

**From:** [Puco ContactOPSB](#)  
**To:** [Puco Docketing](#)  
**Subject:** public comment 20-1605  
**Date:** Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:04:38 AM  
**Attachments:** [Request that you contact OPSB by July 14.msg](#)  
[Opposition- Birch Solar 1.msg](#)  
[Public Comment Opposing - Birch Solar 1 Case No. 20-1605.msg](#)

---

**From:** Bruce Dukeman  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:28 AM  
**To:** Butler, Matthew <matthew.butler@puco.ohio.gov>  
**Cc:** bseibert@allencountyohio.com  
**Subject:** Opposition - Ohio Power Siting Board Case Number: 20-1605-EL-BGN for Birch Solar 1

Mr. Butler,

I am writing you today as a follow up to my previous emails (attached).  
Will you please take action to include this submission in the OPSB's records

ooooooooooooooooOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOoooooooooooooooooooo

I and many others continue to be opposed to the Birch Solar 1 solar complex because it is:

1. being jammed into a very inhabited area; and
2. very likely to increase area flooding, especially for my property.

Birch Solar 1 wants you to believe there is strong support for the project.  
And they have spent considerable time and money to produce this illusion.  
It's true the property lessors are clearly in favor of the project.  
But also seems true many don't live in the footprint now or are planning to leave.

It's obvious this project is of a size and type not desired in near populated areas.  
Ohio passed a law putting such decision making at the local level, where it belongs.  
Allen County surveyed all twelve townships and found total opposition to this size.

Yes, Birch Solar 1 was grandfathered so it could legally avoid such governance.  
That's why it's so important for the OPSB to be responsive to Allen County's desires.

I have also received a recent email from one of our county Commissioners (attached).  
It provides evidence that "over 700 people" are on record with the county opposing Birch Solar 1.  
Perhaps the OPSB has not heard from many of them due to fear of communicating directly.

Therefore, I pray the OPSB will **NOT APPROVE BIRCH SOLAR 1** as it is configured.  
It is too big and too intrusive to be jammed into its planned Shawnee Township

location.

ooooooooooooooooOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOoooooooooooooooo

Thanks for your assistance as this matter has moved through the system.

Respectfully,

*H. Bruce Dukeman  
200 Arrowhead Trl  
Lima, OH 45806-1500*

**From:** [Beth Seibert](#)  
**To:** [hdukeman@woh.rr.com](mailto:hdukeman@woh.rr.com)  
**Subject:** Request that you contact OPSB by July 14  
**Date:** Thursday, July 7, 2022 3:19:00 PM

---

Bruce,

As someone who has expressed opposition to the Birch Solar project, I urge you to contact the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) and make sure they know that you are still opposed to the project. BP Lightsource, the developer of Birch Solar 1, wants the Ohio Power Siting Board to believe that all opposition to the project went away when “Against Birch Solar” withdrew its status as an intervener just prior to the May 18, 2022 OPSB Evidentiary Hearing. Lawyers for BP Lightsource and the Ohio Attorney General (OPSB’s attorney) are currently preparing briefs for their respective sides with a due date of July 15, 2022. And both sides are monitoring incoming comments closely.

The Ohio Power Siting Board Case Number: 20-1605-EL-BGN for Birch Solar 1 can found at the following web location: <https://opsb.ohio.gov/cases/20-1605-el-bgn>

From a review of the comments submitted through the project’s Open Case Record, there have only been twenty-one (21) submissions of comments in objection to the project since the evidentiary hearing. And over the same time period there have been sixteen (16) comments supporting the project. Just Sunday (July 3) BP Lightsource ran a full page color ad in The Lima News asking people to send an email to OPSB saying they support the project! And the advertisement listed the names of 61 people who support Birch Solar 1.

So it’s my goal to get as many of the over 700 people that I am certain still oppose the project to contact the OPSB over the next 7 days, speak out, and let their/your opposition be heard as this project heads into a final hearing (likely in Sept).

Send a message from the link in the web address in the second paragraph above OR email your communication to [matthew.butler@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:matthew.butler@puco.ohio.gov)

So please take action AND reach out to others who can also take action – “NO” TO BIRCH SOLAR.

Beth A. Seibert  
Allen County Commissioner  
204 N. Main Street, Suite 301  
PO Box 1243  
Lima, OH 45802  
419-223-8504  
[bseibert@allencountyohio.com](mailto:bseibert@allencountyohio.com)

**From:** [Bruce Dukeman](#)  
**To:** [Butler, Matthew](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition- Birch Solar 1

---

Mr. Butler,

I am writing you today as a follow up to my 11/28/21 email. I continue to be opposed to the Birch Solar 1 solar complex.

Since my prior communication Allen County Commissioners (after consulting with officials from all townships) have passed a resolution excluding our county from renewable energy developments of this size. I feel the OPSB should deny approval of the project even though it is grandfathered and such resolution is not legally applicable. However, I believe such resolution to be strong evidence to support a staff recommendation to OPSB members to disapprove Birch Solar 1 and hope you will continue to do so.

My wife and I recently communicated with the Commissioners and the Shawnee Township Trustees encouraging both sets of officials to send timely, clear, formal objections to construction of this solar complex to the OPSB.

As an aside, BP threw Allen County "under the bus" previously and assurances by this affiliate that it will not happen again are quite suspect.

Thank you for your ongoing evaluation and consideration of the negative factors related to Birch Solar 1.

Respectfully,

*H. Bruce Dukeman*  
*200 Arrowhead Trl*  
*Lima, OH 45806-1500*

**From:** [Bruce Dukeman](#)  
**To:** [Butler, Matthew](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing - Birch Solar 1, Case No. 20-1605

---

Mr. Butler,

I have already submitted a written public comment.  
You sent me the acknowledgement on behalf of the OPSB.

I'm not at all savvy about OPSB operations.  
So I'm assuming you are staff and assigned to this case.  
I'm writing directly to you upon learning the "staff" has recommended denial.  
But because of my lack of knowledge, I felt obliged to reach out.

My purpose is to reiterate and emphasize my most important logic point.  
**Project construction and resulting topography changes will increase flooding.**

I have an overall objection to more flooding in the general area.  
But it is crucial the 8 acre property my wife and I own **NOT** have added flooding.  
It lies at a junction point where two ditches drain into the Little Ottawa river.  
The south ditch is a conduit for runoff from thousands of acres, many in the project footprint.  
So is the north ditch but runoff comes from the north and west, not the southwest.  
During the worst storms now, only a small portion of our property doesn't flood severely.  
Thankfully, my home is on this small portion but it just barely avoids flooding.

**Even a small increase in the high-water mark will likely result in damage to my home.**

Hopefully, my points will bolster an overall opinion about flooding reached by the staff.

Therefore, will you please add this submission to the official case records and acknowledge its receipt?

Respectfully,  
*H Bruce Dukeman*  
200 Arrowhead Trl  
Lima, OH 45806-1500  
[hdukeman@woh.rr.com](mailto:hdukeman@woh.rr.com)  
419-234-8470

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

**7/14/2022 9:49:21 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