1			2
2	APPEARANCES:		
3			
4		JAMES SIMON, SUPERVISOR	
5		JOHN RIGGI, COUNCILMAN	
6		JAMES WHIPPLE, COUNCILMAN	
7		MICHELE HARLING, TOWN CLERK	
8		ANDREW MEIER, TOWN ATTORNEY	
9		CHARLES MALCOMB, SPECIAL COUNSEL	
10		chimile indecine, briefine coondie	
11	EXCUSED:	BRADLEY BENTLEY, COUNCILMAN	
12		WES BRADLEY, COUNCILMAN	
13		WES SHIBEET, COOKSTERMIN	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
•			•

13 14

12

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Town of Somerset resident. And I would like you to really consider the impact you'll make on your decision making. appreciated by so many. And you can see by the crowd here tonight that you have some very educated citizens who are on your side. And I know you will take into account their responses and comments because if we can let Albany know how furious we are by them taking our voice away with Article 10, well, just think what that could do for your little Town of Yates, put you on the map. You could be the first runners in the race against Albany and I give you all my strength and energy to fight them as well as you can with your laws. Thank you, sir.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Elizabeth Wolanyk.

MRS. ELIZABETH WOLANYK:

Congratulations to the Town of Yates Board for proposing these changes to the local zoning laws in the interest of the health and well being of your citizens, local community and the environment. I'm Betty

Wolanyk, Town of Somerset.

You have done an amazing and thorough job to create a comprehensive group of laws to protect the people, animals and the environment from the impact of huge industrial wind turbines.

I would like to address several specific recommendations and suggest some changes for your consideration and I have this in writing. I'll give this to you when I'm done. By the way, before I start, I would like to thank you for the changes that you made to the Town of Yates web site. It's much easier to navigate. You really did a good job and I, for one, appreciate it because I've dealt with the old web site and I wouldn't have been able to find the changes in these laws.

So specifically, Section 1E

Applicability and whatever the word is.

Number nine, I commend this section that prevents the transfer of ownership of this facility without town approval. If God forbid, these industrial wind turbines

abominations are built, this section will keep the town apprised of the sale of the industrial wind turbine facility and like my brother, I agree, this is not a farm. And ensure that the new owner or owners live up to the technical and financial obligations of the ownership and prevent new owners from avoiding any liability.

It also ensures that the original owner meets outstanding obligations and addresses outstanding violations and we know from their past history, that Apex very often sells the facility that they have built even before they are finished building it. So I think this is an excellent provision.

Section 1F, Number 1J, congratulations on demanding a Complaint Resolution Plan and that the industrial wind turbine facility owner would need to address the complaint within 24 hours notice. However, I feel that the second part of that regulation is a little too nebulous to resolve any complaint in a diligent and timely manner.

Considering the length of time that it took

Apex to sign the New York State Code of

Conduct and a concept of diligent and timely

manner is far different from mine and those

of many members of our community, two

communities. I recommend tightening up on

that terminology and perhaps placing a more

formal time limit on it and another option

would be to include a penalty if the

complaint is not resolved in a specific time

frame.

Number 2C, this is a good provision.

And I recommend adding the wording to include some other examples of other hazards such as hazardous waste spill of lubricating oils, water contamination of fire suppressant chemicals, disposal of hazardous waste materials post fire, et cetera.

2E, I hope that information done on any studies would be made public. One of the problems that prohibits an objective analysis of anything having to do with industrial wind turbine whether it's bird and bat mortality, impact on property values such as this provision, or even how much

electricity these industrial wind turbines actually produce compared to their rated value, is that so much of this information is deemed proprietary information by the company and they will not allow its release.

I would like to see this regulation include that the information be made public. In fact, I believe any company receiving public subsidies and funding should be mandated to provide whatever information the public demands so the public can make intelligent decisions as to whether that subsidy is justified.

2F Section is fine. But how will the impact of electromagnetic interference be addressed for all members of the community?

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Can you submit the rest in writing?

MRS. ELIZABETH WOLANYK: I do have one final thing; however, in findings on impact of turbines on food production, I really think that sentence is the only sentence -- that's the only sentence that's crossed purposes and it needs to be rewritten.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Okay. Thank you.

John Wolanyk.

MR. WOLANYK: Thanks again for your time and allowing me to speak. I'll cut it short. I know my sister pretty much said anything that needs to be said tonight at this point, but I'm opposed to the wind turbines and setbacks and I do not trust Apex. They offered us a contract, a family contract, and in that contract, it was quite lengthy. And basically, they weren't responsible for almost anything. And they could also for any leaseholders here tonight, they could also take a mortgage against the property once the project started. So therefore, you could possibly end up with a lien against your farm or your property. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Alice Wolanyk.

MRS. ALICE WOLANYK: I applaud the
Town of Yates for updating these local
zoning laws to protect its citizens just as
the Town of Somerset has done. I firmly

believe that the decision to have or not have industrial wind turbines built in an area should rest in local hands. I am opposed to industrial wind turbines being built in these two communities.

I strongly oppose Article 10 and New
York State telling us what we must live with
and endure. I'm outraged at Article 10. I
cannot believe that more people are not
informed about it and New York State taking
away local control for these decisions that
will have such serious impact on our quality
of life and our health. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. JohnPaul Simon.

MR. JOHNPAUL SIMON: My name is

JohnPaul Simon. I live in the Town of

Yates. I just wanted to say that I'm for

the law because of the impact it would have

on the birds if it wasn't in place. Thank

you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Sharbel Sinn.

MR. SHARBEL SINN: I'm Sharbel Sinn.

I live in Lyndonville. I would just like to say that I'm in support of the law and I would like to congratulate all the people on the committee that formed the law. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Dan Fitzgerald.

MR. FITZGERALD: I'm Dan Fitzgerald with Lighthouse Wind, local office, Barker, New York. Our submitted comments have been reviewed to great detail on many aspects of the law. And I'll save everybody the trouble of going into each of those tonight because there's definitely not enough time for that.

I just wanted to speak on the timing of this. You know, it was January the Town Board passed the resolution to establish the committee to review the law and to potentially come up with a new one. We have been in the community -- well, in Yates since July of 2014. That's when we first met with the representatives from the government here. But as early as November

of 2013, we met with the Town of Somerset folks with the Town Board there and people were aware that we were in town.

July, 2014, was well five months before we had signed the first lease in the Town of Yates. So our presence was known so the Town Board well beforehand. And now, here we are over a year and a half later and there's a proposal to change the rules. It's just rather difficult to accept that somebody's put a lot of time and effort into developing a project to have the rules changed midgame.

Many members of the Town Board have spoken out against Article 10 and claim that you would rather decisionmaking on energy generation projects such as Lighthouse reside in the town and I fully understand that. My earlier work with siting wind turbine projects has been done under the SEQR process usually with the town board as the lead. I believe that that was a much easier way to have direct communication. So I fully understand the position that people

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take on that.

