

Attachment I

Tamara Wright

From: Pat and Paul Garner [patnpaul2@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 11:40 AM
To: Tamara Wright
Subject: Public Hearing on Wind Ordinance

Good Morning Tamara,
I received the copy of the wind ordinance and will not be able to attend the meeting this evening; however I appreciate my comments being considered via e-mail.

There is no reference to zoning. If the land is currently zoned residential a large wind farm will not allow residential usage of that property. Zoning should be changed to commercial rather than a conditional use permit being authorized. Current zoning should be a consideration prior to permit approval. Also, double use of land should be reviewed to eliminate the potential of county (or other funds) funds being spent under different usage of the property , i.e., if the property is in CRP, payment is being received, a percentage should be removed from CRP because it is no longer agricultural but being used for a different purpose and some property is no longer in a natural state.

If zoned commercial and the wind farm is producing and the product (electricity) is being sold to a commercial entity (RMP) the county could receive revenue through the business side of a wind farm and potentially tax the business. Please consider this for any wind turbine that is installed for other than individual private use for a single family home. Multiple turbines installed for use at a business with excess electricity being sold should be considered as a revenue source for the county.

I would like to see the ordinance contain a notification being sent to all inhabited buildings during the permitting process that are located within a radius of two miles distance of the proposed turbine placement. This is especially important for the larger turbines requiring lighting.

All access roads to and from the turbines must contain roadways constructed to allow county and/or other vehicles access without undue wear and tear on the vehicles to include local fire protection vehicles.

There is no reference to storage of fuel, oil, or other equipment required to maintain the turbines. These should be addressed whether they are above ground barrels or tanks or below ground tanks. This will eliminate any spills and environmental concerns.

Thank you for considering my comments.

I can be reached at 435-458-3597
Pat Garner
13980 N 3100 W
Collinston UT

Attachment II

From: Nathan Darnall(a,fws.gov [mailto:Nathan.Darnall5@fws.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2010 11:48 AM
To: Brian Richards(a,fws.gov
Cc: Sharon Vaughn@fws.gov; Tamara Wright
Subject: Re: Fw: Box Elder County Wind Ordinance

Tamara,

I think it's great that Box Elder County is willing to adopt a wind ordinance. I do recommend that the ordinance include more information about avoiding and minimizing impacts to wildlife and other important natural resources and that it include recommendations (or even requirements) that companies contact both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources early in the planning process.

Even if projects are on private lands, individuals and companies are still prohibited from taking threatened and endangered species, migratory birds and eagles without a permit. And of course there are sensitive habitats (e.g., wetlands) that should be avoided. I would hope that most companies know their responsibilities, but coordinating with us early in the planning process should help avoid "train wrecks" by identifying red flags or major concerns before project proponents get too far down the road. If we can add this to the ordinance, that would help our agencies tremendously.

I suppose there are several ways to approach this. One is to require that companies provide notice and require early coordination with wildlife agencies (i.e., a relatively short addition to the ordinance), or we could include that plus even more details and best management practices within the ordinance (i.e., several paragraphs or even pages of information). As far as moving forward, I could suggest some language to include in the ordinance, or we have some times (e.g., several weeks) we could meet to discuss the various approaches and the amount of information and level of details that could be included in the ordinance.

Thanks,

Nathan

Nathan L. Darnall
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Utah Field Office
2369 West Orton Circle, Suite 50
West Valley City, UT 84119

801-975-3330 x137
801-975-3331 (fax)

Attachment III

State of Utah

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor
Division Director

September 3, 2008

Department of Community and Culture

PALMER DePAULIS
Executive Director

State History

PHILIP F. NOTARIANNI

Penny Berry
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining 1594
West North Temple, Suite 1210 Box
145801
Salt Lake City UT 84114-5801
RE: Murray S0030081

In Reply Please Refer to. Case No. 08-1463

Dear Ms Berry:

The Utah State Historic Preservation office received your request for our comment on the above referenced project on August 21, 2008. From the information you provided, it appears that no cultural resources were located in the project Area of Potential Effects. We concur with your determination of No **Historic Properties** Affected for this project.

