

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

ROBERT COSNER and CHERYL COSNER,

Petitioners,

and

RICHARD STEWART, TED REID, TOM
BUELL, JO LYNN BUELL, BARBARA
CLUTTER, KEN SCHIEWE, IDA
SCHIEWE, GREG TSIATOS, DORIS
TSIATOS, JIM HATLEY, HERB MARCH
and FRED REICHOW,

v.

UMATILLA COUNTY BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS,

Respondent,

and

CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE
UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION,

Intervenor-Respondent.

LUBA Nos. 2011-070,
2011-071, &
2011-072

**RESPONDENT'S SECOND
RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS'
RECORD OBJECTION**

Respondent Umatilla County Board of Commissioners makes it second response to Petitioners' Record Objection. A Revised Table of Contents is being filed, along with pages 4443 to 4484.

ITEMS OMITTED FROM THE RECORD.

The minutes of November 18, 2010 Umatilla County Planning Commission and of January 13, 2011 Planning Commission work session have been added to the record. The

Page 1 – RESPONDENT'S SECOND RESPONSE
TO PETITIONERS RECORD OBJECTION
2011-070

Douglas R. Olsen, OSB #84438
Umatilla County Counsel
216 SE Fourth Street
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
(541) 276-7111/Fax 278-5463
dougo@umatillacounty.net

scheduled meeting before the Board of Commissioners on February 22, 2011 did not take place, and there are not any minutes from this date that need to be made part of the record. Also, notice of Board of Commissioners meetings submitted for all Board of Commissioners hearings or work sessions, have been added to the record.

DATED this 3rd day of October 2011.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas R. Olsen, #84438
Umatilla County Counsel
Attorney for Respondent Umatilla County
Board of Commissioners

Revised/Updated October 3, 2011
Pursuant to Petitioners' Record Objection

**COSNER
V.
UMATILLA COUNTY**

LUBA NO. 2011-070, 2011-071, 2011-072

Local File Number
Text Amendment, #T-10-042

CONSOLIDATED RECORD

VOLUME 1 of 8, Pages 1 - 489

Cosner v. Umatilla County

LUBA No. 2011-070, 2011-071 & 2011-072

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DATE	DOCUMENT	PAGE
VOLUME 1 of 3		
July 6, 2011	Affidavit of Mailing and notice list	1
July 6, 2011	Notice of Adoption Letter	14
July 6, 2011	DLCD Notice of Adoption	15
June 28, 2011	Umatilla County Ordinance No. 2011-05	17
June 28, 2011	Umatilla County Ordinance No. 2011-06	27
June 28, 2011	Umatilla County Ordinance No. 2011-07	29
June 28, 2011	Minutes from 06/28/11 Board of Commissioner's Hearing	33
June 28, 2011	Written testimony presented by Doug Corey, Cunningham Sheep Company	61
June 28, 2011	Written testimony presented by Bob Lazinka	62
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Bob Lazinka	63
June 28, 2011	Written testimony presented by Debbie Kelly, including letter from Larry Knudsen, Oregon DOJ to Hanley Jenkins, Union County Planning Director and "Internal DEQ Guidance on Noise Control Issues"	67
June 28, 2011	Email to Robin Severe from Linda Hayes-Gorman, DEQ Eastern Region Administrator, sharing the "Internal DEQ Guidance on Noise Control Issues" submitted by Robin Severe	71
June 28, 2011	Letter by Larry Knudsen, Department of Justice, to Hanley Jenkins, Union County Planning Director, on funding for DEQ noise program, submitted by Robin Severe	75
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Cindy Severe	76

June 28, 2011	Written testimony (June 2011) presented by Mike and Sherry Eaton	167
June 28, 2011	Written testimony and suggested changes to new Section #11 of the Wind Ordinance presented by Brian Wolcott, Executive Director, Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council	169
June 28, 2011	Letter and photos presented by Stephen Haddock	172
June 28, 2011	Oregon Columbia Plateau Ecoregion Wind Energy Siting and Permitting Guidelines dated September 29, 2008, submitted by Ron Brown	175
June 28, 2011	Affected Environmental Section 3.0 of the Walla Walla Environmental Impact Statement dated December 31, 2007, submitted by Ron Brown	213
June 28, 2011	Written testimony presented by Leo Stewart, Interim Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	219
June 28, 2011	Copy of ORS 215.283 entered into record at the request of Commissioner Dennis Doherty	221
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Arla-June Ruthven	230
June 28, 2011	Letter from Kevin Scribner	236
June 28, 2011	Written testimony presented by Bill Timmermann	237
June 28, 2011	OAR Division 507 Umatilla Basin Program	239
June 28, 2011	Metadata for 303(d) streams map	244
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Tom Rugg	255
June 28, 2011	Proposed EFSC Order Comments and Department Responses E-1, E-12 & E-13 for the Helix Wind Power Facility, submitted by Cindy Severe	263
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Cindy Severe	266
June 28, 2011	Signed petitions submitted by Robin Severe	284

June 28, 2011	Special Report 1067 March 2006: "Umatilla County's Economic Structure and the Economic Impacts of Wind Energy Development: An Input-Output Analysis" by Melissa Torgerson, Bruce Sorte, and Tim Nam Oregon State University/Extension Service	345
June 27, 2011	Letter from Natasha Bellis, Flow Restoration Project Manager, The Freshwater Trust	375
June 27, 2011	Letter from Marcy Holton	376
June 27, 2011	Letter from Mona Geidl, Minnich-Hayner Attorneys	379
June 24, 2011	Letter from Sonja Lane, Field Director, WindWorks! Northwest including	382
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CD "Suitable for Satire: Wind Turbine Syndrome Explained." SEE OVERSIZE EXHIBIT 	
June 24, 2011	Summary Table of Comprehensive Plan Goal 5 resources in the Walla Walla Watershed Sensitive Habitat Area	384
June 24, 2011	Four maps of the Walla Walla Watershed Sensitive Habitat Area	385
June 24, 2011	Summary of applicable Comprehensive Plan and Technical Report in support of UCDC Section (11) standards	389
June 23, 2011	Letter from Rob and Ann Burnside	396
June 22, 2011	e-mail from Diana Walker	397
June 22, 2011	"Final Report: ODA GIS-Based Erosion Screening Tool Project 8/01/01 to 1/31/02", Erick R. Burns/Hydro-geologist, Oregon Department of Agriculture	398
June 22, 2011	Email from Brian Wolcott, Executive Director, Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council (WWBC), including suggested UCDC Section (11) edits	406
June 21, 2011	Letter from Teara Farrow-Ferman, Program Manager Cultural Resources Protection Program, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	408
June 15, 2011	Signed petitions (also faxed to Board on June 21, 2011)	411
June 14, 2011	Letter from the City of Milton-Freewater including	412

	attachments:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Siting council frustrated by turbine laws” – East Oregonian • “Highway Traffic Noise” – Federal Highway Administration • “Figure B-1: Typical Maximum Sound Levels” – Air Force • “McCann Appraisal, LLC” Page 5 of 82, report to Adams County, IL • “McCann Appraisal, LLC” Page 53 of 82, report to Adams County, IL • Excerpt from EFSC document “HWPp0aEdraft” • Excerpt from EFSC document “HWPp0aEdraft” 	
June 14, 2011	Written comments from Eleanor Hockensmith	424
June 13, 2011	Letter from Attorney Dorothy S. Cofield, Cofield Law Office..	425
June 13, 2011	Letter from Elaine Albrich, Stoel Rives LLP	432
June 13, 2011	Email from Jack Bascomb	435
June 10, 2011	Consensus items recommended for adoption	436
June 9, 2011	Article, “Project pits green energy vs. wildlife”, submitted by Richard Jolly	451
June 8, 2011	Comparison Table of February 24th and May 3rd ordinance versions and suggested ordinance changes provided by Stoel Rives LLP	454

VOLUME 2 of 3		
May 24, 2011	Ballot Measure 56 Notice	490
May 24, 2011	Ballot Measure 56 Notice Affidavit of Mailing & property owner list	491
May 20, 2011	Comments via email from Wade & Vick Muller	556
May 20, 2011	Comments via email from Tim Kennedy	558

May 20, 2011	Comments via email from Regina Vandersloot	559
May 20, 2011	Email from Adolf and Lorraine Klein	560
May 20, 2011	Letter from Kent Madison	562
May 20, 2011	Email from Kathryn Hill	563
May 20, 2011	Email from Dana Dibble	565
May 19, 2011	Letter from Kirk and Gunder Terjeson, Mick Kilby, Scott Harper, Jeff Newton, Bill & Marcy Holton, Bob Newton, Jerry Terjeson, Nancy Rees Duff, Gerald Terjeson, Fred Price, Pat Terjeson, Tom Winn and Sheldon Kirk	566
May 19, 2011	Letter and attachments from Elaine Albrich, Stoel Rives LLP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind Turbines and Health, A Rapid Review of the Evidence, • Wind turbine sickness prevented by money drug, by Simon Chapman, • The Potential Health Impact of Wind Turbines, Chief Medical Officer of Health Report 	569
May 19, 2011	Letter from Paul R. Seaquist, Century 21 Seaquist & Associates	596
May 19, 2011	Email from Teresa Kilmer, District Manager of the Walla Walla River Irrigation District, photos of water run-off occurring Spring of 2011 within the Walla Walla Watershed and portions of the Affected Environmental Section 3.0 of the Walla Walla Environmental Impact Statement dated December 31, 2007	597
May 19, 2011	Email from Irene Walters	620
May 19, 2011	Email from Larry Nye, Coordinator, Milton-Freewater Tea Party Patriots	621
May 19, 2011	Letter from Kirk and Gunder Terjeson	623
May 18, 2011	Letter (email) from Deborah Hansen	624
May 18, 2011	Letter (email) from Dave Hansen	626
May 18, 2011	Letter (email) from Jim Burns	628

May 18, 2011	Letter (email) from Casey McClellan/Seven Hills Winery	629
May 18, 2011	Letter from Ed Chestnut including attachments:	631
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Department of Energy A Model Ordinance for Energy Projects Page 27, • Page 13 of DOE Shepherds Flat Central First Amended Site Certificate dated March 12, 2010, • Helix Wind Project Amendment 1 Noise Contour Map, Figure 2 with superimposed two mile setback feature, • Google map of area west of Pilot Rock and home locations and areas that would be protected by two mile setback, • Map showing cumulative wind projects in Umatilla County, • Map showing cumulative wind projects and met towers in Umatilla County, • Letter from McCann Appraisal, LLC re: Property Value Impact and Zoning Evaluation, Cape & Vineyard Electric Cooperative, Freeman's Way Municipal Wind Project, Commerce Park Road Brewster, Massachusetts 	
May 17, 2011	Letter from Geraldine Reese, Reese Orchards	675
May 17, 2011	Letter from Dave and Judy Price	676
May 17, 2011	Comments via email from Leona Shumway	678
May 17, 2011	Email from Jeanne Brady and Milton-Freewater Republican Women	679
May 17, 2011	Letter from Orlin R. Hansen	681
May 16, 2011	Letter from Jay and Julia Spratling	684
May 16, 2011	Email and "Wind Value Spread Sheet" presented by Lauren Prince, Renewable Energy Policy Associate, Renewable Northwest Project	689
May 12, 2011	Minutes from 05/12/11 Board of Commissioner's Hearing	692

May 12, 2011	Letter from Norm Kralman, and newspaper articles:	719
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Leaders learn about wind in Umatilla County” • “May the wind turbine be always at your back” • “The cost of green: Huge Eastern Oregon wind farm raises big questions about state, federal subsidies” • “Wind farms fight against turbine shutdown plan” • “BPA backs away from turbine shutdown plan” • “. . . water despite higher cost as source of power” • “Price of power is going up” • “UEC loses battle, keeps fighting in Legislature” 	
May 12, 2011	Written testimony by Bob Levy, Cunningham Sheep Co.	730
May 12, 2011	Map of watershed service areas presented by Ron Brown	731
May 12, 2011	Cartoon titled “Arguments Against” NUCLEAR, OIL, COAL .	732
May 12, 2011	Paper titled “Oregon Wind Farms: \$54 Million in Property Taxes Benefiting Rural & Urban Communities” provided by Renewable Northwest Project	733
May 12, 2011	“Wind Turbine Sound” power point presentation by Mark Bastasch	735
May 12, 2011	Table of setback comparisons of various Oregon and Washington counties	748
May 12, 2011	Green Paper, Suggested Revisions to Proposed Amendments to UCDC 152.616 (May 3, 2011 version), and “Federal and State Permits for Wind Project Development” dated May 12, 2011, prepared by Elaine Albrich, Stoel-Rives LLP	752
May 12, 2011	Iberdrola power point titled, “Wind Energy Development and Wildlife: Industry Challenges and Perspectives” (November 5, 2008)	774

May 12, 2011

Binder submitted by Clinton Reeder including:

812

- McCann Appraisal, LLC, written testimony Michael S. McCann, CRA, Re: "Wind Turbine setbacks" report to Adams County, IL June 8, 2010, and including addendum, exhibits and appendix
- McCann Appraisal, LLC, real estate impact evaluation by Michael S. McCann, CRA, Re: "Property Value Impact & Zoning evaluation, cape & Vineyard Electric Cooperative (CVEC) Freeman's Way Municipal Wind Project Commerce Park Road Brewster, Massachusetts" January 6, 2011, and exhibits
- "Impact of Wind Turbines on Market Value of Texas Rural Land" Gardner Appraisal Group (some pages are poor quality original, e.g. page 964-965)
- "The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hendonic Analysis" Ben Hoen, Ryan Wiser, Peter Cappers, Mark Thayer, and Gautam Sethi, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, December 2009 (revision #1)
- "Critique of 'The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hendonic Analysis.' Authors: Hoen et al," by Wayne Gulden February 16, 2010
- McCann Appraisal, LLC, Michael S. McCann, CRA, follow up certified review letter to Ben Hoen, Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Re: "The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hendonic Analysis" December 14, 2009
- "Critique of 'Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario'" Authors: Canning et al," by Wayne Gulden February 23, 2010
- Paper titled, "Adverse Impacts from Wind Turbines in Waubra, Austrilia and Surround Area" Preston G. Ribnick and Lilli-Ann Green