One of the things that concerns me though is that the changes in this law are so onerous and so burdensome that it is the kind of thing that only empowers Albany to keep that control. The law that has been put together is, basically, a ban on a wind turbine project in the town. And again, the detailed comments will show that. But it, basically, leaves us so that it even with an even more restrictive law, there's actually technically no way to connect the turbines electrically. So you've spent a lot of time making a law that is, basically, a ban and you probably could have saved a lot of paper and a lot of people's time by actually just going to a ban rather than writing a law that just makes it impossible technically.

Another thing that the Town Board has failed to do is to participate in the Article 10 process. I'll give you one example. In October, we first sent a letter to the Town Board asking for information in regard to visual impact assessment,

basically, asking you know, what are the places, what are the things that concern in the town that you want us to take into consideration as we put together our studies. And this is preliminary to our preliminary scoping statement because you know that the town has some good ideas. The towns I worked with before, you get your quick ones, the churches, the schools, town hall, the ball fields, everybody knows pretty much what those areas are and then we learn usually about some special places that weren't as obvious.

A follow-up request was sent to the Town in October of 2015, by our consultant, ESX. We received no response to that either. In February of 2013, we sent yet another letter asking for visual impact assessment points. And we, finally, did receive a reply. The first reply was we reserve the right to keep this open and suggest anything at any time and more recently, we got a request for an extension of 90 days.

So as we try to bring the Town into the process, we asked the question in September, that is not a monumental question and here we are now in April, almost May, without having any follow-up from the Town on that other than to ask for a further delay.

So what I'm trying to say is, I would like to work closely with the Town. I would like to work to put together the studies that need to be done and again, these actions and this law are the things that do empower Albany to say this is unreasonable. This is burdensome and therefore, we feel we need to control that. I think it would be a better use of the Town's time to put together a law that addresses their concerns but shows responsible effort on the part of the Town's people so that this could become a local controlled process again. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Deborah Arlington.

MRS. ARLINGTON: Town of Yates. I'll just say that I support the law and I

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

commend you for your hard work. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Okay. Tom

Arlington.

MR. ARLINGTON: Tom Arlington, Town of Yates property owner. Thank you, again. Having previewed the Local Law Amendment of Wind Energy Facilities Law of 2008, I find that the law well written having served and worked in code enforcement zoning for 30 plus years, I read a lot of local laws and I think the town committee, whoever worked on this, has done a very good job to help protect the Town of Yates and guide them with these types of projects. And I would urge that the Town Board adopt this local law. I was going to stop there, but the Lighthouse Wind Project seems to have a problem with this proposed local law, whining about this project. All I've got to say is, it's our local law. Deal with it. Do what you got to do. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Bruce Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm going to pass again.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Okay. Thank you.

Pam Atwater.

.

MS. ATWATER: Pam Atwater, Barker.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak.

I support the Local Law to Amend the Wind

Energy Facilities Law of 2008 and the time
and effort that's put in by the committee

members to draft this. I understand they
are taking into account information that

wasn't available when the law in 2008 was
put into place because obviously, the size
and potential impacts of the industrial wind

turbines have changed significantly in that

time period and also there's lot of
information from other siting around the

world that's available now.

The proposed law has many provisions in place to help protect public health, safety, welfare of its residents, minimize impacts on the community and environment. I'm sure I speak for many here tonight that say they had no intention in researching, learning so much about industrial wind turbines as we all have in the past year. I know I'm by no

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

means an expert, but I know enough to have some serious concerns and many of these areas have been addressed in this proposed I'm not going to get into the detail of a lot of my concerns, but a lot of them include the health impacts, noise standards, setbacks, low property value protection, impacts on animal species, particularly, birds and bats.

It, again, appears to be a very strong law, but I hope if you are considering any enhancements in the future, that you always err on the side of caution. I looked at this, if this project were to go through, that we are going to be living in the midst of a living experiment. I don't want to be living with affects that we haven't anticipated.

There's nothing more important than protecting the citizens of your community from potential harm.

Again, very frustrating with Article 10 process because it's taking away the authority the Town has to approve or

disapprove of wind projects. As we are all aware, surveys in the Town of Somerset and Yates have shown overwhelming opposition to this project.

County Legislatures-Niagara, Orleans and Erie Counties representing 1.3 million residents have opposed this project.

Concerns from Niagara and Orleans

Counties Departments of Health have been expressed. Senator Ortt and Assemblyman Hawley have voiced their opposition and concerns shared by the Western New York Senate and Assembly Delegation members.

The Great Lake Seaway Trails have
expressed its opposition of the project
along its scenic byway. Environmental
groups are opposed including Federation of
Monroe County Environmentalists, Genesee
Valley Audubon Society, Rochester Birding
Association, Hawk Migration Association of
North America, the American Bird
Conservancy, which recently named this
project as one of the ten worst sited wind
projects proposed in the country. The U. S.

Fish and Wildlife Services stated the risk to wildlife could rise to severe levels should this project be sited here.

Just today, I learned Niagara U. S. A. Chamber's opposition to this industrial wind project. And also about Randolph, New York, that just denied a special use permit to install a MET Tower for Atlantic Wind LLC. This is just an example of another town trying to respond to some of the projects. I will give you copies of these. I have them here.

Your decisions relative to wind energy in the Town of Yates will have an impact on the entire area and I thank you, again, for work on this law.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you.

MS. ATWATER: And I have some comments from a couple other people.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Chris Bronson.

MS. BRONSON: Chris Bronson, Barker.

Measurable, irrefutable, conclusive,

demonstrable, fixed, verifiable, empirical,

these are scientific words. The only

that these towers measured 620 feet high or thereabouts. That's science. That's taller than the HSBC Tower in Buffalo. That's science. That's provable. The only thing that I can say for sure is that I know in my heart that these kinds of things don't belong in our fields, around homes where people live and that's not science, but I will use science to show that I do not want these things where I live. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Donna Riggi.

MS. RIGGI: Donna Riggi, Lyndonville.

For well over a year I've listened with true appreciation to a number of people who have commented on how long they have lived here including many who have been born here. I think another perspective is also warranted. I was not born here. My father was in the military so we moved often as I also have done as an adult. I have lived in three countries and 13 states, but I chose here to move.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We spent over two years looking before we found our home here. We did not choose to make our home here in the middle of an industrial wind factory. And if I wanted to live in the middle of 70 skyscraper tall buildings, I would have chosen to life in New York City. So how can Apex be upset with this law? It can't be because of property value guarantees. They have repeatedly told us that our property values won't decrease. It certainly cannot be the baseline health study. Again, they have repeatedly said that there are no negative health affects. Despite evidence to the contrary, they proclaim the people complaining about them from around the world are exaggerating what are merely annoyances. So that leaves us with the setbacks, but the setbacks being required by the town are actually under average compared to other communities. If Apex says that these very basic setbacks equal a ban as they said to Somerset, that's on them. What that really means is that this project is improperly

sited. It means that they did not do their homework.

