

4906-17-08 Social and Ecological Data

(A) HEALTH AND SAFETY

(1) Demographic Characteristics

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(2) Noise

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(a) Construction Noise Levels

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Blasting activities

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Operation of earthmoving equipment

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Driving of piles

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iv) Erection of structures

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-9]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that heavy construction activities referenced in the application as occurring during day operations would be turbine erection. Turbine erection may also be required at night depending on construction schedule and wind conditions. During certain seasons, wind conditions are lower at night and thus can allow for safe erection operations. Although the Applicant generally avoids night-time erection operations, erection may be performed at night if conditions during the day have sufficiently delayed the construction schedule to the point that night-time erection is justified.

(v) Truck traffic

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(vi) Equipment installation

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Operational Noise Levels

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-13]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that the Mitsubishi turbines are the loudest turbine being considered. This is true at both hub heights (noise level does not correlate significantly with hub height).
- The Applicant would like to clarify that 960 receptors (as identified in the December 21, 2009 application under Table 8-5) were modeled. In addition to the modeled home locations, noise contours were developed. The Applicant is performing additional noise studies for the Blue Creek Wind Farm. The Applicant will submit the findings of the noise study to OPSB following a Noise Review Meeting with OPSB in early May, 2010.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that although noise implications were extensively analyzed, the actual noise constraints of the Facility were not known at the time of the December 21, 2009 filing. The noise restrictions have since been identified, and the layout has been substantially re-designed at great cost and effort by the Applicant.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that ambient noise measurements commenced in March 2010.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that modeling results provided in the Application are representative of the scenario where geostrophic winds sufficient for generation exist, but ground-level winds remain calm. The maximum sound power level of the turbine was used and is therefore independent of ground level winds.

(c) Location of Noise Sensitive Areas

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Mitigation of Noise Emissions

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-14]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that the layout provided in the April 1, 2010 Supplemental Report is designed to achieve maximum noise levels of 50 dBA at all residences regardless of their participating status in the Good Neighbor Program or with wind leases.

(3) Water

(a) Impact to Public and Private Water Supplies

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, except for the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-16]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that no sole source aquifers are located near the Project area. The closest designated sole source aquifer is approximately 8 miles to the southeast of the Facility.

(b) Construction Water Impacts [Application, 8-17, replacement]

The Applicant is evaluating the option of constructing a concrete batch plant on the site for producing concrete required for construction. Water use during construction of the Facility would include temporary concrete batch plant operations (to produce concrete for turbine foundation construction) and dust suppression *and road watering. Construction water demands for the site will be temporary. Portable restroom facilities will be used for construction workers; therefore, they will not require water.*

If a temporary batch plant were constructed for the Facility, the plant would be used temporarily for the production of concrete during Facility construction. The batch plant would *either* be located on the 20-acre property located in the southern portion of the Project area and adjacent to the location of the future O&M building *or at the existing Stoneco quarry near Scott*. It is estimated that the batch plant would operate *12 hours per day* 6 days a week and produce up to 1,500 cubic yards of concrete cubic yards per day. Based on this production rate, the estimated water demand would be approximately 55,000 gpd (approximately 115 gpm). *For the 20-acre property, water will be supplied via one of three or a combination of the following options:*

- *Onsite bedrock wells*
- *Trucking in water from the Stoneco quarry near Scott*
- *Trucking in water from another source*

Onsite bedrock wells would be drilled and completed at a depth of several hundred feet. Available water well logs near the site indicate that the deepest local domestic well is 63 feet in depth and completed in bedrock. *If a batch plant is planned for the O&M building/substation site*, a production test well and associated monitoring wells would be installed in 2010 and tested to determine the specific well yield and evaluate any potential impacts. An inventory of wells adjacent to the property would be conducted as part of this evaluation. Depending on the production test well results, a water storage tank may be considered to reduce peak demand on the water supply wells. *However, if the concrete batch plant were not to be constructed at the O&M site, a residential well would be drilled to serve the O&M facility.*

If a batch plant is planned for the Stoneco Scott Quarry property, water will be provided by an existing onsite surface water source with a pump rate of 100 gpm. Additional water requirements would be provided by trucking in water from another source.

Construction water demands for the Facility would be temporary. Portable washrooms would be available for construction workers; therefore, they would not require water. Upon completion of construction, onsite wells will be used for the water supply at the O&M building.

Water usage during Facility construction will be minimal, so it is not expected to have a measurable impact on public or private water supplies near the Project area. No adverse impacts are anticipated to the aquifer systems within the Project area. Facility construction is not likely to pose any risk of contaminant release that would compromise the quality of the groundwater resources.

(c) Operation Water Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(4) Ice Throw

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(5) Blade Shear

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(6) Shadow Flicker

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section with the exception of the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-21]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that according to the Gamesa literature, the rotations per minute (RPM) range for the G-90 turbine is 9 to 19 RPM, varying non-

linearly with wind speed. This corresponds to a blade pass frequency of 0.45 to 0.95 Hz.

(a) Shadow Flicker Analysis

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-23]:

- A revised shadow flicker analysis was performed in March 2010 for the new turbine layout [assuming G-90 wind turbines on 328-foot (100-meter) -tall towers] to evaluate the extent of potential shadow flicker experienced at each residence and primary transportation corridor in the Project area.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that there will be more than eight turbines added in the designated expansion area, as a result of the Staff's expected noise conditions. These results are included in the revised shadow flicker analysis and report.
- The shadow flicker report will address potential effects, define "discrete points" and other terminology within the report, and identify how many homes were identified within 2,950 feet of a turbine.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that resident surveys were conducted on November 4 to 5, 2009 for the December 21, 2009 filing. Additional line-of-sight surveys for the April 1, 2010 Supplemental Report were to be conducted on March 23, 2010. The residences studied within 2,950 feet of a turbine totaled 1,275. Thirty-seven of the 39 residences with 30 or more hours of potential shadow flicker were observed to have some type of existing obstruction. Due to the number of residences within the Project area, the assessment was limited to those participating and nonparticipating residences with 30 or more hours of potential exposure. A standard digital camera was used to document the existing obstructions.

(b) Shadow Flicker Results

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section before Table 8-6 [Application, 8-23]:

- The Applicant would like to provide additional information in the form of forecasted operational noise exposure in dBA for receptors identified in the April 1, 2010 Supplemental Report as having an exposure of greater than 30 hours per year. The table below provides these details:

| ID # | Coordinates UTM NAD83 Z16 | | Shadow hours per year | Forecasted Noise Levels |
|------|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Easting | Northing | [h/year] | dBA |
| 1094 | 707683.78 | 4534550.34 | 56:56:00 | 50.3 |
| 445 | 697709.38 | 4541677.27 | 44:40:00 | 50.3 |
| 213 | 702642.75 | 4536429.72 | 41:39:00 | 49.1 |
| 471 | 704155.09 | 4542640.4 | 39:57:00 | 50.3 |
| 224 | 702664.08 | 4536831.15 | 39:27:00 | 49.2 |
| 340 | 699322.59 | 4539592.7 | 38:40:00 | 48.5 |
| 1165 | 708615.31 | 4535770.46 | 33:00:00 | 49.2 |
| 96 | 699523.81 | 4534145.67 | 31:47:00 | 48.4 |
| 470 | 697628.66 | 4542295.44 | 31:07:00 | 48.6 |
| 88 | 697993.19 | 4533816.4 | 31:00:00 | 49.3 |
| 1096 | 709294.58 | 4534771.75 | 30:43:00 | 48.3 |

- The revised shadow flicker analysis performed in March 2010 resulted in predicted shadow flicker effects over 30 hours per year at 11 residences in the Project area. The revised shadow flicker report will provide additional details as requested by the OPSB Staff.

- Table 8-6 has been revised and includes:
 - The distance of each residence from the closest flicker-generating turbine;
 - The number of hours of shadow flicker the model predicts the residence would be exposed to over the course of a year;
 - An identification of the turbines that would contribute to shadow flicker at that residence; and
 - Any features noted during the site visit with the potential to prevent the shadow flickering from being visible at the residence.

The Applicant plans to use a number of mitigation measures as described in the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application to reduce projected shadow flicker impacts to these affected residences.

TABLE 8-6 [ADDITION TO TABLE 8-6 , APPLICATION, 8-24 AND 8-25]
Predicted Shadow Flicker

| Residence ID | Predicted Shadow Flicker (hours:minutes per year)^a | Turbines Contributing to Shadow Flicker | Distance to Closest Contributing Turbine (m) | Noteworthy Obstructions |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 1094 | 56:56 | 9, 10, 12 | 387 | Barn to the southeast at approximately 20 feet aboveground level (AGL). Several deciduous trees to the west approximately 50 feet AGL. |
| 445 | 44:40 | 70, 71, 72 | 340 | Two car garage to the southeast approximately 15 feet aboveground level. Row of mixed deciduous trees/conifers to the east approximately 10 feet AGL. |
| 213 | 41:39 | 113, 115, 116, 127 | 540 | Shed to the west at approximately 12 feet AGL. Row of conifers to the south and southwest at approximately 35 feet AGL. |
| 471 | 39:57 | 146, 147, 153, 154 | 424 | Two conifer trees to the west at approximately 30 feet AGL. |
| 224 | 39:27 | 113, 115, 126, 127 | 489 | Two barns to the south at approximately 30 feet AGL. |

TABLE 8-6 [ADDITION TO TABLE 8-6 , APPLICATION, 8-24 AND 8-25]

Predicted Shadow Flicker

| Residence ID | Predicted Shadow Flicker (hours:minutes per year) ^a | Turbines Contributing to Shadow Flicker | Distance to Closest Contributing Turbine (m) | Noteworthy Obstructions |
|--------------|--|---|--|---|
| 340 | 38:40 | 79, 81 | 391 | Barn to the southwest at approximately 20 feet AGL. Two car garage to the west at approximately 12 feet AGL. Row of conifer trees to the west at approximately 35 feet AGL. |
| 1165 | 33:00 | 14, 21 | 382 | Two conifer trees to the west and northwest at approximately 30 feet AGL. |
| 96 | 31:47 | 59, 60 | 420 | Garage to the southwest at approximately 20 feet AGL. Small barn to the west at approximately 15 feet AGL. Ring of conifers surrounding a pond to the south at approximately 25 feet AGL. |
| 470 | 31:07 | 68, 69 | 421 | One conifer tree to the west at approximately 20 feet AGL. Some deciduous trees to the west at approximately 30 feet AGL. |
| 88 | 31:00 | 64 | 374 | Shed to the northeast at approximately 15 feet AGL. |
| 1096 | 30:43 | 13, 15 | 381 | Two conifer trees to the northwest at approximately 30 feet AGL. |

^a Model results adjusted by mean monthly sky cover from Fort Wayne, Indiana

(c) Mitigation Measures

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section with the exception of the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-26]:

- The Applicant would like to provide additional details on mitigation measures for an affected receptor (>30 hours of shadow flicker per year). If an affected receptor is expected to receive >30 hours of shadow flicker, he/she will first be offered a Good Neighbor Agreement. If a receptor does

not wish to sign a Good Neighbor Agreement, the receptor will be offered a one-time payment to sign a letter agreement stating that the receptor accepts the effects and will be encouraged to use the money to buy window blinds or vegetative plantings, such as tall growing evergreen shrubs, and trees such as local species of spruce and pine. Fast-growing genotype species may also be available. If an agreement is not obtained, the Applicant will reconsider the siting of the relevant turbine or curtailment of the turbine.

- The Applicant would like to provide additional details on micro-siting turbines. It is possible, but not likely, that slight moves to turbines or removal of turbines can bring shadow flicker exposure down below 30 hours per year. A case-by-case analysis is presented in the shadow flicker results report filed with the April 1, 2010 Supplemental Report.

(B) ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

(1) Project Site Information

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section except for the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-27]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that adverse impacts are not anticipated to high quality streams or wetlands. As shown in Figure 8-3, a portion of the proposed 115 kV transmission line heads south and east from the Taylor Road collector substation to the planned interconnection point. In so doing, it bisects a large wooded area. This 115kV line was sited along an existing cleared railroad bed at a height above normal grade that anticipated a reduction in tree clearing based on the additional height provided by the railroad bed and existing cleared corridor. An alternative route through adjacent agricultural fields is currently being evaluated and will be considered an option for this portion of the Facility.

(a) Mapping

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Vegetative Survey

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Upland Habitats

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Wetland Habitats

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following at the end of the section [Application, 8-34]:

- In March and April 2010, the Applicant performed additional wetland delineations for various Facility components. The Applicant will submit a Revised Wetland Delineation Report to the OPSB upon completion of the investigation and coordination with USEPA and OEPA.

(c) Animal Life Survey

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Mammals

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Amphibians

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Reptiles

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iv) Birds

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(v) Raptor Study

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Summary of Ecological Studies

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(e) Major Species List

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Commercial Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Recreational Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Federally Listed Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iv) State Listed Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(2) Construction**(a) Impact of Construction**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-48]:

- In March and April 2010, the Applicant performed additional wetland delineations for various Facility components. The Applicant will submit a Revised Wetland Delineation Report to the OPSB upon completion of the investigation and coordination with USEPA and OEPA.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that roadway improvements (widening, etc.) are expected at intersections, ramps, and other key locations to facilitate oversized-equipment access to the Project site. These are limited to agricultural lands with some temporary impacts that may occur if jurisdictional waterbodies or wetlands are identified. The current roadway improvements are based on the Applicant's experience on past projects. Gamesa's selected trucking company may identify additional areas for

roadway improvement during its pre-delivery review. This review typically occurs prior to component delivery and is anticipated to occur in spring 2011.

(i) Upland Habitat

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Wetlands and Waterbodies

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with exception of the following:

- It is the intent of the Applicant to keep total wetland impacts per location to less than 0.1 acre so the Facility can be authorized by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Nationwide permit program. The December 21, 2009 application identified 0.5 acres [Application, 8-50, last paragraph].
- The Applicant would like to clarify that access road crossings of jurisdictional waters are focused primarily on roadside ditches or minor shallow stream crossings of low quality where vegetative impacts would be limited to previously impacted or routinely maintained areas. Underground collection line crossings would be directionally bored under most stream crossings, allowing for existing vegetation to remain intact. In areas of minor low-quality stream crossings vegetation may be temporarily disturbed for open trenching but also allowed to naturally regenerate with no future maintenance [Application, 8-50 to be added after last paragraph].

(b) Impact of Construction on Major Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Mitigation of Short and Long-term Construction Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(3) Operation

(a) Estimate the Impact of Operation on Areas

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Estimate the Impact of Operation on Major Species

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Mitigation of Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Post-Construction Monitoring of Wildlife Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(C) **ECONOMICS, LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

(1) **Land Uses**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(a) **Land Use Map**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) **Residential Structures In Relation to the Boundary of the Proposed Facility**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following:

- Residential structures were reviewed to determine if they will be located within either 1,000 feet or 100 feet of a Facility component, including turbine towers, underground and aboveground 34.5 kV collection lines, the 115 kV aboveground collection lines, project collector substations (which includes two substations and the O&M building), project collection substation, interconnection substation, and access roads. For this analysis, the centerline was used for all linear Facility components (electric collection system and access roads), center-points for the turbine towers, and the footprint for residences, substations, and O&M building. There are **229** residences within 1,000 feet of access roads or collection lines. Of these, there are **15** residences within 100 feet of access roads or collection lines. [The December 21, 2009 filing identified 147 residences and 20 residences, respectively.] **Revised** Table 8-7 lists the residential structures within 100 feet of an access road or collection line. The table also provides the residence ID, tax lot ID, owner,

latitude and longitude, and distance from the access road or collection line.
No residences are within 1,200 feet of a proposed turbine.

TABLE 8-7 [REPLACES TABLE 8-7 ON APPLICATION, 8-57]
Residential Structures within 100 Feet of the Facility

| Residence ID# | Tax Lot ID, Owner | Longitude, Latitude | Distance (feet) | Facility Component |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 61 | 080122120100, ROLSTEN JAMES L & PHYLLIS L JTS | -84.68302657, 40.92921748 | 77 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 91 | 080115760000, SHOOK DAVID A | -84.68365005, 40.9315185 | 85 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 161 | 080112400000, BROTHERWOOD KATHLEEN JO LIV TR | -84.58161815, 40.94651786 | 73 | Proposed OH Collector |
| 171 | 150391620100, MIHM NANCY | -84.57181807, 40.9470739 | 83 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 215 | 080114920200, HOERSTEN JASON J | -84.66709507, 40.95332615 | 83 | Proposed Access Road |
| 262 | 010004680000, COLLINS WILLIAM J & LORRAINE | -84.69518612, 40.96073713 | 86 | Proposed Access Road |
| 294 | 150386280100, HESSEL RONALD J & JOYCE | -84.56149563, 40.97503364 | 73 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 339 | 080108680000, MCOMBER ROBERT L & CAROLYN S | -84.64928673, 40.98273296 | 54 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 430 | WENNINGER | -84.61139245, 40.99503758 | 98 | Proposed UG Collector |
| 433 | | -84.59110521, 40.99724163 | 47 | Proposed Access Road |
| 685 | 150385200100, FIEDLER BERNARD E & ALBERTA A | -84.53379655, 40.97534432 | 83 | Alternate UG Collector |
| 1008 | 150396660100, WILDER DARRELL & LISA JTS | -84.53304705, 40.91754045 | 51 | Alternate UG Collector |
| 1241 | 150385200100, FIEDLER BERNARD E & ALBERTA A | -84.53378301, 40.97529035 | 79 | Alternate UG Collector |
| 1242 | 150385200100, FIEDLER BERNARD E & ALBERTA A | -84.53379935, 40.97533586 | 84 | Alternate UG Collector |
| 1243 | 150385200100, FIEDLER BERNARD E & ALBERTA A | -84.53381451, 40.97538985 | 88 | Alternate UG Collector |

(c) Wind Turbine Structure Locations [Application, 8-58]

As shown in *Revised* Table 8-8, there are no residences within 1,000 feet of a wind turbine. In accordance with IBR policy, no residences will be within 1,200 feet of a wind turbine.

TABLE 8-8 [REPLACES TABLE 8-8, APPLICATION, 8-58]
Residential Structures Near Facility Components

| Facility Component | Number of Structures within 100 feet of Facility component | Number of Structures within 1,000 feet of Facility component |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Wind Turbine | 0 | 0 |
| Access Road | 3 | 88 |
| 34.5 kV Collection Lines | 12 | 132 |
| 115 kV Collection Line | 0 | 9 |
| Total | 15 | 229 |

(i) Distance from base to property line

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Distance from blade to residential structure

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Waiver of minimum setback

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Impact of Proposed Facility

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following:

- Approximately **1,264.4** acres of land would be temporarily impacted and **229.3** acres of land permanently impacted by construction of turbines and associated access roads (**Revised** Table 8-9). The December 21, 2009 filing identified 793 acres and 237 acres, respectively [First paragraph, Application, 8-59].
- As shown in **Revised** Table 8-9, agricultural land uses account for **95.8** percent of the area that would be permanently impacted if all of the **159** turbines detailed in this Supplemental Filing and associated facilities were constructed. [The December 21, 2009 filing identified agricultural land uses account for 97.4 percent of the area that would be permanently impacted if all of the 167 turbines were constructed.] Lower intensity developed uses, or open space, would account for approximately **0.5** percent of the permanently impacted land uses. [The December 21, 2009 filing identified approximately 1.1 percent.] [Second paragraph, Application, 8-59]

TABLE 8-9 [REPLACES TABLE 8-9 ON APPLICATION, 8-60]
Land Use Within the Project Area

| Land Use Type | Total Land Use | | Temporary Impacts | | Permanent Impacts | |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Acres | Percent of Total | Acres | Percent of Total | Acres | Percent of Total |
| Cultivated Crops | 38601.1 | 95.2 | 1237.3 | 97.9 | 213.2 | 95.6 |
| Deciduous Forest | 717.6 | 1.8 | 19.6 | 1.5 | 8.6 | 3.8 |
| Developed, High Intensity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Developed, Low Intensity | 1078.4 | 2.7 | 7.3 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| Pasture Land | 93.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | <0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Shrub and Brush Rangeland | 28.4 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lakes and Ponds | 30.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | <0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 40,549 | 100 | 1264.4 | 100.0 | 223.0 | 100.0 |

Note: Percentage values have been rounded, so that total is slightly more than 100 percent.

(e) Identification of Structures to be Removed or Relocated

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(f) Plans for Future Use

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(g) Concurrent or Secondary Uses

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(2) Economics

(a) Estimated Payroll

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Estimated Employment

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Estimated Tax Revenue

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Estimated Economic Impact

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(3) Public Services and Facilities

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(a) Sewerage and Sewer Treatment**Construction and Operations**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Water**Construction**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following at the end of the paragraph [Application, 8-64]:

- The location of the batch plant will be either at the Stoneco quarry near Scott or on the proposed 20-acre O&M building/substation property near the southeastern portion of the project area. Water for construction will be obtained from one of the following sources:
 - Unused water from the Stoneco Quarry near Scott,
 - Water from a municipal or commercial water supplier, or
 - Two newly constructed wells adjacent to the O&M building.

If the well option is selected, the Applicant will obtain applicable permits for these wells from the OEPA and the Van Wert County Health Department. If public water sources are to be used, the Applicant will coordinate with the relevant municipality to ensure that it has adequate water to supply the Facility without impairing supply to existing users. Peak day demand for Facility construction would occur for concrete batch plant production and could reach a maximum of 55,000 gpd.

Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Solid Waste Management

Construction and Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(d) Police Protection

Construction and Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(e) Fire Protection and Emergency Response

Construction and Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(f) Health Care

Construction and Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(g) Schools

Construction and Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(4) Impact on Regional Development

(a) Description

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Housing

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Commercial and Industrial Development

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Transportation System Development

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following:

- It is anticipated that during the construction period, delivery of turbines and other equipment will result in **60** large trucks per day traveling to the Project area. [The December 21, 2009 filing identified 20 large trucks per day.] [First paragraph, Application, 8-72]

- In addition, smaller vehicles, such as pickups and automobiles, are expected at a rate of approximately **200** per day during construction. [The December 21, 2009 filing identified 100 smaller vehicles per day would travel to the site.] [First paragraph, Application, 8-72]

(b) Compatibility with Regional Plans

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(D) CULTURAL IMPACT

(1) Landmarks of Cultural Significance

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(a) Archeological Investigation

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Architectural Investigation

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(i) Built Resources

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(ii) Historic Districts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iii) Rural Schools

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(iv) Agricultural Properties

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(v) Individual Properties

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(2) Estimated Impacts on Landmarks

(a) Archeological Resources

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Built Resources

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(3) Consideration of Landmarks

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(4) Mapping Landmarks

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(5) Recreational Areas

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(6) Visual Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(E) PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY**(1) Public Information Program**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of Table 8-12 being revised to show public meetings and correspondences that have occurred since the filing of the December 21, 2009 OPSB Application. [Application, 8-85]

TABLE 8-12 [REVISED TABLE 8-12, APPLICATION , 8-85 TO 8-87]
Public Meetings and Correspondence

| Date | Description |
|----------|--|
| 11/20/08 | A meeting was held with approximately 200 potential landowners to discuss the Facility and lease options. A presentation was provided outlining all aspects of the Facility. |
| 11/21/08 | A tour of the site was conducted with Keith Lott of the ODNR-Division of Wildlife, and Megan Seymour of the USFWS. Both Mr. Lott and Ms. Seymour indicated that they had no specific concerns about the Facility and later confirmed that the Facility area was a low risk to wildlife. This meeting was setup as a pre-survey review of the Facility and included an informal review of the Facility maps and a field review. |
| 1/15/09 | A public meeting was held in Paulding County with approximately 50 attendees. A presentation was provided regarding all aspects of the Facility. |

TABLE 8-12 [REVISED TABLE 8-12, APPLICATION , 8-85 TO 8-87]
Public Meetings and Correspondence

| Date | Description |
|---------|---|
| 1/15/09 | Meetings were held with the Van Wert County engineer, Paulding County engineer, Van Wert County Commissioners, and two township zoning officers in Paulding County. Potential impacts to county roads and road agreements were discussed with the county engineers. The building permit process was discussed with the township zoning officers. A general wind energy presentation was provided to the Van Wert County Commission and an overview of the Facility was provided. As part of this meeting, there were open discussions about the development, construction, and operation of the Facility. In addition, there were discussions of local permits, road and utility requirements, and the use of town and county roads and ROWs. A meeting was also conducted with the Van Wert Conservation District to discuss important issues relative to local farmers including drainage tile and agricultural land restoration. |
| 2/11/09 | A meeting was held with the Paulding County Commissioners to give a general wind energy presentation and to discuss the Facility. |
| 2/12/09 | A meeting was held with the principal and a middle school science teacher of Wayne Trace Junior and Senior High (Paulding area) to plan a wind turbine kit project for a science class. |
| 2/12/09 | The Paulding County Farm Bureau organized a public meeting and the Applicant gave a presentation about the Facility and how wind energy fits with agriculture. |
| 2/13/09 | A meeting was held with the Ohio State University extension office's Professor Andy Kleinschmidt to discuss how wind energy fits with agriculture and possible special construction techniques to minimize impact to heavy clay soils in the area. |
| 2/13/09 | A meeting was held with Crestview schools about wind turbine kit projects for science classes. |
| 2/23/09 | A presentation was given to Van Wert Lions Club about the Facility. |
| 2/24/09 | A presentation was provided to the OPSB, Keith Lott (ODNR) and Dave Snyder (OHPO) to discuss the general Facility details, forecasted surveys, and schedule. The necessary coordination that would be required to move the application forward was also discussed. |
| 3/20/09 | A teleconference was held with the Applicant's Project Engineer Jeromy Miceli and Randall Reeder of Ohio State University about ways to mitigate soil damage due to construction activities. |
| 4/2/09 | A telephone conversation was held with Mildred Chatterton of the Black Swamp Audubon Society to declare the Applicant's intent to build a Facility and detail the Applicant's ABPP. Ms. Chatterton indicated that she had no concerns about the Facility. |
| 4/2/09 | The Applicant attended a tour of the Van Wert Historical society and had further discussions with Joe Steffan regarding the history of the area. Mr. Steffan indicated that he had no concerns about the Facility. |
| 4/2/09 | A telephone conversation was held with Bill Beckham of the Paulding Soil and Water Conservation District/Black Swamp Nature Center to declare the Applicant's intent to build the Facility and detail the Applicant's ABPP. Mr. Beckham indicated that he had no concerns about the Facility. |
| 4/23/09 | The Applicant spoke with Mrs. Randy Shaffer of the Otto Ehrhart Museum of Natural History and Paulding County Historical Society. Mrs. Shaffer indicated that she had no concerns about the Facility and does not foresee opposition to the Facility. |
| 4/24/09 | On Van Wert Arbor Day, the Applicant sponsored the planting of a tree at the reservoir park located south of town. |
| 4/28/09 | The Applicant met with Les Weidenhamer of the John Paulding Historical Museum and had a tour of the museum to learn about the agricultural history of the area. Mr. Weidenhamer indicated that he had no concerns about the Facility. |

TABLE 8-12 [REVISED TABLE 8-12, APPLICATION , 8-85 TO 8-87]
Public Meetings and Correspondence

| Date | Description |
|-----------------------|---|
| 5/13/09 | A meeting was held with Rahel Babb (OEPA Isolated Wetlands) and a follow-up meeting with David Snyder (OHPO) to introduce the Facility and determine how to best coordinate with them. |
| 5/15/09 | A meeting was held with the Van Wert County Soil and Water Conservation District to discuss the Facility and learn how to best coordinate with them. |
| 5/15/09 | A meeting was held with Van Wert County Commissioners' Clerk Larry Clouse and Auditor Nancy Dixon to discuss tax issues. |
| 8/13/09 | A meeting was held with a resident of the project area to discuss his concerns about noise, shadow flicker, and other items. The Applicant provided him with facts regarding each of these issues. The resident left the meeting comfortable with the Facility's plans. |
| 8/26/09 | An email was submitted to area resident to address questions about noise, shadow flicker, wind turbine syndrome, and other items. |
| 9/4/09 | A meeting was held with Union Township (in Van Wert County) to discuss the Facility and tax issues. The Township is supportive of the Facility and would like to be assured of receiving adequate tax revenue. Concerns regarding conflicts of interest were also discussed. Potential conflicts of interest were identified by the Township due to township trustees being lessors and also voting to approve a property tax abatement for the Facility. |
| 9/2/09 through 9/9/09 | The Applicant had a booth at the Van Wert County fair to meet the public and answer any questions about the Facility. During the fair, all persons who approached the booth indicated positive support for the Facility. |
| 9/24/09 | A telephone conversation was conducted with Lynn Army of the Maumee Watershed Conservancy District to discuss collocation with their facilities and agreements that may be needed to cross their drainage easements. |
| 9/29/09 | A meeting was held at Lincolnview High School that was organized by Hoaglin Township. This meeting was held to discuss wind energy and property taxes. |
| 10/7/09 | The Applicant initiated a miniature wind turbine program at Wayne Trace Junior High. |
| 10/8/09 | The Applicant initiated a miniature wind turbine program at Lincolnview High School. |
| 10/8/09 | A meeting was held with Union Township to discuss the Facility and tax implications. |
| 10/19/09 | A presentation was given to the Crestview School Board to discuss the Facility and taxes. |
| 11/19/09 | A public meeting was held for the Facility with assistance from the OPSB. |
| 11/19/09 | A meeting was held with Patricia Tebie (OEPA NPDES) and Lynn Army of the Maumee Watershed Conservation District. |
| 11/20/09 | A presentation was given to a sophomore science class at Crestview School to discuss technical aspects of the proposed Facility. |
| 1/14/10 | <i>Attended Union Township meeting for general project update and tax discussion.</i> |
| 1/26/10 | <i>Meeting with Paulding and Van Wert counties and Benton, Blue Creek, Latty, Tully, Union, and Hoaglin townships to discuss a draft road agreement.</i> |
| 1/26/10 | <i>Iberdrola representative attended Blue Creek Township meeting for general project update.</i> |
| 1/28/10 | <i>Iberdrola Renewables construction site manager Lincoln Phillips attended the Union Township meeting to answer questions about construction process, especially road repair and drainage tile repair.</i> |

TABLE 8-12 [REVISED TABLE 8-12, APPLICATION , 8-85 TO 8-87]
Public Meetings and Correspondence

| Date | Description |
|----------------|--|
| <i>2/8/10</i> | <i>Attended Blue Creek Township Zoning Committee meeting to discuss whether the Township's own zoning regulations would apply to the wind farm.</i> |
| <i>2/8/10</i> | <i>Attended Van Wert TWIGs meeting for general wind energy presentation.</i> |
| <i>2/9/10</i> | <i>Attended Hoaglin Township meeting for general discussion on wind energy, including discussions of the potential effects of an operating wind farm, including noise and shadow flicker, and energy subsidies, and taxes.</i> |
| <i>2/10/10</i> | <i>Attended Paulding County Commissioners' daily session for general project update and discussion of taxes.</i> |
| <i>2/15/10</i> | <i>Attended Crestview Board of Education meeting for general project update and discussion on taxes.</i> |
| <i>2/15/10</i> | <i>General wind energy presentation at the Convoy Lions Club meeting.</i> |
| <i>2/23/10</i> | <i>Iberdrola representative attended Hoaglin Township meeting for discussion on blowing survey debris, Iberdrola's finances, energy subsidies, alleged health effects from wind turbines, and taxes.</i> |
| <i>3/8/10</i> | <i>Iberdrola representative attended Hoaglin Township Meeting for discussion on shadow flicker, alleged health effects from wind turbines, and taxes.</i> |
| <i>3/11/10</i> | <i>Attended Union Township meeting for general project update and tax discussion. Also went through the OPSB application to explain where to find certain information.</i> |
| <i>3/11/10</i> | <i>Paulding County Commissioners' meeting with Latty and Blue Creek township trustees, Wayne Trace Administration and Board of Education, State Senator Steve Buehrer, and Representative Lynn Wachtmann. Gave a presentation on Iberdrola's perspective on taxes in Ohio and participated in a general discussion on wind farm taxes.</i> |

(2) Liability Insurance

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(3) Evaluation of Interference with Radio and Television

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(a) Microwave

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Radio

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Television

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-90]:

- In December 2009, the Applicant performed a TV Broadcast Off-Air Reception Measurement Study for the Facility. Appendix BB, *Comsearch Studies and Communications with NTIA*, has been updated to include a copy of the complete study. The conclusions of the study indicate the following:
 - The Project area relies on off-air television from the greater metropolitan areas of Fort Wayne, Indiana and Lima, Ohio (approximately 30 to 45 miles from the Facility). The existing received signals in the Project area are well below the Grade A or B contour levels for the television stations. It is anticipated that the installation of wind turbines will attenuate the television signal if they are in the path between the station and the residence or business where the signal is received. Because the signals are weak to begin with, the additional attenuation caused by the turbines may make some of the signals unsuitable for producing good video.
 - The maximum number of off-air television stations available in the Project area is nine—one analog and eight digital. Study results show that no more than five stations produce good video.

- Cable television is available in the larger communities in the area. This mode of television service will be undisturbed by the presence of wind turbines.
- Most homes in the area have off-air reception antennas and most of them are pointed toward Fort Wayne, Indiana. Many homes also have direct broadcast satellite antennas. Reception issues may be encountered at agricultural or farm areas that have off-air antennas after the wind turbines are installed, and the resolution to these issues will need to be handled on a case-by-case basis.
- The Applicant will work with landowners to implement the necessary mitigation measures should television reception be degraded as a result of Facility operations. Mitigation measures that may be utilized include any of the following, either singly or in combination:
 - Installation of high-gain television antenna on towers with rotors with a preamplifier to boost the received signal level at individual reception sites. This mitigation measure is most suitable for farm homes and other remote sites where cable television hookup does not exist.
 - Where cable television exists, providing cable hookups to sites affected. This mitigation measure is most applicable inside communities where cable television exists.
 - Provide satellite television reception service to homes affected. This mitigation measure is applicable to both homes within communities and at remote sites.
 - For areas where a cluster of homes exist, providing installation of cable systems, satellite head end reception point with a cable

distribution system, or installation of a wireless television distribution system may also be options.

- The Applicant would like to clarify that “minimal to no impact” to Weather Surveillance Radar-1988 Doppler weather radar operations, is the lowest rating provided, indicating that no significant impact is expected by the Project.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that updated turbine coordinates provided to the OPSB on March 9, 2010 were filed with the FAA on March 11, 2010.

(d) Cellular and Personal Communication Systems

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(4) Evaluation of Interference with Military Radar

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, except for the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-91]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that according to reference correspondence provided in Appendix BB, the Marine Corps does not consider the Project a significant impact and is willing to adjust its training facilities in accordance with the proposed Facility operating layout.

(5) Evaluation of Impact to Roads and Bridges

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(6) Plan for Decommissioning

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following to be added at the end of the section [Application, 8-96]:

- The Applicant would like to clarify that although it is willing to make available full lease agreements to the Staff under appropriate confidential protection, the relevant language from its standard agreement, which provides specific remediation obligations and timeframes, states:

12.3 Effect of Termination. Upon termination of this Agreement, whether as to the entire Property or only as to part, Lessee shall (i) upon written request by Landowner, execute and record a quitclaim deed to Landowner of all of Lessee's right, title and interest in and to the Property, or to that part thereof as to which this Agreement has been terminated, and (ii) as soon as practicable thereafter, remove i) all under-ground Windpower Facilities down to 48 inches from the surface and ii) all above-ground Windpower Facilities from the Property or portion as to which this Agreement was terminated, exclusive of any continuing right established pursuant to this Agreement to survive the term of this Agreement, and restore the soil surface to a condition reasonably similar to its original condition. If Lessee fails to remove such Windpower Facilities within eighteen (18) months of termination of this Agreement, Landowner may do so, in which case Lessee shall reimburse Landowner for reasonable and actual costs of removal incurred by Landowner, less any salvage value received by Landowner, within thirty (30) days after receipt of an invoice from Landowner. Regardless of the date of termination of this Agreement, Lessee shall have a license to enter the Property during the aforesaid eighteen (18) month period for the purpose of removing above ground Windpower Facilities.

Please note that the Applicant has made slight modifications to this language in response to specific landowner requests, but each of the lease agreements contain

terms which impose at least this level of remediation upon the company in the event of termination or expiration of the lease.

- The Applicant would like to clarify that given the fundamental business structure of wind energy – building a high capital cost generating unit that requires no fuel inputs and only minimal operational expenses in the form of maintenance, land lease payments, and taxes – a functional wind turbine has a high intrinsic value. Therefore, a functioning wind turbine in place is invaluable compared to its salvage value. This rationale also serves to demonstrate the low likelihood of decommissioning the facility before the end of its operational life. Details of the Applicant’s investment in the project are confidential but available for Staff review at Counsel’s office.
- The Applicant would like to clarify that the primary logic behind leaving the collector lines in place during/after decommissioning is to avoid additional disturbance of field drainage tile. The farm ground in the Project area is highly dependent on a network of underground drainage tile to reduce moisture levels in the soil to the point that modern farming practices are economically feasible. The underground electrical collection system is necessary to collect the electricity generated by each wind turbine and convey it ultimately to the interconnection substation. (Underground electrical lines are generally preferred by farmers and residents of the Project area because, once installed, they do not interfere with normal farming operations in the fields (i.e., no poles for tractors to navigate around) and because they cannot be seen, lessening visual impact). If underground collection lines are required to be removed as part of a decommissioning sequence, there could be several years of continued maintenance required to ensure that all tile lines repaired upon removal were fixed correctly. This will hinder the farmers’ attempt to return to normal farming operations. It should also be noted, that even though the lines may be left in place, the company has an obligation to restore the surface topsoil to a depth of 48 inches, which exceeds what is required by most farming practices.

(F) AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT IMPACT**(1) Agricultural District Mapping**

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(2) Impact Assessment on Agricultural Land

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following:

- The Facility would disturb some agricultural land temporarily (**1,237.3** acres) and occupy some agricultural land permanently (**213.2** acres). [The December 21, 2009 filing identified that the Facility would disturb some agricultural land temporarily (782.4 acres) and occupy some agricultural land permanently (230.5 acres)] [First paragraph, Application, 8-96].
- The Applicant would like to clarify the total acreage of temporary and permanent impact to agricultural land—1,003.4 acres of temporary impact and 183.8 acres of permanent impact would occur in Van Wert County, and 234.2 acres of temporary impact and 5.4 acres of permanent impact would occur in Paulding County. Of the acres of impact to agricultural land, 22.4 acres of temporary impact and 5.4 acres of permanent impact would occur within a designated agricultural district in Van Wert County. Of the acres of impact to agricultural land, 22.4 acres of temporary impact and 4.0 acres of permanent impact would be within a designated agricultural district in Paulding County. [To be added at the end of the section, Application, 8-97]

(a) Field Operations

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(b) Irrigation

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(c) Field Drainage Systems

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(3) Mitigation for Agricultural Land Impacts

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section.

(4) Agricultural Land Viability Assessment

No text changes from the December 21, 2009 Blue Creek OPSB Application text have occurred in this section, with the exception of the following:

The temporary and permanent impact of the construction and operation of the Facility on the viability of agricultural land has been *revised* and is quantified in Table 8-13.

TABLE 8-13 [REVISED, APPLICATION, 8-101]-
Temporary and Permanent Impacts on the Viability of Agricultural Land

| Agricultural Land | Temporary Disturbance (acres) | Permanent Disturbance (acres) |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Total Agricultural Land | 1237.3 | 213.2 |
| Cultivated Lands | 1234.0 | 213.2 |
| Pasture Land (Permanent) | 0.3 | 0 |
| Managed Wood Lots | 0 | 0 |
| Orchards | 0 | 0 |
| Nurseries | 0 | 0 |
| Livestock and Poultry Confinement Areas | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Related Structures | 0 | 0 |