PUBLIC HEARING
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
KITTITAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON
KITTITAS COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS - HOME ARTS BUILDING
6:00 P.M.

THURSDAY KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT MARCH 30, 2006

Board members present: Chairman David Bowen, Vice-Chairman Alan Crankovich and Commissioner Perry Huston.

Others: Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board; James Hurson, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor; Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services; Allison Kimball, Assistant Director of Community Development Services; a Court Reporter and approximately 75 members of the public.

At approximately 6:00 p.m. CHAIRMAN BOWEN opened the continued public hearing to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

Disclosures were made by Chairman Bowen, Vice-Chairman Crankovich and Commissioner Huston. There were no objections and all Commissioners remained seated. CHAIRMAN BOWEN reviewed the hearing procedures.

DARRYL PIERCY, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES noted that all Exhibits that were entered into the record during the March 29, 2006 public hearing had been copied, and distributed to each Board member as well as the applicant.


CHAIRMAN BOWEN suggested keeping the written record open until 5:00 p.m. Friday March 31, 2006. The Board closed the verbal public testimony.

DANA PECK, PROJECT MANAGER FOR HORIZON WIND ENERGY and ERIN ANDERSON, REPRESENTING HORIZON WIND ENERGY gave closing remarks on the proposed Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN moved to continue the public hearing for Board Deliberations to April 12, 2006 at 6:00 p.m. in the Home Arts Building, Kittitas County Fairgrounds, written record to remain open until Monday April 3, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. COMMISSIONER HUSTON seconded. Motion carried 3-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

*** THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS HEREBY ADOPT THE VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING AS THEIR OFFICIAL MINUTES OF RECORD ***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit #</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BY</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michael Genson</td>
<td>Letter in favor of the proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth Roberton</td>
<td>Letter of comments on proposal</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Debbie Boddy</td>
<td>Message to Governor handout</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geoff Saunders</td>
<td>Letter against proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Terri Petrey</td>
<td>Letter in favor of proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>KCC 17.56.010</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>Petitions in Support of Wind Power</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>Technical Memorandum in Response to 2/13/06 Findings from Planning Commission</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>Misc. notes from Planning Commission Hearings</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>#1 - #11 Photos</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ed Garrett</td>
<td>Letter of comments on proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Desmond Knudson</td>
<td>Comments on proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Phyllis Whitbeck</td>
<td>Comments on proposed project</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project Tax Impacts</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>Letter from Economic Development Group</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>Substitute Senate Bill 6141</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>Economic Impacts of Wind Power in Kittitas (November 2002)</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Debbie Strand</td>
<td>New York Times Article (3-13-06); AUSWEA article Wind Farms &amp; Property Prices; Ohio State University Fact Sheet</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Daniel Williams</td>
<td>Comments on “Wind Turbine Syndrome”</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dana Peck</td>
<td>Horizon Wind Energy comments on</td>
<td>03-30-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Turbines and Sub-area Plan Boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Erin Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Erin Anderson | Letter from Puget Sound Energy (dated 3-29-06) | 03-30-06 |
| Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board | Sign In Sheets from Public Hearing | 03-30-06 |
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KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SPECIAL MEETING RE KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

March 30, 2006
6:00 p.m.
Kittitas County Fairgrounds
Ellensburg, Washington

HEARING BEFORE THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
LOUISE R. BELL, CCR NO. 2676
APPEARANCES:

KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:

COMMISSIONER DAVID BOWEN, Chairman
COMMISSIONER ALAN CRANKOVICH
COMMISSIONER PERRY HUSTON
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Good evening. It's Thursday, March 30th, 2006, 6:00 p.m. in the Kittitas County Fairgrounds Home Arts Building. We are here for continued public hearing to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project Z-2005-22 submitted by Sage Brush Power Partners, LLC, for siting of a maximum of 80 wind turbines and associated facilities at a site located approximately 12 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg.

I'm going to go ahead and start out with declarations for the commissioners. I, for once, have not spoken to a single soul about anything regarding this wind farm today.

And with that, I guess is there anyone here who objects to my sitting in hearing on this issue?

Seeing no one, Commissioner Crankovich?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a couple brief conversations with staff, Mr. Hurson and Mr. Piercy, about procedures, and other than that I have nothing else to disclose.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing that, is there anyone here who wishes to object to Commissioner Crankovich sitting in hearing on this issue?

Seeing no one, Commissioner Huston?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Nothing to disclose, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing that, is there anyone here who wishes to object to Commissioner Huston sitting in hearing on this issue?

Seeing no one, all commissioners will remain seated.

Mr. Piercy, you had some opening staff comments?

MR. DARRYLPIERCY: I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services.

I just wanted to state for the record that the written testimony that was submitted at last night's portion of this public hearing has been duplicated and copies of that written testimony have been transmitted to the Board of County Commissioners. That was given to the
commissioners just prior to this evening's meeting.

A copy of that was also provided to the applicant, and we will be making an effort to have that information available to the public beginning tomorrow, and we also hope to have that information published on our website within the next 48 hours or so. So that information will be available to the public should you wish a copy.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you. Anything else from my seatmates before we get started with public testimony?

Okay, with that, then, I will go with those people that were on the list last night that either left or wanted to be skipped over will be on the list first today.

Our first person -- I should go over the ground rules again, I guess. We're giving a five-minute limit to the testimony, and we'll ask everybody to please turn off their cell phones, direct your comments to the Board, and we'll proceed in that manner.

So Ms. Cheryl Chance, you're first.
MS. CHERYL CHANCE: My name is Cheryl Chance. I live at 1411 Howard Road in Ellensburg, Washington, 98926.

Thank you, commissioners, for the opportunity to speak tonight, I represent myself on the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, and I stand opposed to this project's location for several reasons.

I urge you to do everything in your power to keep this wind farm out of the Kittitas Valley. The negative impact on wildlife, the residents, and the property values far outweigh any potential benefit they might bring to the valley. That's Thing 1.

Thing 2: Do we really know if only 64 turbines are planned? What is planned, gentlemen? Do you know tonight?

No. 3: Where are they going to be placed definite? Again, do we know? Even though it is being termed a wind farm overlay to the existing zoning, it is a fact -- in fact a change to an industrial zone from agriculture. It is a power generation plant.
Again I reiterate, we do not refer to Hanford as a plutonium farm; we refer to it as a power generation plant. Please do not put a power generation plant in this part of our beautiful valley.

I do understand that master plans in a society require specific areas to be zoned for specific reasons in order to ensure a well-balanced community. Because of this, homeowners make decisions based on these master plans.

To change the zoning to allow this overlay is, quite frankly, a dirty trick to play on the many property owners who reside in and around this 6000 acres of the proposed power plant location.

I feel so strongly about this that my belief in self-governments -- self-governance and commitment to grass-roots political activism will not allow me to support any elected official who facilitates the construction of this proposed plant on both sides of scenic Highway 97.

Thank you for your consideration of my
concerns.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Next, if he's here, Rich Bettas?

MR. RICHARD BETTAS: Good evening, county commissioners. My name is Richard Bettas. My address is Box 327, King Cove, Alaska.

Our family has owned 320 acres on Bettas Road since the 1930s. This property is adjacent to the project site for the proposed Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

The unfortunate aspect with the debate on a project of this magnitude is that it sometimes pits neighbor against neighbor; friend against friend; and worst of all, family member against family member. I understand the rights of our long-time neighbors to gain financially from wind turbines sited on their property. They and their family members before them have been good neighbors to our family.

I believe the Kittitas Valley Wind Power applicant has demonstrated a new proposal worth consideration, hopefully limiting the project to 64 turbines. With the realization that this
project could have an adverse effect on property values, perhaps some language could be included in the final stipulations to address this.

My ownership in the Bettas property is legally defined as an undivided third, as it is owned by myself and two brothers, George and Bobby. In the recent past I submitted letters to the Kittitas County Community Development Services and the Board of County Commissioners requesting denial of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

I would request at this time for the official record that those letters signed by myself be removed from the record and my official position for the record be listed as neutral.

Although I cannot legally speak for my brother George, I informed him this afternoon of my decision to take a neutral position, as he was traveling on a business trip in Montana, and he had no objection to my position. God bless our brother Bobby. We always attempt to do what's best for him.

I now place my trust and confidence in the
integrity and knowledge of you three members of
the Board of County Commissioners to make the
final decision for the common good of the people
of Kittitas County. I respectfully thank you for
the opportunity to speak here this evening.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you, Richard.
There is one item that I meant to do
housekeeping-wise. We did receive a couple of
correspondences earlier today regarding one of
our staff members was given a cup of coffee
yesterday, and you get so familiar with people
that we didn't -- I didn't see it happen and
nobody thought much of it, but it was noted by
the public and requested that we mention that
today.

As commissioners I guess I would hope that
people understand that a cup of coffee doesn't
buy a vote on this county commission. Also did
inform the person involved that we just wouldn't
be doing that any further. So just for the
record I wanted to make sure that was out there.

That takes us to Charles Holtz. I don't see
Charles.

Greg Harrington?

Kathy Schumaker? Or "Shoe-maker"?

Joseph Powell?

Mark Schober?

Judith Kleck?

Debbie Boddy, B-o-d-d-y?

Desmond Knudson? Is he not here yet?

MR. DANA PECK: He wanted me to -- he said that he might be running a little late.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: And that's it for last night. Did anybody bring my list for tonight?

Okay, I have Rob Boddy, but he noted not to testify; is that still correct?

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: I'm Debbie Boddy.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay. I think I just called your name, so why don't --

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Do you want me to wait --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: If you're ready --

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Call the next person and then I'll --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, perfect, thank you.

Elizabeth Robertson?
MS. ELIZABETH ROBERTSON: My name is Elizabeth Robertson. My husband and I live at 4101 Bettas Road, Cle Elum. I'd like to read my prepared statement.

Our home is located approximately 1200 feet from proposed Al. After listening to last night's testimony, I got the feeling that our patriotism, lifestyle, and so-called "green" credentials were on trial just by living next to this proposed project.

We bought our 20 acres eight years ago. Five years ago we went through the county permitting process that allowed us to build our home. We were not aware of a wind farm being proposed in our back yard at that time.

My husband is employed by a company on the west side and the money he makes is, for the most part, spent in Kittitas County. Although we could use a local Costco in order to spend more money here. He commutes a couple times a week in a Volkswagen diesel that gets 45 miles to the gallon and is running on biodiesel.

We do not have school-aged children, we do
not attach to the city of Ellensburg water supply or sewer system. We built our own access road, drilled our own well, and put in our septic system using local contractors.

We do not raise animals on our land, if you don't count the bluebirds and the kestrels that every year use the nesting boxes we put up. We don't let our dogs run free.

We control noxious weeds on our property and have even ordered special weevils from WSU to control knap weed intrusions from neighboring properties. We turn our lights off at night so as not to disturb wildlife in a natural corridor on our land and to conserve energy. We don't have the mercury vapor lights. We do pay significant county taxes.

We relied on the county Planning Department to determine that there was, in fact, enough water available in that area and that our land was capable of supporting our septic system.

This is their job. And if growth becomes a problem in these areas, they will undoubtedly limit future home building permits.
The siting of a wind farm is just another land-use decision. We are not here tonight to save the planet. If this project is denied for this site, it doesn't mean it can't be built at a more compatible site.

In closing, I find it hard to believe that the experts who work in the wind industry, some of whom were heard last night, seem to be unaware of the real impacts associated with these projects.

As a transplanted Englishwoman with family still in the U.K., I can assure you that the rosy picture painted of wind turbines in the English countryside is completely false. In fact, it appears that the country will have to revive their aging nuclear industry to meet their carbon reduction targets.

Wind power has its uses but it should not be sited around people's homes. Please deny this project application. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Next let's see, Ms. Boddy made it in, so let me go back and --
correctly.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Yes. Thank you.

Well, these are trying times in our Kittitas County. And my name is Debbie Boddy. I live on 790 Dudley Road. I do not live on Highway 97; I live off the Thorp Highway and Highway 10. These turbines will reside directly above my home within, I don't know, a half a mile, my husband has determined. So they will loom over our home on the Yakima River.

I guess today a picture is worth a thousand words, so I'm going to give you a handout. I'll let the pictures talk for themselves, mostly, so I'll try to make this very brief.

Your charge is to make a recommendation to the governor of this state, so I would like you, as a message to the governor, relay a few things.

No. 1. Kittitas County supports wind farm development. You have proven it through the Wild Horse wind farm project. It was the right project and the right place. So for people to say you don't support it is wrong, and you have plenty of proof of that fact.

No. 2. And this was something important,
new from my last testimony. I looked at the
Swift Water Scenic Byway, and that was part of
your draft Environmental Impact Statement that
was part -- that was going to be impacted by this
wind farm as well as the Mountain to Sound scenic
byway, the John Wayne Trail, and of course the
Swauk Creek Nature Conservancy. Many other areas
as well.

I found the Swift Water Corridor vision,
which that was the part I managed to get a copy.
The County obviously has this record, because it
was developed by the County with the local
residents. This was done in 1997. Not only with
the local residents of Thorp and Cle Elum, but
also with Washington State Department of
Transportation, the U.S. Forest Service.

But I included a few excerpts from this just
as a reminder to you that a vision has already
been declared for this land use on Highway 10 and
in the Thorp community. And it ties very much to
the Mountains to Sound Scenic Byway.

I'd like you as you consider this to review
your vision that was already established. Again,
a vision that looks at rural communities,
preserving rural communities, preserving your
scenic and the beauty of the Yakima River Canyon
and so on.

I want the message to be stated Kittitas
County supports the Washington state tourism and
the scenic byway industry as proven by some of
the websites. Historic Ellensburg, the scenic
hub of the Pacific Northwest.

Again, we promote that scenic corridor in
our valley and recognize it at an integral part
of our tourism industry.

I believe that Kittitas County, through this
decision, will help maintain the standard for
wind farm development, not only in our county but
in the state. And be sure that the governor
understands what that standard is that you're
setting.

I believe that wind farm industry does not
belong near rural, prime residential areas or
communities like Thorp. I believe the wind farm
industry does not belong in scenic byways, scenic
byways to include the scenic Yakima River
Corridor on State Highway 10.

This, again, the photo that I gave you, look
at these photos; because if you look at those,
those turbines will be exactly above those old,
dry, dusty hills looking down on the Yakima River.

The wind farm industry does not belong in prime recreational and tourist industries or areas. The Yakima River scenic corridor, again, it's been quoted and promoted by fly fishing industries and, of course, the real adventure, river rafting, not to mention all the university students that float that river. But it's also known as the finest fly fishing and family rafting in the United States.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: One minute.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Okay, real quick, look at the mountain on that particular excerpt. Wind farms would sit right above it. Again, it does not belong in the John Wayne Trail or adjacent to it.

And the scenic -- to say yes to Horizon, for the governor to say yes to Horizon is to say -- it's to make our scenic byways vulnerable to the wind farm development.

Again, take a look at our state designated scenic byways. To say yes to Horizon means that
Think about that for a minute. What about the community of Kittitas? If Thorp falls victim, Kittitas, places like Thrall Road, Wilson Creek, Manastash, and so on.

I also believe if you say yes, the next company that comes along and wants turbines, if you don't like the location, if you say that you don't like the location because it's too close to Kittitas, you've already set a precedent and it opens a liability issue for being able to deny wind farms in other prime areas in our valley. Please be sure that the governor is aware of that as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Takes us to Mike Robertson; said he didn't want to testify?

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: I testified last night.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That's right; I thought your name was familiar.

And Catherine also did last night.

And Jeb did last night.

Michael -- I'm not going to pronounce the
last name; he said he didn't want to testify.

Tom Burke didn't want to testify.

Geoff Sanders? Or Saunders?

MR. GEOFF SAUNDERS: Saunders. Good

evening. Geoff Saunders. My home is at 8241 Elk Springs Road.

I don't presume to tell you how to do your jobs, but Horizon is trying very hard to change the subject, and I ask that you stay focused on what's important about this issue, which is location. Nothing else.

Horizon's tried to make this about almost anything else except location, and I'd like to take a couple minutes to remind you about what this is not about.

This is not about saving the earth. We've heard from their attorney yesterday that this is about saving the environment and that ordinary people in this county should accept a loss to do the right thing for the earth.

Wind farms may or may not be a good thing, and none of us here I think are really qualified to say one way or the other. But this is about
where to locate this particular wind farm. This
is obviously not the only part of the country,
the county, or the state where wind farms can be
built. The question is, is it an appropriate
location?

Attorneys who tell us that we should accept

this project in this location with all the
accompanying property value loss and damage for
the good of the earth are trying to mislead you.

Zilkha officials made billions in oil
exploration before they discovered that wind
farms are even more lucrative than oil. Selim
Zilkha is listed by Forbes as one of the richest
men in the company.

Then the Zilkhas sold their company to
Goldman Sachs to form Horizon, and I don't think
Goldman Sachs bought the company to save the
earth. I think they bought this because this is
a very lucrative investment. So why are we being
asked to accept a loss to make these companies
richer?

Horizon is quick to tell us that wind power
is a rapidly growing area, that hundreds of new
wind farms are being built each year. Yet they want you to believe that this spot on Highway 97 is the only possible place that a wind farm can be built. Does that make sense to you? It doesn't make any sense to me.

Another thing this is not about is tax revenue. We heard yesterday that this is about the tax revenue that the county will get, and we heard a long list of numbers from Horizon's attorney about what schools and fire departments will get if you approve this project.

Well, I haven't seen any official numbers from the county and I wonder if there are any yet. And without official numbers, the numbers that Horizon is throwing about mean nothing and must not be part of your decision.

But if you are going to consider tax revenue, then you also need to consider the devaluation of a thousand properties, the loss of tourist revenue, and the way that this enormous project will slow growth in the county because people will be less likely to move here.

Horizon actually tells that you that this
project will result in fewer homes being built, as though this were a good thing. They admit that it will cause growth in this county to slow. And another very important thing to remember on the subject of taxes is that if you decide that there is a better location in this county for this wind farm, a remote area where the project is welcomed, like Whiskey Dick, then the county will get whatever tax revenue there is to be had, if there is any. Once again, the issue is location.

And the last thing that this is not about is a choice between houses and wind farms. We heard a lot about that yesterday. I'm sure you find it ironic, as I do, that this developer, Horizon, is arguing you should accept its project to prevent other housing developers from building their projects. That sounds a little hypocritical to me.

And look at this logic. They're telling that you a wind farm will make the area so ugly and noisy that it will be unsuitable for housing. Their argument is that we should destroy the area
to save it. That makes no sense to me. And if Horizon is correct that this project will keep houses away, then it will also keep tourists away; and tourists are a vital part of this county's economy.

The decision you're making is about one thing: location. Wind farms are not currently permitted by county law in this location. The reason that so many people have written to the County, so many people have shown up to these meetings over the last four yours and testified, and so many people have written to the newspapers is because most people think Highway 97 would be the worst possible place for this project.

One more thing. I'm sure you've noticed that there are EnXco executives in the back of this room. You denied their project and they sued you. Now they're here to see if you approve this project. Because if you do, they will argue that you're being inconsistent. And they'd be right. You must deny this project for the same reason that you denied EnXco's project, which is only one mile from Horizon's proposed project.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Next is Terri Perry?

MS. THERESA PETREY: That's me, Terri Petrey.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That's right. I knew I wasn't saying that one right.

MS. THERESA PETREY: Thank you for the opportunity once again to address you. Last night I told you that I'd send you an e-mail, but it's been a busy day and preparing the document, I decided to come on in.

A couple things. I have supported all of the wind projects in this valley. I support PSE in its efforts. I support the Zilkha family and its efforts. I support Goldman Sachs and its purchase of the Zilkha wind farm projects to become Horizon Wind Energy. And I support EnXco, including its executives in the back of the room.

I am here because I'm a member of this community for three and a half years. I didn't come here because I wanted to be here; I came here because I had to come here. As I've stated
before, I came here under unfortunate circumstances and had a chance to live as a member of the working class. A member of one of the families in town that has to struggle.

My circumstances have recently changed a bit and I've been able to purchase a home in town, so I'm now a property owner and really can't represent that 60 to 70 percent of the unrepresented rental population in this discussion.

I do have children. I'm a married person. I have a family of five residing here right now. They include a 24-year-old son who's a WSU nursing student. I have a 13-year-old at Morton Middle School and a 7-year-old at Mt. Stuart.

I've heavily involved myself in the community for a number of reasons. One of those reasons is I've seen economic struggle here at all levels. It's a community that was desperate a couple of years ago, desperate-looking downtown. I'm not the only person that rallied to the effort. I finally had to face the fact that I could make a difference here in the kind
of personal choices that I made.

So I got involved in the community, looking for ways to help drive tourism here. That was something I could do by engaging in the Ellensburg Film Festival. Took a lot of work, a lot of effort. Paid off. And 68 people devoted themselves to helping me on that project.

Personally the choice that I made was that I was going to try to spend every cent that I could in this community. And to do that, I have to go out of my way. I bought all my Christmas presents here this year. Maybe not the things I would have had first priority, but I made sure that those dollars stayed in this community so they could turn and have the multiplier effect.

I go buy bread from Vinman's bakery. It's actually a little cheaper than the kind of bread that I was buying at Fred Meyer, but I can be assured that those dollars stay in this community, because it helps develop this community economically.

I buy my ice cream at Winegar's through the drive-through. I encourage all of you to support
those local businesses who have invested their
hard-earned dollars.

I spent the last week and a half in southern
California, San Diego, Los Angeles, and the
southern San Joaquin Valley. I want to tell you
that things have not improved there, and we see
the kind of development that we are seeing in the
foothills in the valley here, even in the
southern San Joaquin Valley's prime farmland,
Tahahn Ranch is now up for development.

You cannot move about in Los Angeles on the
freeways even at one o'clock in the afternoon
without encountering massive traffic. It's our
choice to make right decisions now.

I think that the most compelling testimony
that we heard last night came from Catherine
Clerf, who is a fourth-generation resident of the
valley, who talked about the sacrifices that were
made to build the Wanapum Dam. I don't know if
those properties were freely given or if they

were taken. I don't know if the property that
became the Yakima Firing Range was freely given
or it was taken. She mentioned that the
compensation wasn't there.

What we have here is a situation where we
don't have any proof of any property loss values
in this area. We have a lot of bad science that
comes through, a lot of incorrect information
gleaned from the internet that's used as evidence
in these hearings.

I am sure the applicant has provided you
with some good solid testimony. You've had
experts from Department of Natural Resources
here.

And it's important to make good choices,
make the right choices, even if they're not easy.
And I encourage you to get in the fight and fight
for the economic future of this county. Thank
you. And I'm going to leave with you a summery
of my testimony to pass here.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Let's see, next one is
Gloria Lindstrom, who testified last night.

James Carmody?

MR. JAMES CARMODY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is James Carmody. My address is 405 East
Lincoln. I've been before you and I've
represented Residents Opposed to Kittitas Turbines from the inception of this process, all the way back to the creation and drafting of the ordinance that you will be applying in this proceeding.

I've testified far too many times, spent far too many hours here, but it's an important decision for you; and more importantly, it's an important decision for the residents in this community.

As a starting proposition and one of the concerns that I have on this was registered in some of the questions that were asked by you, and that is what really is the project? After all these hours of hearing, all these discussions, what in the world is the project?

We're told that it's 80 turbines, but I don't see anyplace in any material a layout with 80 turbines. This (indicating) was pointed to as the example of what was changed about it. But take a substantive look at that. It doesn't change a thing from the original. They put a ceiling of 80, but the turbine strings are in the same locations, run the same distances, have the
potential of impacting properties just as the first one did.

They don't tell you where the turbines are going to be. If you count the turbines on that, it's 64 turbines. That was what was the basis for the aesthetic analysis, all that was before you. We have no idea where the turbines are going to be. All we know is that there are strings and there's a maximum of 80. You can put them in any one of the strings or all of the strings. So we don't even know where the project is from the beginning.

I'm struck in part by the comments earlier about who was here. Because who is here watching this hearing last night were the EnXco representatives, Mr. Steeb and the others. And why are they here? Because you denied Desert Claim and they've filed an action proceeding before EFSEC to tip over the local decision-making process.

And that process will be successful and preemption applied if this decision is made in a manner different than what was applied in Wild Horse and in Desert Claim.

Also here tonight is Mr. Peeples. He's been
here through the entire process. He hasn't spoken to you, but his role is to represent Zilkha and Horizon in the EFSEC proceedings. They want to preempt this decision-making process, and this is the only opportunity this community has to make their voice heard and have their voice be a matter in the land use planning process.

And that's why we asked the Planning Commission and ask you to deny this project, because it's the only opportunity. The fight is a long fight ahead. We've already spent time in the Superior Court with Judge Cooper over Desert Claim, and he concluded that the decision the County made was proper and that the basis of denial was proper. And each of those standards apply in this case even more significantly.

Take a comparison of Wild Horse, Desert Claim, and Kittitas Valley. And take a look at the factors that became important in each of those: Proximity of residents, interfacing problems associated with that, whether it be shadow flicker, property value, noise, magnitude of the project. Each of them is magnified in this particular project.
The impacts in relationships are more significant in this corridor than they were for Desert Claim, and clearly Wild Horse was a proper decision. There were no residential impacts, there were no aesthetic impacts.

Take the fact that this sits on a scenic highway at the foot of Mt. Stewart, and what does that mean to the valley? When I grew up here, Mt. Stuart was a focal point. That's what people would think. If I drove over the hill coming in tonight and I saw that, that is what this community is about.

Think about what wind farms do to communities. State Line; what do you think about? You think about wind machines. You don't think about all the houses that are there. Preserve that, make that an important part.

We have heard -- we have heard about property values. And Geoff Saunders' comments were right. Location is the issue. But there's all kind of talk about you haven't been given information on property values, but think about the record that you have and who testified.

Colleen Anderson, Roger Weaver, the only
local realtors, testified as to the property

value diminution. That is a fact. Just use your
common sense. You put 80 forty-story towers in a
vicinity, you are going to kill values. And
that's just common sense.

You've been told that there's economic
benefits associated with this project. Those
economic benefits don't flow from the location;
they flow from a project. Those benefits can be
had in a proper location. Wild Horse'll bring
that. Diminution of values will reduce your
taxes.

Erin Anderson last night waved Senate
Bill 6141 in front of you and told you that it
was going to generate significant -- hundreds of
thousands of dollars of new tax revenues to you.
Read the bill, because it has nothing to do with
that. It doesn't generate one additional tax
dollar.

These projects are taxed as personal
property or real property, and those dollars come
to you. All this does is -- all this does is
covers your base on your levy base. So we would
urge you to set this aside.

The last quick comment I would like to make -- and I apologize for the time -- is I've been involved in wind farm projects, I've represented them. This is not the only place this has happened. There are five projects, three of which are approved in Klickitat County. Benton County, Walla Walla County all have projects. You have Wild Horse here. There is not a need for that. So all the argument about it saving the environment, ending coverage on petroleum needs aren't present, and you have no fact to support that.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

I have Douglas MacArthur here, but I do believe he testified last night, so I'll skip past that. If you have written testimony, you can certainly hand that to our clerk.

That takes me to the end of the list in front of me. So I'll have my clerk go ahead and check by the door again, and I'll go back through again last night's and see if some folks have come into the room.
Charles Holtz, H-o-l-t-z? He doesn't appear to be here.
Kathy "Shoe-maker" or "Shoe-mocker"? Not here.

Mark Schober. I don't see Mark.
Judith Kleck?
Takes me down to Desmond Knudson, who I see is here.

I'm going to start off by I've taken these pictures recently of the project site. I've taken a few days to make a scaled model that's back there over in the corner by that wind tower, which is also scaled to the wind towers which are to be -- two scale models of the transmission towers that are already out there. You guys are about a half a mile away. That's what you'll see. When I'm up there and I'm standing a half mile away from the towers, that's what I'm seeing
down there.

That picture there is looking up towards the mountains. That's the mountains in Kittitas Valley. As you can see, you don't even see Mt. Stuart because I'm -- I'm kind of above that area.

Another shot looking north. I purposely
took this from a few miles away to see if there's any homes in the photo. I don't see any.

Another faraway shot. This is looking down towards the Manastash Ridge.

Another shot. This would be the northeast corner of the proposed site looking, again, towards town.

Another site looking from the southeast looking up north. Again, the big scale is to look for homes.

And this is the famous Elk Springs Road from the BPA north line looking down towards town. Unfortunately that road's in that condition because some of the property owners didn't want it fixed. You know, if these wind towers were there, we'd have road money budget; that would be
fixed. Even though that is a private road.

There's a wind tower on Hopkin Ridge shot from the county road, which means I wasn't that far away, but that's 750 feet away. We have testimony from Mark Holloway last night saying at that distance he could not tell the difference between the blades going around and the background wind. I was there with him, stood right next to him, and I have to concur with that.

There's what you see a quarter mile away. Yes, folks, these things are big. Don't get me wrong. We're harvesting wind, we're not mowing grass. There are plenty of safety factors built into this thing. If they fall over, they fall over.

Most importantly, remember, folks, this is range -- Forest and Range land; this is not urban land. I don't see any of the people here that are testifying against running down to Community Development Services to file for a rezone to Urban, to Rural, to Rural-20, to Rural 3, 5. Oh, no, they stay in the Forest and Range land.
And I believe I have a copy of that that I'll read into the record. But since I've only got a minute left, I'll read past that.

Here's the benefits: 30K annually in royalties rent to landowners. 1.8 million annually in tax revenues. These things put in a dollar and take out 25 cents. They don't need police, they don't need firemen, and they need very little emergency service. Unlike residential, they put in a dollar and take out a dollar twenty-five. That is a proven fact, and I have the records with me which I will submit to your clerk.

These models of these towers are not 1980, not 1990. They're 2005. A lot has changed since then. Bird kills are little if not none. Hopkins Ridge, one of the engineers who worked at Altamont Pass told me man, that was bad. But they've had three kills in four months and they were starlings.

Thank you very much, and I'll hand in the rest of my testimony.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.
And that is the end of the list from last night that I have. When I do get through the list of sign-ups tonight, I will ask if there's anyone else, so don't feel you'll be left out if you haven't heard your name in case I skipped somebody errantly.

Next on the list is Jill Kuhn.

MS. JILL KUHN: My name is Jill Kuhn, 607 North Okanogan, Kittitas.

Commissioners, what has it been, four or five years of meetings, letter writings, debates? Don't you think the time for debate is over? This proposed wind farm is not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan, nor the zoning. More so, it is not compatible with Kittitas Valley, the community, and the environment.

The outcry from the community has been consistent. No. That should be the end of the debate. I own 70 acres in this proposed site, and a couple weeks ago I was contacted by a local realty company. And they said that how desirable land was off of 97 and that they would be more than happy to list my property. Well, once I
told them that my area would be surrounded by
wind farms, they decided that they would take
back their offer and they wouldn't list my
property.

The last thing I can say, I mean, we have
gone over and over the same information, and it
comes down to one thing, and that is location.
And the majority of people in this county have
said no, and that is what the commissioners
should go with and that is what the State has to
adhere to.

And in closing, may I say that I hope if the
commissioners vote in favor of this proposal that
they certainly have investment with the Goldman
Sachs investment company, who are now the owners
of Zilkha, because they will not have an
investment in this community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Next is Skip Littlefield.

MR. SKIP LITTLEFIELD: Well, number one, I
would like to say that I'm opposed to this
project and it's all about location. We had no
opposition to the project out in Kittitas, and --
but we are opposed to this because of the
location and the residents in the area.

And I would like you to respect the Planning
Commission's opinion that they opposed it
unanimously. And I think you should respect
that. We have a Planning Commission for one
reason: to present you with a guide.

And as far as Desi Knudson's presentation,
he neglected to turn around and let the viewing
audience look at his photos. He let you look at
them but we had no idea what he was -- what you
were looking at. And I don't think that's right.

As far as why don't the residents up there
or even property owners up there want to
subdivide, maybe they don't want 5-acre plots.
Maybe they don't want 10-acre plots. They want
50-acres plots for a reason. They bought for a

reason; they want to keep that it way.

And in conclusion, I just want to say that I
think you should recognize the Planning
Commission, and most of the testimony that you've
heard is against this project, and thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you.
The next person on the list is Charles -- Charlie Schantz, but he said he didn't want to testify.

And then Butch Hauens didn't want to testify.

Next is Edna Fry.

MS. EDNA FRY: Hello. My name is Edna Fry. My address is Post Office Box 1736, Ellensburg.

I have huge files that I have spent the last four years collecting on wind turbines until I could scream. And I decided to condense them down into two papers. I have files full of information on wind turbines. I find it hard to believe; common sense tells us that if someone says no, we don't want them in a certain place, that should speak volumes.

I found an article on my computer that was put together by Christopher Booker: Wind power is one of the great self-deceiving fantasies of our age. Landscapes are important. Industrial wind turbines are monsters that have no place in treasured views. This comes from a botanist.

David Bellamy: Besides blighting the
landscape, they work only about a quarter of the time, as the wind is blowing too hard or not enough.

The suggested solar power is more environmentally friendly and needs to be subsidized. Why is it the people for these monsters believe the power will stay here? Wild Horse has already sold for use on the west side.

Wake up. Once this land's destroyed, it's forever gone. How many of the people for these white elephants are actually wanting them built in their back yard where they obtrude 24/7? The peace and quiet we enjoy have no room for these monsters. I prefer bird songs over whomping noises. Please vote no. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.
Next is Mr. Peterson; I believe it's Robert Peterson.

MR. ROBERT PETERSON: I'm Bob Peterson, and I live at 1736 in Ellensburg.

I just recently called down to the Planning Commission down there and found out there's 226,000 square miles in Kittitas County. And you
should be able to find someplace to put these
wind turbines.

I really don't like to have the wind
turbines around, period. It's really nice to
look at Mt. Stuart and so forth. I grew up in
Duluth, Minnesota. We don't have mountains, we
got hills. When you look at the mountain range,
it's really beautiful over here.

I hope you guys can find another way to --
if you have to have them, put them in a place
that doesn't affect the people's way of living.
We were here first before the wind turbines.

I would like to see you look at some
solar -- the solar panel. I think I talked to
Dave about that before, and that every house in
Ellensburg or Kittitas County should have a solar
panel on it, and that would help. I don't know
if you did a study on it; I think you did, but I
don't know what the results are.

But anyway, that's all I'd like to say.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

And for the record, Bob came by and told me
about that about mid last summer. It was about
the same time that Governor Schwartzenegger
mentioned it down in California, actually a week
before, so he was a visionary at that particular
time.

That is the end of the list in front of me.
And I don't know if anybody else signed up since
I got this list.

Come on up and introduce yourself, please.

Mr. Whitaker.

MR. HARRY WHITAKER: My name's Harry
Whitaker. I live at 3411 Look Road.

And I just wanted to say I'm opposed to this
project in this location. I'm in favor of wind
power, but I think for Ellensburg, for Kittitas
Valley, for the future here of the people who've
already built and plan to build, there's a better
place for it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Mr. Piercy, is there anybody else on the
list over there?

MR. DARRYL PIERCY: No.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I see Mr. Garrett
scribbling madly over there, though, so I'm
assuming he wants to speak here.
Mr. Garrett, you didn't testify last night, did you?

MR. ED GARRETT: No. I was too busy taking notes.

My name's Ed Garrett. Thank you for the opportunity to comment before you on this project. I represent myself and my wife, Rosemary Monaghan.

Much has been said about this project along Highway 97 over the past few years. There's an extensive and voluminous public record.

I'm loathe to repeat it, but we own property on the eastern border of this proposed project on Cricklewood Lane. Our plans of building have been on hold now for four years. I have seen the ever-changing maps that show Horizon -- where they plan to -- intend to place turbines within hundreds of feet from our property, but exactly how many and exactly where they're going to be, it's a moving target. And we've heard controversies about the number of turbines.

Would you continue with your future plans based on this type of uncertainty? Horizon continues to ignore me, as well as my six neighbors who collectively own 320 acres on the
border of this proposed project.

The issues over tax benefit to the county have been brought up, but that's not the real issue. The issue is really over siting. Bottom line is there are other areas in the county as well as in this state that can support wind power. The tax base would be the same locally wherever they are placed.

The BOCC's goals should be to responsibly site an industrial wind size -- industrial-sized wind farm where it will have the least effect on neighboring landowners. The criteria used in Wild Horse project is an example of an ideal placement of a project of this suggested magnitude:

   No. 1. Large land mass owned by one or two persons.

   2. No residences or landowners for at least a mile from the project area.

   3. They preferably buy up the land for the project area.

   4. There is a secure buyer for the power produced that could be used locally.

And that the project met little opposition.
none of this criteria. There are landowners trapped within the project area, and what are they supposed to do? There are literally thousands of parcels within a mile bordering this project area under private ownership that will be affected.

Horizon has no buyer to come forward, so they can't say that the power produced is going to be used locally. To make matters worse, they have taken the approval process out of your hands and ran to the State hoping to preempt the County. They would prefer to force this project under the pretense, as Chris Taylor said before in the past, this is the only place in the county for a wind farm; let the governor decide.

We know this is a lie; why else would Wild Horse and Desert Claim projects have been proposed?

Siting of wind power is the real issue. It's not about taxing agencies and who will get what. That's just the red herring. You are tasked to look at Kittitas County and decide what
is best for all, not just for the few.

Residential development is growing, as it was stated by Darryl Piercy about the number of building permits being applied for in 2005. He also added in a Daily Record article recently that many new applicants will not draw on public resources such as school, sewer, fire protection, as most are retirees.

An area that hasn't been discussed yet that I wanted to bring up is we've heard Elk Springs Road, Cricklewood Lane. Not much has been said about Ellensburg Ranches Road. I took a little tour up there today and gathered some information. That area is within a mile of the project, and it's actually this area right in here (indicating), is Ellensburg Ranches up in there.

There are currently 43 landowners with 64 parcels. Most of all are sold. A lot of these were bought in 1999 and 2000. So I gave you a list of the current owners of those properties out there.

I counted on the map here and when I went up
there today 27 residences already established up on that road all the way up to Highway 10.

Also we'll give to you a copy of a parcel map which shows everything's parceled out. What you've been led to believe in some of these areas is that this is large land masses used for raising cattle, used for agricultural uses, whatever.

This area up there is not used for that at all. It's been already established as a rural residential area with parcels down -- about 12.5 acres each on all these. And again, this was done before the wind farm proposal in 2000.

So I'll have you look over that, so that just adds to the insult of residences being established in that area already being changed. No one's losing any grants to farms up there.

My wife and I urge you to concur with the Planning Commissioners' Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. This project is proposed in an inappropriate location and should be denied. You have to make the decision.

Will it be responsible growth by taxpaying
landowners or will it be an industrial wasteland
by a company who still can't say how many
turbines they want placed and where, thereby
shutting down Kittitas County's future growth.
This is your choice. Please think thoroughly and
vote wisely. The future of the county and its
residents is riding on your decision. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. With that, I'm
going to give my reporter a break. And we'll
take -- go ahead and make it ten minutes so you
can get relieved there.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: As I was sitting here
looking at who was in the room, I saw
Mr. Johnston and realized I probably left out a
declaration that was in the newspaper today. He
contacted me about 6:40 this morning, asking how
the wind farm hearing went last night; and I told
him we wrapped up around 10:40 and that the
testimony continued about the same pattern as it
had earlier in the evening when he was here.
So I thought I should probably make that
declaration. And as always, you see me visiting
with staff occasionally; it's all about process. So with that said, is there anybody here who objects to my continued sitting on this hearing? Seeing no one, we'll go ahead and continue. Had three people sign up during the break.

Roger Clerf would be first.

MR. ROGER CLERF: Good evening. My name is Roger Clerf. I live in the Upper Peoh Point Road in the Cle Elum area. I'm speaking in favor of the wind farm.

We have attended many hearings concerning wind farms. It's been going on now about five years. And I'm sure Perry Huston at least has the calluses to prove it. We've heard a lot of information in the last two nights, but I don't think anything really new has been presented. We all recognize that this country has a need for new energy sources. President Bush encouraged us -- encourages us to use and develop renewable energy sources and all types and all manners and as soon as possible to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

But I would like to stress a couple points
here tonight that have not been emphasized quite
enough, I don't think. And one thing is that
this is a private property issue. If a man has
good farmland, he can farm it, grow crops,
harvest crops, sell the crops, and gain economic
benefit from farming.

If he has rocky, hilly land, he can buy some
cattle and graze it, sell the cattle, and gain
economic income from the land. If he has timber
on his property, he can harvest, sell the timber
and replant the timber and gain economic benefit
from the land. If he has mineral deposits, the
deposits can be mined or quarried and he can gain
economic benefit from his land and from the
resources. If he has oil and gas deposits on his
land, they too can be developed and sold.

A man has a right to use his property for
economic benefit and to make use of the resources
that the good Lord has given him on his land.

There are 51 turbines of this project going
to be on private property. And the landowners
stand to benefit from this natural resource. 13
of them are on public lands. And the public will
benefit from this income.

You cannot and should not deny a man the use of his property for economic benefit. In this case he is producing clean energy and energy that we all need, energy that is renewable; and as you know, wind is delivered to your property free most every day of the year.

The second item I would like to cover is that we all believe that there is a lot of beautiful scenery up there and a lot of wildlife habitat. Approving the wind farm will ensure that this open space will stay open and the scenery will be there and the wildlife habitat will be there.

If you deny the project, there is a very, very good chance, a 90- to a 100-percent chance, that in 30 years the whole area will be covered with homesites. And that will certainly deprecate the scenery and deprecate the wildlife habitat, and that is not the thing that we would like to see.

Approval of the project will preserve the very things that we enjoy right now. I thank
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.


As you know, the Economic Development Group has long supported wind projects and particularly the Kittitas Valley project. Or I shouldn't say particularly, but this one also.

I've been coming before you for probably close to five years talking about this project, as have many of the other people in this room. You know, volumes of information have been submitted about this project, and a lot of it has been the same information. There are a few different things now that you need to remember.

One of the things that people have talked about is that Zilkha has now become Horizon. Well, the Economic Development Group has a new name also. We used to be the Phoenix Economic Development Group, so it is not unusual for an organization to change its name.
Horizon has listened to the testimony and they've listened to the people, and they have downsized this project somewhat to try to -- to try to accommodate what the people have said.

Another thing that's changed tremendously in this community is the residential growth. Housing developments are springing up everywhere. This isn't necessarily a bad thing, but we also need to remember that housing developments demand commercial development and industrial development in order to stay the residents of the community.

There are lots of studies that have been done talking about the cost of government services. People here have touted what is happening with government services and how residential can drain the tax dollars out of a community and how you need a mix and balance of commercial and industrial and open space and farmland in order to sustain a community. I've provided you with those studies in the past and I'll do it again tonight.

One of the big changes that's happened recently is the passage of Senate Bill 6141. I
have a copy of the entire text here and I will
present you with that also.

I've spoken with a local assessor here and
I've done some research on the bill and found
that this will tremendously affect the way the
revenues come to this county. I've provided you
with a tax sheet here based on $190 million value
of the project. Using the taxing district
numbers that have been published by the
assessor's office here, a simple calculation of
what kinds of revenue will come to this
community.

What happens here is, according to the bill,
wind turbines are now considered the same as new
construction. So those revenues will be -- or
these turbines will be taxed at a hundred percent
of their value rather than the 60/40 or 80/20
split that we used to look at regarding real and
personal property difference.

I've talked to the assessor here and shown
her my spreadsheet and asked her about how this
is going to affect the valuation of these
turbines. And she has told me that it will
affect the valuation of the turbines.

I also went into the senate bill and looked at -- pulled out the fiscal note for this bill. And I'd like to read you a few figures off the fiscal note.

At the very end of the fiscal note it talks about Klickitat County and the $220 million project that is going into Klickitat County, and it talks about what the impact is going to be regarding taxes for Klickitat County, and I'd like to read that you section.

It says that the revenue impact represents an estimate of combined regular property tax rate at -- their rate of the local taxing districts, which -- where the construction will take place. The $220 million Klickitat project would increase local tax revenue by, in Fiscal Year 2007, they say 825,000. In Fiscal Year 2008, 1.6 million. 1.63 million. In Fiscal Year 2009, 1.679 million. In Fiscal Year 2010, 1,729 million. And in Fiscal Year 2011, 1,781 million. These figures were created by the Department of Revenue, and this is the fiscal note on the bill.
And I'm also providing with you this.

So I wanted you to know that there are some changes here. I'll provide with you all of this testimony, plus some additional things.

The Economic Development Group urges the commissioners to declare this project consistent with the local land use so that it can move forward with the EFSEC process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Joseph Lowatchie?

MR. JOSEPH LOWATCHIE: Yes, sir. Good evening, commissioners, Planning Commission, members of the audience. My name is Joseph Lowatchie. I reside at 3030 Thrall Road. I'm a 60-year resident of the Kittitas Valley.

I believe in the need and value of wind farms wherever for our nation and the benefits it will provide to Kittitas County. I sympathize with the people that are against this project, but I believe the majority of the citizens of Kittitas County feel the building of the Kittitas County wind farm project is more important than bowing to the negative minority opposing it.
I believe the majority of this minority group purchased their lands after the farm's siting was made public. Why? Everyone understands the need for siting to be near existing transmission lines. We don't have to go into that detail.

I believe our dependency on foreign oil, foreign nations for our oil which translates to power must be broken or one day they will shut us off and virtually bring our nation to a standstill.

Oil, coal, water, they are the power that now run our nation. Oil, coal, and water today needs wind power to help support our needs. I believe the wind farms wherever will help break this cycle of dependency.

Wind farms in Kittitas County will help our nation and locally improve our tax base for our future needs, will lower our power rates while helping to protect the world's environment.

Personally I think they are beautiful and their promise is great for our future. When the many benefits provided by wind farms are placed alongside the few minus complaints against them, the answer is very clear: We need, we want, and
must have this clean, economical source of power.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

That does end the list in front of me, so is there anyone out here who has not spoken who wishes to speak?

Please come forward. Names and address for the record, please.

MS. MARIN SANDALL: My name is Marin Sandall. I reside at 8560 Elk Springs Road in Ellensburg. And I represent myself and my husband.

And I haven't prepared a statement, and I'm really stretching my comfort zone speaking before you, but I think it's important that I be put on record that I oppose the location of this wind farm.

I don't oppose wind farms in general, because we -- my husband and I live in the hills where we have no electrical conventional power; we live off the grid. We have solar power. And we -- so therefore I am living the green life.

But the area that you want to put this wind farm -- or where the proponents want to put this wind farm, despite what Mr. Knudson's pictures
show, there are a lot of homes in the area.
There will be a lot of people affected.

And I don't know what part of the road, Elk Springs Road that Mr. Knudson took a picture of, but I can tell you it's a well-traveled road and there's nothing wrong with it that a little four-wheeling won't solve.

But to make it short, I oppose the area -- whatever you've applied to EnXco applies to this area. We're only a few -- a couple of miles or a mile west of the EnXco site, and everything that you applied to that to deny that site you should take in consideration into our area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wishing to speak who has not signed up and who has not spoken before? Sir. We need your name and address for the record, please.

MR. BRIAN RICH: Hello. My name is Brian Rich. I live at 9711 Manastash Road.

And I've read the paper and, you know, kind of followed the whole procedure, and I've never come to any one of these meetings yet. And I felt that I really needed to do something to express my opinion.
And so for what it's worth, I feel as though the wind farms and other renewable alternative energy sources are extremely important for the safety and continued prosperity of not only Kittitas County but the entire United States.

And I also feel as though the only way that we're going to end the, the necessity for war is by making ourselves independent -- and I'm not an isolationist, but I do believe that we need to be independent so that we -- that our choices are not affected by our energy -- where we have to get our energy sources from.

And so I would encourage going forward with a reasonable alternative -- alternative energy sources; and I consider wind energy, although not, you know, perfectly efficient, and nothing is, I think that it's an important first step.

And you know, I'm sure I'm like a lot of people, when I went and filled my gas tank at $2.60 a gallon today, I would pay $4 a gallon to fill it up with wind energy from Kittitas County, you know. I mean, it's -- I would be willing to pay more to have that independence. Even though
it doesn't make -- you know, I mean, it really shouldn't make a difference to me; I need to get from Point A to Point B and I want to do it in the cheapest way possible, but I would pay extra so that it would help to separate the United States from being dependent on foreign sources of energy.

And I think that that really has a lot to do with why we're in Iraq and why we have troops deployed all over the world right now. And so just, you know, if everybody -- you know, it's going to take sacrifice.

And just as an aside, I happened to find myself in France earlier this year, and driving through the countryside, I drove probably 1500 kilometers while I was there. And in driving through the countryside and seeing the transmission lines coming from the nuclear plants was way more of an eyesore than looking at these big white windmills.

And you know, and the Dutch people, I mean, people, tourists go to -- over there just to see the windmills, you know, and so that's a
different point than the, you know, the practical part of it, but.

So I've taken up enough time. I appreciate being able to have the opportunity to speak.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Anyone else not signed up wishing to speak?

Sir, please introduce yourself and your address.

MR. DANNY HULL: My name is Danny Hull. I live at 1280 Grimrod Road. I work for Hurling Construction. I've lived in this valley for a little over 38 years.

I see nothing wrong with these wind machines. Both my kids rodeo, and so I've traveled quite a bit with them. And we've gone through quite a few areas that have the wind machines, and they're not an eyesore.

Up here where we're putting this project in now, we have wildlife, deer and elk that are going through there all the time and, you know, with us working up there, they -- it hasn't bothered them, you know, one bit.
So I'm actually for this project and any other wind projects that they can put together, because I think it would help as far as benefit the Kittitas Valley and whatever areas that you do happen to go to. But I just wanted to say that I am for this project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wishing to speak who has not signed up and has not spoken before?

Sir, please.

MR. DANIEL WILLIAMS: Daniel Williams, 1611 Brick Road, Ellensburg.

I decided if I could find something other than "Not in my back yard" or "Damn, they're ugly" as arguments (inaudible) property values, seems like that's everybody's argument against them.

So again, looking at -- I have a lot of free time on my hands, time on my hands, and I've got internet access, so I started looking and I found some interesting stuff about Wind Turbine Syndrome. It's actually caused by the noise. A lot of people are very interested in it.
I've got one here, it's Dr. Nina Pierpont of Malone, New York has -- and she, excuse me, she lives -- she testified before the New York State Legislative Energy Committee on March 7th. Her testimony is available at -- "Three doctors that I know of are studying the Wind Turbine Syndrome: Myself, one in England, and one in Australia. We note the same

sets of symptoms. The symptoms start when local turbines go into operation and resolve when the turbines are off or when the person is out of the area. The symptoms include:

"1. Sleep problems: Noise or physical sensations of pulsation or pressure make it hard to go to sleep and cause frequent awakening.

"Headaches which are increased in frequency or severity.

"Dizziness, unsteadiness, and nausea.

"Exhaustion, anxiety, anger, irritability, and depression.

"Problems with concentration and learning.

"Tinnitus (ringing in the ears).

"Not everyone near turbines has these
symptoms. This does not mean people are making them up. It means there are differences among people in susceptibility. These differences are known as risk factors. Defining risk factors and the proportion of people who get symptoms is the role of epidemiologic studies. These studies are underway.

"Chronic sleep disturbance is the most common symptom. Exhaustion, mood problems, and problems with concentration and learning are natural outcomes of poor sleep.

"Sensitivity to low frequency vibration is a risk factor. Contrary to assertions of the wind industry, some people feel distortions -- disturbing amounts of vibration or pulsation from wind turbines, and can count in their bodies, especially their chests, the beats of the blades passing the towers, even when they can't hear or see them. Sensitivity to low frequency vibration in the body or ears is highly variable in people, and hence poorly understood and the subject of much debate.

"Another risk factor is a preexisting
migraine disorder. Migraine is not just a bad headache" -- and then they go on to explain migraine.

"Data from a number of studies and individual cases document that in rolling terrain, disturbing symptoms of the Wind Turbine Syndrome occur up to 1.2 miles from the closest turbine. In long Appalachian valleys, with turbines on ridgetops, disturbing symptoms occur up to 1.5 miles away. In New Zealand, which is more mountainous, disturbing symptoms occur up to 1.9 miles away.

"In New York state, with its mixed terrain, I recommend a setback of 1.5 miles (8000 feet) between all industrial wind turbines and people's homes or schools, hospitals, or similar institutions. This setback should be imposed immediately for turbines not yet built."

Then I've got a letter here from -- says, "Tom Shea of Searsburg, Vt., wrote a letter last August to the district ranger of the U.S. Forest Service August 8, 2005. 'A little less than ten years ago, a "small" generating station of a
"handful" of windmills was proposed and rapidly
sent through the approval process. This was to
generate "clean" energy that was reported to be
no more intrusive than the sound of a "whisper."
I have endured the industrial droning for close
to ten years, with the added arrhythmic clunk of
the gears from the turning mechanisms. This is
described as a "barely noticeable" sound. I beg
to differ. Due to this industrial noise
pollution, I can no longer bring pets to the
property, because the droning disorients them in
the woods. The impact to the wildlife must be
even more severe, despite the claims of the power
company's "consultants." Regardless, my family's

enjoyment of the quite of the woods is severely
diminished."

And then I've got another one here, from the
French Academy of Medicine, just checked their
website and had it translate some of it into
English, and it's actually there. "The French
Academy of Medicine Warns of Wind Turbine Noise."

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You need to wrap up your
points, too, please.
MR. DANIEL WILLIAMS: Basically it warns of the same stuff, basically goes through the same symptoms, chronic stuff.

Oh, and the near towers, the heights vary from -- basically -- basically talking like pitch frequency of this stuff. And they recommend a stand-off distance of 1.5 kilometers from residences for noise pollution.

And let's see, I had some closing stuff I want to say real quick. Oh, yeah, here it is. Okay, get done with this.

Some closing stuff I have. "There is a lot we don't know for sure, but these things do seem to eat a lot of bats. I don't personally own a horse, but if I did I'd be worried about the increase in mosquito population possibly leading to an increase in the West Nile Virus."

And that would be it.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else not listed who would like to speak? Mr. Lee.

And I think we should have wind power. I think it's the future and location, location, you know, we need them, it is for the future. Thank you, guys.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else who has not spoken wish to speak?

Mr. Morrison.

MR. CHET MORRISON: My name is Chet Morrison. I live at 2607 Judge Ronald Road.

I don't have any contract with any wind power, so I don't have a horse in any of these races. But I'm kind of confused, if the Planning Commission recommended to deny the Valley project, it's truly amazing, as their conclusion did not match the evidence.

For example, the Commission found no need for new electricity, when every utility in the northwest says otherwise.

The Commission thinks the project is incompatible with the Comprehensive Plan, yet the site is zoned for natural resource management.
have been created outside the project area in the past years. For an example, Section 35 north of the project area has been addressed for several occasions. How is it possible that over 20 parcels were created without public process in a Forest and Range zone? Had the segregation of these parcels been required to go through the public process like these applications, do you think that all the property owners in the area would have accepted their application with open arms? I doubt it.

It doesn't seem fair for an application to be filed with the Kittitas County in accordance with their guidelines and in accordance with the zoning and Comprehensive Plan could be possible -- possibly receive such a denial of the Planning Commission.

I urge the Board of Commissioners to look at the parcels in the vicinity and determine how the majority of these parcels were created; then look at the project, and you will recognize that this application follows all the county rules and guidelines and has been open to the public
process and should be approved.

And I'm for the wind farms ecstatically.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else who has not spoken and didn't manage to get signed up?

Sir.

MR. JAMES LANDRETH: My name is Jim Landreth. P.O. Box 869, Kittitas.

I'll make it rather short, as I testified in the combined hearings and submitted data from the Energy Information Agency and the Department of Energy, which covered, as I recall correctly, the seven western states and provided for the generation capacity and load requirements for the past and into the future. And it indicated some 20 percent excess generation capacity for the next few years.

Which leads me to wonder why we need a rush to judgment. We have a project in construction in Kittitas County which would give the citizens of the county ample opportunity to judge the environmental impacts, both pro and con, of the
wind farm projects. And for that reason that I
would hope that we would deny this project or at
least delay decision on it until more data is
available to us in real world.

As most of you are well aware, I have sat
through almost every wind farm hearing over the
last five years. Most of the time in total
boredom and ad nauseam. The lack of truth in
testimony is disturbing. Self-appointed experts
stand before you and preach the hellfire and
damnation of "The wind farms will save the world
and will reduce the need for imported oil and
produce biodiesel and alcohol and save the
world."

The truth of the matter is in the United
States, 3 percent of our total electric
generation employs liquid petroleum as an energy
source. The majority of which is made up of
residual oils which are no use for any other
purpose. Anybody that thinks that building wind
farms or any other electric generation facility
is going to reduce the need for imported oil is
just blowing wind, literally.

One of the most disturbing things that I
have heard is people that stand before you and
tout that these property owners have a right to
develop this project. This is simply not true.
Those landowners only have an inherent right for
the use of that property as it was described at
the time the property was acquired.

Any further use of that property over and
above those that were described at the time of
acquisition are granted by the citizens. There
is no inherent God-given right for the use of
that property.

One statement was made that a 1000-foot
setback is not only a national but an
international standard. That is simply not true.
It is simply not true. If we go to the Danish
wind power people, we will find that it is
7 rotor diameters minimum.

I trust that we will not rush to judgment.
This is solely a land use compatibility issue.
All other issues before you have really no
bearing on your decision. It is a land use
compatibility issue. If the wind farm is
compatible with existing use of the land not only
within the project but in the surrounding area,
then approve it. If it is not compatible with
the existing land use in that area, then it must
be denied. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wishing to speak who has not
spoken and is not on my list?

Seeing no one, I am going to ask Mr. Hurson,
I do have one gentleman who signed up again
tonight and he spoke last night. I don't -- I
made a unilateral decision to put that off until
now, so if you can tell me historically what we
do with that, I'd appreciate it.

MR. JAMES HURSON: Jim Hurson, Deputy
Prosecutor.

It's basically the prerogative of the Board
how you want to conduct your meetings. I think
historically, however, you gave everyone at least
one opportunity to speak and they can also submit
basically unlimited written documentation if
they'd like.

And I guess what I would caution is if you
allow one person to speak twice, you have opened
the door. And I'm seeing both pro and con people
nodding their head that yes, if one person gets
to speak twice, they get to speak twice also.

So I would suggest that if someone else
wants to submit some more information, they could
do so in writing if they've already had an
opportunity to speak, and that fulfills our
obligation as far as making this a public
process.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you. That was
my gut instinct.

Board members, any comments?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I would strongly urge
you to not allow us to go back through the list,
Mr. Chairman, because the reality is the more we
talk about it, the more the points you wish you'd
said a little differently or something new pops
into your mind, and at some point res judicata
has to come into play here. There has to be an
end to the discussion so we can move to a
decision. And then I suspect we could talk about
this for a long, long time.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I'll concur with
that.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. I will stay
with that, then. If you wish to add additional
comments, you didn't think you phrased things
that you wanted to when you did speak, please put

them in writing for us, submit them to the clerk.
My intent -- and I'll ask for concurrence
from the Board -- is to keep the written record
open until tomorrow at closing at the County,
which will be five o'clock. And we'll set that
up, though, as we finish this.

But at this point I'm going to close the
oral public testimony for now. And as I said,
leaving the record open for written comment until
closing of business 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, Friday,
March 31st, with concurrence from my seatmates.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I assume you mean,
Mr. Chairman, by closing the public testimony,
you're not referring to the closing, if you will,
of the proponent?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I am not referring to the
proponent at this time.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Very good. I would
certainly support leaving the written record
open, and I don't have a specific time in mind.
I don't know what the druthers of the Board in
terms of the process will be from this point forward. I myself am not prepared to deliberate this evening.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: No, I didn't intend to deliberate this evening.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I would have no issue, then, with leaving the record open to written comment for some period of time to allow everyone that last shot at fine-tuning their testimony.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Maybe we'll set that once the proponent is done with their portion and staff's finished.

With that, do we want to take a break for the court reporter?

She's okay.

So applicant, are you ready for any closing statements, rebuttal?

MR. DANA PECK: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

MR. DANA PECK: I had to turn down the assist on the microphone here; I think I've got it myself this time.

It goes without saying that we'd like --
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Mr. Peck, I need you to
introduce yourself --

MR. DANA PECK: Oh, sorry, sorry. I am Dana
Peck, project manager for Horizon Wind Energy.
Located here in Ellensburg, as I've previously
indicated in the record.

Again, it goes without saying that as the
applicant, we very much thank the Commission and
your staff for really superior staff work and
creating a civil environment even in the face of
counsel to the contrary for us to participate in
both the -- both in the last couple of nights and
previously. That's as I've said before and
continue to feel very much thanks.

I'm going to make some general remarks in
response to what we've heard in the last
24 hours. Erin Anderson is going to make our
concluding remarks on some somewhat more specific
points than mine. I don't plant to take much
time here; just had a few things I wanted to make
sure got said.

First and foremost, we continue to really
recognize that the nature of the documentation of
the project, really stretching back to 2003, raises some questions when it comes to turbines and turbine corridors and sub-area boundaries. We appreciate you making that explicit last night.

By way of further addressing that, we have some summary information on a one-pager that goes back to information already in the record but gets it all in one place that, if you don't mind, I'd like to just give you for the record.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Certainly.

MR. DANA PECK: We very much have heard the statements that have been made about project scope. We've gone from the original 82 to 150 turbines discussed in the earliest days of the Environmental -- draft Environmental Impact Statement dated 2003, to the most recent addendum where we've reduced the number of turbines that we're talking about from a range of 64 to eighty -- 82, actually, in the document.

Going into some of the specifics on that point, and this gets to some of the points Mr. Carmody raised, as well as some of the others
who questioned why those numbers appear to have changed, it really ignores the fact that from 2003 until 2005 of the addendum -- and the development application, I might add -- we've clearly identified both precise corridor locations, as you can see on the map to my right, and your left. Those corridor locations have been intensely studied. They've remained consistent in their definition from the earliest days.

And the thing that has been altered is the number of turbines that would exist within those corridors, as we've responded to your concerns, and I've tried to present a project that met both the elected-official concerns on this subject and our neighbors on the project site.

There have been slight variations that would occur on turbine location, and those would reflect construction considerations once the project were to begin. And that's really the long and the short of it. Again, we've gone from a range of 82 to 150 turbines in the original study materials to what
we think is a far cry from those numbers, of 64 to 80. And again, all within well-studied corridors.

And the specific number of turbines, as well as the sub-area boundaries, are topics which, from our perspective, are best discussed in the Development Agreement negotiations.

And as we've got at the bottom of the handout that I just gave you and as I'd like to reiterate it for the record right now, we would very much hope to be able to pursue those at the staff level on a time line that was set by the Commission in the course of your deliberations.

And the discussion of numbers of turbines could be fixed through that process.

Location of the site. You received a letter from Puget Sound Energy dated March 29th, 2006.

If you look at Paragraph 4 of that letter, I think the folks that we all acknowledge as the experts in this field make it very clear that transmission is really one of the very determining factors when it comes to wind power.

And I'd encourage you to take a look at that
letter in your record as a really good

explanation of why this site.

And on another subject, the need for wind

power, which was just addressed by one of the

folks opposing the project, that again is well

addressed by Puget Sound Energy in the letter

that they submitted to you.

As a corporation, they're making a very

significant commitment to renewable energy and

wind power resource development. They view it as

a least-cost alternative. They spend several

paragraphs of that letter addressing it; and

again, I'd encourage you to take a look at that

as a specific response to why renewables and why

now.

There's a couple other points which, as

someone who's been in the energy world for

30 years on the policy side as a strategic

planner for an investor-owned utility called

Pacific Power -- formerly called Pacific Power,

now called Mid America, oil was referenced as

only 3 percent of electric generation and why is

everybody talking about displacing oil.
Well, everybody isn't talking about

displacing oil; we're talking about displacing

fossil fuels. It's true that since the earliest

ergy crisis, the use of oil for the generation

of electricity in the United States has dropped
dramatically. You see very few facilities that

are either using oil or dual-use fuels.

But that belies a certain other fact in the
energy world, and that's that those facilities,
many of them were converted to natural gas; some
of them just were too old to make that conversion
and were replaced by natural gas. That happened
in the 1980s and the 1990s for a variety of
reasons that, you know, are fun to read about if
you're an energy person and I'm not going to bore
with you tonight.

But the construction of energy facilities in

this country has been largely natural gas for

quite a few years. The two impacts of that are

really simple to see. If you've got a natural
gas water heater and you're a homeowner, you're

competing with the utilities companies and your

price is killing you right now.
We help that. We're another alternative way of getting electricity to your house. And as Puget points out in their letter, we're viewed as the least-cost alternative at this stage.

The other aspect of energy generation in this country where renewable energy is the answer right now is climate change. Climate change is what you were hearing most of the people testify about in the course of both last night, today, and the previous hearings.

Climate change is a controversial issue.

Climate change is the subject of a policy statement by the company that I work for, Goldman Sachs, that says we take it seriously and we're going to do something about it. And Horizon Wind Energy's going to beat the (inaudible) policy in that regard.

Coal and wind are in head-to-head competition right now. And getting more wind now makes a difference in that competition. And if climate change is something that you think about and take seriously, we're part of the solution.

Again, we are not talking about displacing
oil-fired gas plants when we talk about renewable
energy and wind power and the electric utility
grid. And I'd just like to put that to rest real
fast.

On a more local note -- I spent a couple
minutes on the macro energy world there --
D.J. Evans is in Hawaii right now or I suspect
he'd be here reiterating the testimony you've
already got on the record on the benefits that
this project brings both financially now that the
bill has passed, 6141, and some of the
commitments we've made the fire district.

We think where you see wind power projects
on this kind of ground, you see happier volunteer
fire guys. They tend to have more money, more
equipment, and more roads to fight wildland fires
on than before we were there. And if you go back
to his testimony, you'll see that he's pretty
explicit on that subject.

Debbie Strand's been very clear in working

through the implications that legislation have
passed last Friday and talking to the county
assessor on where the money goes now that that
bill's in place.

It's big numbers. It's numbers that when I was in Klickitat County we were really looking forward to getting, and that's one of the reasons the example's in the state bill the way it is. It's one of the first large wind power projects that's going to benefit a county.

In the case of this county, at least at this stage of the game for our project, we're talking a little over a quarter of a million dollars for your general fund; a comparable amount of money to your road fund, which could potentially, as I understand it, be shifted into your general fund. We're talking major money for the hospital, major money for the fire districts.

My own personal favorite example isn't from this county; it's from a little closer to where I live, the little fire district in Bickleton that's going to go from fifty or sixty thousand dollars a year to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year because of a wind project there. D.J.'s district is going to make a similar jump. We feel that's a pretty solid benefit.
On property values, your call. We feel we've brought in a top-flight person who thinks about these things. He's adapted his data to your local situation, and one of your neighbors has come to real similar conclusions looking at the same data from where she lives, and she lives here.

Both sides of the story; you've just got to form your own conclusion on who you're going to believe on that one, I'm afraid. We've tried to bring the best resource we can to bear on it. We feel that we've demonstrated there's no demonstrable impacts. The national studies show the same thing. And again, your call.

And you know, and I guess -- I think we've heard a couple of discussions of property rights. And I don't know how you beat Mike Genson on that subject; I'm not even going to try to quote him or paraphrase him. I just -- to the extent that property rights are something that you're thinking about, I don't think you could do much better than to go back and reread what he said last night. And I'm not going to diminish it by trying to paraphrase.
And in short, I think -- I feel that
Horizon's shown that we meet the criteria that's
established by the county for our project's area.
We've demonstrated that we benefit the county,
the state, and the region both in taxes we pay
and in clean energy we produce.

And we've shown widespread support over the
last couple of nights and what you've seen across
the county from people as diverse as ranchers
from Thorp and environmentalists from Ellensburg.
I don't know how often you see those sorts of
folks standing up being for the same thing. We
don't see a whole lot of it where I live, and
where I live isn't that far away.

With that said, I'd like to just turn over
the rest to Erin. And again, thank you for the
real clean process that you run here and the help
you've given us along the way.

MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, fellow
commissioners, Erin Anderson, 200 East Third here
in Ellensburg; 105 East First in Cle Elum, and
residential 360 Willowbrook Lane.

I've heard probably the most eloquent
speakers in all the years that I've been
practicing in Kittitas County on both sides of
the aisle tonight. And it's hard to follow them.

I offer up just a few personal observations, and then I will summarize my conclusion and encourage you to make a decision to direct your staff to commence negotiations on a Development Agreement, which is the appropriate place to do that.

I've been a resident of this county since the 1970s. You can probably guess how old I am, which makes me pretty much a lifer here. Did not grow up in Ellensburg; grew up in Cle Elum. I've seen what's happened up there. Mr. Crankovich, I know you grew up there too; you know what's going on in this county.

During the last four years it's continued to happen, and I heard somebody encourage you tonight, Don't rush to judgment. Well, let's find out what's happened in the last four years while you have not rushed to judgment:

The price of what you're putting in your gas tank has nearly doubled.

Climate change -- I call it global warming -- climate change has moved itself onto the international agenda.

We're at war.
I wouldn't call this a rush to judgment; I would call this a very necessary reaction that has been delayed by four years.

Insofar as my comments on House Bill -- excuse me, Senate Bill 6141, my comments stand as made to you. I do take umbrage at Mr. Carmody's characterization of them. You heard what I said last night and you know what the bill says, and you know what the assessor and your own Economic Development Group interprets. I stand by my comments.

Insofar as one of these kinds of projects ruining your lifestyle, I do have some personal observations.

And before I make them, let me encourage you to remember SEPA is a process that is designed to help you identify what the impacts are. It does not say all impacts must be eliminated in order to approve a project.

If that were the case, your airport expansion wouldn't happen. You wouldn't have an airport. People wouldn't live near the airport. The university wouldn't be able to expand. You couldn't have new rezones and subdivisions in
Kittitas County, because everything impacts

I'll tell you, I live -- I'm the last house in the flight path at your airport. Those planes come an awful lot closer than 700 feet. They come an awful lot closer than 1000 feet. And they're loud and they're big. And I chose to build there.

I was the first person in my neighborhood. My neighborhood, every lot on the street has built out. Every lot on the street behind me has built out. Every lot to the north of me has built out. And this is with a very, very loud, very, very obvious activity. Those -- the Japanese hay-buyers' jets roar over my garden.

I chose to live there. Everybody in my neighborhood who has clamored to move there belies the argument that this is going to destroy a way of life or that you should take the airport out because people want to come to the nuisance

of an airport. That's simply not true. And if
it were true, we wouldn't get anything done
around here.

And I challenge anybody -- I couldn't afford
today, in 2006, could not afford to buy the house
I built in 2002. Because real estate values
right there in the flight path to your airport
have gone crazy. Just like they have everywhere.

Every buyer in my neighborhood knows that
airport is there. And frankly, some of us like
it. I wave at the pilots that I know.

You have to respect the fact that some
people make those choices. Other people may
disagree. Maybe they choose to leave. But those
are choices. Your job is to balance the needs of
everybody in this county.

I'll move on to -- one other observation.
We're killing what we love, folks. You heard
everybody say: I bought this property to build
my home because it is so beautiful. And you
heard all the realtors say, Land, land, land;
that's the biggest asset we've got.

Well, let me tell you, you continue to
rezone that property and all those properties up there to five-acre, you end up with 1500 new homes on the hillside. You go down to three acres and you end up with 2000 homes in that neighborhood. And I'll bet you the people that say "I bought here because I love the view" aren't going to love that. We're loving it to death.

And that's witnessed by the many, many rezones that have occurred in the last couple of years. We have a surplus right now of rezoned rural home sites over what has been sold.

And so in terms of being brought to a rush to judgment, don't let that judgment get clouded by emotions. Look at the facts. You know what you've done. You're the Board of County Commissioners; you're the ones that have set the table for the tools and resources that we have today.

So let's talk about what the rules really do say. You've been encouraged to abide by the Planning Commission's recommendation. I encourage you to go through it, because it
doesn't cite a single GPO out of your county Comprehensive Plan. Not one.

That's because this project does comport with your county Comprehensive Plan. And I would like to cite some of those GPOs. And I'll call out the very first GPO in the Kittitas County Comp Plan. The very first one. Not the most significant, but the first one out of the chute.

And this is where we start from in this dialogue in Kittitas County.

The maintenance and enhancement of Kittitas County's natural resources. Industry base including, but not limited to, productive timber, agriculture, mineral, and energy resources.

That's your first Goal Policy Objective in Kittitas County.

The very second one is encouraging you to diversify economic development, providing broader employment opportunities. This all feeds into all the testimony you've heard over the last several nights.

When we get to -- I'll just quote a few. I know you're intimately familiar with them. GPO
2.12 talks about private property rights. And it invokes -- not me, not takens -- it invokes our constitution. And it says Kittitas County will administer this chapter -- not "may," "will" -- "administer this chapter in accordance with the United States and the Washington State constitutional provisions for the protection of private property rights and provision of due process.

In this case, four years' worth.

It encourages you not to force the cost of view preservation onto private property owners. That's what the opponents would have you do tonight, is to force their view preservation cost onto private property owners. And in some cases, the state of Washington; DNR in particular, whose charge is to generate money for the state for all of us.

So I would encourage you to resist the temptation to simply adopt the Planning Commission's recommendations and instead look inward to your own Comprehensive Plan.

And what does it say? I'm going to take a
phrase out of everybody's book: location, location, This project is proposed in natural resource land. That is this location. That property is designated and zoned for the highest priority use to be natural resource use. That includes energy resources.

It is not for residential homesites. We have plenty of that property in Kittitas County. This is not it. This is about location.

And this application is consistent with the Comp Plan. It does take into consideration the transmission lines that you heard a gentleman testify have been there 50 years. This is the right location. It's not the right location for rural sprawl. It is resource land.

If you want to engage in that dialogue about changing your Comp Plan designation, that's a separate process; you cannot do it through this process. We're entitled, and Horizon is entitled, to try and utilize its property interests and the private property owed -- excuse me, and the private property owners in conformity with what that says.
I've heard a lot of comments about, you know, the -- and I'm going to excerpt a few -- actually I wish I could attribute them; I think Mrs. Boddy called it "rural prime residential" and also "prime real estate." I've heard this called "rural residential."

It is not. It is not rural residential.

You saw Mr. Knudson's photographs. All of you I know have lived in this county -- Commissioner Huston, I'm not certain all of your life, but I know the other two of you have been here your entire life. You know what this is.

It is -- you know, not in a pejorative sense; it is sagebrush, it is rocky, and the people there are designated and charged to use it for natural resources, including energy.

It's not a cozy little neighborhood. We discourage neighborhoods where you don't have urban services. We don't have good roads. We don't have any sewer collection out there. We don't have any potable water supply there.

Frankly, some of the people are living off the grid, which tells me we don't have a lot of even
electrical utilities. That's not a suitable location now and it is not a suitable location in the future.

And I believe you've been strongly encouraged by a lot of testimony: Well, some people say, No, I'm here now; preserve that view, I love it. The realtors are saying, This is prime real estate; let's develop it.

Well, one day go down that path; you will rue the day you can't look up on that hillside and see 16 lights off of turbines as opposed to 1500, 2000 lights. When this county's paved tip to tail, there will be nowhere to capture the wind resources.

Your job is to balance the needs for housing, land use, infrastructure, utilities, all of those things. It's not to turn this into a bedroom community. It is to balance all of those. That's what your Comp Plan says, and I believe that's why the Planning Commission's recommendation doesn't quote it, doesn't cite it in the first, because that is not the evidence before you. And you know it because you live
It isn't just me that is saying this; it's the many, many people that come before you recently on rezones. As you know, I work for the town of South Cle Elum and was recently copied with a letter sent to Kittitas County dated March 17th from CTED that says, and I'm going to quote, "When cities and counties work with citizens to discuss their priorities for the future, they must balance important considerations, using land wisely, providing the foundation for economic vitality and protecting environmental and natural resource."

And I would like to point out parenthetically this project does meet the WDFW protocols for wildlife and fish.

CTED continues by saying, "We continue to have concerns about the large number of rezone requests that have been submitted and approved in Kittitas County over the past few years without a Comp Plan update." Mr. Piercy I know was working hard on that.

But their comments are this, The designation
of natural resource lands. Such as that before
you tonight. And they call out agriculture,
forest, mineral lands, was the first step this
county, Kittitas County, took in developing its
Comp Plan.

They remain concerned with, quote, removing
natural resource land designations or rezoning to
allow for smaller lot sizes in these zones on a
parcel-by-parcel basis. Think lots of housing
sprawl in the natural resource area.

This approach is not comprehensive, does not
look at the cumulative effects of the decision;
and most significantly, has the ability of
affecting other resource land designations and
the industries these lands support.

You cannot, should not reject this
application because people want to put houses out
there. And that's what CTED is also expressing,
the same concern. Everybody's concerned about

this. And it dovetails very nicely with the
concerns about energy siting.

This is not a fun project to talk about, to
advocate for and, worst of all, to have to make a
decision on. But that is your job, is to balance these needs. That's what the Comprehensive Plan says you need to do.

There is a place for homesites. This isn't it. There is a place for wind energy. This is it. It does comport with the Comp Plan, it does comport with zoning, and it does comport with the very scattered neighborhood. Most people say, I own property there. They don't live there. They haven't built their houses there. That's the reality.

Your job is to serve everybody in this county. We do need energy. I think that that issue has been settled, that there is a very broad need for that. I think you've done an able job of creating homesites and housing and your urban growth areas that have urban facilities to support them in this county.

We've seen substantial investment to support that, particularly the upper county, both through Suncadia and your communities up there. That need has been met. You have a surplus right now of homesite rezoned small properties in this
county, and yet we have a demand for energy that
just doesn't quit because we drive it ourselves.

There are issues, certainly. Everybody
that's stood before you tonight on -- frankly on
either side, I think, recognize that you have
issues to struggle with. Issues such as the
number of turbines, does the corridor stay the
same, does the sub-area shrink down to match the
corridor or does it stay the way it is.

Making a decision to turn this down without
getting to those issues does the disservice to
the people who would use the energy, benefit from
the taxes, and the applicant itself, who's making
a significant investment in this community for
it.

The place to do that is in the Development
Agreement process, and you know how to do it.
I've done it with you before. You've done it
with Suncadia. And frankly, you know how to deal
with ranges. You've done that before too. So I
find this 64 to 80 is an issue that you address
in the Development Agreement process, and you
guys have done that many times before.
That is not a question that gives you a
toehold to say no. Because that's not how you do
it in Kittitas County. The way you do it is you
instruct your staff to get together, listen to
your counsel, listen to your concerns, listen to
the applicant, and try and craft a Development
Agreement that addresses everybody's concerns and
needs.

That's what I ask you to do. Be courageous.
The easy way out is to say no. It's going to get
you -- depending on which side of the aisle
you're on -- get you some political favor. But
that's not what you serve. You serve your
citizens, the people that live here, who go to
school here, the people who want to raise their
children here, who contribute their taxes to
fires and roads and schools, hospitals. That's
who you serve.

If you're courageous enough, I would
encourage you: instruct your staff, use the
Development Agreement process. You've used it
before and actually I think pretty well in this
county. Your staff -- the staff sitting here	onight has been through that process. They
know, you know, it's the way to do it.
Please, I ask you, instruct them to listen to your deliberations, take your concerns into consideration, make the analysis that this does comport with your Comprehensive Plan Natural Resource designation, it does comport with Forest and Range and Ag uses in Kittitas County, and that the facts that demonstrate the need, the benefits to this community far outweigh what adverse impacts may exist.

And do not chase that red herring: If there's an impact we have to say no. Once again, your job is to balance the benefits of everybody you serve versus the desires of a few, frankly, who wish to make money or live in an area that they probably shouldn't be living in.

So I encourage you to be courageous, do the analysis -- you know how to do it, you've done it before -- and direct this back to your staff for negotiation of a Development Agreement in accordance with the county rules.

And I thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Any questions from the commissioners for the proponent?

Not tonight.

Anything else from the proponent to us?
Staff, any observations or input we should be considering for tonight's purposes?

MR. DARRYL PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, for the record, Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services.

I don't believe that we have any additional comments to offer at this time. There are a number of issues that I think came forward and a number of comments that perhaps we would like to be able to respond to questions that the Board may have in regards to those. A number of issues that came up in the course of testimony that we would be prepared to do the same in regards to questions that might arise from the Board as you go into your deliberations.

But I don't believe that we would have anything further to add for you at this time, unless you would like us to respond to questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Any questions for staff?

All right, well, I want to thank everybody for all of their input and living through another two nights of testimony, first of all.
I've looked at my schedule, and I'm -- the

next time I think would probably work where I
could do a thorough job and be prepared to come
back and talk about deliberations would be on
April 12th. I don't know if that works for the
other two of you.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I believe it does
for me, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: So if that works for
everybody, I would -- I guess I would like to
move to continue this public hearing to April
12th, 6:00 p.m., here in the Kittitas County Home
Arts Building at the fairgrounds. And at that
point I would hope to be able to begin
deliberations regarding our next steps.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: How long are you
going to keep the record open?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I had proposed earlier to
keep it open until Friday at 5:00. Mr. Huston
seemed to maybe have a different idea potentially
that he didn't verbalize earlier.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: If we continue out to
the 12th, if we gave until Monday at 5:00, that
would give everyone the opportunity over the
weekend to jot something down if they chose to,
and it would also still be sufficient time that

the proponent would have access to any new
information that came forward before we actually
came back for deliberation.

Not to suggest they're going to make a
presentation when we go into deliberations, but
certainly it would be the opportunity to raise
any objection if something incredibly new were to
come forward.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: So we propose, then, to
keep the record open to written testimony until
April 3rd, 5:00 p.m. And I assume that would be
delivered to CDS or the Commissioners' office,
either one.

So I'll include that in the motion. Is
there a second?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's been moved and
seconded to continue this public hearing
April 12, leaving the record open to written
testimony through April 3rd, 5:00 p.m., at the
Kittitas County offices.

Any discussion to the motion?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Six o'clock at the fairgrounds?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Six o'clock here at the fairgrounds.

Any further discussion?

Hearing none, all those in favor indicate by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I too will vote aye, and the motion carries. Thank you all.

(The proceeding was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.)
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