- Article titled, "Save Western NY"
- Article titled, "Danes decry property depreciation by wind mills"
- Chief Medical Officer of Health (CMOH) Report May 2010 "The Potential Health Impact of Wind Turbines"
- NHMRC PUBLIC STATEMENT, July 2010, "Wind Turbines and Health"
- "Wind Turbines and Health A Rapid Review of the Evidence" July 2010
- "Wind Turbine Syndrome" testimony before the New York State Legislature Energy Committee March 7, 2006, Nina Peirpont, MD PhD
- Power point "Wind Turbine Syndrome & The Brain", Nina Peirpont, MD, PhD, November 15, 2010
- "Your Guide to Wind Turbine Syndrome ...a roadmap to this complicated subject"
- "Wind – Turbine Noise What Audiologist Should Know" by Jerry Punch, Richard James, and Dan Pabst
- "Wind Turbines, Noise and Health" February 2007 by Dr. Amanda Harry M.B.Ch.B. P.G.Dip.E.N.T., and appendix
- National Wind Watch, "Living with the impact of windmills" Chris Luxemberger
- National Wind Watch, "Helath effects of living close to the Waubra wind turbines" Carl and Samantha Stepnell
- National Wind Watch, "Infrasound: Wind Energy's Harmful Flaw (in French)" Clause Renard
- "Submission to the Austrilian Federal Senate Inquiry on Rural Wind Farms" 10th February, 2011, Dr. Sarah Laurie
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Phsiological Health and Wind Turbines"
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Visual Health Effects and Wind Turbines"
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Low Frequency Noise, Infrasound and Wind Turbines"
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Noise and Wind Turbines"

- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Mental Health and Wind Turbines"
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Stress and Wind Turbines"
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, "Annoyance and Wind Turbines"
- Article, "Recent report ties wind turbine noise to potential health problems"
- Article, "Wind Turbines Syndrome: Living Near Wind Farms May be Hazardous to Your Health" Katie Fehrenbacher, August 3, 2009, and posted comments
- "Wind turbines: Friend or foe?"
- Article, "Wind Turbine Syndrome prompts state lawmakers to propose 2-year 'wind farm' moratorium (Idaho)"
- Acoustical Society of America, "Noise annoyance from stationary sources: Relationships with exposure metric day-evening-night level (DENL) and their confidence intervals"
- Acoustical Society of America, "Response to noise from modern wind farms in The Netherlands" (abstract)
- Article, "Effects of Low Frequency Noise and Vibrations: Environmental and Occupational Perspectives"(abstract)
- Article, "Mental Health Effects of Noise" (abstract)
- Article, "Wind turbine noise, annoyance and self-reported health and well-being in different living environments" (abstract)
- Summary, "Project WINDFARMperception Visual and acoustic impact of wind turbine farms on residents"
- Save western NY, "Letters from Wind Farm Neighbors"
- Maine Medical Association, "Resolution RE: Wind Energy and Public Health"
- Health Concerns, "Safety Issues" and Clinical Study of 'Wind Turbine Noise Syndrome'"
- National Wind Watch, "Sleep disturbance and wind

turbine noise” Christopher Hanning

- Article, “Sleep disturbance and wind turbine noise” May 2009, Dr. Christopher Hanning, summary
- “A Primer on Adverse Health Effects and Industrial Wind Turbines”, March 2010, Prepared by the Society for Wind Vigilance
- The Society for Wind Vigilance, “Promoting Research for Authoritative Wind Turbine Guidelines”
- “Wind Turbine Noise, Sleep and Health”, Dr. Christopher Hanning BSc, MB, BS, MRCS< LRCP, FRCA, MD, November 2010
- Monitor On Psychology, “Sleep deprivation may be undermining teen health”, Siri Carpenter, Monitor staff
- Article, “Urinary melatonin rhythms during sleep deprivation in depressed patients and normals” (abstract)
- Sleepmedicine Reviews, “Clinical effects of sleep fragmentation versus sleep deprivation” (abstract)
- Article, “Sleep deprivation: Effect on sleep stages and EEG power density in man” (abstract)
- Article, “Sleep as a Mediator of the Relationship between Socioeconomic Status and Health: A Hypotheses” (abstract)
- Article, “Neural basis of alertness and cognitive performance impairments during sleepiness. 1. Effects of 24 h of sleep deprivation on waking human regional brain activity” (abstract) (page 1576 poor quality)
- Article, “Systemic bacterial invasion induced by sleep deprivation” (abstract)
- Article, “How Sleep Deprivation Affects Psychological Variables Related to College Students’ Cognitive Performance” (abstract)
- Occupational & Environmental Medicine, “Moderate sleep deprivation produces impairments in cognitive and motor performance equivalent to legally prescribed levels of alcohol intoxication” (abstract)
- Thieme eJournals, “Neurocognitive Consequences of Sleep Deprivation” (abstract)
- “SLEEP DURATION AND HYPERTENSION,

Association of Usual Sleep Duration With Hypertension: The Sleep Heart Health Study” Daniel J. Gottlieb, MD, MPH, et al

- Article, American Heart Association, Hypertension, “Short Sleep Duration as a Risk Factor for Hypertension, Analyses of the First National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey”
- Best-seller-books.com, book summary, “The Promise of Sleep: A Pioneer in Sleep Medicine Explores the Vital Connection Between Health, Happiness, and a Good Night’s Sleep”
- Online Information for the Defense Community, title, “Health Effects of Sleep Deprivation” (abstract)
- Google books: sleep deprivation and health, “Sleep disorders and sleep deprivation: an unmet public health problem” by Harvey R. Colten, et al
- Article, “Stress and Infectious Disease in Humans”, Sheldon Cohen and Gail M. Williamson
- The New England Journal of Medicine, “Psychological Stress and Susceptibility to the Common Cold”
- Article, Nutrition, “Relationship between stress, eating behavior, and obesity” (abstract)
- “Strategies for Measureing Stress in Studies of Psychiatric and Physical Disorders” Sheldon Cohen, Ronald Cl. Kessler, and Lynn Underwood Gordon
- PsycARTICLES: Citation and Abstract, “Emotional states and physical health” Salovey, Peter; Rothman, Alexander J.; Detweiler, Jerusha B.; Steward, Wayne T.
- Article, “Stress-induced changes in cerebral metabolites, hippocampal volume, and cell proliferation are prevented by antidepressant treatment with tianeptine” (abstract)
- Article, Digestive Diseases, “Role of Stress in Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders Evidence for Stress-induced Alterations in Gastrointestinal Motility and Sensitivity” (abstract)
- Review, “The Concepts of Stress and Stress System Disorders” (abstract)
- American Psychosomatic Society, “Chronic Fatigue

	Syndrome and High Allostatic Load: Results From a Population-Based Case-Control Study in Georgia” (Abstract)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article, “Stress-induced immune dysfunction: implications for health” Ronald Glaser & Janice K. Keicolt-Glaser Archives of Internal Medicine, “Stress and the Individual Mechanisms Leading to Disease” (abstract) Journal Article Excerpt, “Health Psychology: Psychological Factors and Physical Disease from the Perspective of Human Psychoneuroimmunology” “Health psychology: biopsychosocial interactions, (5th Ed.), SARAFINO Edward P 	
May 12, 2011	Book titled “Wind Turbine Syndrome: A Report on a Natural Experiment” and Executive Summary, dated December 12, 2009, by Nina Pierpont, MD, PhD submitted by Clinton Reeder, SEE OVERSIZE EXHIBIT	1692
May 11, 2011	Letter from the City of Milton-Freewater including attachments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 273 of 739 of Umatilla County Technical Report Power point titled, “Umatilla County Adaptive Farms: An Economic Analysis” by Bruce Sorte, Community Economist OSU Rural Studies Program 	1696
May 9, 2011	Email from Chuck & Marcia Akes	1710
May 9, 2011	Letter from Dave & Judy Price	1711
May 7, 2011	Written testimony presented by Kirk & Gunder Terjeson including attachments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attachment 1- email (part) from Chase Whitney dated April 5, 2011 Attachment 2 - Community Service Fee Description Attachment 3 – Tax year 2010 County Tax Comparison for Wind Power 	1713

May 6, 2011	Packet submitted by Ron Brown:	1721
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An impact on wildlife (ODFW), Executive Order No. EO-96-30 State/Tribal Government-to-Government Relations, • Executive Order No. EO 99-01 The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, • Draft Walla Walla Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan Guidance Document & Administrative Rules dated Sept. 24, 2001, • Comment Letter from Oregon Dept. of Energy dated March 1, 2011 from Oregon Fish & Wildlife on the proposed siting of the Horizon Antelope Ridge Wind Project, and letter Attachment 1- ODFW's Comments on Horizon's Final Application for Site Certificate & Recommended Terms & Conditions for Issuance of a Site Certificate. 	
May 5, 2011	Letter from Robert & Cheryl Cosner/Upper Dry Creek Ranch	1836
May 3, 2011	Minutes from 05/03/11 Board of Commissioner's Work Session	1837
May 3, 2011	May 3 rd , 2011 version of the Umatilla County Proposed Wind Ordinance Revisions	1853
May 3, 2011	Yellow Paper, Draft changes for Board of Commissioners consideration at May 3, 2011 Work Session	1863

VOLUME 4 of 3

May 3, 2011	Letter submitted by Clinton Reeder including:	1869
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary, "Recommended Setback Distances and Associated Siting Permit Requirements: Wind Turbine to Residence" • Pierpont Exhibits: A, B, C & D (Exhibit D is also referenced at page 1692 as an oversize exhibit) • Exhibit E: "What Happened to Noise? Wind Turbines, Property Values and Adverse Human Health Effects" 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit F: “Determining Impact Mitigation Payments for Residences within 2-miles of Wind Power Facilities: A Suggested Impact Mitigation Provision” • Oversize exhibit, “Wind Power Development Toolkit”, Winrock Int’l Brasil, and “New York State Wind Energy ToolKit”, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority 	
May 3, 2011	Email from Casey McClellan	2278
May 2, 2011	Email from Ron Edwards	2279
May 2, 2011	Email from Christa Maiuri	2280
May 2, 2011	Email from Dana Dibble	2281
May 2, 2011	Email from Susan Turbyne Davis	2282
May 2, 2011	Email from Tim Kennedy	2283
May 2, 2011	Email from Lori Kennedy	2284
May 2, 2011	Email from Gerry Reese	2285
May 2, 2011	Email from Leonard & Leslie Brown	2286
May 1, 2011	Email from Irene Walters	2287
April 20, 2011	Planning Department Memo and maps	2288
April 15, 2011	Letter from Nicole Hughes, Senior Project Manager, Element Power	2296
April 15, 2011	Letter from Joy Potter, Project Manager, Horizon Wind Energy, including attachments:	2301
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordinance markup with suggested amendment changes • Site Certification Agreement for Washington • State of Washington Supreme Court ruling 	
April 15, 2011	Letter from Chase Whitney, Project Developer, Iberdrola Renewables, including attachments:	2420
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emails dated April 4th, 5th, 9th and 15th to Umatilla 	

	County Planning	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter from Kirk and Gunder Terjeson to EFSC, Umatilla County Commissioners and Planning Commission with attachments regarding Helix Wind Project Amendment 	
April 15, 2011	Letter from Tom and Jo Lynn Buell	2441

VOLUME 5 of 8		
April 15, 2011	<p>“Blue Note Book” submitted by Lauren Prince, Renewable Northwest Project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cover letter “Renewable Energy & Economic Development: Real Examples from Oregon.” March, 2011 “Windfall from the Wind Farm: Economic Development in Sherman County.” July 2006 “Renewable Energy Fact Sheet.” October, 2005 “Wind Power.” November, 2006 “About the Oregon Renewable Energy Act, SB 838: Powering Oregon’s Future.” August, 2007 “Vansycle Ridge Wind Farm.” July, 1999 “Stateline Wind Energy Center.” January , 2003 “Oregon Strategic Investment Program Agreement ‘Echo Windfarms Project.’” December, 2008 “Oregon Strategic Investment Program Agreement ‘Combine Hills Turbine Ranch Phase II.’” March, 2009 “Oregon Strategic Investment Program Agreement ‘Stateline 3 Wind Project.’” April, 2009 “ENTRIX, Inc. Economic Impacts of Wind Energy Projects in Southeast Washington.” Prepared for Southeast Washington Economic Development Association. March, 2009 Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission. “Effect of Wind Farms on Property Values.” 2009, updated 2010 	2442

- Sterzinger, G., F. Beck and D. Kostiuk. 2003. "The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values." Renewable Energy Policy Project.
- Hoen, B., R. Wiser, et al. 2009. "The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hendonic Analysis." Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Environmental Energy Technologies Division.
- Poletti and Associates, Inc. Prepared for Invenergy Wind LLC. "A Real Estate Study of the Proposed White Oak Wind Energy Center. McLean and Woodford Counties, Illinois." January 2007
- Excerpt: World Health Organization. "Energy, Sustainable Development and Health." June 2004
- Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission. "The Effects of Wind Turbine Sound on Health." January 2010
- Hessler, George and Hessler Associates. "A Note on the Debate about Health Effects from Low Frequency Noise (LFN) from Modern Large Wind Turbines." April 2011
- AWEA and CanWEA. "Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects: An Expert Panel Review." December 2009
- Epilepsy Action, British Epilepsy Association. "Wind turbines." April 2008
- Epilepsy Action, British Epilepsy Association. "Photosensitive epilepsy." August 2007
- New York State Energy Research Development Authority. 2005. "Public Health and Safety." Report by Global Energy Concepts
- GE Energy. 2006. "Ice Shedding and Ice Throw-Risk and Mitigation." Greenville, SC.
- Garrad Hassan Canada Inc. 2007. "Recommendations for Risk Assessments of Ice Throw and Blade Failure in Ontario." 38079/OR/01.
- Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning

Commission. "Sangamon County Wind Energy Conversion System Setback Requirements." January 2010

- Bastasch, Mark. Prepared for Renewable Northwest Project. "Summary of International Wind Turbine Noise Regulations." April 2011
- Sonus. Prepared for: Pacific Hydro Pty Ltd. "Infrasound Measurements from Wind Farms and Other Sources." November 2010
- Leventhall, Geoff. "Infrasound from Wind Turbines – Fact, Fiction or Deception." Canadian Acoustics 29-36. Vol. 34 No. 2 (2006).
- Lawrence Technological University. "Primer for Addressing Wind Turbine Noise." Revised Oct. 2006
- Howe Gastmeier Chapnik Engineering. Submitted to CanWEA. "Wind Turbines and Sound: Review and Best Practices Guidelines." February 2007
- "Wind Turbine Acoustic Noise," A White Paper by Dr. Anthony Rodgers, James F. Manwell, and Sally Wright, at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. January 2006
- Bass, Bowkler, McCaffery, Grimes. "Abstract: Fundamental Research in Amplitude Modulation – a project by RenewableUK." Italy. April 2011
- Dr. Ramani Ramakrishnan for the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. "Wind Turbine Facilities Noise Issues." December 2007

VOLUME 6 of 8		
April 14, 2011	Letter, and book titled, "Wind Farm Scam" by John Etherington, submitted by Tom Rugg, SEE OVERSIZE EXHIBIT	3328
April 13, 2011	Letter and eight maps from Blue Mountain Alliance	3331
April 12, 2011	Letter from Barbara Clutter	3342
April 11, 2011	Letter from Ken & Ida Schiewe	3344

April 7, 2011	Letter from Kirk & Gunder Terjeson to: EFSC, Umatilla County Planning Commission and Umatilla Board of Commissioners regarding the Helix Wind Project including attachments:	3347
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 1- email (part) from Chase Whitney dated April 5, 2011 • Attachment 2 - Community Service Fee Description • Attachment 3 – Tax year 2010 County Tax Comparison for Wind Power 	
April 3, 2011	Email from Wade & Vicki Muller to John White (EFSC) and response from Planning Director, Tamra Mabbott, dated April 7, 2011; and keynote address titled, “Wind Turbine Syndrome & The Brain,” by Nina Pierpont, MD, PhD November 15, 2010	3355
March 30, 2011	Letter from Karen Engels	3378
March 30, 2011	Letter from Dave & Judy Price	3379
March 29, 2011	Letter from Lillian Duncun	3382
March 28, 2011	Letter and map from Robin Severe	3383
March 28, 2011	Letter from Jay & Julia Spratling addressed to John White, Oregon Department of Energy	3385
March 28, 2011	Letter from Jay & Julia Spratling addressed to Umatilla County Commissioners	3387
March 28, 2011	Letter from Robert Lazinka	3389
March 24, 2011	Letter from the Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council	3390
March 22, 2011	Documents submitted by Ron Brown, including:	3392
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft document “Development within Watersheds” dated January 6, 2011 • DEQ proposed rulemaking announcement for Revised Water Quality Standards titled “Human Health Toxic Pollutants and Revised Water Quality 	

	Standards Implementation Policies”	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda for the three hundred and sixtieth regular meeting of the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (Feb. 16-18, 2011) • Draft Issue Paper for Discussion at October 4 Non-NPDES Meeting titled “Implementation Ready” TMDLs for Reducing Toxic Pollutants in Oregon Waters from Nonpoint Sources • Draft (Nov 18, 2010) Oregon’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy. 	
March 21, 2011	Letter from Tom & Maureen Rugg	3546
March 20, 2011	Letter from Dave & Judy Price	3547
March 17, 2011	Minutes from 03/17/11 Board of Commissioner’s Hearing	3550
March 17, 2011	Letter from Jeff Newton	3584
March 17, 2011	Written testimony presented by Sarah Curtiss, Soel Rives LLP, on behalf of Element Power, including: ..	3585
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis” by Ben Hoen, Ryan Wiser, Peter Cappers, Mark Thayer, and Gautam Sethi 	
March 17, 2011	Aerial photo submitted by Bob Levy	3787
March 17, 2011	Letter from Chrissy Froese	3788
March 17, 2011	Letter from Craig Pritchard	3790
March 17, 2011	Written testimony presented by Richard Stewart	3791
March 17, 2011	Written testimony presented by Leo Stewart, Vice-Chairman, Board of Trustees, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	3793

VOLUME 7 of 8

March 17, 2011	Letter and oversized packet from Wendie Kellington, Attorney, including:	3795
----------------	--	------

- Clean. Affordable. Homegrown. American Wind Power, AWEA
- Wind Energy Myths, US Dept of Energy
- Rhetoric vs. Reality: Wind Energy and Birds, AWEA
- Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects an Expert Panel Review, Executive Summary, AWEA & CANWEA
- Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects an Expert Panel Review, AWEA & CANWEA
- Reviewing the Facts on Wind Turbine Sound Impact, Renewable Northwest Project
- Wind Energy: Clean and Reliable, AWEA
- Utility Scale Wind Energy and Sound, AWEA
- Wind Turbines and Health, AWEA
- Wind Energy and Wildlife, AWEA
- Building a Green Power Superhighway, AWEA
- The Hidden Costs of Energy: National Academy of Sciences, AWEA
- Presidential Documents, Executive Order 13212 of May 18, 2001: Actions To Expedite Energy-Related Projects, Federal Register/Vol. 66, No. 99/Tuesday, May 22, 2001/ Presidential Documents
- 74th Oregon Legislative Assembly-2007 Regular Session Enrolled Senate Bill 838
- Oregon Renewable Energy Standard: Progress Made and Remaining Opportunities, Renewable Northwest Project- 02/25/09
- 20 Percent Wind Energy by 2030 Increasing Wind Energy's Contribution to U.S. Electricity Supply, AWEA
- From Snack Bars to Rebar: How Project Development Boosted Local Businesses Up and Down the Wind Energy 'Supply Chain' in Lamar, Colorado (power point) by Craig Cox March 2004
- Oregon Facility Siting Rules and Statutes
- AWEA Siting Handbook Chapter 4: Regulatory

Framework

- Oregon Columbia Plateau Ecoregion Wind Energy Siting and Permitting Guidelines September 29, 2008
- Residents opposed to Kittias Turbines v. State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) and Christine O. Gregoire, Governor of the State of Washington, Respondents. (165 Wash.2d275, 197P.3d 1153)(2008)
- Wind Energy Technology, Renewable Northwest Project
- Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines GOAL 2: LAND USE PLANNING OAR 660-015-0000(2)
- Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines GOAL 5: NATURAL RESOURCES, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, AND OPEN SPACES OAR 660-015-0000(5)
- Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines GOAL 13: ENERGY CONSERVATION
- Umatilla County Comprehensive Plan: Energy Conservation pages XVI-1 and XVI-2
- 152.616 (HHH) Standards for review of conditional uses and land use decision, Page 23 of 24, Ordinance No. 2009-09
- PLANNING BASICS Legal Requirements of the Planning Office, prepared by Gary Darnielle, Lane Council of Governments September 2006
- Memorandum of Lease, Instrument No. 2010-5640354 between Cunningham Sheep & Land Company and RES North America Leasing, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease, Instrument No. 2010-5640355 between Pendleton Ranches, Inc., Cunningham Sheep & Land Company and RES North America Leasing, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease, Instrument No. 2010-5640356 between Cunningham Sheep Company and RES North America Leasing, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease, Instrument No. 2010-5640357 between Pendleton Ranches, Inc. and RES

North America Leasing, LLC

- Memorandum of Lease and Right of First Refusal (unrecorded document) between Cunningham Sheep Company and Element Power Wind Development, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease and Right of First Refusal (unrecorded document) between Hoke Ranches and Element Power Wind Development, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease and Right of First Refusal (unrecorded document) between Mud Springs Ranches and Element Power Wind Development, LLC
- Memorandum of Lease and Right of First Refusal (unrecorded document) between Pendleton Ranches, Inc. and Element Power Wind Development, LLC

VOLUME 8 of 8		
March 17, 2011	Wind Contour Maps of the proposed Iberdrola Helix Power Project, Figure 1 and Figure 2	4156
March 17, 2011	Power point presentation by Clinton Reeder, Planning Commission member, on behalf of the Umatilla County Planning Commission	4158
March 17, 2011	Proposed Ordinance Amendments recommended to the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners for adoption on February 24, 2011 by the Umatilla County Planning Commission	4176
March 16, 2011	Letter from Blue Mountain Alliance	4186
March 16, 2011	Letter from Alan T. Moore, Northwest Director of Habitat Programs, Trout Unlimited	4187
March 15, 2011	Letter from Doris and Greg Tsiatsos	4189
March 15, 2011	Email from Jerry Davis	4190
March 14, 2011	Letter from Daniel Baldner	4191
March 13, 2011	Letter from Sheldon Kirk	4192

March 12, 2011	Letter from Kay Wolf, Shumway Conservancy	4194
March 11, 2011	Letter from Emily Shumway Banks	4195
March 10, 2011	Letter from Walla Walla River Irrigation District Board of Directors	4196
March 9, 2011	Letter from Lindsay Winsor	4197
March 9, 2011	Letter from the City of Pendleton	4198
March 9, 2011	Letter from residents of Milton-Freewater	4199
February 27, 2011	“Why Increase the Wind Tower Setbacks?” paper by Clinton Reeder	4201
February 24, 2011	Minutes of the February 24, 2011 Umatilla County Planning Commission Hearing	4212
February 24, 2011	“Proposed Amendments to UCDO RE: Wind Power Development,” paper by Clinton Reeder	4230
February 24, 2011	“Justice, Fairness & Equity” paper by Clinton Reeder	4244
February 24, 2011	Articles submitted by Dana Dibble:	4245
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Wind turbines are killing condors” from the National Wind Watch website, • “Govt: voluntary rules for wind farm bird impacts” by Frederic J. Frommer Associated Press/ February 8, 2011, • “Are Wind farms a Health Risk? US Scientist Identifies ‘Wind Turbine Syndrome’” by Margareto Pagano, • “Protected eagle halts Eastern Oregon wind farms” by Ted Sickinger, The Oregonian 	
February 24, 2011	Two letters dated February 24, 2011 from Dave and Judy Price	4262
February 24, 2011	Letter from Don Bain, Aeropower Services Inc	4266
February 24, 2011	Thoughts on proposed amendments from Dan Williams	4270
February 22, 2011	Letter and suggested amendment changes from Blue Mountain Alliance	4271
February 17, 2011	Letter from Sheldon Kirk	4275

February 15, 2011	City of Milton-Freewater Resolution No. 2106 and letter with recommended changes	4279
February 15, 2011	Email from Nicole Hughes, Senior Project Manager, Element Power, and attached November 16, 2010 letter and suggested amendment changes	4283
February 15, 2011	Letter from Ken and Ida Schiewe	4301
February 15, 2011	Letter from Chase Whitney, Business Director, Iberdrola Renewables	4303
February 14, 2011	Letter from Joy Potter, Project Manager, Horizon Wind Energy, and suggested amendment changes	4307
February 14, 2011	Letter from Tom and Jo Lynn Buell	4322
February 13, 2011	Letter from Richard Stewart and Walla Walla Union-Bulletin news photo by Matthew	4323
February 12, 2011	Affidavit of Publication from the East Oregonian	4325
February 12, 2011	Affidavit of Publication from the Hermiston Herald	4327
February 3, 2011	Letter from Robert Wondra	4329
February 3, 2011	Letter from Craig Lane	4330
February 3, 2011	Letter from James Reese	4331
February 3, 2011	Letter from Bonnie Ehart	4332
February 3, 2011	Letter from Mick Oliver	4333
February 3, 2011	Letter from Randall Mahoney	4334
February 3, 2011	Letter from W.L. Leacke	4335
February 3, 2011	Letter from Alan and Melody Davis	4336
February 3, 2011	Letter from Alice Meyer	4337
February 3, 2011	Letter from M. Millar	4338
February 3, 2011	Letter from Don and Marilyn LeFore	4339
February 3, 2011	Letter from Todd Davis	4340

February 3, 2011	Letter from Thomas Waliser	4341
February 3, 2011	Letter from Sam LeFore	4342
February 3, 2011	Letter from Leona Shumway	4343
January 1, 2011	Affidavit of Publication from the East Oregonian	4344
January 1, 2011	Affidavit of Publication from the Hermiston Herald	4345
November 18, 2010	Letter from Sean C. Bell, Development Manager, RES America Developments, Inc, and ordinance markup with suggested amendment changes	4346
November 18, 2010	Letter from Eric Quaempts, Director of the Department of Natural Resources, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	4361
November 18, 2010	Letter from Steven H. Corey, Secretary, Cunningham Sheep Company	4364
November 18, 2010	Comment Outline – Milton-Freewater City Councilor, Ed Chesnut, and City of Milton-Freewater Resolution No. 2106, and aerial photo showing “turbine free” zone	4366
November 18, 2010	Comments to Planning Commission and email from Jim Burns	4371
November 17, 2010	Letter from “Friends of the Grande Ronde Valley”	4373
November 16, 2010	Letter from Andrew O’Connell, Manager, Wheatridge Wind Energy, LLC	4375
November 16, 2010	Letter from Nicole Hughes, Senior Project Manager, Element Power, and ordinance markup with suggested amendment changes	4377
November 16, 2010	Letter from Suzi Asmus, Project Manager, Horizon Wind Energy, and ordinance markup with suggested amendment changes	4394
November 15, 2010	Letter from Chase Whitney, Iberdrola Renewables and ordinance markup with suggested amendment changes	4409
November 12, 2010	Email from Eric D. Johnston, Windkraft Nord USA, Inc. (WKN)	4425
November 6, 2010	Affidavit of Publication from the East Oregonian	4426

November 6, 2010	Affidavit of Publication from the Hermiston Herald	4427
November 4, 2010	Affidavit of Publication from the Walla Walla Union Bulletin	4428
September 14, 2010	DLCD Notice of Proposed Amendment	4429
	Additions, pursuant to Petitioners' Record Objection	
November 18, 2010	Minutes from 11/18/10 Planning Commission Hearing.....	4443
January 13, 2011	Minutes from 1/13/11 Planning Commission Work Session...	4476
September 26, 2011	Affidavit of Posting and Publication.....	4480

UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting of Thursday, November 18, 2010
4:00 p.m., Umatilla County Justice Center, Media Room
Pendleton, OR

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT:

David Lynde, Clinton Reeder, Gary Rhinhart, John
Standley, Tammie Williams, Don Wysocki, David Lee,
Frank Kaminski, Randy Randall.

ABSENT:

none

STAFF:

Tamra Mabbott, Carol Johnson, Richard Jennings,
Heather Haueter, Gina Miller.

Note: The following is a summary of the meeting. A recording of the meeting is available at the Umatilla County Planning Department.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Rhinhart called the hearing to order at 4:08 p.m., and welcomed Randy Randall as the newly appointed Planning Commission member.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Chairman Rhinhart asked if everyone had reviewed the minutes from the last hearing of October 28, 2010. There were no corrections or additions, and the minutes were approved by consensus.

NEW HEARING:

- **Amendment to Conditional Use Section 152. 616 (HHH) of the Umatilla County Development Code, pertaining to standards for large scale commercial wind energy projects.**

Chairman Rhinhart called for abstentions, and there were no abstentions or objections to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Chairman Rhinhart read the opening statement and called for the staff report.

Staff report: Carol Johnson, Senior Planner, presented a brief staff report. Last December the Planning Commission asked Commissioner Reeder and Commissioner Colgan to work with staff and draft updated language to the county's wind ordinance. The changes incorporated suggestions from two work sessions in 2009. The resulting draft ordinance has been posted on the county website for comments since last July. New

00004443

comments were considered in the packet before the Planning Commission for this hearing. The proposed changes include the pre-application meeting, fish and wildlife impact studies, emergency management plans, setbacks and changes to financial assurances. In addition to the proposed changes to the wind ordinance chapter (HHH), there are also general changes to the Condition Use Permit chapter. The matter before the Planning Commission for this hearing is to decide whether or not to forward the proposed changes to the Board of Commissioners for adoption, or to continue the hearing to a future date and time. Mrs. Johnson turned the presentation over to Commissioner Clinton Reeder for a presentation of the proposed changes.

Commissioner Reeder stated that he has been involved with wind development in Umatilla County since the first project, and at that time there was no language in the ordinance pertaining to wind development. Commissioner Reeder advised he would begin with some generic discussion for the first 2 hours, and then later analyze the specific draft language of the proposed changes.

Commissioner Reeder read aloud from his presentation handout.

Intent of Planning Process: The process of planning is complicated and involves social, economic and political aspects. It is important to make this process as unbiased as possible to provide equity to all parties involved. As the variety of interests increase in this topic, it becomes increasingly more important to level the playing field. It is important to identify the differences and resolve them among the parties involved. There have been many changes and land use law must adapt to changing circumstances, technology, political and public responses. One of the comments submitted was that county language is contrary to state language in siting standards, and this poses problems for projects in both jurisdictions. The county must listen to the public comments to build confidence and trust.

Land Use Planning: It's not just land any longer; it now includes natural resources such as air, water, wildlife and habitat. It is also inclusive of rural and urban planning. One comment received asked the ordinance to address archeological preservation and protection.

Wind Power Development Concerns vs. Planning: The goal is to minimize conflict between neighbors who wish to develop wind farms on their property and the neighboring property owners who do not wish to have wind farms in their vicinity. Some of the problems to be considered are: access locations, road damage from wind farm construction, noise and vibration, human health issues, view shed interference, negative impact on property values and taxes, erosion and weed control, wildlife habitat, and silt impacts to the water shed.

Oregon's Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC): EFSC has jurisdiction over projects that are 105 megawatts and above, and below 105 megawatts are processed by the local county jurisdiction. The problem has been that large developers have broken up the projects into smaller LLC's in order to qualify for state subsidy funding. The new

00001444

ordinance will continue to state the preferences that Umatilla County has always had when siting wind farms, and may or may not defer to EFSC on smaller projects.

Corporate Structure of Development Company vs. Bonding Requirement: When the larger development companies break their projects into smaller companies, it results in less risk for them as each company presents a lesser liability compared to the whole. But this strategy leaves the county under liability if one of the smaller projects goes into bankruptcy and has no means of decommissioning a wind farm. The county has required a form of financial assurance from wind developers to prevent this from happening. The county will continue to require a surety bond as it provides the most guaranteed form of financial assurance to the county. The developers must maintain an updated cost estimate of decommissioning and rehabilitation and this must be reflected continually in the surety bond amount. There is a language change to the formula and frequency in which this must occur included in this ordinance update. This measure is to protect the county taxpayer and the county budget from having the liability fall to them if a wind project should fail. County constituents are very firm about this particular topic and strongly resolved that it should be present in the ordinance.

Pre-application Consultation Process: There have always been pre-application meetings occurring with wind development in Umatilla County, but this ordinance update formalizes it into the process. This process is particularly effective when dealing with smaller wind developers and projects, as their experience levels are less than the larger companies. County budgets do not allow for additional staffing to process applications, so the better prepared an application is from the beginning, the better for all parties involved. The pre-application meeting is designed to improve efficiency, limit planning costs and minimize delays in permitting.

Evidence of Wind Monitoring Data: The county is not trying to acquire the proprietary data gathered by wind developers, but is looking to establish that the developers have utilized credible methods to gather the data. The county will continue to trust that developers are going ahead with plans to construct a wind farm based on technical and economic feasibility.

Electric Energy Transmission and Interconnections: Easements are sometimes difficult to obtain. The county will continue to require proof that a connection to the grid is established before approving their permit to develop the wind farm. Developers don't always agree with this step, and want to proceed with construction before the interconnection is done.

Fish, Wildlife, and Avian Technical Committee: In the earlier wind farms, there was very little data available. ODFW was asking the first developers to provide broad scale studies, essentially doing the research for ODFW. The county raised the question of why developers would generate this data for their competitors. The goal of the technical committee is to have local people who know the site be involved with working with the technical people from the project. The county encourages wind developers to form this

00004445

committee, as it typically results in a cost savings to the developers by reducing the requirements to the developers.

General Emergency Management Plan: It is essential for local emergency response agencies in the county to know names and contact information for the wind projects, in the event of an emergency with the projects. This plan should also include erosion control plans, and address health and safety issues. The county wants to know how the developers are going to work to protect the territory and people around the wind farms.

Vegetation and Erosion Control Plan: Vegetation and erosion control should also be addressed in the plan. The language in the ordinance update states that other agencies should be consulted prior to development. The Oregon Department of Agriculture administers the Oregon Agricultural Water Quality Management program for silt and erosion control in rural waterways.

Purpose of Facility Set-Backs on Wind Power Development Sites: Umatilla County wishes to minimize the conflict between wind development and other land uses. The factors in this standard are a result of public discussion on the effect of wind farms on human health; noise, flickering shadows, invasion of privacy, blocked view shed, and diminished property values. Uncompensated people affected by the presence of the towers results in a cumulative effect, which increases as the opposition grows.

Requirement Concerning Wind Power Developers Providing Financial Assurance: Public support for the financial assurances of a surety bond is tremendous. The county will continue to require this standard, and will not expose the budget to liability if a wind farm fails.

Commissioner Reeder summarized his reading of the presentation. Commissioner Reeder preceded to the presentation of the actual proposed ordinance updates. There were questions from the floor about cumulative effect and a brief discussion followed.

Mrs. Mabbott advised that the Planning Commission has a packet of information that has been posted on the county website, with numbered pages for reference. Several comments were received yesterday, and have not yet been scanned and posted on the website. The comments received over the last year are included in the mark up version of the proposed ordinance update being reviewed. Mrs. Mabbott went on to explain that after the proposed changes are read, it will be time to take public testimony. Anyone wishing to present testimony should fill out a yellow form and give to a staff member.

Mrs. Mabbott began reviewing the proposed update language for the general Conditional Use chapter. Commissioner Reeder advised that the blue underlined words are the language added to satisfy existing county and/or state rules or submitted comments.

Commissioner Reeder reviewed the proposed updates in order of how they appeared in the chapter. He explained that the language update pertaining to a Zoning Permit for

00004446

each tax lot will remain, as all permitting is tied to tax lots. There is language that allows for the Planning Director to defer an application to the Planning Commission if they feel it is warranted. This allows for public input to the process. Mrs. Mabbott clarified that these updates are applicable to all Conditional Use Permits, not just wind development. In the past several years, all wind development applications have been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Reeder commented on the standard of each tax lot in a project being required to take out a Zoning Permit. Guest Elaine Albrich, Stoel Rives, objected to the Planning Commission drafting any language changes prior to hearing public testimony. Commissioner Reeder stated that he would go through all the changes to the ordinance, and then go back to the points later where further discussion was needed.

The next proposed language addition was to add "water pollution" to Chapter 152.615 in response to public comments submitted as to how important it is to preserve the rivers in Umatilla County. Mrs. Mabbott advised that this chapter pertains to any Conditional Use application, so both air and water resources were added to the language.

Commissioner Reeder advised that the Critical Winter Range overlay zone is addressed in a different chapter. Commissioner Standley asked about prior cumulative effect comments from the floor, and would it be addressed in the Critical Winter Range overlay zone chapter. Mrs. Mabbott explained that wildlife issues will be addressed in the Critical Winter Range overlay zone, as are all Goal 5 protected resources, when reviewing impacts to proposed development.

Commissioner Reeder moved on to Chapter 152.616 (HHH), specific to wind power generation facilities. The word commercial was added to separate these standards from a personal wind tower on someone's property used to provide power to just a single property owner. The definition of commercial to be applied in this chapter is, "a project designed to sell generated power for profit." This definition is also found in Chapter 152.003 of the Umatilla County Development Code. This definition may have to be revisited in the future if larger farming operations propose to build several wind turbines to generate power to sell back to their farms, to reduce the footprint their operation leaves.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(2): The pre-application meeting component has been added to formalize it into the standards. Language was included in this section to ensure specialists with pertinent expertise to relevant fields may be included in this process. Sarah Parsons, Iberdrola Renewables, asked for clarification on this change. Commissioner Reeder explained that this pre-application meeting is not a public meeting; it is only for the applicant, planning staff and relevant agencies and experts.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(4) : Commissioner Reeder explained that all permits must be obtained prior to any construction taking place. There is a specific sequence to the permits that must be followed.

00004417

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5): This section contains the numbered application requirements, including the evidence of wind monitoring data information. There was some discussion as to the burden of completing the application falling on the developer, and Mrs. Mabbott stated that this is addressed in the final decision of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Reeder again commented on Section (5)(C)(1) that the purpose of requesting evidence of wind monitoring data is not to acquire the developer's proprietary data, but evidence that they have made a good faith effort to collect quality data to ensure that the project is feasible. The Planning Commission will trust that a developer will not invest in a project unless it is sound.

Suzi Asmus, Horizon Wind Energy, asked if a met tower permit would be considered adequate to prove evidence of wind monitoring. Commissioner Reeder indicated that it would suffice, as long as it showed a length of time that data was collected.

Chris Copeland, Windkraft Nord, stated that developers must be able to demonstrate feasibility to banks to secure loans in the first place, so why must they provide this information to the county as well? Commissioner Reeder explained that the county will not be evaluating the quality of wind data collected. The county only wishes to ensure that the process used to generate the wind data is sound, and the Planning Commission will trust that the developer concluded that the wind data was good enough to proceed with the project.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5)(C)(2-3) : Commissioner Reeder commented on the added language of requiring evidence of an active utility transmission interconnect to the grid, as it is becoming a huge issue. This amounts to a cumulative effect issue as multiple developers want to have transmission lines along the same corridor, so they must decide who will provide pole maintenance and upgrades for the future.

Chase Whitney, Iberdrola Renewables, stated that they would like to see language in Section (2) about proprietary data in regards to the interconnect plan. Mrs. Mabbott clarified that the language says evidence of an active utility interconnect request. It has been a condition of approval on other projects that the county be provided a copy of the interconnect agreement before the final Zoning Permit is issued. This criterion is just evidence that the developer is working on that process. This language was crafted very carefully by Commissioner Colgan for this reason. The developer can also submit information that describes the process they will undertake to get an active utility interconnect agreement, or evidence that such an agreement request has been filed. Commissioner Reeder explained that a past incident with a developer caused the county to be cautious on this issue. This developer didn't have a proposed route for the transmission line, or any easements from property owners to connect from the project to the grid.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5)(D) : Commissioner Reeder explained this language as the Planning Commission wanting to know exactly what kind of land and uses were present in the project, and how they would be impacted. The words "forest practices" and "ranching" were added and number (3) removed.

00001448

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5)(F) : The fish, avian and wildlife impact monitoring plan language was broadened to include species not included in the first ordinance. There are specific sampling procedures, frequency of evaluation of kills at the site, strategies for walking the site to obtain credible data, and forensic data collected. Mrs. Mabbott commented that the Blue Mountain Alliance had requested a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this standard, rather than a technical committee. Commissioner Reeder explained that an EIS is very complicated and expensive, and so the recommendations in the standard asks the applicant to look at issues similar to those an EIS would include.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5)(G) : Commissioner Reeder explained that the changes in this section are to clean up the language for the emergency management response plan criteria. Due to the nature of the weather in Umatilla County, special allowances have been made to anticipate such problems as run-off following a large snow or rain fall. Extraordinary weather events causing silt erosion into rivers should be addressed in the emergency management plan by developers. Changes in this section deal specifically with handling fire events. Commissioner Reeder stated that he would like to see the developers sit down with the fire districts located near the wind towers and decide who will purchase the specialized equipment needed to respond to fires on and around wind towers.

Suzi Asmus, Horizon Energy, asked about the timing to have these plans submitted. Developers would like to submit a typical plan of how they deal with emergencies with the application, and then a more detailed, site-specific plan later. Mrs. Mabbott agreed that this would be a part of the final condition of approval. Commissioner Reeder explained that the county needs a list of names and phone numbers of who to call in the event of any kind of emergency condition related to the wind projects for emergency dispatch to have on file. Commissioner Reeder briefly discussed the unique nature of wind development in the Blue Mountain area because of the water run-off and silt concerns for the rivers. Discussion followed about the impact of development of lands near water and effects on water quality.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(5)(H) : Commissioner Reeder stated that comments had been received on archeological issues from Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). A list of agencies that have water quality related responsibilities in Oregon was added to this section; Soil and Water Conservation District, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the Watershed Council, and Oregon Department of Agriculture.

Nate Rivera, Umatilla Electric, asked if sections 2, 3, and 4 also applied to the transmission line. Mrs. Mabbott explained that all the conditions applied to the towers in a Conditional Use Permit also apply to internal connector lines on the site. Once the transmission line leaves the project site, it has an entire different set of standards.

00004449

Mrs. Mabbott commented that this section was updated to include the names of agencies involved in erosion control/weed control plans, so developers would have a source of information, and input will be sought from these other agencies to ensure that the plans are sound.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(6) : Mrs. Mabbott moved on to the actual standards/criteria for approval, the first being setbacks. The proposed language states that no portion of a facility will be located within 3,520 feet of property zoned as residential. It also states there must be a half mile between any towers and a dwelling and 500 feet between a transmission line and a dwelling, unless the transmission line is in a right-of-way.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(6)(A)(5) : The word "downwind" was removed from this section, as it is now clear that turbine noise is not restricted to downwind from a tower. Mrs. Mabbott commented that there is added language to address noise issues, and a developer may be required to submit a noise study and must operate within limits established by the state of Oregon. A brief discussion of noise easements and noise standards followed. Mrs. Mabbott clarified that these standards in review will only be applicable to new applications, and may not affect permits already issued. Compliance will be monitored through a yearly review process.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(6)(E) : Commissioner Reeder commented that the language states that private access roads to wind facilities shall be gated, but it does not require them to be locked. This is due to the vandalism that occurs at project sites.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(6)(L-M) : Commissioner Reeder explained language changes to the decommission requirement in this section. The decommissioning fund is an analysis of the amount of the bond required to remove the towers and return the ground to the condition it was, prior to construction. The term "letter of credit" was removed because it is not as much of a guarantee as the surety bond.

Chase Whitney, Iberdrola Renewables, commented on the deletion of the letter of credit from the criteria. He asked that the county follow EFSC's model on being flexible on accepting either a surety bond or letter of credit. Commissioner Reeder advised that the county has not changed their position, and will continue to require a surety bond. Mr. Whitney stated that the cost to the developer is very different on these two items. Doug Olsen, County Counsel, advised that the county wanted to make sure that a third party is involved in the process, and not a sub-entity from the developer having a letter of credit. Commissioner Reeder stated that a letter of credit is not a guarantee of funding; it is assurance the financing is now available and may later be available. A surety bond is actual funds available for the cost of decommissioning. Sarah Parsons, Iberdrola Renewables, commented that their letters of credit are with third parties, and are posted in the name of the State of Oregon. The letters of credit are placed in a bank that the state can draw on at any time. The decommissioning amount is updated every year. They feel that their process of a letter of credit is just as secure as a surety bond, and would like to discuss this further with Mr. Olsen. Commissioner Kaminski pointed out that the only time the county would need to call upon the letter of credit is if a developer goes

00001450

bankrupt, in which case the creditor is going to really think twice before lending additional monies for the decommission. A brief discussion followed on the merits of this method of insuring the decommissioning fund. Commissioner Reeder advised the representatives from Iberdrola Renewables to discuss this further with Mr. Olsen. Commissioner Standley reminded the speaker that the county deals with many companies and must have a consistent standard to apply to all of them.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(9) : Mrs. Mabbott explained that the major change to this section was to add the fish and wildlife monitoring requirement in addition to avian monitoring to the annual report. Sub-section (H)(2) has new language that states the annual report can be modified as the project conditions, circumstances and compliance dictate.

Chapter 152.616 (HHH)(10)(B) : Language has been changed to reflect updates on any amendments that need to be submitted to the permit. Any changes to ownership, emergency plans or contacts must be reported immediately to the county. Mrs. Mabbott advised that proof of insurance has always been a condition of approval in the final permitting process.

Commissioner Reeder called for a dinner break, and the Planning Commission would reconvene at 7 p.m.

Chairman Rhinhart reconvened the meeting at 7:04 p.m. He advised that all people presenting testimony should come forward to the testimony table and state their name and address for the record.

Public testimony: Wade Muller, Helix, stated that his family has been in the Helix area for over 120 years, and they have historical references. He commented on setbacks, voicing concern over the half mile setback, which he doesn't feel is adequate. They have enjoyed their scenic view for 120 years and he would like his children to also have this view to enjoy. He is not opposed to wind power, but is opposed to it affecting his quality of life. He also commented on the county road topic. If it is a county road, then it should be treated as such, even if it is just a two track road and should be considered in the transmission line setback criteria. He was also concerned about the size of the new towers going in, as they are much larger than the first projects that were constructed in that area. He commented on the Columbia River Gorge area and how many wind towers are there now. He said that the term "scenic" is subject to each person's perspective, and he believes the views around his home and area to also be "scenic", not just the Blue Mountains. He believes that the view should be more closely considered in the county's criteria. He has read the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) and knows that the Planning Commission is tasked with maintaining quality of life.

Commissioner Wysocki asked what Mr. Muller thought would be an adequate setback. Mr. Muller replied that he thought a mile from any residences would be appropriate and 2 miles from a residential district. He believes that the size of the towers does make a significant difference in the setback requirements. Commissioner Lynde asked what he

00004451

thought would be a good setback for roads, and Mr. Muller stated he had not thought enough about it to make a suggestion, but that with the increased size of the projects, it should be increased. He believes that people have a right to make a living off their land, but if that affects quality of life for other people around them, it is an issue. Commissioner Reeder asked if there was any compensation that would make the towers more acceptable to him. Mr. Muller replied that their family had been there over 120 years without the towers, so he didn't think so. Money is not the issue.

Public Testimony: Suzi Asmus, Horizon Wind Energy, 53 SW Yamhill, Portland, OR, 97204. Ms. Asmus did submit comments from Horizon, and she hoped they would be helpful to the county when considering this amendment. Their comments were meant to improve clarity and consistency of regulations to assist the Planning Commission in providing a transparent and reliable process for companies proposing wind development in Umatilla County. They hope that the changes they have suggested will reassure wind development companies that permitting through the county instead of EFSC will provide the same reliable process. Ms. Asmus commented on the setback language. The ordinance states that, "no portion of the facility will be within 3,520 feet", and she suggested that the language specifies turbines, as opposed to any and all aspects of the facility. They do not want to see this standard affect roads, underground transmission lines, and operation & maintenance (O & M) buildings. Mrs. Mabbott asked Ms. Asmus if she brought copies of her comments for the Planning Commission as specified in the email. Ms. Asmus stated that she read her comments from the cover page, and their specific language updates were the same as the Iberdrola Renewables and RES comments submitted. Commissioner Reeder asked if she also wanted to include substations in their comments about the 3,520 foot setback requirement affecting the facility. Ms. Asmus clarified that they would request that other aspects of the facility would not be subject to the 3,520 foot setback, just to be specific to the towers.

Public Testimony: Chris Copeland, Windkraft Nord, 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1470, San Diego, CA 92121. Mr. Copeland stated that they are in favor of the language that is presently in front of the Planning Commission. There is a fine line to be maintained between the developer and the county. Their specific concern would be the bonding requirement. He explained that any requirement that is presented to the county must also pass their financing. The language needs to be able to be financed. The risk is on the developer, but one must also consider the developer's risk upon a county. If a county goes bankrupt, and the bonds are tied into that county, then a bank will not finance this. He wants the language very clearly spelled out. Commissioner Lynde asked what Mr. Copeland suggested would guarantee the county financial assurance for a decommission, should a wind developer company fail. Mr. Copeland commented that with input from financial attorneys, they could recommend a guideline of things that would be able to be financed on the street and would provide the long-time security the county is looking for. A one-size fits all agreement will prove to be difficult when financial markets change. The ability to have a living and changing bonding requirement would be helpful in this case.

00004452

Public Testimony: Ed Chestnut, 812 Jacquelyn Street, Milton-Freewater, OR, 97862, representing the City Council of Milton-Freewater. He will be limiting his comments this evening to that of interest to the city council. Mr. Chestnut explained the contents of his packet to the Planning Commission. The first item was a copy of the Declaration #2106 of City of Milton-Freewater. The city is concerned that the proposed language updates do not adequately address the concerns of the city. The City of Milton-Freewater is surrounded with significant agri-tourism business which would be adversely affected by the presence of wind turbine development on the face of the Blue Mountains. Mr. Chestnut referred to the study done by Dr. Bruce Sorte, Oregon State University. This study shows the economic value of agri-tourism to the community. Mr. Chestnut commented that the requirement of a socio-economic study, or some version of it, should be re-instated in the standards. The study should identify what existing businesses would be adversely affected by the presence of wind turbines on the face of the Blue Mountains. He would like to see the setback standards improved, and cited the situation in Morrow County as an example of what can go wrong. Mr. Chestnut spoke to a resident of Morrow County and was told they have spent over \$30,000.00 of their own money to get legal representation and noise studies done to cause enforcement of the state noise standard. The problem with noise standards is that they are essentially a prediction of what may or may not occur as a result of a project. He feels that this situation could eventually put the City of Milton-Freewater in a position of having to spend tax payer dollars to enforce a noise standard. Mr. Chestnut also noted the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has not been involved in investigating violations of state noise ordinances since 1991. He stated that the city feels that noise standards are not the best way to handle noise impacts, but would encourage setting physical setback requirements as a much more effective way to address the noise problem. Mr. Chestnut indicated that in the packet he submitted to the commission is a diagram of projected wind towers and how they would appear around the city of Milton-Freewater. He closed by asking that the Planning Commission not vote to send the proposed amendment to the Board of Commissioners tonight, and there should be another public hearing on this topic. The City of Milton-Freewater would be happy to host this hearing in Milton-Freewater, and would make a space available to the county at no charge. Commissioner Lynde asked Mr. Chestnut what he would suggest for a setback standard. Mr. Chestnut declined to offer an answer, but did state that the current standard of 3,520 foot is not enough. Commissioner Wysocki asked about the agri-tourism impact that Mr. Chestnut talked about, and wanted to know if the city had identified any other negative effects on agri-tourism beyond the visual impact. Mr. Chestnut stated that they didn't feel it necessary, as once you damage a business, it's damaged. That is why they recommend the socio-economic study be a part of the standards.

Public Testimony: Chase Whitney, Iberdrola Renewables, 1125 NW Couch Street, Suite 700, Portland, OR, 97209, was joined by Elaine Albrich, Stoel Rives, 900 SW 5th Ave., Portland, OR, 97204. Ms. Albrich spoke about the updates. They provided an outline of suggested language revisions to the Planning Commission. Mr. Whitney commented further on setbacks. They would like the county to be consistent with the EFSC process, and they feel that EFSC setbacks have proven to be protective of public health and safety. Mr. Whitney asked for clarification on the 3,520 setback requirement

00001453

that was earlier discussed by Ms. Asmus from Horizon Wind. They would also like to see the language specifically apply to turbines, and not the rest of the facility. Ms. Albrich commented on wanting consistency with EFSC standards, because they have projects that cross many counties in Oregon. Ms. Albrich explained that the EFSC standard requires measurement of the distance of setbacks for turbine towers from the center line of the turbine to the center of the nearest residence. This setback is 1,320 feet from turbine to residence. In respect to public safety, Ms. Albrich commented on the setback requirement from public road right-of-way, a minimum distance of 110% of maximum blade tip height. This allows for the changes in turbine technology as time goes by. The noise requirements should be to comply with DEQ's standards of noise, and the county can enforce this through a condition of approval for the lifespan of the facility.

Commissioner Standley asked Mr. Whitney and Ms. Albrich to comment on the Morrow County situation. She replied that they are not involved with this, but are aware of it. This particular facility was county permitted, and there have been complaints raised about compliance with the noise regulations. Commissioner Standley asked Ms. Albrich to consider the point brought up by Mr. Chestnut earlier regarding the citizen who had to expend his personal money to prove non-compliance to the state noise standards, and if Umatilla County should address this in our criteria. Ms. Albrich stated that she believed that this could be handled through a condition of approval; if a complaint is raised regarding compliance by the wind facility, then the permit holder would be accountable to provide the needed studies to prove or disprove the complaint on a cost reimbursement basis to the county.

Commissioner Wysocki commented that he appreciated the desire of the development companies to have consistent standards to deal with, but that Umatilla County has many unique qualities that are not necessarily addressed with uniform standard with the rest of the state. He asked how Iberdrola Renewables would propose how the Planning Commission protects the public interest by having just one standard. Mr. Whitney stated that having the standard of setbacks relative to the tip height will accommodate the changing technologies in turbines, but admitted that it is a very difficult balance to find between private use and community input. Commissioner Reeder asked Mr. Whitney to talk about noise standards. Ms. Albrich replied that during the application process, the noise standards are based on modeling using the manufacturer's data for the turbines used in the project. Then the layout of the project is applied to demonstrate that the facility will comply with DEQ noise regulations. Prior to construction, the permit holder is required to prove up that the final layout will continue to meet these requirements. Sarah Parsons, Iberdrola Renewables, further commented that EFSC requires this information to be verified by an independent consultant and this could be included in the county standards as well. Commissioner Rhinhart asked if anyone had ever required a wind developer to post a bond to protect the neighbors from noise damage. Ms. Parsons stated that it has never been done. The state is currently confident with their process and the burden is on the developer to correct any non-compliance with state standards. Commissioner Rhinhart suggested that the bond could be utilized to pay for noise studies in the event of complaints of non-compliance.

00001454

Commissioner Kaminski asked for clarification on the center of the tower for set-back determination. Ms. Parsons explained that the state has defined setbacks as points that are easily verifiable by GIS, such as the center of the tower, or center of the house. These are simply unified methods of measurement. Commissioner Randall asked what the largest tip height is currently for turbines. Ms. Parsons replied that the tip height is 492 feet for the 3 megawatt Vestas. Most of Iberdrola's turbines are 420 feet or less. The offshore turbines are nearly 900 feet in length. Commissioner Lynde asked the representatives of Iberdrola if any of them had ever gone out and camped near the turbines to experience them first hand. He explained that his daughter, who is totally deaf, cannot stand to be anywhere near the turbines because the vibration causes her actual pain. Commissioner Lynde went on to say that most developers coming before the Planning Commission do not have to live near the turbines, like the residents of Umatilla County do. Ms. Parsons replied that Iberdrola takes this very seriously, and they do their best to reach out to residents where they are building projects, to see what problems do rise from the facilities. Commissioner Rhinhart commented that neighbors in this county who have been close friends for generations are now bitter enemies because of the presence of the wind towers on one neighbor's property affecting the other's quality of life who get no benefit from it. Commissioner Rhinhart asked the wind developers present how they would put a price tag on that. The Planning Commission has to look at balancing this question for the residents of the county.

Commissioner Lee asked Ms. Parsons about setbacks on streams. Ms. Parsons stated that the setbacks depended on the biological resources and are taken into consideration when placing the towers. They don't put turbines on land that is sloped more than 12%, and they have permanent setbacks from wetlands and streams based on coordination with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Commissioner Lee asked about vibrations, and drilling down to the bedrock. Mr. Whitney advised that there are several styles of foundations that can be used, depending on the specific site and soil conditions. When designing a facility, run-off into water ways is not acceptable. The federal guidelines are very stringent on this issue. Commissioner Lee asked if a study had been done on the fish and wildlife habitat in response to the effect of vibration caused by the turbines. Commissioner Reeder commented that if fish and wildlife respond to the vibration like Commissioner Lynde's daughter does to the vibration, this would be problematic. Vibration can act like a dam to fish, and they won't go through it. Ms. Parsons commented that they do studies like geotechnical and biological studies on the impacts to wildlife. Ms. Aldrich commented that Iberdrola Renewables would support having another hearing after the information presented at this hearing has been reviewed.

Public Testimony: Bill Timmerman, 81368 Kupers Road, Helix, OR, 97835. Mr. Timmerman stated he lives 3 miles north of Helix, and is 1.25 miles from the nearest wind turbine put up 2 years ago. Mr. Timmerman hears noise from the nearby turbines at his residence. He believes that a mile setback to residences is not enough. His family has been in this area for 4 generations. He has noticed that even since the smaller towers were first put up, animal behavior in the area has changed. The patterns of movement

00004455

have changed considerably in that time. Mr. Timmerman asked why wind towers were allowed in farm country, and was advised by the Planning Commission that it was legislative law by the state. Mr. Timmerman commented on the subsidies given to the wind development companies. He went on to talk about nuclear and water generated power sources. Commissioner Wysocki asked for Mr. Timmerman's opinion of setbacks if he had a wind tower on his property, and Mr. Timmerman replied that there would never be a wind tower on his property.

Public Testimony: Debbie Kelley deferred her comments until the next hearing.

Public Testimony: Robin Severe, 82422 Vancycle Road, Helix, OR, 97835. Mr. Severe stated that they have lived in the Helix community since he and his wife were first married, and chose the area because of the land zoning (Exclusive Farm Use) and a high quality of people. He spoke about the setbacks. The first projects were over the horizon, and out of their view. They live on the Vancycle Highway, which was the construction route for the small towers. The county required a travel route for all construction phases, but it wasn't always followed and the large rigs came right in front of their home. It was a nightmare experience for them, and they had to call the county three times to ask the county to enforce the travel route requirement. For a year, they had a terrible experience with all the traffic as a result of the project; first construction and then the maintenance trucks afterwards. Now their quiet, little country road is a like heavy industry in the middle of farm ground. They now have 4 large towers in sight of their house, and they can hear them loudly when the wind is slow or intermittent. It sounds like a large vehicle or piece of farm equipment running all the time, and during the night. They are not used to it, and may never get used to it. He doesn't think that the setbacks are enough, and should be increased. He also believes that road setbacks should be substantial, as the traffic created as a result of a wind farm is significant. He is offended by that fact that if he wanted to put something heavy industrial on his land, he couldn't do it unless it was a wind tower. He also is offended to find that his state and federal tax money is being used to help put the wind farms up. He hopes that the county exceeds the state requirements for wind development in Umatilla County, to compensate for the impacts and injustices they have had to live with.

Commissioner Wysocki asked Mr. Severe to describe the topography of Vancycle Canyon. Mr. Severe stated that it is a shallow canyon where they live, but goes much deeper. The projects that are currently under consideration will put a substantial amount of towers between them and Helix, and they will be downwind from this project. Commissioner Lynde asked Mr. Severe if their horses act differently with the towers nearby. Mr. Severe stated that yes, they are afraid of the blades, especially the colts. It takes a long to time to train them to ride near the towers, but some horses don't get used to it.

Public Testimony: Richard Jolly, 54462 Upper Dry Creek Road, Weston, OR, 97886. Mr. Jolly advised the Planning Commission that they are a citizen's committee and they are the first line of defense for property owners to have a chance to speak to. He realized the amount of time that the members of the Planning Commission have put into this

00004456

effort, but he still feels that everyone is not educated enough to realistically address this topic. He feels that the Planning Commission should bring in experts from the Department of Energy to speak to the Commission about wind power issues. He feels that Umatilla County would take a nuclear plant for the money if offered. If the county doesn't pay attention to what the citizens are saying, then some people need to resign their positions and get people in that don't look at the money issue. The Blue Mountain Alliance's position is still the same, and they feel that the issue of cumulative effects is still not being addressed. Most of the other issues could be addressed through adequate setback requirements. Mr. Jolly stated that setbacks should be from property lines, not just residences, in case someone would want to build a residence there in the future. He suggested a four mile setback for residences to address the noise issues. Mr. Jolly suggested that in critical habitat areas, an EIS should be required. He is opposed to the removal of a socio-economic study, as the health department is now doing studies on human health impacts from the wind farms. Mr. Jolly would like to see the annual reports be standardized for all the projects, as the developers are manipulating the information about avian statistics. Commissioner Reeder asked Mr. Jolly how he felt about noise easements. Mr. Jolly replied that noise easements should be treated like any other easement.

Public Testimony: Dana Dibble, 84504 Weis Road, Milton-Freewater, OR, 97862. Mr. Dibble displayed a magazine article about the potential for wind development across the United States. The northwest states are not even listed as marginal according to the article. Mr. Dibble asked what the setback was for a main highway. Commissioner Reeder advised it is twice the height of the highest point of the tower. Mr. Dibble then asked about shadows produced from the turbines. He stated that the Blue Mountains are different than other parts of the county, and that the scenic highway has not been addressed. When the sun comes over the mountains, and the long shadows are produced from turbines, will it affect traffic on Highway 11. Mr. Dibble requested that the Planning Commission drive along Highway 11 early in the morning and in the evening to see what it would look like if towers were put there. Mr. Dibble commented that the first turbines to go up were much smaller than what is currently being constructed, and wondered how much bigger they will get over the years. He asked the Planning Commission where they will draw the line and stop development.

Public Testimony: Jim Burns, 78381 Hodgson Road, Weston, OR, 97886. Mr. Burns stated that he had already said most of what he came to say. He did want to go on the record and file a formal complaint about the hearing. The Planning Commission has tried three times to write this document and the last posting of the proposed changes was three days prior to the meeting. He spent a week writing comments on the last posted version and now found out that it was worthless. Mr. Burns requests that another hearing be scheduled to hear more on this topic, after the revised changes have been posted to give people a chance to review the changes prior to the meeting. Mr. Burns commented on the critical winter range. He stated that for the last several years the county has closed this area from vehicular traffic to protect the deer and elk. He commented on the bull trout in the Walla Walla River, and the Umatilla River. Mr. Burns stated that two years ago he asked a top man in Horizon Wind how much it would

00004457

cost to erect a wind tower. This person told Mr. Burns that it would cost \$850,000.00. Mr. Burns said it will cost at least that much to decommission a tower, as the tower would have to be disassembled just like it was assembled. The roads would have to be widened for the large equipment, cranes brought in, and removal of the metal and concrete done. He stated that they will only be able to get 6 cents per pound for the scrap metal. He feels that a surety bond is the only way to go. There are a lot of banks in trouble today, as their assets are tied up.

Public Testimony: Arla Ruthven, 84547 Weis Road, Milton-Freewater, OR, 97862. Mrs. Ruthven stated that she has lived in Milton-Freewater for 75 years. She is with the Blue Mountain Alliance. She spoke about Bonneville Dam, and has friends in Portland that visit Milton-Freewater. Her friends can't believe the changes in our area because of the wind projects. The fish in the Columbia River are being killed because the water is going over the dams due to the power grid changing. Mrs. Ruthven commented on something the governor said two years ago, about removing the dams from the Columbia River. This used to be sagebrush country, and now it is irrigated farmland because of the dams. Mrs. Ruthven then commented on Arlington, and how the children were frightened by the wind turbines being built. Mrs. Ruthven stated that most of the art located in Walla Walla stores and galleries is based upon the view of the Blue Mountains. If there were turbines in the Blue Mountains, there wouldn't be any art students or anyone coming in to view the mountains. Mrs. Ruthven encouraged the Planning Commission to slow down and not make decision based on experiments. Everyone is still learning after three years, and everything is new. There will be lawsuits in the future if we are not careful now.

Public Testimony: Cindy Severe, 82422 Vancycle Road, Helix, OR, 97835. Mrs. Severe asked who would want a large wind tower a quarter of a mile from their home. She stated that if people like herself that have to put up with the impacts didn't stand up to the wind developers, they will get what they want in the ordinances. She is concerned that the developers want to remove the word "facility" and change it to just "turbines", and this means roads that don't have to meet setbacks. She and her husband listened to the stories that Florida Power told them, and a lot of promises made that were broken. She stated that her property values are now lower because of the towers. Their property is right along the travel route and they were impacted by traffic, garbage, vandalism, and blocked roads from the large equipment being moved. She feels that the people who put up the projects leave and don't care about the problems left behind for the residents of this area. If the developer's quality of life was impacted like theirs has been, they wouldn't like it much. Commissioner Reeder asked Mrs. Severe if the project next to them had ever been sold. She didn't know that answer, but did relate a story about some met towers put up on an adjoining neighbor's land. When the neighbor called the company to come remove the met towers, he found that the company was bankrupt, and had to pay for the removal himself. Mrs. Severe stated that they encountered many problems with the construction of the last project near them, and the trucks not staying on the approved travel route.

00004458

Public Testimony: Ed Chestnut, 812 Jacquelyn Street, Milton-Freewater, OR, 97862. Mr. Chestnut asked to address the Planning Commission as a private citizen, and wanted to make it clear that he was not representing the Milton-Freewater City Council. Mr. Chestnut stated that he wanted to touch on the point brought up earlier by Mr. Dibble about wind turbine shadows. He feels that there needs to be a setback in the ordinance relating to wind turbine shadows in relationship to residences. Commissioner Wysocki asked Mr. Chestnut to now answer his question about what he thought would be a good setback distance. Mr. Chestnut replied that he was in favor of a minimum of two miles, but four miles would be better. He expects that the wind developers will fight this. There are thousands of acres with no residences nearby; he suggests they use those to develop wind farms.


Mrs. Mabbott advised that the Confederated Tribes and Mr. Steven Corey submitted written comments, but were not able to be present to provide testimony for this hearing, as Mr. Corey had to leave earlier. Chairman Rhinhart then asked for comments from other commission members as to how to proceed, and a brief discussion followed. Mrs. Mabbott offered up several options on meeting dates and times. Commissioner Lynde asked if they could have sound experts come and speak to the Planning Commission to help them better understand the problem.

Guest Sarah Parsons, Iberdrola Renewables, commented that they support bringing in specialists from the Department of Energy and BPA to provide further information to the Planning Commission. They would be able to also bring in acoustical engineers about sound, and how counties can enforce sound standards. There could also be biological consultants present to talk about how the vibration and sound affects the wildlife in the county.

Commissioner Standley offered some ideas on how to proceed, and there was further discussion on his suggestions. He would like to move forward on the information they have now such as setbacks and residences, and continue to look into and learn more about the remainder of the issues. Mrs. Mabbott reminded the Planning Commission that they can take all the time they need to work through this, but if an application is presented tomorrow, it will be processed under the existing ordinances. Commissioner Wysocki agreed to sit in and review the draft changes to replace Commissioner Colgan along with Commissioner Reeder and staff. It was decided to hold a work session for the Planning Commission in January. It will be open to the public, but there will be no testimony taken. The time and date for the work session will be announced and advertised later. The hearing will be continued until a later date and time, also to be announced at a later time following the work session.

Chairman Rhinhart adjourned the hearing at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gina Miller, Secretary

00004459

Intent of Planning Process

1. Provide Fairness (unbiased, rational outcomes) and Equity (all parties comply with same, or very similar site specific criteria and standards) among applicants and affected parties and properties.
2. Protect and Enhance the public interests while doing the same for other parties involved in land use, including resource protection, development and utilization.
3. Provide uniform criteria and standards, that is, provide a "level playing field" for all applicants and nearby properties.
4. Assure a reasonable, transparent, credible quasi-judicial process, including meeting records, presentation of factual evidence (feelings, preferences, emotions are "facts" in any socio-economic venture), disciplined process and findings of fact prior to decision making... assuring a credible, trustworthy land (resource) use review and decision process.

*Clinton
Reeder
presentation*

Intent of Planning Process (cont'd)

5. Assure a reasonably efficient, effective process that minimizes delays, costs, and associated burdens for all parties involved, including those who administer the process.
6. Periodically adapt to changing technology, conditions and circumstances, including changes in law, administrative rules, economics, public preferences, political realities, etc.
7. Resolve and/or adapt to existing and evolving local, state, federal and international realities effecting local conditions and circumstances.
8. Develop and maintain an evolving planning process that retains and builds public confidence and trust.

What Is "Land Use Planning"?

1. No longer limited to just "Land".
2. Any and all identified "Significant Resources"
 - a. Water – Quantity and Quality
 - b. Air – Primarily Quality
 - c. Vegetation – Trees, landscaping, etc.
 - d. Habitat – Conservation, Protection, Enhancement
 - e. Land – Quality, Quantity, Conflicts in Use, etc.
 - f. "Resource Development"
 - g. "Wind" (moving air)

Wind Power Development Concerns vs. Planning

Fundamentally – CONFLICT ANTICIPATION PLUS PRIOR RESOLUTION AND/OR MITIGATION, including Human Health and Safety, Technical Considerations, Community Threat Minimization, Endangered Species Protection and Environmental Protection and Conservation

1. Minimize conflicts with other land uses on nearby properties, including but not necessarily limited to...
2. Imposed costs and limitations upon preferred practices.
3. Access locations.
4. Road, culvert and bridge damage.
5. Traffic exceeding carrying capacity of roads.
6. Noise and Vibration.
7. Trespass, vandalism, criminal activity.
8. "Visibility Interference".
9. Blocked view-shed.
10. Erosion and weed control ("trespass" of silt and weed seed).
11. Wildlife, fisheries and avian habitat.
12. Unreasonably diminished property values.

Oregon's Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC)

Perceived Working Relationship between EFSC

and

Umatilla County 's Planning Program

1. Where EFSC is the primary siting authority, the county will generally defer to the regulatory framework and activity of EFSC.
2. On the other hand, Umatilla County has from the beginning of the development process for wind energy decided that the county will at all times protect the wind energy development interests of the county.
3. Therefore, the county ordinance will incorporate criteria and standards which we expect / request be considered by EFSC as they make their decisions.

Corporate Structure of Development Company vs. Bonding Requirement

1. The county is well aware that an energy development company can qualify for additional public funding if they break up a larger entity and form a new LLC for each element of a larger development.
2. This development strategy also spreads development risks for the developer, by allowing them to let one LLC fail while keeping others operating.
3. This potential company strategy might leave the county liable for failure of one element of a larger project, while the rest of the company continues to thrive without liability for decommissioning the failed element.
4. The county has considered investigating the corporate and project financing structure to determine the extent of this risk, but readily concluded doing so went far beyond our obligation as planners.

Corporate Structure of Development Company vs. Bonding Requirement (cont'd)

5. Therefore, by requiring separate surety bond for each company's development. No matter what the corporate structure, or the source of funding, any abandoned or otherwise decommissioned facility will be covered by an appropriate and regularly updated bond, regardless of who owns or operates the facility at the time.
6. This is a major reason why the developers are all required by ordinance language to notify the county if project ownership and/or operator changes... to make sure the bonding requirement is fulfilled, regardless of ownership or operator identity.
7. Therefore, in some respects, the bond serves as collateral for a permit; hence, no bond, no permit.
8. Citizens strongly support the bonding requirement.

Pre-Application Consultation Process

1. Indeed a process, NOT "just a meeting" (may include multiple meetings).
2. Purpose: to make sure developer is aware of the total range and nature of the application content, criteria and standards to be satisfied BEFORE THE APPLICATION IS CONSIDERED COMPLETE.
3. To acquaint the developer with certain agency and other significant parties involved in project permitting process.
4. Facilitate effective working relationships among involved parties.
5. Especially important for less experienced and/or less well-financed developers who attempt to save money by short-cutting the application process.
6. Maintain an efficient, effective county administrative process.
7. Accelerate the planning and permitting process.
8. Improve the efficiency and limit planning costs for the developer.
9. Minimize delays in the permitting processing.

00004467

Evidence of Wind Monitoring Data

1. We have long respected the reality of proprietary data.
2. Respect the fact that the party who develops the data literally "owns" it.... On the other hand,
3. The county does not want developers to invest in land uses that are not technically AND economically feasible.
4. Therefore, please provide evidence that your wind energy monitoring has been accomplished in a credible, trustworthy manner; according to credible industry standards and/or procedures we can have confidence will result in rational evidence to support your desired development.
5. Beyond this, we generally trust you will not invest in projects not supported by reasonable evidence of longer term success.

Electric Energy Transmission and Interconnections

1. A very major county planning concern!
2. Easements are often not as easy to obtain as expected.
3. Sometimes, one party along a proposed route threatens and/or initiates legal action to block a proposed route, at least resulting in a troublesome delay and/or change of route.
4. Too often, developers expect a permit prior to being able to provide reasonable assurance of appropriate connection/s for commercial energy sales.
5. County has not generally, nor does it expect to permit wind power site development until there is reasonable evidence presented to demonstrate credible investment in negotiations that are likely to result in appropriate connection contract/s.

Fish, Wildlife and Avian Technical Committee

1. Considered dropping this requirement, in favor of "boilerplate" language that simply required a developer to "give attention" to this matter, and get approval from one or more appropriate agencies... However,
2. Experience suggests rather than being simply an additional burden on the developer, this committee actually can result in cost savings to the developer... providing local knowledge of site conditions not known to agency representatives.
3. We do not require more monitoring than is necessary to document potential problems and possible mitigation measures for the particular development site. Due to the cost factor, we do not support one developer having to conduct related research that might benefit a number of developers who do not contribute to the study costs.

General Emergency Management Plan

1. County has an experienced Emergency Management Program, but it cannot function appropriately without names and phone numbers... hence, the requirement that such information be provided and updated immediately if changed.
2. If capabilities are not readily available from local sources, such as a local fire department or district, developers are required to plan how they might provide such services in an emergency.
3. Emergency response plans need to consider literally any kind of "emergency", in particular fire but also rain and snowmelt potential, where silt moves down into waterways – endangering "fish" (actually, the law addresses "aquatic species", including microscopic ones) and wildlife habitat.
4. Millions of dollars have been invested in stream restoration and riparian area enhancements. Land owners and agencies passionately oppose any threats to this investment.

00004471

Fire Prevention and Response Plan.

1. This county has many locations where it is difficult, if not impossible to effectively fight fires, especially if driven by wind. Literally thousands of acres can burn in a very short period unless a fire response is almost immediate.
2. Much of the county's grassland and crop land extends up into the forested land. The brushy draw joining these different types of land funnel wind currents that feed fire quickly into timber land, increasing the difficulty and cost of fire control. Hence, the fire plan should focus on both fire prevention strategies as well as quick response strategies.
3. Just a few years ago, local farmers and ranchers responded in large numbers to wildfires anywhere near their operations. In the past few years, the number of farmers in the crop areas has declined by about two-thirds, resulting in far fewer local fire fighting teams responding to wildfires.

Vegetation and Erosion Control Plan

1. Ordinance language requires "**Consultation**", not permits or letters authorizing certain practices. However, developers should keep in mind that, depending on the nature of an agency's authority, they may exercise an authority to block development unless and until certain criteria and standards are included in the plan.
2. **Special Attention** : the Oregon Agricultural Water Quality Management Program, administered by the Oregon Dept. of Agriculture. This program has far-reaching authority, including EPA and DEQ approved enforcement provisions. Enforcement starts with a "Warn and Inform" process. Failure to respond reasonably can result in civil penalties coupled with mandatory changes in practices. Their jurisdiction and authority brings together multiple agencies involved in protection of water quality, with the program administered via ODA staff. Their territory is basically "rural lands", not just "farm land". Rural property owners are becoming more aware of this program, and many are aware that this program could intervene in the development of properties draining into the watersheds of this county.

Purpose of Facility Set-Backs on Wind Power Development Sites

Fundamentally –Mitigate Anticipated Conflicts, including Human Health and Safety, Technical Considerations, Community Threat Minimization, Endangered Species Protection and Environmental Protection and Conservation

1. Minimize conflicts with other land uses on nearby properties, including but not necessarily limited to...
2. Imposed costs and limitations upon preferred practices.
3. Noise.
4. Vibration.
5. Flickering Shadows (seizure triggers?).
6. "Invasion of Privacy".
7. Sleep Interference.
8. Blocked view-shed.
9. Diminished property values.

10. Major Concern – "Cumulative Effect" (as increasingly visible and in larger numbers, opposition increases)... increasing numbers of uncompensated persons affected by their presence, with a perspective of personal loss.

Towers: 3,520 ft Residential zones 2,640 ft (1.5 mi) rural homes 2x tower + blade height, roads Transmission Lines: 500 ft from homes... unless in public right-of-way

Requirement Concerning Wind Power Developers

Providing Financial Assurance

1. Issue carefully reviewed multiple times.
2. Letters of Credit do not Guarantee Performance.
3. In especially cases of project abandonment or bankruptcy, the county is likely to end up responsible for rehabilitation of project site/s.
4. The county does not intend to incur such a performance liability and budget exposure.
5. Hence, all wind power projects will be required to provide a surety bond adequate to cover decommissioning and site rehabilitation costs, including removal of facilities.
6. Public strongly supports the surety bond requirement.

UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session of Thursday, January 13, 2011
4:00 p.m., Umatilla County Justice Center, Media Room
Pendleton, OR

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT: David Lynde, Clinton Reeder, Gary Rhinhart, John Standley, David Lee, Frank Kaminski, Randy Randall.

ABSENT: Tammie Williams, Don Wysocki

STAFF: Tamra Mabbott, Carol Johnson, Richard Jennings, Julie Alford.

Note: The following is a summary of the work session. A recording of the session is available at the Umatilla County Planning Department.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Rhinhart called the work session to order at 4:08 p.m..

WORK SESSION:

- **Discussion on code amendments to Conditional Use Section 152. 616 (HHH) of the Umatilla County Development Code, pertaining to standards for large scale commercial wind energy projects.**

Planning Director, Tamra Mabbott, expressed her goal for the work session was to have a completed draft of Section 152.616 HHH of the Umatilla County Development Code ready for the next public hearing. Discussion was directed by Commissioner Clinton Reeder, who passed around a list of issues he had compiled, regarding wind turbine setbacks. He then walked through the added changes in the Conditional Use text.

When discussing the amendment to Section (F) regarding revegetation and erosion control plans, Commissioner Kaminski inquired about the involvement of other agencies regarding the plans. Clinton clarified that the referenced agencies in the text will be consulted prior to approval and Ms. Mabbott confirmed that this may be required as a condition of approval.

Questions raised previously regarding high altitude rescue lead to the decision of wind companies being responsible for those rescues. It was determined that the County should still examine road layout, addressing and access through private gates for emergency response.

Commissioner Rhinhart brought up concerns with projectiles from wind turbine blades, such as ice, and felt this should be considered in setback requirements from roads. Commissioner Reeder felt this issue should be added to areas of special concern.

00004476

Discussion followed regarding noise standards and setbacks. Commissioner Reeder referred to noise studies he reviewed which predominately declared that there are no quantifiable direct human health effects, such as hearing loss, from noise of a wind turbine. He continued to explain the State noise standards are set as industrial standards. Direct effects are likely loss of hearing but indirect health issues may also occur, such as stress induced physiological health disorders.

Commissioner Reeder asked if current noise easement contracts were between the wind company and land owner or if the easement is attached to the property. Further research was recommended for more information.

In discussion regarding setbacks, Ms. Mabbott clarified that the proposed Conditional Use text does ask for a noise study as part of the permit process. The Planning Commission will have the ability to require a noise study before permit approval. Commissioner Reeder suggested adding text in Section (6)(A)(5) - setbacks based on noise study with wording suggested as *'number of feet or based on noise test, whichever is greater'*. Ms. Mabbott believed the language was already in place.

Discussion on Section (J) regarding impact to roads followed with Commissioner Rhinhart suggesting to add requirement for private roads, within wind project boundaries, be built to best management practices. Ms. Mabbott then commented that the County Public Works Director should not be responsible for inspecting wind project roads to make sure they meet best management practices. Commissioner Rhinhart replied the Soil & Water Conservation District should be the consulting agency with Commissioner Reeder adding that NRCS should provide technical assistance with cost share.

After reviewing Section (6)(M) regarding surety bonds, Commissioner Reeder explained the intent was not to protect the developer but to protect the County. Commissioner Standley commented that the land owner should have more responsibility with the bonds. Commissioner Rhinhart proposed adding language to make the land owner accept residual liability and Commissioner Reeder suggested having the land owner sign an agreement with the County acknowledging responsibility prior to the development permits. Discussion followed regarding leases and County involvement. Commissioner Reeder recommended County Counsel verify nature of the residual liability and to clarify if it can be contracted away.

Issues for Discussion handout:

While reviewing the Aesthetic Intrusion and Deprivation section of the Issues handout, Commissioner Standley asked about assessed value of property with regards to a view. When asked if anyone had appealed to the Board of Property Tax Appeals regarding lower property values because of turbines affecting the view, Commissioner Kaminski, who resides on the BOPTA Board, reported no one had appealed to this date. Commissioner Standley concluded that a view on property can not be tied to assessed tax value.

00001477

Commissioner Reeder noted that Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife will soon submit their study of wildlife habitat areas regarding critical winter range and once the County adopts the study we will have effectively impacted the boundaries of wind power development.

With discussion on turbine setback of 3520' from a residential zone, Commissioner Rhinhart suggested to set a buffer area larger. Commissioner Randall expressed his desire to base the setbacks on blade height. The consensus for setback from a city residential zone was 20 x blade height. Commissioner Randall felt the public consensus of two miles would be the best minimum setback from a residential zone. Richard Jennings, Senior Planner, suggested including a distance of 3520 feet or 10 times blade height, which ever is greater.

After discussion about feedlot setbacks, all agreed to eliminate that portion of the text. Consensus on setbacks to all County Roads, paved or gravel, was 2 x blade height and State Highways and Interstates was 3 x blade height.

Archeological and cultural site setbacks shall be 2 x blade height. Commissioner Lynde urged the Commission to refer to the recommendation of related agencies. Commission consensus was to have 2 x blade height.

Commissioner Reeder asked for clarification on setbacks from a residence. The setback from a city was decided at 20 x blade height or 2 miles, whichever is greater.

Ms. Mabbott explained the Watershed Council Coordinators will meet with the Planning Department staff to come up with a check-off list of issues for wind companies to address before final approval of wind projects.

Ms. Mabbott then explained LCDC adopted a new emergency administrative rule regarding temporary workforce housing for large energy related construction projects. When asked if temporary RV parks should be permitted for wind project areas the Commission's general agreement was they should not be allowed. Staff shared a list of existing RV and mobile home parks in the county. Planning Commission acknowledged that there was a good supply and that contractors could occupy existing RV parks. It was agreed that the county code should therefore not be amended to adopt the new Administrative Rule provisions which are optional.

While clarifying setbacks, it was determined that turbine height shall be ground level to blade tip and the setbacks from city limits shall be 2 miles or 20 x blade height, which ever is greater. After more discussion regarding setbacks from urban growth boundaries, Commissioner Reeder suggested that planning staff come up with language and text to present at next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Richard Jolly addressed the group regarding the critical winter range overlay zone and suggested the wildlife protection issues be considered during this HHH update process. Ms. Mabbott explained that the environmental analysis from ODFW would need to be

adopted before it could be included with the text update and she would like to move forward with the HHH code update as soon as possible and respond to the critical winter range overlay zone at a later date rather than hold up the HHH adoption.

Debbie Kelly spoke about the rural areas being invaded by the industrial noises of wind turbines. Commissioner Lynde inquired about decibel levels that the County can impose for a wind project. Commissioner Standley commented that industrial noise can go up to 54 decibels for a short period of time but there are no firm decibel levels set for an extended length in an industrial area.

Cindy Severe made comments regarding the turbine noise level at her home near Helix and stated that Iberdrola had run noise tests near her home and it was currently in the 50 decibel range.


OTHER BUSINESS:

Definition dealing with storage containers:

Senior Planner, Richard Jennings, asked the Commission to clarify if Cargo Containers should be exempt from a zoning permit in EFU & GF zones, except in a flood zone. Commission members decided cargo containers will need a zoning permit in the EFU & GF zones. Property owners will have a six month grace period to get a zoning permit at no cost for existing containers. Richard Jennings would make those changes in the upcoming code adoption.

Work Session adjourned at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Julie Alford, staff

00001479

STATE OF OREGON)
) ss.
County of Umatilla)

AFFIDAVIT OF
POSTING AND PUBLICATION

I, DOUGLAS R. OLSEN, being first duly sworn, depose and say
as follows:


1. I am county counsel for Umatilla County.
2. The weekly schedule for the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners is posted on the Umatilla County website under Public Notices.
3. The notice is posted Friday of each week for the following week, when the previous week schedule is removed.
4. Attached to this affidavit is a true copy of the schedule for the following weeks:


- A. March 13 through 19, 2011, posted March 11, 2011;
- B. May 1 through 7, 2011, posted April 29, 2011;
- C. May 8 through 14, 2011, posted May 6, 2011;
- D. June 12 through 18, 2011, posted June 10, 2011;
- D. June 26 through July 2, 2011, posted June 24, 2011.

DATED this 26th day of September, 2011.


Douglas R. Olsen

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this 26th day of October,
2011.




Notary Public for Oregon

00004480

Umatilla County Board of Commissioners
Schedule for the week of March 13 through 19, 2011

Day & Date	BOC Courthouse Meetings	Other Meetings and Events
Mon 3/14		All day AOC Legislative & Steering Committees – Salem – Comm Hansell, Comm Givens 10:00 AOC Water Policy Committee teleconference – Comm Doherty
Tues 3/15		7:30 Breakfast of Champions – Convention Ctr, Portland – Comm Hansell 10:30 Al Bankendorf – SHGC – Comm Doherty, Tanra Mabbott 1:30 Umatilla Basin Water Commission – Doherty Conf Rm, SHGC, Hermiston – Comm Doherty 6:00 AWERE Committee – Elementary School, Athena – Comm Hansell
Wed 3/16	9:00 Board of Commissioners' Meeting – Room 114 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consent agenda 2. RCDC presentation (9:00) 3. Natural Resource council presentation 4. Purchase 2 new scanners for records 5. Supplemental budgets (5) (<i>Public Hearing</i>) 6. Establish fund balance allocations 7. Motor Grader Purchase 8. Used pressurized water truck 9. City of Echo request for Bike Path funds discussion 10. Authorization to purchase installation and testing services 11. Authorization to contract with Motorola 12. Eurys Benefit Plan grants 	1:00 Constituent meeting – Stafford Hansell Govt Center, Hermiston – Comm Doherty
Thurs 3/17	9:00 Board of Commissioners' Land Use Planning Hearing – Room 114 Text Amendments #T-10-039 and #T-10-040	
Fri 3/18		

Distribution of this notice will serve as Notice for Oregon Public Meeting Law. For additional information, contact 541-278-6204.

00004481

Umatilla County Board of Commissioners
Schedule for the week of May 1 through 7, 2011

Day & Date	BOC Courthouse Meetings	Other Meetings and Events
Mon 5/2		All day AOC Legislative & Steering Committees – Salem – Comm Hansell, Comm Givens 10:00 Water Policy Committee teleconference – Comm Doherty
Tues 5/3	9:00 – 5:00 Umatilla County Planning Code Text Amendment work session – Media Rm, EOC, Pendleton	
Wed 5/4	9:00 Board of Commissioners' Meeting – Room 114 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consent agenda 2. Employee of the Month 3. Cold Springs Loop Snowmobile Trail designation (Public Hearing) 4. STF grant awards 5. Supplemental Budgets 6. Salvation Army Week Proclamation (May 9-15) 7. Request for authority to request bids for Weed Program UTV and trailer 8. Vacation of portion of old County Rd 407 – City of Adams 9. MOU re Milton-Freewater Ambulance Service 10. Approval for electronic records software for Public Health 11. West Umatilla Mosquito Control District Board appointment 	12:00 Chamber – Milton-Freewater – Comm Givens 1:15 Road employee's union negotiation – Comm Hansell, Connie Caplinger (tentative)
Thurs 5/5		1:00 NFCSC Conference Call - Comm Hansell
Fri 5/6		

Distribution of this notice will serve as Notice for Oregon Public Meeting Law. For additional information contact 541-278-6204.

00004482

Umatilla County Board of Commissioners
Schedule for the week of May 8 through 14, 2011

Day & Date	BOC Courthouse Meetings	Other Meetings and Events
Mon 5/9		All day Local Officials' Advisory Committee – Salem - Comm Givens
Tues 5/10	9:00 Administrative Meeting – Room 121 1. Consent agenda 2. Advance per diem 3. Payable for Eastern Oregon Visitor Guide – \$3500 4. Selling of Stafford Hansell Government Center's old generator 5. Authorization to purchase microwave equipment – Weston Mtn & E. Pendleton 6. OSU Extension Service Umatilla County Day Proclamation 7. Milton-Freewater Ambulance MOA	7:00 State Rep's video conferences – Bd Rm, BMCC, Pendleton – Comm Doherty 1:00 – 4:00 Office Hours – Monahan Rm, Library, Milton-Freewater – Comm Givens 1:30 Umatilla Basin Water Coalition – Doherty Conf Rm, SHGC – Comm Doherty 6:00 AWERE Committee – Elementary School, Athena – Comm Hansell
Wed 5/11	9:00 Senior Managers' Meeting – Room 114 7:00 Milton-Freewater Ambulance Advisory Committee - Albee Rm, Library, Milton-Freewater	10:00 Interagency meeting re levee – Levee, Milton-Freewater - Comm Givens 11:30 Wildhorse Foundation – Tamastslitk – Comm Hansell 1:00 Giant Cane Advisory Group – HAREC, Hermiston – Comm Hansell
Thurs 5/12	9:00 Land Use Planning Hearing Text Amendments #T-10-039 and #T-10-040 – Media Rm, EOC	
Fri 5/13		8:00 American Leadership Forum – Portland – Comm Hansell 8:15 KUMA Coffee Hour – Comm Hansell

Distribution of this notice will serve as Notice for Oregon Public Meeting Law. For additional information, contact 541-278-6204.

00001483

Umatilla County Board of Commissioners
Schedule for the week of June 12 through 18, 2011

Day & Date	BOC Courthouse Meetings	Other Meetings and Events
Mon 6/13		9:00 BCC Staff – Room 121 6:00 HELP Committee - City Hall, Helix - Comm Hansell
Tues 6/14	9:00 – 5:00 Text Amendment #T-10-039 Planning Hearing – Media Rm, EOC, Pendleton	7:00 Water Control District – Milton-Freewater – Comm Givens
Wed 6/15	9:00 Board of Commissioners' Meeting – Room 114 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consent agenda 2. Supplemental budgets (2) (Public Hearings) 3. Budget transfers (4) 4. Proposed formation of the Milton-Freewater Ambulance Service District (Public Hearing) 5. HELP grant awards 6. JCP Plan Update 7. Boyd Hydro option 8. Appointment of Financial Assistance Administrator 9. Master Gardener Civic Demonstration Garden 10. Agape (Martha's) House discussion 	1:30 UMADRA Meeting – Wenaha Rm, Nixyaawii Governance Ctr, CTUIR – Comm Hansell 6:00 OR Environmental Quality Commission Town Hall – Slickfork Saloon, Hamley's, Pendleton – Comm Givens
Thurs 6/16	9:00 2012 Fiscal Year Budget Hearing -- Room 114	
Fri 6/17		

Distribution of this notice will serve as Notice for Oregon Public Meeting Law. For additional information, contact 541-278-6204.

Revised 6/14/11 9:00 a.m.

00001484

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that on October 3, 2011, I filed the original and one copy of this Respondent's Second Response to Petitioners' Record Objection via first class mail with the Land Use Board of Appeals, PUC Building, 550 Capitol Street NE, Suite 235, Salem OR 97301-2552.

I further certify that on October 3, 2011, I served a true and correct copy of this Respondent's Second Response to Petitioners' Record Objection on the following persons by first class mail:

Jennifer M. Bragar
121 SW Morrison Street
Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97204-3141
Attorney for Petitioners


James K. Hayner
PO Box 1757
Walla Walla, WA 99362
Attorney for Intervenor Reid

Richard Stewart
515 Fleetwood
College Place, WA 93224
Intervenor-Petitioner

JoLynn Buell
78441 Rayborn Road
Weston, OR 97886
Intervenor-Petitioner Representative

Joe Pitt
CTUIR
46411 Timine Way
Pendleton, OR 97801
Attorney for Intervenor-Respondent

DATED: October 3, 2011



Douglas R. Olsen, OSB # 84438
Umatilla County Counsel
Attorney for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE