

**PUBLIC HEARING, TOWN OF REDFIELD, November 8, 2018.** The Public Hearing of the Redfield Town Board was held on Thursday, November 8, 2018 at the Redfield Municipal Building starting at 6:30pm. Roll call was taken and the following board members were present:

Tanya Yerdon	- Supervisor
Carla Bauer	- Councilwoman
Elaine Yerdon	- Councilwoman
Erwin Webb	- Councilman
Matthew Tompkins	- Councilman

In addition, Susan Hough -Town Clerk, Paul Pratt -Highway Superintendent, Rob Brenner - Nixon Peabody, LLP, Rob O'Neal - Epsilon Associates, John Yerdon - Dog Control Officer, Matt Smith - Woodwise, Richard Palmer - Mad River Club, Dan Murdie - Avangrid, Jim Muscato - Young/Sommer, Michael Yerdon - Code Enforcement Officer, Walter Meisner - Avangrid, Terry Harlander, John Halstead - IUOE 158, Roger Murdie- Mad River Club, James Cullinan, Tom McHale - NYS Laborers, John Cheney, Jane Jones - Assessor, Tom Jones, Scott Swift - Laborers Local 633

Pledge of the Allegiance was said.

Public Hearing was called to order at 6:30pm by Supervisor Tanya Yerdon. Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - this public hearing on the proposed Local Law #2 of 2018 Wind Energy Facilities. Town Clerk - Susan Hough asked anyone that is going to speak at the Public Hear or Meeting to please stand and state you name, speak clearly, if you need to have a conversation please go outside and have it, it takes her hours to go through the tape to figure out what is being said, thank you. Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - who would like to go first?

Walter Meisner - Avangrid Renewable - we have done several presentations on the proposed wind project and kind of what they would envision working with the town. He would like to introduce, today they have brought a resident expert on sound, they have some interesting conversations prior to today with their sound expert and he's looked at the local law and kind of put some of the impacts that would be for their development, for this project specifically. He would like to introduce Rob, he thinks he was here last year, but he's just going to briefly and overview what he's looked at in the town law and how it would impact not only their project but any other development in the area.

Robert O'Neal - Epsilon Associates - he was asked to take a look at some of the proposed language relating to sound in the wind law. You should have in your packet a figure. The proposed language says 35dBA at property line, he was asked to take a look at what would that mean for the parcel land the proposed wind project (map being referred to is attached) is proposed for, so what you have before you is that figure, he's showing the parcel of land and the resulted setback distance, so what he did was took a typical wind energy turbine and what that generates for a sound level, for a project to meet 35 dBA at anywhere on this yellow line, the property line boundary, what would that mean, so using a couple of basic calculations of sound, the decrease of the turbine over distance, it's approximately a mile and a half, to get from a couple of turbines to get to the 35dBA, that mile and a half is a key number. So he asked his

geographic information system people to measure a mile and a half from any point on the yellow line/the property line to bring into the middle, what resulted from that is the pink area on the map, so what the pink area represents is the only area within about a 20,000 acre parcel where you would be a mile and a half or more from any property boundary anywhere within this parcel, so that would be the consequence of a 35 dBA limit for sound at property boundary, that would leave you with probably enough space to put in two (2) Wind Turbines for example out of this entire property, keep in mind that pink area represents potential area just do to sound, it doesn't take into consideration wetlands for example or any other considerations, just potential sound setbacks, that's kind of pretty much shows what a 35dBA at a property line would do. What they would typically see or recommend for a sound standard, you've probably seen or heard this before would be wind law one (1) and sound law one (1) last October when he was here before the board, 45 dBA at a residence allows for uninterrupted sleep, 45 dBA outside a residence, that's more commend and typical for a sound standard or guideline that they see in the literature and in the potential regulations, for limiting sound that is low enough so it would not interrupt anyone's sleep but reasonable enough to allow some development to go on.

Supervisor - Tanya Yerdon - just so you know we just got this packet late yesterday that she has given to the board, so no one has had a chance to look at it.

CM Matthew Tompkins - he would be interested to see that graphic done for 40/45/50 dBA to see the differences that would be interesting to him.

Robert O'Neal - sure, and obviously it would give you some additional potential buildable areas as the numbers go up, this is a 20,000-acre parcel, so for more typical parcels of land which are much smaller, one could do that exercise, absolutely. Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - could you provide that?

Jim Muscato - one of the challenges too with respect to property boundaries, and we've talked about this before, is there is no discreet measurement point by which you would measure that standard that applies, when you're applying something like a health base standard, which is the guidelines would suggest for the certain dBA levels, those are health base standards, because they contemplate a resident as Rob mentioned sleeping overnight and some extended period of time, which is something you would not have at boundary line, there's both a technical component that's difficult if you don't have a discreet point of receptor in which you would measure that, what you have when you have such a lengthy boundary line throughout the whole project area and then you also have the difficulty of applying any one of these health base guidelines to something like a property boundary as opposed to at a residence where people are actually living or sleeping. Robert O'Neal that's correct you would typically apply that an area of frequent human use where people spend a lot of time.

Jim Muscato- Rob mentioned the comments they provided to date, he knows you haven't had a chance to look at them yet, he does encourage everyone to look at the November 6<sup>th</sup> letter he really tried to summarize the comments beyond the sound issue, they have been coming here to the meetings really for over two (2) years because they started with the Zoning Commission, at the Zoning Commission there was originally a 35dBA standard purposed, they had a number of submission with respect to that 35dBA standard, they provided literature and explanations to why that was an unworkable standard, and eventually that was removed by the Zoning Commission, and that was a Zoning Law that was adopted by the Town Board, now we're almost

a year back into this process before the Town Board which was originally nine (9) laws, we've dwindled down to it seems to the one number two (2) Wind Law, which over regulates the wind use but does so in a way that is disproportionate to other uses in the town that have very similar if not more dramatic environmental impacts both in terms of sound but also just in terms of other land uses, so again it seems as if the restrictions that have been applied here single out wind and they are just proportionally impacting the potential for wind particularly on the Woodwise parcel of course, they have mentioned both the sound as well as the height restriction that's imposed in the law, we've had discussions with the board numerous times about what the literature shows on sound, what the literature shows with prospect to height, what other towns and projects areas where the communities have been open and favorable to wind development, how those have proceeded, how the State has regulated sound and height and other aspects of wind projects and to the best of their knowledge based on the presentations they've seen, the workshops sessions and other wise there hasn't been any evidence to refute the information we've provided to date for the board to rely on in making the determinations on the standards, so we remain willing to work with the town wanting to communicate the basis for questions or concerns a lot of standards they are looking at work for this project and why the standards that are currently proposed in this law are prohibitive for the project and still look forward to those opportunities to do so and to get into the economic benefits and the other community benefits that can come from the project assuming the local law doesn't have a privative nature to it which is where it stands right now. Again he would appreciate it if the town would take the time, he knows it was only submitted a few days ago, but his November 6<sup>th</sup> letter does summarize where they stand and he would appreciate the board looking at it, thank you.

Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - she has a question - on page three (3), where you said you would propose the following language because this is what, an example of what came out of the Cassadaga project, "Individual wind turbines shall be located so that the level of noise produced by wind turbine operation shall not exceed 45 dBA L90 measured at ten minute intervals at 25 feet from the exterior of a residence." Jim Muscato - that's correct. Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - at one time didn't you say it was the PSC who implemented that? Jim Muscato - that's correct, the Cassadaga Wind Project decision, the Siting Board has a standard of 45 dBA it's a LEQ standard, but this was, he thinks it's explained in the letter, the 45 dBA at Cassadaga came out of the decision made by the Siting Board after the three (3) year development process, they could look at, apply that exact same standard here, but what they tried to do was apply a standard that was more common to the Zoning Laws of Pinckney, Harrisburg, and some of the other communities around here, and those were 50 dBA, that they then reduced to 45 dBA and that was mainly in reflection of the conversations and going back even to the Zoning Board, he thinks they even proposed that exact same language, so that's where those two (2) things came from.

Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - so she's asked this many times - is there any documentation on 600 foot towers, like she's said in the past she's looked and looked and everything is pretty much based on a 500 foot tower. Jim Muscato - what do you mean by documentation? Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - when you do the research everything is based on a 500 foot tower, the dBA's just everything, there's nothing that talks about 600 foot towers. Jim Muscato - so part of the reason for that is because of course turbine technology has evolved, especially information you are getting on the internet, there's going to be an information lag between project development and then when information, studies or other things are done, with respect to the existing developing projects and so as times evolves those existing development projects were all the started at below

400 feet and now more recently below 500 feet, and now they've provided local laws where they have 600 foot standards, he could tick through a number of projects that are proposed in New York State now that are all proposing 600 feet if not more, there's projects in Broome County that are proposed higher than 600 feet, so it's just the evolution of the turbines, but as they've talked about the tip height and the blade length the towers they're on can be the same as they were for a 500 foot tip height but because of the length of the blade it increases the overall tip height which raises the height of the turbine and that's what a lot of the difference between a turbine proposed now with a bigger rotor swept zone as compared with some of the existing projects that are operating in New York, shorter blades, small rotor sweep zones are capturing as much of the wind resource and that's really where the technology has gone but in terms of safety and setbacks, your law measures the setbacks based on the tip height it doesn't measure it on a fixed distance, so no matter what the tip height is you're going to have, he thinks it's a one and a half times setback in the law.

CM Matthew Tompkins - they would be real interested to see noise data on the turbines that you propose, because they've been told what we propose won't work but we don't know what you're proposing.

Jim Muscato - he doesn't know if Walter wants to speak to this - but again we are at the very early stages of the development process, it's been awhile since they submitted the preliminary scoping statement so forgive him if he doesn't recall but he believes they identified at least some characteristics of the turbine that's under consideration for the project he also believes they would have discussed at the July presentation that we have, sound power levels that they are looking at for a turbine for this project so whatever you need Matt we can provide it, if you're looking for turbine brochures for common project turbines under consideration, that's the type of information we can see if we can provide, but he just doesn't know what more information they can provide in making this decision on a 35 dBA limit because the reality is no matter what this is the consequence and it's not going to change whether you go from whatever the turbine difference is in dBA it's not going to significantly change this 35 standard.

Robert O'Neal - he's working on a lot of other projects in the State and the turbines are generally getting taller but they are not getting any louder, so the sounds are about the same, the fact that they are getting taller is not really directly relevant to the sound levels themselves. The sample handout he gave them - has a typical setback you would expect is for a turbine that would be over 600 feet.

Matt Smith - after two (2) years of going over Local Law 2 and Local Law 1 which was the Zoning Law, it seems like what's purposed right now is inconsistent with the comments from the Town and it's been the same Town Board with the exception of Matt Tompkins. One of the phrases over the last two (2) years was the Town's duty to protect the health and welfare of its citizens, which is the job of the Town, and it's a very familiar standard, recently within the last couple of months its quickly changed from the citizens and residents, when you talk about decibels levels to a residence, within the last two months it's applicable to seasonal camps, and then bare land, on top of that the latest concern of the Town was the effect on deer migration during the winter months, where they come off the hill to bed, and like Rob said and he thinks everyone agrees is what needs to be done if there's a concern is a study, what would the effect be is there anything comparable, going back to the duty of the Town, not to rehash the Zoning Law - Local Law #1 too much, so now we are talking about what's fair to landowners, so with the Zoning Law the way that ended up, luckily there were some changes made, by he's estimated as a Real Estate Broker - his opinion of value, which isn't an appraisal, devalued the Little John tract which is the 12,000 acres in Redfield, they own other land in town, by \$ 2.4 million. That doesn't seem very protective of their rights to take value away, now the Town is proposing this

law, obviously this law is for the Town not the Avangrid project, that would limit their use even further so the confusion is what is the Town's responsibility and to who, is it to the year around residents, is it camp owners, obviously the Zoning Law wasn't very favorable to anyone that wants to build a camp. At the same time we've heard opinions in the last two years from people that own bare land not them necessarily that they should be able to utilize every square foot of let's say a 40 acre parcel and not be over 35 dBA, everyone understands when you buy property you have a bundle of rights and you have property rights but it goes both ways. About a year or so ago we proposed not allowing snowmobiles on our property and that was met with strict and forceful opinions from not just the Town but no less than four (4) State Legislators and their staffs which lead to social media attacks, but stock snowmobiles are about 70 to 80 decibels, they're not all stock, but the sound that they create it's been talked about in these meetings, people say it's not constant like a windmill which is true, it's intermittent but there's a lot of them, so it goes back to there was no outrage back then - there was no joy from the Town that all of a sudden these deer were being protected because these loud snowmobiles that go 24/7 intermittent bursts that can exceed 100 decibels easily which could affect the deer migration but now all of a sudden based on google searches and things like that not real studies, there's a concern that the type of noise a windmill would produce would have an adverse effect, and that may be the case but these things need to be studied and assumptions can't just be made, they can everyone has opinions, his common sense thought would be without any data he would rather listen to a fan or an air conditioner when he sleeps than have someone run a chainsaw next to his head. He sees windmills as a fan, it does look like a big fan, do you see his point. To summarize, at the end of the day what's proposed here is again not beneficial to the Town obviously as a Company they would benefit if this particular project, the Avangrid project went forward, but then it still doesn't address the rest of the Town, which Rob has mentioned a number of times, if you have 500 foot turbines you can put them anywhere in Town, obviously you would have to get special use permits and what not but as of last meeting the major concern was wildlife, his assumption is that the Town, especially from some of the comments from Mr. Pratt who lives near the property and is very familiar with every part of this Town, made a lot of common sense, in there's not a lot of year around residences near this project, there are some, he'll be the first to say they shouldn't be negatively affected, he will leave it at that. Thank you.

Rob Brenner - after the last meeting he reflected a little on what Matt had talked about and what Carla had talked about, he thinks everyone in the room can agree that the Town is sincere in its intent to come up with a Wind Law that's workable, the intent here he doesn't think is to have a band because you wouldn't have worked on this for 11 months. What we are left with based on the map that was talked about tonight, and some rough calculations they did, basically if you look at that property that Woodwise owns, wind can be developed on under 1 percent of it, and that he thinks functions as a band, he doesn't think that is what anyone is intending. He knows you want to protect neighbors and you want to protect property rights and you want to protect wildlife, and speaking with Dan from Woodwise and Matt from Woodwise, he thinks everyone is going in the same direction on that, they are sincere in their intent to make sure there's a project here that works for the Town and he thinks the developer Avangrid is in the same position as well, they want to go through the Article 10 process and they want to make sure that it's a project that's environmental attainable and workable. He thinks we've come so far and we've had probably he doesn't know Sue would be the one to answer this question, but he asked her for the meeting minutes just to prepare for this meeting and he thinks we've probably had 15 conversations, easily about this, he thinks we've come so far, and we've got 2 big issues on the table but he thinks if they're suddenly dismissed and a decision is made and a local law is passed with a 35 dBA limitation and a 500 foot height limitation, he really thinks it makes a project here

very difficult whether it's an Avangrid project in this proposed configuration or it's a project that's proposed by another wind developer on Woodwise property and an entirely different configuration, he thinks from the Woodwise perspective this is a significant confiscation of their property rights, because if you look at the map that was presented tonight, it's such a small area of that really large property where wind can be developed and if you can't develop wind on the property we are discussing tonight on behalf of Woodwise you really can't do it anywhere in the Town, so what we've got is what he thinks is an unintentional band on wind in a 28 page really thorough wind law and the wind law is really well done, it's well drafted, there's some provisions that we disagree with but it's a really thorough local law intended to regulate wind and to have one or two provisions that would forbid any wind project when you have 28 pages of substance it just doesn't make sense unbalanced, he doesn't think that's the Town's intent so to the extent that there's more information you need from the landowner or from Avangrid they would be happy on behalf of Woodwise to assist in any way that they possibly can to make sure the Town has all the information they need, they would be happy to support studies to the extent that they are studies as they need to be commissioned to provide access to the property. He thinks there needs to be diligence done and qualified people need to do specific Town of Redfield specific studies, we shouldn't rely on information on the internet or information that's shared word of mouth, unless someone's physically seen the Town resources that we are all talking about on the properties where wind can potentially be developed. Thank you.

John Cheney - lifelong resident, he has been involved in the project right from the beginning, being on the Zoning Commission. As far as the 35 dBA that was brought up, after he brought up concern about it, it was taken out and said it would be put in the wind law, as he sees it's in there, he pointed out at the time that a refrigerator is about 45 dBA, it seems to be very unrealistic, he'll come back to that in a minute, he thinks what the Town should be thinking about, he understands their concern, the environmental impacts, he's fought this all of his life, he fought when he was on the Town Board to get some things that would affect the Town, he thinks we need to be really thinking about getting the big picture and what's really happening to our environment. He knows the concern again about protecting that area, but here's the bottom line - we're cooking the planet, global warming, climate change - whatever you want to call it, but the bottom line is we really have a short amount of time to turn things around. As far as this area up here, this whole area by 2050 you're going to see weather like you see in Georgia. What that's going to do with the whole eco system, the maples are going to be gone, your cool water fish are going to be gone, this whole area is going to change significantly, you can already see it, you don't have to list the names just read any scientific journal and information that's out there, don't go to our government website because anything to do with climate was taken down, what's that tell you. He understands again that there is concern, he realizes this is probably just a drop in the bucket, this project here in maybe slowing up global warming, you're not going to stop it, but every time one of these wind projects is shut down, he see another nail in our children's, he won't say coffin, but future, what we are leaving them, what they are going to have to deal with, you can already see the impacts of what's going on, every time one of these are shut down, no he doesn't want to have to see the windmills but which is better, maybe slow this global warming down and protect what we have or throw our hands up and say to heck with it. He remembers as a kid, they use to get out in the spring, when they were making sap, in an old sap pan that was full of holes, paddle around in it, it was leaking like a sieve, they knew it would go down, and eventually it would go down, we would get out in about of a foot of water and walked out, it was no big deal. Our planet we're living on is a big deal, it's not like you can just step off and go somewhere else.

What we are leaving our children is disgraceful, and half the population think there's nothing going on- well you've got to be blind in his opinion, we really should be thinking about what we are leaving the children and again you don't have to take his word for it, just look at the scientific information that's out there. Don't go to the 3 percent scientists that already are paid by the fossil fuel industry, look at the impartial ones the other 97 percent and what they're saying and the actual evidence in what's going on. It's quite obvious what's going on. As far as other concerns, we're really, if this wind law goes through, he feels it going to be hurting the Town as far as any financial incentive we can get from having the project not only for the Town Board, for the Town, for our School Districts, the Fire Department, our whole tax base, he knows he pays a lot of taxes, he would like to have something that would help us on this. Going back to the 35 dBA, that really a thorn in his side, because that really kind of surfaced after the Town Board had a public hearing and had John Droz, who highlighted about a half a dozen different ways how to stop a wind project, and that 35 dBA was one of the ones that's been left right in there. He won't be quite as kind as some of you here before, he really thinks that's in there to stop this wind farm. That's what this is all about and that's what it's been all about right from the beginning, this wholes from the zoning, hell he tried to get zoning for years in this Town, they wouldn't even talk about it, we had a zoning law it was thrown out, all of a sudden this comes along and yeah we're going to have to have zoning to do something about it, and then this wind farm comes along and which really brought the zoning to the front for some people, then of course the wind law, and all this, you went and got yourselves some outside lawyers, high paid people to come in and write this law, they're not from this Town, hell you've got another 8 or 9 other laws you want to throw in, so again, think about what you're actually proposing here and doing, this is nothing more than what you have is 35 dBA noise, this is nothing more than a project stopper, he thinks every one of you on that board knows that, think about it, think about what we are leaving our children, we don't have a lot of time. Thank you.

Tom Halstead - he lives just down the road, 6 miles - right next to Huff and Puff - Roger Clark, he doesn't know if anyone travels 177, but if you spend any time traveling out Lowville, and you look out in the fields this time of year, those wind turbines are surrounded by geese, there's deer in the fields feeding under the turbines, there's deer stands in every field out there, that's because the deer are still there moving and the hunters are hunting between the wind turbines, so as far as the wildlife, you might as well put your car away because you're going to disturb the deer more with your car and kill more deer with your car than any wind turbine is or any of the geese. He saw 6 geese dead on 81 this morning, it wasn't from a wind turbine. So if you're going to say the turbines are doing it, park your car and start walking, otherwise you're being a hypocrite, as simple as that.

Mike Yerdon - he was on the Zoning Commission - we did take that decimal out because we thought it would be better served with the wind law. The one thing we shown tonight, he thinks the question has been asked many times, and tonight is the first time we've heard anything from Avangrid about it, is what's the decimal rating of your turbine, at site and how does it decrease as it goes away from the turbine itself, he would like to see that, or something like that, that's the first time they've talked about to the best of his knowledge, we've talked about and asked about it but they've really never said what the decibels of the turbine they're proposed is, at the turbine and how it decreases as you get away from the turbine, he thinks that's something we would be interested in looking at, basically the same decibels for the 350 or 500 whatever, he thinks they should see that, you're saying that 35 dBA leaves nothing left on the site, what does 45/50 at the boundary line, so without knowing where to start with, it's a little hard to judge how it's going to affect the end.

John Yerdon - this gentleman just said that according to the map, it would be a mile and a half off the property line where a turbine could sit, his question is, are you telling him anything within a mile and a half of that turbine you're going to be in excess of 35 dBA.

Robert O'Neal - yes as you go from a mile and a half away as you get closer to the turbine so less than a mile and a half the sound level will go up, absolutely. John Yerdon - so the turbines here a mile and a half away from that turbines where the 35 will reach - is that what you're saying.

Robert O'Neal - that's correct. John Yerdon - you've done the study to prove this.

Robert O'Neal - this is not a study that you would do for the formal application, this is taking a typical turbine sound level. John Yerdon - what is that. Robert O'Neal - wind turbines are measured in sound power, so a typical wind turbine is around 106/108 decibels sound power.

You take that number and propagate that out over distance and that drops off over distance in this case to about 35 in a mile and a half. The 106/108 sounds scary but it's has nothing to do with you standing there and saying it's 106 and I'm right below it, that's not true, it's just a reading. These light they might be 100 watt bulbs, same thing with the wind turbines, it's a 106 sound power and it just drops off as you get farther away. John Yerdon - the turbines we're talking about here you obviously must know how much noise they make, correct. Walter

Meisner - I think he just said 106/108. John Yerdon - that's the ones you're proposing right now.

Robert O'Neal - he doesn't know what they are proposing exactly, but that is a typical sound, it's going to like that. John Yerdon - what are the ones that you are talking about putting here, what is there sound level, he has asked this for 10 months, and yet have I gotten an answer from any of you people what that is, how do we know that we have to go a mile and a half or that we have to go 8 miles, he doesn't know, and obviously you don't because you don't know how much the turbine puts out, this man right here told me that they are a new design and they didn't know - that's exact words that you told me, supposedly they are an all new turbine, so if you can't answer how much they put out, how are we suppose to know, and how are we suppose to write a law.

Robert O'Neal - whatever turbine they pick is going to be somewhere close to what he just said and it's not going to change the consequence of a 35 dBA setback that will be about the same no matter what they pick because of the technology. You don't need to know what the exact sound power level is for the proposed turbine, any Municipality jurisdiction should set an appropriate, protective health based sound level and then whoever applies for a project has to work from that.

Jim Muscato - it would be just like a mph - you don't need to know how fast a car can go, to set a speed limit, you can look at what's appropriate in terms of the road, the road conditions whatever, the same is true in this example, guidance is available, guidelines are available, world health organization puts out guidance, the State Siting Board puts out guidelines, the Cassadaga example of the wind laws are in other towns nearby those have all set the 55 mph limit, if you will, so it's really working from that as opposed to working from the tower and trying to put a law around a tower design. John Yerdon - if the Town Board decided to say 35 dBA, 50 feet from a structure a building can you live with that. Walter Meisner - their precedence, what they typically see around, kind of like the standard that they see, it's been sighted in Cassadaga as 45, 20 feet from a residents or a receptor, so that's generally what they see, that's kind of the standard and typical, that would kind of like what was alluded to as the 55 mph on the road, and then we work backwards from that to see how we can fit that. Jim Muscato - in terms of people living in proximity to operating wind farm projects, the answer is absolutely yes, there are people living in proximity to wind farm projects with 35, 40, 45, 50 and even higher than 50 in New York in nearby towns, so absolutely yes, you can certainly live and people do live nearby.

Mike Yerdon - you said 45 dBA in proximity to a residents, exactly how far does that mean that your tower would have to be away from it. You said at 35 dBA it would be a mile and a half so you should be able to tell him at 45. Robert O'Neal - he can't give an exact number, these are approximate, because how many turbines are you going to put in a row for example, it depends,



generally to be 45 dBA, say a handful of turbines, because generally when you build a wind farm you put a bunch in a row, so the answer is different depending, the number is different for 1, 2 or 5, 45 dBA from a string of turbines you're probably going to be in the order of 2000 feet give or take, something like that. Mike Yerdon - he's confusing with that answer, why would dropping 10 decibels increase that number to a mile and a half. Robert O'Neal - because to get 10 decibels that's a lot, and every time you double the distance you knock off 6 decibels, you have to go more than double to get 10 less. Walter Meisner - just for illustration purposes what we put together was with lots and lots of assumptions, and that should be taken as such, it's illustrated it's to show a concept, the reality is when we do get into an Article 10 they get into larger studies, after they have kind of gotten to the next step, there's significant amount of detail that goes into the design, that includes the tree covering, includes the topography, includes the weather, includes the air temperature, includes the spacing of the turbines, how many turbines, the list goes on to an amount of variables that get to the question you are asking, so he just wants to make sure everybody's aware in the room we weren't presenting this as science or study this was illustrated purposes of if we do these 3 assumptions this is what happens, just so everybody understands that the caveats with what we provided as an illustration.

CW Elaine Yerdon - when are you planning on the application, do you have any idea when the application might be filed. Walter Meisner - we don't, it's a ways from now we still have a lot of work before they would be submitting an application, he thinks this process was one of the things they would like to see through first. CW Elaine Yerdon - she just saw in the letter - proposing to submit an Application, she didn't know if that meant you were thinking of moving the date up. Walter Meisner - it's a bit of a ways, there's a significant amount of effort that goes into that application.

Supervisor Tanya Yerdon - getting back to the Public Hearing, does anyone want to make a comment since this is a public hearing, does anyone else want to make a comment on the public hearing on the windmill law of 2018.

Motion was made by Tanya Yerdon and seconded by Elaine Yerdon to close the Public Hearing on the Proposed Wind Energy Facilities Local Law #2 of 2018 at 7:30pm.

ADOPTED Ayes 5 T. Yerdon, E. Yerdon, E. Webb, C. Bauer, M. Tompkins  
Nays 0

The next Town of Redfield Town Board meeting will be held Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at 7:30pm.

November 08, 2018

Susan Hough, Town Clerk

11/08/2018phwef pg. 9 of 9