

# FILE

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 JUL 25 2023

**From:** Butler, Matthew  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 25, 2023 4:40 PM  
**To:** PUCO-Docketing  
**Subject:** FW: public comment 22-0549

RECEIVED

JUL 25 2023

DOCKETING DIVISION  
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

**From:** Puco ContactOPSB  
**Sent:** Monday, July 24, 2023 12:54 PM  
**To:** Docketing, PUCO <PUCO.Docketing@puco.ohio.gov>  
**Subject:** public comment 22-0549

The OPSB has received numerous letters of support presented from people who have nothing to do with our local community. This project will not affect them as they will not have to deal with the project and all the negatives associated with it. We live directly across the road from the proposed Oak Run solar project (less than 400 feet) and have for 32 plus years. We are quite concerned about how this project may affect the value of property near the proposed project.

Personally, we have no intention to sell but if circumstances dictate that we need to (for example, health reasons), we are concerned that due to our proximity to this huge solar project we may be unable to receive the amount we would have received if the land remained as farmland. We have tried to work with Savion to reach an agreement to indemnify us for any financial loss we may incur due to our being so close to their project in the event we sell. To date they have declined, indicating real estate valuation is generally marked by uncertainty, and the value of a property to a buyer or appraiser is almost always influenced by subjective considerations.

However, when attending their local meetings, they were always quick to respond that there is no evidence to say property will lose value due to proximity to their project. In one of their meetings, they even brought in a real estate expert appraiser (Rich Kirkland) who laid out his methodology as to establishing property values on properties adjacent to solar projects and stated that only 5% of properties were negatively affected. In fact, he stated that there was no negative impact to rural properties. He stated that the hierarchy of items that impact the value of a property are: (1) hazardous material, (2) odor, (3) noise, (4) traffic, (5) stigma, and (6) appearance. As per what Savion portrays, items 1 through 5 will not be an issue with their solar project and the appearance item is negated by their setback and vegetative screening.

They provided the following to the OPSB in their May testimony (by Michael MaRous, President, MaRous & Company) and this also appeared in their July brief filed with the OPSB:

The Project is not expected to significantly impact housing, transportation system development, or other public services and facilities. A market impact analysis of the Project concluded that the Project will not have a negative impact on rural residential or agricultural property values in the area surrounding the Project. In fact, for agricultural properties that host PV panels, the additional income from the solar lease may increase the value and marketability of those properties. These conclusions are reflective of the fact that: there will be significant financial benefits to the local economy and to the local taxing units from the development of the Project; the Project will create well-paid jobs in the area, which will benefit overall market demand; an analysis of recent residential sales proximate to existing solar projects did not support any finding that proximity to a PV panel had a negative impact on property values; and an analysis of agricultural land values did not support any finding that agricultural land values are negatively impacted by proximity to PV panels. In fact, reports from Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Iowa indicate that PV panel leases add value to agricultural land. Further, a survey of county or township assessors in 6 Illinois counties, 20

Michigan counties, 11 Wisconsin counties, 9 Indiana counties, 7 Iowa counties, 5 North Carolina counties, and 13 Maryland counties in which solar projects with more than 1 MW of nameplate capacity are located determined that there was no market evidence to support a negative impact upon residential property values as a result of the development of and the proximity to a solar project, and that there were no reductions in assessed valuation.

If this project is approved, Savion should be required to assure those adjacent to their project area will not be financially harmed. We are not recommending Savion guarantee a price for property in the event of a sale, but we are requesting they be required to indemnify owners if due to the proximity of property to their solar project, there is a negative impact on sale price of the property. Based on what Savion is claiming to the local community and the OPSB, this would not affect them as property values are allegedly not negatively impacted.

Our concern is if they cannot stand by their claim of no property value loss, how can we rely on all the other claims they have made to us, the local community, and OPSB?

Steve and Debbie Snavley