

Sharon Omstead

Subject: WECS amendments proposal from D.Y. Share as needed

From: Rex and Carolyn Savage [mailto:rcjr1980@fhrd.net]

Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 9:00 AM

To: Sharon Omstead <SOmstead@marioncoks.net>; Dan Holub <dan-navord@hotmail.com>; delgalva@hotmail.com

Emma, Sharon, David, Zoning Committee Members, & BOCC:

After review of TWE's proposed amendments, and very quick review of David's comments, Windborne would offer these remarks:

- #1. Without doubt, the rather cumbersome CUP process for the benefit of all interested parties. Wind Energy development can be streamlined to
- #2. Many of the amendments proposed, in our view, are to the benefit of all.
- #3. Windborne feels it is in the interest of all to keep several of the required submittals, such as the Avian study, a part of the CUP process. Environmental compatibility is not really in question in most of the County, but submitting the documentation supporting that position is a land use issue.
- #4. The elimination of reference to any PPA requirement is clearly warranted. Marketing of any business's product is a pure economic issue, not land use. That said, the current wording of 27-108 also contains language which insures that existing CUP and developmental rights continue for the life of the underlying leases. Proposed deletion of this language and alteration of 12-105 could be viewed as infringing on Windborne's existing CUPs. Of certainty, it would create a significant difference in the handling of any future CUPs, whether for Windborne, TWE, or parties as yet unnamed. We would suggest that this section heading be retained, and retitled "CUP Term" or something of that nature. Additionally, point #5 draft of the amended regulations. below will need to be addressed with this one in the final
- #5. Finally, the language in 12-105 almost creates a "CUP within a CUP" with the timing and "shelf life" factors placed on the Development Plan. I see no benefit to landowners, neighbors, the County, or Developers by having what is in essence a duplicate system.

All said, it appears to me that the scope of the proposed changes is going to require considerable thought and discussion. Perhaps this can all be done in one evening, but I would not be surprised that it takes a bit longer for all parties to hear the concerns of others, think them through, and hopefully meet at a point where the new regulations serve the County and it's residents needs without further rework before the ink even dries on the "fresh" version.

Sorry to not submit these comments sooner, or with more specificity, but we only have had a portion of the work product since Monday.

Thanks,
Rex

| ----- Original Message -----