Wind Siting Council 6.23.10

# STRAW PROPOSAL AMENDMENT WORKSHEET

## Wind Energy System Sizes – General

1.		e rules establish rules for <u>community</u> wind energy systems that are <u>different</u> than small wind and large wind?
		Yes
		No, community wind should be treated the same as large wind
2.		es establish a category for community wind, in <u>what areas</u> should the requirements
		unity wind be different than what is required for a large wind energy system?
		Notification requirements
		Application requirements
		Mitigation requirements
		Other
3.	If the rule	es establish a category for community wind, how should <u>small wind</u> be defined?
		A wind energy system up to 100 kW in size, whether one or more turbines
		A wind energy system <u>up to 300 kW in size</u> , made up of one or more <u>turbines</u> each no greater than <u>100 kW</u> in size
		A wind energy system <u>up to 500 kW in size</u> , made up of one or more <u>turbines</u> each no greater than <u>100 kW</u> in size
4.	If the rule	es establish a category for community wind, how should <u>community wind</u> be
	defined?	
		<u>Up to 2 large wind turbines</u> (over 100 kW) <u>owned by or where the output is used by a local resident, business, school or unit of government</u>
		One large turbine (over 100 kW) for personal or "community" on-site generation and/or educational purposes
		Other
5.	If the rule	es establish a category for community wind, how should <u>large wind</u> be defined?
		A wind energy system that is <u>not</u> a <u>small</u> wind energy system and is <u>not</u> a <u>community</u> wind energy system
		Large wind should <u>include community</u> wind, except where otherwise specified (all rules for large wind should apply to community wind, except where otherwise noted)
Se	tbacks, No	<u>ise &amp; Shadow Flicker – General</u>
		should: (choose as many as apply)
		Set a minimum safety setback
		Set a noise performance standard
		Set a shadow flicker standard
7.		the rules require or allow for (at political subdivision's discretion) different noise and
		icker <u>performance standards</u> for <u>community wind</u> v. large wind?
		Yes, different requirements
		Yes, allow at political subdivision's discretion
		No

### **Minimum Safety Setbacks**

8.	Should the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback?
	□ Yes
	$\square$ No
9.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback, <u>from what</u> should the turbine be set back?
	☐ Nonparticipating landowner's property line
	□ Nonparticipating residence
	☐ Occupied community building
	☐ Participating residence
	□ Other
10.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback <u>from a property line</u> , should the landowner
	be able to <u>waive</u> the property line setback?
	□ Yes
	$\square$ No
	☐ Yes, but only for small wind turbines (up to 100 kW)
11.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback <u>from a residence</u> , should the landowner be
	able to <u>waive</u> the setback from the residence?
	□ Yes
	$\square$ No
	☐ Yes, but only for small wind turbines (up to 100 kW)
12.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback, should the exact distance of the setback
	depend on the maximum blade tip height of the wind turbine (how tall the turbine is with it
	blade extended to the maximum height)?
	□ Yes
	□ No
13.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback <u>from a property line</u> , what should the
	distance be for a <u>large</u> wind turbine (over 100 kW), when measured from the center of the
	turbine?
	☐ 1.1 times the maximum blade tip height
	☐ times the maximum blade tip height
	□ 2500 feet
	□ Other
14.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback <u>from a nonparticipating residence</u> , what
	should the distance be for a <u>large</u> wind turbine (over 100 kW) when measured from the
	center of the turbine?
	☐ 1.1 times the maximum blade tip height
	☐ times the maximum blade tip height
	□ 2500 feet □ 2600 f
	□ 2600 feet
1 =	□ Other
15.	If the rules establish a minimum <u>safety</u> setback, <u>what should the distance be</u> for <u>small</u> wind
	turbines (up to 100 kW) when measured from the center of the turbine?
	□ 1.1 times the maximum blade tip height
	□ 1.0 times the maximum blade tip height
	times the maximum blade tip height  Others
	□ Other

