

TESTIMONY OF GREG SMITH
Seneca County
IN OPPOSITION TO Sub. H. B. 114

Chairman Balderson, Vice Chairman Jordan, Ranking Member O'Brien and members of the Committee, I am a resident of Seneca County and I am against the proposed reduction of the property line setbacks for industrial wind turbines in Sub HB 114. My name is Greg Smith and I am the Senior Vice President of Engineering & Operations at National Machinery in Tiffin, Ohio. I am here today to speak against any revision of the setback distance for industrial wind turbines.

In 2002, my wife and I purchased 35 acres in Bloom Township located in Seneca County. We have since built our home on the property and we have converted a 20-acre tillable field into a series of conservation programs that includes wildlife habitat, food plots, and wind breaks. We have planted over 3000 trees and the wildlife in the area has flourished. We know what it means to be environmentally conscious.

The proposed Seneca Wind Farm plans include (19) turbines within a 1.5-mile radius of our home. Since we are adjacent landowners, we did receive the so-called Good Neighbor contract which we have no intentions of signing due to the Setback Easement clause that would allow the turbines to be located even closer to our home than what the current Setback law allows.

I strongly oppose the idea of reducing the setback distances to wind turbines. I feel the setback law should remain unchanged in order to protect the rights of non-participating land owners. In my case with owning 35 acres, there is a big difference where a turbine can be located when you measure from our property line versus from our residence.

On May 18th, I read an article on the Ohio Chamber of Commerce Facebook page related to recent developments with Sub-House Bill 114. The article included a statement and I quote:

"Another provision included (with) the substitute bill is a proposed fix to Ohio's overly restrictive wind turbine setback law". Overly restrictive setback laws? For who? What about the rights and safety of the adjacent property owners?

The article went on to state that *"the Senate's approach will adequately protect the interests of the property owner".* Adequately protect? Is any Senate committee member here today willing to personally guarantee this?

Please reconsider the proposed changes to the setback rules. Thank you for the opportunity to consider my input.

Greg Smith
5139 E. Twp. Rd. 44
Bloomville, OH 44818