They are trying to place the largest turbines ever built in an area that is too populated. The setbacks would not be a problem if that weren't true. There are communities and even countries that have setbacks in access of a mile or more to protect their populations. These setbacks pale in comparison, not to mention the increasing number of communities that are now actually banning these projects all together due to the overwhelming and the negative affects they have. If only we had that right.

In fact, the only places that have industrial wind turbines without complaints from nearby residents are those projects that are not near people. When Apex says that there are few complaints at most wind projects, it is because most of then are sited in sparsely populated areas like north Texas and Iowa. Rural New York is twenty times more populated than those areas. In

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

projects that are in more populated areas, guess what, there are complaints and lawsuits.

Frankly, in light of that, I wish the setbacks were even further. It's time for Apex to acknowledge their mistake. They chose an area that is too populated, an area rich in wildlife, natural scenic beauty and tourism. A place too close to the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station and a place in the middle of one of the largest migratory bird flyways in North America. It is time they listen to five different surveys, two town elections and the resolutions based by three counties and two town boards. It is time to heed the concerns expressed by the American Bird Conservancy, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Orleans County Federation of Sportsmen's Club, the Great Lakes Seaway Trail, the Hawk Migration Association of North America, the Niagara County Board of Health, the Genesee Orleans Board of Health, the Rochester Birding Association, the Genesee Valley Audubon

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Association, the Federation of Monroe County Environmentalists, the Nature Conservancy, Mercy Flight, the Niagara Chamber of Commerce and the Western New York Delegation of the New York State Senate and House. It is time to leave.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Tanis Bolick.

MS. BOLICCK: Thank you. I had occasion this last winder to drive across country. And I haven't done that in a lot of years. For any of you who have done it recently, there are wind turbines out there, thousands of them. They are not as big as the ones that are proposed for here. Because when I stopped and asked, the people told me that knew of those turbines, they were 450 to 520 feet tall. They looked huge to me. And there were hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of them. Some of them were down. Some of them had fallen over when we saw it. I don't know how long they have been there, but nobody seemed to be picking them up.

22

23

24

25

When I got back, in February, I had occasion to sit down and go on the web site and read about the proposed law. The only thing I'm concerned about are the setbacks not being adequate enough in terms of the size of these turbines. I think you guys did a phenomenal job in revamping the 2008 law to what you're proposing now and I commend all of the people that are on the committee. All you have to do is see hundreds of turbines in an area where there are no homes to actually feel the affect of what -- if you can imagine them in an area where there's residents and houses and animals, and our beautiful lake, then it's just an unimaginable thing. So thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Ann Smith.

MS. SMITH: Ann Smith, 11081 Lake

Shore Road, Lyndonville. I, too, would like
to thank you for all your hard work that you
guys have done developing this new wind law.

I, too, agree that I don't think the

setbacks are quite far enough. That's my one complaint about this. I've got many objections to industrial wind turbines. My main concern is health issues. I've met and talked to people who live by wind turbines that are hundreds of feet smaller than the ones proposed here in the Town of Yates.

The people have experienced sleepless nights, dizziness, headaches, nauseousness, vertigo, ringing in the ears, increased and high blood pressure. They can't sell their property and why should they have to.

My husband and I have owned our property for 32 years. We even invested much time and money and hard work into our property. I fear that our home will become worthless along with our neighbors' homes if these turbines are allowed to go in.

A study was conducted by Clarkson
University School of Business and they
concluded that the Town of Henderson located
in the Thousand Islands could face a total
loss of 40 million in property values
because of the view of the turbines. They

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also stated that any other towns along the shoreline with characteristics similar to Henderson's would likely experience the same loss of value.

There have been two town surveys taken in the Town of Yates. Both times between 60 and 70 percent of the people said no to the turbines. What's happened to our country, our state and our town when a company from out of state can come in and dictate to us what will become of our town? I believe that wind turbines are a spasmodic energy source. Would you want your loved ones on a respirator powered by one? I think not.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Peg Schwabel.

For the

MS. SCHWABEL:

Thank you. opportunity to speak to you tonight. fully support the amendment to the Town of Yates Wind Energy Facilities Law of 2008. By enacting this law, you are helping to protect this community from the risks associated with turning a rural community into an industrial wind turbine complex. You have done your homework and you have

done it well.

Over the past year, we have learned much about the wind industry. We have seen misrepresentations in advertisings and letters and in the omission of information provided by those commissioned by the Wind Energy Developers to do their studies. Half truths and omissions leave a town no course but to develop measures to protect the residents.

Over the past year, the voices of residents across the globe have risen in protest, but the wind developers press on at all costs. You have addressed many key issues including sound, setbacks, health and procedural requirements among many others.

Wind developers and the developers seeking to invade Somerset and Yates talk of robust studies and such studies are required by Article 10.

But ask them to do it, as evidenced by the developer's comments to their PSS filing, they frequently announce, the component or study is not a requirement of

Article 10 or they acknowledge the comment or simply state that they will provide a review of the literature. Further, they seek to ban representatives of the citizens from technical meetings. This is not robust. It is a demonstration of indifference to the affect these structures will have on Somerset and Yates.

Those who do not live in these communities will not bear the brunt of what happens here. The majority of jobs will be temporary and only a few estimated to be, from what we hear, less than ten, but the damage will be permanent and affect every aspect of community life. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Cynthia Hellert.

MS. HELLERT: Cynthia Hellert,

Lyndonville. As a member of the ad hoc

committee appointed to study and revise

Section 591 Wind Energy Facilities Law, I

wish to provide to your attention the

enormous amount of time and energy that went

into this proposal. If anything should be

changed in my opinion, this law should be more restrictive and provide greater protection. Not only has technology advanced significantly since the original law was drafted, but the aggression of wind companies such as Apex who will stop at nothing to become rich from our hard-earned tax dollars has increased dramatically. They care nothing about any of us.

The purpose of the law is to protect
the public safety, health and welfare, to
regulate structure that promotes protection
of Yates residents, to minimize adverse
impacts on the Town's character,
environment, economy and property values; to
minimize negative impacts on our unique
resources. Look at the wording here. Why
do we think we need protection? Because
companies such as Apex will destroy anything
in their way to achieve their goal of making
money. If wind companies are allowed to
invade our town, our lives will not resemble
what we have now.

I have visited with people who are

personally affected by improper placement of turbines. I have read testimonies of those I could not personally visit. I went to numerous homes in Iowa where there are turbines and spoke to the people who were affected by them.

I have spoken on the phone with the medical adviser of the Brown County
Wisconsin Board of Health, Dr. Jay Tibbetts, and to Audrey Murphy, the President of Brown
County Board of Health; even Chua Xiong, the former director of that Board of Health.
Before Chua was bought out by politicians and the wind company, she personally suggested to me that a baseline health study was the missing link in every court case where residents attempted to fight for their health and safety.