(Work in Progress) Page 2 of 15

Page 3 of 15

16. Should the rules require or allow for (at political subdivision's discretion) different setback
requirements for community wind?
☐ Yes, different requirements:
☐ Yes, allow at political subdivision's discretion
□ No, community wind should have the same setback requirements as large wind
□ No, community wind should have the same setback requirements as small wind
140, community which should have the same setback requirements as small which
Noise – General
17. If the rules establish <u>noise performance standards</u> , should the rules have the <u>same</u> noise performance standards for <u>all</u> wind energy systems, small, community and large?
□ Yes
□ No
18. What type(s) of noise standards should the rules specify?  ☐ Setback distances only
☐ Both setback distances and decibel limits
☐ Decibel limits only
19. If the noise standards include <u>decibel limits</u> , should the decibel limits be <u>absolute</u> (i.e., xx
dBA) or <u>relative</u> (i.e., ambient + yy dBA)?
$\Box$ Absolute
□ Relative
□ Both
20. If the noise standards include decibel limits, should the limits vary seasonally?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
21. If the noise standards include decibel limits, to what should the limits apply?
☐ Nonparticipating residences and occupied community buildings
☐ Anywhere on a nonparticipating property
□ Other
22. If the noise standards include <u>absolute</u> decibel limits, <u>what</u> should the limits be?
□ 55 dBA
□ 50 dBA
<ul> <li>□ 45 dBA on summer nights, 50 dBA at all other times</li> <li>□ 45 dBA at night (year round), 50 dBA during day</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>□ 45 dBA at night (year round), 50 dBA during day</li> <li>□ 30 - 35 dBA</li> </ul>
□ Other
23. If the noise standards include <u>absolute</u> decibel limits, should they provide for the instance
when the <u>ambient noise exceeds the absolute decibel limit</u> imposed on the wind energy
system?
☐ Yes, in that case the standard should be ambient dBA plus 5 dBA
☐ Yes, in that case the standard should be:
□ No, the rules do not need to address this
24. If the noise standards include <u>relative</u> decibel limits, <u>what</u> should the limits be?
☐ 5 dBA above ambient
□ 10 dBA above ambient
□ Other

25.		<u>se standards</u> include a <u>setback</u> distance, <u>what</u> should the distance be?
		1000 feet
		2500 feet
		2600 feet
		Other
<b>26.</b>		e rules <u>require</u> use of a standard noise <u>measurement protocol</u> ?
		Yes, the PSC protocol
		Yes, the PSC protocol and additional standards
		Yes, but not the PSC protocol, instead:
		No
27.	Should th	e rule <u>require</u> <u>pre-construction noise testing</u> at typical <u>ambient</u> sound levels?
		Yes
		No
28.		e rule <u>require</u> <u>post-construction noise testing</u> at <u>full turbine power</u> [if this is
	possible]?	
		Yes
		No
29.		e rule <u>require</u> noise <u>measurement</u> readings in <u>winter</u> as well as <u>summer</u> ?
		Yes
		No
Sh	adow Flick	<u>ser – General</u>
•		
30.		e Council <u>recommend</u> a <u>shadow flicker performance standard</u> as a <u>best practice</u> ?
		Yes
21		No
31.		e rules <u>require</u> a <u>standalone shadow flicker performance standard</u> (performance only; no setback specifically designed to address shadow flicker)?
		Yes, shadow flicker should be addressed solely by a performance standard
		No, shadow flicker should be address by something other than just a performance
		standard
32.		es <u>do not</u> require a <u>standalone shadow flicker performance standard</u> , <u>how</u> should
	shadow fl	icker be addressed?
		Shadow flicker-related setback requirement only
		Combination shadow flicker-related setback and performance standard
		Other
33.	If the shad	dow flicker standards include a setback distance, what should the distance be?
		1000 feet
		1100 feet
		2500 feet
		2600 feet
		Other
34.		es <u>require</u> a <u>shadow flicker performance standard</u> , <u>what type of wind energy</u>
		hould it apply to?
		Large wind energy systems
		Community wind energy systems
		Small wind energy systems

