

F-2

This page intentionally left blank.

MINUTES
South County Land Use Advisory Committee
Wednesday, September 19, 2012

1. **Meeting called to order** by _____ Melissa Duflock _____ at _____ 7:05 _____ pm

2. **Roll Call**

Members Present: _____ Melissa Duflock, Carla Martinez, Ed Buntz, Bart Bartosh, Debbie Roberson _____

Members Absent: _____ Will Taylor _____

3. **Approval of Minutes:**

A. May 16, 2012 minutes

Motion: _____ Debbie Roberson _____ (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: _____ Ed Buntz _____ (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: _____ 5 (Duflock, Martinez, Buntz, Bartosh, Roberson) _____

Noes: _____ 0 _____

Absent: _____ 1 (Taylor) _____

Abstain: _____ 0 _____

4. **Public Comments:** The Committee will receive public comment on non-agenda items that are within the purview of the Committee at this time. The length of individual presentations may be limited by the Chair.

None

5. **Scheduled Item(s)** – Refer to attached project referral sheet(s)

6. **Other Items:**

A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects

None

B) Announcements

None

7. **Meeting Adjourned:** 8:45 pm

Minutes taken by: Carla Martinez

Minutes received via email September 22, 2012

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee

Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Planning Department
 168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
 Salinas CA 93901
 (831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: **South County**

Please submit your recommendations for this application by: September 19, 2012

Project Title: CALIFORNIA FLATS SOLAR LLC (HEARST CORPORATION)
File Number: PLN120294
File Type: PC
Planner: KINISON BROWN
Location: SOUTHEAST OF PARKFIELD OFF OF TURKEY FLATS RD

Project Description:

Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) a Use Permit to allow the construction of a 280 Megawatt Solar Energy Facility (SEF) on 22 parcels of Jack Ranch; involving the assembly of photo voltaic (PV) solar panels clustered in a series of blocks distributed over approximately 1,900 acres of the approximately 2,675-acre site, an internal electrical collector system, pad-mounted inverters and transformers, two substations, a 4,000 square foot operations and maintenance building, xxx miles of security fencing, lighting, xxx miles of internal access roads, CalTrans right of way improvements at Highway 41 in San Luis Obispo County, and other infrastructure needed to serve the proposed project; and 2) a Use Permit for the removal of 25 protected oak trees; and grading of approximately 470,000 cubic yards of cut and 470,000 cubic yards of fill. The facility will connect to the existing 135 acre transmission line corridor transecting the site that links the Morro Bay Generating Plant (in San Luis Obispo County) and the Gates Substation (in Fresno County). The Jack Ranch property is located in the southeastern corner of Monterey County, south east of Parkfield, east of Turkey Flats Road and north of State Highway 46 (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 143-011-001-000 through 143-011-003-000, 423-191-037-000 through 423-191-039-000, 424-181-013-000 through 424-181-016-000, 424-181-018-000, 424-181-035-000 through 424-181-038-000, 424-191-015-000, 424-191-016-000, 424-201-007-000, 424-201-009-000 through 424-201-011-000, 424-211-001-000, and 424-211-004-000), South County Area Plan.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative Present at Meeting? Yes _____ No _____

John Gaglioti of Element Power (Project representative)
 Denise Duffy of DDA Planning (Project consultant)
 Cliff Garrison, Jack Ranch and Hearst Ranch Manager

Mr. John Gaglioti of Element Power presented material describing the scope of the project and provided handouts to all LUAC members as well as to guests present. He outlined the reason for the project and presented the layout, scope and preliminary nature of this meeting tonight. He addressed questions and concerns of the guests present (see list attached) as well as questions from LUAC members present.

Denise Duffy of DDA Planning (consultant for this project) also answered questions posed by guests and LUAC members present.

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? _____ Taven Kinison Brown _____ (Name)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
W.J. VanBoxtel & Rose VanBoxtel	X		

CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Ann Myhre (Adjacent property owner)			
Jane Wooster (Adjacent property owner)			Does Hearst Corp. have legal access to use Turkey Flats Road View Shed Impact for adjacent residents Mitigations Lands & Tree mitigation (if this will happen and where) Night Lighting (what type will be required and impact on night sky) Restoration (when and to what degree) Potential loss of grazing land should fire occur on project site
Mary Russell (Adjacent property owner)			
Paul Getzelman (Planning Commissioner)			

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
Committee asked that the notification of area property owners be expanded beyond the 300 feet/yard ordinance requirement considering the size of the parcels in this community. It was suggested that all adjoining parcels be included in the notification process.		

