

**Tuttle, Casaria R.**

---

**From:** Dale and Marlene Land [badlands@internetextension.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2010 8:53 AM  
**To:** casaria.r.tuttle@state.or.us; jim.rue.@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Fwd: corrected file/attachments  
**Attachments:** Wind study article Apprasial group one.doc; Will Newman.doc

----- Original Message -----

**From:-** Wed Nov 17 08:28:45 2010  
**X-Mozilla-Status:**0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:**00800000  
**X-Mozilla-Keys:**  
**Message-ID:**<4CE402B8.6000801@internetextension.com>  
**Date:**Wed, 17 Nov 2010 08:28:40 -0800  
**From:**Dale and Marlene Land <badlands@internetextension.com>  
**User-Agent:**Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:1.9.2.12) Gecko/20101027  
 Lightning/1.0b2 Thunderbird/3.1.6  
**MIME-Version:**1.0  
**To:** michael.morrissey@state.or.us.  
**Subject:**corrected file/attachments  
**Content-Type:**multipart/mixed; boundary="-----030604050604090703060802"



Nov. 15, 2010

To Whom it May Concern;

My husband and I are members of "Concerned Citizens of North Lake County", and we have concerns with the issues surrounding possibly changes, or elimination of the Statewide Goal 3. The CCONLC share the goal of preserving agricultural lands in Northern Lake County, as well as throughout the State of Oregon. We do not feel there needs to be any changes, or elimination of the Statewide Goal 3. It has been in place for 35 years, and has been serving its purpose very well.

To change, or do away with Statewide Goal 3 in order to expedite the placement of solar facilities does not serve, or protect farmland, now or in the future. If Goal 3 is changed or eliminated, to allow solar facilities on land more than 20 acres, without receiving an exception to the Goal, we will have them placed randomly and they will proliferate all over the State

We feel that counties should be working on plans for a "designated area" for solar facilities. With a designated area, regulations in place for Conditional Use Permits, and a Goal 3 exception for these areas already in place, it would expedite the placement of solar facilities, without them being placed randomly all over the landscape. And no need to change the Statewide Goal 3.

11/18/2010

If the acreage amount is changed to a larger amount, like the 100 acres that has been suggested, then all but 1 of the solar facilities (and there are several already in various states of the permitting process) in the Christmas Valley area would be able to proceed once they receive their Conditional Use Permit.

Any Solar Facility planning on using more than 100 acres would have to go through the State Energy Dept., for a siting procedure. And at this time, all but one Solar Facility is staying below the 100 acres or more State Dept. of Energy's guidelines.

Nicole Hughes from Element Power stated at the CUP hearing, that she didn't believe that a solar facility would devalue adjoining property anymore than a wind turbine facility would. Please see the attached document "wind-farms-lower-property-values) as you can see from reading this article, there is evidence that Wind turbines devalue adjoining property values. There is no reason to believe that Solar Facilities will not have the same effect. Local residents have been told they could loose 50% value of their property, if not making some "unsalable".

Not only do our farmlands and ranches need to be protected, so do the farmers, and residents living on AG2 land.

It is not the farmers, or ranchers that are going to benefit from changing or the elimination of Goal 3 (except for a few that may lease their land to a Solar Facility). The ones that stand to gain the most are the Solar Facilities that are want their facilities up and running. And since a Goal 3 exception slows them down, they have decided that it would be to their benefit to eliminate or change the Goal 3, to suit their needs to expedite the placement of Solar Facilities.

Not only do our farmlands and ranches need to be protected, so do the farmers, and residents living on AG2 land.

There will be added costs to ranchers or farmers, with the loss of grazing land. Although the same amount of cattle, or livestock could be grazed, the livestock will need supplemental feed. An extra cost to the rancher.

Also see attachment from Will Newman/Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust. Agricultural land does not need to be irrigated in order for it to be considered productive agricultural land.  
That say's a lot.

We are already giving these Solar Facilities enough tax credits, incentives, grants, and tax abatement.

Do we have to give them the farm land also?

Thank you,

Dale & Marlene Land

Christmas Valley, OR.

Marlene,

Thanks for the information.

Is there some way you think OSALT or I can help?

(Whether or not agricultural land can be irrigated is not a determining factor concerning whether or not it can be productive agricultural land. Do not allow planners/developers to get away with using that false justification.)

Will

Will Newman II  
Natural Harvest Farm  
Research and Education Director  
Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust (OSALT)

# Wednesday, October 21, 2009

## [Wind Farms = lower property values \(read this Wisconsin study!\)](#)

### Wind Turbine Impact Study

Author: Appraisal Group One

This is a study of the impact that wind turbines have on residential property value. The wind turbines that are the focus of this study are the larger turbines being approximately 389ft tall and producing 1.0+ megawatts each.

The study has been broken into three component parts, each looking at the value impact of the wind turbines from a different perspective. The three parts are: (1) a literature study, which reviews and summarizes what has been published on this matter found in the general media; (2) an opinion survey, which was given to area Realtors to learn their opinions on the impact of wind turbines in their area; and, 3) sales studies, which compared vacant residential lot sales within the wind turbine farm area to comparable sales located outside of the turbine influence.

The sponsor for this study was the Calumet County Citizens for Responsible Energy (CCCRE) (Calumet County, Wisconsin), which contracted our firm, Appraisal Group One, to research the value impact that wind turbines have on property value. Appraisal Group One (AGO) protected against outside influence from CCCRE by having complete independence to the gathering of facts, data and other related material and the interpretation of this data to the purpose of this study. AGO chose the location of the study, the search parameters, the methodology used and the three-step approach to the study. AGO does not enter into any contract that would espouse any preconceived notion or have a bias as to the direction of the study and its findings. The purpose of the study was to investigate the value impacts of large wind turbines, the issues influencing these impacts and to report these findings on an impartial basis. ...

The geographic area of this study was focused in Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties. These two counties have three large wind farms. They are:

- \* WE Energies – Blue Sky Green Field wind farm which has approximately 88 wind turbines and is located in the northeast section of Fond du Lac County, bordering Calumet County to the north.
- \* Invenergy – Forward wind farm which has approximately 86 wind turbines and is located in southwest Fond du Lac County and northeast Dodge County.
- \* Alliant – Cedar Ridge wind farm which has approximately 41 wind turbines and is located in the southeastern part of Fond du Lac County.

Of these three wind farms, only the WE Energies and Invenergy wind farms were used in the sales study since the Alliant – Cedar Ridge wind farm did not have enough viable

sales within the turbine influence area to use as a base of comparison. The Realtor survey was limited to Fond du Lac and Dodge Counties, that being the area which had the three wind farms. ...

#### Summary of Findings & Conclusion of Impact

The survey indicated that in all but two scenarios (those being Questions #8 and #9), over 60% the participants thought that the presence of the wind turbines had a negative impact on property value. This was true with vacant land and improved land. Where the group diverted from that opinion is when they were presented with a 10-20 acre hobby farm being in close and near proximity. In these cases 47% (close proximity) and 44% (near proximity) of the participants felt that the wind turbines caused a negative impact in property value.

The answers showed that bordering proximity showed the greatest loss of value at -43% for 1-5 acre vacant land and -39% for improved properties. Next in line was the close proximity showing a -36% value loss for 1-5 acre vacant land and -33% for improved property. Last in line was the near proximity, showing a -29% loss of value for a 1-5 acre vacant parcel and -24% loss in value for improved parcels. These losses show a close relationship between vacant land and improved land. This pattern was replicated regarding the bordering proximity for a hobby farm, whereas 70% believed it would be negatively impacted. Lastly, the opinions regarding the impact of the wind turbines due to placement, that being in front of the residence or behind the residence, showed that in both situations most participants believed there would a negative impact (74% said negative to the front placement and 71% said negative to the rear placement).

In conclusion, it can be observed that: (a) in all cases with a 1-5 acre residential property, whether vacant or improved, there will be a negative impact in property value; (b) with 1-5 acre properties the negative impact in property value in bordering proximity ranged from -39% to -43%; (c) with 1-5 acre properties the negative impact in property value in close proximity ranged from -33% to -36%; (d) with 1-5 acre properties the negative impact in property value in near proximity ranged from -24% to -29%; (e) in all cases the estimated loss of value between the vacant land and improved property was close, however the vacant land estimates were always higher by a few percentage points; (f) it appears that hobby farm use on larger parcels would have lesser sensitivity to the proximity of wind turbines than single family land use; and (g) placement either in front or at the rear of a residence has similar negative impacts.