



**From:** Puco Contact OPSB  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** public comment 21-0902-GE-BRO.  
**Date:** Friday, January 27, 2023 4:21:42 PM

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2023 JAN 27 PM 4:48

**Subject:** IN THE MATTER OF THE OPSB REVIEW OF ADM CODE - CASE 21-0902-GE-BRO

PUCO

The proposed modification of the 150 foot setback from non-participating neighboring boundaries should remain as originally proposed.

In fact, it needs to be even more detailed with reworded detailed alignments - The carte blanche recommendation to modify this to 50 feet is preposterous. And the language here is too vague for so many allowances of "bending" the law by the solar developers whom all they want as testified to Congress is easy and cheap. To ensure public safety your decision will be detrimental to Ohio and its tax paying residents; such as noise beyond ambient levels (see the link video of an inverter buzzing in -Shiawassee County, Michigan) 50 feet from a property line; deadly pesticides that would have to be sprayed along the fences that now would be within 50 feet of fenced in horses, cattle, children, crops; this is a sorely small distance for any kind of maintenance anyways or for stormwater management (see Hardin County pictures); and lastly this all will produce all kinds of issues adversely affecting neighboring properties landscape and or crops and waterways that dump into the reservoirs and your city's drinking water WILL be affected.

In regards to the requested rewording from 150 to 50, nothing is mentioned about whether inverters, batteries, buildings, ditches, fencing, will also be able to be placed within this distance from an established property line? Also how will these "boundaries" of non-participating landowners be defined? There is no mention of how this will be established? Is it just setback to the modules themselves? There are so many ways that this ambiguous language can be bent. Having the "point" you are measuring "to" be a point such as a module or is it the center, back, front of a racking system? Please better define.

Noise is another aspect in which a 50 foot setback is insufficient. Everyone thinks solar is noiseless. So far from the truth - see aforementioned video. Of course the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers used in farming have been monitored and limited. Now you are going to adversely affect additional citizens to this. These are heat islands and now decreasing the setback to 50 foot makes this closer to all the aforementioned innocents.

The 150 foot setback in my opinion is even too close and does not affect the developer, they lease land far more than what is needed, and they themselves say solar technology is getting better. Why does it have to cover 10s of 1000s of acres of land - when small slivers of solar heat an entire skyscraper. <https://nocamels.com/2022/11/solar-powered-skyscrapers-a-new-window-of-opportunity/>

Setbacks and more detail surrounding even 150 feet should revolve around public safety and YOUR CONCERN should lie there and there alone and allow adjacent property owners the ability to fully survive on their own property. This 150 foot setback distance should be maintained if not increased and the language as to what can/cannot be construed within this setback modified to better detail. In fact here is a better example:

*Developer shall maintain the following setbacks from the Facility's solar panels and racks, inverters,*

**THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE IMAGES APPEARING ARE AN  
ACCURATE AND COMPLETE REPRODUCTION OF A CASE FILE  
DOCUMENT DELIVERED IN THE REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS.**

**Technician** EC **Date Processed** 1/27/23