

Testimony submitted for Senate Bill No. 279
Senate Utilities Committee hearing held March 22, 2021
Member of Reno County Citizens for Quality of Life

Chairman Thompson and members of the Senate Utilities Committee
Proponent Testimony SB279

On behalf of past, current, and future prospective residents of Kansas, I am advocating in favor of setbacks from property lines of 12X turbine height or 7,920 ft. I live in Reno County where our commission has left many residents to the wind so-to-speak by not offering appropriate setbacks in one of the most densely populated areas wind has ever tried to force consent of non-participating land-owners to place turbines within 2000' from a foundation.

I am not against wind energy for our wind-blessed state, however proper siting of wind turbines should be carefully considered when crafting a wind energy plan. Just as our residents must abide by appropriate setbacks from state, county and city right-of-ways, wind turbine placement should be subject to setbacks from property lines to protect the one thing we cannot ever have more of, that is, land.

In Reno County KS, we the people, are experiencing a wind company that designed a wind farm that not only is in one of the most densely populated areas ever proposed in Kansas, but is also being pushed by paid lobbyists. The proposed footprint of this project is in areas with anywhere from 13-29 population density per square mile. Other existing wind farms have been located in areas with only 0-8 population density per square mile, with an average of 3.

I own a Real Estate brokerage in Reno County, KS, specializing in rural residential sales. I also served as Economic Development Director for 4 years for City of Haven, I'm a 2nd term School Board member for USD 312. I share this with you to give you an idea of my background.

Perception equals value. The perception of me wearing sweatpants is different than if I was wearing a business suit. Value changes through visual differences, much

like a wind turbine on a beautiful open prairie. Many things negatively affect value, such as proximity to highway, crime, being in a flood plain, haunted house.

Wide open spaces, serene evenings on a porch watching the sunset, places to hunt, play, ranch or farm away from buildings and close-by neighbors are *why* people move to rural areas of our state. Perception drives buying decisions, for example, the perceived enjoyment of a home on a beautiful (unobstructed) open prairie vs a rural home next to a massive wind turbine. When a buyer acts on perception, they establish value and we see the effects of this perception.

Forensic Appraisal Service out of Neenah, WI (which also performed Reno County value analysis) studied what would happen if a turbine was located 2600' away from a 1-5 acre value-improved property line:

- Of the Realtors surveyed, they said it would lead to a 60% loss in value
- An impact analysis of actual sales data showed 12-40% loss but never a positive effect on value. The farther away the turbine, the less loss in value

In Reno County, we have been disclosing the potential for wind turbines when homes sell in the footprint. I looked at home sales in the last 24 months on 3-10 acre improved parcels (then divided Reno county at Highway 50) and found:
North of Highway 50, no the threat of wind – homes sold for 98.4% of list price
South of Highway 50, homes are facing potential turbines coming in – homes sold for 91.9% of list price

This data, along with negative feedback such as “we like the home but if wind turbines are coming here, we are not interested” demonstrates a negative impact of the *potential* for wind in our county – wind potential is being disclosed & has been noted in feedback as reason for buyers not making offers.

Reno County home sales in the footprint have been directly impacted due to the possibility of wind farm, I give you the following examples I am personally involved with or aware of:

- 17005 S Haven Rd Haven, KS (\$58,000 less than asking, wind was disclosed) this home sold about 1.5 years ago after NextEra started garnering wind leases.
- 15401 S Kent Rd Haven, KS (\$19,000 less than asking, one contract before selling was canceled due to wind potential), this home has closed within the last 30 days.

Worried about the threat of wind for future buyers, I decided to poll my own rural Reno County buyer clients about turbines within 2500' of their property line.

- 71% of my active, rural home buyers indicated they would not purchase a home near a wind turbine even if it was just what they were looking for (many clients won't purchase a home if it has popcorn ceilings even if everything else is what they want).
- 93% of rural Reno County home-owners say they would sell their home if wind turbines were placed nearby and 98% feel turbines would decrease their home value (data available upon request).

To see what has happened in other areas that have had wind farms added, I called Real Estate brokerages in Kingman, Pratt, Greensburg and Anderson Counties to see what their experience has been. They laughed at me when I asked about property values because there are so few homes in the footprint of their wind farms, and unlike Reno County, most of those who do have residences or land in the footprint are getting a check.

Being a former economic development professional, I'd like to point out that the goal of job creation in Economic Development is to create primary jobs (think permanent jobs that produce goods sold outside the local area). When I asked what effect other Kansas communities saw from wind farms - they boasted mainly about the short-term benefit to restaurants and retail (secondary jobs) Their construction crews come from out of town and some stayed/ate and shopped locally.

The story is all too true for every community where a wind company comes in and dangles carrots for those communities to grow. Take a look at the communities in Kansas with wind farms, you will find they are rural areas with low population

density. Are those communities booming as a result of the wind turbine placement? Again, they will see a short-term benefit, but ultimately the construction crew return to their home state after construction. While a few jobs remain, irresponsible wind development stands to squelch future home development in densely populated areas and areas of high economic growth opportunities.

In closing, I urge you to protect the property rights of current and future residents of Kansas by supporting SB 279.

Jessica Schmidt
13114 E Lake Cable Rd
Haven, KS 67543