

Testimony Opposing SB88 – Ohio Property Protection Act

Submitted to the Senate General Government Committee

By Drew, Ohio Resident and Property Owner

Date: 5/26/2025

Chairman, Vice Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my testimony opposing **Senate Bill 88**, the Ohio Property Protection Act.

I am a lifelong Ohio resident, a homeowner, a small business owner, and a private investor in real estate. I care deeply about our state's economic future and our national security. However, **SB88 is an overreaching and impractical proposal that will harm Ohio's property market, erode individual rights, and do little to actually enhance our security.**

1. The 25-Mile Exclusion Zone Is a De Facto Statewide Ban

SB88 proposes banning certain foreign entities from owning real estate within 25 miles of “critical infrastructure facilities” like water treatment plants and telecommunications hubs. But the reality is:

- **These facilities are everywhere** — almost every city, town, and many rural areas in Ohio have them.
- The 25-mile radius around each one covers vast areas, overlapping to the point that **most of Ohio falls inside these zones.**

This is not a narrow national security measure. It is, in effect, a **statewide property ban** for a loosely defined group of people and entities — a group that includes lawful immigrants, foreign-born residents, and U.S.-based companies with foreign ownership.

2. This Bill Punishes the Wrong People

As a private citizen, I've worked hard to build my business and invest in property here in Ohio. I've also seen firsthand how **foreign capital and international connections have helped local businesses grow**, created jobs, and revitalized neighborhoods.

SB88 lumps together hostile governments with law-abiding individuals and investors — some of whom may be **my neighbors, coworkers, or business partners**. This is **not national security policy** — **it's fear-based overreach** that risks discrimination, profiling, and the erosion of property rights.

3. The Law is Vague, Unenforceable, and Risky

The bill does not provide any public list or map of where these exclusion zones apply. There's no way for a buyer, seller, or local government to know if a property is covered. This creates:

- **Legal uncertainty**
- **Transaction risk**
- **A chilling effect on real estate markets**

I don't want to see Ohio's housing and commercial markets slowed down by vague legislation that will clog our courts and confuse our communities.

4. Ohio Can Be Secure Without Being Hostile

I support protecting critical infrastructure. But we already have federal processes for reviewing suspicious transactions — such as **CFIUS**. We do **not** need a poorly defined state-level ban that hurts law-abiding people and businesses and scares away investment.

SB88 will make Ohio look **unwelcoming, high-risk, and legally unstable** — especially to entrepreneurs, students, and innovators who want to live and build a life here.

Conclusion

Please do not pass this bill in its current form. It's too broad, too vague, and too damaging to the rights and prosperity of Ohio residents — including myself. I urge you to take a more balanced, precise, and legally sound approach that targets actual threats, not people based on geography or fear.

Thank you for your time and service to our state.

Respectfully,

Drew

Ohio Resident, Property Owner, Small Business Investor