






## Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart


### Chapter 12 Energy Element - PC Final Markup 1-26-12


Plan Alternative		Chapter 12 Energy Element		Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
<b>12.4 Goals</b>					
A	B		<p><b>E-G1. Countywide Strategic Energy Planning.</b> An effective energy strategy based on self-sufficiency, development of renewable energy resources and <u>energy</u> conservation that is actively implemented countywide through <u>Climate Action Plans</u>, <del>local</del> General Plans and the Redwood Coast Energy Authority's Comprehensive Energy Action Plan.</p>	<p>Staff recommend edit to tie Energy Planning to Climate Action Planning</p> 	R
			<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B		<p><b>E-G2. Increase Energy Efficiency and Conservation.</b> Decreased <u>energy</u> consumption through increased energy conservation and efficiency in building, transportation, business, industry, government, water and waste management.</p>		R
			<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B		<p><b>E-G3. Supply of Energy from Local Renewable Sources.</b> Increased <u>local</u> energy supply <del>from a distributed and diverse array of renewable energy sources and providers available for</del> <u>and local</u> purchases <u>and export</u>. <del>from a distributed and diverse array of local renewable energy</del></p>	<p>Staff recommend edit for clarity and to</p>	R

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				sources and providers.	include export as a goal. 	
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			<del>E-G4. Local Management of Energy Supply.</del> Increased local control, management, and ownership of energy sources with greater diversification and competition among suppliers.	Staff recommended deletion to avoid redundancy with E-G3.	D
				COMMENTS:		
A				<del>E-G5. Self-sufficiency in Energy Use.</del> Move toward Self-sufficiency in energy use, with maximum reliance on local renewable resources for local energy needs.		D
				COMMENTS:		
<b>12.4 Policies</b>						
	B			<del>E-P1. Land Use and Development Review.</del> The County shall provide incentives for discretionary and ministerial development incorporating renewable energy sources, energy conservation and green building measures above mandated levels consistent with this Plan.	Staff edit to extend incentives to ministerial development. <b>Prog, IM-1,5</b>	D See alt A


Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
						
				<p>COMMENTS: 9-15-11 (Commissioners Disiere, Masten and Nelson excused)</p> <p><b>Straw Vote:</b>                      Commissioner Disiere – supports the B version (submitted written testimony).                      Commissioners Faust, Kreb, Edmonds and Gearheart support A version.</p>		
A				<p><b>E-P1. Land Use and Development Review.</b> The County shall adopt a residential and commercial energy conservation ordinance that establishes energy conservation incentives and performance standards exceeding state mandates for building construction, retrofit and sales.</p>		<p>R                      Straw vote                      4-1</p>
				<p>COMMENTS: see discussion under Alternative B.</p>		
A	B			<p><b>E-P2. Oil and Gas Development.</b> Oil and gas development shall be permitted consistent with the following:</p> <p>A. The development is performed safely and consistent with the geologic conditions of the well site.</p> <p>B. New or expanded facilities related to such development are consolidated, to the maximum extent feasible and legally permissible, unless consolidation will have adverse environmental consequences and will not significantly reduce the number of producing wells, support facilities, or sites required to produce the reservoir economically and with minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p>C. Such development will not cause or contribute to subsidence hazards unless it is determined that adequate measures will be undertaken to prevent damage from such subsidence.</p> <p><u>D. Hydraulic fracturing for release and recovery of hydrocarbons is prohibited.</u></p>	<p>QJ, S-1,2,4</p> 	<p>M                      Straw vote                      6-0</p>



Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – I would like to add “prohibit fracking” with a definition added to the glossary (staff suggested including this under S2)  <b>Staff to return with new wording for S2 and definition on “fracking”.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-22-11</b> At the 9-15 meeting, the Commission discussed adding a prohibition on “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing as a method to release hydrocarbons), and possible financial assurances to ensure restoration. The Commission also noted some language problems with “CEQA applications”, and that some items were informational requests and some were standards. Based on the Commission’s discussion staff recommended the following revision of E-P2 and standard E-S2:</p> <p><b>E-P2. Oil and Gas Development.</b> Oil and gas development shall be permitted consistent with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The development is performed safely and consistent with the geologic conditions of the well site.</li> <li>B. New or expanded facilities related to such development are consolidated, to the maximum extent feasible and legally permissible, unless consolidation will have adverse environmental consequences and will not significantly reduce the number of producing wells, support facilities, or sites required to produce the reservoir economically and with minimal environmental impacts.</li> <li>C. Such development will not cause or contribute to subsidence hazards unless it is determined that adequate measures will be undertaken to prevent damage from such subsidence.</li> <li><b>D. Hydraulic fracturing for release and recovery of hydrocarbons is prohibited.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>All support changes proposed by staff.</b></p>		


Plan Alternative		Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	B	<del>E-P3. Local Management and Ownership of Energy Supply. The County shall support energy development projects including biomass, wind, solar, and ocean energy, consistent with this Plan that increase local management and ownership of energy supply and decrease expenditures for imported energy.</del>	Staff edits to place emphasis on support for projects that decrease the need for imported energy. Pol, IM-2,5,7	D
		<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> would like to add "run of the river hydro" to this policy (staff suggested adding this after "solar"). All okay with this.  <b>Straw Vote:</b>  <b>Commissioner Disiere – supports the B version (submitted written testimony).</b>  <b>Commissioners Faust, Kreb, Edmonds and Gearheart support A version with the addition made by Commissioner Kreb.</b></p>		
A		E-P3. <b>Local Energy Supply.</b> The County shall support energy development projects including biomass, wind, solar, <u>"run of the river" hydro-electric</u> , and ocean energy, consistent with this Plan that increase local management and ownership of energy supply and decrease expenditures for imported energy.		M Straw vote 4-1
		<b>COMMENTS: see discussion under the B Alternative</b>		
A	B	E-P4. <del>Transportation Energy Conservation and Alternative Fuels Substitution. Revitalization and Reinvestment in Existing Resources.</del> Support revitalization and infilling of Urban Development Areas to reduce long-term vehicle miles traveled as an energy conservation strategy. <u>Support the development and implementation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations to encourage substitution of alternative fuels for plug in electrical sources.</u> Favor rehabilitation and revitalization of older existing buildings over replacement when doing so would conserve energy resources.	Staff edited for clarity. Leg, Pol, IM-2 	M Straw vote 6-0

Plan Alternative			Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> – public comments asked for EV charging stations – where does that fit?  <b>T. Hofweber (TH)</b> – IM-14 would get you there.  <b>Staff to return with wording to support electrical charging stations as an alternative fueling station. All support.</b></p>		
			<p><b>Comments 9-22-11</b>                      Staff provided the following recommended changes:  <b>E-P4. Transportation Energy Conservation and Alternative Fuels Substitution. Revitalization and Reinvestment in Existing Resources.</b> Support revitalization and infilling of Urban Development Areas to reduce long-term vehicle miles traveled as an energy conservation strategy. <b>Support the development and implementation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations to encourage substitution of alternative fuels for plug in electrical sources.</b> Favor rehabilitation and revitalization of older existing buildings over replacement when doing so would conserve energy resources.   <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>Approved as rewritten with Jim Zoellick’s recommendation for charging stations.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>		<p><b>E-P5. Regional Energy Authority.</b> Recognize the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) as the regional energy authority, which will foster, coordinate, and facilitate countywide strategic energy planning, implementation and education through a <u>Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy</u>. <del>Direct RCEA to administer the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy.</del></p>	<p>Edited to introduce the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy and eliminate redundancy with E-P6.  <b>Prog, IM-2</b>  </p>	<p><b>R</b>  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>4-0</b></p>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> asked staff why we recommended deleting P6.  <b>TH</b> – we believe that P6 is overly prescriptive but P5 is consistent with the JPA with RCEA.  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> – maybe this is something the Board should review and decide.  <b>C. Krebs</b> – I agree that rural areas are treated differently – how are they represented here?  <b>TH</b> – The BOS has a seat on the RCEA Board so the County is represented.  <b>C. Faust</b> – is the CAPE in draft form now (yes) – if it was adopted now, what is the authority over citizens now?  <b>Mathew Marshall (RCEA)</b> – everything we do is voluntary. This document is now on our website. The draft is programmatic and not policy based. We look at opportunities to implement the policies in the energy element. This is a guiding document that prioritizes our activities. Some things we already do now.  <b>C. Krebs</b> – are there opportunities for other groups to participate in this plan?  <b>Mathew</b> – certainly, our meetings are public and we are open to all ideas. Ryan Sundberg is the county rep – contact him for rural areas. We try to serve all areas of the county.  <b>C. Faust</b> – is CAPE intended to apply to structures only on the grid?  <b>Mathew</b> – no – certain utility probate programs people have to be on the grid to participate, but there are other programs that are implemented county wide.  <b>C. Faust</b> – is the CAPE binding on rural residents?  <b>Mathew</b> – no – our programs are voluntary – our goal is to make sure that everyone can participate if they would like.  <b>C. Faust</b> – I don't know what is controversial about P5 – I don't know why anyone would be against having the urban areas be energy efficient. I would like a more complete report from staff on how it does or does not support the rural areas.  <b>D. Girard</b> – when RCEA did the background technical report – staff felt the energy element was appropriate in the GPU – and other was needed in a voluntary plan (CAPE).I did not see a rural bias.  <b>C. Krebs</b> – I would have to respectfully disagree with Mr. Grover and would support this without waiting for more information from staff.  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> supports also, and would like to see the CAPE when it is done.</p>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>C. Edmonds</b> – I still have the concerns with the CAPE (There is a draft on the website. We can incorporate rural issues).</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – does the RCEA plan need approval by the BOS?</p> <p><b>Matthew</b> – it does need to be approved by the JPA that has a Board representative. Any programmatic requirements would need to be approved by our board. All activities in the CAPE are already under our purview in our JPA.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – what I think Mr. Grover’s comments were indicating is that the representation from the Board of Supervisors on the RCEA Board for the CAPE is not adequate. If the CAPE has binding standards we should discuss.</p> <p><b>K Girard</b> – there are no regulatory standards in the CAPE.</p> <p><b>TH</b> – if there were, they would have to go to the BOS for approval.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – I can support P5 as written.</p> <p><b>c. Edmonds</b> – I can support P5 as written.</p> <p><b>Straw Vote:</b>  <b>Commissioners Faust, Kreb, Edmonds and Gearheart support E-P5 as written.</b></p>		
A	B		<p><del><b>E-P6. Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy.</b> The County shall assist in the implementation and align its energy strategy with the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy, as amended.</del></p>	<p>Prog, IM-2  </p>	<p><b>D</b>  <b>Straw Vote</b>  <b>4-0</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Staff</b> recommended deletion.  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – I don’t see P6 as being incongruent with P5; P6 directs the county in assisting in the implementation in this.  <b>TH</b> – that is what IM 2 says; I don’t think you need both.  <b>C. Kreb</b> recommended deletion based on staff’s recommendation.  <b>All support deletion.</b></p>		
A	B		<p><b>E-P7 County <u>Government</u> Energy Consumption.</b> The County <u>government</u> shall reduce building and transportation energy consumption by implementing energy conservation measures and purchasing renewable energy and energy efficient equipment and vehicles whenever cost-effective. Conservation and renewable energy investments should be</p>	<p>New staff recommended policy on County</p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>4-0</b></p>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				planned and implemented in accordance with and performance-based action plan and County Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction goals.	energy conservation. <b>Prog, IM-3-4, S-8</b> 	
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Staff</b> added the word "government" in title and first sentence.  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – I don't oppose this but I think there should be a separate policy that applies to the private sector.  <b>TH</b> – look at P1 (A version) and P10.  <b>C. Faust</b> – the county has an active role in the transportation policy in private sector and I don't believe P1 addresses that.  <b>TH</b> – P10 does.  <b>All support as revised by staff.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<p><b>E-P8. County Building Design Standards.</b> Design, construct and operate all new and renovated County-owned facilities to U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) "Silver" or better energy efficiency standards consistent with State Executive Order S-20-04, <u>or to similar California Green Building Standards.</u></p>	<p>New staff recommended policy on County energy conservation.  <b>Prog, IM-3-4</b>  </p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>4-0</b></p>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Staff</b> recommended revising the last sentence to allow for consideration of other standards.  <b>All approve as revised by staff.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<p><b>E-P9. Electrical Transmission.</b> Promote <b>PG&amp;E funded</b> capacity upgrades to <b>main</b> electric distribution lines to facilitate distributed renewable energy production and electricity export from the county.</p>	<p>New staff recommended policy on transmission capacity. <b>Pol,</b></p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
		IM-2 	
	<u>(NEW) E-P9x. Electricity Buyback. Support revisions to the electricity buyback program that encourages more distributed local generation and more equitably compensates such generation.</u>	New – added by PC on 9-22	<b>M Straw vote 6-0</b>
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – I would like to address the active discouragement from PG&amp;E on individuals who produce power and sell back to PG&amp; E. We are faced with an unregulated monopoly that impedes individuals producing energy and trying to market any excess power. Don't want to concentrate on main electrical systems. This policy should go further.  <b>K. Girard</b> - We can modify addressing the grid and fair use of distribution lines.  <b>C. Kreb</b> – suggests using “optimal distribution lines”  <u>Staff to return with revised language.</u></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-22-11</b>                  During the 9-15 meeting, the Commission discussed the fair use of electrical distribution lines and requested a revision that promotes the production and buy back of excess power by individuals to PG &amp; E. Based on the Commission's discussion staff recommended the following revision of E-P9 and new policy E-P9x:</p> <p><b>E-P9. Electrical Transmission.</b> Promote <b>PG&amp;E funded</b> capacity upgrades to <b>main</b> electric distribution lines to facilitate distributed renewable energy production and electricity export from the county.</p> <p><b>(NEW) E-P9x. Electricity Buyback.</b> Support revisions to the electricity buyback program that encourages more distributed local generation and more equitably compensates such generation.</p> <p><u>Straw Vote:</u>  <b>All support P9 as revised by staff and new Px.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	<p><b>E-P10. Transportation Management Plans.</b> Major commercial, business, industrial, or mixed-use facility developments shall be required to submit a transportation management plan that addresses energy conservation measures such as connectivity to alternative transportation modes; preferential parking for carpools, vanpools, motorcycles, mopeds, and bicycles; shuttle services; alternative fueling stations; transit passes; bike lockers; and locker-room facilities. <del>Management plans should include policies to encourage local employers to offer flex time and/or shifting work schedules that minimize employees' impacts on peak hour traffic and provide incentives for employees to use alternatives to the single occupancy automobile mode of travel.</del></p>	QJ	M Straw vote 4-0
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> read Commissioner Disiere's comments into the record.  <b>C. Gearheart</b> – I read this and thought it was a wonderful policy for a more urban area.  <b>C. Kreb</b> – I think this is a great policy until you get to the last sentence – I recommend deleting. I would then support.  <b>C. Faust</b> – it doesn't look like an appropriate place to address my concerns in P7 – the key concept that is missing is the connection to land use. The elephant in the room here is vehicle miles traveled (VMT). I would like to deal with that.  <b>TH</b> – land use maps are different for each alternative. We had a consultant review the VMT for each plan. These are a key component to the plan with the VMT issue. There are some policies in circulation that deal with VMT also.  <b>K Girard</b> – the first policy in the air quality chapter deal with this through the Climate Action Plan. I would support TH's discussion regarding the land use maps and climate action plans (GHG emissions).  <b>C. Faust</b> – I don't think that the major developments in the County are going to be in large mixed use subdivisions (like Forester – Gill) in the future. Large land owners are working hard to do division of land and do "ranchettes". This type of land use pattern doesn't help the county when looking at energy and climate change impacts. I don't know how we say you can't do this type of land use pattern. I would support decreasing rural densities to address this. Not through a management plan.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>C. Edmonds – I agree with C. Kreb that last sentence should be deleted.                      Chair Gearheart and Faust okay with that also.  <b>Straw Vote:</b>                      Commissioners Faust, Kreb, Edmonds and Gearheart support A version with the last sentence deleted as suggested by Commissioner Kreb.</p>		
A	<p><b>E-P11. Energy-efficient Landscape Design.</b> Require energy-efficient landscape design in development projects, subdivisions, and in new and existing streets and parking areas in order to reduce impervious surfaces, minimize heat and glare, control soil erosion, conserve water, and promote pedestrian safety and vehicular traffic calming measures.</p>	QJ	R Straw vote 3-2
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>                      Staff introduced an Alternative B version that says “encourage” instead of require in the staff report as follows:  <b>E-P11. Energy-efficient Landscape Design.</b> <del>Require</del> Encourage cost-effective energy-efficient landscape design in development projects, subdivisions, and in new and existing streets and parking areas in order to reduce impervious surfaces, minimize heat and glare, control soil erosion, and conserve water, <del>and promote pedestrian safety and vehicular traffic calming measures.</del></p> <p>Chair Gearheart – I’m in support of trees; studies show that the presence of trees reduces crime and has a calming effect. I am going to support the A version and request that you add “clean the air” back in.                      Th – I struck it out because I thought it did not relate to energy, but I don’t have a problem keeping it in.                      C. Faust – I like the word “require” and support the A version.  <b>Straw Vote:</b>                      Commissioners Disiere (submitted written testimony) and Edmonds – support the B version.                      Commissioners Faust, Kreb and Gearheart support A version as written.</p>		
A	<p><b>E-P12. Municipal Purchasing and Procurement.</b> Encourage the purchase and use of administrative supplies and building materials made from recycled materials and renewable resources whenever cost-effective (considering life-cycle costs). Follow principles of energy-</p>	Prog	D

