

WASCO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 7, 2011

**Meeting begins at 3:00p.m.
Columbia Gorge Discovery Center
Classroom, lower level
5000 Discovery Drive
The Dalles, OR 97058**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Don Hoffman
Vicki Ashley
Ron Archer
Jill Amery
Russ Hargrave
Chip Wood
Mike Omeg

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

John Roberts, Planning Director
Jeanette Montour, Associate Planner
Brenda Jenkins, Planning Coordinator

OTHER AGENCIES PRESENT

Todd Cornett, Siting Officer, Oregon Department of Energy (Acting as Consultant for Wasco County)

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: Maximum 15 minutes, limited to items not being heard or discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

None

IV. APPROVAL OF PAST MINUTES- May 3, 2011

Vice Chair Ashley moved to approve the minutes as submitted.
Commissioner Wood seconded
Chair Hoffman called for discussion
None.
Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 7 to 0. A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – yes
Commissioner Wood – yes
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – yes
Commissioner Amery – yes

V. LEGISLATIVE HEARING: File # PLALEG-09-06-0003. Continuation of the request to:

Amend the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan).

1. Amend policy and inventory language related to energy production, consumption and conservation.
2. Include prior acknowledged updates that were never added.
3. Modernize language that is not compliant with state law, incorrect, or out of date.
4. Reformat entire Comp Plan
 - Create Oregon Land Use Goal related chapters
 - Remove Duplication

Amend the Wasco County Land Use and Development Ordinance (WCLUDO)

1. Amend language related to where and how commercial and non-commercial energy development is allowed.
2. Modernize language that is not compliant with state law, incorrect, or out of date.
3. Reformat all zones and add similar uses to create as much consistency between the zones as possible.

Chair Hoffman opened the hearing as follows:

Time Limitations

If numerous people in the audience wish to testify, do a show of hands of those who would like to testify either for or against the proposal. If a lot of people want to testify, indicate they will be limited to 5 minutes (or other) and their testimony will be timed. Also indicate that their testimony needs to be limited to applicable criteria.

The Rules of Evidence are as follows:

- a. No person shall present irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious testimony or evidence.
- b. Evidence received shall be of a quality that reasonable persons rely upon in the conduct of their daily affairs.
- c. Testimony and evidence must be directed toward the subject hearing.
- d. Any party of record may request that the record remain open for at least seven (7) days prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing.

Disclosure of Interest of Ex Parte Contact (For Commissioners who were not in attendance at the May 3, 2011 hearing):

- a. Does any Planning Commission member wish to disqualify themselves for any personal or financial interest in this matter?
None.
- b. Does any member of the audience wish to challenge the right of any Planning Commission to hear this matter?
None.
- c. Is there any member of the audience who wishes to question the jurisdiction of this body to act on behalf of Wasco County in this matter?
None.

Chair Hoffman called for the staff report.

Todd Cornett, Siting Officer, Oregon Department of Energy

Mr. Cornett presented the staff report as follows:

- I. Introduction
- II. Comments Submitted Not included in the Packet
 - Would the Commission like to take time to review them?
- III. Comprehensive Plan: Unless there are any specific questions or concerns I won't spend any time on the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

IV. LUDO Chapters Other than Chapter 19: Unless there are any specific questions or concerns I won't spend any time on the proposed amendments to Chapters other than Chapter 19.

V. LUDO Chapter 19 – Standards for Energy Facilities:
Proposed amendments from PC Hearing #1 are highlighted blue.
Areas of potential concern are highlighted green.
Clarification comments to be removed are highlighted yellow with red text.

A. Definitions

-Downwind, Downwind Properties & Upwind

-Shadow Flicker

-Sound Power & Sound Pressure

B. Non-Commercial

-Tower Height - 19.020(A)(1): Any concerns with the proposal?

-Solar System Size – 19.020(A)(2): Any concerns with the proposal?

-Noise – 19.020(B)(1)(g) & 19.020(C)(1)(b): Go over handout and explain proposal as necessary.

-Lighting –19.020(C)(2)(a)(2)(c): Proposed language is meant to require applicant to consider radar triggered or shielding but based on technology, cost and safety it may not be required.

-Shadowing/Flicker –19.020(C)(2)(a)(4): Should this be retained? See definition as well.

C. Commercial

-Elaine Albrich proposed amendments: I have evaluated and included proposed changes I concurred with (Highlighted in blue along with the other proposed amendments). I will let Elaine testify about her other proposed changes not included.

-County's role as Special Advisory Group - 19.030(A)(1)(c)(1): This is just a reference to how Wasco County participates in the EFSC process. Several comments have come in requesting this process include a requirement of public involvement of the applicable substantive requirements that Wasco County will provide to EFSC. There are several procedural concerns associated with doing this:

-Who gets notice?

-Does the process include a report, public hearing, or public testimony?

-Are there appeal rights and if so who has standing to appeal?

-All of these issues would need to be specified.

-Regardless of any additional procedural requirements included by Wasco County, it is important to remember at this level it is an EFSC jurisdictional process and it will proceed with or without the County's input.

-BOCC Deferring Regulatory Authority to EFSC - 19.030(A)(1)(c)(3): Should there be

the opportunity for the BOCC to defer regulatory authority to EFSC? The applicant has the authority to request this pursuant to the prior subsection. The applicant also has the ability in an EFSC jurisdictional process to elect to go through the land use requirements at the local level instead of EFSC.

-Related or Supporting Facilities Connection to Chapter 3 - 19.030(B)(3): A question raised the concern about the lack of a clear connection between this use and the non-resource zones. After further evaluation I determined there was not a clear connection. Therefore, the following was included in the Conditional Use Section of each zone.

“Related or Supporting Facilities to a Commercial Power Generating Facility subject to Chapter 19 - Standards for Energy Facilities - Section 19.030.”

-Noise - 19.030(C)(3): The proposal is a reference to the DEQ standards. Any concerns?

-Visual Impact -19.030(C)(4):

-Option 1: Least discretionary and provides the least amount of protection to visual resources but is the easiest to administer.

-Option 2: Most complex to establish.

-Option 3: Most discretionary but it is the standard used by EFSC so if there is precedence.

-Erosion & Sediment Control – 19.030(13): Soil and Water Conservation requested highlighted language. Questions of duplication and jurisdiction have been raised because of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit require by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Should it be retained?

-Public Utility Coordination - 19.030(C)(19): This was put in at the request of one of the utilities. Conditional Use standard 5.020(C) already requires the following:

The proposed use will not exceed or significantly burden public facilities and services available to the area, including, but not limited to: roads, fire and police protection, sewer and water facilities, telephone and electrical service, or solid waste disposal facilities.

I believe the requested language was to ensure coordination but comments have been received about the vagueness of this proposed standard. Should it be retained?

-Lighting - 19.030(D)(1)(a)(3): Same discussion as Non-Commercial

-Shadow Flicker - 19.030(D)(1)(a)(6): Same discussion as Non-Commercial.

-Setbacks - 19.030(D)(1)(c): See maps produced

Final editorial revisions (BOCC Hearing)

If approved a final editorial revision will be required. This will not change the substance of what is approved by the Wasco County Court. It will be limited to editorial changes

including but not limited section numbers, references to section numbers and headers and footers.

Chair Hoffman called for questions from the Commission.
None.

*****break*****returned to session at 4:11

Chair Hoffman called for public testimony.

Submitted comments may be seen in the official record

Elaine Albrich, Stoel Rives Attorneys

Clarification on language and terminology she used in her comments submitted to the Commission. State setbacks or FSEC standards are standards that the state has found to be sufficiently protective and have adopted for multiple projects in the form of conditions of approval. So they are not FSEC Standards set in ORS/OAR, they are standards that the state has found to be sufficiently protective for large scale energy projects.

She also stated that some language in the proposal continues to be problematic and she then summarized her submitted comments.

Chair Hoffman asked for a recommendation from Ms. Albrich on the 3520' setback standard. Ms. Albrich stated that her recommendation for setbacks were stated in her submitted comments. She stated that her recommendation is that the County look to setbacks that the State has already found to be sufficiently protective setbacks for rural residential dwellings, nonresource boundaries, cities and UGBs (Urban Growth Boundaries): 1320' for homes within resource zones, and for nonresource zones looking at the 3500 and apply that to those zones, city limits, and UGBs. She also stated that if the Commission decides to go with greater setbacks, she recommends that they ensure that there is adequate justification in the record to support that or allow for a waiver to allow for a lesser setback.

Rick Till, Friends of the Columbia River Gorge

Mr. Till submitted comments and an informational packet to the Commission, he then summarized those comments for the Commission. (see record for comments)

Chair Hoffman called for questions from the Commission.

Chuck Barker, Property Owner

Mr. Barker made comments regarding the power grid and (in)equity of wind power. He stated that the existing power grid is penetrated and cannot handle the additional wind power. He then advocated placing commercial facilities in vast agricultural areas. He also recommended setbacks of 10 miles from homes in the city areas and 5 miles from residential cluster areas. He suggested encouraging solar power and small scale wind power on homes and small businesses.

Sheila Dooley, Property Owner

Ms. Dooley stated that she supports option # 2 or #3 as submitted by staff. She then summarized her comments submitted to the Commission.

Jill Barker, Property Owner

Ms. Barker submitted several health studies to the Commission (see record for studies). She then summarized the studies for the Commission. Ms. Barker also stated that her recommendation is to site turbines no closer than 2 miles (and farther in hilly topography) from any residence. She also referred to a book by Dr. Nina Pierpont, MD, PhD titled Wind Turbine Syndrome. Ms. Barker stated that Wasco County is mandated to protect the health and welfare of all of its citizens equally, she believes the proposed will not give adequate setback for the health, safety and welfare of the County and its residents. She also feels the proposal is not fair and impartial, as the advisory groups were

almost exclusively composed of Wasco County employees, Wind Power Profiteers, and the land owners that stand to gain economically from leasing their land to the wind developers. She also stated that she believed Mr. Cornett had a conflict of interest by representing the County in the process while employed by the State. In conclusion she stated that the Planning Commission in Umatilla County wanted 2 mile setbacks, (the same as required by the city). She thinks having uniform setback standards throughout the state.

Fred Justesen, Property Owner

Mr. Justesen summarized his submitted comments and stated that he was in strong support of wind energy farms. He also was in support of setback waivers.

Phil Swaim, Property Owner

Mr. Swaim stated that in Chapter 19 it talks about protecting public health safety welfare, he wonders how industrial wind turbines are compatible with health and safety. He then discussed the noise level of wind turbines versus the ambient noise of the surrounding area of the resource zones. He asked for clarification on how and who determines if shadow flicker is an issue. Mr. Swaim then stated that he thought setbacks should be at least 3500 feet for anyone that could be affected by the turbines. He believes the language also needs to be reworked. He then discussed the proposed authority of the Board of County Commissioners, stating that he felt the language should be shall solicit public input, not may solicit public input. He believes all county residents should be notified of industrial wind power facilities. He recommend the setback in resource zones should be 1 mile, with a waiver if residents agree. Mr. Swaim also testified to the ambient noise level in the resource zone and the proposed setbacks. He quoted OAR 340.035 Noise Control stating that it reads the ambient noise level is 26 decibel, 10 decibels over the level shall not be allowed in any 1 hour. Which is 39 decibels. He stated that the handout shows a rifle shot at 1.5 ft and doubles all the way out to a mile. If you apply the sound level of the wind turbine as the rifle shot, even at the half mile point you are at 39 decibel, which is over the allowed 36 decibel. He also thought it was interesting that the proposed had greater setbacks for existing turbines from other turbines than from residences. Mr. Swaim also submitted articles to the Commission.

Paul Kuyper, Property Owner

Mr. Kuyper stated that he loves living in Wasco County, he also stated that he agrees with Mr. Womble on the 1.5 mile setback but would also concur with a 2 mile setback. He cautioned the Commission by stating that he agrees with green energy resources but we need to be selective about the methods we choose. He asked the Commission to consider the risks to the environment and wildlife from the wind turbines. He promotes solar over wind.

Jon Justesen, Property Owner

Mr. Justesen stated that he was in support of the wind energy.

Brian Walsh, Iberdola Renewables

Mr. Walsh stated that he wanted to agree with the gentlemen who testified they were in support of wind energy development. He also stated that he was in support of solar power, however he believes that we will need more than one type of renewable energy both wind and solar. He then summarized his submitted comments.

Chair Hoffman asked Mr. Walsh as a developer, how would you look at the option of a waiver to the setbacks. Mr. Walsh stated that having the ability for a waiver is preferable to not having the alternative. He stated that it is a common practice.

Chair Hoffman called for additional testimony
None.

Chair Hoffman closed the hearing for deliberation.

*****break *****

reconvened at 5:27

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the updates to the Comprehensive Plan as presented by Staff.

Commissioner Archer seconded

Chair Hoffman called for discussion

None.

Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 7 to 0. A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes

Vice-Chair Ashley – yes

Commissioner Hargrave – yes

Commissioner Wood – yes

Commissioner Omeg – yes

Commissioner Archer – yes

Commissioner Amery – yes

Consensus was reached regarding the definition of Shadow Flicker as proposed, however the Commission wanted to look at how this was regulated.

Consensus was reached regarding the definition of Sound Power and Sound Pressure as proposed.

Consensus was reached regarding Section 19.020 Standards Review Process as proposed.

Vice Chair Ashley regarding Section 19.020 Vice Chair Ashley would like to strike sections regarding FAA and leave this to the authority of the FAA.

Chair Hoffman stated that it was a case of protecting health and safety versus aesthetic considerations.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he would like to keep it to allow for the use if the technology becomes mature at some point in the future.

Commissioner Omeg stated that he would like to keep it. He feels the lights are a form of visual pollution, if the technology gets to the point that it can be implemented, it should be implemented.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that the FAA has the control of the pilots so she suggests leaving it to the authority of the FAA.

Commissioner Wood said he would like to see it left as written.

Commissioner Amery said she would like to strike it and leave it with the FAA authority.

Commissioner Archer said he would like to leave it with the FAA, he feels it puts another level of uncertainty for the applicant.

Commissioner Omeg said that if there is a company that sees a business opportunity to get the technology up to date, then there is no harm in having the language in the ordinance for when the technology matures.

Chair Hoffman suggested language as follows: Lighting towers is only required if allowed by the FAA. The applicant submits an approved lighting plan. If at the time the approved lighting plan allows for radar controlled triggering of lights, than that is the required standard of Wasco County.

The Commission reached a consensus on the above language.

Todd Cornett asked for clarification as to whether this language was intended for both the commercial and noncommercial. Commission directed that it was for both commercial and noncommercial.

Commissioner Hargrave discussed the standard for sound. Language was discussed as follows: impacted sound level as defined in international standard. Commissioner Omeg asked for clarification as to the origins of the 60 db number. Mr. Cornett explained that based on conversations with Commissioner Hargrave, the 60 db is not an accurate number. He explained the options to the Commissioner were as follows: 1) Deal with the number now, 2) Have an additional Hearing to address the number, 3) Go forward with a recommendation to Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) and Mr. Cornett will present the accurate number at the BOCC hearing.

Sound Power Level

Commissioner Hargrave stated that the first thing the Commission should be concerned with is what is referred to as the Standard. He suggested language as follows: Manufactured sound power level as defined by International Standard

Commissioner Wood asked for clarification on where the 60 dba level came from. Mr. Cornett explained that it was an inaccurate number and based on his discussions with Commissioner Hargrave, he is aware that it needs to be adjusted and he referred to the options given earlier.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that the letter from Stoel Rives submitted into the record has a chart on where dba fall.

Commissioner Wood stated that Ms. Albrich brought up the point that different turbines and different megawatts have different sounds/sound levels.

Mr. Cornett reminded the Commission that this criteria is only on small scale non-commercial uses.

Chair Hoffman stated that perhaps 60 dba would be alright on small scale non-commercial uses.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that there is an assumption that the manufacturer will not be able to meet 60 dba.

Mr. Cornett asked if the Commission would like to leave it at 60 dba or do additional evaluation on the criteria.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that the Commission should leave it at 60 dba.

Commissioner Wood stated that he would rather have 50 dba or additional review and evaluation.

Commissioner Amery stated that she would like additional review and evaluation

Commissioner Archer stated that he would like 60 dba.

Commissioner Omeg stated that he would like additional review and evaluation.

Consensus was reached to do additional review and evaluation. Mr. Cornett was directed to perform additional evaluation and submit the results to the Commission for review.

Shadow Flicker

Consensus was reached regarding alternative language, submitted by Stoel Rives, which the Commission determined set a footage impact which was more definable.

Board of County Commission and Special Advisory Group Role

Chair Hoffman asked the Commission if they wanted to have public participation at the BOCC, and what type of public participation.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he felt there should be public participation, however the participation should not be allowed to be used to stop the process. He felt that the County should make available the substantive criteria, that they will be submitting to FSEC, available for public comment.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that she felt there should not be public participation at that level.

Commissioner Amery stated that she was undecided on the issue

Commissioner Wood agreed with Commissioner Hargrave

Commissioner Archer agreed with Commissioner Hargrave

Commissioner Omeg agreed with Commissioner Hargrave

Mr. Cornett reminded the Commission that this is only applicable to substantive criteria.

Chair Hoffman suggested language as follows: Prior to submitting substantive criteria back to FSEC, the BOCC will notify citizens of Wasco County about the meeting where they (BOCC) will take action to submit the applicable substantive criteria and they will take public testimony on the applicable substantive criteria. Recommendations of the Planning Department to BOCC will be available to the public for 7 days prior to the BOCC Hearing.

Consensus was reached on the above language.

Visual Impacts

Chair Hoffman read the three options submitted by staff.

Commissioner Archer stated that he liked Option #1 (Do not require visual impact analysis beyond existing scenic designated lands or buffers.)

Commissioner Wood stated that he liked Option #3 (Use standards more consistent with EFSC for Protected Areas & Scenic Resources - OAR- 345-022-0040)

Commissioner Amery stated that she liked Option #3

Vice Chair Ashley stated that she liked Option #3

Commissioner Omeg stated that he liked Option #3

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he liked Option #3

Consensus was reached to recommend Option #3.

Setback for Major versus Minor

Chair Hoffman stated that there were comments regarding the setbacks for Major versus Minor use during discussion of the definition, he feels this impacts how the setbacks are applied.

Commissioner Hargrave suggested changing language to make setback for major utility rather than just utility. Mr. Cornett clarified the difference between major utility and minor utility, explaining that minor utilities are things such as telephone lines and power lines that are located in a right of way with attached lines which if the pole fell over it would knock out phone service for the house at the site. Major Utility facilities have a fall height issue. If they fall over they can damage something. There is a potential to take out local distribution lines for water, sewer, power...Mr. Cornett also pointed out that the ordinance has a built in ability to receive a waiver of the setback by getting permission from the landowner. The Commission discussed who would need to sign the waiver, whether it is the property owner or the "transmission line owner" such as Wasco Electric.

Chair Hoffman suggested a two tiered standard; one for major (1.5) and one for minor (1.1).

Consensus was reached on the above language.

Public Utility Coordination

Chair Hoffman asked for a consensus on the language regarding Public Utility Coordination. He asked whether the language should be kept as proposed by Staff (The energy facility will not significantly burden the utility in whose service territory the project is proposed to be located), stricken, or replaced by language proposed by Elaine Albrich, with Stoel Rives (All transmission lines or associated transmission lines shall will comply with the National Electric Safety Code).

Commissioner Omeg stated that he did not understand the purpose of this section. Chair Hoffman stated that the burden comes into play when a developer puts in a facility up which in turn requires the public utility to upgrade or increase their transmission lines. It was an attempt to put criteria in to alleviate the burden.

Commissioner Omeg suggested removing the whole section.

Vice Chair Ashley agreed with removing the language.

Commissioner Amery agreed with removing the language.

Commissioner Wood agreed with removing the language.

Commissioner Archer agreed with removing the language.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he felt the language should be kept in an effort to support the public utilities.

Setbacks

Chair Hoffman stated that the testimony showed that not everyone agreed with the 1 mile. He also feels that a 1 mile setback might cause applicants to simply go to the FSEC standard. He believes there is a point between the minimum and the 1 mile that would satisfy the health and safety.

Commissioner Archer feels the county should not be putting on more restriction than we have to. He believes most sites are being developed in the agricultural lands, he doesn't want to legislate those places out of existence. He also stated that he doesn't like the double layered requirements of having different standards than those at the State. He feels the county needs good reason to go with different standards than the state requirements.

Commissioner Wood suggested starting with a 1 mile setback to city and those zones. Then he suggests creating ordinances to protect health and individual rights of the more populated areas.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that the Commission needed to consider South County, Central County, and North County as separate entities. She suggested backing the buffers off in South and Central County but leave

them in the North County. She agreed the County should uphold the State Energy Standards. She also stated that the County should allow waivers to the setbacks. She also suggested ½ mile setbacks in rural communities.

Commissioner Omeg suggested 1 mile buffers with the ability for land owners to get waivers signed from their neighbors, in the more rural areas of south county.

Commissioner Hargrave agreed with the 1 mile buffer with the ability to get waivers, however he wanted to add the ability to get a city waiver as well.

Commissioner Wood stated that he could not support city waivers.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that she was against city waivers as well.

Commissioner Wood suggested ½ mile buffer with the ability for waivers, for commercial facilities.

Chair Hoffman asked for a consensus on the interest of allowing the ability for a waiver.

Consensus was reached on allowing the ability for a waiver to the setbacks.

Chair Hoffman stated that the Commission needed to set a minimum buffer which cannot be waived.

Mr. Cornett stated that if the County went with the noise level, DEQ already has a built in threshold that could be used as a minimum.

Chair Hoffman suggested language as follows: the ability to waive is limited to the noise standard.

Chair Hoffman asked for a consensus on a 1 mile buffer for non-resource land. He also stated that the city of The Dalles is already protected by other regulations such as the National Scenic Area, therefore if the county went with a smaller buffer, it wouldn't be affecting The Dalles, and he didn't believe there would be an adverse affect to Dufur or Maupin.

Chair Hoffman asked for a Consensus on ½, ¾, or 1 mile buffer in a resource zone.

Commissioner Hargrave stated he wanted 1 mile.

Commissioner Omeg stated he wanted 1 mile.

Vice Chair Ashley stated she wanted ½ mile.

Commissioner Amery stated she wanted ½ mile.

Commissioner Wood stated he wanted ½ mile.

Commissioner Archer stated he wanted ½ mile.

Commissioner Omeg stated that he felt ½ mile isn't very far, he didn't feel it would provide adequate protection.

Chair Hoffman asked for a consensus on a 3520' buffer, with the ability for a waiver.

Commissioner Hargrave stated he could agree to 3520'.

Commissioner Omeg stated he could agree to 3520'.

Commissioner Amery stated she could agree to 3520'.

Commissioner Wood stated that he could agree to 3520'.

Vice Chair Ashley stated that she did not agree to 3520'.

Commissioner Archer stated the he did not agree to 3520'.

Chair Hoffman called on Elaine Albrich, from Stoel Rives, to offer clarification on the FSEC setbacks. Ms. Albrich stated that FSEC would go to the County for substantive criteria; setbacks are included as substantive criteria. In order for FSEC to vary from those substantive criteria they have to go through an analysis to determine if a variation is warranted.

Mr. Cornett stated that FSEC has the authority to evaluate if the applicable substantive criteria from the County are not required by state law, therefore giving FSEC the opportunity to apply directly their standard. Chair Hoffman stated that he was trying to determine what buffer would offer the protection without causing people to "go around" them because the are too onerous.

Consensus was reached at a ¾ mile buffer with the ability to waive down to ¼ mile.

Commissioner Hargrave moved to recommend a minimum of 3520' measured from the center line of the turbine tower to the edge of the dwelling. *** a consensus was reached of 3/4 mile setback; vote was intended to be taken on the consensus distance. However wording of the Motion was clarified through consensus by email with the Commission on June 14, 2011.***

Commissioner Omeg seconded

Chair Hoffman called for discussion

None.

Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was approved 5 to 2. A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – no
Commissioner Hargrave – yes
Commissioner Wood – yes
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – no
Commissioner Amery – yes

Vice Chair Ashley moved to recommend approval of the findings as discussed and agreed upon by the Planning Commission, of the proposed Wasco County Land Use Ordinance Updates

Commissioner Hargrave seconded.

Chair Hoffman called for discussion

None.

Chair Hoffman called for the vote

The motion was unanimously approved 7 to 0. A listing of the vote, as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 192.650.c., is as follows:

Chair Hoffman – yes
Vice-Chair Ashley – yes
Commissioner Hargrave – yes
Commissioner Wood – yes
Commissioner Omeg – yes
Commissioner Archer – yes
Commissioner Amery – yes

VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

July 5, 2011 Columbia Land Trust, request for open space taxation

VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Vice Chair Ashley proposed to keep the offices the same.

Commission agreed.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 8 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Hoffman, Chair
Wasco County Planning Commission

John Roberts, Planning Director
Wasco County Planning & Development