



June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021

Ohio House of Representatives  
Riffe Center  
77 S. High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

Members of the Ohio House,

We write to outline our objections to potential amendments to Sub. Senate Bill 52 that would substantially increase regulation and uncertainty for wind development. Currently, both of our organizations are neutral on the most recent version of Sub. SB 52. However, if amended, both of us would oppose the bill.

The ongoing transition to a more diverse energy portfolio represents a significant economic development opportunity for our state. We are seeing increased demand for renewables from large employers across all sectors of the economy and think Ohio has a tremendous opportunity to capitalize on this market trend. State policy should eliminate barriers to new energy infrastructure investment- not erect new ones, which will increase costs and reduce consumer choice.

Am\_134\_1617 would require wind to be constructed in compliance with Ohio Building Code (OBC). This amendment would conflict with existing law and could have unintended consequences because of varying interpretations of the OBC by local jurisdictions. Current statute gives OPSB the sole permitting authority. Am\_134\_1661-1 allows township trustees to submit a resolution, subject to referendum, to exclude or include townships in an energy development exclusion zone after the county commissioners establish the boundaries, creating more local patchwork.

Following a stakeholder meeting a few weeks ago, we were pleased to have reached an agreement with the bill sponsors on changes that would require developers to provide notice and gain approval at the county level prior to any application being filed with the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) and establish a timetable by which both developers and local governments must adhere. These changes resulted in an approach that better balances the need for more

local input earlier in the process with the need for regulatory certainty. The two proposed amendments though, represent a step backwards.

We recognize the importance of adding more local input to the siting process, but we urge you not to include the aforementioned amendments that would create more regulatory uncertainty.