

TESTIMONY OF KEVIN LEDET
HURON COUNTY
IN OPPOSITION TO Sub. H. B. 114

To revise the provisions governing renewable energy, energy efficiency, and peak demand reduction and to alter funding allocations under the Home Energy Assistance Program.

Chairman Balderson, Vice Chair Jordan, Ranking Member O'Brien, and Members of the Ohio Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide written testimony in opposition of Substitute House Bill 114.

I'm here to oppose any reduction in the current law regarding the setback distance of industrial wind turbines from the adjacent property line. I live in Greenwich TWSP and the OPSB has approved a wind facility that will fall under the old setback of 1.1 times the turbine height from the adjacent property line.

My wife and I own a small farm in Greenwich TWSP Ohio. We have owned this farm and home since 1975. There is a wind facility that has been approved by the OPSB to be located in Greenwich TWSP. Our property has been identified by the developer of that project, Windlab, as an adjacent property to their wind facility. We have, like any of you, a keen interest in protecting our property.

I will be using Greenwich's dimensions for these examples. In the Greenwich case, **the turbine height 490ft; hub height 298ft; rotor diameter 383ft.** Under the proposed set back distance of 1.2 times the turbine height $490\text{ft} \times 1.2$ the setback would be 588ft.

On the OPSB web site in the case documents section of Greenwich Wind Farm OPSB case number 13-0990-EL-BGN, you can find an entry dated 12/27/2013 concerning exhibit R. It is the safety manual for the Nordex turbine chosen for this project. On pg. 104 in the section concerning fire it states "no one is permitted within a 500 meter radius of the turbine." 500 meters = 1640ft this distance is far greater than the 588ft offered in the proposed set back.

An amendment was filed in this case and given an OPSB case number 15-1921-EL-BGA. In the case document section an entry dated 11/16/2015 concerning Part 2 of exhibit A also contains the safety manuals of different turbines now proposed for this project. On pg. 297 in the GE 2.5 120 model's safety manual, in the ice buildup section. GE uses a formula to project ice throw. $1.5 \times \text{hub height} + \text{rotor diameter}$. This formula is usable on all models. The Greenwich case $1.5 \times 298\text{ft.} + 383\text{ft.} = 830\text{ft.}$ again this distance is far greater than the 588ft. offered in the proposed setback. Also, on pg. 306 of this case document in a section concerning frosted turbines, the workers are instructed to stop at a distance of 350 meters and check the turbine for icing. Then call for remote stop if necessary, do the work then call for a remote start only after they have distanced themselves 350 meters from the turbine. 350 meters = 1061 ft. this distance is again far greater than the 588ft offered in the proposed set back.

There is a pending wind project on the OPSB web site, Republic Wind case number 17-2295-EL- BGN. These turbines are going to be just shy of 600ft. tall. I wanted to look at the safety manuals for the proposed turbines to see what the manufacturers recommendations were for fire, ice throw, etc. and was amazed to find out that the developer had made a motion to the OPSB for a protective order for confidential treatment of these safety manuals. These safety manuals are available in other cases for the public and legislators to access if they desire. When did safety become confidential?

My question to this committee is how can you think about reducing the setback distance when the manufacturer makes a clear recommendation of safe distances far greater than the one offered in this bill? This safe distance should only be measured from the property line in order to protect the present and future use of the property.