

I wish to thank the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) and its staff for the opportunity to voice our general concerns and offer suggestions. I offer the perspective of small, rural, non-participating landowners who involuntarily find themselves next to a large industrial facility.

My wife and I own a homestead and small farm that would be surrounded by a proposed wind farm here in Ohio. This farm has been in my wife's family over six generations, and for nearly 150 years. We strive to pass our farm on to our children in better condition than we found it. Our son is training to be a farmer, and he aspires to continue this family vocation on this farm.

In essence, government is asking citizens like us to sacrifice our rural ways and wellbeing for the sake of building wind turbines. We recognize this workshop is not the venue to debate the merits of global warming. And we are willing to be good citizens and work towards the best interests of our nation. However, we strongly believe we are being asked to make far greater sacrifices than our brethren who may consume this "clean" electricity.

Briefly, we have three concerns: High voltage power lines and substations, setbacks from non-participating properties, and remedies available to small landowners.

1) Most of the media attention has focused on the wind turbines. However, we wish to point out that the most objectionable and disruptive parts of these wind farms are the attendant electrical substations, —and the long, high voltage overhead power lines (not the buried collector lines), that transform and transmit the power generated by these turbines. Careful attention should be given to their impact on the rural community as well. The OPSB should also adopt clearly established minimum setbacks, mandatory screening, and noise and lighting abatement practices, strictly applied, to these industrial facilities.

2) As for the wind turbines themselves, we are very concerned with the unknown risks associated with proximity to them: Low frequency noise, shadow flicker, and who knows what else. Knowledge about these specific risks, as well as perhaps new, unknown health risks is still evolving. Placing large numbers of these huge machines in areas of high population density exposes many more people to these risks. Low population regions are perhaps more appropriate than Ohio for siting wind machines.

Put simply, we advocate longer setbacks from non-participating properties because they reduce these unknown risks. Longer setbacks lower the density of the turbines within these wind farms. While we can offer no expertise on how far projectiles will fly if a turbine disintegrates in a wind storm, all we can say with certainty is that risk increases with proximity.

Furthermore, if turbine setbacks are lengthened, with advancing technology wind developers will no doubt seek to increase turbine rotor heights, blade lengths, (and with it weight), to regain the generation capacity lost to reductions in turbine density. As Mr. Stacy articulated very well in earlier remarks, the OPSB's setback rules must be smart enough to adapt to change, as potential throw distances are increased, perhaps exponentially. And in the future, after the first wind turbine life cycle, wind developers may seek to re-power their projects by mounting larger

turbines on their old, existing towers. The OPSB's setback rules must be able to adapt to altered situations like these.

Small landowners cannot afford to hire the engineering expertise necessary to calculate these throw distances, etc. to determine proper setbacks. To protect the public safety, the OPSB should retain its own expertise, and should not take the wind industry's calculations carte blanche.

3) This leads to our final point, remedies. As these turbines, and other industrial facilities are built, there will be construction damage, traffic, noise, and disruption associated with their construction. Likewise, in the future it may be confirmed that, for example, subsonic sound is very damaging to the health of those in proximity to these turbines.

The OPSB should adopt clear, direct, low-cost procedures and protocols for registering complaints and claiming damages arising from these wind farms. These procedures should include methods for obtaining appropriate payments. Big landowners with turbines on their farm are compensated with royalties from the wind companies for accepting such risks. The small, non-participating landowners receive no compensation for the risks imposed on them.

Many small, non-participating farmers in the midst of these proposed wind farms simply wish these projects would go away. They do not have the required technical expertise. They can't afford to hire a lawyer and fight them. They lack accurate information about the wind projects. If something goes wrong and their farms are damaged or they are injured, small landowners need recourse to the OPSB, not just the phone number of the wind company.

In conclusion, wind companies and those who participate with the wind companies must realize and acknowledge that their industrial machinery imposes costs and sacrifices on the surrounding neighborhoods. OPSB rules must protect the rights of those who elect not to participate.

Thank you for listening-

Kent F. Hampton
kenthampton@earthlink.net