

Town of Fort Fairfield  
Wind Energy Technical Review Committee  
Council Chambers  
Monday, March 9, 2015  
6:00 P.M.

Members: Dick Langley, Carl Young, Todd Maynard, John Herold, Tim Goff, Michael Bosse,  
Heather Cassidy, David McCrea and Phil Christensen  
Excused: Brent Churchill, Jim Everett  
Also Present: Tony Levesque  
Citizens: 2

- I. Call to Order – Richard Langley, Esq. – Committee Chair
- II. Review/Acceptance of Minutes of February 23, 2015.  
Motion: Phil Christensen moved to approve Minutes of February 23, 2015 as presented.  
Second: Todd Maynard Vote – All affirmative

Discussion:

Carl -- Asked if the motion made at the last meeting pertaining to the wind noise levels of ambient plus five and the roll call vote could be copied out to a separate document altogether as they are buried in the minutes.

Tony – Stated that the minutes are accurate as to how things were said and when they were said, maybe the roll call was in a different section as there was a lot of discussion in between. I think we need to adopt the minutes as presented and maybe take action to create excerpts of the minutes to be added with the section you are referring to.

- III. Old Business –

- A. Other –

Motion: Carl Young moved that we copy that section of the minutes that addresses the direction that the committee has decided to go regarding the noise levels and the recorded vote thereof into a separate document that would be inserted into our straw man ordinance.

Second: Phil Christensen Vote- 7 in favor  
1 opposed

Tim – Reminded the group about the questionnaire from Professor Horton with three questions on it. She would like to have some feedback, this would be done individually and not as a group. Everyone can get their surveys to Tim and he can send them to her altogether. Carl wanted to go on record that he will not be responding to this questionnaire. It was decided that everyone can fill it out in their own manner, they can do it or not.

Mike - Just for housekeeping, want to remind you that the moratorium ends April 15th. If this group wants this extended than it really needs to be taken care of with the Council this March 18th.

Motion: Carl Young moved to ask the council to extend the moratorium another 180 days.  
Second: Phil Christensen Vote – All Affirmative

IV. New Business

A. Discussion – Setback for ice throw -

Some of the research that has been done shows that some manufactures recommend a safety zone of 500 meters and it doesn't depend so much on the height as it does the speed of the tip of the blade. A lot of them just say minimum of so many feet or "X" times the height of the turbine. This study reflects the size and speed of the turbine, not only ice throw but also debris throw. Another thing to consider when we are looking at ice throw is that Mars Hill is a manned facility so if some anomaly is coming up they can turn them off or on. If we have a non-manned facility it has to be considered separately.

If was suggested to go with 1500 feet or the manufactures suggested distance whichever is greater.

The Montville ordinance states setbacks for public roads are based on an approximation of 1800 foot debris field for ice throw. Four times the turbine height for a 440 feet turbine is equal to 1760, so they are saying 1800 feet. There are others out there they say potential ice throw for the facility shall not cross the property line. Others says that it is based on the size of the turbine and the diameter of the blade. One study found that for a 1.5 KW machine, 115 feet that the throw was 1935 feet.

There is a math equation that we can use instead of pulling a number from the air, it uses the radius of the blade. As an example if it has a blade radius of over 100 feet, a rotation of three seconds we would be looking at 1660 feet ice throw. This equation is used in several cases, its pretty standard.

It was suggested to get off the discussion side of this and give Tim and Tony some direction so that they can craft some language for a standard setback for ice throw and other debris and reference the study and the minimum and also incorporate the formula into the language for them to bring to the next meeting for discussion then.

Motion: Phil Christensen moved to establish set back from the base of the turbine for ice and debris throw from a public road way, a public facility and overhead power lines at 1700 feet or to be determined in calculation form whichever is greater.

Second: David McCrea

Roll Call - Heather – yes, Phil – yes, Mike – no, John – no, Tim – yes, Todd – yes, David-yes and Carl- yes

Discussion:

It was decided to add the specific language of the formula to the motion, this will be given to Tim and Tony to be crafted in for next week's meeting.

B. Discussion – General setback standards-

There is a big range of distances in other documents, they range from 500 feet up to a mile. We have to understand that this is a physical distance in respect to the device, it is completely different than the noise setback.

It is our job to devise an ordinance to protect the stakeholders in the community, and allow the stakeholders to have a say.

Mike – I have a concern, I want to ask everyone how they believe this ordinance will be enacted? Is it going to be by the Council itself, by the citizens of Fort Fairfield or by this committee? He then went around the table and asked each committee member. It is all part of the planning process, of how you have to think this whole thing becomes enacted.

The members discussed how they felt this ordinance would be adopted, many believed that a process is already in place. A citizen attending the meeting stated that he believed it would go to the council where they would either rejected it or adopt it, if it was rejected then through some other means could go to referendum where the citizens would vote on it.

Mike continued saying that it is his concern that if you build in the rules of a mile setback it will be perceived by the community as anti-wind. There are people out there that would like to see wind come to the community based on the fact of the perception their taxes will go down. As a caution if this ordinance is perceived as anti-wind the town will vote it down.

Tony clarified that the committee would present the draft ordination to the council to introduce, and then there would be a public hearing where each section of the ordinance would be reviewed. Then at the next council meeting it would be approved, denied, amended or tabled.

John stated that in the town's charter section C-15 there is no provision to the council itself to refer to public vote, but if the council rejects it, citizens can get together a petition and circulate it getting 15% of the total number of qualified voters registered to vote at the last regular town election. This then would go a vote at the regular scheduled election or a special election can be scheduled.

We are a town made up of 3400 people, there will be people out there that love it, people who hate it and others that just don't know. But we have to do the best we can with what we have available as regards to reference material. We can't let our personal dislikes or likes get into this.

It was the recommend that they dispense with this type of conversation and go about their job in putting together an ordinance based on the scientific information as we know it and present the ordinance that we have put together to the council.

Motion: Carl Young moved to set the general setbacks at 1 mile or 13 times the turbine height as measured from the center of the turbine tower to the project's property line.

Second: Phil Christensen

March 9, 2015

Wind Energy Technical Review Committee

Discussion:

The 1 mile setback was determined based on the number of current industry standards reference or documents that was reviewed.

The project boundary is abutting with a non- participant or participant boundary's, if a waiver is signed the participant can allow the turbine to be closer to their home or property line. We need to craft the right language into the waiver requirements.

Motion: Carl withdrew his motion and moved to table this discussion until the next meeting and suggested that the staff draft wording to include language on waivers.

Second: David McCrea

C. List of topics to be researched in advance of next meeting - Tim and Tony will draft the language of General Setbacks taking Carl's suggestion to look at the State's model section 12 and 14 and craft language regarding waivers.

D. Other - None

V. Public Comment Period

Rick Shepherd – Spoke regarding the purpose of the general setback is to protect the quality of life and health of the participating and non-participating land owners. There is a part in the Montville ordinance that says “given the abundant evidence that wind turbines sited to close to humans have a debilitating effect on them and given that the most effective means for preventing negative health affects is proper setbacks”. You need to look at the big picture.

VI. Other – Next week we will be having Tim bring in the language on general setbacks, please email to Tim any comments that you may have and any wording that you would like added.

Next meeting is March 23, 2015 at 6:00 pm – Council Chambers

Motion: Phil Christensen moved to adjourn at 7:55PM

Second: Heather Cassidy

Vote – All affirmative

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca J. Hersey  
Secretary Pro-Tem