

Re: Opposition to SB 52/HB 118

Dear Ohio Lawmakers,

**I strongly oppose SB 52 and HB 118 because:**

- **it prevents the positive economic development** that wind and solar would provide to rural Ohio landowners and school districts.
- An Ohio renewable energy project has the potential of providing \$130 million in investment, 100 construction jobs, and 10 permanent local jobs to a community. It could deliver \$ 50 million in land owner payments, \$55 million in local school funding revenue, and \$ 25 million in local tax revenue to fund police, fire, and county and township services while requiring very little in terms of local services.
- **It is anti-consumer** because it increases consumer energy costs by restricting the supply of energy.
- **It is anti-business** because many Ohio businesses are choosing to obtain fixed cost energy renewables and these bills dramatically hinder their ability to make energy choices, manage energy costs, and take control of their energy future.
- **These bills are politicizing infrastructure projects** and setting a troubling precedent that will have a limiting effect on future projects of all kinds.
- **These bills are retroactive and will effect projects already in the pipeline** that are waiting for permits. Businesses, relying on the present law, have spent significant amounts of money to get to the point of requesting a permit. SB 52 and HB 118 negates their efforts, causing them to lose the time and money they have already invested **and may violate the prohibition on “ex post facto” laws.**

**I urge you to vote NO to SB 52 and HB 118.**

Sincerely,

Chris Pekoc