



# Ohio Environmental Council

## [Action Fund]

May 12, 2026

### Opposition Testimony - Senate Bill 294 Ohio Senate Energy Committee

Chair Chavez, Vice-Chair Landis, Ranking Member Smith and members of the Senate Energy Committee: Thank you for the opportunity to provide opponent testimony on Senate Bill 294 (SB 294). My name is Nolan Rutschilling, I serve as the Managing Director of Energy Policy for the Ohio Environmental Council Action Fund (OEC Action Fund). The OEC Action Fund's mission is to protect the environment and health of all Ohio communities. We share the goal of ensuring Ohio has affordable, reliable, and clean energy to meet growing demand, support economic development, and protect Ohio households and businesses.

The OEC Action Fund previously offered opponent testimony before this committee, and has the following concerns with the bill:

#### **SB 294 does not reflect the cost and supply chain realities facing energy generation in Ohio**

As recognized through House Bill 15's intended reform to siting and permitting processes, Ohio needs new generation online as soon as possible. Utility costs continue to rise, and in June, PJM capacity prices will again increase, driving up costs further. Picking winners and losers in the energy marketplace will not help solve this problem, and its important to note the following challenges to gas generation:

- Gas plant construction costs have spiked 66% in two years,<sup>1</sup> driving up costs for customers.
- Gas turbine supply chain constraints continue: a Wood McKenzie analysis<sup>2</sup> shows that the average lead time of gas turbine delivery was around five years in 2025, while in 2021 it was two years. Manufacturers are increasing capacity, but the impacts of that increase are not expected until 2030 and beyond.

Locking in Ohio for one or two types of generation that may be deployed at best 5-7 years from now means substantial risk of increasing costs for Ohioans. With this uncertainty around costs and deployment time, the Ohio legislature should focus on improving

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-04-23/cost-to-build-natural-gas-fired-power-plant-surges-66-bnef-says?embedded-checkout=true>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.woodmac.com/blogs/energy-pulse/supply-chain-constraints-limit-the-growth-of-gas/>



## Ohio Environmental Council [Action Fund]

permitting and siting for all forms of generation, rather than picking and choosing solutions.

### **SB 294 discounts the role and effectiveness of battery storage, and should define dispatchability by timeline**

Battery storage is a valuable resource for grid reliability, and is being used across Ohio to meet grid needs. Currently, projects using battery storage in front of the OPSB include:

- Natural Gas and battery storage
- Solar and battery storage
- Standalone Battery projects

The use of storage increases dispatchability, but SB 294 does not clarify timeline needed for energy to be dispatched at times of peak demand. We recommend the addition of language clarifying that generation should be able to be dispatched for at least 4 hours, which battery storage could easily meet. The market is clear—battery storage is a useful tool, and tweaking the language to better recognize its role would prevent restricting/discouraging its use across all generation types.

### **SB 294 could influence the regulatory process, and should instead be a resolution**

The OEC Action Fund recognizes the changes made to the legislation, particularly the language clarifying that the legislation is not meant to influence the Ohio Power Siting Board timelines or process. However, we suggest that with this change, the legislation is better suited as a resolution rather than a bill. We recommend this new language be adapted to be a resolution to ensure the market plays out fairly and without bias.

SB 294 sets out an important objective: ensuring Ohio's energy future is affordable, reliable, and clean. As written, the bill has the potential to pick winners and losers in the energy market, and could limit Ohio's options in a time when all energy options can help reduce utility costs and ensure reliability. To put it plainly: Ohioans concerned about land use tied to energy generation already have the ability to restrict generation based on preference, so this legislation just adds more confusion and barriers in the siting process.

We respectfully urge the Committee to consider making the bill a resolution, or to avoid passing it altogether.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony. I am happy to answer any questions.