Utah Code 9-8-404(1)(a) denotes that your agency is responsible for all final decisions regarding cultural resources for this undertaking. Our comments here are provided as specified in U.C.A. 9-8-404(3)(a)(i). If you have questions, please contact me at (801-533-3555 or idykman@utah.gov).

UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY ANTIQUITIES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION RESEARCH CENTER &
COLLECTIONS

Dykman
Acting deputy State Historic Preservation Officer - Archaeology

Joel

Attachment IV

From: "Paul Baker" <paulbaker@utah.gov>
To: <willardpeak@didis.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 8:31 AM
Subject: Cultural Resources Clearance

Mr Murray,

I am writing in response to your request for a new determination letter concerning cultural resources at your mine site in Box Elder county.

A cultural resources clearance is good for the life of the operation. SBPO concurred with DOGM's determination that no historic properties would be affected by your operation, and no further determination is needed. There is the potential a new archaeological survey would find something new, but it is unlikely. The only exception where a new survey and a new determination would be required is if you find something while conducting operations. Our standard approval letter contains a stipulation that you notify both DOGM and SBPO if this occurs. Otherwise, you only need one letter. We contacted SIPO about obtaining a new letter-, -and- this is basically what they told us.

I would be happy to talk with someone from Willard City if that is necessary.

Paul Baker
Minerals Program Manager
Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
801-538-5261
Fax 801-359-3940

MEMORANDUM

JONES

ASSOCIATES c:UNSLT1NU L;NUINUERS

To:

Tamara narrative

Box Elder County Planner

From:

Brent W. Slater, PLS

Jones & Associates Consulting Engineers

Box Elder County Engineers & Surveyor

RE:

5 C's Mobile Home Park - Site visit

Date:

May 13, 2010

Andre and I have completed a site visit to the above mentioned Mobile Home Park and have some comments and recommendations:

1. One thing we noticed about this Park is how narrow the road is going into and through the area. There is a lot of congestion with the available parking, etc.
2. The owner of this Park wants to make some of the spaces into RV parking and has shown these pads to be right in the middle of existing, established Mobile Homes which, in my opinion, would not be conducive to the "neighborhood" feel of existing homes.

It is difficult to portray all our concerns and issues with this Site through this memo so I would recommend that the Planning Commission make a site visit to form their own opinions. Should you have any questions please let us know.

MEMORANDUM

ASSOCIATES CONSULTING ENGINEERS

To: Tamara narrative
Box Elder County Planner

From: Brent W. Slater, PLS

Jones & Associates Consulting Engineers
Box Elder County Engineers & Surveyor

RE: Michael K. Munsee Storage sheds - Site visit

Date: May 13, 2010

Andre and I have completed a site visit to the above mentioned Storage sheds and have some comments and recommendations:

1. The sketch provided to us from the developer was not accurate at all. They are not showing, very well, what the distance is from the proposed building to the UDOT right-of-way. As we stepped off the distances, things were not matching up. I think the developer needs to give us a better drawing, one that is more representative of what is there. One that is to scale with more accurate information on it.
2. The driveways are mostly just made from granular material. When it rains, water erodes a channel down the driveway and out into the UDOT right-of-way. There is no culvert, at this time, under the driveway to carry water in the borrow ditch alongside the Highway. Because of this, water doesn't flow as freely to the UDOT inlet boxes as it should. It is my observation that something needs to be done with the storm water runoff from this site. If more storage sheds are allowed, we should require a detention basin to handle the storm water and a culvert under the driveway. They should be able to utilize the storm drain that is already in the Highway right-ofway to discharge their waster. We should also be able to review their building plans so we can see how they plan on handling the run-off .
3. We maybe ought to have the developer receive a new access permit from UDOT. UDOT should decide if anything more is needed for this access onto their right-of-way. Adding more storage units will increase the amount of traffic going in and out of this area.

It is difficult to portray all our concerns and issues with this Site through this memo so I would recommend that the Planning Commission make a site visit to form their own opinions. Should you have any questions please let us know.