Why do we need a baseline health study?

Because the onus of proof that industrial

wind turbines cause health problems would be

on the wind company. The wind companies

already know the answer and will, therefore,

fight tooth and nail to prevent such a

study.

I attended the Niagara County Board of
Health meeting where Apex hired consults to
try to convince the Board of this.

Apparently, they paid Mr. Christopher Ollson
enough money that he forgot his previous
presentations where he emphasized the
importance of a health study prior to any
construction of wind turbines in residential
areas.

There are many conflicts that discount the reliability and integrity of a company such as Apex. We must remain vigilant. I have done my homework. And I will continue to do so until Apex leaves town honoring the wishes of the majority of our residents.

I applaud this Town Board for taking action to protect the residents of Yates. I support the enactment of this law. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Kathy Evans.

MS. EVANS: Kathy Evans, Yates. I support the amendment to the Wind Energy Facilities Law of 2008. And I would like to

sincerely thank everyone who has been working so hard for the sake of all the town residents to modify our Wind Energy
Facilities Law. I was especially grateful to see that the setbacks have been revised from one thousand feet from the nearest offsite resident to a minimum of 4.5 times the total height of the turbine, but even that is not enough. For turbines 600 feet high, twenty-seven hundred feet is only half a mile and is still too close to residents' homes.

The closer people live to wind turbines, the more likely they will experience noise annoyance, have sleep disturbance and develop adverse health affects from the low frequency noise and the infrasound especially in rural areas where background noise levels are low. There's also serious safety concerns from blade throws, ice throws and fires. Many places in the United States and throughout the world have extensively researched this issue and have setbacks greater than half a mile

in order to protect the health and safety of the residents in their communities. The health affects section needs to be stronger and should include a baseline health report of all the willing residents of the Town of Yates in order to determine what health issues have been caused if the wind turbines are erected and what course of action would be taken to resolve them.

The Real Property Value Protection Plan is another important inclusion in the new law in order to protect residents who may suffer from wind turbine related health issues and be forced to sell their homes. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Agnus LaPort.

MS. LAPORT: I wondered why the existing law needs to be changed. A hundred years ago most traffic laws probably were out of date as most transportation was horse and buggies. First, automobiles did not go very fast. No more than many of them.

Drivers did not need to pass a driver's test or have a license or insurance.

- -

Fast forward to today, the traffic, imagine what a mess it would be if we had no traffic signs or laws. Times change. Many years ago when the Town of Yates adopted the windmill law, there's weren't as many expected and they were much smaller. And huge turbines who would forever alter the character of a community were totally unthought of.

With constant changes in today's technologies, all laws must be watched and changed as needed. I applaud the Yates Town Board for protecting the community. As I read the proposed changes, one that I'd like to comment on is the interference with TV reception, et cetera. This would be extremely burdensome to many retired people on social security who rely on antennas. They can't afford to pay for Direct TV and/or have no access to cable. We all reside far away from city life. We put up with many inconveniences in return for the peaceful life in this countryside. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Paula Simon.

MS. PAULA SIMON: I'd like to thank
the Board for letting me speak. There were
so many good speeches already that I cut
mine in half. So instead I can use my whole
three minutes on bats. They are not only
cute, but they are very important to our
community because of the economic impact
they have on agriculture, as well as an
environmental standpoint.

It is a well known fact that turbines kill bats. But why in such high numbers? I was able to do some research and I was able to communicate with Paul Cryan, he's a Biologist from the U. S. Geological Survey, which is a nonbiased government agency. He and his colleagues have been doing research about bats and their behavior at wind turbines for a long time. They have on-going studies. There's research that points to an unusual phenomenon. Tree dwelling bats are actually attracted to wind turbines. The MET Towers are not going to

give accurate information about bat behavior near wind turbines. I've talked to people at the DEC. They can only agree with Apex's information that they submit that they submit something that is true. So if Apex says, we got great information. Five bats passed our MET Tower on this day, but they don't know if that's one bat or five bats. If it was a hundred passes, they don't if it was a hundred bats or one bat passing a hundred times. They do not have enough surveillance.

In the studies that I found just with the U. S. Geological Survey, they used four types of surveillance including infrared cameras and and different scientific devices that I have no clue about. But these are scientists. These are biologists. Like I said, it was a nonbiased United States Governmental organization that's doing this research.

The other issue that I have about bats is that in our area, we already have a very significant threat to bats with White-nose

Syndrome. Certain bats are on the endangered species list. And we had a problem with the White-nose Syndrome and that whole colonies of bats can be wiped out. If they are affected in that way, along with the turbines, we actually have a problem with two different species becoming extinct.

The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service is right on the brink of listing two more types of bats as endangered and they are in our area. So I'd just like the Board to consider making very strong laws with the understanding that we will get more scientific information about bats and other wildlife. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Dennis Seekins.

MR. SEEKINS: I graduated from Medina High School 60 years ago, went to college for a couple years, flunked out. Went in the air force. They give me training in computers and electronics I stayed in for the rest of my life. There worked on the

guided missile systems. When I got out and everything and I got a job and there's a point to my personal history believe me.

When I got out, I got a job. I worked five years with the Navy's big Research

Development Lab. After that, I spent 15 years in NASA in the hype of the space program. After that, it was more big, you know, massive computers.

Starting about 25 years ago, I started a rare used book business. Now, this is a particular point I want to make here. When I was working for NASA, we had scientific colloquialisms every Friday from 5:00 to 6:00. We had guys like Edward Tell, the Father of the Hydrogen Bomb, Buckminister Fuller, the geodesic dome guy and everything. The Leakeys, the researchers in Africa, one of the people talking there, this is 40 years ago. He is talking about the potential for global warming. He's saying we don't have to worry, but the potential is there and everything, you know. He said we need to start studying it because

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scientists know whether there have been -- a lot of times it only takes about a matter of decades to change climate drastically. We tend to think this stuff is going to be centuries, thousands of years. Not so. In some cases it's decades.

Now, my main point of everything is the thing that is not talked about here is the thing about global warming. There may be a lot of bad side affects on this, but nothing is going to compare if the ocean rises ten feet. Like I say, I've had a lot of contact with scientists, you know. In all this time my used rare book business probably monthly I'm selling a book to a rare book library, to a scientist. I just sent a guy in Popaheti a book about malus of Popaheti. He'd been looking for this thing for 15 years. Couldn't find it. He says, Dennis, if you were here, I'm kiss you on both cheeks. I have faith in what the scientists say. They're about 98 percent sure that global warming is a problem. And I haven't heard that thought here today at all. I

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

appreciate the opportunity to make the comments.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Pam Shirback.

MS. SHIRBACK: I'm going to pass. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Taylor Quarles.

