

From: [Puco ContactOPSB](#)
To: [Puco Docketing](#)
Subject: public comment 21-0277 and 21-0669
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 8:40:10 AM
Attachments: [Document 2022-05-09 070814.pdf](#)

From: Linda Bishop <bish2468@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 9, 2022 7:11 AM
To: Butler, Matthew <matthew.butler@puco.ohio.gov>
Subject: Letters About Solar in Saturday's Findlay, OH courier attached

Cass 21-0277-EL-BGN
Washington 21-0669-EL-BGN

I will print and send you mine next. It was in the paper but they left off the last paragraph.

READERS' VIEWS

Technological progress?

Solar farms and windmills are not technological progress for the generation of electricity. They are a government subsidized and mandated boondoggle that makes electricity more expensive and less reliable.

Their problem is simple and obvious: they produce much less, or no, electricity when clouds block the sun or the wind blows too weakly or strongly. The Energy Information Administration reports their average capacity utilization in recent years has been roughly one-third for wind and one-quarter for solar. They don't necessarily work when you need them. When demand surges, we can't increase them.

By contrast, nuclear capacity utilization averages over 90%. Fossil fuel plants used to be designed for base-load operation like nuclear, except their operation could be scaled up or down with demand. The increased government subsidization and mandating of wind and solar is pushing fossil fuel use (mostly natural gas and some diesel) into "peaking" use, running overtime when windmills and solar farms aren't generating fully, then stopping when solar and wind glut the market. It is inefficient and wasteful use akin to driving your car somewhere at 20 mph, then

90 mph, then 20 mph, etc., instead of a steady, reasonable speed. Batteries are seldom used to even solar and wind generation out because they are far too expensive, despite about 150 years of development.

Solar and wind total costs are much higher than natural gas or coal because of this critical need for double coverage. How expensive is it? Denmark and Germany have pushed wind and solar generation much further than we have, and pay more than twice average U.S. costs for residential electricity per kilowatt-hour, even after we have already increased our own costs with solar and wind.

Government is pushing solar and wind power because climate models forecast a climate disaster with continued fossil fuel use. These models do not work, because small-scale phenomena important to determining climate, like storms, winds, mountain thermals, etc., cannot be modeled. So they get current temperatures and the pattern of the last century's warming wrong, and overpredict warming since 1979 by two times. Contrary to their forecasts, scientists have low confidence in any uptrends in disastrous weather worldwide over recent decades. Basing energy policy on these models has been a huge

mistake.

*Ralph Mulli
Fin*

THE COURIER, FRIDAY, MAY 6, 202

FFA creed alignment with solar agriculture

E.M. Tiffany wrote: "I believe in the future of agriculture with a faith born not of words, but of deeds. In the promise of better days through better ways.

"I believe that to live and work on a good farm, or to be engaged in other agricultural pursuits is pleasant as well as challenging. I believe American agriculture can and will hold true to the best traditions of our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community that will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task."

This was adopted as part of the FFA creed at the 3rd National FFA Convention. It as revised at the 38th and 63rd national conventions. As President of the Arcadia FFA Alumni, I cannot believe in the future of agriculture if building solar

(farms) is our deeds. What promise for better days are we leaving our children if we are leaving them to clean up our messes from solar (farms), unfit land to farm, and no promise of futures in agriculture?

When Tiffany wrote to live and work on a good farm, is a solar (farm) truly a good working farm when it only raises electric cost. He believed American agriculture would hold true to the best traditions of our national life. I don't think he meant for us to stray away from traditional agriculture and combine it with energy. I can certainly exert an influence in my home and community to stand solid as my part in the inspiring task of opposing South Branch Solar project in Washington Township of Hancock County.

Our ancestors never thought in their wildest dreams we would be turning our backs on them by being greedy for money and destroying our agriculture heritage. We must hold true to the best traditions of our national life to continue the promise of better days. Please don't support South Branch or Border Basin 1 Solar, provide better days for our children's futures in agriculture.

*Rachelle Harmon
Arcadia*

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

5/9/2022 8:46:25 AM

in

Case No(s). 21-0277-EL-BGN, 21-0669-EL-BGN

Summary: Public Comment of Linda Bishop, via website, electronically filed by
Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing