

On April 6, 2015, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors held a joint Wind Energy work session with the Botetourt County Planning Commission in Meeting Rooms 226, 227 and 228 at the Greenfield Education Training Center in Daleville, Virginia.

Dr. Scothorn opened the joint Board of Supervisors work session at 6:01 PM, followed by Mr. Nicely, who then called the April 6, 2015 Planning Commission work session to order. The following were noted as being present:

PRESENT: Mr. Hiawatha Nicely, Jr., Chairman, Planning Commission
 Mr. Todd Dodson, Member, Board of Supervisors
 Mr. William Thurman, Vice-Chairman, Planning Commission
 Dr. Mac Scothorn, Chairman, Board of Superv./Planning Comm. Ex-Officio
 Mr. Jack Leffel, Vice-Chairman, Board of Supervisors
 Mr. Billy Martin, Member, Board of Supervisors
 Mr. Sam Foster, Member, Planning Commission
 Mr. Jim H. Guynn, County Attorney
 Mrs. Kathleen D. Guzi, County Administrator
 Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator
 Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager/Zoning Administrator
 Mr. Jeffrey Busby, Planner
 Mrs. Laura Goad, Administrative Assistant

ABSENT: Mr. John Williamson, Member, Board of Supervisors
 Mr. John Griffin, Member, Planning Commission
 Mr. Steven L. Kidd, Member, Planning Commission
 Mrs. Susan Fain, Secretary to the County Administrator

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. Cody Sexton, Information Specialist

Mrs. Guzi welcomed those in attendance. She said that a lot of work had been accomplished in the first work session and Mrs. Pendleton would walk members through the remainder of the key elements of the proposed ordinance in this second work session. She encouraged members to stop at any point for clarification and noted staff would report on the West Virginia wind farm tour from this past Wednesday.

Mrs. Pendleton greeted both boards then continued discussion on proposed text amendments. She said she appreciated the dialogue from the previous work session. Mrs. Pendleton brought up topics to review from the February work session: how much is one mega-watt of energy, MET tower height needs in relation to final turbine heights, further research on turbine finish and color, as well as further information on setbacks.

Regarding the quantity of one mega-watt of energy, Mrs. Pendleton explained that a one mega-watt turbine would produce 1 million watts of energy at any given time when the wind speed that is ideal for that model (e.g., between 25 – 50 mph). She noted that professionals in the wind energy industry use that measure to determine what average capacity the turbine, or farm, would need to produce to generate the amount of energy that makes the project worthwhile. She further noted that one mega-watt turbines are defined as utility because, at that scale, it would not be cost effective to generate wind for site consumption only, which is why one mega-watt turbines are generally clustered and not operated singly, and an industry such as Roanoke Cement would not need one mega-watt that could power 200-300 homes for on-site utilization. She further explained that a five mega-watt turbine could produce enough energy to power more than 1,400 households.

Mrs. Pendleton clarified MET tower heights. She said that MET towers did not need to be as tall as the proposed turbines because their data is extrapolated to predict wind speed at the turbine height; this was general industry standards and building towers taller than 199 feet and engaging FAA review was not cost effective, so all MET towers would be under 199 feet.

Concerning turbine finish and color, Mrs. Pendleton explained that per industry standards, most smaller scale turbines were galvanized steel, while larger ones were painted; because some parts of the ordinance will apply to different scales of wind, she recommended including both options, then the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors could impose conditions on the color of the turbines, as she suggested keeping “galvanized” in the proposed text amendment.

Mrs. Pendleton then discussed setbacks. She stated that her research indicated many ordinances use the percentages of 110% of the turbine height to non-participating adjoining property lines and 150% of the turbine height to occupied structures on non-participating adjoining properties, similar to the state model ordinance, but some localities specify a distance to structures on adjacent properties, and then state "whichever is greater." Mrs. Pendleton said that Northampton County uses 600 feet or 150% to structures, Roanoke County uses 1,000 feet, Rockingham and Washington counties use 800 feet, while four other localities follow the model ordinance. She noted they could have further discussion on this, or rely on the Special Exception Permit process, so that once a project would be considered by the Board, the Commission and Board could impose conditions related to further setbacks, and there was always the opportunity to get site specific.

There being no further discussion, Board and Commission members indicated they had no objections to Botetourt's proposed text amendments as currently proposed.

Mr. Busby commented on the April 1, 2015 trip to Beech Ridge Wind Farm in Greenbrier County, West Virginia. He said that a Chicago-based company, Invenergy, leased the site with 67 wind turbines on the ridge; all turbines averaged about 400' in height; Wind Farm Manager Jack McClung discussed the construction phase, issues they encountered, environmental issues, and the mechanics of how the wind farm and turbine operated.

Dr. Scothorn wanted to know about the length of time required to set up a wind turbine.

Mr. Foster said it took three days to set up a wind turbine on a prepared foundation.

Mr. Dodson explained that the transformer was installed on a concrete pad, the foundation was then spread out and the tower went down 16' into the ground. He further explained that the construction of the foundation and roads were the longest part of the process.

Mr. Martin said that one revolution of blades equaled 78 revolutions on the generator, and Mr. Dodson said that these towers were 1.5 mega-watt-capacity each with an average annual output of half a megawatt per tower.

After questioning from Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Foster noted that because there were other uses such as coal extraction and wood harvesting in the area, this use appeared to be a good fit for that particular site.

Mr. Thurman mentioned that this location had a bad snow year for the construction of the 67 turbines, which lengthened the construction phase, and that the footings were very time consuming. He noted that, after the one year construction period, the traffic was virtually non-existent.

Dr. Scothorn wanted to know about the life expectancy of a wind turbine.

Mr. Martin replied that the maximum was 25 years and the return on investment was achieved in about five years, as Mrs. Guzi commented that the wind farm manager indicated that decommissioning was built into their business model.

When Dr. Scothorn inquired if the state helped the wind farm, Mrs. Guzi responded that West Virginia has a much different governmental structure than Virginia. As an example, she noted that Greenbrier County did not have zoning or the equivalent of a county administrator.

Discussing the clean energy aspect, Dr. Scothorn noted the turbines were spread out in different areas and asked why they were not closer together.

Mr. Nicely answered that the MET towers and the availability of the wind dictated part of that, as Mr. Leffel observed that when two towers were relatively close, one would turn, while the other would not turn.

Mr. Dodson said that, while standing at the base of the turbine, he was able to have a normal conversation, although he could hear the transformer hum.

Regarding the life span, Mr. Thurman said the turbines did not have to be removed, but they might be replaced due to improved technology. Mr. Dodson said the wind farm would do a study every 20-25 years to see if they are worth replacing.

Dr. Scothorn asked about wildlife. Mr. Leffel responded that approximately 1.8 birds were killed per turbine per year, and the wind farm had to do a mandatory check every day.

Mr. Foster remarked that some of the turbines were relocated so as not to endanger a certain bat population and the migratory route. Mr. Leffel noted that the concrete had already been poured and a study showed a possible bat route, so they moved the turbines.

Dr. Scothorn asked about decommissioning.

Regarding decommissioning, Mr. Nicely said the wind farm had to plan for decommissioning prior to putting in turbines. Mr. Nicely also said several hunting camps were located near the wind farm.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that a presentation by the company, emailed to the members of the Board and Planning Commission, showed that wildlife increased at the twelve hunting camps.

Mrs. Pendleton then discussed agenda topics. For safety and ground clearance, she stated that the minimum distance between the ground and any protruding blades utilized on a wind energy system shall be fifteen (15) feet, as measured at the lowest point of the arc of the blades; the lowest point of the arc of the blade shall be ten (10) feet higher than the tallest peak of any structure within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the base of the tower. She further stated that wind energy systems shall be equipped with manual (electronic or mechanical) and automatic over speed controls to limit the blade rotation speed to within the design limits of the wind energy system and the base of the tower shall not be climbable for a distance of fifteen feet above ground surface; all access doors to wind turbines and electrical equipment shall be locked or fenced, as appropriate, to prevent entry by unauthorized persons.

In relation to site design, Mrs. Pendleton said there would be limits on clearing, plus undergrounding of utility lines, where feasible. She stated that clearing of natural vegetation shall be limited to that which is necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of the wind energy system; adherence to erosion and sediment control regulations would be required; the restoration of natural vegetation in areas denuded for construction activities shall be required so long as the restored vegetation would not interfere with the operation of the wind energy system or the maintenance thereof; any onsite transmission or power lines shall, to the maximum extent possible, be placed underground.

Mr. Leffel noticed that everything at the wind farm was very well maintained with low grass mainly for fire protection.

Dr. Scothorn wanted to know about the connection to the wind farm and if any energy was lost in the process due to the distance.

Mr. Dodson replied that the connection was 14 miles into the grid.

Mr. Busby noted that the wind farm manager, Mr. Jack McClung, said the amount of voltage lost was not enough to be significant, that they have capacitors, and that the difference was negligible, approximately 13.8 kilovolts by the time it gets to distribution.

Mrs. Pendleton discussed compliance. She stated that wind energy systems must comply with applicable FAA regulations; wind energy systems shall be designed, constructed and operated without significant adverse impact to fish, wildlife or native plant resources, including fish and wildlife habitat, migratory routes, and state or federally-listed threatened or endangered fish, wildlife or plant species, and text would be phrased to "meet all state and federal environmental requirements"; utility scale wind energy systems that generate over five (5) megawatts of electricity shall comply with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC) application regulations and receive all necessary approvals as required, prior to issuance of a zoning and building permit; a building and zoning permit would be required prior to the initiation of construction of any and each component of a wind energy system or a temporary meteorological (MET) tower. She further stated that she wanted to make sure the County would be in compliance in case there were changes to the federal or state code.

Regarding monitoring and maintenance, Mrs. Pendleton stated the owner or operator shall maintain large wind energy systems and utility wind energy systems in good condition; such maintenance shall include, but not be limited to, painting, structural integrity of the foundation and support structure and security barrier if applicable, and maintenance of the buffer areas and

landscaping if present; site access shall be maintained to a level acceptable to the Chief of Fire and Emergency Medical Service.

Mr. Nicely remarked that this particular company was very safety conscious, and included a helipad for emergencies. He further remarked Invenergy had their maintenance schedule on the wall showing planned repairs for each turbine.

Dr. Scothorn inquired about who reviewed the wind farm's safety procedures.

Mr. Busby and Mr. Nicely responded that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration would go at an employee's request and Mr. Dodson noted OSHA would be there if the company reported a work related accident.

Mr. Thurman said he was very surprised at the cleanliness and organization and that they had trained their employees to do inspections in addition to receiving private inspections.

Mr. Nicely commented that, with the amount of money these companies have invested, they would not lose the opportunity to generate wind by not maintaining the facilities.

Dr. Scothorn brought up a concern regarding the County's ability to require maintenance.

Mrs. Pendleton replied that this would be written into the ordinance and it would give the County the opportunity to perform building and zoning inspections and noted that these inclusions in the Zoning Ordinance would allow the County to issue zoning violations. By requiring a surety, if the County would have to become involved, it would be at no cost to the County.

Mr. Martin said the site was very clean and neat.

Mr. Dodson said that the County would have to take a hard look at the company if their equipment started going down and we would need a good escrow.

Mr. Foster observed that every bolt had a plastic zip on it to see if the bolt had moved. Mr. Nicely said that also prevented corrosion.

Mrs. Pendleton said the county would require adequate liability insurance, and an emergency response plan.

Mr. Nicely said the wind farm had that covered with posted information on their walls.

Mrs. Pendleton said it was also important to not impede on others' quality of life with signal interference. In addition, the company would be required to update contact information annually and that the county would need to know within ten days of any change of ownership.

As to the Special Exception Permit application requirements, Mrs. Pendleton explained the requirements and listed a narrative identifying the applicant and the proposed owner or operator of the wind energy system and a description of the proposed wind project, including an overview of the project and its location; approximate generating capacity of the wind energy project; the approximate number, types and height or range of heights of wind turbines to be constructed; and a description of ancillary facilities, if applicable, to include all specifications of the proposed wind energy system, including the manufacturer and model, materials, color and finish, rotor diameters, rated capacity and tower types.

For the concept plan, she stated that each applicant requesting a special exception permit for a wind energy system shall submit a scaled concept plan, prepared by an engineer with a professional engineering license in the Commonwealth of Virginia, to include the following: the proposed location of all wind energy system structures and components, including all turbines, permanent meteorological towers, ground equipment, transmission lines, utility lines, electrical storage and cabling, collection and supply equipment, transformers, ancillary equipment and other proposed structures; property lines, setback lines, access roads and turnout locations, parking, proposed lighting, service areas, any existing or proposed easements and/or rights-of-way, and excavation and fill areas; the proposed heights of all wind energy systems structures. The applicant shall provide evidence that the proposed height of the wind turbines do not exceed the height recommended by the manufacturer or distributor of the system; the location of any public or private road rights-of-way being utilized for or adjacent to the proposed project; the location of existing vegetation and the limits of proposed clearing and grading; existing tree cover, including average height of trees, on the subject property and on adjacent parcels within the setback distance of any component of the wind energy system; outline of all existing

buildings and their uses on all adjacent parcels within the setback distance of any component of the wind energy system. Include distances from the wind energy system to each building shown; location of visualization viewpoints as required in this ordinance.

Mrs. Pendleton said the applicant shall provide a summary of the wind data gathered for the proposed system. The dates and periods of the collection of the wind data shall also be submitted; for visual impact analysis, the applicant shall demonstrate through project siting and proposed mitigation, if necessary, that the wind energy system minimizes impact on the visual character of Botetourt County; a plan for the operation and maintenance of the wind energy system.

An environmental inventory and impact statement would be required and the applicant shall present information regarding any site and viewshed impacts, including direct and indirect impacts to national and state forests, national or state parks, wildlife management areas, conservation easements, or any known historic or cultural resources within five (5) miles of the proposed project. The applicant shall provide written notification to the office of a national or state forest, national or state park unit, wildlife management area, or known historic or cultural resource sites, if a proposed wind energy system is within five (5) miles of the boundary of said entity.

A sound study, prepared by an acoustical engineer with a professional engineering license in the Commonwealth of Virginia, will be required to provide an assessment of pre-construction and post-construction conditions. Additionally, the applicant shall provide documentation regarding noise complaint response procedures and protocol for post-construction monitoring.

The construction plan with a phasing schedule for the construction of the large wind energy system or utility wind energy system, including the estimated commencement and completion date will be necessary. Such plan shall identify staging areas, off-site storage facilities, and transportation routes to be used by construction and delivery vehicles, and the gross weight and height of the maximum delivery vehicle.

A shadow flicker model, certified by an engineer with a professional engineering license in the Commonwealth of Virginia, that certifies that any wind turbine that is sited within one half mile of any occupied building on a non-participating landowner's property either avoids shadow flicker on any occupied building or that reasonable efforts to minimize shadow flicker to any occupied building on a non-participating landowner's property shall be made. The model shall include a description of the zones where shadow flicker will likely be present within the project boundary and a one-half mile radius beyond the project boundary, the expected durations of the flicker at these locations and the calculation of the total number of hours per year of flicker at all locations.

As part of the project application, the applicant shall submit a decommissioning plan, certified by an engineer with a professional engineering license in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which shall include the following: the anticipated life of the project; the estimated decommissioning cost in current dollars; how said estimate was determined; the method of ensuring that funds will be available for decommissioning and restoration; the method that the decommissioning cost will be kept current; and the manner in which the project will be decommissioned and the site restored.

Another requirement includes an independent review, upon submission for a special exception permit for a wind energy system, the County will be authorized to hire an independent consultant to review the application and all associated documents for compliance with this section and any other state and federal codes. Any costs associated with the review shall be paid by the applicant. Any payment of such fees would in no way be a substitute of payment for any other application review fees otherwise required by this chapter.

Mr. Thurman wanted to know who would be responsible for the environmental impact studies for migratory, bird flight patterns, and if the owner would be responsible upfront.

Mrs. Pendleton responded that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would require a desktop analysis and then field data might be required based on those findings.

Mr. Nicely commented that the West Virginia DEQ required certified checklists prior to any construction.

Mrs. Pendleton brought up a lawsuit where state regulations were challenged in court, and rather than pursuing litigation, Invenergy relocated their turbines.

Mrs. Pendleton remarked that a project would require a sound study and a construction plan including information on transportation routes to be used during construction as well as the gross weight and height of delivery vehicles.

Mr. Nicely asked if the visual analysis would include the location of the turbine back to certain areas that would have high visibility capability, such as to U. S. Route 220 or Interstates 64 and 81.

As Mrs. Pendleton explained that a pre-application meeting would be required, at which staff would receive information on the site, including that information, Mr. Nicely said we needed to consider the viewsheds as we go along.

Mrs. Pendleton discussed shadow flicker. Mr. Martin noted that the wind farm manager considered that not to be a big problem; Mr. Dodson commented that if structures were nearby that shadow flicker would be an issue and Mr. Leffel said that shadow flicker would be important to look at for residential areas.

Mrs. Pendleton said it would be important to see a flicker model if a proposed project was located within a half-mile of buildings and include zones where shadow flicker would likely be present.

Mr. Martin noted that, if a project were close to residential area, shadow flicker would be a problem.

Mrs. Pendleton reiterated that a decommissioning plan would be a required part of the application process and the estimated cost would be in current dollars as well as methods of calculations and the anticipated life of turbine.

Mr. Leffel wanted to know if a decommissioning plan was a state regulation for the plan and the funds. Mr. Nicely said it would be important to have an escalator built in the ordinance.

Mrs. Pendleton stated an independent review would be conducted as with telecommunication towers.

When Mr. Dodson commented signal interference needed to be in the SEP application, Mrs. Pendleton confirmed that it could be part of the application process.

Mrs. Pendleton then described the decommissioning/abandonment procedure. She said the Zoning Administrator must be notified within ten days of their plan to decommission or cease operations, and the owner/operator would have 150 days to complete decommissioning, and unless extended. Decommissioning consists of the removal of all turbines and structures, below grade structures must be removed to 4' or covered, compacted soils must be decompact to 4' depth, topography restoration will be required, and solid and hazardous waste must be properly disposed of. Mrs. Pendleton said that if abandoned after more than one year of ceasing to be in operation, the County would make a determination, and would remove at the owner's expense.

Mr. Dodson confirmed with Mrs. Pendleton that every fifth year, the owner would be required to update the estimated cost of decommissioning.

She stated that was correct and the ordinance is proposed to require the owner or operator to post surety/cash bond or an irrevocable letter of credit in a form approved by the County Administrator or the County Attorney in order to ensure removal or decommissioning. Mrs. Pendleton stated the amount shall be approved by the zoning administrator that would be no less than the total estimated cost for decommissioning, removing of the utility scale wind energy project and restoring the wind energy site. She noted that staff was in the process of determining a percentage of said estimated costs that would be reasonable to consider administrative costs, inflation, potential damage to existing roads and utilities. Mrs. Pendleton stated the applicant shall ensure that the surety shall remain in full force and effect until the Community Development Department has inspected the site and verified that the system has been decommissioned as stated, at which time the Community Development Department shall release the surety, which would also be binding on subsequent owners of the property. If the property owner then fails to decommission the wind project or to decommission a discontinued derelict wind turbine in accordance with this section, Botetourt County may access the surety for completion of decommissioning and site restoration.

After questioning from Mr. Dodson regarding a worst case scenario, Mr. Guynn responded there was not much difference between a surety that involved insurance ratings, and letter of credit.

Mr. Foster requested to revisit the site design segment. He stated that he was uneasy requiring applicants to install electric utility lines underground "where feasible" and questioned the timing of the approval, who would approve this, if it was cost prohibitive and to whose detriment, theirs or ours.

Mr. Leffel said that, if all the lines were overhead, it would be a mess. He recalled that during the tour the operators did comment on how ice on the blades was destructive.

Mr. Foster wanted to know who would make the decision on underground transmission line placement to the maximum extent possible as he discussed the possible problems with pole placement.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that the proposed ordinance required "...any onsite transmission or power lines shall to the maximum extent possible, shall be placed underground."

Mr. Foster asked who would make the decision on "to the maximum extent possible."

Mr. Dodson wanted to know which lines Mr. Foster was referring to, noting their feeder line to the substation was aboveground.

Mr. Foster said he was referring to the lines between the towers and that poles would affect the view if a project were to be proposed on a mountain ridge.

Dr. Scothorn stated that we needed to require underground power lines.

Mrs. Pendleton pointed out that the SEP could require underground power lines and if rock or something was found that could not be mitigated, then that could be a deal breaker at that point. She also said that, because we require utility lines to be shown on the concept plan, this would be where the Board or Planning Commission would have some authority on a site specific basis.

Mr. Moorman asked if there was a sub-surface investigation as part of the application process; he then suggested a requirement to consider characteristics of rock on-site.

Mr. Martin wanted to know if it would be unreasonable to make underground lines mandatory.

Mrs. Pendleton responded that she did believe requiring underground lines has been a deal breaker for some projects based on her research.

Mr. Foster said that when pictures of towers were shown during a public hearing, pictures of the 20 poles in-between the towers, that people might see on top of the ridge, and that could be huge difference in how people would view the project.

Mr. Moorman noted that overhead lines were more vulnerable and had more intensive upkeep than underground lines.

Mrs. Pendleton suggested rephrasing that section to, "Please provide reasoning" if the utility lines were to be placed aboveground, rather than "feasible." Mr. Foster said he liked that better.

Mr. Moorman proposed using a similar approach here that is currently used in the telecommunications ordinance, where the applicant is required to provide evidence satisfactory to the Board of Supervisors to show that it is not feasible.

Mrs. Pendleton presented a proposed timeline and requested feedback on the schedule.

Mrs. Pendleton said that a public forum had been scheduled here at Greenfield on April 21, 2015 from 4:00 PM-6:30 PM for the public to give their comments. She said that staff was ready to advertise for the public forum; depending on tonight's outcome, she could request authorization from the Board at their April 28, 2015, meeting to advertise for the public hearing; the Planning Commission wanted one more work session; then joint public hearing could be held on May 26, 2015, as previously discussed.

When Dr. Scothorn asked if questions would be posted on the website, Mrs. Guzi replied that they would be on the County's website.

Mrs. Guzi noted that with the public forum scheduled for April 21, 2015, there would be a relatively short time period to incorporate input from the forum into a proposed ordinance that would be ready for advertisement.

Mr. Martin wanted to know if Botetourt would use Pulaski County's ordinance as a guideline, as he expressed a hope that Botetourt's ordinance would not be too restrictive.

Mrs. Guzi explained that Botetourt's ordinance contained information from several areas such as Franklin, Roanoke, Northampton, and Rockingham counties. She cautioned that while these areas had adopted an ordinance, they did not have an actual project. Mrs. Guzi said that a couple of ordinances were more restrictive, but with the input provided by the Commission and Board the proposed ordinance will strike a balance between protecting existing property owners without over-regulating.

Mrs. Guzi replied that what the boards had agreed to at tonight's work session would be incorporated into message boards that would be displayed at various stations at the public forum. She noted that the format of the forum is designed to solicit input and provide information.

After a brief discussion on possible opposition, Mr. Dodson brought up the number and timing of public hearings and questioned if only one public hearing would be conducted. It was noted that, as per the current proposed timeline, there is only one public hearing scheduled. It was noted that, in order to meet advertising deadlines, a joint public hearing is necessary if we are to consider action on a proposed ordinance in May.

Mr. Dodson asked why this had to be done by the end of May.

Mrs. Guzi responded that was a deadline that we had set for ourselves.

Mr. Leffel confirmed dates with Mr. Dodson, who wanted to know about precedence in this County for a joint public hearing.

Mr. Moorman stated that while they were not routine, joint public hearings did occur on larger issues on an infrequent basis, perhaps two to three times during the past 20 years.

Mr. Dodson suggested holding the April 21, 2015 public forum to get the pulse of the community and reevaluate the hearing schedule.

Mr. Nicely stated the Planning Commission wanted the Board to be satisfied and they would follow the Board's lead.

Mr. Dodson suggested holding the forum and, if people objected, then consider other options; Mr. Leffel agreed.

Further, Mr. Nicely commented that he wanted to make sure the Planning Commission completed their work in a timely manner for the Board.

Dr. Scothorn said that the Board wanted to make sure that the public understood that the Board had heard their comments.

Mrs. Pendleton noted the Planning Commission still had a work session on May 11, 2015, and a June hearing date would allow an extra month if there were any changes.

Mrs. Guzi said that staff would send out a revised schedule in the next couple of days, clarifying what would take place at each of the following meetings.

Dr. Scothorn thanked Mrs. Pendleton for the vast amount of information, and scheduling the tour to the wind farm. He said he looked forward to more information and questions from the public.

At 7:29 PM, Mr. Martin motioned to adjourn the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dodson seconded, which was approved with the following recorded vote: (Resolution Number 15-04-02)

Aye:	Mr. Leffel, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Dr. Scothorn
Nay:	None
Absent:	Mr. Williamson
	Abstain: None

At 7:29 PM, Mr. Foster motioned to adjourn the Planning Commission. Mr. Thurman seconded, which was approved with the following recorded vote:

Yes: Mr. Nicely, Mr. Thurman, Mr. Foster
No: None
Absent: Mr. Kidd, Mr. Griffin Abstain: None