MR. QUARLES: Good evening. My name is Taylor Quarles. I'm working on the Lighthouse Wind Project. We have an office in Barker. Before I talk on the law, I just want to outline the time line of our work within Somerset and Yates. We first spoke to Supervisor Engert in December of 2013. Then appeared in Board minutes in November 2013. It was five months before we signed a lease in Somerset. We first spoke to Supervisor Belson in Yates in July of 2014, and was then, once again, nearly five months after that initial meeting in December when we signed our first lease in Yates. Since that first landowner signed up, we have approximately eighty-five hundred acres and well over a hundred landowners who have

chosen to participate in the project. I encourage every potential landowner before they choose to participate to visit one of the 22 wind farms that are currently operating in the State of New York. There's over 40,000 in the country. So they have lots of opportunities to visit.

A full year after that first initial outreach, we followed our PSS. We then went to the full year of -- excuse me, our PIV. We then went to a full year of that public involvement planned activities that included opening an office in Somerset, hiring local employees. I sponsored both of the state, county fairs and had a great time for two weeks at the fair. Had many positive conversations about wind energy there. Over a year later, we filed our PSS. We received over eleven hundred comments and we responded substantively to all of them.

The next process ahead of us is the Stipulation Process. It's the last process before we file applications. We look forward to productive meetings with all the

different parties including the Town, the

County in order to develop a thorough and

comprehensive application. So now,

approximately 31 months after we first spoke

to Somerset, over approximately 22 months

after we first spoke to the government in

Yates, there's new law being proposed.

Thorough analysis of this law, which I will offer you, shows that in effect, it's a wind ban. So I'm not going to go into every point, but the 13 page analysis and several maps and setback maps I'll offer will demonstrate this is not a thoughtful law which is open to wind energy, but instead, a ban on the project.

Now, it seems like it's targeting the project I'm proposing, but certainly, it would apply to any other project that's proposed in the future and restrict the ability of the Town to enjoy the benefits of a project.

I'm going to touch on these two issues in the law. Firstly, it defines wind energy conversion systems. It's including all

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

infrastructure and electrical lines, substations, access roads and et cetera. So they all apply to the setbacks, meaning that there's no physical way to connect the turbines to one another. Thus, it being a ban.

Second is the Town's overreaching control on landowner's property rights. law states building permits shall not be issued for new construction on the same parcel as permitted WECS. It then goes onto define a structure as walls, fences, signs, shed, billboards, poster panels, docks or similar construction types. So the result here is that any one of the landowners who own, you know, close to nine thousand acres who chose to participate, largely, the agricultural community in this area would not be able to, you know, for instance, build a new barn, impoundment for water on agricultural property, an addition to a home, a fence around an agricultural paddock. So in my opinion, this is a vast overreaching of the Town's zoning authority.

It's inconsistent with the Town's

Comprehensive Plan. These and many other provisions of the law are clearly intended to restrict landowners' rights and prohibit the chance for a wind project to ever be constructed. Any reasonable analysis of this law shows that numerous provisions are unreasonably burdensome and some of them have questionable legality.

Due to the points I've raised and numerous other shaky provisions that we've noticed within the law, I'm going to present them tonight and I would encourage the Board to keep this public hearing open so that they can have time to consider what you've provided and potentially, make changes to the wind law based on the information we have provided.

I really look forward to continuing to work within both communities in developing a project that can deliver benefits for many years to come. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Cathy Orr.

24

25

MS. ORR: I thank you for all your hard work also. I think that you have done a great job. I have to also agree not with Taylor Quarles this time but with the people talking about the setbacks. I don't believe they are far enough away. Besides the fact of the increase in height, you have the spinning of the blades and when blades break off, which is what they usually do, they have been noted in smaller turbine studies such as the Town of Bethany had done, to be able to fly twenty-six hundred feet. would be tips or come down. There's ice There's a lot of issues besides just shear. the fact of, you know, the site. And so I would advise you to follow the World Health Organization recommendations for which started at a mile and a quarter and keep in mind that is for smaller turbines.

And I also wish that Apex would take the hint and take a fast flight out of here. Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Georgette Stockman.

MS. STOCKMAN: Hi, thanks for an

opportunity to speak. Georgette Stockman,
Town of Yates. I wanted to make comments
about property values. In the introduction
to the new revised Wind Energy Facilities
Laws, Section 16 talks about Utility-Scale
Wind to Energy Facilities, when improperly
sited, may adversely affect property values
and therefore, cause economic hardship to
property owners.

And number 17, says that the Town of Yates contains clusters and stretches of homes as well as dispersed residences, which residents have chosen as their homes often because of a love for the rural pastoral lifestyle.

Forbes Magazine addressed this concern in an article entitled, Do Wind Turbines
Lower Property Values? September 23rd, 2015.
And sought out individuals not paid by or with financial interest in wind projects for answers. It cited the Appraisal Journal in 2012, a Dr. James Talmers qualified as an expert witness in over twenty states, found that residential properties near

transmission lines sold for twenty to fifty percent less than comparable residential properties.

Also cited was a North Ontario Real
Estate Development Broker, John L. Goodwin,
who reported that wind turbines absolutely
impact property values. Turbines complicate
your property enjoyment, period. That alone
spells depreciated value. They will also
cause a significant loss of real estate
value. For our area, especially Lakeside
homes, property enjoyment is a major reason
for purchasing the property.

In 2013, an Ontario Superior Court of
Justice determined that landowners living
near large wind farms do suffer from lower
property values with the court accepting a
22 to 55 percent reduction. Michael McCann,
of McCann Appraisal LLC, in a letter to
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory of
December 14th, 2009, commented on the report
the lab had released about housing values
located near the Mendota Hills turbines that
are located in Lee County, Illinois. And

his quote is, the deterrent to sale of the homes directly attributable to the wind farm project is well understood by the local realtor who had the listings and who, at the time of my communication with you, had reported to me the consistent rejection rationale of over a hundred otherwise interested would-be buyers and their agents. Interest that evaporated once potential buyers visited the properties and saw the nearby and surrounding turbines.

The Mendota Hills project consists of 63 operating wind turbines. Each wind turbine stands 214 feet tall and has three 85 foot long blades. So that's about a third of the height of the proposed turbines for Lighthouse Wind. Clearly, there is a very legitimate concern that property values and therefore, tax revenues will be adversely affected by any wind turbine project proposed for the Town of Yates. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Richard Fisk.

1920

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FISK: I just have a suggestion maybe the Town Board could check out that maybe could please everyone here in the audience, those for and those against. I'm just wondering when I turn on Channel 4 News in the morning, I see all the wind turbines in the back. How they get away with it? see fishing boats underneath them fishing, but I don't think they'd be there if the fish were all dead. I've received no reported deaths on the TV about it. And land values don't seem to be going down because they are building like crazy all the way around there. So if the Town Board could investigate that and see how they get away with that or how they do it, then maybe we could solve the whole problem here. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Stacy Pellicano.

MRS. PELLICANO: Hello, again. I want to, again, like everybody else applaud your efforts to amend the wind laws. We went to purchase our property. We thought we had done quite a bit of homework. We purchased

in October of 2014. We derived all the information that was on the web site and we have since heard that there were conversations going on about wind turbines in this area when we purchased. Had we known that, we would not have purchased and in fact, we are considering another piece of property down the road. It's a big investment for our family, but we are waiting and hoping, it will still be available when, hopefully, the wind turbine project goes away.

My concern, obviously, we feel that our home is priceless. So we aren't really worried about the property value. We are worried about the fact that we may not be comfortable living there and obviously, property value is an issue if you can't sell it. We plan to keep it in our family God willing and pass it on to our children. So my concern is, obviously, setbacks. I think that while I respect your efforts, I think that they are not significant enough for me to be comfortable to expose my children to

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wind turbines for any significant amount of time.

And that leads me to my next conversation. I understand that there's a concern regarding timing. A few years ago, a few summers ago, we had some breakins of vehicles in our neighborhood. And of course, we had alarm system in our house that we cannot set. And there were some loose change stolen, some CD's, some DVD's, pretty harmless. I'm not sure what the statistical probability would be that those thieves would then come in our homes, but we weren't willing to take the chance. And so now daily, we set our alarm when we come and go. We set our alarm when we sleep at night to keep our family safe and I feel like this amendment to the wind law does the same thing for our community. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Brian Fisk.

MR. FISK: I'm passing.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: He passed. Okay.

Barb Lutz.

MRS. LUTZ: I pass.

3

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Pass. Okay. Ed

4

Lutz. Would you like to speak? Okay.

5

MR. LUTZ: Ed Lutz, Town of Yates.

6

I'd like to oppose the windmills officially.

7

I don't see any positive aspect for those

8

windmills in this community. Thank you.

9

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Rebecca

MS. WINTERS: Thank you. I want to

10

Winters.

11

12

tell you all that I'm very much in favor of

honored by six of our area farmers with

13

the Lighthouse Wind Project. And I was

14

15 letters that they supplied in their absence

16

tonight because they are busy taking care of

17

18 that there's enough misinformation on both

19

sides. And I had intended to let you know

their properties. And it would seem to me

20

that I was going to read one of the letters.

21

You've asked us not to so I'm going to

submit these letters to the Board.

22

23

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Okay. Thank you.

24

Howard Pierce.

25

MR. PIERCE: I will try to keep this

to three minutes. My name is Howard Pierce.

I was on the committee to help write this

law. So I'd like to give the people some

history how this was done.

At the Town of Yates annual organization meeting this year, Mr. Simon and Mr. Riggi added a new committee called a Sustainability Committee making Mr. Simon, the chair, and Mr. Riggi, a member. This committee was to review Yates Local Law No. 1 Wind Energy Facilities 2008 and develop the Draft Law Number 1, which was nothing more than a recently passed Somerset Wind Law with Barker and Niagara County still in the law in many places. This could be called plagiarism.

The Town of Yates Board passed

Resolution Number 37-216 in January

establishing the membership of the ad hoc

task force and charter. On 18 February

2016, I received a letter from Mr. Simon

asking me to serve on the ad hoc task force.

At first, I was honored to serve. The task

force was to meet Saturday, 27 February,

2016, and Saturday, March 2016, 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Before the meeting on the 27th of February, the Town Board was to have a special meeting to appoint me to the task force because I was not on the original list. The task force in general was to provide advice to the Yates Town Board on recommended changes, updates and/or amendments no later than 7 March, 2016.

The first morning we had a round of introductions. It didn't take me long to figure out the committee was loaded with SOS members, which in my opinion is a special interest group that appears to be taking over our town at this time.

I had what I thought were three easy questions. Russ Martino was the town supervisor when the first wind law was written in 2008. How long did it take to write that law? Answer, about two years. Mr. Riggi, as President of SOS, you helped write the new Somerset Wind Law. How long did that take? Answer, six months.

The Ad Hoc Task Force is being asked to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do the same thing in eight hours. What's wrong with this picture? Mr. Simon's first statement was, this new wind law is not about Apex or against Apex. Anyone reading this law can draw your own conclusions, but my opinion is that that's exactly what the law is and does.

Once we got to work, my first statement was, needed to write a law that wasn't unduly burdensome. Mr. Spitzer, our town attorney, took a half hour to explain unduly burdensome, but as you can see, the committee ignored Mr. Spitzer's advice. Ιn doing wind turbine research for the past 10 to 12 months, Mr. Spitzer's name, working with several counties and towns, kept coming up over and over in the past 10 or 12 years. After working with Mr. Spitzer on this law, I truly believe we have one of the most knowledgeable wind attorneys working with I would especially like to thank John Belson, our previous town supervisor; Board Members Wes Bradley, Brad Bentley and Jim Whipple for that.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

In writing a new wind law, we need to listen to Mr. Spitzer and heed his advice. Once we got to work, the procedure was for Mr. Simon read the recently passed Somerset Law, and Mr. Riggi sounded very much like the president of SOS, adding his comments.

Section C: findings-new proposed wind The Town of Yates is a rural agricultural community supporting varied agricultural uses and is in the heart of Western New York's fruit growing region. Ben Atwater pointed out to the Somerset Town Board, Somerset is a right to farm community. On behalf of my farming friends in the Town of Yates, I would like to point out to this Board that the Town of Yates is a right to farming community.

Section F, applications for Wind Energy Convergent Systems. A report analysis on affect in the air space above the town. Two SOS myths, the town's turbines would affect Mercy Flight. I'm enclosing a copy of a letter I received from the Director of Operations from Mercy Flight. The only

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

thing Mercy Flight requests is that the coordinates of latitude and longitude of newly constructed towers and windmills be handed to them, relayed to them as early as possible so they can plot them on their hazardous map. They fly around existing farms with no trouble in the Southern Tier.

The wind turbines would affect the Niagara Falls Air Base. I have spoken to Mr. John Cooper, Base Public Service Relations Officer and the Base Commander, and they see no problem now or in the future. The two main missions of the base now are flying of drones overseas and return of the KC-135 tanker refueling wing. served in the air force from '63 to '67. Mr. Simon, as a retired air force officer, you know we have the best damn pilots in the world. And I'm sure they would rather fly around a few windmills than some anti-aircraft guns.

The first thing that any wind farm does in siting their turbines is to have their first conference with the FAA and DOD.

March, Russ Martino was appointed by

Governor Cuomo to the Electric Generating

Site Board. Congratulation, Russ. He was
here earlier.

After being appointed to the Article 10 Siting Board, Russ was absent for the second Saturday at the Ad Hoc Wind Task Force meeting. In my opinion, that is so Russ can sit on the board in Albany and say he had nothing to do with writing this unduly burdensome law.

The second Saturday was spent working on the part of the law that governs
Utility-Scale Wind Energy Facilities. One of the first things we worked on was setbacks. And originally, Yates law the setbacks were 500 feet from roads, property lines and villages, a thousand feet from residents.

