

June 11, 2017

I am deeply opposed to the lessening of the setback distance of a nonparticipating property to a wind farm. My wife and I own a farm in Huron County Ohio and that farm has been identified by Windlab as a non-participating adjacent property to their Ohio Power Siting board (OPSB) approved project, Greenwich Windpark Case Number 13-0990-EL-BGN, a 60 MW industrial wind project in Greenwich Township Ohio. This project is grandfathered in under the old setback distances.

The original turbine model approved for this project was the Nordex N117 model. Total height roughly 490.5 feet. $490.5 \text{ feet} \times 1.1 = 539.55 \text{ feet}$. The distance to the property line setback is 1.1 times the height of the turbine's blade at its highest point to the ground. I guess the people at the OPSB assumed that that distance would be sufficient to keep the turbine from trespassing on my property if the turbine fell over on a calm day. No thought about ice throw, blade shear or flaming debris easily traveling further than the meager 539.55 foot distance allowed in the old setback. No thought about the safety of someone hunting or working in their own woods with an industrial wind turbine situated dangerously close to them. The manufacturer of the Nordex N117 even states in their manual that in case of a fire a 500 meter, 1640 feet, safety area should be afforded. It appears to be the practice of the OPSB to make the statutory minimum setback the maximum setback. To my knowledge I have never heard that the OPSB has required a greater setback than the minimum afforded by statute.

The OPSB has approved an amendment to the Greenwich Windpark certificate Case Number 15-1921-EL-BGA for even bigger turbine models. Taller, greater power and longer blades. These turbines will operate more often and cause greater noise, shadow flicker and risks of ice throw. The effects of noise and shadow flicker on peoples' health should be a primary concern of any government entity. The safety of the people that will have to live in the presence of these industrial wind turbines is being overlooked by the OPSB.

Having a turbine located a mere 539.55 feet from my property would seriously limit your use and economic value of my land. It is possible to predict how the shorter setback distance would restrict the use on my land. At the present time there is no housing structure at the furthest depth of the land I own. Having a wind turbine erected at a distance of 1.1 times its' height from my property boundary would stop any future development of that property for housing. I wouldn't gift it to my children because they could not develop it the way that they would want. Also the possibility of ice throw and blade shear will easily traverse such a short distance, jeopardizing the safety of anyone that has use of my property.

Many other countries and states that have turbines in service for years are also reassessing their setback distances. They are not lessening the distance they are increasing it. As a public servant you have been given the privilege of not only representing your constituents but you are also responsible for maintaining a margin of safety for them.

I urge you to please think about the reduced safety aspect that such a decrease in the setback distance would cause. The legislature has already established a setback distance that afforded nonparticipating property owners some protection. Please don't be misled by self-serving politicians and the bank rolls that support them.

I'm writing this letter to you as President of Greenwich Neighbors United (GNU). Sincerely, Kevin Ledet