information in a clear and succinct manner.

No date has been set for any hearing nor has any specific deadline been established by the Board in these proceedings. This petition to intervene is timely and will not unduly prejudice any existing party.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Intervenors request the Board to grant this Petition To Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John F. Stock

John F. Stock (0004921)

Mark D. Tucker (0036855)

BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP

41 S. High St., 26<sup>th</sup> Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 223-9300

FAX: (614) 223-9330

*Attorneys for Intervenors Andrew J. Biglin, Marcia M. Biglin, Gary J. Biglin, Karel A. Davis, Brett A. Heffner, Alan Price, Catherine Price, Margaret Rietschlin, and John Warrington*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion To Intervene was served, via regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid, and email this 14th day of November, 2018, upon all parties listed in the attached Exhibit A.

/s/ John F. Stock \_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Stock



### Exhibit A

Matt Bachelder  
Mansfield-Richfield County Public Library  
Ontario Branch  
2221 Village Mall Drive  
Onario, Ohio 44906

Galion Public Library  
123 N. Market Street  
Galion, Ohio 44833

Joseph C. Palmer, Director  
Mansfield-Richland County Public Library  
43 W. Third Street  
Mansfield, Ohio 44902

Kathy Webb, Director  
Marvin Memorial Library  
29 W. Whitney Avenue  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

Brenda Crider, Director  
Bucyrus Public Library  
200 E. Mansfield Street  
Bucyrus, Ohio 44820

Mayor Ron Brown  
Village of Tiro  
5870 SR 98  
Tiro, Ohio 44887

Crawford County Commissioners  
112 E. Mansfield Street, Suite 304  
Bucyrus, Ohio 44820

Gary Frankhouse, Executive Director  
Crawford County Education and Economic  
Development Partnership  
117 E. Mansfield Street, Suite 208  
Bucyrus, Ohio 44820

Auburn Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Jeanette D. Brown  
218 N. Main Street  
Tiro, Ohio 44887

Jackson Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Kathleen F. Paynter  
7950 Old Field Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Jefferson Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Kathryn Weber  
5853 Crestline Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Sandusky Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Tracy Cleland  
Township Hall  
5812 Annapolis DeKalb Rd.  
Tiro, Ohio 44887

Vernon Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Robin L. Hipsher  
7600 Cole Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Richland County Commissioners  
50 Park Avenue East  
Mansfield, Ohio 44902

Matthew Huffman, Executive Director  
Richland County Regional Planning  
Commission  
35 N. Park St., Suite 230  
Mansfield, Ohio 44902

Sandusky Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Sally Glauer  
5201 Hook Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Gary J. Biglin  
5331 State Route 61 South  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

Carol and Loren Gledhill  
7255 Remlinger Rd.  
Crestline, Ohio 44827-9775

Brett A. Heffner  
3429 Stein Road  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

Chad A. Endsley  
Ohio Farm Bureau Federation  
280 N. High Street  
P.O. Box 182382  
Columbus, Ohio 43218-2382

Grover Reynolds  
7179 Remlinger Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

John Warrington  
7040 State Route 96  
Tiro, Ohio 44887

Mary Studer  
6716 Remlinger Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Plymouth Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer M. Francis Miller  
7025 Kuhn Road  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

Sharon Township Trustees  
c/o Fiscal Officer Ursula Esterline  
24 Taft Street  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

Debra and Bradley F. Bauer  
7298 Remlinger Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Kaerel A. Davis  
6675 Champion Road  
Shelby, Ohio 44875

William P. Alt  
1718 Gulfside Village Blvd.  
Apopka, FL 32712

Thomas Karbula  
3026 Solinger Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Katherine and Alan Price  
7956 Remlinger Rd.  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Margaret Rietschlin  
4240 Baker Road  
Crestline, Ohio 44827

Michael J. Settineri  
MacDonald W. Taylor  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street  
P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/14/2018 3:31:27 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 18-1346-EL-BGA**

Summary: Petition TO INTERVENE OF ANDREW J. BIGLIN, MARCIA M. BIGLIN, GARY J. BIGLIN, KAREL A. DAVIS, BRETT A. HEFFNER, ALAN PRICE, CATHERINE PRICE, MARGARET RIETSCHLIN, AND JOHN WARRINGTON  
electronically filed by John F Stock on behalf of Andrew J Biglin and Marcia M Biglin and Gary J Biglin and Karel A Davis and Brett A Heffner and Alan Price and Catherine Price and Margaret Rietschlin and John Warrington