

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: public comment 20-1605-EL-BGN
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 7:14:38 PM

Submitted to OPSB because I could not stay at the November 4th meeting long enough to testify.

I arrived too close to the starting time and my name was near the end of the list.

In the spirit evidenced at the meeting, I promise this submission will be truthful, but opinionated.

Name: H. Bruce Dukeman

Address: 200 Arrowhead Trl, Lima, Ohio 45806-1500, Shawnee Township

Location: Directly NE of the NE corner of the latest Overview Map and adjacent to a drainage ditch for the Project.

Flooding: My wife and I own an 8 acre property located NW of the intersection of Breese Rd and Beeler Rd.

We have lived on the property since acquisition 23 years ago. Flooding always has been a problem.

The property is bordered:

- >North by a ditch that drains significant acreage to the NW, including much Shawnee school land

- >South by a ditch that drains significant acreage to the SW, including a good part of the project

- >East by the Little Ottawa river that is about 8 miles long and drains land to the south and SE

We have endured much destruction due to flooding over the years, due to at least seven 100-year floods.

I have worked with the county to improve river flow and reroute the north ditch to improve matters.

The south ditch was a minor contributor to the problem but the Project seems likely to worsen matters.

County drainage personnel indicated over the years that faster run off exacerbates flooding problems.

The information being provided seems to indicate the Project will cause faster run off, not better absorption.

Many properties in and around the Project seem likely to be adversely affected by faster run off.

Additionally, many other adverse factors have been mentioned, some that affect me and some that don't.

However, I sympathize with those who seem likely to be more frequently and severely affected.

Therefore, I strongly oppose the Project because it likely will increase flooding for those in close proximity.

Recipients: A goodly number of individuals testified in support of the Project on November 4th.

My wife and I were somewhat surprised by this until we realized a college had bussed in students.

Further, it was apparent much other support was coming from folks living far from the Project.

As a still practicing CPA with advanced business degrees, I have significant financial experience.

One assumption usually proves true in situations like this, follow the money for the facts.

Clearly, aside from the youthful zealots, many positive testimonies resulted because of the money.

Further, of those interested in the money, few are living next to or near the immediate Project area.

Supposedly, many lessors are leaving or not situated near the Project area.

And clearly, most PILOT recipients are entities located well out of harm's way.

Therefore, it's easy for such folks to offer support because they will not be physically annoyed.

Therefore, I strongly oppose the Project because I very likely will be physically annoyed.

Land Use: Ohio has very varied topography, population densities and existing current development.

The alternative energy want-to-be suppliers care little about changing or disturbing land or people.

Highest on their list seems to be federal money, few restrictions, PILOT type tax alternatives, etc.

The huge influx of such suppliers clearly indicates Ohio is easy to convince, regardless of site.

My wife and I are not opposed to alternative energy sources per se, only those poorly placed.

Ohio has much land with no agricultural value and low population density available. It also has many possible rooftops and seems to have more every day, e.g. Chase Columbus parking.

Why does it make sense to take some of the best farm land in the state out of service?

Why does it make sense to put projects in high residential population density areas.

Rocky sites, remote sites, commercial areas with vast flat roofs all seem better suited.

Therefore, I definitely oppose the Project because its physical site makes no sense.

Respectfully submitted by email on Saturday, November 6, 2021.

H Bruce Dukeman

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

11/9/2021 10:13:32 AM

in

Case No(s). 20-1605-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment of H. Bruce Dukeman, via website, electronically filed
by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing