SHASTA COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES **Special Meeting**

Date: July 24, 2008
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: Mountain View High School
Burney, CA

Flag Salute

ROLL CALL **Commissioners Present:**

Dave Rutledge	District 1
Roy Ramsey	District 4
John Wilson	District 2
John Cornelius	District 3
Shirley Easley	District 5

Staff Present: Richard Simon, Assistant Director of Resource Management
Bill Walker, Senior Planner
Mike Ralston, County Counsel
Al Cathey, Public Works/Subdivision Engineer
Jim Diehl, Shasta County Fire Department
Dawn Duckett, Staff Services Manager, Recording Secretary

Note: **All unanimous actions reflect a 5-0 vote.**

Key: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), Negative Declaration (ND), Categorically Exempt (CE), General Exemption from CEQA (GE); Not Subject to CEQA (N/A).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS: None.

PUBLIC HEARING:

R1: **Use Permit 06-016 (Hatchet Ridge Wind)**: The applicant, Hatchet Ridge Wind, LLC, proposes to construct a wind energy project on 73 acres scattered over 17 parcels totaling approximately 3,000 acres on Hatchet Mountain. The site is approximately seven miles due west of Burney, and 34 miles northeast of Redding, and immediately north of State Highway 299 at Hatchet Mountain Pass.

The project would produce approximately 100 megawatts of electricity and would require construction of 42 to 68 wind turbines on steel tubular towers from about 213 feet to 263 feet tall. The total height of each tower with its attached wind turbine could reach from about 338 feet to about 418 feet high. The line of towers would stretch for about 6.5 miles northeasterly along the ridge of Hatchet Mountain.

The project would include transmission lines from the turbines to a new substation and additional lines to interconnect with existing high-voltage transmission lines that cross the project site which are owned by Pacific Gas and Electric Company. The project would also include a temporary construction office, an operations and maintenance building/control center, new access roads, temporary staging areas, and up to four permanent meteorological masts up to 220 feet high. The project would be constructed over a 6 to 12-month period. In general, the towers would be constructed in areas managed for commercial timber production which were replanted after the 1992 Fountain Fire. Staff Planner: Walker. District 3.

Senior Planner Bill Walker presented the staff report and John Forsythe, from Jones & Stokes Associates (Environmental Impact Report (EIR) consultant) gave a presentation describing the EIR process for the project. The public hearing was opened and speaking in favor of the project were:

Speaker's Name	***Comment/Issue/Concern***
Nicole Hughes	Ms. Hughes, representing RES (the applicant) described the site selection process and the benefits of wind energy.
George Hardie	Mr. Hardie (Babcock & Brown) described the economic benefits of wind energy.
David Young	Mr. Young (West, Inc.) discussed the biological studies performed at the site and wildlife impact mitigation measures.
Perry Thompson	Mr. Thompson (Hat Creek Construction) voiced support for the project discussing the use of fossil fuels and economic benefits of renewable energy sources.
Richard Taylor	Mr. Taylor discussed the benefits of renewable energy as well as the economic benefits to local infrastructure and education systems.
Terry Hufft	Mr. Hufft stated that the wind project would generate interest in the area.
Rob Moseman	Mr. Moseman (Shasta Constructors) discussed renewable energy, global warming, and agreed that the wind project would generate interest in the Burney area.
Eric Sargent	Mr. Sargent (Construction Workers' Union) agreed with the previous speakers and stated that the project would provide jobs for unemployed construction workers.

Phil George	Mr. George (Stimpel Wiebelhaus) discussed global warming and stated that wind energy emits no pollution into the environment. He also opined that the local wildlife would accommodate the project and that the project would generate interest in the Burney area.
Dan Brown	Mr. Brown discussed dependency on foreign oil and possible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to birds.
Pam Giacomini	Mrs. Giacomini (Burney Chamber of Commerce) stated that the Chamber of Commerce had in January 2008, voted to support the project.
Marian Marglen	Ms. Marglen discussed fossil fuels and tourism in the Burney area.
Henry Giacomini	Mr. Giacomini voiced support for the project and discussed renewable energy and the economic benefits of wind projects.

Speaking in opposition to the project were:

David Larson	Mr. Larson read aloud a written statement opposing the project and asked the Commission to examine a to-scale model of a wind turbine located in the rear of the meeting room. He noted that hundreds of people have signed a petition against the project and he cited General Plan policies against the project. Mr. Larson recommended moving the turbines further west.
Karen Scholls	Ms. Scholls stated that Mallory Lane was not included in the street analysis performed by Jones and Stokes. She also discussed visual impacts, bird fatalities, re-siting the project, bonds for de-construction, and inquired about noise and the duration of benefits such as employment opportunities. Ms. Scholls asked that the project be denied unless the turbines were relocated.
Frank Germano	Mr. Germano stated that the project is not economically feasible and discussed visual impacts.
Joe Studenicka	Mr. Studenicka stated that the project is not conducive to the surrounding area and its scenic vistas. He requested that the next public hearing also be held in Burney and stated that the $.05 per kilowatt hour fee was insufficient and the funds collected should be used exclusively to benefit the Burney area.
Ken Archuleta	Mr. Archuleta discussed alternative locations for the turbines, quality of life and questioned the validity of the number of new jobs versus salaries as stated by the applicant.
Andrew Urlie	Mr. Urlie agreed with the previous speakers and discussed quality of life, views, and alternative locations.

Lynn Dorroh	Ms. Dorroh discussed concerns regarding noise, quality of life, and the siting of the turbines. She questioned the economic benefits stated in the EIR.
Lola Harris	Ms. Harris discussed the location of the turbines and impacts to views. She requested that all future public hearings for the project be held in Burney and said that the use of any fees collected should be governed by the residents of Burney.
Joanne Germano	Ms. Germano voiced general opposition to the project and stated that proponents of the project had financial interests.
Jill Young	Ms. Young agreed with the previous speakers and discussed visual impacts, nighttime views (blinking lights), and stated that the economic endowments to the community were not sufficient.
Claudia Yerion	Ms. Yerion (Wintu Audubon Society) read aloud a written statement which discussed concerns regarding siting of the turbines and effects on birds and wildlife.
Bob Murray	Mr. Murray stated that wind is an unreliable source of energy and discussed the location of the turbines.
Jerry Smith	Mr. Smith read aloud several internet news articles regarding various subjects including, wind energy overloading electrical grids, bird strikes, and the share values of Babcock and Brown's stock.
Melinda Kirby	Ms. Kirby opined that proponents have a financial interest in the project.
Jean Boggs	Ms. Boggs agreed with previous speakers and discussed impacts to views and siting of the turbines.
Carl Heier	Mr. Heier (Save Burney Skyline Committee) distributed revised photo simulations to the Commission.
Carolyn Heier	Mrs. Heier (on behalf of Richard Morris) read aloud a written statement discussing impacts to views and siting of the turbines.
Bob Nelson	Mr. Nelson discussed the failure rate of wind turbines, declining share value of Babcock and Brown's stock, and adequate bonding for decommissioning the structures.
Mike Foley	Mr. Foley discussed civics and County liability if the project were approved as proposed. He also said that the community would support the project if the turbines were moved behind the ridge.

Scott Brule	Mr. Brule (Scott's Guaranteed Glass) discussed the intent of proponents of the projects, impacts to views, bonding for decommissioning, and stated that Burney residents should have input on spending any recreation fees collected from the project.
Kathy Urlie	Ms. Urlie discussed economics and stated that there was no guarantee that jobs generated by the project would be local residents nor was there a guarantee that the tax revenue would benefit the Burney area. She also discussed impacts to birds and alternative siting and suggested that approval of the project be referred to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Urlie also requested that future public hearings for the project be held in Burney.
Kathy Newton	Ms. Newton discussed impacts to scenic vistas and noise.
Chuck Sardoch	Mr. Sardoch discussed noise, impacts on birds and views and recommended smaller windmills.
David Wilson	Mr. Wilson agreed with previous speakers and discussed impacts to real estate values.
Wayne Rodman	Mr. Rodman contested earlier testimony that the Chamber of Commerce supported the project and discussed impacts on views and siting of the turbines.
Ann Wilburn	Ms. Wilburn discussed significant and unavoidable impacts and suggested that the Planning Commission meet with the Pit River Tribe to hear the Tribe's concerns.
Dennis Young	Mr. Young discussed impacts to views and objected to the height of the turbines.
Bob Murray	Mr. Murray provided additional discussion regarding the siting of the turbines.
Jerry Smith	Mr. Smith discussed the validity of the applicant's assertion that there was Chamber of Commerce and community support for the project. Mr. Smith also discussed an on-line survey.
Joe Studenicka	Mr. Studenicka discussed the Burney Basin versus existing wind energy projects in other areas, in particular, Dayton, Washington.
Vince Meglio	Mr. Meglio discussed significant and unavoidable impacts.

Sabrina Teller, attorney for the applicant, made rebuttal remarks stating that: 1) the applicant had no influence in the preparation of the EIR; 2) mitigation would be triggered by the death of one bird and the mitigation measures placed on the project for birds are the most comprehensive in the state; 3) the scope of the project was reduced from 64 to 43

turbines; 4) the project can not be moved off of the ridge and remain feasible; 5) the project is not visible from Burney Falls or Lake Britton; 6) red lights will only be located on turbines at the end of each row; and 7) residents in the nearest homes to the project site will not hear any noise from the site. Ms. Teller also discussed tourism benefits from existing wind projects and reasons why alternative sites for the turbines were not viable.

There being no other speakers for or against the project, the public hearing was closed.

ACTION: By motion made, seconded (Cornelius/Easley), and carried unanimously, the Commission continued Use Permit 06-016 to a date uncertain.

ADJOURNMENT: The Planning Commission adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Submitted by:

_____

Dawn Duckett, Staff Services Manager
Recording Secretary