Mr. Riggi produced a bunch of graphs comparing setbacks. The trouble with the graphs were many of the setbacks were from UK, Denmark, Scotland, Quebec, Germany. You get the picture. One setback on the graph

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was very interesting to me. It was Yates County of New York.

For those of you who don't know, Yates County is a rural agricultural community supporting varied agricultural uses and it's in the heart of the Finger Lakes grape growing region. Penn Yan, New York, is a county seat nestled in the Finger Lakes. 12 miles south of Penn Yan is a little village called Dundee. This is where I grew up on a family dairy farm. I know my parents would have welcomed turbines on the farm for their many benefits, green energy, stable farm income, reduce taxes for the farm and our neighbors. Yates County setbacks are 2,000 feet from residences and ten hundred and fifty feet from roads and property lines. Mr. Riggi's own information. Maybe if we had wind turbines, I'd still be on the family farm.

One thing the committee did agree on was using a multiplier times the height for distances. This is where agreements ended with a committee member on one side of the

_

table and one on the other side the table.

I thought I was at a cattle auction. 1.5,

2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, all the way up to the six.

And appears the average across the state is anywheres from one and a half to maybe three. As you can see in the proposal, the setbacks are much greater.

Two other issues I have with the proposed law are the health affects section, meaning the baseline physical aspect and the real property value section. According to Mr. Spitzer, our own attorney, no one yet has won a health issue lawsuit against any wind farm. My issue with the real estate section is that no one knows what real estate values are going to be in twenty years or thirty years with wind turbines or without wind turbines.

After listening to Mr. Spitzer's definition of unduly burdensome, I believe this law will be challenged at the site board in many years.

So in rewriting this wind law, why not be selective and rewrite one or two areas.

I'm sure when the siting board challenge areas of the wind law as written, Mr. Simon and Mr. Riggi will spend thousands of our tax dollars on attorney's fees, money that the Town doesn't have. This law could have been written in ten words, no utility scale wind turbines in the Town of Yates. That's exactly what this 32 pages has done.

So in growing up my dad taught me three things, respect your parents and the law. I have a problem with the law. If you are going to do something, take the time to do it right. Sorry dad, I tried, but this law isn't right.

If you put something down, then you better have a solution. My solution, throw this proposal law out. Start over with a new committee made of residents representing the whole town including farmers, not just SOS members. Write a new law down the middle respecting the term unduly burdensome that won't have to be tried in court, saving the town taxpayers' money.

In closing, in my opinion, when writing

this law, Mr. Riggi, you acted very much like still like the President of SOS. I know you have said that you're not, but actions speak louder than words.

Mr. Bradley, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Whipple,
I urge you to vote no on this new proposed
law. I feel we can do better and the Town
deserves better. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Harold Scribner.

MR. SCRIBNER: I pass.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Jim Bansbach.

MR. BANSBACH: Hi, Jim Bansbach, Town of Yates. I would like to thank the Yates Town Board for amending the Wind Energy Facilities Law 2008. Our knowledge of potential hazards and problems associated with large scale wind turbines has increased dramatically since the original law was passed. More importantly, Governor Cuomo has changed the rules since 2008 by implementing Article 10 in an attempt to prevent local governments from stopping him from achieving his desired goals even if it comes at our expense. I feel we need to

protect ourselves and our community from potentially bad decisions made at the state level. And that's why I feel it's important to amend the wind law and thank you, again, for doing so.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Faith Basil.

MS. BASIL: Faith Basil, Yates. Just before I start, just a fun fact and I always tell everybody this because no one can believe how big these wind turbines are going to be. If everyone is familiar with Eastern Hills Mall, Transit Road, in Williamsville, Sheridan Drive, we will be able to see the wind turbines from Sheridan Drive overpass in Williamsville. Without even squinting you'll be able to see them.

Okay. Here's my spiel. When I hear
the name Lighthouse Wind, my mind scatters
so many concerns I don't know which one to
put first. Our health, will I be able to
overcome the constant thump of turbines?
I'm a light sleeper. Will my sleep be
impacted, in turn, my health impacted? Will
the calming affects of living in the country

be gone? Will we lose the darkness with the constant flashing of the lights on the turbines at night? And what about our ability to go outside and see the meteor showers, the space station? And what about this name sake of Lighthouse Winds, Golden Hill Lighthouse? The beacon on the lighthouse will be dwarfed by the industrial wind turbines hulking behind it. All the time and effort put into its restoration by the community for what? So we can climb to the top and look at our beautiful countryside scarred with industrial wind turbines and access roads cutting through the fields and orchards.

What is the impact on my property value? Who will pay top dollar for property in a rural community that has giant industrial wind turbines spinning at random times of the day and night? Is it still considered for agriculture or will it become an industrial community with one product, hot air.

One thing that makes some of the

pro-wind's annoyed is our avian population.

I'm not willing to excuse the death of our avian friends and I do not want to witness or hear a flock of geese encounter an industrial wind turbine. I am pretty sure I would never forget the sight or the sound of it.

The young Bald Eagle my neighbors and I have been watching over the last few years.

Will we see him mature to a full mature

Eagle or will he be just another kill statistic? Are we really going to forever change our community in the name of industrial wind? I support the revised wind law. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Mike Basil.

MR. MICHAEL BASIL: Mike Basil from Yates. I support the law that's going through. And I want to, again, point out the setbacks. When we are looking at these six to seven megawatt generators, 600 feet in the air, the initial research I'm doing right now, is they're anywhere from 40 to 48

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

percent louder than 400 footers.

So we are talking about setbacks. got to talk about the setbacks. But more importantly, we keep ignoring the fact that right now we are in pursuit of clean renewable energy. We get a hundred percent -- or almost a hundred percent of our energy right now from clean renewable energy. are we going through all this? We don't need this project. We already know these turbines last around twenty years or less. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to an out of state company that is taking all our tax money for a project we don't need. When we talk about this project, we also need to talk about the fact of what's going on in the real world.

I spoke at the Board meeting the other day and I'll say it again. Apex sits here right now and after it's been so, obviously, pointed out, this is totally the wrong wrong location for this project, totally. And yet they are willing to sit here and tell us we're being over burdensome to their

accomplishment of their project. And yet, they sit there right now and they open a wind farm about a year ago in Oklahoma and in that short time, they are already facing lawsuits for everything that we are talking about here and yet they continue to push on.

So I commend you for the law. We need to do our homework. And like I said earlier, the biggest information we need to seek out is the information that Apex is not giving us because there's so much concealment going on and all they care about is the dollar, stealing our tax money and raping our community. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Larry Wolf. Larry Wolf left.

MR. WILLIAMS: Rob Williams, Lakeshore Road, Yates. I support the amendment to the law. I think it's the way to go. I don't think this is the right place for these things for all of the reasons that have been said. And I don't think the setbacks in the law are enough. I want to state that.

From a property value perspective, I

can speak directly to that. My house on
Lakeshore Road is for sale. My airport is
not, but my house is for sale. I've had
some potential buyers, unique house. It's a
high end house. I've had some very
interested people. Two of them have already
said, you know what, we really love this
house, but with this wind project thing
going on, this is not the right time for us.
I've had two potential buyers say that. So
I can speak directly to the property values
in terms of that. It has an affect. People
don't want to deal with it. I support what
you are doing. And thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Thank you. Bonnie Hartway.

MS. HARTWAY: I'll pass.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Okay. David Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: David Robinson, Yates.

I'd just like to say a few things. We,
obviously, know that we live in a really
special area, very beautiful area. The area
is special for a number of different

24

25

reasons. It has Niagara Peninsula located, of course, between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. It has a really nice fetch for wind. It has a fetch in front and a fetch behind and that's why the prevailing wind is so great. And that's what makes it a good location for a wind farm as far as efficiency is concerned. Anyone that's been here in the Blizzard of 77, clearly, you know that, right? You feel the wind daily in the last few months. And the thing is that the reality of the situation is that, of course, you've brought up many good issues. The issues that are brought up, they all can be studied. If you look at many of the studies that I've seen, they are not as controversial as they may seem here. And a lot of the things I've heard this evening are very fear based, which is understandable, because, well, change is hard. But the reality of the situation is that the world is changing. And it's called climate change. And I'd like to thank you for pointing that out, but the thing is, 80

percent of the scientists of the world, the climate is changing. And we need to do something about it.

So the thing is that even a geologist having studied this for so long, the biggest environmental cost that we have for birds, you know, every single creature on the Earth is our climate. It literally is connected to the last five great extinctions in the last 500 million years.

In the last five great extinctions, 251 million years ago, it was called the Great Dying. It was called the Great Dying because 95 percent of all creatures on the Earth in the sea and on the land died permanently. All of them gone. And it was directly tied to the production of carbon dioxide and climate change and the other four are directly tied to that as well.

Right now, we are doing things to the world that are causing environmentally cataclysmic and potentially very dangerous world events. Just off the coast of Greenland and Iceland, there is just for the

last two years a very large cold -- you can call it a blob of the North Atlantic Ocean. It's the only place in the world that is not warming. And the reason it's the only place in the world that's not warming is because the ice shelf and the glaciers of Greenland are melting so fast that it's creating a less dense part of the sea. It's the same thing that happened 251 million years ago and the rest of the extinctions, the dinosaurs, sure it's linked to an asteroid or comet that created volcanic eruptions that put CO2 in the atmosphere that started this whole cycle of death.

Today is the only time it's caused by a species and the species is us. We are the cause of this extinction that we're going through. And this extinction that we're causing, we have a moral duty to do something about. Since we live in this special area that has a great fetch of wind potential and energy that can provide electricity for sixty thousand homes, that can do a little bit in the grand scheme of

things.

I think we have a duty to our children to do what we can and I think if we don't, our names, your signatures, us, we are going to be on the wrong side of history and that saddens me deeply.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Roy Thearing.

MR. THEARING: I pass.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Jennie Robinson.

MS. ROBINSON: I just want to say that I strongly oppose this law. I oppose this law and I want to add that I really think that I find -- as I'm sitting in here, I find that I really think a lot of us have a fear of what it's not normal, when it doesn't look like everyday things to us. You know, it seems like sometimes we get fear of humans that don't look the same. Even a car, for example, if it doesn't look normal. You know, so I think that we have to be a little bit more open-minded and think about the children, the future.

And like they were saying, global warming for example. I worry more about the

water we are drinking at home. And when it comes to the noise, there are people at Walmart working everyday that are going with their purchase. I don't know if you have been there, but that thing rings all the time. I will get sick in the store with my ears working in that store from that noises. I will worry about my kid if they were working in there than a wind farm.

I live on 104. It's very noisy in there. And I really think wind farms are actually breathtaking if you think about it if we look at it that way and I understand that there are tourist people that come in this area, but in the future, if we are thinking about global warming, tourists are not going to save us, you know.

If we are going into a future of pollution and having our kids sick, today we are having so many problems with our kids.

If you look at school, we are having a lot of kids with learning problems and we don't know why. And don't you think it could be pollution? And something is going on with

our children today. And I worry about about that.

I really worry about the water I'm drinking at home every day and there are a lot of old farm houses that I swear their pipes are old and who knows how the water is. So I worry about those things.

And I think a cosmetic part of the town, we've been so used -- we get so used to looking at one thing all the time and we get so fearful of the change all the time.

And also, those guys over there from

Apex. They're pretty cool. They're pretty

nice. If you have questions -- I mean if

you have questions, you can go and ask them

and they will answer you questions, you

know. And that's the same with the other

group. I think you guys are pretty cool.

If I have a question, I can go ask instead

of things getting lost in translation. It

seems to me as I'm sitting observing people,

things get lost in translation.

And we are a community. And that's when we should come together and work

MR. GATES: Good evening. My name is Mark Gates. I didn't come here planning to speak tonight or anything written. I'm speaking from the heart. My family and I bought our place on Lake Ontario eight years ago in the Town of Yates. Four years later, we went through the process of your Board. Doubled the size of it, increased the property value and increased our taxes. Like so many people on that lake, that is our home. It is going to be our retirement home.

mortgages, but they get by and also rent out their property to other people so they can help pay their bills. If those wind turbines go in, nobody is going to rent that property. Nobody is going to go to the Golden Hills State Park and camp. Nobody is going to go to Eyndonville during those summer months and frequent all the shops and the stores, the little fruit and vegetable stands on the side of the road. All those businesses are

going to suffer because of the wind turbines.

I appreciate the work you guys have done. The setbacks are not far enough. I have worked over twenty years as a police officer, six years on the JTTF and the Buffalo FBI office. I'm looking forward to my retirement on the beautiful shores of Lake Ontario without wind turbines. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: Vince Mulholland.

Is he still here? Is there anybody that

hasn't had a chance to speak that would like
to say anything?

Okay. Public comment is closed. Like to have someone move for a motion to close the public hearing on the proposed Local Law Amending the Wind Energy Facilities Law of 2008?

MR. RIGGI: So moved.

MR. WHIPPLE: Second.

SUPERVISOR SIMON: It's moved and seconded. And any discussion amongst the Board? Seeing none, all in favor say aye?

CERTIFICATE

I, DOREEN M. SHARICK, do hereby certify that I have reported in stenotype shorthand the proceedings of the Public Hearing on the Adoption of a Local Law to Amend the Wind Energy Facilities Law of 2008, held at the Lyndonville High School Auditorium, 77 Housel Avenue, Lyndonville, New York 14098, on April 21, 2016.

That the transcript herewith is a true, accurate and complete record of my stenotype notes.

Doreen M. Sharick,

Notary Public.