(Work in Progress) Page 4 of 15

35. If the rules	<u>require</u> a <u>shadow flicker performance standard</u> , what must a developer do to <u>plan</u>
to comply w	vith the standard?
$\Box$ E	Existing computer modeling offers a satisfactory method of measurement at this time.
	Existing computer modeling needs to be improved via set, uniform standards
	Other
	require a shadow flicker performance standard, what should the standard take
<u>into accoun</u>	
	All nonparticipating landowners (whether or not a residence exists)
	Nonparticipating residences <u>existing</u> at the time of the wind energy system <u>application</u>
	Nonparticipating residences <u>existing</u> at the time of the wind energy system <u>approval</u>
	Nonparticipating residences <u>not yet constructed</u> at the time of the application but for
	which a building permit has been filed prior to the wind energy system <u>application</u>
	Nonparticipating residences <u>not yet constructed</u> at the time of the approval but for which a building permit has been filed prior to the wind energy system <u>approval</u>
	Nonparticipating residences constructed after the wind energy system receives approval
	for which <u>no</u> building permit was filed prior to the wind energy system approval
	Other
	require a shadow flicker performance standard, what should it include?
	Properties (which would include existing and potential residences and outbuildings)
	Existing residences only
	Existing residences and outbuildings only
38. If the rules	require a shadow flicker performance standard, what should the standard be?
	No shadow flicker may occur on affected areas
	Shadow flicker may not exceed 25 hours per year
	Shadow flicker may not exceed 40 hours per year
	Shadow flicker may not exceed 45 hours per year
	Shadow flicker may not exceed 50 hours per year
	Other
	require a shadow flicker performance standard, can the requirement be waived
	ted landowner (i.e. for compensation)?
	Yes No
	<u>require</u> a <u>shadow flicker performance standard</u> , to what extent should <u>mitigation</u> licker be <u>required</u> ?
	No mitigation required; mitigation at developer's/owner's discretion
	Mitigation required for exceeding hours per year
	Other
	THE
Siting – Other	
	rules treat <u>private airports at medical facilities</u> used for air ambulance purposes
-	airport for purposes of establishing siting criteria around the private airport?
	Yes
☐ N	
	rules <u>require</u> that siting requirements be <u>science-based</u> ? Yes
⊔ l'	NU .

### <u>Mitigation – General</u>

43. Should the rules establish <u>requirements</u> that apply to new residences or buildings <u>not yet</u>
<u>constructed</u> ?
$\Box$ Yes
☐ Yes, but only for which a building permit has been filed prior to the wind energy system
application filing
☐ Yes, but only for which a building permit has been filed prior to the wind energy system
receiving approval
$\Box$ No
44. Should the rules address other future potential (not construction-related) uses of leased
properties and non-participating properties?
☐ Yes, to address these issues:
$\Box$ No
Mitigation – Noise & Shadow Flicker
Miligation Troise & Bradow Tricker
45. Should the rules require specific mitigation measures when shadow flicker or noise standards
are exceeded?
☐ Yes, shut down the turbine as needed to prevent exceeding performance standards
☐ Yes, other
$\square$ No
46. When mitigation is <u>required</u> for a residence, what residences <u>qualify</u> for mitigation?
☐ All residences
☐ Only those in existence when the wind energy system requested approval
☐ Only those in existence when the wind energy system received approval
☐ Only those in existence when the wind energy system was constructed
□ Other
47. Should the rules address potential tax liability of a landowner relating to mitigation measures
received by the landowner?
☐ Yes, the rules should:
□ No, the rules should not address this
48. Should the rules <u>require</u> wind energy system <u>applications</u> to include a [minimum?] <u>plan</u> for
mitigating shadow flicker?
$\Box$ Yes
$\Box$ No
Mitigation – Signal Interference
49. Should the rules provide a <u>definition</u> of what constitutes " <u>reasonable effort</u> " to mitigate
signal interference?
☐ Yes, it should be defined as:

(Work in Progress) Page 6 of 15

### **Complaint Resolution**

50. Should th	e Council <u>recommend</u> complaint resolution process <u>best practices</u> ?
	Yes
	No
51. Should th	e rules <u>define</u> the <u>types of complaints</u> that will be considered by the entity
responsib	le for complaint resolution?
	Yes
	No
52. Should th	e rules <u>require</u> political subdivisions to establish a <u>complaint resolution procedure</u>
pursuant	to a <u>protocol</u> to be established by the Public Service Commission?
	Yes
	No
53. Should th	e rules <u>require</u> that a complaint must be <u>resolved</u> within 90 days?
	Yes
	No, the rules should not place a hard time limit on complaint resolution
	No, the rules should impose a different time limit of:
54. Should th	e rules require dismissal of complaints if the complaint stems from an activity or
	that is <u>clearly allowed</u> pursuant to the political subdivision's approval?
	Yes
	No
	Other
55. Should th	e rules require that complaints be overseen by the political subdivision granting the
approval	for a wind energy system?
	Yes
	No
56. Should th	e rules <u>require</u> that complaints be <u>handled</u> by the political subdivision in the first
instance?	
	Yes, the political subdivision <u>itself</u> should deal with complaints
	Yes, but if the political subdivision does not have sufficient resources, the
	developer/owner should be responsible for responding to complaints according to a
	standardized protocol, and the political subdivision may review complaint records at
	any time
	No, the political subdivision should be <u>able</u> to <u>establish a committee</u> to deal with
	complaints
	No, the political subdivision should be <u>required</u> to <u>establish a committee</u> to deal with
	complaints
	No, complaints should be handled <u>directly</u> by the Public Service Commission with <u>no</u>
	political subdivision involvement
57. Should th	e rules <u>clarify</u> the Public Service Commission's <u>authority</u> to review complaints?
	Yes, the rules should be clarified regarding:
	No
58. Should th	e rules <u>clarify how stakeholders will engage</u> in the Public Service Commission's
	complaints?
	Yes, stakeholder should be able to:
	No, the draft rules are sufficient on this issue

### **Property Value Protection Plan**

59. Should the Council <u>recommend</u> a property value protection plan as a <u>best practice</u> ?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
60. Should the rules <u>require</u> developers to <u>offer</u> a property value protection plan?
□ Yes
□ No
61. If the rules <u>require</u> developers to <u>offer</u> a property value protection plan, <u>what wind energy</u>
systems should it apply to?
☐ Large wind energy systems
☐ Community wind energy systems
☐ Small wind energy systems  62. If the rules require developers to offer a property value protection plan, who should it be
62. If the rules <u>require</u> developers to <u>offer</u> a property value protection plan, <u>who</u> should it be offered to?
☐ Landowners adjacent to turbine host properties
☐ Landowners within feet of a turbine
☐ Other
Wind Leases & Easements
63. Should the Council establish a <u>list</u> of items to include in a lease or easement as part of a <u>best</u>
practices document?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
64. Should the <u>rules</u> address items that <u>must</u> be included and <u>may not</u> be included in a lease or
easement?
☐ Yes, with as much detail as possible
☐ Yes, for certain limited topics
□ No
65. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> requiring the developer, owner and operator of the
wind energy system to <u>comply</u> with all federal, state and local <u>laws and regulations</u> applicable
to the wind energy system be <u>removed</u> ?
□ Yes □ No
66. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> requiring a lease to permit the property owner to
terminate the wind lease if the portion of the wind energy system located on the property has
not operated for a period of at least 18 months unless the property owner receives the normal
minimum payments be removed?
□ Yes
□ No, it should stay as is
□ No, but it should be modified to state:
67. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> requiring a lease to <u>specify the circumstances</u> under
which the developer, owner or operator of the wind energy system <u>may withhold payments</u>
from the property owner be <u>removed</u> ?
□ Yes —
$\square$ No

(Work in Progress) Page 8 of 15

68. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> requiring a lease to permit the property owner to
<u>rescind</u> an executed wind lease within 3 business days of signing the wind lease be <u>removed</u> ?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
69. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> stating that a lease, except for compensation terms,
may not be required to be confidential be removed?
$\Box$ Yes
$\square$ No
70. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> stating that a lease may <u>not make the property owner liable</u> for any <u>property tax</u> associated with the wind energy system or other equipment
related to the production of electricity by the wind energy system be <u>removed</u> ?
$\Box$ Yes
□ No, it should stay as is
□ No, but it should be modified to state:
71. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> stating that a lease may <u>not make the property owner liable</u> for any <u>violation</u> of federal, state or local <u>laws and regulations</u> by the developer, owner
or operator of the wind energy system be <u>removed</u> ?
$\Box$ Yes
$\square$ No
72. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> stating that a lease may <u>not make the property owner</u>
<u>liable</u> for any <u>damages</u> caused by the wind energy system or the operation of the wind energy
system, including liability or damage to the property owner or to third parties be <u>removed</u> ?
$\Box$ Yes
$\square$ No
73. Should the language in the draft rules stating that a developer, owner or operator may not, a
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, <u>require a property owner to keep the settlement confidentia</u>
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?  — Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?  Yes  No
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidentia or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No     No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:   74. Should the rules require the lease to state that a person negotiating or presenting a wind lease
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No     No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No     No, but it should be modified to state:  74. Should the rules require the lease to state that a person negotiating or presenting a wind least or easement on behalf of a developer represents the developer and not the landowner?    Yes   No     No    75. Should the rules require the lease to state that the lease is a contract?
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes   No   No, but it should be modified to state:
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes
a condition of accepting any benefit to settle a noise, signal interference, stray voltage or shadow flicker mitigation issue, require a property owner to keep the settlement confidential or require the property owner to waive any right to make a future claim about an unrelated issue be removed?    Yes

	es <u>invalidate</u> any lease or easement signed prior to general public notice, should the
rules <u>allo</u>	w a letter of intent to be signed in lieu of a lease [without requiring general public
notice firs	st]?
	Yes
	No
	e rules require any person negotiating or presenting a wind lease or easement on
	a developer to hold a license to conduct real estate activities and be under the
	on of a real estate broker?
	Yes
	No No
	e rules <u>require</u> any <u>person negotiating or presenting a wind lease or easement</u> on
	a developer to <u>hold a real estate broker license</u> ?
	Yes
	No
	e rules <u>require</u> wind leases and easements to <u>comply</u> with existing precedents and
	relating to other types of construction?
	Yes
	No
<b>Decommissio</b>	<u>ning</u>
82. For how <u>l</u>	ong should a wind energy system be allowed to stand continuously without
operating	before decommissioning is required?
	18 continuous months, with limited exceptions
	24 months, with a rebuttable presumption if the system will be reused
	Other
83. Should th	the rules <u>require removal</u> of the turbine foundation and other <u>underground</u>
structures	
	Yes, they should be completely removed
	Yes, they should be removed to at least four feet below grade
	Yes, they should be removed to
	No
	es require removal of below ground improvements, should the rules require wind
	stem <u>applications</u> to include <u>plans and estimated costs</u> for excavating and removing
	grade improvements?
Ш	Yes
	No
_	<u>condition</u> should the rules require <u>restoration</u> of the land upon decommissioning?
	Pre-construction condition, to the extent feasible
	The same general topography that existed just prior to construction and with topsoil re-
	spread over the disturbed areas at a depth similar to that in existence prior to the
	disturbance. Areas disturbed by the construction of the facility and decommissioning
	activities must be graded, top-soiled, and re-seeded according to NRCS technical guide
	recommendations and other agency recommendations, unless the landowner requests in
	writing that the access roads or other land surface areas be retained.
	Other

	What should the rules <u>require</u> developers/owners to provide in terms of <u>financial assurances</u>
	elated to decommissioning?
	☐ Proof of financial ability to decommission in a form and amount based on a cost
	estimate by a mutually agreeable third-party
	☐ Bonds or monies up front to guarantee decommissioning
	□ Other
<b>87.</b>	should the <u>language in the draft rule</u> requiring owners of wind energy systems to file a <u>notice</u>
•	pon <u>completion</u> of decommissioning be <u>removed</u> ?
	$\Box$ Yes
	$\square$ No
<b>88.</b>	hould the rules stipulate <u>penalties</u> if <u>decommissioning</u> requirements are not followed?
	□ Yes
	$\square$ No
<b>89.</b> ]	f the rules stipulate <u>penalties</u> if <u>decommissioning</u> requirements are not followed, <u>what</u> should
	hese penalties be?
	☐ Penalties imposed by political subdivision using political subdivision's general
	authority
	□ Specific financial forfeiture in the amount of
	□ Other
<b>90.</b>	should the <u>State</u> assume ultimate <u>responsibility</u> for <u>decommissioning</u> wind energy systems
	pproved by political subdivisions?
	□ Yes
	$\square$ No
Cor	struction and Operation Standards – General
	should the language in the draft rules establishing <u>requirements</u> relating to turbine
	ppearance be removed or modified?
	☐ Yes, they should be removed
	☐ Yes, they should be modified
	□ No, the language should stay as is
92.	f the <u>language in the draft rules</u> establishing <u>requirements</u> relating to turbine appearance
	hould be removed or modified, should the rules require wind turbines to have a <u>neutral</u>
;	
;	inish?
;	□ Yes
;	<ul><li>☐ Yes</li><li>☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish</li></ul>
;	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish</li> <li>☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish</li> </ul>
93.	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish</li> <li>☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish</li> <li>☐ the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance</li> </ul>
93.	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish</li> <li>☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish</li> <li>☐ In the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or</li> </ul>
93.	☐ Yes ☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish ☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish ☐ the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or ignage on a wind turbine, other than warnings, equipment information or indicia of
93.	☐ Yes ☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish ☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish ☐ Ithe language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or ignage on a wind turbine, other than warnings, equipment information or indicia of warership?
93.	☐ Yes ☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish ☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish ☐ In the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or ignage on a wind turbine, other than warnings, equipment information or indicia of winership? ☐ Yes
93.	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish</li> <li>☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish</li> <li>☐ In the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or ignage on a wind turbine, other than warnings, equipment information or indicia of winership?</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No</li> </ul>
93.	☐ Yes ☐ No, there should be no requirements about the finish ☐ No, there should be a different requirement about the finish ☐ In the language in the draft rules establishing requirements relating to turbine appearance hould be removed or modified, should the rules prohibit displaying advertising material or ignage on a wind turbine, other than warnings, equipment information or indicia of winership? ☐ Yes

(Work in Progress) Page 11 of 15

94. If the <u>language in the draft rules</u> establishing <u>requirements</u> relating to turbine appearance
should be removed or modified, should the rules <u>prohibit attaching</u> any flag, decorative sign,
streamers, pennants, ribbons, spinners, fluttering, or revolving devices except for safety
features or wind monitoring devices?
□ Yes
□ No
☐ Yes, these should be prohibited, but with different/additional exceptions:
95. Should the rules require the wind energy system owner to provide as-built specifications for
the wind energy system?
☐ Yes, to the political subdivision granting the approval
☐ Yes, to the Public Service Commission
☐ Yes, to some other entity:
$\square$ No
Construction and Operation Standards – Emergency Procedures
96. Should the rules set forth <u>default areas of responsibility</u> for <u>emergency services provision</u> at the wind energy system (what is the developer/owner responsible for, what is the local service provider responsible for)?  \[ \triangle \text{Yes} \] \[ \triangle \text{No} \]
97. If the rules set forth <u>default areas of responsibility</u> for emergency services provision at the wind energy system, should the <u>developer/owner</u> be responsible for services <u>starting at the base of the turbine</u> ?
☐ Yes, and the developer/owner should also be responsible for
□ No, the developer/owner should only be responsible for
98. Should the rules require the applicant to provide a copy of the project summary and site plan to the local emergency services provider, as designated by the political subdivision reviewing the application?   Yes
$\square$ No
99. Should the rules <u>require</u> the applicant to <u>cooperate</u> with local emergency services in developing an emergency response plan upon the request [of the political subdivision]?
\[ \text{Yes} \] \[ \text{Yes}
100. If the rules <u>require</u> the applicant to <u>cooperate</u> with local emergency services in developing an <u>emergency response plan</u> upon request, what area should this plan cover?
☐ The wind energy system
☐ The area within feet of the wind energy system
□ Other

## **Conflict of Interest**

101.	Should the rules <u>require</u> that <u>no member</u> of the <u>political subdivision</u> reviewing an		
ap	plicatio	on, or any of the political subdivision's involved committees, may derive any	
<u>pe</u>	rsonal	profit or gain, directly or indirectly, by reason of his or her acting on an application	
fo	r a wind	l energy system?	
		Yes	
		No, the rules should not address political subdivision conflicts of interest	
		No, the rules should address conflicts of interests differently:	
102.		d the rules <u>require</u> any <u>member</u> of the <u>political subdivision</u> reviewing an application	
to	disclose	to the political subdivision any <u>personal interest</u> that he or she may have in any	
wi	ind ener	gy system matter pending before the local jurisdiction?	
		Yes	
		No	
103.	Shoul	d the rules <u>require</u> any <u>member</u> of the <u>political subdivision</u> reviewing an application	
		from participating in any wind energy system matter pending before the local	
ju	risdictio	on in which the political subdivision member has a <u>personal interest</u> ?	
		Yes	
		No	
<u>Gener</u>	<u>ral Noti</u>	fication Requirements	
104.		should the general public notification period be for large wind energy systems?	
		270 days before filing a construction application or 180 days before planned start of	
		construction, whichever is earlier	
		90 days before filing a construction application	
		60 days before filing a construction application	
		30 days before filing a construction application or 60 days before planned start of	
		construction, whichever is earlier	
4 A =		Other	
105.		should the <u>notification period</u> be for <u>small</u> wind energy systems?	
		270 days before filing a construction application or 180 days before planned start of	
		construction, whichever is earlier	
		90 days before filing a construction application	
		60 days before filing a construction application	
		30 days before filing a construction application or the planned start of construction,	
		whichever is earlier	
106		Other	
106.		d the rules <u>require</u> developers to provide <u>general public notification prior</u> to signing	
an	-	ng leases or easements?	
		Yes	
105		No	
107.		d the rules require <u>small</u> wind energy systems to notify only <u>adjacent</u> landowners?	
		Yes	
		No, they should notify the same people as large wind	
		No, they should notify:	

108. [Regarding the form of notification to be given,] should the rules require notification
using "commercially reasonable efforts" only?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
Application Process Requirements
109. Should the rules <u>require</u> that wind energy system <u>applications</u> include <u>plans and</u>
specifications for the turbines being built?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
110. Should the rules <u>allow</u> a political subdivision to <u>request only</u> additional information
<u>required</u> under the rules?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
111. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> allowing political subdivisions to request
information in an application pursuant to detailed application filing requirements specified
by the Commission be <u>removed</u> ?
□ Yes
$\Box$ No
112. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> allowing political subdivisions to request any other
information necessary to understand the proposed wind energy system be removed?
□ Yes
$\Box$ No
113. Should the <u>language in the draft rules</u> allowing political subdivisions to request
information related to the wind energy system be removed?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
Political Subdivision Process
114. Should the rules <u>prohibit</u> a political subdivision from placing any <u>condition or regulation</u>
on a wind energy system except as specifically authorized by the rules?
□ Yes
$\square$ No
Additional questions from Commission staff:
115. Should the rules specify <u>numerical</u> limits on the <u>amount</u> of reasonable fees that a political
subdivision can charge?
$\Box$ Yes
$\square$ No
116. If the rules specify <u>numerical limits</u> on the amount of reasonable fees that a political
subdivision can charge, what should the limits be?
$\Box$ Fee capped at 1.0% of estimated wind energy system cost
☐ Fee capped at 0.5% of estimated wind energy system cost
☐ Fee capped at 0.3% of estimated wind energy system cost
□ Other

(Work in Progress) Page 14 of 15

#### **Stray Voltage**

117.	. Should the rules establish required standards for pre-construction and post-construction			
stray voltage testing?				
	$\Box$ Ye	es		
	$\square$ No	0		
118.		es establish required standards for pre-construction and post-construction stray		
vo		ng, <u>what</u> should the rules require?		
	□ Pa	arties must follow the PSC's Phase 2 stray voltage protocol		
	□ Fa	acility should be tested by a licensed engineer before the utility gets involved		
	□ Ut	tilities should be required to install neutral isolation devices on all transformers		
	se	rving dairies and other livestock operation.		
		ther		
119.	Should th	he rules address who (developer/owner v. utility) is responsible for ensuring that		
required pre-construction and post-construction stray voltage testing is conducted?				
	$\Box$ Ye	es		
	$\square$ No	0		
<b>120.</b>	Should th	he rules address who (developer/owner v. utility) is financially responsible for		
wł		ns of pre-construction and post-construction stray voltage testing?		
		es		
	$\square$ No	0		
Comn	nission Rev	<u>view</u>		
(No ar	nendments	suggested)		

#### **About this document:**

This Straw Proposal Amendment Worksheet was prepared by Commission staff based on written responses to the Straw Proposal of June 9, 2010 that were submitted by Wind Siting Council members as of June 21, 2010, and based on discussions at the Wind Siting Council meetings June 15 and June 21, 2010.

Wind Siting Council members are encouraged to contact Commission staff as soon as possible regarding any errors in or omissions from this Worksheet.

(Work in Progress) Page 15 of 15