

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Air Quality							
Comment 1	Mitigation should be required	Air	Department of Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator	September 18, 2009	Some air emission producing activities will be undertaken as part of the construction and operation of this project. Mitigation measures, such as a dust management plan, are recommended. Non-road engines. Ecology will want to know how the applicant proposes to power the operations building on site. See Attachment 7 for complete letter.	The Applicant will prepare a dust management plan prior to the construction of this project to ensure minimization of dust impacts. The Applicant will coordinate with the Yakima Regional Clean Air Authority on the contents of the plan, including any applicable best management practices. The applicant will power the operations building through the electrical grid.	Yes
Comment 2	Disposal of woody material.	Air	Department of Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator	September 18, 2009	Woody debris disposal. Ecology and Kittitas County will prefer that the applicant signs a beneficial reuse statement. However, if the site is in an area that permits burning and the applicant chooses that option, analysis of impacts from burning needs to be in the SEPA. See Attachment 7 for complete letter.	The applicant will sign a beneficial reuse statement and suggests that this be a condition of approval under an MDNS for the application.	Yes
Decommissioning							
Comment 3	Concerns about decommissioning the project	Energy and Natural Resources	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	The development agreement has decommissioning and reclamation requirements. What is the enforcement ability for this when a company goes out of business? There is none. The county will be stuck with an area that at one time was a major asset for all its citizens and will have become a desolate wasteland without trees, populated with thousands of concrete pads and inverter buildings, a massive network of roads and no possible use or value to anyone. This should be of major concern to the County, which does not own the land but is responsible for authorizing its use. See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	The Applicant will revise DA to clarify decommissioning and reclamation obligations.	Yes
Comment 4	Concerns about decommissioning the project	Energy and Natural Resources	Barbara M. Hodgson Box 68, Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	The developers appear to be counting on substantial tax subsidies to support the project and generate profit. If this fails to materialize in the future, the neighborhood could be left with overgrown industrial blight in a once beautiful environment and it would be impossible to restore the land. See Attachment 24 for complete letter.	The Applicant will revise DA to clarify decommissioning and reclamation obligations.	Yes
Comment 5	Concerns about decommissioning the project	Energy and Natural Resources	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	So why do we care if they can't make a profit? Because if they cannot, the business will go under and we could be left with 400,000 ugly solar panels, clear cuts and ugly road systems in perpetuity on Cle Elum ridge. The CUP application has no plan for how to deconstruct this site should this occur. See Attachment 29 for complete letter.	The Applicant will revise DA to clarify decommissioning and reclamation obligations.	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Economic							
Comment 6	Economic concerns.	Energy and Natural Resources	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	Where are the construction and operational cost analyses? What is the financial commitment of the people behind this? Is their motivation for a quick buck? What happens when the panels need replacing in 10 years and there is not money for that? The application says 2 to 4 maintenance employees will be needed. This is not significant to the county to warrant destruction of the area. The additional jobs for a panel assembly plant are positive but what is the connection between the farm and panel assembly? To save money, would not the owners simply outsource panel construction to China? Could that assembly plant be moved once the plant is in place and the owners say they need to cut costs or close down? See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	The applicant is committed to advancing the growing need for sustainable energy sources and the State of Washington's Renewable Electricity Standard, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Title 19, mandate that by the year 2020, the state's largest electric utilities meet 15 percent of their retail electric load with renewable electricity (for example, wind and solar energy). An economic analysis has been conducted and was submitted to the County on October 9, 2009 for public review as part of the Applicant's responses to public comments and County requests. This analysis demonstrates the considerable economic benefits to the County presented by the project. The applicant does not presently manufacture solar panels.	No
Comment 7	Economic concerns.	Energy and Natural Resources	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	So what will Kittitas County really get? Not much. At best we will get an out of town company, using the state's forests for a quick profit, creating a two mile eye sore with very little economic benefit. All of our land values will be diminished and the Teanaway will join the ranks of those many great places in the state that used to be pristine. See Attachment 29 for complete letter.	An economic analysis has been conducted and was submitted to the County on October 9, 2009 for public review as part of the Applicant's responses to public comments and County requests. This analysis, along with the administrative record, demonstrates the considerable economic benefits to the County presented by the project. The proposed project site is not pristine; it was formerly logged as a commercial forestry operation.	No
EIS							
Comment 8	Need more time for review.	Not Applicable to SEPA	Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hodgson Partners, Pine Hills Ranch PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	September 14, 2009	At least one thousand "consultant days" were probably expended in preparing the hundreds of pages included in the Application and SEPA documents. There has been limited publicity about the opportunity for citizen response. What is mentioned in the official documents is not seen by the vast majority of interested individuals who would respond singly. It seems very unreasonable to provide an individual or family but 15 days of response time to comment on the Conditional Use Permit. We had about 10 days once we learned of the end date. We know the property and have access to it. This is not a reasonable period of time for input from the general public. We hope you will extend this period of time for response and deliberation.	The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable environmental impacts.	No
Comment 9	Wants issues to be addressed in an EIS	Not Applicable to SEPA	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Mentions several issues and then requests that they be addressed as part of a full environmental impact study.	Applicant believes the administrative record for the project, including any information submitted to the County in response to the public comments, supports issuance of an MDNS for the project and that, as mitigated, any probable environmental impacts	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						from the project will be less than significant.	
Comment 10	More time for review is needed.	Land use and Shoreline	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	An industrial project of the size and scale proposed must be examined further and more time granted for a public review of the applicant's phone book this application. Moreover, much of the applicant's proposals are conceptual. Without knowing what the applicant intends to build and how, how can the county properly examine its impacts? At the very least, the applicant needs to first flesh out the details of what it is actually proposing, and then a full environmental impact statement must be required to examine the serious negative impacts of the project. See Attachment 6 for complete letter	As explained in this Matrix, Applicant is preparing additional information to clarify its impacts analysis in response to public comments and County requests. See also responses to Comment #5 (regarding the issue of public comment period) and Comment #6 (regarding the issue of the SEPA determination).	No
Comment 11	Need more time for review.	Not Applicable to SEPA	Richard Robbins 154 Lake Washington Blvd. East Seattle, WA 98112	September 18, 2009	The people living and owning property in the vicinity of the proposed solar farm should have sufficient time to study such an EIS and to make comments on the plans and site before it is permitted. See Attachment 11 for complete letter.	See also responses to Comment #5 (regarding the issue of public comment period) and Comment #6 (regarding the issue of the SEPA determination).	No
Comment 12	Need more time for review.	Not Applicable to SEPA	Bonnie Robbins 154 Lake Washington Blvd. East Seattle, WA 98112	September 17, 2009	An EIS should be prepared and the comment period should be extended. "Please give us more time so that we can learn more about the impact the solar facility would make on the whole area." See Attachment 13 for complete letter.	See also responses to Comment #5 (regarding the issue of public comment period) and Comment #6 (regarding the issue of the SEPA determination).	No
Comment 13	Wants EIS	Not Applicable to SEPA	Robert and Diane Hill 2548 S. Camano Drive Camano Island, Wash. 98282 360 387 0393	October 4, 2009	Anna, I wanted to let you know that my Wife Diane and I do oppose the process being followed to get Conditional Use approval for the Teanaway Solar Reserve. Such a major project will have very long lasting impact on the area and the approach to shorten the process from a full EIS to the DNS just offers major opportunity for error and needed broad scale evaluation. We own three Properties that Loping Lane, the project access road goes through Parcels 17792,21129 and 314136) Please clearly understand we do not support the direction being followed and asks for your consideration and voice in requesting a full Environmental Impact Statement plan. So, clearly we feel the CUP and DNS treatment is not the proper and honest approach to follow in such a large scale project.	Applicant believes the administrative record for the project, including any information submitted to the County in response to the public comments, supports issuance of an MDNS (not a DNS) for the project and that, as mitigated, any probable environmental impacts from the project will be less than significant. The applicant completed a SEPA checklist, the state equivalent of the NEPA process. Since there was no federal regulatory trigger, and EIS would be inappropriate at this time.	No
Comment 14	Wants EIS	Not Applicable to SEPA	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	The problem is the County has already issued a preliminary Designation of Non-Significance (DNS). In short this means that they don't think this will do much to the environment?? However, the Washington Department of Fish [sic] and Wildlife has directly disagreed with this ruling and has objected asking for a full Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Good for them. Of Course this needs to be studied, at the very least. Why not study it? TSR doesn't want it studied, because of all of the game migration, wetland, steep slope, drainage, and	The Applicant believes that a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance would be an appropriate SEPA determination for the project. After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					<p>ESA listed species (Steelhead and Bull Trout) issues it will trigger.</p> <p>The answer is TSR doesn't want you to know until its [sic] too late and they want to start building in early Spring. That is Right away! TSR has requested a 15 day notice and comment period. This is the shortest period allowed in county code. They have done this to try and "pull a fast one" on all of us by not providing time for us to comment--and trying to get their permits before anybody of consequence really noticed. A sign was nailed to the base of a pine tree (nice touch) by TSR on September 3rd off of Red Bridge Road. The same date notices were allegedly sent out to property to a handful of property owners (less than 20). What about those of us who look right across SR 970 at the site, or those that live below it? Aren't we entitled to know about something that so directly effects [sic] us? To be sure, a good neighbor would have allowed a much longer comment period an followed good process. A good neighbor would have spoken to the community before it rammed this down our throats. Is this an indication of how TSR will treat this community once it gets it permits?</p> <p>Denial of the CUP will effectively kill the project.. at least for now. Also, if a full EIS is required, this will also delay the project allowing us to get our ducks in a row. A full EIS is also something you should ask for in your public comment.</p> <p>See Attachment 29 for complete letter.</p>	<p>means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable environmental impacts. These are deadlines set by longstanding county code and state legislation – not by the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant is undertaking a variety of studies, including several new studies in response to public comments and the county's requests for additional information. As a result of current information on the project, and the additional information applicant is compiling, the applicant is confident there will be no foundation or necessity of an EIS.</p>	
Comment 15	More time for public comments	Not Applicable to SEPA	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	<p>The biggest issue we do have is the way this has been rushed through with little input from the community. Sure there would be some road improvement, but we moved here to enjoy a less hectic lifestyle and rural setting. A paved road will only encourage more traffic. The construction phase would ruin entire seasons of the spring and summer months, which is unacceptable to us. The notices have allowed us little time to respond or comment because of the clandestine way the county has promoted this program to the detriment of those who live in the community. No, we are not up on all the EIS requirements or even understand why a Conditional Use Permit would be granted when the area is clearly zoned. We need time to understand what rational the Commissioners are following. We would like the process to involve us, not skip us. We look forward to the opportunity to be heard.</p> <p>See Attachment 30 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable environmental impacts. These are deadlines set by longstanding county code and state legislation – not by the applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant met with the County on 9/23/09 to discuss the standards for roads and plans to improve Wehl Road as needed to comply with County standards. The Applicant is preparing a road use plan that will provide additional details on impacts from anticipated road use during and post-construction. County and City of Kittitas highway and shoulder pavement shall be video monitored before and after construction of the Project. If construction of the Project results in the degradation of the existing pavement and/or shoulders Applicant shall reinstate these facilities to equal or better condition than they were prior to construction.</p>	Yes
Comment 16	EIS requested to "slow down" the project	Not Applicable to SEPA	Bill King	October 1, 2009	<p>I just would appreciate some help to stop this CUP or at least slow it down with the requested EIS.</p> <p>See Attachment 31 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						<p>environmental impacts. These are deadlines set by longstanding county code and state legislation – not by the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges the comment. The applicant is undertaking a variety of studies, including several new studies in response to public comments and the county's requests for additional information, and the county's requests for additional information. As a result of current information on the project, and the additional information applicant is compiling, the applicant is confident there will be no foundation or necessity of an EIS.</p>	
Comment 17	Wants EIS	Land Use and Shoreline	Bill Sparks PO Box 490 691 Quail Drive Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 3, 2009	This is the wrong location and should not be approved. I would certainly require an EIS at the very least.	The applicant acknowledges the comment. The applicant is undertaking a variety of studies, including several new studies in response to public comments and the county's requests for additional information, and the county's requests for additional information. As a result of current information on the project, and the additional information applicant is compiling, the applicant is confident there will be no foundation or necessity of an EIS.	No
Comment 18	More time for public comments	Not Applicable to SEPA	Barbara Faulkner 32513 42 nd Place SW Federal Way, WA 98023	October 1, 2009	<p>NOTE: COMMENT TO COMMISSIONER MARK MCCAIN, FORWARDED TO THE COUNTY</p> <p>Commissioner McClain, I was alarmed today to hear of the proposed TSR 1000 acre solar site project. I am a landowner off of Weihl Road and respectfully request and urge the county require additional time for public input and comment. I believe The size and scope of this proposed project would have a long lasting negative impact on The Cle Elum ridge, property owners, property values, wildlife and the natural beauty of the area for years to come. I would also like to see a full EIS required for this project.</p> <p>See Attachment 34 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable environmental impacts. These are deadlines set by longstanding county code and state legislation – not by the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges the comment. The applicant is undertaking a variety of studies, including several new studies in response to public comments and the county's requests for additional information, and the county's requests for additional information. As a result of current information on the project, and the additional information applicant is compiling, the applicant is confident there will be no foundation or necessity of an EIS.</p>	No
Fire							
Comment 19	Concerned about fire danger.	Public Services	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Fire is a concern to all who live in or near the woods and grasslands in the Teanaway area, particularly with its summer hot, dry and windy conditions. Applicant will have a huge number of wires, electrical connections, transformers, electric substations, a transmission intertie and other electrical equipment in close proximity with acres of dry grass under its approximately 160 acres of solar panels.	<p>Applicant will contract with Fire District #7 for the provision of fire protection services unless and until the project area is annexed into the district.</p> <p>Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility.</p> <p>The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations.</p> <p>In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 20	Compliance issues with fire code.	Public Services	Brenda Larsen Kittitas County Fire Marshal's Office 411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2, Ellensburg, WA 98926	September 23, 2009	The minimum road width shall not be less than 20' in width. In the event that the roadway infringes on a critical area, i.e. wetland, etc., provisions may be made to allow for a narrower road width in that area. All cul-de-sacs must have a minimum turning radius of no less than 50'. All development, design & construction shall comply with Kittitas County Code, Kittitas County Zoning and the 2006 International Fire & Building Codes. Due to the remote nature and topography of proposed project in this area, all new structures shall comply with the Wild-land Urban Interface Code requirements for defensible space and ignition resistant construction materials. In the event that sprinkler suppression systems and/or alarm systems are to be installed within the buildings, each system requires a separate permit from the Fire Marshal's Office. See Attachment 8 for complete letter.	Applicant agrees with the Fire Marshall and shall incorporate measures into site design and road improvement plans. See also responses to Comments #10 (regarding site vegetation plans), and #38-#40 (regarding issue of roads)	Yes
Comments 21	Fire concerns	Public Services	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	Also, without water access in the proposed reserve, we are extremely apprehensive about the fire danger. What assurances will we have that these panels and electrical components will not ignite a fire?	Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff. Water sources for fire suppression purposes have been identified and all provisions of the fire code will be followed.	Yes
Information Requests							
Comment 22	Needs more information	Not Applicable to SEPA	Joan Neslund Ellensburg Public Library	September 29, 2009	I work at the Ellensburg Public library in Kittitas County. Patron are coming in with comments that this project is a scheme and not valid. Can you provide the library information on your project? See Attachment 16 for complete letter.	There is no "scheme" by the Applicant, and the permitting process has been fully transparent in accordance with local and state requirements. The Ellensburg Public Library has been contacted. The Applicant will supply any information submitted to the Library, which has been submitted to the County. See also response to Comment #13 (regarding KCC provisions permitting solar facility).	No
Land Use							
Comment 23	Project will disrupt	Land Use and	Michael R. Hansen	September 17, 2009	The proposed solar farm is a gross deviation from the current Forest & Range zoning and a violation of the protections that	The project is a "Major alternative energy facility" as defined in Section 17.61.010(9) and is an authorized conditional use in the	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
	wildlife corridor.	Shoreline	Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016		zoning provides to adjacent land owners. If the County follows through with the plant, it will be a major eyesore and cause a large loss in the value of my 20 acre parcel. To minimize this loss, the County should require the following accommodations. It is also reasonable that there be no fencing on the property line, preferably none at all. A lack of fencing should provide access through the farm to the forest beyond. The area is a major recreational area for horseback riding, hiking, snowmobile access to the backcountry and hunting. The owners must reestablish natural vegetation and control weeds such as the noxious Russian Knapweed we have spreading in the area. See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6). The proposed project will not include a fence; the Applicant proposes this as a mitigation measure for an MDNS. The proposed project will be built on private land. Historically the landowner has allowed responsible uses of the land by anyone lawfully accessing the site, except for not allowing motorized vehicles on the property. Historically the road to the project site is gated to prevent access. The Applicant does not intend to change these policies. Responsible access through the project site will be allowed subject to conflicting requirements beyond Applicant's control (such as insurance or fire protection), provided that individuals do not interfere with the construction, operations or maintenance of the project. Gating will continue to regulate motorized vehicles but a fence restricting access is not proposed. Natural vegetation will be reestablished through a site vegetation maintenance plan; the plan will also provide for the control of noxious or invasive plant species.	
Comment 24	Conflict with character of the area	Land Use and Shoreline	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	"An industrial project like the one envisioned would be spectacularly out of character with what is now a beautiful forest and range environment...Allowing this project would be a signal that industrial developments could be allowed almost anywhere, to the detriment of the environment and long term urban planning throughout the county and state." Short, cloudy days are the norm for much of the winter and regular snowfall would certainly impact the project. It appears the main driver of the project as a confluence of a willing lessor and serious tax subsidies allowing for a quick private profit while they last. See Attachment 6 for complete letter.	The project as designed will not present detrimental impacts to the character of the surrounding area. See prior responses, including those responding to issues of wildlife, setback, visual impacts, vegetation, etc. Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate. A more detailed discussion of how snow might affect output and performance of solar panels will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.	Yes
Comment 25	Proposed setbacks	Land Use and Shoreline	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Applicant has only provided "conceptual" view of the project which includes a 500 ft setback along our joint property line. There is no way to determine if this setback is adequate to mitigate impacts to our property. Would like to see "a larger setback to shield our property from some of the negative effects of the project but also to provide a buffer and corridor for deer, elk and other wildlife to move up the slope to the north facing areas of the site". Applicant shows 100 foot setback along portions of the southern boundary. "This minimum setback seems unreasonable in light of its direct visual impact." See Attachment 5 for complete letter.	The Applicant is working with concerned landowners to devise potential alternatives and mitigation measures to further ensure against visual or detrimental impacts to character of surrounding area. The applicant will comply with all firebreaks, as mandated by the county. To maximum extent practicable, fire break shall be constructed to minimize impacts to existing vegetation and bordering trees. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. Alternative migratory routes for wildlife and the potential impact on wildlife, particularly large game (elk, deer) will be presented in greater detail in the Applicant's additional information.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 26	Deviation from current zoning	Land Use and Shoreline	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	<p>We moved to this property 10 years ago for peace of mind, understanding that Forest & Range zoning restricted development to logging, low density housing or open-space. My wife and I are quite alarmed to find that the county is considering a conditional use permit for an industrial power plant, which is not compatible with the zoning and is a violation of the protections zoning provides to the community.</p> <p>Located on our steep slopes, the farm will require a dense road structure and require retaining walls for the panel bases. This will add to the fixed and maintenance costs of the project and make it less likely to be profitable.</p> <p>Where is the study indicating the numbers of hours of cloudless days/hours around the year? Our ridge is on the edge between unpredictable mountain weather and desert weather. We have many days that are cloudy here when it is not cloudy to the east.</p> <p>The 900 acres proposed for this project is a very large and beautiful area that is unique along Cle Elum Ridge and unique in the county. This area is not steep unusable land. It is full of rolling forested areas, open meadows and wetlands. The area is valuable for recreation and development of low-density housing, where many can enjoy it's beauty.</p> <p>See Attachment 4 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The project is a <i>"Major alternative energy facility"</i> as defined in Section 17.61.010(9) and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6).</p> <p>After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy.</p> <p>Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate.</p> <p>The site is sparsely populated with open stands dominated by pine. Few wetlands, meadows, and woody vegetation exist on the site. The property owner has no plans to open the property to housing.</p>	Yes
Comment 27	Use type confusion	Land Use and Shoreline	Barbara M. Hodgson Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	<p>This comment perfectly describes the Teanaway Solar Reserve's proposed development on Cle Elum Ridge, which is being rushed through the county's approval process with very little opportunity for public comment on an industrial use of land which is zoned "Forest and Range".</p> <p>The conditional use permit application and related documents were published September 3 with limited notice and the public was given 15 days to read over 600 pages of material and submit comments. To further discourage comment, the county stated that, unless strong opposition was encountered, they intended to issue a Determination of Non-significance. Given the fact that all the newspaper articles on the project have made it sound as though there would be no environmental or visual impact on the community, significant opposition is unlikely. These articles were based on information provided by the developer, some of which are not accurate.</p> <p>Public statements indicate that the land in question has been logged and has no useful purpose. In fact, the land has been selectively logged and still has many remaining trees. It is open pine forest and meadows that have been used through the years by many valley residents for hiking, orienteering, hunting, and horseback riding, all of which will be eliminated by restricted access.</p>	<p>The project is a <i>"Major alternative energy facility"</i> as defined in Section 17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6).</p> <p>The Applicant believes that a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance would be an appropriate SEPA determination for the project. After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>The proposed project will be built on private land. Historically the landowner has allowed responsible uses of the land by anyone lawfully accessing the site, except for not allowing motorized vehicles on the property. Historically the road to the project site is gated to prevent access.</p> <p>The Applicant does not intend to change these policies. Responsible access through the project site will be</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					See Attachment 24 for complete letter.	allowed subject to conflicting requirements beyond Applicant's control (such as insurance or fire protection), provided that individuals do not interfere with the construction, operations or maintenance of the project. Gating will continue to regulate motorized vehicles but a fence restricting access is not proposed.	
Comment 28	Use type confusion	Land Use and Shoreline	Jack N. Hodgsontel PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	<p>There has been some selective logging but numerous existing trees would have to be cut to make room for the installation of the panels. The developer's representation of the panel site shows a clear cut hillside. Removal of these trees will cause very serious runoff problems.</p> <p>Upon review of the zoning ordinances, I find no zoning called "Resource". It would be a stretch to say that this project would qualify as a conditional use if it were zoned "Commercial Forest". There are no conditional uses listed for "Forest and Range" which come close to resembling the proposal.</p> <p>This is an industrial use which is totally incompatible with the existing neighborhood. Let me be absolutely clear. I am not suggesting mitigation. I am recommending relocation and think there are many better and more suitable locations.</p> <p>See Attachment 25 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The project is a "Major alternative energy facility" as defined in Section 17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6).</p> <p>After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy.</p> <p>More detailed analysis on the criteria used for site selection and location of project facilities will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.</p>	No
Comment 29	Adjacent landowner concern	Land Use and Shoreline	Lori Hinton 4000 SW Donovan St. Seattle, WA 98136 206-854-1685	October 5, 2009	<p>My name is Lori Hinton and I recently purchased property in Kittitas County in 2007 because I love the rural atmosphere and wildlife. I am in the process of building my retirement home there on this property as this is where I am choosing to live because of these things. ... I heard word of a proposed solar project which would be sited in these very pristine areas I hold so sacred. I am 100% behind solar energy and all kinds of renewable energies, but I strongly believe the Teanaway is not the location to conduct such a project. It will forever negatively change this pristine area whether it fails or succeeds, and there are far more suitable locations further east along 1-90 that are not so treasured for wildlife and views yet have less snow and great sun exposure. Please consider this a vote against the TSR by a very concerned citizen, yet a push for solar energy in a more suitable Kittitas environment.</p> <p>See Attachment 27 for complete letter.</p>	<p>After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy.</p> <p>The proposed project site has been logged numerous times in the past. Field biologists and wetland scientists have found no evidence of protected wildlife or plants.</p>	No
Comment 30	Project confusion	Land Use and Shoreline	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	<p>The Teanaway Solar Reserve (TSR) is corporation recently formed by Seattle-area businessmen. TSR is a spin-off business of the American Forest Land Company (AFLC), a Wyoming corporation, with offices in Bellingham. AFLC is also trying to create a large development cluster in the upper Teanaway while TSR is simultaneously trying to place the largest solar array in the United States right in our scenic valley.</p> <p>See Attachment 29 for complete letter.</p>	The proposed project only includes the solar array and associated features stated in the CUP and SEPA.	No
Comment 31	Use type confusion		Barb King	October 1, 2009	The property is zoned for use as a Commercial Forrestr. This means that if Kittitas County followed its own zoning	The proposed property site in zoned Commercial Forrestr, but instead is zoned Forest and Range Zone. The project is a "Major	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
		Land Use and Shoreline	Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922		<p>practices, not more than 1 house could be built on 88 acres of land. However, the County is seriously considering approval of a conditional Use Permit (CUP) that would allow this use in direct contradiction of the County's current zoning.</p> <p>Most of us purchased our land and built our homes in this area to enjoy a rural lifestyle. We relied on the County's practice of zoning to cluster development in the cities and towns and keep the rural areas rural. Each solar panel is nearly the size of a car and the ridge will look like a parking lot for 400,000 of them. The County must not grant the CUP and this gross-misuse of our land-use policies must be stopped.</p> <p>You can help be [sic] letting your voice be heard.</p> <p>I believe in Solar Power and think we should invest in this important resource for our future. But the proper place for real solar power is NOT in the beautiful pine and fir forests of the Teanaway. Along with the Methow Valley, the Teanaway is one of this state's two most scenic watersheds. This Valley and watershed should be protected. The proper place for a solar array of this magnitude should be in the sage brush country toward vantage, near the wind farm or by Hanford. It's OK to be a fan of solar power but against the siting of this project. That makes sense and is not somehow "anti environment." Don't be afraid to protest. I would be the first to support a project that was properly cited.</p> <p>TSR's site location on the top of the Cle Elum Ridge is at approximately 2500 feet is a poor choice for a solar array of this size. The site averages 25-30 inches of snow in mid-winter and frequently has more than 3 feet of snow. In their application materials, TSR has no serious plan to keep the panels clear of snow. With a snow load on them, the panels PV cells will generate very little energy.</p> <p>As many of you know, the Teanaway is not a desert. The area receives 23 inches of rain per year. This is more than the San Juan Islands and twice as much as Hanford. The clouds that frequently hang over the Cascades make for a fair amount of cloudy days also make this site far less effective for PV cells than sunnier climates. To be sure, winter months with short cloudy days will hurt the ability of the PV cells to generate power.</p> <p>See Attachment 29 for complete letter.</p>	<p><i>alternative energy facility</i>" as defined in Section 17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6). Thus the proposed project is not in direct contradiction of the County's current zoning. The applicant has followed all legal and procedural requirements in the siting and licensing of the proposed project.</p> <p>After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate.</p>	
Comment 32	Use type confusion	Land Use and Shoreline	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	<p>AFLC and TSR are pushing this project for two reasons. The first is that they can no longer get much value for their land because the large trees have already been logged. (Many small trees exist with 12-15 inch trunks however). In short, one house per 88 acres doesn't fetch much profit for them if they were to sell it. TSR is trying to use a CUP and the promise of a renewable energy to convince the County planners to let them have a second "bite at the apple" and use their land for a quasi-industrial purpose. (That's really what it is--an industrial</p>	<p>The applicant is committed to advancing the growing need for sustainable energy sources and the State of Washington's Renewable Electricity Standard, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Title 19, mandate that by the year 2020, the state's largest electric utilities meet 15 percent of their retail electric load with renewable electricity (for example, wind and solar energy).</p> <p>The proposed property is zoned Forest and Range Zone. The project is a "<i>Major alternative energy facility</i>" as defined in Section</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					<p>purpose. If this were any other business enterprise--other than "green" energy—it wouldn't even pass the laugh test. But somehow because it is Solar it seems to be nearly sacred. In the end, its still just an industrial use and a forest area).</p> <p>The second reason TSR is pushing this is that the state recently created some pretty big tax incentives for renewable energy. So the promise of cheap land and tax breaks makes it easy for TSR to make their proposal. They hope they can get the CUP from the county and then go shopping for investors world-wide to fund their project. They don't have the hundreds of millions now to pay the tab. Remember, this is essentially a timber company trying to run a solar business. If it doesn't work, the bones of their failure will remain long after they are gone for the rest of us to enjoy. The County seems to biting this hook, line and sinker. TSR has "promised" to establish a solar manufacturing plant in Cle Elum and the promise of hundreds of new jobs. However, as of the date of this e-mail no application for the actual plant in Cle Elum has been submitted. A source with the City Cle Elum believes that they don't ever really intend to build a plant at all and will truck PV cells and the towers from Moses Lake, a city in a different county.</p> <p>See Attachment 29 for complete letter.</p>	<p>17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6). While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>The Teanaway Solar Reserve, LLC is not a timber company, though the proposed project site is former forest land.</p> <p>The Applicant will revise DA to clarify decommissioning and reclamation obligations.</p> <p>The County has worked with state agencies, landowners, the developers under the regulatory framework set forth by the county code and state legislation. The applicant feels that this comment unfairly characterizes the County planners and staff.</p> <p>An economic analysis has been conducted and was submitted to the County on October 9, 2009 for public review as part of the Applicant's responses to public comments and County requests. This analysis, along with the administrative record, demonstrates the considerable economic benefits to the County presented by the project.</p> <p>The applicant does not presently manufacture solar panels.</p>	
Comment 33	Incompatible land use	Land Use and Shoreline	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	<p>We are writing to respond to the short notice afforded us regarding the proposed Solar Reserve on some of the most beautiful forested countryside in Eastern Washington. Our understanding all along has been that we bordered land zoned forest and range, not lands designed for commercial use. From all appearances this would clearly impact home and property values. We are very concerned about the location selected for a number of reasons, but at the same time support the concept of developing alternative sources of energy. JUST NOT IN OUR BACKYARD!! Nor would you want it in YOURS! A solar reserve should be located in a flat open non forested and not residential area.</p> <p>The proposed clearing and location of the ten acres for the substation is of particular concern.</p> <p>Vandalism of our home and property damage are also of great concern.</p> <p>See Attachment 30 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The public comment periods for the CUP and DA are fully compliant with the County Code and the Growth Management Act. As explained in the County's NOA, the public has 30 days to submit comments regarding SEPA and the project's probable environmental impacts. These are deadlines set by longstanding county code and state legislation – not by the applicant.</p> <p>The proposed property is zoned Forest and Range Zone. The project is a "Major alternative energy facility" as defined in Section 17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6).</p> <p>After careful consideration the site was selected based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>The applicant does not anticipate any increased visitors to the site, beyond construction and operations personnel. A security guard</p>	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						will be present at all times and will notify local police of any suspicious activity.	
Comment 34	Inconsistent land use	Land Use and Shoreline	Bill King	October 1, 2009	<p>I guess I must have my head in the sand, to have this CUP get as far as it has without me getting involved [sic]. There has been a problem in the area that there doesn't seem to be much thought put into the overall effects of the different planning decisions.</p> <p>All of the previous development [sic] of this projected area has been residential (and pretty high end residential for the most part). It seems way off the track to put what is obviously a pretty high density commercial project into the middle of the area. It's hard for me to believe that there has not been a bunch of negative response from these neighbors.</p> <p>I can't help but think the reason for this development is because of the downturn in the real estate market that put a wrench in the original plan of the American Forest Land Co. which was to log and then develop [sic] this property by breaking it up into smaller residential pieces. I hate to say I envision them pulling in their 100 million dollars worth of investors, taking their share (which is probably a lot more than what they would have gotten with the original residential idea) and walking away either immediately [sic] or at the first winter when this sight proves unfeasible. I certainly know that I won't be one of the investors.</p> <p>See Attachment 31 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The site was selected after careful based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p> <p>While there are some residences in the area, this particular property is zoned as Forest and Range Land. The project is a "Major alternative energy facility" as defined in Section 17.61.010(9), not an industrial use, and is an authorized use in the Forest and Range Zone subject to approval of a CUP per Section 17.61.020(4) & (6).</p> <p>The applicant has received numerous public comments, as evidenced by this matrix. Some are positive others are not.</p> <p>The proposed project is not a response to the "downturn in the real estate market," but instead the applicant is committed to advancing the growing need for sustainable energy sources. The State of Washington's Renewable Electricity Standard, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Title 19, mandate that by the year 2020, the state's largest electric utilities meet 15 percent of their retail electric load with renewable electricity (for example, wind and solar energy). Without projects like the Teanaway Solar Reserve the state will not meet its goals, putting everyone's electricity supply in jeopardy.</p> <p>Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate.</p>	No
Comment 35	Location concerns	Land Use and Shoreline	Bill Sparks PO Box 490 691 Quail Drive Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 3, 2009	<p>I would like to record my opposition to the proposed solar installation in the Teanaway Valley. I live on 40 acres of land in the Teanaway Rifer valley directly below the proposed solar installation. When I first read the article in the paper I was incredulous that the largest solar installation in the world - according to the newspaper would be sited on a ridge in the foothills of the Cascade Mountain range. My first thought was that something other than common sense was driving this proposal. Somehow money, through tax incentives, or energy incentives, must be at the root of this misguided venture. I am all for energy production, whether by drilling for oil, natural gas, bio-fuel generators, wind, hydro, solar, etc., but to place the largest solar installation in the world in the Teanaway Valley does not compute. The only justifying reason is that there is a</p>	<p>The applicant is committed to advancing the growing need for sustainable energy sources. The State of Washington's Renewable Electricity Standard, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Title 19, mandate that by the year 2020, the state's largest electric utilities meet 15 percent of their retail electric load with renewable electricity (for example, wind and solar energy). Without projects like the Teanaway Solar Reserve the state will not meet its goals, putting everyone's electricity supply in jeopardy.</p> <p>Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate.</p>	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					<p>major power transmission line adjacent or on the property. Forty miles to the east of this location, where the present Wild Horse Wind Farm is located, the weather is dramatically different. We receive about 20-25 inches of precipitation a year, most of which is in the form of snow. I cannot imagine placing the largest solar location in the world in a location such as the Teanaway where we experience a considerable amount of inclement days as it relates to solar production. Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, California, Texas, - I can understand siting the solar preserve in such places located where the basic necessities are present for maximum solar production, i.e. clear, sunny days. The only reason I can come up with for the siting of the solar preserve in the Teanaway is artificial financial inducement. I have seen many tax favored investments ultimately go bust and be a liability to tax payers when the basic tenet for the investment is strictly the tax incentives and not sound economic decision making. This is the wrong project in the wrong location and should not be approved.</p> <p>See Attachment 32 for the complete letter.</p>		
Comment 36	Inconsistent land use	Land Use and Shoreline	Richard Luchinsinger and Jane McClenney 9300 Brick Mill Road Ellensburg, WA 98926	October 3, 2009	<p>We need to keep our forest lands AS forest land. These private timber companies have received big tax breaks to keep these lands in forest. They are always telling us on TV how they protect fish and wildlife. When are they going to do so? The Fish and Wildlife Department disagreed with the County and says that there would be a big impact if this development was allowed. Why not put a solar project of this magnitude in sagebrush area — where no trees need be destroyed, where sun is plentiful, snowfall is lighter? Where this is planned is in higher elevation with heavy snowfall. The panels will be virtually useless for 3 months of the year, where in sagebrush, they would not. The lots and development are in higher elevation which also means snowfall would need to be removed for these lots. And who would pay for this?</p> <p>See Attachment 33 for the complete letter.</p>	<p>The applicant is working with WDFW to prevent impacts where possible, and to mitigate impacts where unavoidable.</p> <p>Solar panels do not need full sunlight to generate electricity. The solar radiation capacity of the area has been assessed and deemed appropriate. The site was selected after careful based on a variety of environmental, economic, and social factors. The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy.</p> <p>While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.</p>	No
Noise							
Comment 37	Noise impacts are not assessed.	Aesthetics	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	<p>Applicant has not addressed construction related noise.</p> <p>Noise generated by 15,000 solar arrays moving to track the sun.</p> <p>Do 400,000 solar panels producing power produce sound?</p> <p>What noise impacts if you include the regular strong winds?</p> <p>Address noise in a full Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>See Attachment 5 for complete letter.</p>	<p>At sundown, the tracker moves flat, and stays in this position until sunrise. After this, the tracker will enable for ~10-15 seconds at a time, at different intervals throughout the day, maybe every 15 minutes on average.</p> <p>More detailed information regarding the decibels levels of the tracking panels will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 38	Noise Impacts	Aesthetics	Chuck Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	August 27, 2009	Also, I saw nothing about the motor noise generated by 400,000 solar panels rotating. Am I missing something? See Attachment 23 for the complete letter.	At sundown, the tracker moves flat, and stays in this position until sunrise. After this, the tracker will enable for ~10-15 seconds at a time, at different intervals throughout the day, maybe every 15 minutes on average.	No
NPDES							
Comment 39	Flooding and water quality implications.	Earth/Water	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Mark S. Teske South Central Region Ellensburg District Office 201 N. Pearl Ellensburg, WA 98926	September 16, 2009	Solar panels create impervious surfaces and change the native vegetation. The snowmelt runoff coefficients, timing, distribution and infiltration of water across the site will be significantly altered as a result of the construction of this proposal. During the flood of January 2009 Red Bridge Road was significantly impacted. This road is directly south of the project. An increase in impervious surfaces may increase the flooding along this road. Teanaway River is 303(d) listed due to impaired flow and temperature. An increase in impervious surfaces will further hinder the quality of this river. Vegetation management will require disturbed surfaces and reduced vegetation to prevent shading and fire hazards. See Attachment 2 for complete letter.	A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions. Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate the installation and operation for the solar panels. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff. A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of the site	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes.	
Comment 40	Siltation, run-off, and chemicals will affect groundwater.	Earth	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	<p>Applicant hardly mentions water run-off and siltation issues that will result from construction and maintenance of the facility which ultimately ends up in the Teanaway and Yakima Rivers.</p> <p>Run-off effect could also impact groundwater recharge, by not allowing the run-off to percolate slowly into groundwater. Ground water is already a major issue of contention between the county and the Dept of Ecology, with the resulting ban on new wells.</p> <p>Applicant has failed to address wash-off of the solar structures which would include pollutants from metals, alloys, plastics, lubricants, glues, etc. There is the same concern from herbicides use to control brush and grass.</p> <p>See Attachment 5 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions.</p> <p>The solar panels will be maintained and washed on a regular basis so they can function properly. Where possible, the Applicant will investigate using green technology in the design of the project.</p> <p>The use of herbicides will be limited to target those species outlined in the vegetation and weed control plan (which will be developed pre-construction) and only herbicides approved for use in water (per Ecology and NOAA Fisheries) will be used to maintain the site.</p>	Yes
Comment 41	May cause water runoff and erosion	Water	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	<p>Removing trees and foliage and replacing it with thousands of panels and other impervious surfaces would greatly increase the risk of severe flooding down to Red Bridge Road and the valley below. The project would also impact the percolation rate into the groundwater, a serious issue in the area.</p> <p>Solvents, chemicals, lubricants, etc. used in the construction and maintenance of this industrial site would leach into the groundwater and Teanaway River.</p> <p>I understand efforts are being made to bring salmon runs to the Teanaway and any potential negative impacts to water quality attributable to the site should be fully examined.</p> <p>See Attachment 6 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions. Aquatic species in the Teanaway will not be affected by the project.</p> <p>The solar panels will be maintained and washed on a regular basis so they can function properly. Where possible, the Applicant will investigate using green technology in the design of the project.</p> <p>The use of herbicides will be limited to target those species outlined in the vegetation and weed control plan (which will be developed pre-construction) and only herbicides approved for use in water (per Ecology and NOAA Fisheries) will be used to maintain the site.</p>	Yes
Comment 42	Several other	Water	Department of	September 18, 2009	Per 173-539A WAC, projects relying on new appropriations of	The only uses of water we anticipate are minimal amounts to	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
	permits may be required.		Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator		<p>groundwater must be determined by Ecology to be water budget neutral. Prospective groundwater users in the area affected by Chapter 173-539A WAC shall apply to Ecology for a permit to appropriate public groundwater or, if seeking to use the groundwater exemption, shall submit to Ecology a request for determination that the proposed exempt use would be water budget neutral. No new exempt uses under Section 90.44.050 RCW may commence unless Ecology has approved a request for determination that the proposed exempt use would be water budget neutral. Application states that water will either be trucked in or withdrawn from an onsite well. This must be clarified.</p> <p>If water is used for construction, the water purveyor is responsible for ensuring that the proposed uses are within the limitations of their water rights.</p> <p>Individual NPDES Construction Stormwater permit may be required for the project.</p> <p>Control of vegetation by herbicides in and around water courses, including intermittent streams and wetlands may require an aquatic herbicide permit.</p> <p>Solid wastes, solvents and solutions used in cleaning the panels require proper disposal.</p> <p>Exposure of materials and processes to weather may require an NPDES Industrial Permit.</p> <p>See Attachment 7 for complete letter.</p>	<p>accommodate activities such as drinking water, toilets, and cleaning the panels. We will purchase water from a local purveyor such as the Kittitas County water district to satisfy these water needs.</p> <p>Applicant agrees with Ecology that any water used must be so authorized, and we suggest it as a condition of an MDNS.</p> <p>Applicant agrees that construction and industrial stormwater permits may be required, and is working with Ecology to address this question.</p> <p>The use of herbicides will be limited to target those species outlined in the vegetation and weed control plan (which will be developed pre-construction) and only herbicides approved for use in water (per Ecology and NOAA Fisheries) will be used to maintain the site.</p> <p>Applicant agrees that any waste, hazardous or otherwise, be properly disposed in accordance with any applicable state or federal law.</p>	
Comment 43	More information about hydrology is needed	Water	Department of Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator	September 23, 2009	<p>More information about depth to groundwater is needed to rule out the proposed project's potential impact on wetland hydrology.</p> <p>A geotechnical report was not available for review, and soil mapping unit characteristics were not discussed to support the conclusion. This information should be included in the SEPA.</p> <p>If straw bales are being used as BMPs, weed free straw should be specified for use.</p> <p>See Attachment 9 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A geotechnical report will be prepared prior to the finalization of the design and layout of the project.</p> <p>Soil pits dug by wetland scientists indicated that groundwater levels in early June are below 20 inches. No streams showed evidence of recent flow during field visits in early June. No springs, seeps or other indications of groundwater were observed during field visits.</p> <p>Weed free straw bales will be used. This BMP will be detailed in the NPDES permit submittal.</p>	No
Comment 44	Flooding concerns	Earth	Barbara M. Hodgson Box 68 Medina, WA 98039 bmhodgson@comcast.net	October 1, 2009	<p>There are other issues that have not been addressed. Much of the run off that inundated Red Bridge and Wehl Road during the "Pineapple Express" in January of 2009 came from the hillside where the panels will be placed.</p> <p>See Attachment 24 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions. Aquatic species in the Teanaway will not be affected by the project.	
Comment 45	Water use questions	Water	Jack N. Hodgsontel PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	<p>The need to keep the panels clean in order for them to function and access.</p> <p>The developer recognizes the need and likelihood that there may not be enough water on the property to do this. So, for purposes of the application, they assume water will be trucked to the site and the panels cleaned once a month. With eight panels per section, the 50,000 mounts (according to my math) will be 6-7 yards apart. This density would need to be diminished dramatically to get the necessary wiggle room for large trucks. How many truck loads and how many days does it take to rinse down 400,000 panels?</p> <p>Forget about summer, think about the winter months. The ground is frozen or muddy depending on the time of day and the temperature. Even with paving all of the roadways, how do trucks navigate the hillside? Snow must be plowed. Where does the snow get piled? Can the panels be sprayed in freezing conditions without being harmed? What percentage of the time in winter is the temperature such that the water will evaporate rather than freeze? Where does this much water go?</p> <p>See Attachment 25 for complete letter.</p>	<p>In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions. Aquatic species in the Teanaway will not be affected by the project.</p> <p>The solar panels will be maintained and washed on a regular basis so they can function properly. Where possible, the Applicant will investigate using green technology in the design of the project.</p>	Yes
Comment 46	Drainage	Earth	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA	October 5, 2009	<p>Proper draining for the road and culvert system must be added. The whole hillside along loping lane is unstable. I think something like 2 million dollars in FEMA money was used to rehab the site this spring. Even during normal winter snow runoff the creeks are all full and drain into the Teanaway River in a muddy mess. In January, the floods took out HWY 970 along with Red Bridge Road in a few spots. The applicant wants to put up numerous solar panels on the site. As I read the application, there will be a bunch of access roads and lots of trenching for power lines which will require all of the trees to be cut because the roots will be compromised or the trees are simply in the way. In addition, a buffer will be created. The first</p>	<p>Solar panels will be spaced so that water may move across the panels and to the surface immediately.</p> <p>Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff. A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of the site clearing and placing solar panels on</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
			98038		<p>problem is that the solar panels don't allow water to pass through them and will act just like a big tarp. Second, clearing this huge amount of trees and other biomass will further reduce the ability of the land to absorb this run off. Believe me, this area already floods EVERY spring. Unless extraordinary measures are taken to mitigate, the flooding will be far worse. (Again, I don't want to stand in the way of this project but it might be wise for the County to consider a full Environment Impact Study for this project--especially with all this drainage running into the Teanaway River.)</p> <p>See Attachment 26 for complete letter.</p>	<p>south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces.</p> <p>In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions.</p>	
Comment 47	Impervious surfaces	Earth	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	<p>Imagine the drainage problems that nearly 1/2 square mile of impervious solar panels will create in Wehl Road and Loping Lane. That slope is highly unstable and it failed in no less than four paces earlier this January.</p> <p>See Attachment 29 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Solar panels will be spaced so that water may move across the panels and to the surface immediately.</p> <p>In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions.</p>	Yes
Comment 48	Drainage	Earth	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	<p>Just last spring county engineers roamed the surrounding properties because of severe water runoff and damage along Loping Lane to Red Bridge Rd. after the January 09 flood. The county engineers uncovered little to point to the reason for the flood damage. We personally incurred the loss of over half of our driveway which required fourteen trucks to replace the base that washed away. We can only image the greater threats if the natural vegetation is removed and replaced with panels causing even more erosion from the snow and rain run off.</p> <p>See Attachment 30 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions. Aquatic species in the Teanaway will not be affected by the project.</p>	Yes
Comment 49	Forest soil impacts, impervious surfaces	Earth	Richard Luchinsinger and Jane McClenney 9300 Brick Mill Road Ellensburg, WA 98926	October 3, 2009	<p>Have you ever studied forest or soils? Hard surface runoff is 100% and immediate. Grasslands, much slower, with only about a 90% total runoff. And forest land is even longer yet, with only 75-80% runoff to the rivers. This is why so many rivers on the west side of the mountains flood even withonly heavy rain. It is overdeveloped with a lot of hard surface runoff area.</p> <p>See Attachment 33 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Professional soil scientists and engineers have analyzed the characteristics of the soil. A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible to limit the amount of runoff.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Recreation							
Comment 50	Proposed project will limit recreational opportunities on the private property of the proposed project.	Recreation	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Orienteering, skiing, biking has occurred on the property over time. Proposed project will limit these recreational activities. "Hunters frequent the site during the hunting season, looking for deer, elk and bear, which has on occasion caused us problems when they stray on to our property where we do not allow hunting." See Attachment 5 for complete letter.	The proposed project will be built on private land. Historically the landowner has allowed responsible uses of the land by anyone lawfully accessing the site, except for not allowing motorized vehicles on the property. Historically the road to the project site is gated to prevent access. The Applicant does not intend to change these policies. Responsible access through the project site will be allowed subject to conflicting requirements beyond Applicant's control (such as insurance or fire protection), provided that individuals do not interfere with the construction, operations or maintenance of the project. Gating will continue to regulate motorized vehicles but a fence restricting access is not proposed. Hunting will not be allowed within the project site; the Applicant proposes this as a mitigation measure for an MDNS.	No
Comment 51	Adverse Impacts to Orienteering.	Recreation	Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hodgson Partners, Pine Hills Ranch PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	September 14, 2009	Construction of the proposed project will not only obsolete this [orienteering] map, it will also terminate this activity entirely. See Attachment 1 for complete letter	Proposed project is located on private land and is a permissible conditional use subject to county requirements. Public recreation, such as orienteering, has been allowed on the site by the landowner on a case-by-case basis. The proposed project will be built on private land. Historically the landowner has allowed responsible uses of the land by anyone lawfully accessing the site, except for not allowing motorized vehicles on the property. Historically the road to the project site is gated to prevent access. The Applicant does not intend to change these policies. Responsible access through the project site will be allowed subject to conflicting requirements beyond Applicant's control (such as insurance or fire protection), provided that individuals do not interfere with the construction, operations or maintenance of the project. Gating will continue to regulate motorized vehicles but a fence restricting access is not proposed.	No
Comment 52	Access concerns.	Recreation	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	Imagine how you will feel when your access gets cut off to the AFLC property as early as next year. They say they won't but they will need to to protect their construction and solar equipment. See Attachment 29 for complete letter.	The proposed project will be built on private land. Historically the landowner has allowed responsible uses of the land by anyone lawfully accessing the site, except for not allowing motorized vehicles on the property. Historically the road to the project site is gated to prevent access. The Applicant does not intend to change these policies. Responsible access through the project site will be allowed subject to conflicting requirements beyond Applicant's control (such as insurance or fire protection), provided that individuals do not interfere with the construction, operations or maintenance of the project. Gating will continue to regulate motorized vehicles but a fence restricting access is not proposed.	No
Right of Way							

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 53	Supportive of project as long as ROW is not impacted.	Utilities	Lila Black Field Realty Specialist Bonneville Power Administration Ellensburg Maintenance District 14001 Wilson Creek Road Ellensburg, WA 98926	September 30, 2009	BPA does not have any objection to this project as long as any planned buildings and facilities remain off the BPA right-of-way. We do request, however, that the following statement be forwarded to the property owner to help ensure public safety and reliable operation of BPA's facilities. Portions of the property (Kittitas County parcel map number 20-16-27000-0009) located in Section 27, Township 20 North, Range 16 East, W.M., are encumbered by an easement for high-voltage transmission lines owned by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). BPA has acquired rights for these easements that limit the landowner's use of this area. BPA has the right of ingress and egress, the right to keep the easement free and clear of all brush, timber, structures and fire hazards, and rights associated with roads within the easement area. All activities planned within the BPA easement need to be reviewed by BPA prior to their occurrence. Do not build, dig, install utilities, plant, or burn within the easement area. For further questions or concerns regarding any proposed uses of the easement, you may contact BPA Real Estate Field Services at the address listed above or by calling (877) 417-9454. See Attachment 20 for the complete letter.	The Applicant will avoid impacts to the BPA right-of-way and the request will be forwarded to the property owner.	No
Comment 54	Road will be built on road easement	Transportation	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	I am the closest landowner to the site and the road will run THROUGH my property, across a road easement. Those trucks and construction workers will pass about 150 feet from the future home site (where I have spent a ton of money trenching power and phone etc nearly a quarter mile in homes of a pristine retirement home). See Attachment 26 for complete letter.	The Applicant has been working with the County to ensure proper road improvements and haul routes.	No
Support for Renewable Energy							
Comment 55	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Carlos Arriola	September 29, 2009	As a property owner and taxpayer in Kittitas County, I STRONGLY SUPPORT The Teanaway Solar Power Reserve. See Attachment 14 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees, and appreciates the support for solar power and this project.	No
Comment 56	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Mike Haschak 225 19 th Place Kirkland, WA 98033	September 29, 2009	Dear Sirs, as a homeowner in Easton, WA. (51 Homestead Lane), I wanted to express my enthusiastic support of the Teanaway Solar Reserve out of Cle Elum. What a great environmental project. This could not only mean lots of jobs for Kittitas County, but possibly be a worldwide example of a way	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					out of our dependence on oil and coal. See Attachment 15 for complete letter.		
Comment 57	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	W. J. Bender Industrial and Engineering Technology Department 400 E. University Way Ellensburg WA 98926-7584	September 29, 2009	We would like to add our public support to the Teanaway Solar Reserve. We have met with Howard Trott and looked at their project description; we feel this is a great opportunity with clear benefits for CWU's department of Industrial and Engineering Technology. The Teanaway Solar Reserve has taken the steps to show its intent to build a much-needed power source while protecting the character and integrity of our natural forest lands. The added benefit of a solar panel manufacturer here in Kittitas County is of even greater importance to this project, because of the jobs and opportunities it provides to our students. The benefits of renewable energy and the jobs this project will bring to Kittitas County in general are immense. When this project becomes a reality we plan to perform applied research in support of the Teanaway Solar Reserve. We encourage you to weigh these benefits and approve a Conditional Use Permit for the Teanaway Solar Reserve. See Attachment 17 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No
Comment 58	Supportive of project and renewable energy, job creation	Energy and Natural Resources	A.K. Wintzer Project Manager Renewable Energy Workforce Training Needs Study 120 South 3rd Street, Suite 299-A Yakima, WA 98901	September 30, 2009	I would like to express my support for the Teanaway Solar Reserve that is seeking to be developed in the Cle Elum area. It is my understanding that this private project will consist of 400,000 photovoltaic panels spread across 145 acres on a 900 acre of privately owned timberland. During construction this project will create up to 235 badly needed construction jobs. It will require around 35 full-time family wage jobs after construction is completed. As part of this project, the Reserve will require that their solar panel vender locate a manufacturing plant in Cle Elum. Please look favorably on this project so it can move forward and contribute to the economic base of Kittitas County. See Attachment 18 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No
Comment 59	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Mike Haschak 225 19 th Place Kirkland, WA 98033	September 29, 2009	I would like to throw my complete support behind this project. As a homeowner in Easton (51 Homestead Lane), I think this would be good for the economy, good for the environment, and possibly have the eyes of the world looking to this project as how things should be done in the 21 st century. What a great opportunity for our area. See Attachment 19 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No
Comment 60	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	K.C. Golden Policy Director	September 15, 2009	The Teanaway Solar Reserve is an example of the kind of project we need many more of in our state.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
			Climate Solutions		See Attachment 10 for complete letter.		
Comment 61	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Terry Walker	October 01, 2009	<p>I am writing to endorse the Teanaway Solar Reserve project. As an architect I am concerned with the built environment and the expanding carbon footprint, the pollution from coal power plants and the associated waste and health issues. I endorse clean renewable solar power as an imperative step into the most desirable future state. I endorse the expanding green economy. I am in good company in endorsing this project, joined by Senator Murray, Senator Cantwell and U.S Rep. Jay Inslee. The project is rare in its bold vision and serves as a shining example of the promise embodied in the emergent green economy, to create clean energy jobs, renewable power, to lead the way for future projects, to strengthen the local community and to summon from the people of a small community the inspiration to lead a nation. To be among the pioneers who forge a new world is a rare opportunity.</p> <p>In a speech delivered September 22, 2009, President Obama said "No nation, however large or small, wealthy or poor, can escape the impact of climate change." The president of the United states has committed the United States to support renewable energy as a component of an international effort to address our shared global problems. In closing he called upon the people of this nation to take action saying:</p> <p>" So let us begin. For if we are flexible and pragmatic; if we can resolve to work tirelessly in common effort, then we will achieve our common purpose: a world that is safer, cleaner, and healthier than the one we found; and a future that is worthy of our children."</p> <p>I urge the people of Kittitas Co to rise to the moment and approve the Teanaway Solar Reserve Conditional Use Permit Application. To carry the torch and light the way for other communities in the State of Washington, to a clean and sustainable future.</p> <p>See Attachment 22 for complete letter.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 62	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Rob and Cheri Marusa PO Box 433 South Cle Elum, WA 98943	September 29, 2009	<p>We would like to add our public support to the Teanaway Solar Reserve. Having spoken with Howard Trott and looked at theft project description, we feel this is a great opportunity with clear benefits for the Upper County.</p> <p>The Teanaway Solar Reserve has taken the steps to show its intent to build a much needed power source while protecting the character and integrity of our natural forest lands. The studies on plants and animals show minimal impact to these important resources.</p> <p>Additionally, the working families of our community need a new industry to replace the loss of the timber and mining jobs and slow-down in construction. The added benefit of a solar panel manufacturer here in Cle Hum is of even greater importance to this project.</p> <p>The benefits of renewable energy and the jobs this project will bring to the Cle Elum area and Kittitas County in general are immense. This project has the potential to keep a strong work-force here in the community and draw more projects of this type to the county. We encourage you to weigh these benefits and approve a Conditional Use Permit for the Teanaway Solar Reserve.</p> <p>See Attachment 35 for complete letter.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No
Comment 63	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Charles J. Glondo City of Cle Elum Mayor 119 West First Street Cle Elum, WA 98922	September 18, 2009	<p>As Mayor of the City of Cle Hum I am writing to offer my unqualified support for the Teanaway Solar Reserve Project and respectfully request that the Board of Adjustment approve the Conditional Use Permit for this project. There is significant local interest in seeing this project realized, in terms of the economic and employment benefits to Kittitas County and the Cle Elum area specifically.</p> <p>This project will not only provide a local source of clean energy but will also provide new jobs in Kittitas County. The 200 plus construction jobs created by this project are very much needed in the Upper County and once Teanaway Solar receives permit approval from the County they will work to locate a manufacturing plant in the Cle Elum area which will translate into potentially hundreds of permanent jobs. In addition to the new jobs, there will be an increased demand in goods and services and increased tax revenues for Cle Elum and the County.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed conditional use permit and I urge the Board of Adjustment to approve this application.</p> <p>See Attachment 36 for complete letter.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 64	Supportive of project and renewable energy	Energy and Natural Resources	Bill Hinkle Minority Whip State Representative 13 th District 401 John L O'Brien Building PO Box 40600 Olympia, WA 98504-0600	October 8, 2009	I would like to add my public support to the Teanaway Solar Reserve and their request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the Teanaway Solar Reserve. I have been briefed on the project and I feel this is a great opportunity with clear benefits for the Upper Kittitas County, and all of Kittitas County and Washington State. The Teanaway Solar Reserve will develop a high-quality renewable energy resource while providing needed economic development and jobs to the area. At the same time, the project will maintain the nature of the Teanaway Valley, which is important to local residents. I see this project as having the potential to develop related jobs and bring other renewable energy industries to our area. I encourage you to weigh these benefits while determining appropriate conditions. I hope you will ultimately approve a Conditional Use Permit in a timely manner. See Attachment 38 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees.	No
Comment 65	Supportive of renewable energy, and of project if mitigation occurs	Energy and Natural Resources	John and Sarah Talley 3008 3 rd Street NE Tacoma, WA 98422	October 5, 2009	In general I'm a supporter of solar and wind power and am excited that there could be some serious jobs potential for the Cle Elum area. Specifically, I could be proud of a big solar electric plant nearby, and so would my kids. I do have some serious concerns about this particular project that I would like to see mitigated by any conditional use permit. See Attachment 37 for complete letter.	Comment acknowledged. Applicant agrees. The applicant is working with the County, state agencies, and local landowners to mitigate negative impacts created by the project. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable.	No
Traffic							
Comment 66	Will impact local roads	Transportation	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Applicant paints a picture of very few homes and very little traffic on Weihl Road, which is incorrect. The project would have very damaging impacts on both Weihl Road and Loping Lane, due to trucks and heavy equipment making thousands of vehicle trips on these gravel roads. If project is approved, County should require improvement of	The Applicant met with the County on 9/23/09 to discuss the standards for roads and plans to improve Weihl Road as needed to comply with County standards. The Applicant is preparing a road use plan that will provide additional details on impacts from anticipated road use during and post-construction. County and City of Kittitas highway and shoulder pavement shall be video monitored before and after construction of the Project. If construction of the Project results in the degradation of the	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					Weihl Road to paved County standards. See Attachment 5 for complete letter.	existing pavement and/or shoulders Applicant shall reinstate these facilities to equal or better condition than they were prior to construction. The need for an engineering analysis of the bridge and Red Bridge Road was discussed with Kittitas County Construction Manager, Tom Kelley. TSR will continue discussions with Tom to determine the type of analysis needed to determine the potential effects of the project on the roads.. More detail on the engineering analysis will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.	
Comment 67	Increased traffic due to construction	Transportation	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	...and increased traffic are just a few of the [impacts] that come to mind. See Attachment 6 for complete letter.	Applicant to prepare a traffic management plan regulating flow of traffic during and after construction. The Applicant is working with the County on a haul routes plan. This will be provided in the supplemental submittal to the County.	Yes
Comment 68	Road drawings and details should be provided	Transportation	Department of Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator	September 23, 2009	Unclear whether the road maps presented included proposed roads. If existing roads will be widened, the needed maximum width should be described. The areas where this would occur should be specifically identified or at least the rationale used to decide if new road is needed should be discussed. An estimate of how much more land disturbance is likely to be required for roads should be provided. Drawings of conceptual road cross-sections and cross-sections of stream crossings should be provided.	The Applicant met with the County on 9/23/09 to discuss the standards for roads and plans to improve Weihl Road as needed to comply with County standards. Drawings of conceptual road cross-sections and cross-sections of stream crossings will be provided in the Applicant's additional information for the County.	Yes
Comment 69	Inadequate access roads	Transportation	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	The access road to the site is poor. Even in the spring I have required four wheel chains on full-size 4 wheel drive truck simply to get through the mud roads without snow. With snow I have been stuck no less than six times and required towing. The proposed access road to the site is wholly inadequate for the scale of the site and will need to be improved. Because of drainage problems, discussed later, the road should be a high quality gravel road with steps taken to keep the level of dust down. Culverts must be improved to handle the considerable drainage that runs off in many stream beds. If they are serious about getting vehicles up there from October until late April, the road improvements must be made by the applicant from Red Bridge Road all the way to the American Forrest Property Gate which sits on my property. The CUP should be conditioned on this improvement. See Attachment 26 for complete letter.	The Applicant is working with the County to determine appropriate haul routes and road improvements (including the most appropriate type of gravel). The access roads have supported logging efforts in the past, and construction vehicles will be comparable in size or smaller than logging trucks. The Applicant is aware of the drainage challenges on certain roads near the project site and is currently working with the County and the Department of Ecology to mitigate such problems.	Yes
Comment 70	Adjacent owner threatens gating property	Transportation	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington	October 5, 2009	I built and own the gate at the bottom of lot 1, this will need to be automated to allow construction and also homeowners access. The road easement is NOT a public one. I do not allow tress passing without written permission. The gate must be closed at all times when not actually letting vehicles in. If a passing area is required for trucks, construct it on Lot 2 under	The Applicant proposes to access the project through the use public roads and easement rights conveyed by the lessors. Applicant will work closely with landowners along Loping Lane to coordinate and resolve any gating and access concerns.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
			Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038		the power lines and try not to disturb the gate since it has a Ranch look to it and it was expensive. I don't believe a guard shack is necessary but if one is needed, I would place it by the lower gate (the one I built) just inside of lot two. I would prefer not to have a guard shack just behind my house and in view of it. Not only would he be a very lonely guy in the middle of the night, but it wouldn't make any sense if visitors couldn't get through the lower gate. I request to have a meaningful input as the applicant designs the gate and the policy for entry into the site. See Attachment 26 for complete letter.		
Comment 71	Will require written permission for access	Transportation	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	If all of the above is granted, my family will require written permission to access the site. See Attachment 26 for complete letter.	The Applicant proposes to access the project through the use public roads and easement rights conveyed by the lessors. The Applicant will work closely with landowners along Loping Lane to coordinate and resolve any gating and access concerns.	No
Comment 72	Road improvement	Transportation	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	For those of you who live on Red Bridge Road and Weihl Road you will really suffer. You will have to endure at least three years of construction. TSR expects to bring up to 450 workers up your road system daily at the peak, with no proposals to fix the roads other than to "work with the Neighbors." See Attachment 29 for complete letter.	The Applicant met with the County on 9/23/09 to discuss the standards for roads and plans to improve Weihl Road as needed to comply with County standards. The Applicant is preparing a road use plan that will provide additional details on impacts from anticipated road use during and post-construction. County and City of Kittitas highway and shoulder pavement shall be video monitored before and after construction of the Project. If construction of the Project results in the degradation of the existing pavement and/or shoulders Applicant shall reinstate these facilities to equal or better condition than they were prior to construction. The need for an engineering analysis of the bridge and Red Bridge Road was discussed with Kittitas County Construction Manager, Tom Kelley. TSR will continue discussions with Tom to determine the type of analysis needed to determine the potential effects of the project on the roads. More detail on the engineering analysis will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.	Yes
Comment 73	Road improvements to support construction	Transportation	John and Sarah Talley 3008 3 rd Street NE Tacoma, WA 98422	October 5, 2009	I'm concerned about Weihl Road from Red Bridge Road up to Loping Lane (assuming ALL construction traffic turns left at that point). The permit application has no compelling language detailing the extent to which Weihl Road ought to be rebuilt in order to sustain the pounding of all the heavy trucks over all the seasons. There are a few in my neighborhood who take up	The Applicant met with the County on 9/23/09 to discuss the standards for roads and plans to improve Weihl Road as needed to comply with County standards. The Applicant is preparing a road use plan that will provide additional details on impacts from anticipated road use during and post-construction. County and	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					<p>collections of dollars, equipment, and many labor hours to patch together and snow plow Weihl Road simply to keep the road together under a minimal amount of traffic. We know what is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Weihl Road from Red Bridge Road to Loping Lane as officially a "county maintained road" • Negotiate a shared cost approach between the appropriate governmental agency and TSR, LLC and rebuild Weihl Road to meet the true standard of what is needed to withstand multiple years of very heavy construction traffic, increased employee traffic and the heavy impact of snow and snow melt on this poorly built dirt road 	<p>City of Kittitas highway and shoulder pavement shall be video monitored before and after construction of the Project. If construction of the Project results in the degradation of the existing pavement and/or shoulders Applicant shall reinstate these facilities to equal or better condition than they were prior to construction.</p> <p>The need for an engineering analysis of the bridge and Red Bridge Road was discussed with Kittitas County Construction Manager, Tom Kelley. TSR will continue discussions with Tom to determine the type of analysis needed to determine the potential effects of the project on the roads. More detail on the engineering analysis will be included in the supplemental submittal to the County.</p>	
Vegetation							
Comment 74	Solar panels will damage vegetation	Water	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	<p>There are a number of meadows and wetlands on the site. Some of these areas dry up with the heat of late summer and some stay wet. In many areas that plan life stays green and the soil damp long after the surface water is gone.</p> <p>Area is habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>See Attachment 5 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Extensive rare plant and wetland studies have been conducted on the proposed project site. No threatened or endangered plants have been found.</p> <p>The applicant will prepare a JARPA and obtain any wetland permits (such as a hydraulic project approval, HPA) in accordance with state and federal wetland laws. The proposed project will impact less than one tenth of an acre of wetland and these impacts will be mitigated in accordance with the permitting requirements.</p>	No
Comment 75	Will impact vegetation and cause run-off.	Plants	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	<p>Seed trees would be removed from south slope eliminating habitat, views and buffers and creating substantial water run-off issues, which have not been addressed by the Applicant.</p> <p>See Attachment 5 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff. A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of the site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes. The solar panels and supporting facilities will be designed and placed to minimize impervious surfaces.</p> <p>In compliance with stormwater requirements for eastern WA, BMPs will be implemented to prevent soil erosion and any downstream turbidity during construction and operation. These BMPs will be outlined in the NPDES permit and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which will be submitted to the Department of Ecology prior to construction. Ground cover will be maintained throughout the project area where possible. The project's stormwater management and treatment system will be also designed to ensure maintenance of downstream dominant stream flows in natural conditions.</p>	Yes
Comment 76	Project needs more analysis and	Plants	Cathie Conolly	September 17, 2009	The Colockum elk herd is present in the area. The project would require the clearing of most vegetation within a 400-acre site.	A more detailed site plan will be provided in the Applicant's additional information for the County that shows spacing between	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
	supporting data. Is in support of alternative energy.				Irrigation needs to be installed to promote the vegetation planted as part of the revegetation effort. Water trucks could be used to help the vegetation become established. See Attachment 12 for complete letter.	the panels and the layout of the facility. See prior response to wildlife issues.	
Comment 77	Weed impacts.	Plants	Cathie Conolly	September 17, 2009	Spotted and Russian knapweed, mullein, ox-eye daisy, kochia, and perennial pepperweed are common to the site. The proposed project would increase the presence of weeds at the site. See Attachment 12 for complete letter.	A weed management plan will be prepared and submitted to the County prior to construction. See prior response to vegetation and weed eradication issue.	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 78	Wetland buffers are not adequate.	Water	Department of Ecology Gwen Clear Environmental Review Coordinator	September 23, 2009	<p>More information about the field reconnaissance is needed.</p> <p>The wetland buffers are based on the 1994 County CAO, which is no longer based on the best available science. These buffers should be at least 150 ft.</p> <p>See Attachment 9 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Applicant will summarize field level wetland surveys. Applicant is aware of Ecology's guidance on wetland buffers and will condition its wetland buffers for the project in consideration of the guidance as applied to on-the-ground science.</p> <p>In addition to the methods described in the wetland delineation report, all swale areas and land topography signatures that would suggest water passage were walked during field visits. Areas identified as "wet meadows" by adjacent land owners were investigated. Aerial photography from various years was also studied to identify color signatures that could suggest presence of water were walked during field visits.</p> <p>Although wetland functions showed high potential and opportunity to provide amphibian habitat, no evidence of amphibians or invertebrates (burrows, casings, shells, water, mating calls, etc.) were observed in wetlands W1-W11 on the surface or within the upper 20" of soil pits. W12 is the only wetland with potential habitat for invertebrates or amphibians. The eastern Washington wetland rating system was not tested on wetlands less than 1/10 acre (only wetlands W6, W7, and W12 are greater than 0.10 acre in size) so more focus was placed on field observations and best professional judgment to determine wetland functions. Most of the delineated wetlands were also sparsely vegetated or dominated by non-native species (<i>Ventenata dubia</i>) providing poor habitat for aquatic wildlife.</p> <p>Based on WDFW functional assessment data and field observations, wetlands 1-7 exhibit low habitat function due to an absence of invertebrates, amphibians, aquatic birds, aquatic mammals, and low to moderate native plant diversity. Buffers for these wetlands should therefore be between 25 and 75 feet.</p> <p>Based on WDFW functional assessment data and field observations, wetlands 8-11 exhibit low habitat functions due to an absence of invertebrates, amphibians, aquatic birds, aquatic mammals, and little or no native plant diversity. Buffers for these wetlands should therefore be between 25 and 75 feet.</p> <p>Based on WDFW functional assessment data and field observations, wetland 12 exhibits moderate to high habitat functions based on habitat suitability for a variety of aquatic species. Buffers for these wetlands should therefore be between 150 and 300 feet.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 79	Concerns about clear cutting	Plants	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	Clear cutting to the property line with 100 foot setbacks for the solar panels is really cutting it close, not to make a pun. Setbacks should be at least 500 feet from the property lines and 1000 feet from existing structures or developed home sites like mine. I could accept less if they would work with me on site lines for the solar panels and other structures. See Attachment 26 for complete letter.	Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff.	Yes
Comment 80	Concerns about clear cutting	Plants	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	If you border the AFLC, they plan on clear-culling a 100 foot wide fire line right to the edge of your property line and only set the solar panels back 100 feet.	The applicant has worked with the County Fire Marshal's Office to develop a vegetation plan to avoid clear-cutting a 100-foot wide fire lines. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff.	No
Visual/Glare							
Comment 81	Visual impacts to adjacent property owners.	Light and Glare	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	The current development agreement calls for cutting down all trees up to my property line, creating an open space for a fire break, with vast clusters of shiny solar panels connected by roads just beyond. See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	The proposed project will comply with all county regulations; include the regulated fire break setbacks. To maximum extent practicable, fire break shall be constructed to minimize impacts to existing vegetation and bordering trees. Trees will be left as a buffer around the perimeter of the site where possible, but will be limbed up to 12' to comply with the Fire Code. A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	No

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 82	Visual impacts to adjacent property owner	Aesthetic	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	Our neighborhood will be drastically affected by this project. The plant will be an extreme eyesore. They intend to cut down all trees in a 100' firebreak (and elk fence?) adjacent to our properties and to cut down most of the rest of the trees. A 2,000' side of the proposed farm is visible from our house all the way up to the ridge top – over half a mile, where they will cut all trees on the crest as well. 650' of the project is adjacent to our property. See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. The applicant will comply with all firebreaks, as mandated by the county. To maximum extent practicable, fire break shall be constructed to minimize impacts to existing vegetation and bordering trees. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. Trees will be left as a buffer around the perimeter of the site where possible, but will be limbed up to 12' to comply with the Fire Code.	Yes
Comment 83	Visual Impacts.	Aesthetic	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Applicant downplays visual impact of its constructed facility. Neighbors along the south line will be looking directly at a hillside lined with solar arrays with minimal setbacks. Visual issues should be evaluated in a full EIS. See Attachment 5 for complete letter.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	No
Comment 84	Visual impacts to adjacent property owners.	Aesthetic	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	...visual impacts from nearby and across the valley... See Attachment 6 for complete letter.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 85	Adjacent property owners will see the site.	Aesthetic	Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hodgson Partners, Pine Hills Ranch PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	September 14, 2009	The developer's press release claims that no one can see the site. <u>This is not true.</u> Everyone nearby will feel its presence. It will be seen from the half dozen or so houses in the immediate area <u>and</u> by others located across the valley. To resemble the site illustration in the Application, most of these tress would have to be cleared. This would have a very negative effect on the view of the Ridge from below and from across the valley. We request that everyone participating in the approval process visit the site in person with members of our ownership group and these maps and photographs so they can validate these facts for themselves. See Attachment 1 for complete letter	The proposed project will comply with all county regulations; include the regulated fire break setbacks. To maximum extent practicable, fire break shall be constructed to minimize impacts to existing vegetation and bordering trees and avoid detrimental impacts to surrounding area. A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	Yes
Comment 86	Wants a 200-ft vegetated buffer to reduce impacts	Aesthetic	Cathie Conolly	September 17, 2009	Request that the project provide a 200-foot buffer of existing trees and vegetation for the properties to the south. The visual impact technical memo did not address impacts to the closest properties. See Attachment 12 for complete letter.	An additional visual analysis will be performed to assess the visual impacts to the southern properties. See prior responses to issues of setback and visual impacts.	Yes
Comment 87	Visual impacts	Aesthetic	Barbara M. Hodgson Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	The public has been led to believe that no one can see the solar area except by plane. Based on the conceptual placement of the panels outlined in the document, this is not true. There are seven or eight houses on adjoining property which will look directly onto a hillside of panels with minimal setbacks and screening. The proposed area that would include solar panels and infrastructure is over 500 acres. It's a HUGE piece of property. In addition to the visual impact on neighboring properties, it is obvious that some of this solar paneled area will be seen from the valley, I90, and from the hills across the valley. See Attachment 24 for complete letter.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	Yes
Comment 88	Visual impacts	Aesthetic	Jack N. Hodgsontel PO Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	Not only are there homes abutting the proposed site some of which are new and substantial, you can stand on the property and look across the valley and see many other homes and I90. What you can see can see you. See Attachment 25 for complete letter.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%).	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
						Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	
Comment 89	Visual impacts due to transmission lines	Aesthetic	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	They should be buried, regardless of the cost. If not buried, they should be as low to the ground as possible with the fewest trees cut as possible. Also, they should be required to use the brown/rusty single power polls that look like tree trunks. A 300 foot wide clear cut with huge power polls would really kill the rural feel up there and it doesn't need to if properly designed. See Attachment 26 for complete letter.	The transmission associated with the project will be designed according to appropriate health, safety, and technical standards. Every effort will be made to balance the visual appearance of the line with health, safety, technical, environmental, and cost considerations.	No
Comment 90	Visual impacts due to substation	Aesthetic	Reagan Dunn 1370 Loping Lane Cle Elum, Washington Mail To: Reagan Dunn 24488 SE 179 th Street Maple Valley, WA 98038	October 5, 2009	This feature should be placed WELL back into the applicant's property out of site from all landowners at least 1000 feet. I could handle some power lines, but a substation that is fenced is in sight of the home site is unnecessary. Applicant should bear the cost of adding a few more feet of power lines and place it well back on the American Forrest property and nowhere near lots 1, 2 and 3. Not on lot 2, where the access road exists. An appropriate fence should be as small as possible should be used to hide the station and minimize its appearance to neighboring properties.	The site layout will be optimized to reduce impacts as well as generate up to 75 MW of renewable energy. While the Applicant has taken great lengths to consider a variety of factors in facility design and layout, not all impacts are avoidable. Those that are not will be mitigated to a level of non-significance through appropriate means, which will include significant input from agencies and landowners.	Yes
Comment 91	Visual impacts	Light and Glare	Barb King Bill King Cle Elum, WA 98922	October 1, 2009	400,000 solar panels will be perched on top of Cle Elum Ridge directly above SR 970. The site will consist of shiny solar arrays nearly TWO MILES across. These arrays will be visible in ALL directions for up to 8 miles, including from 1-90, SR 970, and even parts of Cle [sic] Elum! Imagine what 400,000 shiny solar panels will look like 100 feet behind your fence with a clear cut between you and them.	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays. PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	Yes
Comment 92	Visual Impacts	Aesthetic	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	Directly behind our home is a southern facing hillside which appears slated to be populated with hundreds of these panels? The articles we have read have repeatedly suggested the panels would not be visible to anyone except from the air. Yet, if the program proceeds why must it be located directly out our	A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					door?	<p>a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays.</p> <p>PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.</p>	
Comment 93	Visual impacts	Aesthetic	Bill King	October 1, 2009	<p>My wife and I have a home straight across 970 and, if this is built, it will be ruining one of the most beautiful views of the Stewart Mountains in the area. (Although [sic] all of our neighbors would probably say theirs is the best). It would surprise me that you haven't heard from them. You would be more than welcome to come to our place and sit with us in the front yard and try to picture the change to our view. This will certainly have a negative effect on the value of our home,</p> <p>See Attachment 31 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays.</p>	Yes
Comment 94	Visual impacts	Aesthetic	Richard Luchinsinger and Jane McClenney 9300 Brick Mill Road Ellensburg, WA 98926	October 3, 2009	<p>And finally, this would be a blight on the landscape for visual reasons.</p> <p>See Attachment 33 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays.</p> <p>PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%). Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.</p>	Yes
Comment 95	Visual Impacts	Aesthetic	John and Sarah Talley 3008 3 rd Street NE Tacoma, WA 98422	October 5, 2009	<p>The TSR marketing pronouncements and public statements are not matching up with the details in the permit application. I specifically recall them saying that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the area was already logged there were trees all around the perimeter nearby homeowners would not even see the panels <p>The early PR work (quoted on the company's website) gives the distinct impression that the project will be non-invasive and hardly noticeable - "It was logged for so there's a row of trees left around it so we have a great natural buffer," said Trott. (Aug 9, 2009). Also..... "The site has been heavily logged in the past, but is surrounded by Ponderosa pine forest that will screen the array from view, Trott said."</p> <p>But the application that I and others read on-line show that the company plans to clear-cut a 100 foot fire protection rim around the border and then install panels right up to that point. That will produce a starkly visible industrial plant footprint that will be</p>	<p>The applicant originally included a 100-ft fire break to comply with the County Fire Code. After working with the County Fire Marshal's Office the applicant will only remove Large trees when and where necessary to facilitate installation and operations of solar facility. The applicant will develop a vegetation plan to address impacts from construction and on-going operations. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact and visual impacts would be minimized.</p> <p>A visual impact study and simulation concludes that visual impacts will be minimal and not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. PV glass has anti-reflective coatings to keep as much light as possible absorbed in the solar cells, and is not highly reflective. PV glass is one of the least reflective materials in a comparison of other commonly used materials and naturally-occurring reflective materials. The amount of light reflected at an incident angle of 60 degrees is less than 3.5% of the solar rays.</p> <p>PV Glass percent of incident light reflected is less than that of a body of smooth water (3.5%), plastic (6%) and snow (18.7%).</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
					<p>glaringly visible. Speaking of glare, the permit application contains language denying that these photovoltaic panels will produce glare. That is much less than hard to believe.</p> <p>My neighbors and I would greatly prefer that <u>IF</u> the conditional use permit is granted that some conditions be imposed on the TSR LLC – keeping a negotiated healthy size border of trees around the panels (as implied by the company originally) and somehow visually softening up any clearcutting of a 100' fire boundary. Naturally my neighbors and I are concerned about the southern border directly above the Goodwins, Hansen, and Milt Kuolt property up to the Pine Hill Ranch eastern border.</p> <p>See Attachment 37 for complete letter.</p>	Applicant will configure the site layout to minimize visual impacts to surrounding area where possible.	
Wildlife							
Comment 96	Will block migratory routes.	Animals	<p>Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hodgson</p> <p>Partners, Pine Hills Ranch</p> <p>PO Box 68</p> <p>Medina, WA 98039</p>	September 14, 2009	<p>Because of steep cliffs to the East and West, the proposed "industrial site" blocks the primary access from which game enters our property.</p> <p>Game will not walk through such a grid regardless of how high the panels are raised.</p> <p>See Attachment 1 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Alternative migratory routes for wildlife and the potential impact on wildlife, particularly large game (elk, deer) will be presented in greater detail in the Applicant's additional information for the County.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.</p>	No
Comment 97	Impacts to elk and deer habitat.	Animals	<p>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>Mark S. Teske</p> <p>South Central Region</p> <p>Ellensburg District Office</p> <p>201 N. Pearl</p> <p>Ellensburg, WA 98926</p>	September 16, 2009	<p>This area is key winter range for deer and elk. The amount of winter range dictates how many animals an area can support. Preventing the reestablishment of vegetation reduces habitat.</p> <p>Bull elk rubbing antlers on solar panels may cause damage and lead to a fence, further cutting off wintering habitat.</p> <p>No mitigation is currently proposed to off-set these aspects.</p> <p>Kittitas County has not updated their CAO. The proposed project is in an area that WDFW will propose as a critical area in the future. A cautious approach is warranted if potential critical habitat is at risk of elimination especially when reduced habitat availability is already limiting wildlife populations.</p> <p>Locating the panels in a manner that avoids any conflict with commercial forest would also be a buffer for wildlife species in the adjacent lands.</p> <p>See Attachment 2 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p> <p>Subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control, fences are not planned as part of this project; Applicant suggests this requirement be a condition of an MDNS. Vegetated corridors and open spaces will be maintained throughout and around the site where possible.</p> <p>The proposed project is a permissible conditional use under the KCC and will not create significant conflicts with any adjacent lands.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation measures that will be implemented to offset these impacts.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 98	Impacts to elk and deer habitat.	Animals	Sam and Claudette Maybo 5607 169th Pl. S.W. Lynnwood, WA 98037	September 17, 2009	The project "will be interfering with the natural migrating path and breeding area for many animals," including elk and deer. See Attachment 3 for complete letter.	Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence). Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area. Proposed mitigation will be developed in coordination with agency recommendations. A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.	Yes
Comment 99	Project will disrupt wildlife corridor.	Animals	Michael R. Hansen Resident of land adjacent to the proposed Solar Farm Parcel ID 14725, Tax Parcel Number 20-16-23000-0016	September 17, 2009	There needs to be written language in the development agreement regarding no fences and retention of a suitable amount of tree clusters and vegetation to support the large amount of wildlife and provide a wildlife corridor. See Attachment 4 for complete letter.	Subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control, fences are not intended for the project area; the Applicant proposes this as a mitigation measure for an MDNS. Natural vegetation will be restored through the Applicant's vegetation plan in areas that do not pose health, safety, or fire threats. Applicant will consider WDFW wind power guidelines in designing mitigation measures. There will be space between solar panels to allow for the movement of wildlife, the project has been sited in a way that will have the fewest impacts to wildlife, and the project area only makes up a small portion of the wintering range for elk and deer.	Yes
Comment 100	Will impact wildlife	Animals	Charles Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	September 17, 2009	Wildlife are not concerned with property lines, unless there is fencing, and there currently no fencing. Fencing cannot be addressed in a "conceptual" manner. We do not know if there are spotted owls or other endangered birds on the site, but the Applicant's brief and superficial survey does not adequately address this possibility. Applicant's wildlife field studies also failed to establish wildlife baselines for the different seasons of the year, even though the variety and number of a given species can change dramatically by season. Applicant's wildlife study conducted over a five day period is inadequate to truly gage the impact of this project on animals in the area. See Attachment 5 for complete letter.	The applicant understands the wildlife implications associated with fencing and therefore does not propose the addition of a fence (subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control); Applicant suggests this requirement be a condition of an MDNS. Experienced biologists first conducted a desk top survey of the relevant databases and data maintained by state and federal agencies. The conclusion from this review was that federal or state listed species (endangered or threatened) species were unlikely to occur on the project site. Biologists conducted field surveys for such species; however no evidence of such species or their habitat was discovered on the proposed project site during the course of the surveys.	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 101	Impact to wildlife habitat and corridors	Animals	Bart Fite 730 39 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98122	September 18, 2009	<p>An array of thousands of panels sitting on concrete and steel bases and requiring regular maintenance would destroy habitat and form a significant barrier to wildlife, include the elk, deer, coyote, bear, cougar, and various other small animals that frequent the area.</p> <p>The applicants state it will not fence the property, but this seems unlikely as the applicant would want to protect its investment- and fencing would clearly have severe impacts to wildlife corridors. Significant numbers of trees and other foliage would have to be clear cut, denuding the site area of valuable shade cover, bird and wildlife habitat, and erosion control.</p> <p>See Attachment 6 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence).</p> <p>A more detailed site plan will be provided that shows spacing between the panels and the layout of the facility. Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p> <p>Fences are not planned as part of this project (subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control); Applicant suggests this requirement be a condition of an MDNS. Vegetated corridors and open spaces will be maintained throughout and around the site where possible.</p> <p>Large trees will only be removed when and where necessary to facilitate the installation and operation for the solar panels. In most cases, the trees would be "limbed" up to 12' per the Fire Code so that the seed source could remain intact. Small shrubs and herbs (<3' in height) will be left in place where possible to reduce the potential for storm water runoff. A hydrologic analysis is currently being performed to assess the impact of site clearing and placing solar panels on south slopes.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.</p>	Yes
Comment 102	Fence could impact elk and deer habitat.	Animals	Richard Robbins 154 Lake Washington Blvd. East Seattle, WA 98112	September 18, 2009	<p>Member of Pine Hills Ranch who states that he is generally in favor of renewable energy projects. Opposes the project due to its location and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The site should be protected from vandals by a fence; however, a fence would restrict wildlife movement.</p> <p>See Attachment 11 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Security personnel will be on site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. See prior responses to location, environmental impacts, and fencing.</p>	No
Comment 103	Project needs more analysis and supporting data.	Animals	Cathie Conolly	September 17, 2009	<p>Information from the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation shows that elk are unlikely to move underneath the panels. Only one corridor is planned between the two main portions of the solar panels and it does not connect with properties to the south and east of the site, where elk movement is common. Incorporation of additional wildlife corridors is necessary.</p> <p>See Attachment 12 for complete letter.</p>	<p>A more detailed site plan will be provided in the Applicant's additional information for the County that shows spacing between the panels and the layout of the facility. See prior response to wildlife issue.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 104	Wildlife impacts	Animals	Bonnie Robbins 154 Lake Washington Blvd. East Seattle, WA 98112	September 17, 2009	Impacts to the diversity of wildlife in the area would be disastrous. Elk movement would be disrupted. The development would impact the cougars in the area.	Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence). See also prior responses. See prior responses to issues of wildlife. Proposed mitigation will be developed in coordination with agency recommendations. Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer are present in the adjacent land parcels. The project area is small compared to the overall wintering range. While the cougar data provided by WDFW appears to show that cougars rarely enter the project site, WDFW notes that its data has not been analyzed or interpreted yet. These data represent the movements of up to 7 individuals who were tracked over a 6 year period. Applicant will address the data more fully in its additional information for the County. A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.	Yes
Comment 105	Cougar information	Animals	Perry Harvester 1701 South 24th Avenue Yakima, Washington 98902-5720	September 28, 2009	Concern has been expressed regarding what is depicted in the map titled " <i>Cougar locations in vicinity of proposed solar reserve</i> ", which was attached to and submitted with our comment letter. The data is from "Project CAT", a research project, involving Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) scientists, a carnivore research institute, and the Cle Elum School District. There were 2116 total cougar locations (shown as red dots) identified from GPS collars in the map. The collars were set to provide location signals at four to six hour intervals. The data has not been analyzed or interpreted yet. See Attachment 21 for complete letter	Comment acknowledged.	Yes
Comment 106	Elk concerns	Animals	Chuck Adams General Manager Pine Hills Ranch LLC	August 27, 2009	As adjoining neighbors, we see a lot of the elk herd, and some of the company environmental statements about the herd seem erroneous to us. See Attachment 23 for complete letter	Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence). Areas that provide a wintering range for elk within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area. Proposed mitigation will be developed in coordination with agency recommendations. A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 107	Wildlife impacts	Animals	Barbara M. Hodgson Box 68 Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	<p>The document states that there is no wildlife of note on the property. In fact, a large elk herd is present in the area from mid- October to May, and we have seen significant birdlife, deer, cougar, coyotes, and an occasional bear and turkey. None of this wildlife is likely to wander through a maze of concrete pillars topped with solar panels spaced about six yards apart. No fences are proposed at this time but given the value of the panels, one can not be sure that fences won't be required in the future.</p> <p>See Attachment 24 for complete letter.</p>	<p>The Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence).</p> <p>A more detailed site plan will be provided that shows spacing between the panels and the layout of the facility. Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p> <p>Subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control, fences are not planned as part of this project; Applicant suggests this requirement be a condition of an MDNS. Vegetated corridors and open spaces will be maintained throughout and around the site where possible.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.</p>	Yes
Comment 108	Elk impacts	Animals	Jack N. Hodgsontel PO Box 68, Medina, WA 98039	October 1, 2009	<p>There is an estimate for the cost of the panels at \$300,000,000 and a statement that access must be restricted but the area would not be fenced so the elk can move through. But how can all of this equipment be secured from man without a fence or full time guard force of considerable numbers? We are dealing with a minimum perimeter of 2.5 miles. I can't imagine elk walking through this maze of concrete and metal with or without a fence. This is not just a migratory route for elk. It is their home for most of the year excluding the summer months.</p> <p>See Attachment 25 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Areas that provide a wintering range for elk and deer within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p>	Yes

**Preliminary Approach to Respond to Public Comments on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist for the
Teanaway Solar Reserve Project**

Comment Number	Issues Raised	SEPA Checklist Category	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Summarized Comment(s)	Preliminary Response Approach	Additional Information To Be Prepared
Comment 109	Wildlife impacts	Animals	Jim and Janet Brose 951 Loping Lane Cle Elum, WA	October 5, 2009	<p>We also question how easily the impact to the natural wildlife has been dismissed in the presentations of these plans for the solar reserve. We have the good fortune to enjoy much of the animal population, yet the removal of their natural habitat will certainly change our lives and theirs especially. To reestablish the lost vegetation as a result of the construction will take years.</p> <p>The idea of a fence in the area further limiting food for the wildlife and significantly changing the rural appeal just boggles our minds. What are these commissioners thinking?</p> <p>See Attachment 30 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence). Areas that provide a wintering range for elk within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation will be developed in coordination with agency recommendations.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation.</p> <p>Subject to requirements beyond Applicant's control, fences are not planned as part of this project; Applicant suggests this requirement be a condition of an MDNS. Vegetated corridors and open spaces will be maintained throughout and around the site where possible.</p>	Yes
Comment 110	Wildlife impacts	Animals	Richard Luchinsinger and Jane McClenney 9300 Brick Mill Road Ellensburg, WA 98926	October 3, 2009	<p>Deer, elk, and other wildlife would be totally displaced. Look at what's even happening with Suncadia. They are having trouble with deer and elk there, which would force even more wildlife onto 1-90. We also have to remember tree, shrubs and other plants is the only true air conditioning this earth has. Their development would destroy all this. We would have to cut down even more trees as more houses were built and power lines go in. If you want to really be "green" pass laws that make all new building and remodels have solar and some type of wind power. Other countries are already doing so, and eventually we will have to get there as well.</p> <p>See Attachment 33 for complete letter.</p>	<p>Proposed project will be developed in a way to reduce impacts on wildlife (setbacks, migration rows between solar panels, no fence). Areas that provide a wintering range for elk within the project area will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant will develop site design, site clearing, and vegetation maintenance plan to ensure open space patches that meet objectives of winter range, foraging, and migration corridor habitats. The Applicant will better explain the overall effect on large game from siting the solar facility on large game when compared to the amount of habitat within and adjacent to the project area.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation will be developed in coordination with agency recommendations. Applicant will consider WDFW wind power guidelines in designing mitigation measures.</p> <p>A more comprehensive technical memo is currently being prepared to analyze impacts to elk and potential mitigation</p>	Yes