

Attn: Eric Gibson, Director Dept of Planning and Land Use
Matthew Schneider, Wind Energy Ordinance Project Manager
Patrick Brown, Tule Wind MUP/GPA Project Manager

Comments on Wind Energy Zoning Ordinance & Plan Amendment POD 10-007; LOG NO 09-00-003; SCH NO 2010091030
AND Tule Wind Project MUP 3300 09-019, GPA3800 11-001, LOG NO. 09-021-002

Dear Sirs,

A parallel has recently become evident, between wind farms on one hand, and the tobacco industry before billion-dollar lawsuits were brought to bear on its activities. We think it is in your interest to be well informed of this development, and with this in mind we are suggesting you read the following: <http://www.epaw.org/media.php?lang=en&article=pr6>

T-1

Governments world-wide are now increasing the size of the buffer zones between industrial wind turbines and habitations:

- In the State of Victoria, Australia, a minimum setback of 2 km is being enforced between wind turbines and residences, a 5 km setback from 21 nominated regional towns, and no-go zones in several regions of the state.
http://www.weeklytimesnow.com.au/article/2011/11/04/401911_opinion-news.html

T-2

- In Caratunk, Maine, the former rules mandated that wind turbines could be no less than four times the tower height or 1,000 feet -- whichever was greater -- from the nearest occupied building. **The new rules extend the setback to at least one-and-a-half miles from a property line.** Depending on the number of proposed turbines and their power, however, they could be placed even farther away, said Marie Beane, a Caratunk planning board member.
http://www.windtaskforce.org/profiles/blog/show?id=4401701%3ABlogPost%3A33105&xgs=1&xg_source=msg_share_post

T-3

- In the State of Oregon, USA, Umatilla County passed a by-law prohibiting wind turbines within 2 miles of habitations.
<http://www.wind-watch.org/news/2011/06/17/commissioners-ok-setback-for-now/>

- the list goes on...

It would be appropriate for California to follow their example, especially after being warned herein of the health hazards caused by wind turbines implanted too close to habitations. There is ample evidence available, including nine peer-reviewed articles of a scientific nature:
<http://bst.sagepub.com/content/current>
More evidence here: <http://www.epaw.org/documents.php?lang=en&article=ns29> --> See the documents listed in the right margin.

T-4

As you may induce from this communication, windfarm victims worldwide are getting

T-5

Draft Responses to Comments

organized. It won't be long before the courts are requested to apply sanctions where there has been negligence or wrongdoing.

↑
T-5
Cont.

Please acknowledge upon receipt.

Sincerely,

Mark Duchamp
CEO, EPAW
www.epaw.org

Response to Comment Letter T

**EPAW
Mark Duchamp**

- T-1** The County appreciates and acknowledges the information provided in this comment and on the referenced website.
- T-2** County staff has reviewed the article provided in this comment and has kept up with the land use issues emerging in Australia regarding wind energy projects. The County appreciates this information.
- T-3** The County acknowledges the increased setback provisions in Caratunk and Umatilla. These issues were also considered during the preparation of the County's Wind Energy Ordinance and DEIR.
- T-4** The County appreciates this information regarding potential health effects. See also Response to Comment K9.
- T-5** The County acknowledges the growing opposition to wind farms and seeks to find a balance between competing interests on this issue.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK