

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT 16-1871- EL-BGN
Date: Friday, April 10, 2020 9:47:47 AM

From: salbright2@aol.com <salbright2@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2020 3:02 PM
To: Puco ContactOPSB <contactopsb@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: Icebreaker Wind, Inc., Case #16-1871- EL-BGN, Public Comments

Good Afternoon Mr. Butler,

I am writing in regard to the letter that was posted to Public Comments from April Popp on 4/06/2020. First, the letter was written on Dickinson-Wright Attorneys letterhead. However, it was written and signed by a secretary with no mention of, or sanction by, a partner at the law firm. It is my understanding that lawyers involved in a pending case are **not allowed** to post public comments. And of course, they did not in this instance. Allowing a secretary to do so on their letterhead should not be allowed either. It looks unethical to this observer.

Second, the submission is a compilation of previously submitted letters, as evidenced by the dates on the letters. The first one, dated March 20, 2020, identifies the project as "Lighthouse Wind", when in fact, it is Lighthouse Wind, Inc., a for profit corporation owned by a foreign developer, Fred Olsen.

Third, the last letter included is dated 12/03/2019, and also leaves off the "Inc." designation. Further, it falsely states that the project application was submitted by LEEDCo (Lake Erie Economic Development Company), a nonprofit company in Cleveland. Wrong. It was submitted by Icebreaker Wind, Inc.

The March 20, 2020 letter in the inclusion makes claims regarding jobs and economic benefits that the project will bring, but fails to present data or evidence to support the claims. Further, it states:

"Finally, we support the health and environmental benefits of this project as well: it will reduce air pollution, improve public health, and help to mitigate climate change."

Again, no evidence is offered, including how it will reduce air pollution, since it is only an additive to the electric grid and the conventional energy sources will not be shut down (based on the fact that nowhere in the world has a conventional energy producer been shuttered where a wind project has been constructed).

Where in the submission does it dispute the heinous anticipated avian slaughter that has led to a lawsuit against the DOE by the Black Swamp Bird Observatory and American Bird Conservatory, anticipated because an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) by an independent organization was not done versus the biased studies that were paid for by the Icebreaker Wind, Inc. developer? And, if that lawsuit is won, any and all construction done by the developer in Lake Erie will be required to be dismantled and removed. How much wasted money and materials would that entail? How environmentally desirable would that be? It sounds terribly risky to me!

I would think that the legal firm Dickinson-Wright would not allow this type of public comment, including the inaccurate information, the lack of scientific evidence, the lack of new information, and the glaring fact that there is pending litigation that will delay or prevent the project, on it's letterhead by a secretary. That certainly doesn't impress me as worthy of consideration!

Respectfully Submitted,
Suzanne Albright
Co-director, Great Lakes Wind Truth, USA

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/10/2020 9:57:47 AM

in

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

Summary: Public Comment of Suzanne Albright, Co-director, Great Lakes Wind Truth, USA,
via website,
electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing