Those in attendance: Kittitas County Board of Commissioners – Chairman David Bowen; Vice-Chairman Alan Crankovich; and Commissioner Perry Huston.

Planning Commission Members – Chairman David Black, Scott Pernaa, Doug Harris, Grant Clark, Mark McClain, Don Williamson.

Others in attendance: Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board; Joanna Valencia, Community Development Staff Planner; Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services; Allison Kimball, Assistant Director of Community Development Services; Mandy Weed, Community Development Services Administrative Assistant. There was a Court Reporter in attendance as well as approximately members of the public.

PUBLIC HEARING KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT CDS

CHAIRMAN BOWEN opened the continued public hearing held by the Kittitas County Board of Commissioners and the Planning Commission, to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project Z-2005-22, submitted by Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC for siting of a maximum of 80 wind turbines and associated facilities at a site located approximately 12 miles northwest of the City of Ellensburg. The Board of County Commissioners made disclosures. No one objected to the Board staying seated at the public hearing. DAVID BLACK, CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION introduced the Planning Commission members and asked for any declarations. MARK HALLOWAY expressed concerns of previous statements that David Black made. MR. BLACK acknowledged the editorial he wrote in June of 2002, and said he was open minded when it came to the application. He said he did not intend on stepping down. There were no motions made requesting Mr. Black to step down.

DARRYL PIERCY, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES announced all members had received copies of the items that were submitted into the record at the previous public hearing. He noted that in addition to those items, there were copies of the applicant’s power point presentation and letters they referenced from the Department of Fish & Wildlife.

THOSE PRESENT & PROVIDING PUBLIC TESTIMONY -

CHERYL CHANCE - JEFF SLOTHOWER - LARRY PUTNAM - MIKE ROBERTSON - WILLIAM ERICKSON - C OLLEEN ANDERSON - PHILLIS WHITBECK - LINDA SCHANTZ - MARY MORGAN - TINA SANDS - IAN ELLIOT - MARILYN SORENSON - DEBBIE BODDY - BERNICE BEST - HELEN WISE - GLORIA BALDI - JAMES CARMODY - JEB BALDI

CHAIRMAN BOWEN moved to continue the public hearing to January 12, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. at the Kittitas County Events Center (Fairgrounds) in the Home Arts building, noting the record was to remain open. COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH seconded. Motion carried 3-0.
*** THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS HEREBY ADOPT THE VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING AS THEIR OFFICIAL MINUTES OF RECORD ***

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

CLERK OF THE BOARD  KITTITAS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

[Signatures]

Julie A. Kjorsvik
David B. Bowen, Chairman

KITTITAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON
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MINUTES
**EXHIBITS**

**JANUARY 11, 2006**

**KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter, Table 3.4.2; Shadow Flicker Analysis, Map - Submitted by Mike Robertson</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Letter, CMA Report, Market Analysis Report – Submitted by Colleen Anderson</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Letter from Alex Eyre (dated 1/10/06) - Submitted by Colleen Anderson</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Letter - Submitted by Phillis Whitbeck</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Letter (dated 1/11/06) – Submitted by Linda Schantz</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Letter – Submitted by Tina Sands</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Letter, Decibel Sound Measure Level Exam, Point Flashing Beacon – Submitted by Ian Elliot</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Letter with various attachments - Submitted by Debbie Boddy</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Letter (dated 1/10/06) – Submitted by Bernice Best</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Letter (dated 1/10/06) – Submitted by Helen Wise</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Letter - Submitted by Jeb Baldi</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Letter on behalf of Kittitas Audubon (dated 1/10/06) – Submitted by Gloria Baldi</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter - Submitted by Tom Crawford</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Letter (dated 12/2/05) - Submitted by Gloria Lindstrom</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Letter - Submitted by (unknown) – this was given to Clerk after the meeting and there is no name or address listed</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Letter to Chris Taylor from Dept. Fish &amp; Wildlife (dated 3/10/04) – Referenced in testimony by Horizon during 1/10/06 Public Hearing - Submitted by Horizon</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Letter to Chris Taylor from Dept. Fish &amp; Wildlife (dated 9/17/03 – Referenced in testimony by Horizon during 1/10/06 Public Hearing - Submitted by Horizon</td>
<td>01/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Power Point Presentation given by Horizon on 1/10/06 Submitted by Horizon</td>
<td>1/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Public Hearing Sign In Sheet – Submitted by Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>1/11/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF KITITAS

KITITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SPECIAL MEETING RE KITITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT
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AND
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REPORTED BY:
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KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:

COMMISSIONER DAVID BOWEN, Chairman
COMMISSIONER ALAN CRANKOVICH
COMMISSIONER PERRY HUSTON

KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION:

COMMISSIONER DAVID BLACK, Chairman
COMMISSIONER DOUG HARRIS
COMMISSIONER MARK McCLAIN
COMMISSIONER SCOTT PERNAA
COMMISSIONER GRANT CLARK
COMMISSIONER DON WILLIAMSON
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Good evening. It's Wednesday, January 11, 2006, 7:00 p.m. at the Kittitas County Events Center.

We're here for an open-record hearing -- a continued open-record hearing before the Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners and the Kittitas County Planning Commission to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project submitted by the Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC, for siting of a maximum of 80 wind turbines and associated facilities at a site located approximately 12 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg.

I've got a few record-keeping issues. Gentlemen, first of all, so I don't forget, why don't we go through any declarations over the last, I don't know, 24 hours, I guess, or less.

My only contact has been some procedural questions with Chief Deputy Prosecutor Hurson regarding how tonight would go. And that would be the extent of my declarations.

So with that said, does anyone object to my continuing to sit in hearing on this project?

Hearing no objections, Commissioner Crankovich.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I have no
declarations since last we met.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing that, does anyone object to Commissioner Crankovich continuing to sit in hearing on this project?

Hearing none, Commissioner Huston.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: No contacts, no new information other than that which is on our table.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: With that said, does anyone object to Commissioner Huston continuing to sit in hearing on this project?

Hearing none, all commissioners will remain seated.

Once again I'll go through a few of the reminders. Cell phones, please, silent or vibrate, if you would. Tonight we anticipate will probably be filled with public testimony most of the evening, if not all of it, and we understand that and will expect that and appreciate that.

We will check again about ten o'clock, see where we're at; and if we need to continue, we'll continue. If we're at a spot that makes sense to stop, we'll probably stop somewhere in that vicinity, 10:00, 10:30.
We have one personnel change that I'm aware of. That would be Mandy Weed is serving as clerk for the Planning Commission tonight in place of Susan Barret, if I remember correctly.

And I think staff wanted to make a couple of comments before we got going. I don't know if we need to bring the Planning Commission up in the meeting first before those comments or not.

MR. PIERCY: That would probably be the appropriate thing to do, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I'll turn it over to Chairman Black.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you, Chairman Bowen. Let me introduce the Planning Commission. Third from my right is Grant Clark. Second from my right is Scott Pernaa. Immediately to my right is Mark McClain. To -- second man is Don Williamson on my left, and Doug Harris next to me. I'm David Black, and I am Planning Commission chairman.

I think that we should go through any updates on contacts. I have had absolutely no additional contacts other than I disclosed last evening. Nothing any further.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes
to object to my serving on this board?

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I do.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Name.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Speaking as an individual --

Mark Holloway, 1581 Thomas Road.

I am a little -- I'm concerned from previous statements about -- since you're the chairman of this committee and this is -- refers to should be fairly impartial or a hundred percent impartial and very neutral. I'm concerned that from your previous statements that you may have problems with the impartiality and also with the fact that you're sitting as the chair.

This is about wind generation and the ability for farmers and local people to use wind energy, and -- and as -- as a way to maybe subsidize their farming activities or also, you know, bring in new businesses into our community, into our area. And so it --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: -- I'm concerned when --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me, go ahead.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yeah. I'm concerned when I hear statements that -- like in the 2002
hearings that you wanted to ban wind generation in the county.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Is that incorrect?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's incorrect. That was an editorial written about wind farms going in the Kittitas Valley. And that project was never -- never came to fruition. It was this same project only it was much, much larger. The -- many more turbines, many things of that type. And that was what I was objecting to.

I, I am totally open-minded. I have sat on this board through the Desert Claim, and that was a 7-0 unanimous vote by the Planning Commission to vote no on that, to deny that. The County Commissioners, the Board of County Commissioners also upheld the Planning Commission on that.

I voted with Horizon on the Wild Horse. So it isn't that I'm against the wind farms. That project was much, much larger than this project.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay. So you feel --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm totally open minded --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, that's where my concerns come from, because I mean, this is a --
that's what this is a forum for --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Absolutely. And I can appreciate your concern from that standpoint. But this was three and a half years ago, a project that was much larger that never came before this board, had nothing to do with this board at that time. We never had an application. It was taken, it was preempted to EFSEC a long time ago.

And so I'm totally open-minded. If I didn't feel like I could be open-minded --

Now, I have to explain to you, however, that because I don't necessarily vote one way or the other way doesn't mean that I'm not open-minded. You have to understand that.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yeah, oh, yeah, I mean, I'd feel the same way --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: And I can listen to this and I have listened to these people talk, these experts, and I can read this stuff, and I have absolutely no problem with being open-minded. However, I need to look at all of the facts; and if I didn't think that I could be open-minded, I would have resigned years ago.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, if that's
what --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I hope that that satisfies you. But if not, I'll ask for a motion from this board or from the Board of County Commissioners to ask whether I should step down.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm open-minded. I'm as open-minded as anybody in this room. And we know that some people in this room are not very open-minded.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Sure. I mean, that's the nature of people.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I can vouch for that.

But I can tell you, I can assure you that when I wrote that editorial --

Now, the other things that I disclosed were mailings that I received that were totally unsolicited. And I think that many of the people in this audience have received unsolicited information. And I don't know whether you have or not. But I have absolutely no problem of listening to all of the testimony and making a vote on that based upon the facts.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Well, that's what I hope. I mean, that's --
CHAIRMAN BLACK: But because of that --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: -- as a person from this county I think that it's really important that you're sitting in a place that you need to represent us neutrally and with an open mind.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I haven't sat in this position for a long period of time, but I have sat on this Planning Commission board for many, many years. And I have absolutely no problem of looking at all of the facts and making a decision based on those facts.

But if you wish me to -- you either have a choice of asking me to ask this board for a motion to have me step down, or you have a right to withdraw your objection.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: And at what time, at what point do I get to make that -- do I have to make that decision right now?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right now. I'll ask the board right now.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: He hasn't actually made a formal objection, so Mr. Holloway --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: No, I just -- I wanted to bring that up, that --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You don't have to withdraw
your objection. That was an an either/or. Either I’ll ask this board for a motion to step down, or you can withdraw your objection.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I think we get to the same place. He doesn’t have to withdraw his objection.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I do not intend to not -- to step down, okay? That’s my intention, is not to step down. If the boards -- either the Planning Commission board or the Board of County Commissioners asks me to step down, I would do that at that time.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, all I -- all I really want is for your -- use your mind. I mean, start from this point on, not previous -- I mean, if we go by your previous statements, that’s kind of like, well, what the heck.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: But also this project never came up. This project is --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: The wind project; wind has come up.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I tried to explain that to you, and I can explain again --

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Point of order --
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yes?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: We're getting a little conversational here, and I would suggest if you keep the record clean -- recording this is going to be a fascinating project at some point in the future.

Mr. Holloway has explained the nature of his objection. If he has additional information, I would take that. You've already rendered your decision that you would not step down. I think we should move ahead with that.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: In other words, Mr. Holloway --

Sorry, Commissioner Bowen over here. I forget you can't tell who's speaking.

If you -- at this point, if you're willing -- if you're accepting his explanation and his statement as factual and okay with you, you can withdraw your objection. Or if you don't want to withdraw your objection, then we have other --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: But I can choose to read -- withdraw my objection in the future? Or do I have to --
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You would have to do it right now. For us to proceed tonight we have to take care of that right now.

MR. HURSON: Mr. Chairman, Jim Hurson, Deputy Prosecutor.

Technically he doesn’t have to withdraw, just so you know. He can make his objection for the record, and then there can be an action. So he isn’t really compelled to do anything.

I would want to add some context, though, because when this came up last night, I’ve been involved in various stages of this as we’ve gone through. As I -- I was trying to recall myself what the initial discussions were back in '02 as to what had occurred.

And then it dawned on me this evening. I looked in my old files and there was some pretrial testimony in the EPSEC process back when there was a request for production, which there isn’t anymore. And it was some testimony of Chris Taylor, Exhibit 20, in the EPSEC process, and this may just give some context of the time frame.

Because in 2004, Mr. Taylor’s testimony on Page 8 and 9 said, "The Kittitas Valley Wind
Power Project is a major project for Kittitas County. Since proposing the project nearly three years ago, we have worked to provide answers and solutions to issues raised by the public and county officials. For example, leading experts to conduct studies on everything from wildlife to noise. We produced visual simulations and made significant modifications, including removing turbines entirely from Lookout Mountain (one of the best wind resources there is in the valley) in response to suggestions. The overall project was reduced from some 16,000 acres to just over 7000 acres."

And so as I understood the testimony from 2004 when they were initially discussing this in 2002, it was including the location of Lookout Mountain and the 16,000-acre-plus area. There was an application made to the County in '03 which had a certain arrangement, and then we have a new application now which has fewer turbines in a more consolidated location.

So it's a different -- it's in essence a different location, different number of turbines. And so I was trying to find some objective piece of paper other than my memory as to what were
people hearing or thinking or looking at back in '02 with regards to what we have --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: And you're looking at this as a hundred percent different --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Exactly.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I would like to clarify something, that I did vote with the rest of the Board of -- the Planning Commission on Desert Claim and I voted for the Wild Horse project. So I don't think it's quite fair to characterize me as anti-wind farm. Because it's a one-and-one.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay?

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I appreciate that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would -- I will ask the -- this board to make a motion to have me step down, however.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: That's your --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm asking them right now, this board, the Planning Commission board to make a motion to have me step down if they wish me to step down.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Not hearing one, no motion was made; therefore I will stay as chairman.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, I'm still reserving -- as I have the right to reserve my --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Oh, sure, absolutely.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You didn't -- fine.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: And for the record, I'll ask the same question. Is there a motion to remove Chairman Black from the Planning Commission for this hearing?

Hearing none, Chairman Black will remain seated. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would ask each one of these members, starting with Grant Clark if he has any additional things that he had not disclosed since yesterday.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I have no additional contacts since last night.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience wish to object to Grant Clark sitting on the board? Seeing no one, Scott Pernaa.

COMMISSIONER PERNAA: I also have had no contact since last night.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience wishing to object to Scott Pernaa sitting on the board?

Mark McClain.

COMMISSIONER McClAIN: Like Commissioner Bowen, I have had procedural discussion with Deputy Prosecutor Jim Hurson. Other than that, no other disclosure.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience wishing to have Mark McClain removed from the board?

Doug Harris?

COMMISSIONER HARRIS: None.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone wishing to have Doug -- objecting to Doug Harris sitting on the board?

Don Williamson?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Last night I asked the man who stood up and said he was a mechanical engineer if there was a formula that could determine how much the sound was attenuated from the point of origination, which is the turbine, to the house; and he said there was none available to him.

I work in the physics department at CWU, and
I talked with one of our professors, and he says not only is there a formula, he has a research project going on with some of his students, and they're working in the area of Tri-Cities. There's a wind farm down there; Nine Valleys I think is the name of that project.

And he says they are very interested in that. Their results are inconclusive right now because they do not have enough data to actually set it up. There is a program that does that.

And I asked him if he would, would he let me know as soon as he gets some conclusive information, and he said he would. They just started waiting -- there's not much wind in the wintertime -- until they get some relatively high winds. They don't know what the result of high wind on the noise is, and so he will not know until they get some high winds, and it'll probably be sometime this spring.

But I wanted to know because I wanted to be able to intelligently diagnose what they -- the experts present at what the noise factor will be. Unfortunately he was not able to give me that information, but I'm sure he will.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Is there anyone
in the audience that wishes to object to Don Williamson sitting on the commission?

Seeing no one, we will go to -- I believe Mr. Piercy has some information or some staff information?

MR. PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, I do. Thank you. For the record, Darryl Piercy, director of Community Development Services.

I wanted everyone to be aware of some actions that were taken by County staff this evening. First off, we were able to duplicate and provide to all members of the Planning Commission as well as the Board of County Commissioners the items that were submitted into the record last evening. There were a total of 16 written items that were submitted into the record. Those have been distributed to all of the Planning Commission members and the Board of County Commissioners.

In addition, as part of the testimony that was received last night, we have requested a copy of the PowerPoint presentation that was provided by the applicant. We have not yet received that, but as soon as we do, we will have that in a hard copy form, place that also into the record, and
give a copy to each of the Planning Commission
members as well as the Board of County
Commissioners.

And there is a letter from the Washington
Department of Fish & Wildlife that was identified
in testimony last night. We yet do not have a
copy of that letter. Again, we have requested
that letter and will be submitting that to the
members as well.

Excuse me, those are in your record and they
have been distributed. So they have been
provided -- we have been provided a copy of that.

You should also be aware that following last
night's meeting, the department has received a
number of inquiries in regards to two of the
submittal items that were part of the application
from the applicant. Those were the Proposed
Findings of Facts and Conclusions for the
project. They are identified as Book 1 and
Book 2, dated December 30th of 2005.

We have limited numbers of copies of that
available. We have requested additional copies
from the applicant as well as requesting the
document in electronic format. We anticipate
receipt of that at a very short period of time
and will begin distributing that once we have those copies available.

So anyone wishing to receive a copy of that, please contact our office, Department of Community Development Services, and as soon as those copies are available we'll be happy to distribute those as well. And again, we have to have them in both formats, but the easiest for distribution will be in the electronic format.

In addition, for those of you in attendance this evening that may have seen discussions between myself as the director of the department and Mr. Hurson, along with other members of the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners, the primary focus of our conversation this evening prior to the meeting was a discussion in regards to the scheduling following tonight's activities.

We did discuss the possibility of continuation of this hearing should it not conclude this evening. We also discussed the possibility of the next available date, should the hearing conclude, as to when the Planning Commission may want to reconvene to begin their deliberations.
The discussions centered around the concept of giving the Planning Commission adequate time to review the record, to have an opportunity to read and review all of the information that has been submitted, prior to reconvening and starting on their deliberations.

We have indicated to all members of the Planning Commission, as well as the Board of County Commissioners that this facility is available tomorrow night, and we would also look forward to some time next week, with Monday being a holiday, perhaps Tuesday or Wednesday for a possible reconvening of the Planning Commission.

But again, that's a housekeeping item that will be discussed at a later time. But just to know that that discussion has in fact taken place.

I'd be happy to respond to any questions or comments that either the Planning Commission or the Board of County Commissioners might have of staff this evening prior to beginning.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: No.

MR. PIERCY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Piercy.

At this time we have approximately 90 names
yet to testify. We don't think we'll get through this, this evening. Kind of the schedule that we would like to work towards is about to five to 8:00 we'll have a break, about five to 9:00 we'll have a break, and we'll probably go to ten o'clock, 10:15 and at that time see how many are left to do. Then we hope to -- if we're still additional testimony, we will continue until tomorrow evening at 6:30.

And so with that, the staff report has been done, the applicant's report has been given; we're into the public testimony. So Mandy?

MS. WEED: Cheryl Chance?

MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Good evening. My name is Cheryl Chance. I reside at 1411 Howard Road here in Ellensburg, Washington.

Good evening. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Board of Commissioners to allow me to testify at this time instead of later. Also I'd like to thank the Planning Commission for this opportunity to testify, and the staff.

Ladies and gentlemen, I stand opposed to the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. I'd like to -- those of you who know me know that I like
numbers, and I also like the numbers to balance. This particular project has been advertised as 64 turbines, but I believe the application says up to 80. Forgive me, Mr. Johnson, but in tonight's paper it says 64 turbines.

The engineering studies done for the DEIS I believe are based on 64 turbines. Based on 64 turbines. I believe which means we don't have an engineering analysis for the additional proposed 16 turbines. Therefore, does the DEIS represent ultimately what is being proposed?

This is important because the maps -- and I'm referring to the handouts that I picked up last night -- the maps, Exhibit 2, Book 1 of the applicant's handout of last night, shows 64 turbines. On Page 1.1 of the same handout, second paragraph, eighth line down, says 80 turbines. In the staff's proposed project, Page 7 of 26, wind turbine generators, a maximum of 80 wind turbines.

Okay, that may or may not be accurate. So my question is, will there be 64 turbines, 80 turbines, or somewhere in between?

The impact which is supposed to be addressed in the DEIS for such things as shadow flicker,
et cetera, is important. How are the citizens to know the true impacts? This same concern of the citizens would also apply to the length and location of the strings of the turbines. So what are the citizens supposed to understand? What is the real proposal which is based on, in part, on the number of turbines?

This is, in my opinion, intrinsic to the accuracy of the application. We either have a flawed application, an incomplete application, or both. I'm confused. I'd like to see the numbers balance. Can anybody help me?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we go ahead, take the testimony, and we'll come back to this question later --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay, that's my concern, because it has been advertised in the Daily Record as 64 turbines. In tonight's paper, which I forgot to bring, it says 64 turbines. And so this is my concern. I believe the DEIS only addresses 16.

So when you start adding -- I mean 64. When you start adding 16 more turbines, you significantly change the scope of this project.
Again, thank you for the opportunity to testify. Does anyone before me have any questions? Because I still have that question.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think that you'll find that the -- I think that you'll find that the applicant is taking some notes and will probably be able to answer those types of questions. We're not able to do that at this time.

MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay. I was just -- because --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I think that's part of the testimony, is to bring out these things so that they do have a chance of rebuttal on those things.

MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay. And that's my concern, is if people are relying on the maps, which shows 64, and people are relying on our community newspaper, when we have 80 there's a discrepancy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

MS. WEED: Michael Ptaszynski?

Preston Shugart?

Ann Gabrielson?

Gordon Gabrielson?

Tracy Frame?
Skip Littlefield?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you speak up?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: They may be here, but nobody can hear you.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Skip Littlefield?

Joe Brown? Joe Brown?

Jeff Slothower?

MR. JEFF SLOTHOWER: Here.

Good evening. My name is Jeff Slothower, and I reside at 2581 Hunter Road in Ellensburg. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of myself; my wife, Susan Harrel; and Steve Lathrop, who happens to be out of state for the week.

First I would like to make a couple of observations on last night. First, it would have been nice to have the tabs that they referenced available to the public. I don't know when the County received them, but they certainly weren't available to the public, as far as I can tell in some brief checking I did last night and also in some checking I did today.

That aside, I want to make a couple of observations on what you heard last night. First, with respect to the Comprehensive Plan, I have lived here since 1984. I participated in
the mid 1990s as a citizen in the adoption of the current Comprehensive Plan. I work with that document on a daily basis in my profession right now.

That plan is a guide; it's not a hard-and-fast rule book. It's designed under the Growth Management Act to guide development in the next 20 years, subject to regular amendments.

For every argument that a particular project fits or is consistent with or implements the Comprehensive Plan, you can go through the Comprehensive Plan and you can pick out areas where it doesn't fit with the Comprehensive Plan, doesn't implement the Comprehensive Plan, and arguably may be inconsistent.

I raise that because I disagree with the assertion that this project and projects like this automatically protect resource lands. I don't believe they do. I believe that that is an argument that ultimately will prove wrong.

I believe that this type of a project, with its aesthetic impacts and its impact on our view shed and its impact on -- basically a disincentive to locate in areas of the county where arguably growth should occur, creates an
incentive for the growth that will surely come
and is coming to this valley to locate on the
valley floor or in other parts of the valley
where arguably we would -- where there are
resource lands that are worthy of protecting and
should be protected.

So I think that to use the Comprehensive
Plan and then say that we’re protecting resource
lands by adopting this project is not a valid
argument.

Secondly, I really enjoyed listening to Tom
Priestly, the expert who performed the aesthetic
analysis, and I think it’s very important to
listen to what he said.

I took three things away from his testimony
last night. A, the first proposed project had
high aesthetic impacts in a number of places.
The reduced project, despite removing a number of
towers, a significant number of towers, still has
high aesthetic impact in places. And those
aesthetic impacts are not impacts that can be
mitigated.

And at this point I want to talk just a
little bit about impacts. Look at Horizon’s
proposed findings. Much like EnXco, Horizon
proposes to buy easements from neighboring landowners or non-participating landowners, as they refer to them, when towers are located near neighboring -- or non-participating properties.

I think that clearly demonstrates and drives home the point that this type of an industrial development has negative impacts that are -- that are -- that you cannot mitigate on neighbors, the neighborhood, and the surrounding character of the neighborhood. Maybe these neighbors that sell the easements will have the resources to purchase the curtains and blinds that EnXco freely admitted they needed.

Third, I wanted to talk about the property value analysis. And one thing that I've always enjoyed in being a lawyer and what I like about experts is once you get them on the payroll, they pretty much will say anything you want.

You need to pay particular attention to what Mr. DeLacey said, because what he said is scary. In order to know if there will be an impact on property values, you need to build the towers, you need comparable sales data, and then you'll do an appraisal. In other words, he was correct: Never buy land where the appraisers are buying,
because they're the last to know. We will not know if there's a negative impact on property values until it exists. That's the message I took away from his testimony.

    I think you'll hear other people provide contrary evidence that there’s already evidence of a negative affect on property values of a chilling in the market in that area where this project is proposed.

    But -- and then Mr. DeLacey suggests that we rely on anecdotal evidence to -- which now suggests that, well, there will be no impact. Again, not knowing whether there really will be an impact to the property values in the area until we build these. So that -- that kind of expert testimony is scary at best, and should really open your eyes.

    Fourth, and this is -- you know, when I first met Chris Taylor, he came to my office to talk to me and to -- and to a couple of the other lawyers in our office to see how we felt about the project. He was trying to generate support.

    And I'll admit that was a much different project. And I had just built a house and the house had -- arguably has some of these towers in
the view -- in its view. And so I said, Well, Chris, I can't really figure out how this is going to impact me, so why don't you come out to my house, come out on my patio, take a picture, and do a simulation.

And he did it, and I was very appreciative of that. He e-mailed it to me with a short e-mail saying, See, I don't think that there's any impacts. And when I looked at it, I had a different perspective.

So I -- my next real encounter with wind farms is I went on a wine tour in Walla Walla with some friends, and there were six of us: my wife and I, both lawyers; a developer; and a doctor from Seattle. And we drove to Walla Walla, and as we started to see these turbines, you know, they had -- that was my next encounter with them, and it -- and I looked at them and I thought, you know, these don't fit; they're out of place with the environment, they are out of place with the landscape; they're disruptive.

And at that point I did some additional looking at wind towers, and one thing that I have never been able to find is the economics on these things. We've heard people -- I've been through
these hearings. You know, I counted it up today; I think this is probably I'm into maybe 20-some hours' worth of wind power hearings over the last four years.

And I've heard a lot of people talking about tax incentives: They're only doing this for the tax incentives. And I've other people say, Oh, no, this is the wave of the future; it's a profitable venture. But not in the mountain of paperwork have I seen the pro forma, the dollar, the bottom line. And that causes me some concern.

And I'm particularly concerned here because I don't see who's operating this project in ten years. I don't see where the power's going. I don't see where the revenue's going.

Mr. Bowen, you're the chairman right now. You don't know who the chairman's going to be in ten years. Are you going to saddle him or her with an unknown entity to deal with on such an important scale when some -- a project like this when something goes wrong? Who are we dealing with?

We know that Horizon is in the business of developing wind power and we all know that there
are appropriate places to locate wind power. And I view it still as an experiment. I may be wrong, but I view it as an experience -- as an experiment. But I just don't see the economics there.

And then I hear everybody talking about the tax incentives and the subsidies that are out there. And if the true economics are that this is a subsidized industry -- and I believe that that's the true economics, that it is a subsidized industry -- then the argument that hey, you know, this project is going to put $1.6 million into Kittitas County -- and by the way, when they gave us that figure they didn't tell us what the time line was on that.

That's a circular argument that's invalid, in my book, because I'm the taxpayer that just put the money in my pocket. I took money out of one pocket and put it in the other. I don't think that argument works, and that causes me some concern.

Now, comments about last night aside, the reason that you need to deny this and the reason I think you have to deny it is that this is about the location of a wind power project. It's not
about whether wind power is good, bad, great for the environment, bad for the environment. It's about location.

And Horizon, Puget Sound Energy, and EnXco have made you gentlemen experts on wind power project locations. In fact, you may be the most knowledgeable individuals on the location of wind power projects in the state of Washington. I'm confident you have more knowledge, more expertise based upon practical experience than anyone sitting on the EFSEC panel.

So you people make the decision. And you need to rely on your experiences over the last four years in siting, in permitting these projects. You've got two; you denied one and you approved one.

And I'm going to ask you tonight in denying this project to do one simple thing: Take the findings from Wild Horse, take your factual findings that you prepared and you put together to support the Wild Horse finding, the Wild Horse project. Pull it out, take a look at the findings. Not one of those findings is present here. Not one.

There is no single landowner with huge
buffers between adjoining landowners; and there are -- instead there are multiple landowners with hundreds of neighbors. There are, by my count, rough count, it looks like over a hundred houses in and around the project, not the one that there was located a mile away from Wild Horse.

This has got an extremely high aesthetic impact. Everyone who drives the Highway 97 scenic corridor, everyone who drives Interstate 90 and looks at the Stuarts, the signature trademark of Kittitas Valley, is going to see these. This stands out. You didn’t have that in Wild Horse.

Here you’ve got recognized, admitted impacts on neighbors that cannot be mitigated. So instead they’re insured around. Think about your last insurance claim.

None of the factors that you relied on in Wild Horse are present, not one.

Now, take the EnXco findings, the ones you relied upon to deny that project, the ones that were upheld in court, and pull them out. All the factors you relied on to deny EnXco are present here in this project: the site, the topography, the number of houses, the terrain; it’s
identical. The existing land uses, identical.
The -- there is a comparable number of residences. There's a comparable number of tax parcels.

There are impacts just like in Wild -- or in EnXco that you absolutely cannot admit -- mitigate. And they admit it.

The factors in EnXco that led you to conclude that the project was detrimental or injurious to the public health, peace, and safety or the character of the surrounding neighborhood -- or the character of the surrounding neighborhood. You see that term a lot. I work with it a lot in my -- my business in front of you gentlemen. The character of the surrounding neighborhood. In EnXco that's what you looked at. You looked at the character of the surrounding neighborhood, exact same project, exact same impact, within two miles of this project, and you concluded that that project was injurious to the character of the neighborhood.

It's present here. You do -- you approve this and you've injured the character of this neighborhood, you've approved a project that is detrimental and injurious to the public health,
peace, and safety of the community. You clearly have.

All of the factors that led you to conclude that the EnXco project would be unreasonably detrimental to the economic welfare of the county and would create excessive costs are also present.

And I remember hours of discussion in EnXco about this development agreement and, you know, what the bonding requirements were going to be and et cetera and et cetera. We're not even there, and you know why? We don't know who's operating this. We don't know. You don't know. So there's even greater uncertainty.

And then I would submit a detrimental impact on the economic welfare of the county and the clear possibility that you would create excessive cost. And when I think about excessive cost, and I always think of one of the first visions I have the Kittitas Valley, and this goes back, you know, 19 -- late 1970s, between Seattle and Pullman.

And you always get to the crest of the hill there, what I now know as Horlick Road, and there's this goofy little metal structure that,
you know, once I moved here I learned was an experimental wind power project from sometime in the '60s or '70s. And it's there, it's still there. And you wonder why is it still there?

Well, it was an experiment that didn't work. And A, the guy who put it there or the business who put it there didn't have the money to remove it; or B -- and this is what obviously occurred -- it was put there probably through some type of process that didn't deal with the long-term impact in case it didn't work or had to be removed. You don't have any of that here.

So I think you have a real danger that you're going to -- that this is going to be unreasonably detrimental to the economic welfare of the county and create excessive cost.

Now, the reasons -- again, go back to the reasons that you relied on in EnXco to deny the application. They're all present here; it is no different. It may be wrapped in a different package, admittedly tied up in a nicer bow. But it's the same. And just like EnXco, it should be denied.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any questions? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McClAIN: I have a question.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Oh --

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I have a question.

Mark McClain.

You indicated that you're involved in a lot of development in this area -- or that you do development. Can you tell me about the development that's occurring in this area that you're aware of?

MR. JEFF SLOTHOWER: Well, I think the development you're referring to is a rezone that I brought through the Planning Commission a number of -- well, three or four months ago. That's a non-project action. Ms. Anderson was correct last night. That rezone does not automatically create "X" number of houses.

I will say, however, there are a number of those types of non-project actions, some of which are ultimately going to need -- going to lead to additional houses in the area and thus additional conflicts with this type of an industrial development.

I'd also -- on the subject of development, I think if you take a look at the map -- and last night Horizon had a very good map against the back wall. I don't see it there tonight. And I
know it's recreated in some of the materials that I've seen.

But look at the expanded one, because what it shows is all of the subdivision that has occurred in this area over the last few years. And you know, one thing that would be really nice to look at -- and I don't know, it can't be replicated, as far as I can tell, at least not with the resources I'm dealing with -- would be to look at the tax parcels five years ago and look at them now.

The area is constantly being divided, you know. 80 to 90 percent of those tax parcels were created under the prior subdivision code, which allowed exempt segregations in the land without a review process.

But what it -- what it does tell you and what it -- and the message you should take away is that this is the area -- one of the areas of the valley where there is a lot of residential and recreational development right now and the prospect of additional recreational development occurring here is very good with the rezones, the non-project action rezones and the subdivision of the property. And candidly, if you put it up
there, you won’t have to worry about it on the valley floor creating, you know, the rural sprawl that we’re all so afraid of, so.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any other questions? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, did you want to go to your break or to the next speaker?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is it time?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: It’s six minutes to 8:00.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yeah, let’s go for a ten-minute break.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BLACK: We’re ready to go with the next testimony.

MS. BARRET: Larry Putnam?

MR. LARRY PUTNAM: My name is Larry Putnam. I live at 3601 Emerck Road. That’s up on Lookout Mountain.

I am a contractor, developer, and I spend a lot of time in land investment, buying and selling. I actually purchased and sold six parcels in that area out there. I did very well on them, but that was before there was any mention of wind farms.
In regards to -- in regards to Exhibit 10 -- which I'm sure you've all read; that's the report on the land value impacts -- this was done by apparently a very qualified person. A paid consultant by Sagebrush. As we all know that you can take two highly skilled, paid consultants and get two totally different pictures even though they may be all telling the truth. You see that in the courtroom all the time. That's what you have here.

From all the years of experience that I have here in this valley, my opinion is it's wrong. Your property values will be -- will be diminished. And I hope that the Planning Commission listens to other real estate people that are local, other land developers, other investors. And you'll get a totally different picture.

I only have one other thing. Does anyone know what is in place or what provisions are in place to prevent Horizon or anyone else from adding additional towers at a later date? There is none? What would be the process if they wanted to?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Through the development
agreement? Would be through the development agreement.

MR. HURSON: Mr. Chairman, Jim Hurson. Just as far as your process -- and I've had other people in the audience ask me this during the break -- what I have suggested to people if they have questions, what the questions -- maybe the way is, is they aren't supposed to be asking the applicant questions. They can ask the Planning Commission: These are questions I have. And then ask the Planning Commission maybe to ask these questions of the applicant or staff. And so that can kind of help keep it focused.

Because the way the public process is set up, it is not for a question-and-answer session between the Board and the public; it's for the public to provide information, provide questions, provide spots or issues for the Planning Commission, and for the Planning Commission to take that and do with it as they may.

So that -- I would suggest that you not try to be in a dialogue, but if this gentlemen has questions, those can be noted; he can maybe then ask the Planning Commission to ask the applicant to answer those sorts of questions, and then when
they have a chance to rebut, they can do that.

MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Then what I will comment
on that is if in fact Horizon or someone else can
come back a couple years from now and make
application to put those "X"s back in, if they
can do that, it's going to be hard to turn them
down once you've already turned that into a
industrial park. When I look at those "X"s, I
see Phase 2.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: You said you've
developed something in this area? You've sold
some plots. Can you elaborate on that?

MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Up on top of Lookout
Mountain.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I guess I mean a
number and character. You said you sold some --

MR. LARRY PUTNAM: They were parcels that
varied from 8 acres to 20 acres.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: And since?

MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Well, I've built a lot of
things around -- I've built the Centennial
Center, developed that. Storage units. And I've
bought a lot of different pieces of land in the
general area and sold them.
Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Mike Robertson?

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: My name is Mike Robertson. I live at 4101 Bettas Road, Cle Elum. I'm representing myself and my wife Elizabeth.

I believe it should be evident at this point -- I believe it should be evident at this point that the project is in the wrong place and inconsistent with land-use trends for the area.

The applicant has reduced the number of turbines from their original project application, but using their own EIS addendum documentation they still have not mitigated impacts the project would create.

Although this hearing is to determine whether this project is consistent with current land uses, the applicant has decided to inundate you folks with updated EIS information. And I'd like to respond to just two of these impacts.

Shadow flicker is still affecting non-participating neighbors. By their own analysis, our residents will be affected 149 days a year, and there are other neighbors in the area that will be affected even more. My closest
neighbor will be affected 240 days a year.

The applicant’s mitigation is to have us install blinds or plant trees. This is unacceptable. No other land use I am aware of requires the affected parties to mitigate impacts caused by a proposed land use.

There is only one acceptable mitigation for shadow flicker, and that is sufficient setback distance. This setback distance should be measured from non-participating landowner boundary lines, not just existing residences. Shadow flicker limits the land uses for non-participating property owners. As an example, it is widely accepted that shadow flicker affects horses as well as people. And people in the area have horses.

Another impact that the applicant fails to even acknowledge is low frequency noise that these large machines produce. The applicant has been -- even suggested that these turbines are as quiet as a refrigerator. I don’t know where they buy their refrigerators, but any of us that had one that produced a low thumping sound, I’m sure it would be removed from our homes.

And that is the main point about low
frequency sound impacts. There is no mitigation for this impact other than locating the turbines at great distance from people. You have to act conservatively on siting these machines because after installation, the only option to fix the problem would be to remove them.

Finally, the wind industry would have us believe that wind farms are just an extension of agricultural land use. This is nothing but spin. A commercial wind farm is an industrial power-generation facility and it is incompatible with rural residential land use, which is prevalent in the proposed location.

I urge you to deny this project application as inconsistent with current land uses for the area. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Questions?

Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Elizabeth Robertson?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She's not here tonight.

MS. BARRET: William Erickson?

MR. WILLIAM ERICKSON: I'm William Erickson, address 6980 Wilson Creek Road. I also have property up in Naneum.

I'm against these wind farms in the valley.
To create large wind industrial generating complexes within the Kittitas Valley is wrong. These complexes are not compatible with the people living in the rural residences.

I'm concerned because I live in the north end of the valley, and I may be a distance from the proposed project along Highway 97, I am downwind of it and downwind of the second proposed project, being EnXco. I think they're still in some litigation on it.

The way the agreements are written, the complexes are -- areas are flexible and they could be located in my back yard. We've lived there for nearly 37 years and don't appreciate things like this coming into the valley that cause people problems.

When one gets its foot in the door, you can expect there's going to be a lot more of them that are going to want to be there too.

I'm concerned about the health, safety, and welfare of the county residents. Health means both physical and mental. It doesn't take much stress to send someone over the edge. And I'm sure that some people perhaps living with that, the flicker and all, not only would be -- it
would be a physical but it would be a mental
thing.

The noise has been addressed. It's
something like a car pulling up next to you at a
stop sign or a stop light and you hear that boom,
boom, boom. I normally turn to my wife and say
there's something wrong with that car. But it's
similar to that. It's kind of that type of a
noise that's annoying if you have to live with
that. It's just not the best thing.

The flicker, the sunlight is totally
unacceptable. We know how large corporations
work with mitigation. I mean, the pipeline going
up to the upper county was -- large corporations
normally try and run over the landowners. I
mean, that's -- that's obvious from our -- from
that experience. And so it's not very acceptable
with the small people working with the large
corporations. They don't work too well with you.

The strobe lights on the -- on the wind --
on the turbines, I have a farm magazine that I
get, and I've ordered a couple of strobe lights
from them for the express purpose of to get rid
of ground hogs and that type of thing.

Strobe lights are detrimental to the -- to
your wildlife. You get your deer, your elk, and so forth and they see that constant flashing, they clear out. You’re not going to have that type of wildlife in the area where those are at.

There’s dust. I read a letter to the editor -- a letter to the editor of somebody who was viewing them down in Walla Walla and they -- and they started up. There was dust from the turbulence. And it’s the same thing that you would have here. You would have that -- you’d have dust in the air. More than what’s needed now.

Fire. I know that they’ve made many improvements to the wind farm -- to the turbines. However, anything that’s mechanical is subject to failure. You get -- you hear trains crashing, airplanes going down. They’ve got the best that there is, but sometimes there’s failures and it’s no different with these.

I don’t know if you’ve been in a wind-driven fire. It’s a scary thing. There was a little one that was up by our place, and you don’t want to be in one. And if you have a wind-driven fire, there’s -- I know the -- I think it was EnXco that had something like 80 gallons of -- of
oil up in the -- up in the base; and I don't
know, with the larger ones it may be more.

You have something happen with that, it
spreads over a large area, you're not going to
contain it. How many homes are there downwind of
it? There's hundreds of homes in that -- in the
north end of the valley. And there's people. If
we don't have to have it, let's not.

The liability, also there's a possibility of
oil getting into your springs. You have a tower
go down, whatever, you have in the surface and
under the surface for the wells --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could you move a little
closer to the mic? We're having a problem
hearing you in the back, please.

MR. WILLIAM ERICKSON: Okay. Liability
insurance, it's a limited liability corporation,
and before that -- this on many of the
applications I've never seen insurance addressed
of needing to carry a certain amount. With that
many homes downwind, are they willing to -- would
they be willing to put, you know, 200 million or
300 million with the size of -- with the cost of
houses nowadays? There's -- you'd be surprised
at the amount of value of what's up there
downwind.

The feed lines, the grids, the pictures that they show us doesn't -- don't show anything. In the previous agreements or proposed agreements that were from the other ones, if it's more than four feet -- or if it wasn't -- if they couldn't go down four feet if there was rock, they went up. And so you're not seeing everything. You're maybe seeing these turbines.

But look at the pictures. There's nothing against the blue sky, there's nothing against the Stuart range. It's really showing you what it's really like. I don't think we can -- we can imagine to know what it's like, even. But I think that it's -- it's not showing it what it is.

Property values. The expert, quote/unquote, that we heard from was looking at property values after the intention was announced that there would be a wind farm in the area. What would it have been if there was no announcement? I don't think that we can tell, but I think it would be much higher. It would have an automatic dampening affect on what somebody was -- if they were wanting to purchase.
The person that -- yesterday that had over 800 acres that sold some said there's only two or three cabins or three or four cabins or whatever on the land. Nobody has taken into consideration how many RV spots there are. Are there snowbirds that -- up there? And they're in Arizona or someplace else now and they come up and park their vehicle, live in it. How many tent sites are there?

Those type of people aren't going to want these -- this noise, the -- I mean, they want it where it's quiet. This is what they -- I'm sure that they intended it for.

I know when we -- we live in the country and we like it quiet. We expect cows bawling and farm equipment going, but that's only temporary, and you don't hear it all the time; you don't have a constant thump, thump, thump or whatever in the background. We like it quiet.

Wind generation is not consistent. So there's a -- you really question whether the capital expenditure for these is worth the output. You look at -- also they say, well, this will produce so-much. What does it produce where it's used? You lose a lot in the transmission
lines. The transmission lines, it's one of
their -- the objects of trying to place it here,
but if it's used in Seattle or wherever, you've
got a lot of loss.

And you also have to have a back-up thing
for that -- when it's not running you have to
have a back-up, so you have to have a different
type of generation.

It would be better for -- for the renewable
energy to be looking at the tide -- you have the
constant tide falling and to harness that, and
then because the bigger cities are along the
ocean, you wouldn't have the transmission loss of
electricity. It seems to be much better use of
the money, of the government money. At least to
get more research in it and to produce that.

About ten years ago a couple farm boys back
in the midwest were producing hydrogen from their
own farm pond and bringing it in their pickups.
It isn't rocket science technology that those
types of things could be dealt with or could be
used for that.

The wind projects, the actual building of
them are exempt from sales tax, so the county
isn't going to gain anything from that. I don't
know if you’re aware of that or not, but
that’s -- there’s no -- there’s an exemption
there. As many other things with taxes and the
exemptions.

You have to look at the experts that give
you all these opinions. Who’s paying for them?
And if they didn’t give the right opinion, you
don’t think they’re going to be paid. Or, I
mean, that’s my own personal thought of it. I
doubt if any of them are living within the sound
or sight of a wind farm. They’re expecting us
to -- to have to live with it, but they’re not
willing to themselves.

I'd say keep it out of the -- keep it out of
the valley. The valley is residential. They
compare it with a lot of the other wind farms.
There’s not residential there; there’s wheat
fields. Klickitat. There’s more on the
Columbia -- the side of the Columbia River. If
they want a wind farm, why don’t they put it down
in Hood River where all these windboarders --
where that’s the capital of the northwest? And
they say, Well, that’s a gorgeous area. Well,
it’s no -- it’s no less than the Stuart range.

I guess that’s all for now. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.
Questions? Thank you.

MS. BARRET: David Gordon?
Bettina Rigby?
John Rigby?
Bob Acheson?
Pamela Hillemann?
Dennis Rommple?
Diane Schwab?
Bud Schwab?

Colleen Anderson?

MS. COLLEEN ANDERSON: Colleen Anderson, 231 Peavine Road. I am a realtor at Coldwell Banker, Kittitas Valley Realty, and I’ve been working there for ten years.

I have been involved in the Kittitas County real estate industry for the past ten years. I strongly believe that the wind farms will have an adverse affect on the value of the property close to the proposed wind farms.

Based on my research in the Northwest Multiple Listing Service, I have found that active listings near the wind farms have an average days of market of 611 days, while the county-wide average days on market for active
listings is 239 days. Also the days on market for sold listings in the wind farm area is 350 (sic) days, and the county-wide average days on market for the sold properties is 219 days.

In addition, there is also a significant difference on the sale price of properties close to the wind farms versus the average county sale price. Vacant land near the wind farms has average sale price of $66,038. The county average sale price is $126,223. The difference in average sale price is $60,185.

My research was based on real estate activity in the last six months for 3- to 20-acre parcels. This is vacant land.

Based on this information, it is my professional opinion that real estate values are adversely affected by the wind farms. I strongly urge you to reject the wind farm proposal in order to maintain the quality of life and property values that we presently have in this community.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

MS. COLLEEN ANDERSON: I do have the printout of all the information --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Would you leave that with
her, please. Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Phyllis Whitbeck?

Woody Whitbeck? Oh, I'm sorry, sorry.

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: My name is Phyllis Whitbeck. I am representing myself and my husband. And I wanted to say something about the shadow flicker.

Because we have a small wind turbine and it's kind of noisy, to the point like if we wanted to put it up on our lot here in the city of Ellensburg if we had one, they would turn us down; it would be no. I mean, one wouldn't want to live that close to it with their neighbors, you know, with that sort of thing. Nor would the neighbors, well, they wouldn't like to live next to the small turbine.

But one day I unknowingly got to working in the flicker of the turbine. The sun was not bright that day, so the flicker wasn't really noticeable. I started to feel terrible, like the flu was happening. And I'm very prone to motion sickness, and the motion of the blade flicker was making me feel sick. I moved and everything was fine.

I'd hate to see this happen to somebody, you
know, when they have that going through their
house. And when the turbine flicker passes over
a window, it affects the whole entire room, not
just the window. Everyone knows how fast a sun
shadow moves. It takes a long time for this
flicker shadow to pass over the window. Hours,
maybe. You know, like the shadow of a tree
moving across the lawn. It takes quite a while.

Also with the red flashing lights, imagine a
couple of miles of flashing lights. These can be
seen from most of our valley. The people that
live above those lights will get their biggest
impact. My neighbors have their yard lights on
at nighttime, and they are a half a mile away
from us. These lights light up our house at
nighttime, so we do not need any night lights in
our house in order to get around.

It would be unreal if they were flashing
turbine lights. That would be awful. We could
close the curtains, but on hot summer nights it
would get way too warm and stuffy.

I also have a friend that gets tremendous
headaches from those kind of lights. If these
lights can affect people, I'd hate to meet a bull
or a bear affected from these lights while
outside enjoying the nighttime.

Let us listen to our European neighbors and their warnings on not putting wind turbines in populated areas. They are ahead of us with turbines and know their problems better than our experts here in this room.

I want to thank you, and please say no to these wind turbines.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Don?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: How big is your windmill and how fast does it turn?

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to overwhelm you, but --

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Well, I was just trying to think, how can I answer that? It only turns up to so-fast and then it starts to feather. And it ceases to rotate as fast. Otherwise the wind would literally tear it apart.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Speak a little closer to the microphone.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I add to her question? The blades are seven feet long. I live a half a mile away and I can hear them.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, you can do that when you testify, okay?

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Okay, well, I'll testify for him, then. He's my neighbor and he can hear it. Particularly when they feather. But he doesn't hear it when the wind isn't blowing real strong and it's going nicely.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: I think probably the speed of it has as much or more to do with it than anything. If you can't give me an answer, that's okay.

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Well, the only thing I can say is that it's not too loud up to a certain point; and when it tries to feather or put its brakes on, and that's when it makes the noise.

Now, I don't know how these newer ones keep from blowing themselves apart, you know, with 50-, 60-, 80-mile-an-hour winds. When they start to slow down, how do they slow down or how much noise do they make when they are slowing down?

And that seems to be about the noisiest part that I know of with the wind turbine. It seemed
that way too with the other small ones I have encountered. They are getting better and better with it, though. I mean, things are improving.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Okay.

MS. BARRET: Woody Whitbeck?

MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: He wasn't going to testify.

MS. BARRET: Linda or Bobby Rubio? James Havens? Linda Schantz?

MS. LINDA SCHANTZ: Hi. My name is Linda Schantz, and I'm representing my husband and myself, who both reside at 4190 Robbins Road in Ellensburg.

Last February I read in the Daily Record an article that was written by a House of Representative member, Mr. Frank Miller. And he sent out a letter regarding wind power, stating that the push for wind power comes only in the light of tax breaks and income for wind power companies.

He went on to outline the four tax breaks that wind power companies get, the largest being a federal production tax credit of .018 cent per
kilowatt hour produced for the first ten years of operation. He gave an example of a hundred-tower farm rated at a hundred megawatts at 30 percent efficiency would generate an income of $47 million in ten years.

So I'm making this point not because I want to argue whether wind farms should exist in our country but to really say that's why we're here and that's why we've been in this hearing and all the others. It's all about money for the wind farms.

And that's why we're here, and the wind farm companies would really kind of be stupid not to try to take advantage of this, and their objective is to get as many in as quickly as possible.

Wind farms are not compatible with our county's stated objectives, which is to keep the Kittitas Valley a rural valley with a vibrant city and university in its center. As landowners and tax payers, we have a Comprehensive Plan and zoning laws that protect us.

If the Comp Plan and zoning laws supported wind farms, as Mr. Peck suggests, then why was the original wind power project abandoned? Why
are we still working on the land-use issues three years later?

The reason is that wind farms do not belong where people live and that our zoning laws and Comp Plans do protect the citizens from inappropriate industrial development. For us the fight has always been about location.

The size of the proposed wind farm now is about approximately ten miles in length and six miles in width. There are approximately 80 to 100 residences that will bear the burden of the noise, the shadows, the strobing, and visual impacts from the placement of that wind farm. Their quality of life would be negatively impacted and some of them severely. And I, I believe that this number is unacceptable and should be unacceptable to you.

We hear from the noise experts that graph the dBAs and decimels and -- or decibels, and they state there's no inherent danger to residents. Then why do we hear testimony from residents in Pennsylvania and Ohio and other states that state the noise has affected their quality of life and their ability to sleep? Why has Great Britain commissioned a study on the
health affects of wind turbines on nearby residents? The reason, you can’t fit human life and human sensitivity into a graph and into numbers.

On last night’s testimony I questioned why there were no similar situations or comparisons on property values comparing the Kittitas Valley situation with other wind farms. Certainly we really need to expect evidence that supports their claim that our property values will not be affected.

Yes, Horizon has reduced the number of turbines, but it was never about whether there were 50 or 100. It’s always been about no turbines where people live. Why do we think -- or why do they think Whiskey Dick went through so fast? They’re already starting to build it.

Lastly, regarding the participating landowners, you know, you just can’t have it both ways. It was stated last night in testimony that the property was bought to utilize the natural resources. Then in another testimony it was stated how many parcels of land were sold to recreationalists and residential homes. I propose it’s too late for the former. The land
has been divided and the development has begun.
It is far too late.

Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Mary Morgan?

MS. MARY MORGAN: I'm Mary Morgan. I live at 771 -- 771 Watson Road here in Ellensburg.
I've lived in Ellensburg almost eight years. I'm a native of the state of Washington. My family homesteaded in the upper county. And I moved back over here several years ago.

And I just have one question. They keep talking about the million dollars to a million and a half, somewhere in that range, that we're going to get in tax dollars. My question to you and my real concern to you is, what's it worth to us to give up one of the most extraordinary views that I know of in Washington state? And all of us in this county look to that view. Is it worth throwing it away for a million and a half dollars?

I'm sorry, but in the real estate business that's way cheap. And if you'll sell it for a million and a half, I will guarantee you I can get a buyer who will pay you more.
Thanks.


MS. BARRET: Tina Sands.

MS. TINA SANDS: I'm Tina Sands. I live at 5690 Smithson Road in Ellensburg. We live here full-time. I speak on behalf of myself, my husband Cliff, and my son Christopher.

I speak tonight because I do not want to be mistaken for the silent majority mentioned in a recent newspaper article. Everyone I have talked with about wind turbines -- people who live near and far from the proposed sites -- all tell me they are opposed to them, don't support them, don't expect them to be built. They don't bother to speak up in opposition because they can't imagine that the application will be approved. This silent majority is opposed to the wind turbines.

I'm sure there are many people here tonight prepared to speak about why the turbines are a bad idea altogether. We moved here five years ago. I can tell you we absolutely would not have bought here and sunk all our equity, blood, sweat, and tears into our place here had we known there would be wind developers trying to plant
their giant industrial turbines right in amongst us.

The suggestion that these monstrous industrial towers will not devastate our land and home values and quality of life is absolutely ridiculous.

I have talked to many people who have bought, moved into their places here, only to find out after the fact that there was a raging debate over the placement of these turbines. They were not advised in advance of the applications you are considering. They have not been getting the Daily Record. I have heard this complaint many times.

We are living here now because we saw a rural and peaceful environment to have our farm animals and raise our son. My husband makes a huge sacrifice driving to Seattle to his job daily, year-round, so that we may live in this quiet, rural environment. This is no small feat. This is very costly in time, fuel, wear and tear on himself and his vehicle. This is income from outside this valley being poured into the economy of this county.

We are not the only ones. If we wanted to
live in an industrial environment, such as would be created by adding wind turbines in this location, we could do so with a much easier commute.

I suspect not a person in this room would choose to live under or in view of those industrial turbines. Those in favor of them own the land they want to put them on, will be compensated for having them on their land, and will probably not continue to live there.

Perhaps some people generally support the idea of wind energy, but they live elsewhere and will neither have to see nor hear the roaring turbines on a daily basis.

The appraiser for the corporation is so cavalier as to say that people will just get used to them, but people should not have to get used to them. This is not what we bargained for when we invested everything we have in this county. He fails to understand that the personal preference of people who buy land and move to these areas is not to live with industrialization. His logic is flawed at best.

The insurance man for the wind corporations stated that they have settled mostly fire claims
as third-party liability for these wind turbine sites. Why would we want to put fire-starting turbines upwind of us in this dry and very fire-prone area? As we all saw last summer, water is not always available to fight these fires. We’ve all seen in the last few summers how easily fires start here and how quickly they spread. These turbines can start fires, and homes will be engulfed and lives destroyed, if not lost, before the fire crews can even get in their trucks. These turbines do not belong where people live.

Mention was also made last evening of parked haystacks and irrigation pipes in the field. These are the sights one should expect to see in a rural, agricultural area. Those who have fled the city in this generation or in the previous generation expect to live with the usual sights and sounds of a rural, agricultural environment. They do not expect and should not have to put up with industrialization being forced upon them.

We have submitted our opposition to these wind turbines in writing. We opposed in writing and in person the previous application for the turbines on Smithson Road.
We ask you today to exercise the wisdom you did when you turned down the application for turbines on Smithson. Deny the application for the turbines on Highway 97. They are no more appropriate there towering over and endangering those residents and despoiling the extraordinary beauty of the area than they are on Smithson. Monstrous, noisy, dangerous turbines should never be built where people live, and many people live in the area where the currently considered application proposes to build them. These people did not bargain for life amongst industrial turbines.

Just because you are seeing the same people opposing the turbines being built amongst people's homes does not negate the point that these people make. This is the wrong location for wind turbines.

Thank you for listening.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much. Do you have any questions?

MS. BARRET: Sandy Elliot?

MS. SANDY ELLIOT: I’ll give my time to my husband.

MS. BARRET: Ian Elliot?
MR. IAN ELLIOT: Thank you very much. I won't need that much time, so I'll take it at home.

My name is Ian Elliot, and I live at 250 Catlin Canyon Road in Ellensburg. My background is civil engineering. I can't say that I work for CH2M Hill, although I did study under Fred Merrifield, who started it, down at Oregon State.

My testimony tonight will not deal with the philosophical issues and incentives, tax incentives of the wind farm project. That will never stand on its own, even though that is the core issue, nor will I expand on the removal requirement contingency that is imperative should the project not perform or not operate due to market forces or lack of tax incentives.

Or mention except in passing that the representative from Cushman & Wakefield once again proved that MAI means "made as instructed." He has got to be kidding that the construction of a hundred million dollars' worth of industrial eyesores will not affect the desirability of residential real estate. What gall, I mean.

Instead this will itemize the issues that we feel will give the Commission and also the
commissioners the valid reasons to disallow the request for wind use overlay and development contract.

The environmental review lead agency status was denied to the County, and I believe that action allows the County to deny the project because either the County believes that the wrong methodology was employed or that the material facts were omitted or distorted to skew the outcomes.

The questions on the State Environmental Protection Act checklist are very broad and require applicants to address all impacts regarding the specific environmental checklist item and also to ask if there are any other factors that would be of significant impact.

If these answers are not addressed adequately, the commissioners have the ability to rejection the application and refer said application back to the lead agency to address those issues if possible.

View corridors: The selection of view corridors is so myopic one would think that Mr. Magoo was the consultant. The clever graphics omitted the material fact that it is the
vast majority of the valley that is impacted by
the location of the turbines and not the adjacent
property owners and that the reduction of the
number of the units makes no impact to the
thousands of residents that have the ability to
view the project directly in the view corridor of
the Stuart range. Nearly every house built in
recent years is oriented to capitalize on that
vista.

The measured impacts with 160 towers were
high, and the impact after reduction is still
high throughout the valley. This mitigation is
insufficient to address the impact.

Lighting: Albeit the announcement of the
number of lights has been reduced, the issue
remains valid. A pilot flying VFR in marginal
conditions on the route from Seattle to
Ellensburg via Stampede Pass looking for the
airport at 200 knots can legally approach the
project in visibility of one mile and 500 feet
from the ground. In our notoriously foggy
conditions. This gives him less than 20 seconds
to identify and avoid multiple towers painted the
same color as the fog. Dicey at best.

The nighttime scenario is different in that
the directional character of the beacons is such that they too must alert the same pilot in the same conditions. This requires the intensity to be at least valley-wide and bright enough to attract the attention of the pilot. It will attract your attention also, every night, all night.

This is the beacon information. It's 700 watts. If you do a little math, that is a longitudinal light bulb with a 42,000-watt capacity (indicating) across the valley.

Noise: Expanding on the testimony from last night, the noise levels have not been adequately addressed. The noise level of this project, if addressed honestly, will have to look at the same levels as the new freeway across the valley. The point source, 109 dBA, of the noise generator -- at the generator, not at the property line -- is greater than that of a semi truck and trailer at freeway speeds. Which is 95 dBA.

If I remember my acoustics from engineering, every 10 dBA is twice the noise of 10 below it. So if it's 95 to 105, that's twice the noise.

When you look at the graphs of noise, you'll note that down at the bottom is the background
night country noise. And that is at 25 dBA. At 95 it isn’t just proportional; it doubles every 10 to get up to 95. At 105 it is noisy.

This means that we’ll have a stationary noise generator equivalent to 60 very noisy trucks and trailers in continuous motion. This mitigation is insignificant to address the impact.

In summation, the impacts on the noise, lighting, and visual have yet to be addressed adequately to mitigate the potential detriment of the citizens, voters, and taxpayers of Kittitas County. My wife and I urge you to reject this application. Thank you very much.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Gerry Sorenson?

Marilyn Sorenson?

Debbie --

MS. MARILYN SORENSON: I’m Marilyn Sorenson. I live at 870 Sorenson Road, and I just say that this is not the right location for the windmills. I’ve read all the editorial, I’ve studied, and I’ve listened to all the testimony, and it’s just not right; I’m against it.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions anyone? Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Debbie Boddy?

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: I have a new hero; all of you are added to my list. This is brutal; I don’t know how do you this for a living.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Some of them do it for free.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: But I do, as a citizen of this county, thank you and appreciate all the work you do and even just with this project. You need to know that there are people that appreciate you, and I’m one of them. I may not agree at times, but it’s a tough job.

Quickly, my name is Debbie Boddy. I represent my husband and my family. We live on 790 Dudley Road in Thorp.

Tonight my comments -- I’m trying really hard to keep personal comments out of what I want to say to you. I realize the decisions you have to make involve a much broader scope and the good of all, so -- and you’re probably -- by the time I’m done you’re going to wish that I had a PowerPoint. I don’t do well this way.

I did give a handout. I believe a picture
is worth a thousand words, so included in my
written statement that you received, I simply
printed the references that I made in my written
statement so that you'd have them before you.
And I did give them -- I did have three copies.
You can perhaps disburse them.

My comments tonight are primarily going to
be from legitimate organizations, Daily Record
articles, that kind of thing, that I believe are
relevant to this project and to the decision you
have to make.

Most of where I've -- my -- I started with
my research in the -- is it the DEIS? Or the
Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That
document was really enlightening and surprising
to me because it did identify impact. And of
course my attention was drawn to the three scenic
byways that were identified that will be impacted
in this project.

Before I begin with those, I thought it
might be relevant in terms of when something is
designated as a National Scenic Byway or a state
byway, especially when you use the term "scenic."
I wanted to make a distinction.

Webster's Dictionary defines "scenic" as
having to do with natural scenery affording beautiful views. Now, when someone hears that connotation about scenic byway, us as English-speaking people are naturally going to assume this definition, and you know, it's very clear in our language.

Wind turbines, again, my conclusion with their methodology for identifying scenic impact, basically I concluded that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. And so I -- but I want to make a distinction. Wind farms perhaps are very beautiful, but they are not a -- as defined in this context, natural, having to do with natural scenery. They are having to do with manmade versus natural, as we would think as citizens and English-speaking people.

With that in mind, I decided I'd go to, well, more research and understanding. The scenic byway, Mountains to Sound Greenway, I went to their official website, and I wanted to know what are they saying about this scenic byway. And I'm reading directly from them.

"From the shores of Puget Sound in Seattle at Alki Beach," to "the downtown waterfront, and Discovery Park, to the Thorp Mill" -- I love
seeing Thorp -- "in Kittitas County, treasures of the Northwest nature and history are easily accessible and preserved as Mountains to Sound Greenway, a National Scenic Byway."

There they clearly identified this project is in a scenic -- this particular National Scenic Byway.

Second, I -- also on their website you can request -- people around the world can request additional information. On there is a map, clearly showing the Greenway in this case. This map clearly shows that they consider where that project is as part of their Greenway. And I'll leave this with you. I did make a copy of it.

What is of interest to me in this documentation is Thorp's on the map, yes, and not only is Thorp on the map, it talks specifically "Thorp Historic Mill and Scenic Loop," okay.

And it goes on to say within this document, "The loop drive following the Yakima River on Old Highway 10 from I-90 to (sic) Thorp and Cle Elum is one of the most beautiful scenic drives along the Greenway."

So not only in the context with their EIS, they were talking about we never did anything
about that designation of Highway 10 being a
scenic byway. In this context we don’t have to;
it’s included in the national -- at a national
level scenic byway.

Also in this documentation it says "Greenway
Vision: Encourage preservation and
interpretation of" -- sorry guys, it’s awful
going old. Okay, "Encourage preservation and
interpretation of Thorp’s historic character;
support enhancement of the local economy through
recreation, connection to the John Wayne Trail,
and creation of a local historic district."

Now, what I loved about this is it infers
that because of this byway, there is economic
value specifically to Thorp and to this area,
this area that will be impacted. So I thought,
wow, you know, they’re referring scenic byway,
economy, that kind of thing.

So my point here is, again, this clearly is
demonstrating to me the land use in this case
has -- the primary land use besides the ag is
it’s a scenic byway, a national, state scenic
byway already designated. Just by using the word
"scenic," when you’re bringing manmade obstacles
in it is definitely contrary to what most
Americans would refer to in this.

    My next point, it falls -- because this leads into economic, I decided to go to Washington State Tourism, which is the "Experience Washington - The Official Site of Washington State Tourism," okay? And how do -- why would they also include -- it's in your packet. There clearly the Mountains to Sound Greenway is promoted in the tourist industry. And again, the official Washington state tourist industry.

    So again, when you think about this -- by the way, I guess at this point I'd like to mention that the EIS disclosed that there was over 21,000 vehicles that travel this byway daily. I believe that was in there. So if you actually multiplied that, one person per vehicle per day by that number by 365 days, we're talking about, what, 7.6 million people a year, annually.

    Now, when you're looking at that, the tourism industry, that's a pretty significant number of people impacted -- that are potential impact to Kittitas and the industry there.

    Also I wanted to -- oh, I wanted to share with you in a Daily Record -- it's Thursday,
February 1st, 1996 -- the front page included was about a, quote, "County Scenic Loop Studied."
"The tourist trade is already here. What we want to do now is find a way to get them to stop long enough to enjoy our county and spend their money here."

Now, this particular plan, it was "A plan to designate a scenic loop through Kittitas County could bolster the local economy by capitalizing on tourism while keeping impact to the environment...a minimum, proponents of the loop told the group" -- these are proponents.

Now, on in that particular article it said, "The proposed scenic loop would veer from Interstate 90 at Thorp, head northwest and hook up with Highway 10, which the state designated a scenic highway about 25 years ago, then on up to Cle Elum."

This particular route they're talking about is going to have -- well, I just wanted you to know that they're recognizing the value of scenic and economics and how it could -- the potential with that.

Again, I think the fact that 7.6 million people drive that highway way, or it's more; I
mean, it's obvious there's more than one person in a vehicle each day. But I think the potential is just tremendous and the impact is tremendous for what the state and nation actually are promoting.

Another little article -- again, just what I noticed, I thought most people when they want to come to Ellensburg will do a web search on -- on the Chamber of Commerce. Now, I'm not -- I don't know if the Chamber's for -- I think they are for this.

But it's interesting how they promote their website, because the number one thing they're using is our beautiful scenery. Their -- a picture on their front page, the Yakima River with fishing. And again, there's dry hills up above that looks very similar to the -- where they want to put the wind turbines.

But again, a picture's worth a thousand words, and the draw -- it's very clear the draw that they're trying to bring is natural scenic. That's not to say that in the future you could have a beautiful picture of wind turbines that would also be attractive. It's just it's contrary to what we consider scenic byways as
they're defined.

One thing, too, I wanted to bring forward is the John Wayne Trail. The number of people impacted by this, people are drawn to the John Wayne Trail. The DEIS talked about 167,000 -- over 167,000 people visit the John Wayne Trail between North Bend and -- not Cle Elum; they said North Bend and Thorp. Again, that trail is directly below the wind turbine proposal, meaning they will be impacted; it was identified and there will be an impact to that. We're talking about 167,000 people a year.

In my original document -- just -- I'm going to just share what one person that enjoyed that trail and why she enjoyed the trail. It wasn't -- which I could relate to. And I quote -- actually this was from the John Wayne Trail website.

"We rode from South Cle Elum to Thorp. It is a very reasonable surface and a very pleasant ride." I think they were bicycling. "Once away from Cle Elum and the highway, it was quiet and scenic as one parallels the river."

Another quote: "This is by far the most beautiful trails I have ever been on. I have
ridden it from North Bend to Thorp."

Again, these aren't people that live here; these are people that the tourist industry that -- they're not coming, again, for industry; they're coming to get away from industry.

One thing, too. In November 4th, 1999, I think they identified the John Wayne Trail as a state park or state trail. I discovered an article written in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer dated November 4th, 1999, and it says, "John Wayne...Trail designated" as "a national Millennium Legacy Trail," which is a very prestigious honor. And it goes clear -- it was nominated for that honor by Governor Locke, and it was approved by the White House Millennium's Program.

So what was interesting to me is our John Wayne Trail that we talk about all the time is recognized at very high levels in our government, including governors and presidents. So I love that that there is that recognition and that the value that it adds to what -- just putting these natural resources into perspective and the number of people that are interested in our natural resources.
The third point I wanted to make, and I know -- I guess you’ve heard many people talk about history repeating itself and the ugly power pole issue, and I am not going to come up and give you hearsay on that. I did manage to find research I believe -- please be patient -- I believe this is a relevant history lesson for you for the decision you have to make now.

Number one, with that history lesson, with these kind of processes, you’re never going to hear from that silent majority of people is out there, that they do have opinion. You’ll probably never hear from them through this process.

However, why this is a relevant point with these power pole issues, I’ll start in with the Daily Record and Monday, March 18th, 1996, front page. "Ugly, ugly, ugly." We’re talking about 12 power poles that were constructed that were 110 feet high. Okay?

Now, why are they calling them ugly, you know, why? Why "Ugly, ugly, ugly"? Let me just, again, from that same edition, "Part of the Ellensburg skyline, and especially the look of Central Washington University’s campus, are about
to be ruined forever by 12 huge steel poles that were put in place..."

It goes on to say, "The view of the Stuarts that is familiar to thousands of residents and non-residents has been marred." Go on to say, "Views of the campus and the Stuart range are probably not high priorities with the bean counters and contractors, but they are high priorities with the average citizen of this lovely valley..."

"The argument" -- here's my point -- "The argument that residents had plenty of time to object to the poles during the environmental review period is irrelevant. No one could have read the plans and envisioned how ugly these poles" would be.

Now, that particular publication, there's many more there; I just didn't want to take the time to try to find them. But what I did find, too, is in the Colombian in Vancouver, Washington, carried these articles. So we're talking about newspapers now far beyond us but were interested in this particular issue. And we're actually seeming to be an advocate for those protesters.
And let me quote from this particular edition. "Newly erected steel poles, towering 110 feet tall, have some residents of" the "college town furious," okay.

Other quotes: In a letter published to the Daily Record, the poles were described as a "desecration of our valley." We're talking about 12 poles. That project is far beyond the scope of 12 poles.

Another quote in this particular publication: "'Horror!' they wrote. 'It reminds us of the horror along I-90 between here and Cle Elum, where you top a ridge and see perhaps the most beautiful panorama in our state terribly blemished by huge power poles and lines.'" They're talking about those transmission lines, of course.

Another publication of the Colombian, dated April 21st.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me, is this --

Right here.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm sorry. Is this basically another article on the same --

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could we just simply --

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Point made.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Our typist is -- her fingers are starting to get --

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: I'm sorry --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Go ahead and finish up if you don't mind, though, please.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: One quick thing here Because of this, again, residents didn't speak out during these kind of processes. In fact, I was there, I worked with the project manager, Dick Brown. When the first committee like this was set up, three people showed up. Okay? 3000 signatures, once they were constructed, went -- came forward.

Again, my point is, you're not hearing from the majority here on industrial-size projects like this.

My last point I wanted to make that was not included in the EIS that I could see was I discovered, you know, it's -- directly borders the Swauk Creek, and I thought, well, that used to be the Taneum ranch, and I wasn't sure what it was called, so I did a web search on just Swauk Creek in Ellensburg. What I found was a thousand
acres of Swauk Creek valley are protected by an international nature conservancy. So this particular project directly borders this nature conservancy. And again, it's clearly Swauk Creek valley between Cle Elum and Ellensburg.

I would encourage you perhaps to consider that issue or it should maybe be addressed at some point in your study or their study, the impact to an international nature conservancy.

I guess in closing -- sorry to be so long; I'm really sorry. Because I've worked with project managers on multi-million-dollar projects, the scope of this, again, someone else made the reference, and I do encourage you as well, this to me looks like Phase 1 of the project. And you do need to be sure that if there was a Phase 2, have you clearly opened the door so that there's no process for a Phase 2; and if you do open that door to them, be sure that there's a clear process of what you do.

And again, I know you're just making your recommendation to the governor, but I highly encourage you, the residents of this valley are impacted. There's millions of King County and other residents of this state that will be
impacted by this decision and this recommendation that you make. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any questions? No.

Did you get an opportunity to say everything you wanted to say? I didn't mean to cut you short.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: No, did I talk -- sorry.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. We have about an hour, approximately an hour yet to go, so I think we'll have about a ten-minute break now and run maybe to 10:00, 10:15 or so.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BLACK: It must be about 9:15?

MR. PIERCY: 9:23.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Nine --

MR. PIERCY: 9:23.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: 9:23. We'd like to run possibly another hour, but before we do that, could we get a show of hands of how many still in the audience that wish to testify.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Well that, solves that problem. We will be looking at tomorrow evening, I'm sure.
So Chairman Bowen, are you --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Let's continue. And I just -- we've done really well on our -- kind of getting our points out there and being concise; and if we can continue to do that for everybody, that would be great. That way we can guarantee we can get done tomorrow night as well. So don't want to cut anybody off or --

We don't want to cut people off or anything, but let's try and go ahead and be precise in what it is we're trying to get across. So hand us any hard copies that you have and we'll all read the record, so.

Encourage you to do what you can to make sure we get the information but to be precise in your comments. Appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would second that also. I think it's important that we get all the testimony from both sides and we, we really don't want to cut anyone off, we don't want to set a time limit; but looking at the number of hands, if we could speed the operation up a little bit, it might be helpful.

In any event, let's go to the next person.

MS. BARRET: Bernice Best.
MS. BERNICE BEST: Good evening. My name is Bernice Best. My family and I reside at 210 Tomahawk Lane. That is in the Green Canyon area, the northeast corner of the boundary of the proposed project. I represent myself and my husband, my grandson, and my son, and the Rock 'N' Tomahawk Ranch.

We purchased our property in 1988, moved over to the Valley in 1990. And until he was injured on the job, my husband commuted back and forth. My son still commutes to Seattle to work in order to maintain the type of living that we want to live, away from people. Not that I don't like people; it's just that I don't want to live close to them.

But a couple things I want into the record. I overheard a conversation last night, a person saying that people that are in favor of wind farms must have property or tend to have a monetary value for wind farms on their property. That's not the case with us. We anticipate no revenue from a wind machine on our property. And we still like them.

The other comment that was made was that people that were in favor of wind farms were
crazy. I have not been certified as crazy, so I’ll let that stand there.

We did, when we purchased our property, try to make it a paying operation. Went through the conditional use permit recommended for guided horse ride business as well as a Native American campground. The campground didn’t get off the ground. We operated with the horse rides for seven years. Right now the only income we’ve got coming off the land is my blue agate rock permits, which I just about pay property tax with what I make off of that.

That said, my talk tonight is mainly about the scenic views and the way I see and feel about the views that are there. And "scenic view," a term quite often used in the real estate industry and by persons determined to hinder or stop projects they’re opposed to, this term is often used by the persons opposed to the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

And what is a scenic view? My -- I think my Merriam-Webster dictionary’s just a little bit older than the young lady before me. It does not have that combination of words. But it does have "scenic" and it does have "view." And "scenic"
is defined as a view or picturesque view of a landscape. And "view" is a sight, as of a landscape, regarded for its pictorial quality. I love pictures of wind machines, so there you go. It's really -- again, it's in the eyes of the beholder.

When the first humans set foot in the Kittitas Valley, the view was a landscape with no sign of human activity. Certainly much different from what it currently is. The first changes were subtle and gradual. Then our European ancestors arrived on the scene, causing dramatic changes in the view. In the 1900s the scene began to change much faster, to what it currently is.

That being said, let's look at the current view in the area of concern. Not withstanding the rolling hills, valleys, flora, fauna, and of course the beautiful Stuart mountain range -- visible to some; I'm too close to that range, I don't see it, only when I'm coming home from town -- that view also includes six large sets of high voltage transmission lines; several power lines running in many directions; fences, many in dire need of repair; numerous roads and many
buildings and homes, some of which have huge lights that are left on all night. I'm not quite sure just what part of that view these people are concerned about being obstructed.

With the setback, very little of the landscape would be obscured from view, though I wonder just how much time is actually being spent sitting around looking at the scenic view.

With the project being proposed to occupy approximately 6000 acres, the vastness of the land would most certainly diminish the size of the turbines, thereby lessening the impact on the view, while adding, in my opinion, another interesting feature to it. I feel the possibility of increasing tourism is very likely, as people actually are interested in wind machines and the production of clean energy.

We can never go back to what the Kittitas Valley once was. We should be thankful that our valley homes and land are not covered with water to meet the demand of the electrical power, which has been the case in other areas in the past.

The sacrifice of some scenic view is nothing compared to what others have given up for the common good. The need for the electrical power
will increase as the population in the Pacific Northwest, including the Kittitas Valley, continues to expand. We need to be ready to meet that need with a variety of power sources.

As for the loss of property values, there's no proof of long-term loss of property values. That is an assumption based on speculation and not fact. Scenic views are just one of the many requirements used to set property values by the tax assessor's office, if it exists, be sure that property and tax values will increase accordingly.

I personally feel that persons worried about property values decreasing are not really interested in the Kittitas Valley; rather, they are interested in the resale value of their property so they can profit, which is not necessarily a bad thing, and move on.

And I do want to mention there was talk about sales of property there. We purchased quite a bit of property, have sold some to partners at one time. The first of last year we had over 200 acres. We sold an 80-acre parcel. We paid $20,000 for that acre -- that 80 acres. We sold it for 65,000 cash. And I made very sure
that these people knew about the wind machines.
They were not concerned. They bought it anyhow.
It's for recreation. They have horses, and the
wind machines didn't bother them at all.

Thank you very much for your time and this
opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

COMMISSIONER McCLEIN: Can I --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER McCLEIN: Thank you.

Can you tell me a little bit about the
characteristics of the area, and what have you
seen in terms of development in the area?

MS. BERNICE BEST: There's some building,
there are two permanent -- one permanent home and
a summer cabin straight up above us. We're there
full-time. There's one person that's at the end
of the upper Green Canyon Road that has a ranch
there, 50 acres.

Straight up where Green Canyon Road ends
there's the Green Canyon Ranch, which is used
strictly as recreation property. It has a huge
house and barns and everything else. And it's
just recreation; they don't live there full-time.

There's two other houses along the property
on upper Green Canyon Road. And then right up on
Green Canyon and Reecer there's a home, and then
there's several homes on the Reecer Creek side in
that area.

There are a few recreational spots for
trailers and things, where people come up now and
then. So that's just on my side right there. So
I'm -- I don't get over the hill much to see
what's on the other side. Okay?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Helen Wise.

MS. HELEN WISE: My name is Helen Wise. I
live at 1106 East Third Avenue in Ellensburg.
I'm here for myself and for the generations to
come. And there's several of them already here.

I came here in 1953. Next summer I will
have been here 53 years. And let me tell you, I
have seen some changes; and you have no idea, if
you haven't lived here that long, how much
different it is. It's a beautiful valley. It's
never going to be other than a beautiful,
beautiful valley.

As you are listening to us as we make our
comments and then make your deliberations and
recommendations later, I urge you to be
objective. Whether a person thinks a wind turbine is a work of art or not is really a subjective matter. And it should not be a part of this deliberation and decision.

I think they're beautiful. Lots of people that I know think they're beautiful. They're graceful, and they don't -- the turbines -- or the blades don't go around rapidly. When you're watching them it's almost a soothing, hypnotic effect. And I've been at the base of turbines. You can stand there and talk and be heard by your companion. Anyway, beauty is, as has been said many times tonight, beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Now, as I say, I love the looks of these, the gracefulness and all that. But I would not stand here and ask you to allow these turbines for the wind farm to be put out there just so I could enjoy them, could enjoy their gracefulness and all that. It seems that it should work both ways. The decision should not be made on whether I like to look at them or somebody else doesn't like to look at these -- at the turbines.

I haven't really heard much about anything but what is happening now. This is, as they used
to say, bigger than both of us. We have to look to the future, and that's why I say I'm concerned about this project as it relates to the future of this community, this valley, this state, this region. In fact, the whole world.

On a national and international level, the clean generation of electricity is necessary to help reduce the emission of gases that lead to global warming. And that we're really seeing the effects of it, and you can't just turn that off, but you can slow down the increase of global warming.

As a renewable resource, wind energy helps free us from dependence on the more finite -- the finite fuels: coal, oil, gas. On the local level and on the state levels, wind projects bring jobs, income from land leases, economic development, and state and local taxes.

Directly and indirectly Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project means benefits to all of us, whether you like to look at them or not.

The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project addendum to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, which includes a
representative from our county. It's not just that we're out of this altogether. It includes that representative, it -- as well as representatives from four Washington state departments and one state commission, plus a chairman.

Every effort has been made to address the concerns expressed in both written and oral comments presented at public hearings held here in Ellensburg, and including the reduction of the number of turbines by almost 50 percent.

The spokesman for the Residents Against Kittitas Turbines is quoted in the January 7th Daily Record as saying, "Our main issue, as it always has been, is that this is an inappropriate site for an industrial wind farm, whether it has 20 or 200 turbines."

Now, before considering whether the site is appropriate, note that Chapter 6 in the Comprehensive Plan -- it's Utilities -- and it says in its definition of utilities, the supply and treatment and distribution of electricity, among a number of other utilities. Such utilities consist of both the service activity along with the physical facilities necessary.
So it's been referred to as industrial. The Comprehensive Plan refers to this as utilities. And it's there in Chapter 6.

So we look at the -- I've lost my spot. Anyway, we're looking at Chapter 6. And there are goals and they're called GPOs: goals, policies, and objectives.

If you want to determine whether the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is sited appropriately from the standpoint of the Comprehensive Plan, turn to Page 3-13 of the addendum. It's an attachment on the letter I just gave you.

I have reviewed all 34 of the GPOs of that chapter and not found any that would declare construction of the project on the proposed site inappropriate. Indeed, these GPOs support the project and outline the process for permitting.

In the proposed Draft Environmental Impact Statement it was pointed out by EFSEC that it remains inconsistent with the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan until it submits its application for a change, for the land use consistency.

The first GPO in Chapter 6, the first goal
is, "Additions to and improvements of utilities facilities will be allowed to occur at a time and in a manner sufficient to serve growth." Growth is coming; there's no doubt about that.

The process, the second -- 6.9 says, Process, permits, and approval for all utility facilities -- oh, excuse me, "Process permits and approvals for all utility facilities in a fair and timely manner, and in accordance with development regulations that ensure predictability and project concurrency."

GPO 6.18: "Decisions made" -- "Decisions made regarding utility facilities should be consistent with and complementary to regional demand and resources and should reinforce an interconnected regional distribution network."

The proposed project would significantly reinforce an interconnected regional power transmission and distribution network by connecting the Puget Sound Energy's and Bonneville Power Administration's power grid.

The GPO 6.34: "Wind farms may only be located in areas designated as Wind Farm Resource overlay districts in the Comprehensive Plan. Such Wind Farm Resource overlay districts need
not be designated as Major Industrial
Developments..."

That -- such a designation requires that the
applicant seek a subarea Comprehensive Plan
amendment, which is what we're all about. The
docketing application for a Comprehensive Plan
amendment was submitted October 17th, 2005, along
with the request for rezone.

Then -- so there's a process there, and we
are in the midst of -- hopefully toward the end
of that process.

As you will find on Page 3-14 of the
addendum, and that's the attachment, these are
GPOs from Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan.
It's on densities and uses of rural lands, and
they are quoted here.

GPO 8.5: "Kittitas County recognizes and
agrees with the need for continued diversity in
densities and uses in rural lands." This project
will not change densities in the rural lands. It
will not change or preclude the existing open
space and the agricultural uses. It will help
diversify the county's rural economy.

GPO 8.9 says, "Projects or developments
which result in the significant conservation of
rural lands or rural character will be encouraged." This project is compatible with traditional rural land use and is an alternative to the development of residential subdivisions or other uses which do not preserve or encourage rural land conservation.

GFO 8.11 says, "Existing and traditional uses should be protected and supported..."

Traditionally this project area and surrounding lands have been used for cattle grazing and recreation, which are compatible with this project. Generations of electricity using wind power is a relatively new rural land use which generates revenues to the landowners and the public through the taxes and royalties paid.

So this is a Comprehensive Plan; these are goals, and they're policies and they're objectives. The Comprehensive Plan, as you well know, is not something that is just pulled out of thin air. You've worked enough with these things to know that it was really a lot of people with concerns for the community for the valley, for all of us who put this together. I think that you should keep these things very much in mind.

The remaining requirement for EFSEC approval
of the project is that the project be consistent with the current -- the current county zoning code. Sagebrush Power Partners has submitted the required applications with Kittitas County to become consistent with that code.

I urge you to recommend the approval of the application for the Comprehensive Plan amendment as submitted on October 17th, 2005, for a Wind Farm Resource overlay along with the request for rezone. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very much.

MS. BARRET: Gloria Baldi?

MR. JAMES CARMODY: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible if there are people who can't be here tomorrow night that they could possibly be given an opportunity to speak tonight?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: We tried that last night and it didn't work very well, so I'm sorry, I think that we should just stay with the order that we are at the present time.

Go ahead.

MS. GLORIA BALDI: Commissioners, my name is Gloria Baldi. I'm representing Kittitas Audubon, an organization with about 130 members in the
Kittitas County.

More than three and a half years ago when Zilkha -- now Horizon Wind Energy -- was beginning to introduce its wind power project to valley residents, Zilkha was find enough to meet with Kittitas Audubon to represent its bird research.

At that time we questioned procedures involving observations over short amounts of time for a period of just one year. But we were informed that that was the accepted protocol.

From that original meeting and more strongly now, Kittitas has continued to state that we feel the studies are incomplete and therefore inadequate. With the newness of wind power development, the lethal effects are just beginning to be realized to the birds and bats, the latter which were not even considered at that time.

The area of this project is a bird migration flyway. Each year in the spring and the fall, birds -- including many raptors, which are hawks -- funnel up or down, depending on the season, and they funnel up and down the canyons and over the ridges in the area of this proposed
project. No other wind power project is located on such a bird migratory flyway.

Additionally, no night studies have been performed to determine the effects on bats or the birds migrating at higher altitudes. Milton-Freewater Wind Power Project was very surprised that they found that they had more bat kills than they had bird kills. And as I say, this is brand-new research that was not even known at the beginning of this project.

Our concerns remain for the wildlife impacts; and now after more than three years of expressing our reservations, these same concerns are being expressed by others. Most recently the Government Accounting Office, the GAO. And the GAO-05-906 Report on Wind Power Impacts on Wildlife and Government Responsibilities for Regulating Development and Protecting Wildlife reflected these same concerns. Our letter to the planning office gives the website address for this report.

And the following are some quotes that are reflected in this report. No. 1 -- and this is all quoted -- "Once thought to have practically no adverse environmental effects, it is now
recognized that wind power facilities can have adverse effects, particularly on wildlife and most significantly on birds and bats."

No. 2: "Large numbers of birds and bats are believed to follow and cross through many parts of the United States, including along mountain ridges, during seasonal migration. Consequently wind power projects located in these areas could potentially impact these species." A perfect example is this project.

No. 3: "...there is a shortage of information on migratory bird routes and bat behavior as well as ways in which topography, weather and turbine type affect mortality."

No. 4: "...studies conducted at one location can rarely be used to extrapolate potential impacts or mitigation effectiveness at other locations..."

"It appears" --

And No. 5: "It appears" that new -- "when new wind power facilities are permitted" -- if "It appears when new wind power facilities are permitted, no one is considering the impacts of wind power on a regional or 'ecosystem' scale that often spans governmental jurisdictions."
Kittitas Audubon has spoken to these concerns on every proposed wind farm, and although we support renewable energy, we believe the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is a migratory flyway and is not in the best interests of wildlife and the citizen of Kittitas County, and we strongly recommend that you deny this project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Jeb Baldi?

Wayne Bell?

Barbara Bell?

J.P. Roan?

Paul Peshusta?

James Carmody.

MR. JAMES CARMODY: Sometimes you get lucky, huh.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Better to be lucky than good.

MR. JAMES CARMODY: For the record, my name is James Carmody. My address is 405 East Lincoln. I'm here representing the Residents Opposed to Kittitas Turbines.

We've been at this a long time. I was here
during the initial Comprehensive Plan adoptions
in the initial Zilkha project. I’ve been
involved in the original Kittitas Valley project.
I’ve been involved in the litigation appeals on
the EnXco Desert Claim project through successful
proceedings before Judge Cooper. And I’m here
again. And it’s always challenging and it’s
always a challenge.

I want to start off by supporting the
comments made by your planning director,
Mr. Piercy, yesterday with respect to
environmental review.

The public has not had an opportunity to
comment upon the addendum that’s been presented.
EFSEC is the lead agency. That element of
evidence hasn’t been developed for you and isn’t
before you, and the public has not had an
opportunity to proceed on that basis.

I was also frustrated last night with three
hours of testimony from Horizon -- I keep wanting
to call them Zilkha -- with materials that none
of us have seen. Experts that have been flown in
from everywhere and exited without opportunities
for cross-examination or comment.

What I would ask for you is that the public
and the community be given an opportunity to
review those materials and that testimony within
a reasonable period of time and provide comment
to you before you enter into deliberations.

Now, there are a few comments that I want to
make, and I'm going to try to move forward so
others can speak. But the project itself I think
has been lost in what you've been reviewing.
We've seen nice distant pictures of painted-in
turbines. And I think it's important to keep in
mind exactly what's being proposed here.

The turbines being proposed are 410 feet
tall. That's a 40-story building. The rotor on
the top is the same size as a Boeing 747. So you
are going to have eighty 747s spinning in the
wind in this area. They are massive. They are
huge. They're not little pencils painted in on
pictures, but they are gigantic, huge pieces of
equipment.

But there's a lot more to the project than
that. There's 13 miles of new roads being
proposed. There's improvements to seven miles of
existing roads. There are 23 miles of
underground electrical power lines. Two miles of
overhead electrical power lines. Two
substations. One 5000-square-foot operation and maintenance facility, and up to nine additional permanent meteorological towers. That's the project. And that's what's being introduced into this rural environment. And that's why people are concerned.

That was exactly the kind of concept that was dealt with in Desert Claim, and this is an even more intrusive and a more sensitive environment than that was.

One of the things that's been confusing tonight and I think confusing in this process is exactly what is the proposal in terms of numbers of turbines. If you look at that, that's what they're telling you is the project -- there's 65 turbines identified on that. In the materials that you have there are 64 turbines identified.

But in their submissions, they're saying their project is 80 turbines. They haven't given you a site plan, they haven't given you a diagram, they haven't shown you a thing as to 80 turbines. 16 more turbines.

The addendum to the Draft EIS also says that with their DAA, the application, applicant now brings forward a range -- the range of the middle
to lower end scenario as that most probably to be constructed. In the DEIS there are three ranges: low, medium, high. The lowest is one up to 82.

It goes on, says, Regardless of whether the middle or lower end scenario is chosen, the project would consist of no more than 80 turbines.

If you're going to evaluate it, you need 80 turbines. You don't have it on this map.

They go on to say that the turbine lines that are shown there with the "X"s remain in place; they just reduced the density.

On Page 2.4 of the DEIS it says up to 80 turbines would be arranged in numerous strings and labeled A through J throughout the project site for a maximum of 23 total miles of turbine strings. The length of the nine turbine strings would remain constant under the three project scenarios. Only density of the turbines sited with each string would change.

So those nine strings remain intact the full distance. The only thing that changes is a density.

You don't have a specific proposal. What they propose to you is a nameplate capacity with
a maximum of 80 machines. The siting, the
locations, all of those things are for later
terms.

Now, let me put in it perspective. Mr. Peck
is involved in Klickitat County. I represented a
wind developer in Klickitat County, Windtricity.
We proposed a project with identical machines,
virtually identical size, and had it approved in
Klickitat County. Interestingly, in contrast to
this, in contrast to this, not one neighbor
showed up for the hearings.

And that gets to the point of what you have
to decide, what your Comprehensive Plan puts in
place. It's a locational chase. This isn't
about whether wind farms are good, wind energy is
good, renewable energy is good; everyone would
agree to that.

But locational choices are what this is all
about. You made that locational choice at Wild
Horse, and I believe that was a correct
locational choice. You denied it at Desert
Claim, and I believe that was appropriate.

And one of the things that you denied it on
at Desert Claim was aesthetic impacts, the
interrelationship with existing residential uses
and occupancies and the huge size and magnitude of this project. And that EIS said those were unavoidable impacts.

Interestingly, the DEIS in this case has exactly the same finding. 3-28 of the addendum says the revised KVWPP layout will not create additional adverse impacts to visual resources. With the proposed layout, the KVWPP will have less impact on the visual resources than before.

And then it goes on to say, But those that exist even on a reduced basis are unavoidable, adverse impacts.

That's your environmental determination. That was one of the bases for denial on Desert Claim in terms of consistency. That same ruling and determination should apply in this case.

You've heard a lot about shadow flicker, noise. The comments, Mr. Williamson, that you made were exactly appropriate. There are methodologies. And you can take a noise source and you can reduce it simply by distance.

One of the problems you have here with noise is you have no way to mitigate that other than distance. You can't build a wall. Noise'll go straight. If you've got it coming from up here
down, you can't build walls, you can't build barriers; trees don't do anything.

And that formula can be -- can be put together; and with some opportunity, we could provide that information to you along with the people at the university. But it won't mitigate in that area.

The comments earlier on noise about the doubling with each 10 dB increase is absolutely right. Years ago we did the gravel mine on the top of Horse Canyon, and some of you'll recall the noise studies that were done there.

The ambient -- the ambient noise levels measured at that time were in the upper 40s range. Every 10-dB increase over that doubles it, so going from 48 to 58 is a doubling of noise. 58 to 68 is another doubling. So it's an exponential function.

Just think what you get in terms of noise increase when you get up to 108 dBA, which is what we're starting with on this project.

That information can be developed. There's also information in the Desert Claim EIS, which Mr. Piercy urged you to review.

I'm not going to go through the shadow
flicker. I want to talk about a couple other quick points. I thought one of the more interesting comments from the experts last night was on insurance. Because he told you on one that there's going to be no insurance claims or haven't been very many claims made, yet he also told you that FERC requires a minimum insurance level, $20 million.

Now, if these things aren't risky, if they don't pose liability potentials, if there's not a problem with them, why in the world are you having a $20 million minimum insurance policy required?

And the reason is because they have major potentials to create problems. Your record is filled with that throughout.

There's been talk to you about all the money that's going to be generated to the county and the comments on sales tax. But more importantly, the money isn't site-specific-driven. That money will come with a properly located wind farm in this community. It doesn't go away; you get it with Wild Horse. You can get it in Vantage.

So it's not a choice of saying "I'm turning away those dollars." Those dollars exist on a
project-specific locational basis. So that's --
that's a misnomer and misleading.

You're not getting anything on employment on
this thing. What is it, three, four, five people
at most employed?

The final thing I want to take and make a
comment on, as someone said, you know, you don't
need a Ph.D. in common sense. And this is pretty
common sense, pretty straightforward, pretty
simple, in my mind. I did grow up here. I know
it always bothered my dad when he sat in your
shoes and people from out of town came and said,
Yeah, I understand Kittitas Valley because I used
to live here and that.

But I grew up here, my family's here. It's
a special place, it's a special valley. And no
matter how you cut it, you put in eighty 40-story
turbines in that court, you're gutting the core
of this valley.

Think about -- what do you think about the
hills around Kennewick when you look up on the
turbines? Do you think they're nice hills, do
you enjoy that, or do you just, jeez, there's
turbines there. Or going to Walla Walla or other
places. That becomes the mind-set.
You have something special to preserve. You have done something special in this community, in this valley, with Suncadia. There's a reason people like this, there's a reason people come here to live, there's a reason for that environment.

And that's what's preserved; that's the world component that you preserve, in my judgment, not wind farms. And preserve that for the people, preserve that for posterity. How many times have we heard: I'm the third or fourth generation here? Let that -- let that carry through. Give that opportunity and preserve that sort of special corridor.

I think Steve Lathrop made a comment, I think one of the earlier times when we were here, about the county logo and what it's a picture of. It's the Stuart range. I urge you to protect it. There's a place for wind farms. There's plenty of opportunities here. Believe it or not, this is not the only place in the world the wind blows. It blows in Klickitat County, it blows in Benton County, it blows in Franklin County, it blows in Walla Walla County. And it blows here. But do it in the right way.
I appreciate all the time that you've taken on this and urge you, please, to reject this particular project. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very much.

10:15.

MS. BARRET: One more? Okay. I did miss Jeb Baldi, pardon me.

MR. JEB BALDI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: 10:15. Do we want to go longer?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Let's go ahead, take Jeb, see where we're at when he's done.

MR. JEB BALDI: Thank you. My name is Jeb Baldi, and I live here in town.

I'd like to -- the following questions for both the commissioners and the Planning Commission, I'd like to you answer these questions to yourself and take a minute of consideration when you're making your determination on the Horizon Wind Energy proposal along Highway 97.

The first question is, why do we have to sacrifice our landscape for the more populated areas of Washington? Wind development farms
could just as well be placed along the shores of Puget Sound as in this valley. And without the cost of transmission lines.

Why must we keep finding the wind farm corporations time and time again when the majority of the landowners in this valley don’t want these monstrous machines?

Why must we continue to listen to these out-of-state developers that plan to spoil our quality of life? Tax incentives allow them to build and to leave with their pockets full of money.

Very few people in this valley will benefit financially, while all the others will lose their viewscape.

Why not consider conservation? Projections for all the proposed wind developments in Kittitas County will produce about 1 percent of the state’s energy needs. With incentives on conservation, 1 percent could easily be obtained and would not spoil our beautiful valley.

As just mentioned before me, we are not the only place in this state or in this nation that has wind. Washington state doesn’t show up on the top 15 windiest places in the nation.
Every six months or so we come to the fairgrounds, we sit for hours, we listen to the same material. Yes, the industry does send different players, and yes, we have different members on the county board from time to time. However, it's same hashing of the same materials over and over.

The developers have the most to gain, the local community has the most to lose. Each and every hearing the majority oppose wind development. But we are forced to keep coming back. What happened to democracy?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very much.

It's 10:20.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Do you want to wrap it up for today?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think we should. I apologize to those that are out in the audience. I hope you can all attend the next meeting, but it's starting to get pretty late.

So I would entertain a motion to continue this meeting until tomorrow evening, 6:30 in this building.
COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: So moved.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's been moved and seconded that we continue this public hearing until tomorrow, 6:30 p.m. , July -- January -- that's a long time. A long, long time.

January 12th. 6:30, this room. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER HARRIS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PERNAA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I too vote aye.

Opposed?

Motion carries.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I would move to continue this public hearing to January 12th, 6:30 p.m., here at the Kittitas County Events Center, Home Arts building. The record will remain open to both verbal and written testimony.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's been moved and seconded to continue this public hearing to January 12th, 6:30 p.m., here in the Kittitas
Any discussion to the motion?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was pointed out last night that there may be a conflicting event in the city with the City of Ellensburg Comp Plan review tomorrow night. That's something we should take into consideration.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That was brought up by someone who I believe testified here this evening. I didn't hear any other comments on that. I don't know if Commissioner Huston has any feedback on that or direction.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: The list of conflicts is endless; I suggest we forge ahead.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any further discussion regarding that?

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

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Aye.

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

(The proceeding was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.)
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