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				efficient source reduction and resource recovery for County operations, and promote these principles in the community.		
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>				<b>E-P13. Water Efficiency.</b> Promote the efficient use of water in residences, businesses, industries, and agriculture by requiring water-saving plumbing and landscaping devices in new developments, plumbing-related remodels, or upon change of ownership.	<b>QJ</b>	<b>D</b>
	<b>B</b>			<b>E-P13. Water Efficiency.</b> Promote the efficient use of water in residences, businesses, industries, and agriculture by requiring water-saving plumbing and landscaping devices in new developments, <u>or</u> plumbing-related remodels, <del>or upon change of ownership.</del>	<b>New – introduced on 9-15-11</b>	<b>R Straw Vote 4-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Staff</b> introduced an Alternative B that says removes point of sale removal as follows:</p> <p><b>E-P13. Water Efficiency.</b> Promote the efficient use of water in residences, businesses, industries, and agriculture by requiring water-saving plumbing and landscaping devices in new developments, <u>or</u> plumbing-related remodels, <del>or upon change of ownership.</del></p> <p><b>All support the new B version.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>				<b>E-P14. Incentives for Using Alternative Energy.</b> Provide incentives to encourage the use of renewable energy and environmentally preferable distributed energy generation systems in the county.	<b>Prog</b>	<b>D</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		


Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A				<p><b>E-P15. Wind Energy Overlay Zone.</b> The County shall develop a wind energy overlay zone to protect potential wind energy sites identified as having "excellent" wind energy potential by the California Department of Water Resources in their Humboldt County Wind Resource Map (1985).</p>	Leg	R Straw vote 4-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> – there were some changes suggested by Mr. Zoelnick I would like to consider.  <b>K. Girard</b> – he recommended the ability to do "district heating". We wouldn't do that through a zone overlay. We could just recognize the potential in the plan and return with language to support this.  <b>All support E-P15 as written.</b>  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> – what about transmission lines?  <b>Girard</b> – our grid in Humboldt County is limited. Our ability to export is also constrained with the line that connects us to larger energy grid. Our biggest constraint is our internal grid.  <b>TH</b> – RLWG noted the proximity of wind energy to transmission lands should be considered.  <b>Jim Zoelnick</b> – the technical analysis is mostly complete regarding our grids. This is leading to a strategic plan on renewable energy and energy efficiencies.</p>		
<b>12.5 Standards</b>						
A	B	C	D	<p><b>E-S1. Oil and Gas.</b></p> <p>Development associated with onshore oil and gas wells shall be conditionally permitted by a conditional use permit in agricultural, timber, rural lands, industrial general, and resource-related industrial land use classifications.</p> <p>A permit will be required for each drill site and a separate permit will be required for production facilities. Additional wells proposed for an approved drill site may be administratively approved provided that they can be accomplished within the limitations</p>	QJ	R

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				and conditions of the original use permit for the drill site.		
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – how are cumulative impacts handled under this?  <b>K Girard</b> – if you can locate in an area already developed with an existing well pad, impacts have already occurred.  <b>All support as written.</b></p>		
A	B	C	D	<p><del>E-S2. Application and Initial Study Information Requirements and Standards for Oil and Gas Energy Exploration or Extraction Projects. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) applications for oil and gas exploration or extraction projects shall include the following:</del></p> <p><u>1. Applications for oil and gas energy exploration or extraction projects shall include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. A plot plan for the entire area under lease or ownership, showing the relationship of the proposed facilities to ultimate potential development, and a map showing the relationship of contours, buildings, structures, and/or natural features.</li> <li>B. A description of the relationship of the proposed facilities to existing facilities.</li> <li>C. Procedures for the transport and disposal of all solid and liquid wastes to meet discharge requirements of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB).</li> <li>D. Grading plans and procedures for minimizing erosion.</li> <li>E. Where public views are affected by production facilities, landscaping plans and measures for minimizing visual impacts.</li> <li>F. Fire prevention procedures.</li> <li>G. Air emission control measures.</li> <li>H. Oil spill contingency procedures.</li> </ul>	QJ	M Straw Vote 4-2

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>I. For production facilities, a phasing plan for the staging of development, indicating an approximate anticipated timetable and production levels for the project.</p> <p>J. Procedures for the abandonment and restoration of the site, which provide for removal of all equipment; disposal of wastes; and re-contouring, reseeded, and planting to conform to surrounding topography and vegetation.</p> <p>2. Drill sites should generally not be established at a density greater than one per 80 acres.</p> <p>3. All solid and liquid wastes shall meet the discharge requirements of the NCRWQCB.</p> <p>4. Projects shall meet all applicable air quality regulations.</p> <p>5. All earthen sumps or other depressions shall be regraded to restore the area to its original condition.</p> <p><u>6. Hydraulic fracturing for release and recovery of hydrocarbons is prohibited.</u></p> <p><u>7. Financial assurance requirements may be imposed on the property owner at the discretion of the Planning Commission to ensure site restoration consistent with 1.J. above.</u></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Krebs</b> asked why the limitation for wellheads to 80 acres.  <b>TH</b> – it is based on the geology and a recognition for the need to consolidate well heads.  <b>Krebs</b> – I support that. What about fracking?  <b>K. Girard</b> – this should be a new Item “O” with language requiring evidence that recovery methods do not include infraction. Under E-P2 – add an item D that states “hydraulic fracking for lease is prohibited”.  <b>C. Faust</b> – why CEQA reference in the first language? (staff to look into that).                      Also, L, M and N all seemed to be behavioral standards – just didn’t seem to follow. May want to divide into an new standard with reference to conditions of approval.  <b>TH</b> – these have been in our coastal plans for a long time.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>C. Faust</b> – regarding item J – industries have abandoned sites without doing cleanup – there should be a requirement to do this with financial assurances.</p> <p><b>C. Kreb</b> – noted that the income to be generated from ag operations long after the oil and gas are gone is great and should be protected.</p> <p><b>Chair Gearheart requested that staff bring this back regarding the CEQA reference, adding an new Item O and address restoration under Item J.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-22-11</b></p> <p>The Commission discussed adding a prohibition on “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing as a method to release hydrocarbons), and possible financial assurances to ensure restoration. The Commission also noted some language problems with “CEQA applications”, and that some items were informational requests and some were standards.</p> <p>Based on the Commission’s discussion staff recommended the following revision of standard E-S2:</p> <p><b>E-S2. Application and Initial Study Information Requirements and Standards for Oil and Gas Energy Exploration or Extraction Projects.</b> <del>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) applications for oil and gas exploration or extraction projects shall include the following:</del></p> <p><b>1. Applications for oil and gas energy exploration or extraction projects shall include :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K. A plot plan for the entire area under lease or ownership, showing the relationship of the proposed facilities to ultimate potential development, and a map showing the relationship of contours, buildings, structures, and/or natural features.</li> <li>L. A description of the relationship of the proposed facilities to existing facilities.</li> <li>M. Procedures for the transport and disposal of all solid and liquid wastes to meet discharge requirements of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB).</li> <li>N. Grading plans and procedures for minimizing erosion.</li> <li>O. Where public views are affected by production facilities, landscaping plans and</li> </ul>		


Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>measures for minimizing visual impacts.</p> <p>P. Fire prevention procedures.</p> <p>Q. Air emission control measures.</p> <p>R. Oil spill contingency procedures.</p> <p>S. For production facilities, a phasing plan for the staging of development, indicating an approximate anticipated timetable and production levels for the project.</p> <p>T. Procedures for the abandonment and restoration of the site, which provide for removal of all equipment; disposal of wastes; and re-contouring, reseeding, and planting to conform to surrounding topography and vegetation.</p> <p>2. Drill sites should generally not be established at a density greater than one per 80 acres.</p> <p>3. All solid and liquid wastes shall meet the discharge requirements of the NCRWQCB.</p> <p>4. Projects shall meet all applicable air quality regulations.</p> <p>5. All earthen sumps or other depressions shall be regraded to restore the area to its original condition.</p> <p>6. <u>Hydraulic fracturing for release and recovery of hydrocarbons is prohibited.</u></p> <p>7. <u>Financial assurance requirements may be imposed on the property owner at the discretion of the Planning Commission to ensure site restoration consistent with 1.J. above.</u></p> <p><b>PC Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>C. Kreb</b> – this meets with my requirements for financial assurances.</p> <p><b>C. Gearheart</b> – why wouldn't we just say we want financial assurances? (staff - Sometimes the cost exceeds the benefits for a small project).</p> <p><b>C. Masten</b> – wouldn't that be defined elsewhere? Implementation?</p> <p><b>K. Girard</b> – you could require this for all projects and exempt in a subsequent ordinance. Then you have to have another ordinance. We would recommend that you use our SMARA process so we don't have to write a subsequent ordinance. This is your choice – if you think that every project needs one look to IM7.</p>		


Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>C. Faust</b> – I am interested in what a minor project would be where the cost of the clean up is minor. Most projects I have seen always mess up the land.</p> <p><b>C. Masten</b> – I think there should be some kind of scale. Applicants should know ahead of time. I have a problem with it. I want to know what the criteria is before I can approve it.</p> <p><b>K. Girard</b> – if you want to do a oil and gas ordinance you could put in the parameters. If you don't want an ordinance than you need to design here or allow on a case by case basis. Example is exploratory well. Not much impact – wouldn't require financial assurance.</p> <p><b>C.. Edmonds</b> – the owner is going to experience the inconvenience and would require a clean up. What is the police power? (would be on the owner not developer).</p> <p><b>Straw Vote:</b>  <b>Commissioners Disiere, Gearheart, Edmonds and Kreb support staff recommendation.</b></p>		
A	B	C	D	<p><b>E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.</b></p> <p>A. Unless allowed by right pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65892.13(f) as amended, wind generating facilities shall be a conditionally permitted use in all land use designations except "resource dependent" (MR).</p> <p>B. The following shall be considered in reviewing proposed wind generating facilities: parcel size, relationship to other structures, effect on potential down-wind sites, compliance with Uniform Building Code and national Electrical Code, rotor and tower safety, noise, electromagnetic interference, utility notification, height, liability insurance, and appearance and design.</p> <p>C. Findings necessary for project approval shall be:</p> <p>1) The proposed use is not detrimental to the public health, convenience, safety, and welfare.</p> <p>2) That the use of the property for such purposes will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity.</p>	<p>QJ</p> 	<p>M                      Straw                      Vote                      5-0</p>


Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>3) <u>Within the Coastal Zone</u>, the project will not have a significant adverse effect on coastal resources, including wildlife qualities.</p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> – are you addressing impacts on birds? under Item C.(3) – (yes)  <b>TH</b> - There is extensive reporting done by Shell Wind on this. Different types of wind turbines and their affects on different species. USFWS weighs in on flyways.  <b>K. Girard</b> – C3 may prevent our county from doing a statement of overriding consideration. This could be problematic for large projects like Shell (i.e. marbled murrelets). Recommend that we change this.  <b>C. Kreb</b> – I would accept that change to “avoidable” .  <b>Faust</b> – I suggest an item D – override for impacts under C.  <b>Edmonds</b> – I concur on the use of the word avoidable.  <b>Faust</b> – eliminate the word “quality” with that I support. Or new D.  <b>Chair</b> – I could support that also.  <b>Staff to return with alternative language</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-22-11</b>                      The Commission discussed whether wind projects considered and avoided bird mortality. Staff noted subsection C3 does address this; however, additional discussion noted this language may prevent a CEQA overriding consideration finding being used and result in project denial. The Commission suggested a wording change to remedy this, but directed staff to return with a revised recommendation. Your Commission also was interested in a standard dealing with wind generating facilities in areas that would be identified as Coastal Scenic. Staff recommends addressing this issue at the time Coastal Scenic areas are defined and identified by ordinance.  <b>PC Discussion:</b>  <b>C. Masten</b> wondered if viewshed is considered with wind generation?  <b>K. Girard</b> – that is covered in the scenic resources – defer inappropriate uses when you designate those zones – identify scenic areas. For cultural protection, it would be the same. Prohibit development in that area. Coastal scenic – no wind.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>C. Masten</b> – does say “not have a significant adverse affect “ - will that cover it?  <b>K. Girard</b> – that would be in the scenic resources ordinance not here.  <b>C. Masten</b> – culturally significant viewsheds – can staff look to see what the language is for state law – does it address viewsheds – if it does – I want to see the language included here, if not – we need further discussion.  <b>C. Faust</b> – what were you trying to do when you change to avoidable?  <b>K. Girard</b> – CEQA term – if it is avoidable, you have feasible mitigation available, unavoidable impacts are the grounds you need to adopt a statement of overriding consideration.  <b>C. Faust</b> – the language says – the project will not have significant avoidable effects – what if it is an unavoidable effects – are you then going to allow? Im not sure if the language you have here really deals with it.  <b>K. Girard</b> – that is correct – because you could not accept an unavoidable impact – then you have to adopt a statement of overriding consideration. At least not preclude it.  <b>C. Faust</b> – I was reading the language differently – do I understand than that if you place it in an area that was highly scenic – if the applicant says it has to be there – okay with the county to then just have to have a statement of overriding consideration.  <b>C. Masten</b> – I had asked staff to come back for the viewshed as a legal under state law with recognized cultural areas. Specific references under state law.  <b>RETURN –</b>  <b>Faust</b> – also think about subsection 3 – overriding considerations don’t work inside the coastal zone – I invite you to speak with counsel. The Coastal Commission does a different thing.</p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-26-12 (introduced on 1-24-12 but voted on 1-26-12)</b>                      The Commission asked staff to revise E-S3 to address continuing concerns on the wording of provision C.3 regarding effects on coastal resources. The discussion had focused around the term “adverse” in C.3, with staff suggesting “avoidable” to allow for a statement of overriding considerations be made. As noted in the staff report, the core issues with this provision is that it comes from the County’s LCP, hence the reference to “coastal resources”. It’s been a required finding for more than 25 years, and is implemented in the Coastal</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>Zoning Regulations. Staff recommended that a clarification was needed that for sensitive resources within the coastal zone, a stricter finding will continue to apply. Staff recommended the following revision: Staff recommended the following revisions for Subsection C-3:</p> <p><b>E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.</b></p> <p><u>C.3 Within the coastal zone,</u> <del>coastal resources, including wildlife, qualities.</del> The project will not have a significant adverse effect on sensitive habitat resources.</p> <p><b>PC Discussion:</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> - It might be easier to just say, "Within the coastal zone"  <b>Tom Hofweber</b> - The zoning language seemed a little more appropriate, but staff has no problem changing it to "Within the coastal zone" and leave it exactly the same.                      Staff also advised against trying to tack on additional criteria at this particular time without re-noticing.  <b>Commissioner Nelson</b> - What about a bond for removal of the wind turbines when they are no longer functional. Concerned about the scenic impact - not many people come to view wind-generating facilities. Good idea to have a fund put up by developers to improve scenic views. .  <b>Commissioner Krebs</b> - supports staff with the revisions and the wording changes suggested by Commissioner Faust.  <b>Commissioner Disiere</b> - Can most of the issues brought up by Commissioner Nelson be addressed during permitting process under CEQA?  <b>Director Girard</b> - Yes; discussion about financial concerns for decommissioning the turbines; plans and financial terms for decommissioning.  <u>Straw vote</u>  <b>Commissioners Disiere, Krebs, Faust, Gearheart, and Nelson - support the revisions that Commissioner Faust has made and the suggestion made about de-commissioning.</b>  <b>Commissioner Edmonds - Does not support the suggested revisions.</b></p>		



Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	D	<p><b>E-S4. Oil and Gas Pipelines.</b> For pipelines serving oil and gas facilities, the following shall apply:</p> <p>A. Pipelines should, where feasible, avoid sensitive habitat areas and archaeological sites and follow existing utility corridors where they are present. Active faults or other geologically unstable areas should be avoided where feasible, or be designed to mitigate against such hazards.</p> <p>B. When avoidance of a sensitive habitat area is not feasible, effective mitigation measures shall be employed to minimize adverse impacts. Directional drilling shall be employed to avoid wetlands and riparian habitats, unless an independent engineering contractor selected by the County determines that to do so would not be feasible.</p> <p>C. All right-of-ways shall be regraded and revegetated to their original state. When a responsible agency identifies a degraded habitat along the proposed right-of-way, when it might be preferable to restore it to a condition other than its present state, said agency shall recommend plans to the lead agency for restoration of the habitat. The lead agency shall require restoration of the habitat as a condition of approval, unless a review of the public record indicates it would be more appropriate to do otherwise.</p> <p>D. All compressor, metering, or odorizing stations shall be visually and acoustically buffered with vegetation and other means as necessary.</p> <p>E. Above-ground pipelines should be sited to minimize visual impacts, when feasible. When an aboveground pipeline must be sited in a highly scenic area, it shall be visually buffered with vegetation and other means as necessary.</p> <p>F. For liquid carrying pipelines passing through important coastal resource areas including recreation, habitat, and archaeological sites and geologically unstable areas, segments shall be isolated by automatic shutoff valves. The County may determine</p>	<p>QJ</p> 	R





Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				whether spacing of automatic shutoff valves is required at intervals less than the maximum set by the U.S. Department of Transportation to protect sensitive coastal resources.		
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<p><b>E-S5. Electrical Transmission Lines.</b></p> <p>A. Transmission line rights-of-way shall be routed to minimize impacts on the viewshed in the coastal zone, especially in highly scenic areas, and to avoid locations that are on or near habitat, recreational, or archaeological resources, whenever feasible. Scarring, grading, or other vegetative removal shall be minimized and revegetated with plants similar to those in the area.</p> <p>B. Where above-ground transmission line placement would unavoidably affect views, underground placement shall be required where it is technically and economically feasible, unless it can be shown that other alternatives are less environmentally damaging. When above-ground facilities are necessary, design of the support towers shall be compatible with the surroundings to the extent safety and economic considerations allow.</p> <p>C. Above-ground transmission lines should be sited so as to minimize visual impacts.</p> <p>D. Siting of transmission lines should avoid the crests of roadways to minimize their visibility on distant views. Where visual impacts would be minimized, lines should cross the roadway at a downhill low elevation site or a curve in the road.</p> <p>E. New major steel tower electrical transmission facilities should be consolidated with existing electrical steel-tower transmission facilities unless there are social, aesthetic, or</p>	<p>QJ</p> 	R



Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>significant economic concerns.</p> <p>F. Existing rights-of-way should be utilized for other related utilities to provide consolidated corridors wherever such uses are compatible or feasible.</p> <p>G. Access and construction roads should be located to minimize landform alterations. Road grades and alignments should follow the contour of the land with smooth, gradual curves where possible.</p>		
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<p><b>E-S6. Consistency with Climate Action Plan.</b> The County’s implementation of the Redwood Energy Authority (RCEA) Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy shall be consistent with the Board-adopted Climate Action Plan.</p>	<p><b>Prog</b></p> 	<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<p><b>E-S7. Solar Access Protection.</b> – Proposed structures and landscaping <u>associated with planned unit developments and/or subdivisions that create five (5) or more new parcels</u> shall be designed and located to avoid blocking views and solar access from other properties to the maximum extent feasible. The lot size, configuration, and proposed building envelope in a subdivision or planned development shall be oriented to ensure that no additional shadows will be cast on the south side <del>or roof</del> of an existing building between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. on December 21. <u>A shade projection map shadow analysis shall be required showing the identifying proposed height and orientation of existing and proposed buildings and the slope of land to determine and that identifies the length of shadows projected.</u></p>	<p>New staff recommended policy to support existing ordinance. <b>QJ, IM-21</b></p> <p>Modifications made to be consistent with our</p>	<p><b>M</b> <b>Straw vote</b> <b>6-0</b></p>


Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		existing shading ordinance language	
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> stated that he was opposed to new wording that limits this to new subdivisions over 5 lots and for new PUD's – it should be for every subdivision.  <b>Staff</b> noted that this is our existing policy.  <b>C. Edmonds</b> – does this affect condos with common walls?  <b>TH</b> – it has been in effect for years and does not constrain development. For condos, it only constrains the orientation. With respect to 5 or more lot subdivisions, I think that this is the language included in state law; we may need to check to see if we can be more restrictive.  <b>C. Kreb</b> – even if you have a new house being built next door and someone plants trees that blocks the sun that could be a problem.  <b>K. Girard</b> – there was a state law passed – one for buildings and one for trees.  <b>Report back.</b></p>		
	<p><b>Comments: 9-22-11</b></p> <p>Based on the Commission's discussion staff recommended the current language be retained.</p> <p><b>C. Masten</b> - If we chose to "opt in" does that affect this language?(No)  <b>C. Disiere</b> – in reading the solar shade control act – doesn't address the changing of hand of ownership – prohibition on shading – flimsy – I think this ordinance creates more problems – should not opt in. does S7 require more than what we do now?  <b>K. Girard - S7</b> – this repeats existing requirements.  <b>C. Disiere – CAPE</b> – does this get wrapped into an ordinance?                      No – policies that made it into the energy element – and the CAPE – staff looked at the work for the background document should go into the energy element but not in an ordinance</p>		



Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>and we thought RCEA should implement the CAPE not the county.</p> <p><b>C. Disiere</b> – support S7 as written.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – I would like to recommend the solar shade ordinance be repealed so that we are brought into the solar shade act. It should also be applied to more than just subdivisions of 5 or more. I’m more interested in solar access for existing development and things that the neighbors can do that impinge upon solar access. Property values – protect solar access. I would expand S7 to all buildings and landscaping.</p> <p><b>C. Disiere</b> – I have seen in older subdivisions – it is very prohibitive to try to apply the solar shading requirement in particular infill.</p> <p><b>C. Edmonds</b> – I support C. Disiere and staff recommendations.</p> <p><b>C. Masten</b> – I think these are two issues. Opt in is separate. Grandfather existing development – applies only to new development. I support all new construction be included in S7.</p> <p><b>C. Edmonds</b> – there is an exemption process a developer can apply.</p> <p><b>Girard</b> – there are special programs that illustrate solar shading for these developments. If it was for every development we would need this. Now there is also height limitation and setbacks that affect solar access (not often but it does happen). There are exemptions. State law is just for solar systems not shade on buildings.</p> <p><b>C. Gearheart</b> – I support what c. Faust has said but I have also seen where city lots have no way to build without shading. I support staff’s wording.</p> <p><b>C. Kreb</b> – I also support S7.</p> <p>Commission recommends that the BOS repeal the current opt out, as suggested by staff.</p> <p><b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as rewritten by staff</b></p>		
<p><b>12.6 Implementation Measures</b></p>			

Plan Alternative		Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	<p><b>E-IM1. Alternative Energy Use.</b> Develop or modify regulations that eliminate obstacles to alternative energy use. Regulations may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Allowing height exceptions for solar equipment.</li> <li>B. Allowing alternative heating and cooling systems components such as collectors, shading louvers, or reflectors to project into yards in a manner similar to cornices and canopies.</li> <li>C. Defining solar heating systems and cogeneration facilities as accessory uses.</li> <li>D. Preventing planned development covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&amp;Rs) from unreasonably restricting alternative energy systems.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Leg</b></p> 	<p><b>R</b> <b>Straw vote</b> <b>4-0</b></p>
		<p><b>Comments: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> had questions regarding C.  <b>TH</b> – stated that by enumerating this item here, it identified that the use is principally permitted.  <b>All support as written.</b></p>		
A	B	<p><b>E-IM2. Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy.</b> Seek funding and support efforts to implement the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy, <del>as amended.</del></p>	<p><b>Prog</b></p> 	<p><b>M</b> <b>Straw vote</b> <b>4-0</b></p>
		<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b> Based on comments received, staff recommended the following revision:</p> <p><b>E-IM2. Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy.</b> <del>Seek funding and s-</del>Support efforts to implement the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy.</p> <p><b>Commissioner Faust</b> stated that he did not understand why the county would delete the</p>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				reference to seeking funding. <b>TH</b> – it is more about the roles and who would take the lead. We believe RCEA would take the lead on seeking funding. <b>All support the staff recommendations.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>E-IM3. County Energy Consumption Reduction.</b> Develop a comprehensive program to reduce County energy consumption in operations including: public buildings and facilities, street lighting, vehicle fleet management, equipment procurement, and employee energy awareness program.	<b>Prog</b> 	<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>E-IM4. Install County Systems.</b> Pursue the installation of cost-effective conservation measures, renewable energy systems, cogeneration systems, and distributed energy systems in County facilities.	<b>Prog</b> 	<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>E-IM5. Wind Energy Development.</b> Develop wind-permitting guidelines for residential and small commercial-scale wind energy systems. Adopt and modify, as appropriate, the guidelines established in California State Law AB 1207. Educate the public about the benefits of small-scale wind energy systems.	<b>Prog</b> 	<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>E-IM6. Energy-conserving Landscaping.</b> Consider the use of natural and drought-resistant planting materials and efficient irrigation systems and the siting of trees to reduce energy demand in the preparation of the County landscaping ordinance.	<b>Prog</b> 	<b>R</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			<b>E-IM7. Small Hydroelectric Development.</b> Support local efforts to develop cost-effective, environmentally sensitive, small-scale, run-of-the-river hydroelectric facilities in the County.	Pol 	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			<b>E-IM8. Energy Efficiency Standards.</b> Develop and implement energy-efficiency standards for subdivision, mixed use, infill, and planned unit development that shall incorporate Green Building standards, which may include <del>compliance</del> incentives such as tax credits, fee reductions, or faster-track permitting for silver rating or higher compliance with Green Building standards.	New staff recommended implementation measure to support policy EP-1. Prog 	
				COMMENTS: 9-15-11 <b>Commissioner Disiere</b> supports the RLWG’s recommendations (submitted written testimony). <b>TH</b> – I don’t think you need the word “compliance” as added by the RLWG. <b>C. Faust</b> – I don’t believe it is needed here either. Are these standards to be developed that are designed to be met – not discretionary? Fine with this with elimination of the word compliance. <b>C. Edmonds</b> – I’m concerned about it being mandatory. There are situations where it is not practical to incorporate all green building standards. <b>Gearheart</b> – I can support staff’s version with elimination of word compliance. <b>All support. Staff to return with new wording.</b> <b>Straw vote</b>		M Straw vote 5-1

Plan Alternative			Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>Unanimous support 4/0 when deleting the word “compliance”.</b>  <b>Chairperson Gearheart notes that Commissioner Disiere would recommend changes from working lands group – provide compliance.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>		<p><b>E-IM9. Develop Incentives for Private Sector.</b> Develop incentives to encourage the installation of cost-effective energy efficiency measures, distributed generation, and solar electric and solar heating systems in all new construction and building retrofits. <u>Develop incentives that support the development and implementation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations and heat pumps in new commercial developments and retrofits.</u> Incentives may include: density bonuses, fast-track permitting, fee reductions, expedited low-cost approval of standardized designs, property tax exemptions, sales tax rebates, and award programs that recognize builders and developers for well-designed systems.</p>	<p>New staff recommended implementation measure to support policy EP-1.</p> <p><b>Prog</b> </p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw</b>  <b>vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Faust – I would staff to return with electric vehicles charging stations added into this.</b>  <b>All support. Staff to return with new wording.</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-22-11</b>                      The Commission discussed changes suggested by Jim Zoellick to add Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations to E-P4. Based on the Commission’s discussion staff recommended the following revision of IM-9:</p> <p><b>E-IM9. Develop Incentives for Private Sector.</b> Develop incentives to encourage the installation of cost-effective energy efficiency measures, distributed generation, and solar electric and solar heating systems in all new construction and building retrofits. <u>Develop incentives that support the development and implementation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations and heat pumps in new commercial developments and retrofits.</u> Incentives may include: density bonuses, fast-track permitting, fee reductions, expedited low-cost approval of standardized designs, property tax exemptions, sales tax rebates, and award programs that recognize builders and developers for well-designed systems.</p>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				Straw vote: approved as rewritten to include heat pumps.		
A	B			<b>E-IM-10. County Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Improvements Plan.</b> The County shall develop and maintain a performance-based action plan to guide the implementation of energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements in county operations.	New staff recommended implementation measure to support EP-7. Prog, 	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			<b>E-IM11. County Facility Efficiency and Alternative Energy Fund.</b> Establish a “County facility efficiency <u>and alternative energy</u> fund” to support implementation of <u>County energy efficiency and alternative energy investments in County owned or operated facilities</u> <del>this Energy Element</del> . The fund would receive up to <u>75%</u> <del>50%</del> of the County’s monetary savings from improved <del>municipal</del> <u>County</u> energy efficiency and conservation practices. The estimate of monetary savings will be based on the likely energy costs that would have been incurred had the energy efficiency measures and/or conservation practices not been implemented.	New staff recommended implementation measure to support policy EP-7. Prog 	M Straw vote 6-0
				COMMENTS: 9-15-11 Commissioner Faust – we need a discussion on how the County wants the money used. <u>Return</u> . What is the purpose? <u>All support this concept.</u>		
				Comments: 9-22-11 The Commission discussed that E-IM11 appeared to lack a direction on how the fund would be used. The measure states that the fund is to be established “to support implementation of this Energy Element”. Based on the Commission’s discussion staff recommended the		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>following revision of E-IM11:</p> <p><b>E-IM11. County Facility Efficiency and Alternative Energy Fund.</b> Establish a “County facility efficiency and alternative energy fund” to support implementation of <b>County energy efficiency and alternative energy investments in County owned or operated facilities</b> <del>this Energy Element</del>. The fund would receive <b>up to 75%</b> <del>50%</del> of the County’s monetary savings from improved <b>municipal County</b> energy efficiency and conservation practices. The estimate of monetary savings will be based on the likely energy costs that would have been incurred had the energy efficiency measures and/or conservation practices not been implemented.</p> <p><b>All support – as modified by staff.</b></p>		
A	<p><b>E-IM12. Assess Existing Regulations.</b> Assess <b>and revise as necessary</b> the existing subdivision, zoning, and building code implications associated with the potential development of renewable energy and distributed energy generation facilities and related electrical transmission lines.</p>	Prog	M Straw vote 5-0
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 9-15-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> – what do you mean by “assess”? Are you going to do anything?  <b>Th</b> suggested to remove “assess” from the title and add the words “and revise as necessary” to the first sentence.</p> <p><b>All support as revised by staff.</b></p>		
A	<p><b>E-IM13. Fair Regulations Renewable Energy Permitting Process.</b> Develop a clear permit process to provide for the installation of renewable energy and distributed energy generation systems. Identify zones where renewable energy and distributed energy generation facilities will be allowed as a permitted use. Identify small-scale systems that meet annual onsite energy needs, and that would not require a use permit. Zoning regulations should address the following types of renewable energy and distributed energy generation facilities: commercial wind farms, wave and tidal energy facilities, biomass energy facilities, biogas energy facilities, small-scale hydroelectric facilities, cogeneration and distributed generation facilities, and solar electric and solar heating facilities.</p>	Prog	M Straw vote 6-0

Plan Alternative	Chapter 12 Energy Element			Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p>COMMENTS: 9-15-11  <b>Faust</b> – I object to the use of the word “fair” in the title.                      All support a new title for IM 13.</p>		
			<p>COMMENTS: 9-22-11  <b>Faust</b> – I object to the use of the word “fair” in the title.                      E-IM13. <b>Renewable Energy Permitting Process</b>. Develop a clear permit process to provide for the installation of renewable energy and distributed energy generation systems....                      All support a new title for IM 13.</p>		
<b>A</b>			<p><b>E-IM14 Energy Conservation and Green Building Ordinance.</b> The County shall adopt a residential and commercial energy conservation and green building ordinance that establishes energy conservation incentives and performance standards exceeding state mandates for building construction and retrofit and sales.</p>	<b>Prog</b>	<b>M Straw vote 5-1</b>
			<p>COMMENTS: 9-15-11  <b>Chair Gearheart</b> read <b>Commissioners Disiere’s</b> recommendations into the record. She did not support an ordinance and wanted to let RCEA take the lead on this.  <b>C. Krebs</b> – I support this with the removal of the words “and sales”.                      All support the revision made by Commissioner Krebs.</p>		