

Dear Senator Balderson:

Please find my written testimony regarding the subject Hearing. I oppose the weakening of the setback law on the placement of industrial wind turbines in relation to residences and property lines. I planned on being at this Hearing but a family emergency came up.

I was a previous resident of Willoughby and Euclid in Lake and Cuyahoga Counties and worked out of downtown Cleveland. As an employee of the U.S. Department of Energy I traveled extensively throughout northern Ohio from around north of Columbus and over to the borders of Indiana and Pennsylvania to do audits and investigations. And on occasion, I went to areas in the rest of Ohio. I am very familiar with the areas where industrial wind turbine projects have been built and are planned. Not good for the people and wildlife trying to live in the vicinity of these industrial wind projects. I have traveled to Ontario, New York, Pennsylvania and West Virginia during the last ten years to observe these projects and talk to people affected by these projects. Mentioned prominently by people were the adverse health effects due to infrasound, and low frequency sound which people and livestock are having to deal with. And then also the loss in real property values they were experiencing because of these IWTs etc.

Currently, I live in Edinboro, PA but spend extensive time in Conneaut, Ohio (Ashtabula County) as an observer of birds and especially as the coordinator of the newly established Conneaut, Ohio Hawk Watch. Because of that interest I have been looking at homes to buy west and south of Conneaut near Ashtabula Township. Unfortunately for me (and others) the area appears that it will be under siege by industrial wind developers like Apex, EverPower in the years ahead. Having adequate setbacks for the placement of these monstrosities is critical. Many localities in Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Europe have learned that proper setbacks are critical to their residents. Some localities are now enacting setback ordinances of 1.5 miles or more from residences (See wind resistance ontario website) --they are lengthening the setback distance to protect their residents and not shortening this protective setback distance like Ohio is proposing. The area I am looking at to buy is one of the most important migratory bird flyways in eastern U.S.A.-not a place to put up 600 ft. high IWTs with blade diameters larger than a football field.

VISUAL IMPACT STUDY OF WIND TURBINES BY THE ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY (issued in 2012)

"Wind Turbine Visibility and Visual Impact Threshold Distances"-two page summary (see link at <http://visualimpact.anl.gov/windvitd/>)

Robert G. Sullivan of the Argonne National Laboratory (part of the U.S. Department of Energy) was the lead investigator and author of this study. [his phone number and e-mail are 630-252-6181 and sullivan@anl.gov]. He was joined by a number of investigators including state agency personnel in Colorado and Wyoming. This was a study conducted a five wind projects in these two states. They had 377 observations of wind turbines and the largest wind turbine was 404 feet to the top of the upright blade, their field work was done in 2011. In Ohio and other states IWTs are being proposed at 600 feet or higher so the results of this study will be much worse for the citizens in the viewshed of the bigger IWTs. The full study of a total 47 pages (including references) can be accessed at the link in the link above.

On page 40 of the report it discusses the High Impact of wind projects from a visual view:

"10 miles - "A major focus of visual attention"

Here is a quote from the two page summary noted above:

"Study Results"

"The facilities were found to be visible to the unaided eye at >36 mi (58km) under optimal viewing conditions, with turbine blade movement often visible at 24 mi (39km). Under favorable viewing conditions, the wind facilities were judged to be a major foci of visual attention at up to 12 mi (19km) and

were likely to be noticed by casual observers at > 23 mi (37 km). A conservative interpretation suggests that for such facilities, an appropriate radius for visual impact analyses would be 30 mi (48 km), that the facilities would be unlikely to be missed by casual observers at distances of up to 20 mi (32km), and that the facilities could be major sources of visual contrast of up to 10 mi (km)."

Visual beauty of an area to citizens and visitors is being severely impacted by wind projects and the cost to residents and others in federal taxes paid and higher electricity prices for these inefficient and land intensive projects has to be evaluated by state governments like Ohio and the U.S. Congress.

Thank You for considering my comments in opposition to weakening protective setbacks to homeowners as proposed in HB 114.

Tom Wasilewski
P.O. Box 575
Fairview, PA 16415
814-734-3653

Coordinator of the Conneaut, Ohio Hawk Watch (Hawk Migration Association of North America)
Member of Black Swamp Bird Observatory, Oak Harbor, Ohio
Member of the Ottawa National Refuge, Oak Harbor, Ohio
Member of Save Our Allegheny Ridges
Member of the American Bird Conservancy