

Fra: "Greg Huetinck" <ghuetinck@yahoo.com>
Sendt: torsdag 18. september 2025 22.29.02
Til: "NVE Postmottak" <nve@nve.no>
Emne: Consultation Statement 202514643
Vedlegg: IMG_9475 2.jpeg, DJI_0420.jpeg, IMG_9483.jpeg, IMG_9482.jpeg

Gregory Huetinck
Hagane Gard
Ofredalsvegen 787
6885 Årdalstangen
+460725001004

Good Day,

Please read my concerns below regarding case number 202514643.

I am against the change to the original permit regarding dam location and modification for the following reasons:

Moving the dam upstream 200m to a narrower part of the river - with steeper banks will be far more susceptible to blockage by fallen trees and other debris - and will cause a heavy negative impact to my farm; especially when flooding takes place to the degree it did last November. My fields and bridge were considerably damaged in the flood - without a dam close downstream to catch fallen trees, raise water levels and aggravate the destruction.

The original position of the dam has been thoroughly vetted, commented on and extensively studied. It is positioned to create a wider flood area with more room for heavy water management without creating a severe bottleneck. Also, it is situated so any flood damage resulting from the dam will affect the farm that is being paid a considerable annual stipend to host the power plant.

The original dam location is the best position to handle flooding in the valley. Hagane Gard would bear all the risk for flooding if the new location was approved - despite receiving zero compensation for the operation of the power plant.

I would say the main reason for wanting to move the dam is economic - as it is cheaper to build and manage - except when the river runs high. It was probably permitted in the original location as the obvious spot for managing flood control.

My acceptance of the original plan without complaint was due to its position at the lower end of Skogli Farm - where Hagane Gard would not be affected.

I am completely opposed to moving the dam towards my farm from its originally permitted location. The river flow near my waterfall will be affected, the water will pool, the flood risk will be completely unacceptable. The additional water depth under my bridge would make it prohibitively expensive and nearly impossible to repair and maintain the bridge foundations.

The application to move and reconfigure the dam was conceived without any modeling, engineering study or consideration towards the projected effects of flooding on my bridge and fields.

The farm being paid compensation to host the power plant should take the water damage risk - not the farm upstream.

I also oppose long permit extensions. The incessant extension process leaves open a constant assault to reduce costs from the original proposal - to work around accepted and thoroughly vetted solutions in an effort to slide in proposals that likely would have never initially been accepted. The permit should be extended for another year or two - and expire entirely without action to actually build.

Also with the application for a change in permit all negotiations for compensation should be reopened - as many farms that stand to benefit from the power plant have not had their compensation package updated to reflect the meteoric increase in the price of electricity in recent years as Norwegian companies continue to export green power heavily to the European market at great profit.

Please see attached flood damage photos.

Thank you and best regards,

Gregory Huetinck