

Chair Peterson, Vice Chair Schuring, Ranking Member Williams and members of the Senate Energy and Public Utilities Committee,

Senate Bill 52:

- singles out solar and wind specifically, allowing local additional referenda on these two most important renewable sources alone;
- would discourage investment in Ohio, since wind and solar providers will not be able to count on a stable regulatory environment. This would cost Ohio millions of dollars in economic investment and thousands of clean, safe, and well-paid jobs;
- would stymie much-needed energy growth in Ohio;
- allows referenda that could prolong the need for climate-threatening industries like oil, gas and nuclear power (which uses large amounts of carbon energy in getting its fuel and in attempting to deal with its forever-deadly radioactive waste); and
- would drive up electricity costs by cutting down on supply.

The Ohio legislature is picking and choosing what energy sources can and cannot be vetoed at the local level. The legislature also has entertained two bills that will stop local jurisdictions from banning fracking and pipelines in their jurisdictions - House Bills 192 and 201.

The legislature has also passed legislation that would ban peaceful protests of fossil fuel facilities, a move that is going to face legal challenges.

Demand for renewables is overwhelmingly strong. Not only that, they are the cheaper, safer, less polluting energy of the future. The legislature is attempting to move back to the past while ignoring a sustainable future.

The fact that SB 52 undercuts of renewables is made worse by the fact that is retroactive to projects already at the Power Siting Board.

In the past, you have heard testimony from Van Wert and Paulding Counties on how much the local jurisdictions and the farmers depend on the revenues of the wind development there. Once projects are on the ground, they are overwhelmingly championed by the local residents and jurisdictions.

The Ohio legislature needs to develop an energy plan. We keep hearing legislators talk about “all of the above,” which may sound good to the uninformed, but which is actually not a plan at all. SB 52 would be “all of the above except for wind and solar.” That is another step backward, not forward.

Patricia A. Marida  
Columbus, Ohio