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

There is a Parkfield community meeting in which the project representatives have been invited to discuss this project on October 3, 2012. Mr. Gaglioti and Ms. Duffy will advise LUAC members as to the exact time and place and encouraged all to attend.

RECOMMENDATION :

Motion by: Debbie Roberson (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Ed Buntz (LUAC Member's Name)

Support Project as proposed

Recommend Changes (as noted above)

Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: Project is in its preliminary stages of Planning Department approval. Motion was made to continue dialogue with project owner/representatives as project progresses through Planning Department process.

Continued to what date: Undetermined

AYES: 5 (Duflock, Martinez, Buntz, Bartosh, Roberson)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 1 (Taylor)

ABSTAIN: 0

**SUBMITTED PUBLIC COMMENTS
TO THE SOUTH MONTEREY COUNTY LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 19, 2012, 7:00 pm Bradley Union School District Community Building**

**PROJECT NAME: CALIFORNIA FLATS SOLAR LLC (HEARST CORPORATION)
FILE NUMBER: PLN120294**

As private property owners on Turkey Flat Road, we are concerned about the proposed construction of a 280 Megawatt Solar Energy Facility on 22 parcels of the Jack Ranch involving the assembly of solar panels on 1,900 acres adjoining our property line for a distance of approximately one mile, with the entire project taking up an area of over 2,600 acres.

We are sick that the view from our parcel may be a bank of solar panels rather than the wide open space that you see in the attached picture. We are concerned about the amount of dust that will be created during construction, about the amount of water than will be used in the proposed well as it is within several hundred feet of our free-flowing spring, and about increased traffic during the construction period.

This is a quiet and serene area and it now faces an almost overnight change from agricultural to industrial use.

We have several questions and comments:

- 1. Who is Element Power? Is it related to Solargen Energy who is the solar company who has been trying for over two years to build a massive solar energy plant in the Panoche Valley of San Benito County?**
- 2. Will this project get Federal stimulus funds or other governmental funds? It is our understanding that solar projects do not pencil out without massive government subsidies. It has been reported that in the Panoche Valley the developers are looking at receiving \$360,000,000 in subsidies but that the whole photovoltaic world is also supported by scores of subsidies at many levels. We reserve the right to object to this project based on further information we may receive on its funding.**
- 3. We understand that a solar project's goal is to stop any sun from getting to the ground so it can be used instead for energy. We also have been told that the panels are generally so flammable that half a foot of crushed rock under the panels is the industry standard and that the project totally destroys the land. In reality, we have been told, solar "farms" are scorched earth. We object to further agricultural**

property being removed from production and used in this manner, and we are concerned that an accidental fire could destroy adjacent grasslands. Is there a mitigation plan for such an occurrence?

4. The Underwriters Labs standard, as we understand it, calls for the total sterilization of the earth under the solar array. In this county we are currently addressing a Notice of Certification of Total Maximum Daily Loads for Fecal Indicator Bacteria and Alternative Non-regulatory Implementation Programs for Cholame Creek. Since this project is in the Cholame Creek drainage, we would be interested in the response of the Water Board to such planned sterilization.
5. If we have been correctly informed, most solar arrays are made in China. Someone will work briefly erecting them, but in doing so they will take thousands of acres out of agricultural production. How many actual, new, permanent jobs will this facility provide?
6. Is it true that current panels for such a project have a life expectancy of five years? If so, what then becomes of the land and what then becomes of the panels?
7. Where will the mitigation lands be and who will be managing them? On the Panoche Project the California Rangeland Trust will evidently receive \$158,000 a year, in perpetuity, for managing the mitigation lands. Do they have their hand in this pot too?
8. We understand that the County of Monterey will contract with an environmental consultant as regards to this property. We are concerned that a contracted consultant will not be as independent in his decisions as an employee of Monterey County would be.
9. We believe there may be an access issue between property owners at the access on Turkey Flat Road and we are asking that the County request to see proof that the Hearst Ranch actually has title to a legal second access at the end of Turkey Flat Road. Specifically, we believe that approximately 200 yards of abandoned county road, fenced into the Hearst Ranch behind their locked gate, is actually owned half by the Hearst Ranch and half by various members of our family.
10. As a final concern, we question whether adequate public notice was given for this hearing as we understand property owners within 300 feet of the project were notified but other property owners adjacent to the rest of the Hearst Ranch, and property owners adjoining access roads, were not.

Jane Wooster

Ethel Russell

Ann Myhre

Mary Russell





This page intentionally left blank.