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

Others: Julie Kjorsvik, Clerk of the Board; Joanna Valencia, Staff Planner; James Hurson, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor; Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services; a Court Reporter and approximately 150 members of the public.

At approximately 6:00 p.m. CHAIRMAN BOWEN opened the continued public hearing to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. He noted that staff had provided the Board copies of the Planning Commission recommendations, findings and citizen comments. He reviewed the hearing process and noted public comments would be limited to 5 minutes each.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN, VICE-CHAIRMAN CRANKOVICH and COMMISSIONER HUSTON gave declarations. No one objected and all Board members remained seated.

HAL LINDSTROM questioned the process of citizens telling a Commissioner in passing, if they supported the project or not. CHAIRMAN BOWEN did not feel it had any more influence than some one else and that it didn’t take the place of testimony during a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN AND COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH outlined issues they would like to have addressed by the Proponent.

PROONENT DANA PECK, PROJECT MANAGER, REPRESENTING HORIZON WIND asked for a five minute recess to discuss the issues brought up by the Board.

Meeting recessed at 6:21 p.m. Meeting reconvened at 6:29 p.m.

JOANNA VALENCIA, STAFF PLANNER gave a brief staff report on the Planning Commissions findings and recommendation of denial of the project. DARRYL PIERCY, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES said advertisements that were in the newspaper would be obtained to be included in the record.

DANA PECK, PROJECT MANAGER and ERIN ANDERSON, ATTORNEY representing Horizon Wind gave remarks and comments on the proposal.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH moved to continue the public hearing to Thursday March 30, 2006 at 6:00 p.m. in the Home Arts Building at the Kittitas County Fairgrounds. COMMISSIONER HUSTON seconded. Motion carried 3-0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Louise Genson</td>
<td>Letter with various attachments</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
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<td>David Crane</td>
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<td>23</td>
<td>Linda Schantz</td>
<td>Letter (email) opposing project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Michael Genson</td>
<td>Letter in support of property</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gloria Lindstrom</td>
<td>Letter against proposal</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hal Lindstrom</td>
<td>Photo of Windfall from the Wind Farm</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Phyllis Whitbeck</td>
<td>Letter with comments on project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Noel Andrew</td>
<td>Letter &amp; drawing of wind project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Roger Bennet</td>
<td>Letter opposing project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Helen Wise</td>
<td>Findings from Planning Commission</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ken Fyall</td>
<td>Letter opposing project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Joseph Powell</td>
<td>Letter opposing project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christine Cole</td>
<td>Letter opposing project with attached newspaper advertisements</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gloria Baldi</td>
<td>Letter representing the Kittitas Audubon on proposed project &amp; copy of Bat Conservation International article</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Robert Keller</td>
<td>Wild Horse Project benefits</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Diane Schwab</td>
<td>Letter opposing project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jeb Baldi</td>
<td>Letter commenting on project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>William Erickson</td>
<td>Letter opposing project &amp; Advertisement for Business for Sale – Rodent Repellent Strobe Light</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Scott Nicolai</td>
<td>Time Magazine Cover Story – 3/28/06</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Milton Johnston</td>
<td>Letter in support of project</td>
<td>03-26-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Neal Houser</td>
<td>Letter in opposition of project</td>
<td>03-29-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMISSIONER DAVID BOWEN, Chairman
COMMISSIONER ALAN CRANKOVICH
COMMISSIONER PERRY HUSTON
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It is Wednesday, March 29th, 2006, 6:00 p.m. We're here in the Kittitas County Fairgrounds Home Arts Building. We're here for the purposes of continued public hearing 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 the site located approximately 12 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg.

I'll go through currently what we have in our possession up here. We do have the Planning Commission findings, the deliberations transcript, all e-mails, and I've lost my sound. Is it back?

(Pause in the proceedings.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, within the record we have all e-mails, letters, telephone calls; they've been forwarded to CDS as part of the record before us.

The record is still open to written and verbal comment. And we did receive a stack of additional comments today which we haven't had an
I'm going to go over how the evening will go, and then we'll get into our declaration.

First of all, I'd like everybody to check their cell phones and please turn the ringers off, put them on vibrate, silent, turn them off, whatever you need to do.

We'll have our declarations. We'll have a staff report. And actually before the staff report, I think I want to interject some -- I have about four items that didn't come out of the record that I'd like the public to comment on, the proponent to comment on, and staff to comment on. I'll also give my seatmates an opportunity to throw anything out that they feel specifically needs some additional information for us to make a good decision up here.

Once we do that, we'll go to a staff report. The proponent indicated that they have a 15- to 20-minute opening presentation regarding the Planning Commission deliberations. That could go a little longer, depending on the feedback they get from us and questions we may have for them.
I will be -- once that's done, the public comment will open, and tonight I am going to put a five-minute limit on public comment so that we can try and focus and be precise about the issues that are before us. And we'll give the proponent an opportunity to respond to that public comment. Any staff comments and questions from the Board. And at some point in time, whether it's tonight or some other night, we'll go into board deliberations.

So with that, declarations from myself, I obviously drive around and I hear radio advertisements, and newspaper ads are in the paper. Normally when the radio comes on, I turn the station or turn it off. Newspaper ads, tend to glance over them and not read them until they actually are officially in the record in front of me.

Any e-mails I receive I forward to staff over at CDS for inclusion in the record and then read them as they come back from CDS as part of the official record. Same thing with any letters to the editor, that type of thing; I wait until
they come to me in the official record as well.

I've had a couple of conversations with Deputy Prosecutor Hurson regarding process and what I can and can't do up here as a commissioner regarding asking questions and giving direction. I've also spoken with Director Piercy from CDS, asked him for some information specifically regarding setbacks that were in the record, and provided that for me earlier today.

And then I believe I had -- I had one conversation that I can specifically remember other than the occasional "I'm for" or "I'm against wind farms" in general out in the public, and one topic that came over lunch was with Ben George, and we were talking about process and then he threw in he understands making adjustments but overall approves of the project.

So that would be the limit of my declarations. So with that, is there anyone here who objects to my sitting in hearing on this particular issue?

Seeing no one objects, Commissioner Crankovich.
COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have reviewed the official record as it has been presented to us from staff. Today I did have two brief conversations about the process and procedures tonight with Deputy Prosecutor Hurson and Mr. Piercy. And although I've avoided the letters to the editor in the newspaper, it's kind of hard to avoid a half- to full-page ad, whether it be for or against, so I must say that I did read some of those. And the only actual conversation that I had was today, prior to a meeting on another subject, Mr. Ben George caught me and said that he could not attend tonight and wanted to go on record as supporting the project. And that's all I have to declare.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing those declarations, does anyone object to Commissioner Crankovich sitting in hearing on this issue?

Seeing no one in objection, Commissioner Huston.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I must have entered a
quiet time in my life, because I don't recall anybody asking me anything since we last met here. Ditto, we get the e-mails and whatnot; I don't open those. And if that upsets some of you, I'm sorry, but they're not opened, they're forwarded and put in the record and we see them in the hard copy when we come to the hearing.

I didn't read the ads, to be honest with you. I looked at them but I didn't read them. So I guess I have nothing to declare. I'm pretty much where I was last time.

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

Seeing no one --

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Certainly. Please come to the microphone.

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: My name is Hal Lindstrom. I just have a question about anybody coming to you and telling you that they are for or against the wind farm. Now, does that -- how does that play? That's not what I would do, and
I would --

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, if I might interrupt, the question was, do you object to my sitting. Are you objecting to my sitting?

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: No, I'm not.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Good enough. Then I'll let you talk to the chairman.

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: Excuse me. I'm just curious about the process. I mean, if I object or if I'm for, I'll write it or I'll come and testify. But does somebody -- what's going to happen to his recommendation? I guess that's my question.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: We give those declarations so the people are aware of the information we received besides what's in the record. Would I personally do that myself? No. Other people feel that's the only way they're going to get it through: If you don't hear it rather than read it, then you're not going to hear it. But does it have any more influence or standing than anybody else's? No, if that's the gist of your question.
MR. HAL LINDSTROM: Does that take the place of his coming here or writing? Can you tell me that?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It doesn't take the place, in my opinion. It's just if you're out and about in the community, as commissioners here we are very close to everybody. His communication with me was part of about nine different issues, and it came up and I didn't expect it to or I would have cut him off.

But I just can't say that -- I mean, I've heard it so I can't say that I don't acknowledge that now that I've heard but. But whether -- it doesn't carry any more weight or any less weight than any other comment I read in the record or anything else.

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Questions on those?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I'd like to add too that he caught me totally off guard today. He had his spiel blurted out before I could even shake my head that no, I don't want to hear it, so -- but it's not going to affect my decision
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Anything else on that? All right, thank you.

With that, I'll -- I think I already stated we would all remain seated, but I will state again for the record all commissioners will remain seated on this issue.

Okay, the next thing I'd like to do is, as I was reading through the record and thinking about the last projects that have been in front of us, I ended up with four issues that came out from public testimony, from the record in front, and just stuff from listening to the proponent.

And I'm trying to speak slowly; am I doing okay this time? I need to slow down some more, all right.

First of all, the DEIS has analyzed a map for 64 turbines. The proposal indicates up to 80. I personally need to know the specific number of turbines, their specific location, and which turbine the analysis was based upon, what megawatt or whatever the measurement is on those turbines.
The second issue, the sub-area boundary itself, the project has been significantly reduced in size compared to the original application, and I assume that was done based on a business plan and public opinion. Although the -- the number of turbines are reduced, the sub-area boundary remains the same, and I'd like some feedback from the proponent and the public on reducing the sub-area boundary to reflect the current proposal or a modified proposal, should one come forward.

The next item would be setbacks. And this is the one that has me bouncing all over the place. We've got -- setbacks are put in place for mitigation; I'll grant that and I think everybody'll agree with that.

A thousand-foot setback is proposed. I didn't find in the analysis or the DEIS regarding that particular distance. I'm a bit curious on if it was just an arbitrary number or if it was based on previous applications or what, where that number came from.
Section 3.8.3.1 of the Desert Claim Wind Power Project there's a correspondence from Zilkha regarding shadow flicker that indicates any receptor beyond 2000 feet would not be subject to shadow flicker, indicating that potentially that would be a -- a setback to consider.

Other analysis describes high impacts, mainly visual, from a half mile to one mile, which is 2640 feet to 5280 feet. Other information in the record indicates that those impacts begin to decrease beginning at a half mile to one mile and becoming moderate. I'd like to hear specific comment from the proponent and the public regarding that particular area.

There are very few comments about the Development Agreement itself. So if people have reviewed that Development Agreement and have some feedback on it, I would sure like to hear some more details and thoughts on it.

And the last two items as I was reading through, re-reading the testimony, one person referred to the towers being powered by diesel when the wind wasn't blowing, and I wasn't aware
of that anywhere, so if the proponent could
address that.

And then microwave interference was also
mentioned in one of the comments, and I don't
remember hearing much on that.

So with that -- that's trying to help you
guys give me some information that will help me
evaluate and make some decisions up here.

And with that, I'll see if Commissioner
Crankovich has anything he'd like to add.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I have a few
things that I'd like to add, and I will ask you
if it's appropriate --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear at all.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: There's a couple
things I'm going to ask, and I may turn to you to
see if it's appropriate at this time or not.

One of the things that has been said about
this project, and it's located -- and I don't
have the exact page here, where it was described
that it -- the project is located where its
viewscape is dominated by large electrical

transmission corridor facilities.
Now, I haven't seen anywhere in public comment or by the proponent or those against it that have gone on record saying that with the exception of possibly a few landowners that those transmission towers were there prior to most of the people purchasing the property in that area. So that's one point that I think that hasn't been addressed, you know. And the proponent is asking to add to that viewscape, I guess, or change it. That's just for an editorial comment, I guess.

I have gone over the Draft Development Agreement, and under the section regarding the project access roads; and it says that the accesses from Highways 10 and 97 shall be constructed with slope and culvert design according to WSDOT. And that any of the access roads off of the county roads of Bettis Road and Hayward Road would be reconstructed to the county standards.

Having pretty sound knowledge of both of them roads, I would suggest that we add, if appropriate, into the requirements of the Development Agreement that both Bettis Road and Hayward Road be constructed totally. Hayward
Road is very -- it's classified as primitive, and I know that that's not the exact classification as it is called now, but it's a primitive road. Bettis Road, I do have a lot of knowledge on that, and even though it's been chip sealed and worked on within the last couple of years, I have seen it over the course of my time with the County deteriorate very fast; and any -- any heavy use of that road is going to lead to an extreme deterioration.

I would like to see those reconstructed as part of the project, you know, whether it be prior to or after, as a condition.

The Elk Springs Road I am not familiar with, so I can't speak to the condition, but I would -- I would possibly consider that being reconstructed the same. You know, you're entering an area where people live and use that as their main ingress and egress, and I think it should be built appropriately.

Also, in -- a couple of the things that have been the real focus of this particular project are on the view and the, you know, if the towers are built, they will definitely have an effect on the view. So, you know, those can only be
mitigated so far.

The other big thing that I see is property values and the concern of the effect on property values. And so using a study that was done regarding property values in EgoNorth -- EcoNorthwest -- I believe it is here -- on property value impacts, I highlighted some of the areas and I'll use those right now.

Lincoln, Minnesota, it said -- and this has to do with the location and proximity to the towns and homes and various things. Turbines are located about two miles outside of town. It doesn't say if there's anything any closer or not.

Buena Vista, Ohio, they're located a couple miles outside of town and sit on a high ridge. It doesn't say whether there's any homes any closer.

Howard, Texas, there are no homes within two miles of the wind turbines. And in Walla Walla County the turbines are on a high cliff that have a lot of wind and low land values, and the unincorporated town of Touchet lies eight miles from the turbine project.

In the next page, as part of a mitigation by
project proponents, and this has to do with Curran County, and I'll read it verbatim: In Curran County some residents located on rural properties complained about the plan to locate wind turbines near their properties. They argued that they had bought their properties with the expectation of a view of grazing land and not a wind farm. To solve the problem, the wind developer paid them for the property and the people moved. The wind developer then sold the property, although the property values did not decrease.

And all the things that are cited here cited no decrease in property values. So I don't know whether it would be appropriate right now or at some time, but I guess I would like to throw a consideration out there, and I used the chart that's in one of these booklets that outlines an area that encompasses a mile from the project boundaries.

I'm going to suggest, possibly, that if there is no concern about the property values that the proponent be willing to purchase the
properties for fair market value of anybody that
would be willing if the project were approved.

And Commissioner Bowen already brought up the
fact of the 64 turbine locations that are sited
on the project maps versus the 80. You know,
there's a -- quite a percentage number of
difference there from 64 to 80. And I realize
that, you know, in viewing the contents that it's
based upon what type of towers are going to be
used, but I would like to see more of the
specific -- specifics of what the project would
look like, you know, in number. And that's -- to
me that's almost too big of a variance to work
with. I'd like to see the numbers pinned down
more closely.

And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Commissioner
Huston, do you have anything you'd like to add or
specifically like more information on?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Actually,
Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I have any
observations at this time.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. I will add one
more to the setback, which has been bouncing in
my head, and that's in comparing the old strings
versus the new strings of proposed sitings of the
wind towers, I'd like to know if the applicant's

open to discussing the alignment of the towers
more centrally in the project area to address the
setback situation as well.

So with that, we will move on to the
proponent's presentation if they're ready to go.

MR. DANA PECK: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate
the opportunity to have this list as we go into
our presentation. Would it be possible to
have --

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, we need
him on the record, please.

MR. DANA PECK: Excellent point; sorry about
that.

Dana Peck, Horizon Wind. I believe my
address is on record, but I can give it to you if
you'd like.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Why don't we do that, just
to have a clear record.

MR. DANA PECK: 222 East 4th, Suite 105 in
Ellensburg, 98926. I'm the project manager for Horizon Wind Energy.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Is the microphone up high enough? You have to pretty much speak right into it.

MR. DANA PECK: Would you like me to do that over again?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's not necessary.

MR. DANA PECK: We very much appreciate the opportunity to have this list to incorporate into our presentation. It would be a huge help to us if we could have three or four minutes to just discuss among ourselves the specific responses.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That's fine with me, a five-minute recess to give him a chance, out of fairness. I realize we threw these at you, but given the public process we have, we couldn't really communicate those to you prior to this, so I want to --

MR. DANA PECK: No, we appreciate the opportunity to work off of this like this; we just need a couple of minutes to caucus among
ourselves to make sure that we give you the best answers.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Certainly. We'll take a break, then, until, looks like, 6:30. It's 6:25 right now.

MR. DANA PECK: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Mr. Piercy?

MR. DARRYL PIERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services. I'm going to call on Joanna Valencia, our staff planner, who has had the primary responsibility in the development of this project from the staff's perspective as well as the development of the record, to give a brief introduction as to why we're here and how we happened to get here in terms of this process and to give a history of that effort.

I would just like to add, though, before we go there that since we had disclosures in regards to the advertisements that appeared in local newspapers, we will obtain copies of those
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

MS. JOANNA VALENCIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, Joanna Valencia, Kittitas County Community Development Services staff planner. The applicant, Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC, is requesting approval to develop a proposed wind farm pursuant to the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. A complete application was filed with Kittitas County on October 14th, 2005.

Implementation of the proposal requires the following related actions by Kittitas County.

(A) An amendment to the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan to designate the approximately 6000-acre project area as a Wind Farm Resource overlay district pursuant to KCC 15B.03, which can be accomplished by adoption of a sub-area plan for the wind farm site.

(B) Zoning reclassification of the project area as a Wind Farm Resource overlay zoning district in conformance with the provisions of advertisements and place those in the record.
the Kittitas County County Code, Zoning Section 17.61A and KCC 17.98.

(C) Approval of a Wind Farm Resource development permit for the proposal.

And (D) The adoption a Development Agreement pursuant to RCW 36.70B.170 and Chapter 15A.11 of the Kittitas County Code, setting forth the standards and conditions of development of the wind farm, including measures required to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the DEIS for the proposal.

The proposal involves construction and operation of a utility-scale wind energy facility. The subject parcels are currently zoned Forest and Range and Agricultural-20 and the Comprehensive Plan designation is Rural.

The Planning Commission did, on February 13, 2006, approve findings to unanimously recommend denial of the Kittitas County -- of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project in its entirety.

On February 21st, 2006, the Board of County Commissioners did set an open record hearing for March 29, 2006, at 6:00 p.m. A notice of the
continued public hearing was issued on February 28th, 2006. This notice was published in the official county paper of record and was mailed to jurisdictional government agencies, adjacent property owners, and other interested parties.

Attachments as listed in the staff report were forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners on March 22nd, 2006.

Staff would also like to add that all this information, in an attempt to make sure that the public is fully aware of it, has posted everything on the Kittitas County Community Development Services website. In addition, there has been numerous articles in the Daily Record published to make the public aware of these.

At this time I'd like to conclude my staff report and ask if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any questions for Ms. Valencia from the commissioners?

Mr. Hurson, do you have anything to add, or Mr. Piercy?

Okay, thank you. All right, thank you all
for your indulgence. We just want to make sure we get everything on the record and that everybody hears what we're talking about and thinking about so it definitely is an open process and nobody can question that as we move forward.

So with that, now, the proponent, are you ready?

MR. DANA PECK: Let me do my introduction again, since it sounds like it wasn't heard by the folks in the back. Am I doing better on the microphone this time?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stay into it.

MR. DANA PECK: Got it, got it. Too many years of working with lapel mics; I've gotten insensitive to the ones sticking out in front of me.

Again, my name is Dana Peck; I'm the project manager for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, Horizon Wind Energy. My address here is 222 East 4th, Suite 105, here in Ellensburg, 98926.

I'd like to thank the Board of County
Commissioners for the opportunity to meet with you and present the company's response to the Planning Commission's action. And I add to that the opportunity to respond to the points that you've raised here this evening.

Erin Anderson and I plan to take not more than 20 minutes, possibly a little longer now that we've got a list, presenting our response to the Planning Commission action, including a brief summary of Mr. DeLacy's information on property values, which I believe you have before you, and the implications to the county and its residents of the bill signed on Friday, March 24th, by Governor Gregoire. And we feel that those topics meet the test of limiting ourselves to clarification and new information on material already in the record.

After several meetings with county staff,

It's our understanding that the previously submitted response matrix from Horizon is what the Board wanted from us and that prior to the close of this hearing, Horizon will be allowed to present a response to public testimony.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That's correct.

MR. DANA PECK: If this meets the Board's expectations, I'll get started here.

Horizon Wind Energy reasserts its position that the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project as proposed meets the various tests for wind power project development established by Kittitas County, as did the Wild Horse project, and that the project should be approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

These points are reinforced by the updated report submitted by Mr. Delacey on property values, whose professional credentials are included in the record, and that report demonstrates there is no reason to believe there are any negative property values impacts from the project.

And although I'll come back to this point, we feel Mr. DeLacy's report very much goes beyond those more other area reports that we already have in the record, and I hope that we'll be able to get more specific on that in a couple minutes.

Those points are also reinforced by the
recent action by Governor Gregoire which
establishes the taxes paid by the project will
directly benefit the county and local residents,
as reported in the Daily Record.

The Economic Development Group will be
presenting more specific information on this
point later, but I'd like to point out that the
dollars involved from this scale project are a
significant increase in revenue for each of the
local taxing districts, and I think that's true
by anyone's standards.

And as well, they represent a reduction in
tax rates, as pointed out by the assessor, a
point that will be reinforced later. And this
comes at no additional cost to the county's
taxpayers.

Horizon's been asked by county staff to
address the question of the identification of the
number of turbines and several other points that
have come up separately, so I'll go into those
more specifically without kind of the general
level discussion that I've got here, hopefully

save us all a little time.
And at this point I'm going to go into a
couple of those specific points, but Erin will be
also going through the matrix that we presented
in a couple of minutes. See if I can get them in
the same order that you were generous enough to
provide them in.

On the subject of number of turbines, I
think the first and most critical point to
recognize is that the 80-turbine number is what
was evaluated throughout the Draft Environmental
Impact Statement process. So in effect, the
environmental analysis that's before you has
addressed the greatest impact from the larger
number of turbines.

For the rest of the points, we very much
feel that we're in almost an identical
presentation on that as we were in the Wild Horse
project. Throughout the Wild Horse project --
and I can provide specific citations if the
Commission would like -- the range of turbines
were discussed frequently between 102 and 158,
depending on the turbine technology that was
eventually applied. The corridors were defined
there as they are in the Kittitas Valley project
in the Development Agreement.

And we feel there's pretty sound precedent for approaching -- the kind of range of turbine installation, you know, has been already gone through in the Wild Horse project and we're following the exact same process here.

And again, the environmental review has been with the larger number and not the smaller number. But in any case, if you'd like, the Wild Horse project we feel sets the precedent on that.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It guess it might help you be more -- for me to be more specific. You've got the -- you've got the different strings, and so you're saying if there's 80 turbines, they'll be confined within those strings you've shown, is what I'm hearing you say --

MR. DANA PECK: You know, as very precisely defined in the Development Agreement.

And just to kind of jump to the last point that was raised, the relative lack of discussion of the Development Agreement up to this point, we'd certainly entertain staff-level conversations on the provisions of that agreement.

Which, you know, again, is modeled, you
know, almost at the cut-and-paste level after the Wild Horse agreement, because we felt that provided a good starting point for both our organizations.

On the sub-area, much like the turbine and the turbine strings, this is also a point that's addressed very thoroughly in the Development Agreement. To get into modifying the sub-area would, we feel, involve really wholesale revisions that don't really reflect either of our interests, frankly.

I mean, the corridors are well-defined, the sub-area around them is well-defined, and it's all been environmentally assessed, if you will, and it's incorporated into the Development Agreement itself. So we feel that kind of negotiation level would be paretic to go into those questions.

The question of the setbacks, the thousand-foot setback is not even a national standard; it's an international standard for our industry. It's a standard that's imposed -- self-imposed, if you will, even where the local jurisdictions don't have setback standards to address.
The specifics of them are that it's a categorical noise compliance issue. It's a way of very clearly getting at noise compliance and model for that.

Shadow flicker was raised as an issue related to setback. The 2000-foot number I believe was mentioned in your remarks. At 2000 feet there is zero shadow flicker effect.

And it's not something that cuts off between no feet and 2000 feet. I mean, there's a diminution of effect, and at 1000 feet we feel that the mitigation's fully achieved. At 2000 feet you're asking us to meet a total no-impact standard.

When it comes to visual impact, we dramatically changed the size of this project from the original project proposed. We're talking about half the original size. If you go back to the original map, you know, you might remember -- I'm not sure we've got it with us right away, but the reduction of turbines proposed by Horizon is the visual mitigation, in our mind.

If you look at where we have dropped
turbines from the original proposal, almost

without exception they're on the periphery of the
existing project, and those turbines were dropped
to enhance people's viewsheds. And that was a
self-selected action on our part.

So we've got a project that's half the
original size, it's half the original size to
meet largely visual concerns of our neighbors,
and -- I, I don't know what to say beyond that.
We feel like we've already shrunk it down to the
center.

Transmission. Didn't grow up here, couldn't
tell you, you know, the history of transmission
in the Kittitas Valley. It's my understanding
that the transmission corridor easements were
laid out in the '20s. You know, I'd be really
hard-pressed to provide you with a citation I
wanted to stand behind, but it's my understanding
that the corridors were defined that early and
the construction occurred somewhere between the
late '40s and the mid '50s.

Again, I'm not -- I'm real reluctant to talk
about that at all; I'm sure there's people behind
me that can nail this one without any effort because they were there when it happened. And again, it's my understanding that the range of

years that transmission's been considered for this valley as opposed to just being there is well within those years I just mentioned. Roads. It's been our agreement that roads that we affected we'd restore, that we'd reconstruct them to their original conditions. Again, that's industry-standard practice in the wind power business. We move big stuff and we come back and fix what we tore up. You know, we're going to affect -- we're going to fix what we affect.

Another point on view impacts, if I could just go back to that point, although the project's been redefined with that sentiment in mind, I mean, under the County's existing Comprehensive Plan, preservation of habitat and scenic vistas are a public responsibility. And it's made pretty clear, I believe, throughout the document that individual private landowners should not be expected to provide these goods for
And I think that's very much the situation we have here. The neighbors, you know, as you will hear tonight, who are in the project area, especially the associated landowners, are being asked, frankly, to give up -- well, right out of what you said, individual private landowners are being asked to provide this goods as a response to the viewshed issue, and I think that's something that your own Comp plan makes very clear is not how this county chooses to operate.

Property values. I appreciate the attention that you paid to the reports that we brought into the record. We recognize also that those were reports from other areas. There were some gaps in them. I mean, were there people between, you know, the site and the two miles of the town that the commissioner brought up.

That's why we had someone with the credentials of Barton DeLacy come in and take a specific look at this area, not once but twice. We've got his original submittal and we also have his most recent submittal for your consideration.
I believe that it shows -- and if I could just go back to my own notes --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear.

MR. DANA PECK: Am I slipping off the microphone again for the folks back there? Sorry. It's not for lack of trying.

Going back to my point about Mr. DeLacy, whose, as I said, professional credentials are on the record, we feel his report demonstrates that there's no reason to believe there's any negative property value impacts from the project.

I'm certainly aware of the ebb and flow of that conversation in Kittitas County. I'd just urge you to take a look at Mr. DeLacy's qualifications for making that statement. He's as good as we've been able to find to provide that kind of information for your record.

On the subject of buying land -- and I'm not sure exactly how you phrased that; I didn't get it transcribed exactly in my notes -- I think I'll have Erin discuss that more thoroughly than I am, although none of us are aware of a legal basis for that action. But again, I'll have Erin
Anderson be the person who gets into that. And I think that gets the list.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Questions for Mr. Peck?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I don't have any questions. I just wanted to clarify, it was just -- it was just something to throw out there. Because you had it in your record that you gave to us, that that was something that had been done previously with another project. And so I, I put it out there that, you know, maybe that would be considered as a condition.

MR. DANA PECK: Okay, thank you.

Well, let's see. Well, at that point, thank you for the opportunity to address the specific questions. I hope that I've been at least in shorthand version been able to get at most of them for you.

And if I could, I'll transfer this over to Erin at this point.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Certainly.

MR. DANA PECK: And I'll be giving just a very brief close after she concludes her remarks.

MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Mr. Chair, counsel --
commissioners. Can you hear me in the back?

Erin Anderson, 200 East 3rd here in Ellensburg, residential at 360 Willowbrook out by the airport, and business address in Cle Elum at 105 East First Street, on behalf the applicant/proponent.

I think Dana has said most of what I had planned to say, so I will make it short.

Following the joint hearings between the Board of County Commissioners and the Planning Commissioners, we were encouraged to get all of our information in to you; don't wait to introduce new information until the last minute.

In essence sandbagging, as we call in it my practice.

So after several meetings with county staff and reviewing the comments of the three county commissioners, we attempted to streamline this by preparing a response matrix to the Planning Commission's findings, understanding that we were required to respond to their findings and to, also, some extent if new evidence comes up or, in this case, questions have come up, or rebuttal to
public comment.

I believe that the matrix itself is pretty clear. We're enumerated every one of the Planning Commission's findings and stated them verbatim and cross-referenced in your record already all the information that we think addresses that rather than regurgitate it again over the next three nights.

A few comments and a little bit of analysis in regard to those. If you have specific questions about the matrix -- I think we've heard them tonight. Commissioner Crankovich, you had some questions, observations; Commissioner Bowen, you had some specific questions. Mr. Peck I believe has answered most of those. I wanted to go through and just supplement a few of those questions.

I note specifically that in the Planning Commission's recommendations and -- or findings and conclusions, they find that there has been a demonstration -- or has failed to be a demonstration of need.

And I would point out that this subject is
not just a local subject. The matter of need and
demand is an international issue. And if you
will, the community that we live in is not
Kittitas County, it is not that ridge; it is this
region represented by our regional legislators in
Olympia, it is statewide represented by our
statewide officials, and it's represented on a
national basis by our senators, congressmen, and
our president.

This issue is an issue just within the
confines of the United States on the spotlight at
every single level. I don't find any credibility
to say there's no need here. Our president in
his State of the Union Address says this is a
problem. We have got to find ways to maximize

renewable alternate energy sources.

The state government has focused on -- both
in rebuttal to the president's weekly radio
address in about December and also in addresses
to the legislature -- that Washington is going to
be a leader in the issue of renewable energy
sources if the -- if our national government
doesn't put it in the forefront. And in fact,
they both have done that.

It's a regional issue. Our representative, Janea Holmquist, has led the charge just this most recent legislative session on biodiesel as a viable alternative energy resource.

The City of Ellensburg is trying to get a pilot solar energy program off the ground.

Is there a demand to get ourselves weaned off of foreign oil? Absolutely. Is this an issue of "We are Kittitas County, we have to keep it here"? No, this is an issue that affects you whether you live here or your children live in King County or they live in Grant County, which exports its energy to Kittitas County.

This is a big issue for all of us, and to posit that there is no demand is to somehow suggest that we live in this isolated little bubble, ignorant of the rest of the world; and I don't think you are ignorant of what is going on in the rest of the world. It impacts all of us.

Our children fighting in the Middle East over these things; our president -- whatever side of the aisle you are on politically, Democrat,
Republican, this is an issue for everybody, and
we can't pretend that it doesn't exist here by
cherry picking out of the testimony to say that
it doesn't exist; it does.

Insofar as public benefits, I've read the
newspaper. Commissioner Huston, I admire you for
your ability to ignore those ads. I haven't
gotten to that point yet, and so I do read them.
And in fact, I read a quote attributed to Iris
Rominger, who is your county assessor, where she
said -- and she was quoted as saying -- that the
additional revenue -- and I put in brackets
"generated by this project" -- is most likely
insignificant.

I was flabbergasted by that quote and,
frankly, I contacted your county assessor today
to verify whether or not she made that statement.
Her response -- I posed her the following
question, and I have this in writing.

"Good morning, Iris." After all the address
stuff. "I have finished reading yesterday's
Daily Record...wherein the following quote
regarding tax revenues that could be generated
for Kittitas County by the KV Wind Power Project is directly attributed to you." And I quote, "The additional revenue is most likely insignificant."

My question to your assessor was this: "The date of said quote is not given. However, given the passage of Senate Bill 6141 signed into law by the governor last Friday, March 24th, isn't it true that the additional tax revenue and reduction in the tax rates that would benefit the County from the KV Wind Power Project are, in fact, significant?" Not insignificant; significant.

Her response to that is, "Yes, Erin, since the signing of SB6141 last Friday..." Yes, they are significant. And that is the truth of the matter.

In the case at hand -- and we're going to get this evidence from the public as well -- the public benefits in addition to generating renewable, clean, low-cost alternative energy resources -- I'm assuming it kind of goes without saying, although I seem to think that people
still think that the issue --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, that's 20

minutes. 20 minutes --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Please, it is not up yet; I
am keeping track of it, and we did ask them
additional questions, as I told you when he came
up here. I will keep control of this meeting and
you will be quiet, please --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I understand that, but it
is 20 minutes.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Quiet.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We waited a long time for
the last session.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Sir --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you, I'm done.

MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
commissioners.

This project's revenues generated to the
county in addition to jobs and electricity
include -- and I'm reading here -- $77,000-plus
to our local hospital. That's not insignificant.
I'm sure they would be saddened to see that
turned away.
Our little tiny Thorp School District,
$325,000, a third of a million dollars, to that
school district by no stretch of the means could
be insignificant.

171,000 to fire districts. 293 to the
local -- 293,000 to the local road district. 240
to the general fund. My understanding is those
moneys in the road district can be extended over
to the general fund to be used for other purposes
such as law enforcement. That also is hundreds
of thousands of dollars you're making available
to the sheriff's department.

Now, bear in mind this project doesn't
generate students for schools, but it generates
money for schools. This project self-polices
itself, but it can generate money for the
sheriff's department. They build and maintain
their own roads, but it can generate money for
the road department.

Demand on hospitals, granted; if something
happens out there, sure, there's going to be a
demand on the hospital, but is that proportionate
to the seventy-seven, nearly seventy-eight
thousand that will go to the hospital? I would
posit probably not. The public benefits are huge

Briefly, I can't compete with Barton DeLacy's curriculum vitae or qualifications on property values and the like, but I can attest to the fact that I'm very familiar with our county's Comprehensive Plan, and it prohibits you from requiring a public -- excuse me, a private property owner -- or in this case 6000 acres of private property owners -- to be required to preserve their property as a viewshed to benefit the need of the adjacent property owners. That's a taking.

To say no, you cannot use your natural resource property for natural resource because we want you to preserve that view for your neighbor, your county Comprehensive Plan prohibits that. Not once. At least four times.

And there's a reason for that. You can't impose a public benefit to a third party upon a private property owner, and these people are here before you today saying, Please allow us to maximize our property in accordance with our Comp Plan and our zoning code; we bought our property knowing it was natural resource. Presumably their neighbors did too. But the people that are
before you today asking this be approved are
asking to use their natural resource property as
natural resource. To impose view preservation of
viewshed on them, not permissible.

Insofar as property values, I would note a
letter was submitted to you today from a
gentleman named Ian Elliott, and I point this
out -- I know people are certain that they might
want to sell if this project gets approved, and
we do have a free market economy.

Mr. Elliott's letter submitted today said
that he had previously testified against noise
levels but then took the initiative to go down
and stand next to one at another project, did not
find them offensive to him. As a result of that,
two weeks ago today he spent several hundred
thousand dollars and bought several hundred acres
immediately adjacent to this project and plans to
put in a housing development.

Two weeks ago. After this has been blasted
across the front page of the newspaper for four
years, somebody dumps hundreds of thousands of
dollars to snap up that property and start
building. That's the proof in the pudding here.
Not "I think it's going to happen, I think it's going to reduce my property values." You've got people putting their money where their mouth is already in this county to buy and build immediately adjacent, immediately adjacent. And I have all the details on that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you when you're mumbling. Would you please talk so we can hear back here --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: She's silent right now, and she will speak directly into the microphone to assist, okay?

MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thanks.

I think the remainder of my comments, I do have Ms. Rominger's response to my inquiry today. I'm going to give that to you. You have Mr. Elliot's letter in the record, so I don't need to provide that to you.

I don't believe there's anything else that I have that I would like to introduce that would constitute new evidence, because I understand you don't want that in our rebuttal.

I will have some closing argument at the end
of the evening after everybody's had an
opportunity to speak. But I thank you for your
time and opportunity to address and hopefully

answer some more of your questions.
And I will hand these to your clerk.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any questions for
Ms. Anderson before she steps away? No.
Thank you.
MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Mr. Peck, you said you had
some closing statement, or --
MR. DANA PECK: No, I think she said it.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You're set?
MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: And I ended up with 25
minutes. You did well to answer all our
questions and do your presentation. Thank you.
MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, with that, I have,
looks like, five sign-up sheets. Do you need a
break over here before we start?
We're going to take a five-minute break for
our court reporter, and we'll be right back with
public testimony.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I realize this is an emotionally charged issue for many people, and I want to make sure we address our comments to the

Board up here. We've been very civilized in previous hearings and we will be civilized in this hearing as well. Local people have come -- or actually out-of-town people have come and watched our process and commented to us later on how our community can disagree yet do it civilly, and we are going to do that tonight.

I'm going to move forward with the public testimony. We will give each person up to five minutes. I would request that -- and I understand people feel it's unfair that the proponent or applicant has more time. They also have -- they have the application in front of us. We need to have a full and complete record that gives them an opportunity to speak and present their project.

And I just -- I wish I could do something different, but we really can't in order to keep
this process moving forward and being complete. I'm going to -- we've got four and a half pages of folks. I'm planning on going until 10:00 or 10:30. I used an extra half-hour to get us started today, so that's why I was kind of looking at the 10:30 time, and we'll get through as many of these as we can. Anybody that doesn't get to speak, we do have tomorrow night reserved here as well; and if we need to continue it to another night, we will do that.

So please everybody, if you would, as I said, direct your comments to us up here. And let's try and have a civil hearing.

So with that said, the first person on my list is Mr. Lee Bates.

MR. LEE BATES: I'm Lee Bates. 1509 Brick Road, Ellensburg, and I represent myself.

I am opposed to this wind farm. I do not feel the wind farm developer has been complete in their wind farm presentation for the following reasons. No. 1: The wind farm developer hides the fact that all the new turbines will be 410 feet tall. See the DEIS Page 3-9 and -10 and
Figures 2-1 and 2-2.

No. 2: The shadow flicker estimates shown in the DEIS Appendix A in my opinion are too small since they are for October and November and not December and January, when the sun is lowest and the shadows longest.

No. 3: The wind farm developer has not come out to the public with information on which turbine configuration they have selected.

No. 4: The noise levels estimated in the DEIS Table 3.12-5 as shown on Page 3-31 shows the estimator used a turbine hub height of 67 meters or 221 feet, which is for the smaller turbine and not for their 410-foot-high turbines they want to build for this project. See Figure 2-2. If you're going to make accurate noise estimates, you need to use a turbine the same size as the turbine in the project and not a smaller turbine.

Is there any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Next person will be Michael Maw, M-a-w.

MR. MICHAEL MAW: Good evening. I am -- have listed my address both here and in Auburn.
I am originally from this area.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Please state your name.

MR. MICHAEL MAW: My name is Michael Maw. I currently reside at 10807 Southeast 290th Street, Auburn. I also have property at 5740 -- or 5370 Smithson Road here in Ellensburg.

There were some points made here tonight that I'd like to make comments on. One of them was --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You need to speak in the mic, I'm sorry.

MR. MICHAEL MAW: I think maybe what I need to do is take this down a little bit. Thank you. I'd like to make a couple of comments on some of the things that were raised tonight as far as property values. There have been issues presented that maybe these projects would not negatively impact property values.

This piece of property I purchased on Smithson Road was right smack dab in the middle of the Desert Claim project, and I can tell you for a fact that I purchased this piece of property for forty to sixty thousand dollars less
than what a comparable property would be located
in other areas of the valley. This was verified
not only by the agent that sold it to me but also
by the listing agents and several other agents
that I contacted in the area.

I think as far as property values in these
areas, I believe perceptions are -- and
perceptions are basically what drives property
values, how people perceive these projects.

The turbines being in the 400-foot range are
going to significantly impact the aesthetics in
the areas that they are located in. They're
going to be backdrops to the views of the

mountains to the north and the west. I think all
the valley residents around here are going to
begin to realize that if they're put in as
proposed, which is one of the reasons that I
think the Planning Commission was so opposed to
these things.

The other thing that was mentioned was the
tax revenue that would be generated from these
projects. I don't think there's any doubt that
there's going to be some tax advantages to these,
but I don't think anybody really knows exactly what they're going to be for sure.

The Grover Report done by EcoNorthwest estimates them anywhere from 1.2 million to 2.9 million dollars for both the EnXco and the wind -- the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. But they also say that perhaps 698 -- or $693,000 of that would actually directly benefit the county.

Now, on the 9th of January, Senate Bill 6141 was introduced to the 59th Legislature; it's in committee on Water, Energy, and Environment. Basically what they want to do is amend a certain amount of RCWs to include electric generation wind turbines in the property tax levy limit calculation. I don't know what that will do one way or the other to the tax revenue situation as far as values of these things once they're erected.

I think based on some of the things that I've read in other areas of the country, in the Midwest these projects work real well, they're done in rural areas; there's very little growth
pressure. The benefits to the local economy are well-stated. The tax revenues are there.

In Europe, where fossil fuels for powering generation plant are prohibitively expensive, they're working well there, as the fact that wind generation is somewhat cheaper than fossil fuel generating plants.

In other areas they've been a colossal failure. Altamont Pass, California, they erected these things right in a migration path of the California Condor. The slaughter of these birds has caused them to now alternate; half of these windmill generators are running half the time, half of them are not.

On the east coast in West Virginia they erected some along the ridges in the Appalachians. There was very little local opposition to these things. Once the forests were clear-cut and these 400-foot behemoths were put up, people begin to realize that they are just eyesores.

There's moratoriums being proposed up and down the east coast. And basically the studies,
some of the aesthetic and noise impacts of these things, based on some of the projects that have gone up and what people realize after they've gone in.

The Cape Wind Project in Massachusetts is generating stiff opposition because it's going to be out in the middle of Cape Cod where it's going to visually impact anybody that's anywhere near the shore.

I think in a lot of ways some of these issues parallel what is happening here as the concerns of many of the people I've talked to are of the esthetics and the noise, the shadow flicker and things. But what we have here in Kittitas County, I think, is an opportunity where other places don't have, is that we have other areas of the county where we can locate these things where they are not going to necessarily impact the esthetics of the county, aren't necessarily going to negatively affect property values or --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You need to end your comments, please.
MR. MICHAEL MAW: I'm sorry; I'm just about done.

(Continuing) -- hinder growth pressures as such.

So I think we need to consider these things, perhaps need to come up with alternate sites of the ones being proposed. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Next is Jeff Howard.

MR. JEFF HOWARD: My name is Jeff Howard. 21 Fawn Road in Cle Elum.

Mr. -- or Commissioner Crankovich was referring to a report on property values that came with the original application a couple of years ago. I've been an associate broker with John L. Scott for 16 years, and I went through that report with a fine-tooth comb. Believe me, that particular report was a prime example of the old saying that statistics never lie but all liars use statistics.

Now, Mr. Peck has mentioned that he's had an updated report by a Mr. DeLacy. Perhaps two of them. I couldn't quite tell from his
conversations what they were. I'm going to contact your staff and get a copy of those updated reports, go through them myself, and then I'll send another letter to the commissioners about what my findings are. Because they may have come up with something less than spin.

Now, I've spoken and written on this subject for nearly four years now. And in the interest of brevity, the Board of County Commissioners are well aware of my views. This massive industrial project should not be sited in the area proposed. It is not appropriate adjacent to numerous private properties that are used for residences, recreation, retirement homes, so forth.

The proposed wind power project should be sited where it will not disturb the existing uses of the land and adversely affect nearby property values and scar this marvelous corner of the earth with monstrous turbines.

Please consider the recommendations of your Planning Commission and deny this project in its entirety. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. I have Gordon
Gabrielson didn't want to testify. But I have Ann Gabrielson that did.

ANN GABRIELSON: My name is Ann Gabrielson. My mailing address is 16516 Northeast 1st Street, Bellevue.

I am co-owner of property immediately adjacent to the wind power project site. If the current plan is followed, we will have two to four of these obstructive (sic) turbines within a few hundred feet of our property line.

This property was purchased as a family recreation area because of the beauty, the peace and quiet, and the many recreational opportunities for outdoor enthusiasts. The beauty and peace and quiet would certainly disappear if the project is approved.

Locating a wind farm at this location will negatively impact the many property owners in the area and the community as a whole. I support the majority of citizens in Kittitas County by stating that this is the wrong site to locate a large-scale wind power project.

In the interests of time, I have purposely kept my comments brief, but I thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Mary Patillo?

I can't tell if it's a "T" or a "D" I'm reading. 1001 South Chestnut? Okay.

MS. MARY PATILLO: Are you saying Mary Patillo?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I am trying to, yes. Mary Patillo?

MS. MARY PATILLO: Yes.

Well, I go to the desert almost every winter and I usually go across the Hatchview Pass from Mojave, California, to catch I-5 up, and then at Weed I get 97 all the way into Ellensburg.

Well, this year, actually a couple years ago, I saw two or three turbines or maybe a little row of those wind turbines down low near Mojave. But this year all the ridges everywhere, these huge things, there's just like hundreds of them were there. And I thought well, mechanical earth. It just completely ruined the beauty.

People have built very expensive homes there, and it's always been a very beautiful pass. Very windy too, because the western air comes up through there and over the mountains into the desert.

But I'll tell you, I just urge you to turn
them down. This is a small valley. It's not really very big, you know. It's going to ruin it. It's going to ruin this valley. I've seen those things -- they were all over the place, and a lot of them had fallen over, crashed on the ground. I just -- I tell you, turn them down. 

Bye. Talk to you later.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Next is Sandy Sandall. Sandy Sandall?

MR. SANDY SANDALL: I'm here. I'm getting my stuff together.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, I couldn't see you.

MR. SANDY SANDALL: My name's Sandy Sandall. I reside at 8560 Elk Springs Road. I have a post office box, 954, Ellensburg, Washington.

I'm here to -- a show and tell, I guess is what you want to call it. The pictures before you are from Section 35, and in that area we have approximately 33 parcels of land; 27 cabins, homes, and trailers; and 26 landowners. This is a view that is shared partially by other people, probably 12 other recreational people and a couple of landowners.

If you look on the map, I show the view from my deck at Milepost 93 all the way back over to
the Badger Pocket. In there you have a cell
tower, then you show the eggbeat -- what I call
the eggbeater. It's the old wind turbine or
whatever it was over on the Springbrook Ranch.
Manastash Ridge.

Then we have a picture of Elk Springs Road.
And over further you have the canyon. And I-82
and then Badger Pocket. That's just a panoramic
view off of my deck.

Also on Picture No. 2 is a test tower down
on Elk Springs Road. The lighting has to be so
that you can see it, but that's approximately six
inches in diameter. I'm not sure of the height.
Anywheres from maybe 110 to 165 feet. But that's
visible.

And then, of course, just a little show and
tell on Lake Ellensburg with the fog.

The other item I give to the young lady over
there is a real estate guide from the Daily
Record. And I've put on the front the pages just
to give you an example, when you get time to look
at it, showing what the view is. They say view,
view. We don't own the view, yes, but they sure
sell a lot of it.

And our elevation where I'm at is about

3295 feet. And one of the H towers -- and it's H1, it's a little further down, but in the H series, about where this test tower is, there's 2665. That puts me about 630 feet above the ground, 220 feet above the tower. I'm going to be looking at all of them.

The whole viewshed there in the, what is it -- Figure 3.9-6 shows where the towers go. This looks over towards Hayward Hill, all across Manastash, the valley there above 97, up Elk Springs Road, up over by the gravel pit, up Cricklewood. There's maybe a few trees in there that blot out maybe one or two towers or a few towers, but the view is there.

The firing range in Yakima. On occasion we can feel the vibration and hear the shooting or hear the firing where I live. Now, what's the -- what's the noise level going to be up that short distance? A mile, mile and a half, to my place and these other residents up in that area?

Also last year, 2004-2005 winter, we had
seven to eight weeks of fog. No wind. This year so far we've had 45 -- about 44 days of ice, rain, ice fog, and fog.

You're faced with a big decision here, and

I've heard people say it's a hard decision to make. But you know, EnXco is going to look at this, and if this project is approved, EnXco's going to be right there knocking at your door saying, Hey, it's the same thing we've got over there; why did you allow it here?

And then what about the rights -- they talk about the rights of the landowners. Everybody has rights. As long as everything is done within the law, they can build and do whatever they want on their property, but at least they have that right; we have the right to complain about it.

We -- where I live we have no power; we live off the grid. And I live on solar power. And it works out fine for me. I'm not against alternative energy; I think it's great. But location, location, location. That's the whole thing.

And in this I'd like you to remember your
home is your castle and you're dealing with a lot of people that have homes, recreational property, and they are planning on building over here eventually. More people are going to move over. The progress is going to be there; I don't know how it can be stopped. It's sad to see a small community grow, but Issaquah was that way at one time in 1968 and look what it is today. So I hope you make the right decision. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

MR. SANDY SANDALL: And you can keep the paper clips too.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Craig Johnson is next.

MR. CRAIG JOHNSON: My name is Craig Johnson. 352 Danko Road, Cle Elum. I'm representing myself here.

There are a couple of -- one thing you ought to know about me, I'm a pilot and I live a couple thousand feet from the airport. I live what I talk about. I don't like being accused of the "not in my back yard" syndrome. I also have
I'm an engineer, Ph.D., professional engineer, that kind of thing, so I have some views about energy. And boy, am I pro wind farm. You can't get much more --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: They need to you speak into the microphone, it looks like.

MR. CRAIG JOHNSON: I am pro the Kittitas Valley Farm Wind Project. Did I say that enough?

No fuel, no thermal emission, no exhaust emissions. That just -- that speaks volumes. That -- as you heard before, this country's going there whether you like it or not. I'd like to do it under control rather than later under duress.

I also have an ancillary interest in environmental issues. I'm on the board for Kittitas Environmental (inaudible) stuff like that. And when I see that a farm like this can save habitat -- and what I mean by save habitat is it supports current use of range land and farmland by at least -- you know, there's money coming in for leasing those sites. This is a good thing. So maybe we can keep some of our
rural atmosphere.

And if it can prevent some development, I --
you know, every time I see more mercury vapor
lamps and grass, all that means to me is less
habitat for the things -- a lot of these things
my -- my fellow citizens enjoy, wildlife,
et cetera.

So those two things predominate the message
I'd like you three to take with you, and that is
it's very efficient, socially, environmentally;

wow, politically, you can't get a much better
scenario here. And I urge you to allow this
project to go through. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Howard
Mitchell?

MR. HOWARD MITCHELL: I'm Howard Mitchell.
371 Howard Road. I'm here representing my wife,
LeOttie and my son Steve and his family. We are
lifetime farmers in the area of the proposed wind
farm.

We favor wind turbines in the area that is
zoned Range/Forest and Ag-20. It's already in
the power line corridor. Somebody asked me
tonight that I -- as I can recall, the power
lines were in the late '40s and the early '50s.
And then future lines added after that. Wooden
lines before -- until after the second war, and
then they started putting steel towers in.

It makes sense to locate wind turbines in
that area, because it's undoubtedly the windiest
part of the county. If you commissioners turn
down wind farms in that zone, you invite
subdivision, realtors and developers. When the
realtors and developers get this valley all
filled with homes, we will have a wellwater and a

septic drainfield catastrophe.

If wind farms in the Kittitas County help
prevent land from being urbanized, they have made
an outstanding contribution. They also make
renewable energy, create a great deal on tax
dollars as well as income to the owners of the
land they are placed on. This includes state
land.

I will encourage our governor to support the
Horizon wind farm. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.
Helen Wise?

MS. HELEN WISE: My name is Helen Wise. I live in Ellensburg at 1103 (sic) East Third Avenue. I'm here on behalf of myself and my family and all your families. I'm here because I believe it is a very important decision that you will be making this evening. Probably more influence on the future of this area than any other you might make.

I attended the Planning Commission's January 30th meeting at which the decision was made to recommend denial of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project applications. I have since read the verbatim -- the verbatim transcript of the proceedings of that -- a hundred and -- 112 pages. Big print, double spaced, but still it's a lot of talking.

I read them to see if what I was remembering had been said really was said. It was for me a very disturbing, disturbing meeting. Well, actually a lot of these are hard on the digestion, you know.

The chairman started the discussion on
Page 10 of the transcript by saying, "My feeling had been and always has been that it is inappropriate for a wind farm to be considered as a sub-area." Now, that's objective: It had been and always had been. Anyway, his argument seemed to be that the denial of the applications should be based on that belief alone. A lengthy discussion on this concept ensued. But finally they moved on.

Now, throughout those proceedings -- and I assume you have not read this transcript, to know what went on in this meeting, how they came to their decision to deny. But throughout the proceedings, the concerns revolved around the view and the property values. Those were the two things that they revolved around.

When speaking -- Commissioner Mark McClain, when speaking of the visual impacts, on Page 32 says that they are still moderately high. That's in this revised description. And he declares, quote, "I certainly think that this is the principal issue of concern in this project."

He referred -- Page 56 -- 66 -- as he
remembered it, to the testimony of Roger Weaver. Quote, "These wind farms, if they are placed here, that the land then in this area would just decrease in value exponentially just overnight."

When Commissioner Clark, Page 67, pointed out that according to the Comprehensive Plan -- gosh, he read the plan, pointing to the Comprehensive Plan. Quote, "The primary use of that land isn't supposed to be for housing; it's supposed to be for development of natural resources," unquote.

Commissioner McClain responded with Weaver's statement that, "Well, it's more pristine high-end development."

Okay. The Planning Commission's document, the Findings of Fact, which they used to support their recommendation to, quote, "deny the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project in its entirety" --

Pardon?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: One minute.

MS. HELEN WISE: One minute? Okay.

They had Findings of Fact. The first seven
have to do with procedure. The next -- I won't
give you the rest of it here, but in every case
they were -- the Findings of Fact were not borne
out by reality. They said that it was not for
public convenience, but I suspect the public will
be inconvenienced when demands for electricity
cannot be met in the future.

City Light Power was shut down in 1951. We
have produced no power in this valley since that
time. We have been using somebody else's power
all that time. It's important that we have power
produced, clean power produced in the Kittitas
Valley.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Bernice Best?

MS. BERNICE BEST: My name is Bernice Best.

I live at 210 Tomahawk Lane. It's right at the
east boundary of the proposed wind power project.

I'd like to state that I do add my name and
the names of my family members to the over 200

persons that have voiced their approval of the
wind farms, especially of the Kittitas Valley
Wind Power Project. And that was on the kcares
In my opinion, the current pros and cons seem to be growth in Kittitas County versus siting of the wind farms within sight of that growth. Currently growth seems to be going unchecked and unmanaged. As I look out over the valley at night, I see a long line of not only homes but large outdoor lights that are left on all night. My view's already been destroyed by those lights, which are at a much more intensive rate than the view of others would be by the current proposed siting.

People want to live in the rural area of the county but have city-style street lights. What is that about? Not only do the lights on at night spoil my view, they are detrimental to the wildlife.

I can remember the rural area around Issaquah 20 years ago. Just look at it now. That is what the Kittitas Valley is going to look like if the real estate developers have their way to develop every bit of land that can be developed for homes.
Where is all the water going to come from for all those homes and lawns? One real estate agent was quoted in a local publication last year as saying we will run out of water before we run out of land.

The drain on services, including schools, will be more than the current available services can bear. The rate of school enrollment will increase as people start moving into the homes currently being built.

I really believe that persons worried about their property values decreasing are not concerned about the valley. Rather, they are more concerned about resale and making bigger profit.

I'm not against making profit. That should be available to everyone, including those wanting to keep their land and lease it for wind farms. Creative marketing to a different type of buyer will still create a nice profit.

And I need to add, even though it's not on your paper, we talk about property values. I sold an 80-acre parcel that I paid $20,000 for, for 65,000. The parcel next to it this year,
just a year later, was another 80 acres, just sold for $120,000. And that's right next to where those easternmost wind towers are going to be. And I know for a fact that they knew they were coming in, because I told them. So it wasn't that they bought it without knowledge.

It was suggested in the Growth Management Plan the proposed siting area for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project be available for the preservation of natural resources and restricted residential growth. Hence the reason for the 20-acre restriction on parcel sizes.

The reduction in those parcel sizes for more housing adversely affects all the natural resources in the area, including the view some people are so fond of. That view was badly corrupted when six sets of high voltage power lines were erected, and they were there when I moved in there too, so that was almost 20 years ago.

It has been stated that we should use conventional power sources and practice conservation to manage the increasing need for power. This is all well and good; however, the main conventional source, hydro, is no longer an
option. No more dams will be built.

The other sources are non-renewable, polluting, or very hazardous to health.

Conservation would be great; however, it is not in our nature as humans as a group to practice effective conservation, even if a few do.

Kittitas County is not an island and the only place on this earth. We are a part of the state of Washington, a part of the United States of America, a part of the North American continent, the western hemisphere, and the Planet Earth. As such, we need to look to the common good in providing clean, renewable energy sources for all. We need to look to the future and not just the here and now. Wind power generated in Kittitas County is just a start to provide clean, renewable energy for everyone.

I strongly urge the Kittitas County commissioners' support for Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, and thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Dan Morgan?

MR. DAN MORGAN: Thank you, commissioners.

My name is Dan Morgan. My mailing address is Post Office Box 999, Ellensburg.
I am the third generation in my family to operate our excavation business in Kittitas County. And I'm here to support the wind farms. When they -- when these guys first came to town, they made the promise that they would hire local companies and hire local people, and they are keeping that promise and I appreciate that. They are providing jobs for my company and the local people that we employ.

The wind farms also provide a way for the landowners to keep their Forest and Range land in that usage, which I think is a good thing. They're also providing clean energy and a tremendous amount of tax revenue. Which is why I support the wind farms. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Tina Sands?

MS. TINA SANDS: I'm Tina Sands. We live at 5690 Smithson Road. I speak tonight for myself, my husband, and my son Christopher.

We are vehemently opposed to the wind turbines proposed by Horizon Wind. Monstrous turbines should not be located where people already live. Huge industrial projects like this
have major negative impacts on the people who own homes and land in this populated, scenic area, as well as negative impacts on the community and the natural habitat.

Wind farms create noise and vibration. They have well-established dangers. And they are a massive visual intrusion. Such projects should at least be restricted to remote and unpopulated areas.

We believe that turbines should not be allowed to be considered or built near existing residences, as they are not only seen but felt and heard by residents for many miles from the site of the turbines.

The Board of Commissioners and Planning Commission have already exercised great wisdom in declining the recent EnXco application. Please realize that residents of this area equally oppose turbines being built in the area that Horizon is currently proposing.

Just the other day we were talking to a fellow who mentioned he was considering making an offer on some land for sale just across the
street from us. He was ready to make an offer on
property, which indicates he has looked at it
pretty seriously. He knew nothing of the
turbines that have been proposed on the land he
was considering purchasing. The sellers didn't
tell him, the realtors didn't tell him; he hadn't
heard about it. It is erroneous to assume that
any property that has sold during this conflict
was sold with the buyers' knowledge of the
possibility of wind turbines being built right on
top of them.

The wind farm proponents have said the
turbines coming in are not hurting land sales now
and won't in the future. If there's land still
selling, it isn't because no one is telling the
buyers prior to their purchase. Or that it's
probably an exception if they do.

These projects, they haven't told them
they're in the works and the fight we're having
trying to stop them. We have personally talked
with many people who found out after closing that
they had just purchased their new place within
the impact zone of these proposed projects.
Please deny the application for this wind farm; it does not belong here. We live here full-time and we are opposed to this project.

And the rest of my comment is from some of the questions you asked at the start. And I made some notes. We built our place five years ago, and we had an appraisal. Two years and many improvements later we heard the news of the wind turbine applications. We looked into selling. We were told by realtors, more than one of them, that we would not get our appraisal value out of our place.

This is property that should have only appreciated. In fact, I was advised by the realtors that if we could get 20,000 less than our appraisal, we should take the money and run. You can't tell me there has been no impact on our property values. The disparity in value between our property and properties farther from these projects will only grow.

And as to the power lines, they were currently in place in the area when we moved here, but they are not 40 stories high, they do
not move, create shadow flicker, noise and
vibration for miles around.
So we're opposed and go on record. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.
Louise Genson?

MS. LOUISE GENSEN: Can you all see that?

My name is Louise Genson. My address is 101 Elk Springs Road, Ellensburg.

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak in favor of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project and to speak specifically about property values.

The concern that property values will suffer in the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project if it is approved doesn't have any supporting evidence.
The real estate market around the project's boundary has remained very strong since the announcement of the project in April 2002.
One only has to look at the records in the office of the county treasurer to see that real estate professionals, real estate investors, people looking for houses and recreational
property have continued to purchase property near
the wind farm.

This area that is highlighted in the blue is
access from the Elk Springs Road, which is a
private road, and 16 properties have sold since
the announcement of the wind farm. All the
properties have sold for more than they were
purchased.

An example I have is Property No. 8 on the
map there, which I'll show you. You can see it
right here. That was purchased for $55,000 in
5-12-2000 and it sold for $85,000 on 4-2-03.

Also No. -- Property No. 14, which is in the
very corner of that section, it was purchased
in -- on 4-4-01 for $195,000 and it was sold for
$260,000 on 10-15-04.

And I selected these two examples because to
the best of my knowledge, few, if any,
improvements were made to the property from the
time that it was purchased to the time that it
was sold.

The Elk Springs area attracts buyers because
of the many recreational opportunities that are
available. Opportunities that include hiking on state and national forestland, wildlife viewing, hunting, snowmobiling in Green Canyon and the Reecer Creek areas, riding quads and riding horses.

People who have purchased land that is accessed by the Elk Springs Road will not lose any of these recreational opportunities they had before the approval of the wind farm.

Our county has an opportunity to make the most of the resources we have been given. The land that borders the wind farm can provide for houses -- I'm sorry, can provide housing for people moving into the area, while at the same time we could use the wind resource to supply the energy that will be needed for these new homes and provide significant income to the property owners of the 6000 acres of land on which the turbines will be located.

In researching this property, it's been my -- as I look at these properties, I see real estate professionals, real estate investors, just people looking for homes and recreational homes
that are still very much interested in this area.

Some of them, I -- I admit some of them
might not have known about the wind farm until
after they purchased the property. The one
person that is in that section that wrote a
letter to the editor, she expressed the concern
that she didn't know about the wind farm before
she bought their property; they have yet to sell
their property.

People are choosing to buy property and
build there with full knowledge of the project.
16 properties have sold in the Elk Springs area,
all at a good profit. This is not an area that
will be adversely affected by the wind farm.

This is an area that will -- this is an area that
will benefit, as will the county as a whole if
the -- if the project is approved.

I don't know if you had any questions about
the area or the Elk Springs Road. Mr. Crankovich
wondered earlier; it's a private road, it's not a
county road. We have a road association that
maintains the road, so.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. We'll need to
have you submit your map to our clerk, please.

MS. LOUISE GENSON: Okay, sure.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Henry Yoder?

MR. HENRY YODER: Thank you. I am Henry Yoder. I live at 1201 Vista Road here in Ellensburg.

I have been asked if I could mention the fact that there have been petitions passed, signatures collected in favor of the wind farms, and I'd like to submit them at this point.

Some of the audience has already received a copy of the presentation, and the commissioners have already received that also as far as there's one for the record and one to be torn apart for each of you to receive one.

I'm just going to take and emphasize some very, to me, telling statistics. Many of the arguments against siting of wind power generating farms stems from the destruction of scenery and/or the loss of property values. Under this are bird death, noise, land value deterioration, et cetera.

As hard as it is to accept, all progress
comes at a price. No land purchase has a
guarantee of appreciating in value. All the
interstate freeways that cross our land came at a
price of scenery destruction. Birds and other
wildlife are constantly being killed by vehicles
using these highways. Vehicle noise from either
the tires or loud radios or just obnoxious people
pervade these travelways.

President Eisenhower, upon taking office
after being a military leader during World
War II, took inventory of our military personnel
and facilities. It was learned that 50 percent
or more of our troops could not locate, let alone
reach, the post firing ranges or other lodging
and training facilities here in the United States
to which military convoys were destined.

It was his vision to maintain a strong
military viability that caused our interstate
freeway system to be established. This
interstate highway system had destroyed and is
still destroying many, quote, scenic, unquote,
highways and scenery.

Since we no longer have that strong need to
move our troops over the highways here at home, should we dismantle the interstate system and return that land to the scenic beauty it once was? The same principle is on this wind farm. I think we need to look at that.

Continuing on, those who display antagonism about the building and the sale of the Wild Horse Wind Farm to Puget Sound Energy and are spreading falsehood that Kittitas County does not receive any of the generated power from that facility or any benefits has not done their homework.

The Kittitas County Development Agency has been working on what the financial benefits are to Kittitas County and all of the residents living in the whole of Kittitas County and have either presented or will be presenting their case further tonight.

Information from the Kittitas County Assessor's office, there are 5001 residential properties within the boundaries of Ellensburg.

The gross taxable value of the properties is $764,903,597. That's the total, commercial residential total.
My request came too late to get just for the residential. Therefore, I'm taking figures --
I'm taking figures, just like everybody is taking figures to say that there's no benefit. You will have this report in yours.

The way this is broken down just for points of -- interest points of comparison, taking this, I broke it into fourths, the gross of $765,000,000, rounding it off to make the figures easy. Each quarter is 190 million. So taking three quarters of that, being what would go to residential, would make that 570 million do -- you know, available for residential.

Taking that figure and dividing it by 5000, rounding it off, makes it $114,000 average. Now, being average, it's kind of like putting a foot in a bucket of water and a book in the bucket of ice; on the average you're comfortable --

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Wrap up your point, please.

MR. HENRY YODER: Yes. The point I'm making is Kittitas Valley development has already said we're getting about $25, just a tad under, I'm using $25 at -- per $100,000 valuation. On
$114,000 valuation, that would be $28.50 per year tax reduction. That makes for the 5000 homes, $28,142,500 additional discretionary spending. That, if spent in Ellensburg, would make $10,972.50 in collected sales tax, of which Ellensburg gets a direct proportion.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you, we need to stop. Thank you.

I'm going to give my reporter a five-minute break again and give my staff a chance to change the CD probably.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Our next speaker is David Crane.

MR. DAVID CRANE: My name is David Crane. I live at 1201 Vista Road, Ellensburg, Washington. And I had some things here. And I can see that because of the time restriction, I'm not going to have time to read them, so I will submit these items to you.

And I would like to address a couple of things. There is a poll that was quoted in the newspaper. Some 4000 people supposedly registered their opinion on a poll that was
quoted in the Daily Record, and it was later
basically downplayed because it was not
scientifically done and people could enter their
opinion as many times as they wished, so the poll
was real inaccurate and untrustworthy.

And in that poll it had said that 90 percent
of the people opposed the siting of wind -- it
said opposed wind farms.

I have here a picture that was published in
the 11th -- the March 11th Daily Record showing a
huge wind tower right in the middle of the city.
And this, to me, illustrates the behavior of some
of the people who are opposed to this siting.
Because this is right almost in the middle of a
city.

But the interesting thing about it is that
that's the way they do it in Europe. And I
talked to some people in my neighborhood just a
week ago who said they just came back from Europe
and they have these things right in the
communities where people live. And we sat there
and listened to them to try to hear them, and we
could not hear them because the traffic was too
loud.

I took some of these little petitions that
said "We support wind farms" and circulated them on my own for the wind farm people because I chose to do that. And I went to approximately 150 homes in my neighborhood. I had approximately -- I would say exactly 140 signatures, and I will tell you that eight out of ten supported this wind farm in its location.

And most of the people who did not want to sign the petition said they agreed with it but they didn't want to do it because they were in some public position or because they had friends who lived out there and they didn't want to offend them or that they had a business in town and did not want to be expressing their opinion one way or the other, but they did support it.

I've had many conversations with people over a period of several days. I went to one house. The gentleman came to the door. He told me -- I introduced myself as David Crane, I live in your neighborhood, I have here a petition in favor of wind farms. He turned, almost immediately, away from me; he said he's not interested, and he started closing the door. I barely had time to even say "Thank you for your time" as he closed the door.
I went across the street, the young people across the street signed the petition, said that they -- as they were talking to me about it, this gentleman came across the street and proceeded to stand -- and this is about seven o'clock at night, when it's dark -- stand out by the curb and said that I was misinforming people because I wasn't telling them where it was. And I would challenge anyone who says that people signed that petition didn't know where it was. The petition is very simple, it's just a few lines, and I spoke to most of them telling them where it was even when they didn't ask me.

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: One minute.

MR. DAVID CRANE: I have here a statement, "Requirements for Siting Wind Farms": They must be built so far from civilization that no one will know they are there. All negative impacts must be totally eliminated. Must guarantee no birds will ever be killed. Must be at least as beautiful as a Rembrandt and invisible.
them.

Zoning for them must have been in place at the time Kittitas became a county.

All lights must be invisible to the human eye.

Must be no taller than any other structures in the area.

Any person who objects can cancel the project.

No cement can touch the surrounding ecology.

They must not cast shadows and can operate only at night because of flicker.

Must guarantee all property values will increase and pay for those who don't.

Must be accessible only by invisible roads and provide hundreds of new high-paying jobs.

All power generated must be from -- must be from our -- from our wind must be sold only to Kittitas County.

Promoters must not be allowed to make a profit.

No tax incentives can be permitted.
A clause must be included in any permit which will allow any new rules and restrictions to be added later when thought of.

If windmills don't work, they must be immediately removed and sagebrush, trees, and wildlife must be brought in to exactly duplicate the original ecology, including bats and snakes. They must produce equal to hydroelectric and be at least as efficient. Their insurance policies must indicate that they are safer than any other power generation facility ever invented.

And, my apologies to you gentlemen, they must guarantee that if we vote them in, we will be re-elected to office if we vote for them. And this is not meant to be a criticism of you gentlemen or the people on the commission, but that's the hurdles that these people have to go through.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

MR. DAVID CRANE: So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Mike Robertson?

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: Good evening. My name
is Mike Robertson. I'm representing myself and
my wife Elizabeth. We live at 4101 Bettas Road,
Cle Elum. I'm going to read a prepared statement
that I've handed to you. I've also handed you a
copy of a transcript of an expert witness in a

New York State Legislative Energy Committee

hearing that concerns low frequency sound impacts

on people and animals.

And then I'd like to answer a couple of

questions that Commissioner Crankovich had

concerning power lines and what people knew about

it when they bought property.

The applicant, a few people who stand to

gain financially if the project is built, and a

few other people who think wind power is great

since it's not in their back yard would argue

that this project should be permitted at any cost

to save the planet and make the United States

energy-independent.

Whether or not this project gets built will

have absolutely no bearing on those outcomes.

The permitting of this project is not a

litmus test on whether you support commercially
generated wind power but is about whether the
industrial project is consistent with current
land uses in the project area. It is obviously
not.

In the applicant's own EIS it states our
homes will be impacted by shadow flicker and
noise. They offer no solutions to the impacts

and in fact they admit there are impacts
associated with their plan that cannot be mitigated.

There is one impact that the wind industry
as a whole refuses to even recognize, and that is
health problems associated with long-term
exposure to low frequency sound sources. The applicant offered paid expert opinion from an accoustic engineer to deny there is any problem with low frequency noise.

But as Dr. Pierpont recently testified before the New York State Legislature Energy Committee -- and you have a copy of that -- "Describing and documenting symptoms is the province of physicians. So is research on the causes of diseases. Deciding whether people have
significant symptoms is not within the expertise
of engineers or specialists in acoustics, even
when the symptoms appear to be caused by noise."

This project is a public health hazard as
proposed. A minimum setback of one and a half
miles from the nearest non-participating
landowner is required to mitigate the effects of
low frequency noise.

The Planning Commissioners have unanimously
determined that this project is not consistent
with current land uses in the area, and I urge
you to accept the recommendation and deny this
project. Wind power may or may not be a good
idea, but this project is in the wrong place.

And Commissioner Crankovich wondered whether
we knew or people out there knew about the power
lines. Of course we did, when we bought these
properties.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That's good --

Do you want to let him finish?

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: When we bought these
properties, we knew about the power lines and we
sited our properties such that we didn't look at
them. And that's all I wanted to say.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Okay, I just
wanted -- for a point of clarification, that's
what I wanted to convey, was that the people that
bought the property knew that the power lines
were there. I'm not questioning whether or not
you knew -- whether anybody new --

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: Oh, okay. We didn't
know they were going to build 410-foot
turbines --

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: And I was just
pointing out that the lines were there prior to
any kind -- you know, probably most people that
purchased the property --

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: Sure, sure.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: So if there's any
confusion, that's what I wanted to clear up, is
I, you know, I'm fully aware that people knew
that they were there.

MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: Let's see, there was
one other. Somebody mentioned, and I don't know
who it was, said that denying this project would
be like a taking of property by other people
around it. There's a law in King County that's passed recently where that's in fact what they did. The County took property, two-thirds of rural property, and said you can't develop it. So this is a moot point. It cuts both ways. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Lenny Morrison?

MR. LENNY MORRISON: Hello, I'm Lenny Morrison. I live at 1481 Tozer Road. I support the Kittitas Valley wind farm. And the reason -- two reasons. One is the Forest and Range land located along that side of the valley -- excuse me, the Forest and Range land located along that side of the valley. It keeps 6000 acres in the Forest and Range land, and that's basically what it was zoned for, was the resource management in that area. So that's it. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Sharon Gordon?

MS. SHARON GORDON: Hello. I'm Sharon Gordon. I represent my husband, David Gordon. He's already sent you a form, so I didn't come prepared with a letter to hand you.
I live at 940 Low Road, which is just off of Bettas Road. I'm a new resident there. And as my husband and I thought about our retirement and where we might like to go, we've been Washingtonians all our life, and we looked around and we loved your community. We loved the places that we saw and we've loved the people that we've met.

And as we looked around to find land to build on, we saw that a huge amount of Cle Elum is covered with electrical power lines. And I just said no, we're not going to live near power lines. So we looked a long time. We drove around a lot, we rode around with the realtors, and one of them showed us Bettas Road.

It was beautiful. We saw it in the snow; it was gorgeous. And then in the spring we fell in love with it. And strangely enough, our realtor didn't tell us that there was anything in the forecast for this area.

So we bought and we built our dream home. The first -- front part of it is all covered with windows. We look out at the view across the
valley, and it's absolutely stunning. We watch the eagles fly around. And it's a wonderful place to be. I've loved the community.

But if these wind farms come in, that's what I will see in my view. I will see it in the morning when I wake up; I will see it at night as I go to sleep, because I have no curtains because I just have a beautiful view.

And to hear it, to see it, and to lose the birds -- because where are they going to fly if they can fly into those turbines?

So I would urge you to think about this. And I know that what I'm -- I'm astounded to hear tonight that there are people who would like these because it would keep people like myself from coming. But I'm here to enjoy your community and to add to it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Matt Burt?

MR. MATTHEW BURT: Yeah, hi, I'm Matthew Burt. I'm the project manager for RES America Construction, Inc., who is presently constructing the Wild Horse Wind Project. Although I guess I'm also a temporary resident of Ellensburg.
Acacia Lane.

I guess I do not really have the right to say whether it is correct or not, as I'm not a proper resident as such. I would just like to just state a few hard facts, basically.

Today we have spent in the region of $1.6 million in the local community. That is in the Kittitas Valley area. My staff presently consists of ten staff members; five of those are local people from -- I think three from Ellensburg, one from Kittitas, and one from Vantage.

On top of that we also have security services, which I believe is between three to four people rotated at night and weekend services.

On top of that, there's the subcontractors working under me also are employing quite a few people. We don't have the current total, although we're presently working on that. The last total we had was 23 employees. So there is, I think, a fair share of local involvement in the construction itself.
Obviously it's 23, some people may argue and say that's a low figure for the size of this construction project. The actual labor intensity of a construction project like this is a lot less than, say, a big skyscraper or something like that. So it is actually quite a high proportion, probably within the range of 30 percent.

Other items which have come up here, generally sort of comments about noise vibrations and other bits and pieces. I've been personally in the wind industry for around seven years. I've been involved in -- I think it's around between 6 to 7 percent of the steel capacity in the U.S., and I believe that is -- with my European experience previous to that, I think around 1 or 2 percent of the world's wind energy to date.

On the noise front, these things are actually remarkably quiet. If you stood underneath it, you can hear it; if you stood, you know, 500 foot away, you have very, very little -- very difficulty in basically hearing them.
You know, I would say anyone that has any sort of claims that the noise pollution is an issue to actually go out and see for yourself. That's the best, fairest way. You know, I'm not an acoustic engineer, I'm not qualified to give you a testimony saying this is such-and-such a decibel. I mean, that's not my field.

I would basically say if that is one of the issues, then you should go out and you should stand, you know, a thousand foot, wherever the setbacks are on this project which is going through, and basically hear for yourself.

On the other issues, obviously vibration, that's a fairly new one to me. Again, it's something that I personally haven't witnessed, and I guess on average I've probably had 14,000 days of wind projects over the last seven years, and it's one thing that I've personally never seen. Again, I'm not qualified to say if that exists or not.

Other items also brought up today was about the urban turbines and stuff. My parent company is actually New (inaudible) Systems, and our
office is in Kings Langley, which is just north
of London in the U.K. There we actually have a
small wind turbine away from our office probably
the length of this room distance-wise. The
people in that office, you know, you can't hear
it in the office whatsoever. You can obviously
see it because it's, you know, it's a few hundred
feet away. But you know, again, it's, you know,
it's a matter of opinion, basically.

The other things I guess we also hear about
the health benefits or health -- not benefits,
but it's damaging to your health. That is a new
one. I've never heard that in any argument to
me. Again, personal experience of being in the
wind farms for seven years, I'm very healthy; I
see the doctor once or twice a year, and I
haven't missed a day of work in seven years. So
to me, I find that a little bit hard to swallow.

I guess -- I guess also on the environmental
side, I think as a kind of outsider I would say
the environmental benefits of a wind farm is
basically great. Obviously with natural
resources, fossil fuels, oil, et cetera, the
supplies are running low and obviously we've got
to think of the future.
The amount of years it takes to create oil and coal is phenomenal, and in the few years in the proportion that we've been using them, we've used up a huge resource, and that is actually dwindling and basically fading away.

So the way forward obviously is to seek renewable sources, energy that can be generated without damaging -- not so much damaging but using up natural resources. I think it's very important for the future of the people.

I think I've taken enough of your time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Jeff Slothower?

MR. JEFF SLOTHOWER: Jeff Slothower, 2581 Hunter Road in Ellensburg. I will be brief tonight.

I wanted to start out by saying that I do agree with my friend and colleague, Ms. Anderson, that this issue -- our dependence on fossil fuel and finding alternative energy, whether it be wind or solar or whatever -- is an issue that affects all of us and will affect her children and my children, who are about the same age. So I think it's important that we solve our energy problems.
But just because an alternative form of energy is needed, and in this case a wind power facility, doesn't mean that you put them everywhere. You still have a land-use decision to make. And that's what this is.

And to me, it's very simple: You look at what you have done with Wild Horse and the factors that you looked at to approve the Wild Horse project. You looked at the proximity of residences, you looked at the proximity of the population, you looked at the proximity of conflicting land uses. It doesn't matter how long they've been there, how they got there. You looked at whether they were conflicting land uses. And when you looked at that, you concluded that Wild Horse was properly sited. And put it there.

The opposite is true here. If you apply the reasoning that you followed in siting the Wild Horse facility, there's no way you can site it here. Because at every point where you get through the analysis, the opposite facts are here. This is an area where there are a number of residences. There are a number of individuals
who reside on a permanent and temporary basis.

There are a number of individuals who visit the area to recreate. You cannot apply the Wild Horse reasoning to these facts and conclude that this is a proper site.

You have incompatible land uses that you cannot mitigate. The discussion should end there and you should deny it solely based on that.

Your code requires you to do that.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. This next one, I -- Linda Johnston or Johanston? 4190 Robbins Road?

MS. LINDA SCHANTZ; I need to spell better, huh? It's Linda Schantz, and it's 4190 Robbins Road. I'm here representing my husband and myself.

I wanted to make a couple of comments on a point or two that Mr. Bowen and Mr. Crankovich made. The sub-area boundary didn't change, yet the number of turbines were reduced to half. And I believe Mr. Peck said that that was part of the visual mitigation, in the answer to your comment.

And I guess my point there, and he had said...
that they were basically centrally located --
really, the strings still reside basically in the
same places; there's just less of them. And that

 helps with the visual, and it's a short-term
advantage for the homeowners over there, but it's
a long-term advantage for the wind farm in that
in later years there's opportunity to make that
wind farm more dense with wind turbines. And
that's something that you should think about in
your decision.

 The other thing with shadow flicker, I
didn't feel that -- I think a comment was that
really to get a hundred percent mitigation on
shadow flicker was 2000 feet. That was
substantiated by Mr. Peck, but I didn't feel that
he really answered the question, in that he said
it could mostly be mitigated by 1000, at least
that's how I heard it. So that's my comments on
those two items.

 And just my brief statement, just my husband
and I, our record has been really consistent and
clear for the last four years regarding the
siting of the wind farms in a residential area.
So I don't want to take any time, more time other
than just to say that wind farms should not be
sited where people live, period. That's the only
solution to the issue at hand.

And we urge you to accept the recommendation
by the Planning Commission and deny the Kittitas
Valley Wind Power Project as it is currently
sited. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Charles had
indicated he didn't want to speak. Is that still
correct?

That takes us to Mike Genson.

MR. MIKE GENSON: My name is Mike Genson. I
reside at 101 Elk Springs Road, Ellensburg,
Washington. I'm representing myself and my
family.

So people say location, location, location.
And I agree. I agree. We need wind, we need the
power grid, and we need willing landowners. We
have all of those things in the Kittitas Valley
Wind Power Project.

If we took a poll, if we polled the people
of this state and asked them the question, What's
the windiest spot in the state, they would say
undoubtedly Ellensburg. We might tie with the
Columbia Gorge, but I doubt it.

This location is so important to wind
farming that several years ago when I went to
visit the State Line project, when I mentioned
that a company was interested in my property

because of this location for a wind farm, the
very next day I had representatives from that
compny out there standing on the ridges in the
wind with me. And if at-that-time-Zilkha had not
pursued this project, then that company would
have.

We've heard a lot tonight about the benefits
to the world and to everyone and to this county
in particular. I want to talk about the benefits
to me as a personal landowner in this project.

I'm urging you to support the Kittitas
Valley Wind Power Project. I have land within
the project. If the project is approved, I will
receive an income from my land that will enable
me to keep it intact for the foreseeable future.
If the turbines don't even turn one revolution,
my family will receive $14,000 per year from the turbines -- from the turbine sites. If -- this is more than I've been able to make from my horse and buffalo ranching efforts.

Wind studies indicate that my family can expect to receive more than $35,000 per year from wind farm royalties. Income from the 50 turbines shown on the private land on the project map will most likely exceed $250,000 per year. These are very significant numbers to those property owners.

Our wind is a valuable resource. The majority of the land within the proposed wind farm is zoned Forest and Range 20. The county zoning code clearly states that management of natural resource is the highest priority in this zone. Wind farming is doing just that.

I can't see how anyone from inside our county or from outside of our county could interpret the code differently. This is a property rights issue that extends beyond this project. This is a property rights issue that has changed the laws in Oregon through the
initiative process. And it is very likely to
have the same effect here in Washington within
this year.

If my neighbor has the right to subdivide
his property to maximize the economic potential
of that property, even though it is not the
highest priority in that zone according to the
county zoning code, then how can I not be allowed
to have wind turbines on my property to
accomplish the same means?

The negative effect of this project to the
county is much greater -- the positive effect of the Kittitas
Valley Wind Power Project to the county is much
greater.

There is a need for more housing, and if we
look at what's happening in this county, that's
very obvious. And there is a need for more
energy. When you build more houses, you need
more energy. The power from wind turbines goes
into the grid with all of the rest, but it is
green. It is renewable, it is clean, it is the
cheapest source available.
I will close by asking you once more to support my property rights by supporting this project. Thanks, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Darlene Young?

MS. DARLENE YOUNG: My name is Darlene Young. I live at 771 Sun East Road. And I'm speaking for myself. And I've been to a lot of these meetings; and every time I come, I think I know what I'm going to say. I know that I'm totally against the location of these wind turbines. And it's been quite an emotional roller coaster for myself and I know for everybody else here.

We can't stop people from coming here. People want to live here. This is America; we should be able to live where we want to and buy and sell how we want to. But we should be able to control what goes on where we live. It's no different than having a neighbor that hauls in all kinds of junk and crap on their property; it shouldn't be allowed.

It's no different than bringing in wind turbines that is going to destroy the valley not
only for the property values but it's just not
what the valley is made of. People come here
because they want to live and retire. And it's a
great community.

   Erin Anderson made a comment about
Mr. Elliott buying a hundred acres in the
proposed wind turbine areas. Well, that's great.
Mr. Elliott can go in, develop that, short plat
it, sell it, and be out of there long before the
wind turbines are ever built. And so he will
have no effect on the wind turbines; only the
people that live there.

   One of the gentlemen, Mr. Crane, and I
didn't think I was going to say this, but it
really bothers me. I had an occasion to speak

with him, and he asked me my feeling on the wind
turbines, and said I was against them and because
of the location. He said, Oh, do you live out
there? And I said, Yes, I do. And he said, I
didn't know anybody lived out there.

   And that's really sad. It makes me wonder
how many other people are not aware that people
do live there. And that's my feeling. I just
think we need to back off, see what Wild Horse
looks like, and then go from there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Robert Young.

MR. ROBERT YOUNG: My name's Robert Young,
and I live at 771 Sun East Road. And I'm not
against wind farms, but I'm definitely against
them where people live, and I don't think they
should be where they're trying to put them in
now, so that's my only complaint.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Gloria
Lindstrom?

MS. GLORIA LINDSTROM: Gloria Lindstrom,
1831 Hanson Road, Ellensburg, Washington. This
is just a brief summary of my previous
testimonies that I seem like have been endless.
So I'll make it quick.

First of all, no adequate bird studies have

been done. One year's time is not enough. Bird
populations vary from year to year. This area is
a recognized migratory route for raptors.

And there have been absolutely no bat
studies. Neither birds nor bats are being given
consideration, and yet many questions are being
raised and problems encountered in the United States and in various parts of the world about kills on wind power projects. Adequate studies are needed.

Wind power can be great, but this project is proposed for the wrong place. Do not build wind farms in populated areas. This has not been done elsewhere in the U.S. Why here?

How many valleys can boast of a unique and magnificent backdrop that the Kittitas Valley has: the Mt. Stuart range. This is a priceless scenic area that should never be polluted with gigantic wind turbines.

Mr. Crankovich mentioned about the transmission lines in our viewscape. Unfortunately they were there before any of us ever knew, and it's been years and years ago. But fortunately they're very short compared to these huge wind-powered turbines that are proposed to be put in there. That's the benefit.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Hal Lindstrom?

MR. HAL LINDSTROM: My name is Hal
Lindstrom. I live at 1831 Hanson Road.

I thought you gentlemen would be a little --
seated a little closer together. I thought about
bringing three photos, but I just brought one.
But some of what I'm saying hinges on this photo,
so I'd like to have you look at it.

The photo is a project -- shows the project
area for what's called the Klondike project.
I've mentioned this before in previous testimony.
And at the time there were I think 16 turbines.
Now generating close to 30 megawatts. And I
think now there are 74; the project has been
enlarged.

But what you'll see there, what you do see
there is rolling wheat fields and zero
population. My wife Gloria and I were there; we
visited it about three years ago, and it's quite
unusual, if you've never seen them before, to
come upon them out in these rolling wheat fields
and get up close to them, and they are enormous.
Now, these aren't the largest ones. I think the

ones that are scheduled for this project are
close to 400 feet to the blade tip.
And the bird count, they had a bird count -- they'd only been going about five months when we got there, and the bird kill count was four -- no, it was three, and the bat kill was a little bit more than the bird kill. Which brings out a point that Gloria mentioned, and that is the need for adequate wildlife studies. And a single year is not enough.

I have another thought and I'll close here, and that is the Wild Horse project has been approved and it's being constructed. And why not -- wouldn't a conservative view be to wait about five years and see how that thing cranks out before you put another one of approximately the same size in? Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Howard Carlin? Is Howard still here?

I have Kurt Linder, but he marked he didn't want to testify. I think he has left, if I remember right.

That takes us to Patrick Butler. Do you still not want to speak, if you're here?

Phyllis Whitbeck?
MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: My name is Phyllis Whitbeck. I live at 7440 Robbins Road, Ellensburg, Washington, and I represent me and my husband.

And it was stated that wind turbines will bring a stop to selling off large amounts of land to the developers in our county. Well, that's wrong. These lands would then sell for less. Developers would put more affordable houses up at a denser rate. No $500,000 home would want to be built near these turbines. Urban sprawl would be in hog heaven. Example: Land under and near power towers and homes sell for less, making these areas more affordable than the choice land further away.

Turbines affect more land because of their huge size, noise, flashing lights which can be seen across the valley, bird kill, and shadow flicker.

Please say no to wind turbines and put them away from people in big wheat fields and say yes to solar energy, which is shorter in height, no flashing lights, no vibrations, no noise, no bird kill, easier for animals to live with, and less to keep up because of no moving parts. They use
as much land and or less and produce as much or
more electricity. I know; we have them both.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Noel Anderson
or Andrews. 2701 Elk Springs.

MR. NOEL ANDREW: It's Andrew.

My name is Noel Andrew. 2701 Elk Springs
Road. Ellensburg, Washington, 98926.

All around the valley, farms and ranches are
being sold to housing developers who are covering
the land with houses and blacktop as fast as you,
the commissioners, can and do approve the
subdivisions of the once several-hundred-acre
farm or ranch into small-acre parcels or, in some
cases, small lots with houses right next to each
other.

It is a no-brainer to see that is not
preserving the integrity of this valley as a
farming and ranching community, as some opponents
say the towers will ruin the integrity.

Approving Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project
would secure just a small portion of this valley
to remain open land that could not be had by the
developers to line their silver pockets with
gold.
As a landowner pretty much in the middle of the project with several turbines proposed, it would make my land very productive and would generate from my royalties more tax revenue from me on top of what the project would generate to the county. So the royalties from all the landowners in the project would balloon the tax revenue even more.

I really do think the project with towers dotted around the ridges in the foothills of this valley would enhance its beauty.

The project's proposed turbines' sites and roads are all situation on ridges that are rocky, wind-swept, and unproductive that is good only for pasture and wildlife. Animals love newly disturbed land as it provides new tender shoots of protein for them.

I ask of you, the commissioners, to approve this project on the basis of preserving open land and the tremendous tax benefit it provides. And please don't make a decision on which side has more of your friends on it. Thank you. And I have a picture of -- of a blend-in thing for you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Joe Brown is listed; didn't want to testify.
Is that still correct?

And I'm going to -- I'm going to butcher this one probably. Roger "Ben-netty" or "Be-neat"? 7430 Robbins Road?

MR. ROGER BINETTE: My name is Roger Binette. 7430 Robbins Road, Ellensburg.

I usually come in here without having something written, but I had too much to say this time, so I wrote it down and I will read it.

I'd like to start off by saying this is now a fight for our health, safety, and simply our well-being. We have folks who stress that only the economic value of the wind farm and seem blind to the evidence and refuse to listen to people now living and agonizing over the state of their lives living with turbines near their homes.

Here's just a few of the facts from people in Europe that are being subjected to in-place turbines:

Sounds like a gravel pit crushing rock nearby.

The noise dominates the sound
It's very unsettling and disturbing especially since it had been so peaceful here. It's an ongoing source of irritation. Can be heard throughout our house even with all the windows and doors closed. It makes an uneven pitch, not like the white noise of a fan. Can be heard through closed windows, making it hard to fall asleep any time of the year. You can hear them at times as far away as two miles. It is the annoyance of never having a quiet evening outdoors. When the blades occasionally stop, it's like pressure being removed from my ears. You can actually hear the quiet, which is a relief.
A power giant has been told it
will have to carry out a background
noise survey before a controversial
proposal to build three -- only

three, not eighty -- giant wind
turbines.

Steel towers will have some
impact on local TV, radio, and mobile
phone service.

Several months ago we spoke with a fellow
that worked on turbines in Arizona. He stated
how noisy they were and that his father and
neighbors received compensation for the
tremendous noise intrusion upon their homes from
the wind farms next to their properties. Money,
for an invasive noise. And Ellensburg, just
downwind. How about that one?

There's a reason people want to live here in
the valley, and it's not because wind turbines
will surround their homes. According to an
article in the Daily Record dated 18-11-03,
Kittitas County -- "Kittitas County's 5.5 percent
growth rate since the 2000 census makes it the"
state's fastest -- "fourth fastest growing county."

Our population is growing rapidly because more people want to live here and be part of what the essence of this valley is and has always been: quiet, beautiful, and serene.

The land in Kittitas County is being threatened. Population growth is not what's threatening the county. Wind turbines are what is threatening it. The ugly monstrosities which will at some point fall into disrepair, as has happened to many of them, is what will drive people away instead of attracting them. It seems that others coming into the county with their children value this area more than we do. I guess they're not aware of the turbines.

Granted, the lands leased for the turbines are under private ownership, but by a very small number of owners and being leased for who knows how much. I would like to venture to guess that the money they would receive for leasing their land would then -- would make them stern advocates of wind power.
What about the rest of us and the legacy left to our children? Children have no vote; that is what parents are for. That's what parents are for, so it is up to us to make the choice. There is always a choice.

Besides our children, who are our greatest assets, there has to be land for them to inherit. Once it's filled with concrete it's gone. We have to make a choice: our children or our land. Will it be the legacy of 410-foot towers or this valley that our children will inherit? Will they have to endure these mega structures or enjoy the incredible beauty and serenity of this valley?

The two are incompatible and have no comparison for value, validity, and necessity. We need to make a choice. Again, there is always a choice.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You have one minute.

MR. ROGER BINETTE: There's an Amish proverb: "We did not inherit this land from our fathers. We are borrowing it from our children."

There was an article in the Ellensburg Daily Record this week by the Economic Development
Group of Kittitas County promoting the wind power project. I quote: "The new homes are everywhere in our valley. But in general, residences cost local government more than they pay in taxes, which means fewer services or higher taxes for everyone" -- "for everyone else."

This is a ludicrous excuse for turning the valley into an industrial complex, and an industrial complex it is regardless of what label the wind companies put on it. The residents of these new homes, however, buy gas at local gas stations, food at local grocery stores, their automobiles at the local dealership, furniture at the local furniture store, hardware at the local hardware store, feed at the feed store, lumber at the local lumber yards; frequent local restaurants, taverns, art galleries, and all other businesses in the area, which in turn means revenue for the county as well as the local businesses and, by the way, more jobs as these companies grow.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you, Roger.

MR. ROGER BINETTE: I'll give it to you; I
had a little bit more.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I'm sure you did. But if you hand it to the clerk, we'll read it, I promise. Thank you.

Christine Cole?

MS. CHRISTINE COLE: I'm Christine Cole, I reside at 7430 Robbins Road in Ellensburg.

The surest way to denigrate this fragile, scenic, and irreplaceable valley is to allow an industrial wind power project to be placed here. It is totally incompatible with our human and fragile-wildlife environment.

The most ludicrous way to impede further population growth, as some would prefer, is to use this massive, ugly, potentially dangerous and totally unnecessary project as a deterrent. The logic is absolutely flawed and ludicrous.

The fact that our county is looking at biomass and solar as potential energy producers is certainly more environmentally responsible, less offensive, and a more productive avenue of approach to future power needs.

We are also hearing that our dams have
reduced their power output for lack of need.

A current ad placed in the Daily Record by
the Phoenix Group does not show a house in sight
and the turbines are placed in totally open land
with cows that are clueless and obviously distant
from the towers. A more realistic photo placed
in the newspaper with public comment is also
attached here. Those opposed to the turbines are
neither distant nor clueless.

As a governing board, you have been
inundated with all the information you need to
deny this project.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. We're going to
go ahead and take a five-minute break for my

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Our next person I have on
the list was Rich Bettas, but he did ask to be
skipped until tomorrow, unless he is still here
for some reason.

And I see somebody asking me to speak up.

Is that better?

So the next person wishing to speak, then,
is Gloria Baldi?

MS. GLORIA BALDI: I'm Gloria Baldi, and I'm representing Kittitas Audubon, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify once again.

The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project draft Environmental Impact Statement issued on August of 2004, Page 3-9 states, "The Kittitas Valley site is located within the Pacific flyway. Because it is located closer to the Cascade Mountains and the Yakima River, it may have a higher incidence of use by migratory birds than the Wild Horse site."

The same draft EIS on Page 3-8 states 97 species of birds are known to frequent the area of this wind power project. This is 39 percent of Kittitas County bird species, and some of these are known to be in decline, as reported in a recent study completed by Audubon Washington.

We do not know the consequences of this project to these birds because the research has not been done. Any wind power project like KVWPP which is located on a bird migratory flyway should require additional study to prevent
unintentional consequences of high wildlife kills.

Almost four years ago when Zilkha, now Horizon Wind Energy, was beginning to introduce its wind power project to valley residents, Kittitas Audubon questioned the extent of bird research procedures. We voiced our concern then about the accepted protocol, and we continue to stand behind the belief that the one year of point counts, which is periodic noting of species within a certain defined area, is inadequate and incomplete research to support this wind project.

No night studies have been done to note bat activity or migration patterns of both bats and birds at higher altitudes to 410 feet. No continuous periodic observation has been done to note patterns of birds in the spring when winds are heaviest. Or in spring and fall when many raptors (hawks) funnel down the canyons and over the ridges in the area of this proposed project.

We are not the only ones to have concerns. Two articles from Bat Conservation International are being included with my testimony, and I have
copies of that for you. One dated fall of 2005
describes the rejection of access to wind farms
owned by Florida Power & Light, the largest
producer of wind power in the nation, to the
researchers doing bat research.

The rejection came after 2000 bat kills were
found in a six-week period at two of Florida
Power's facilities. And the numbers were
probably much higher if one considers predator
removal rates and the searcher efficiency in
brushy areas. At this time no one knows why bats
appear to not be able to escape the tower blades.

KAS, Kittitas Audubon, reported earlier in
wind farm testimony that the wind project in
nearby Walla Walla, which is the Touchet one
mentioned earlier, or State Line, have been
surprised at the number of bat kills they have
discovered.

The second report by the Bat Conservation is
titled "Impacts of Wind Energy Development on
Wildlife, Key Issues of Concern" and in part
states that approval processes rarely include
scientific peer review either of methodology or
A second entity that also is expressing our concerns is the Government Accounting Office, and we've mentioned this in previous testimony. And I will just run through the -- basically what they are saying. They are some of the quotes regarding our concerns.

1. "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."

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." Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project falls within these parameters.

3. "...there is a shortage of information on migratory bird routes" -- which we mentioned -- "and bat behavior, as well as ways
in which topography, weather, and turbine type affect mortality."

4. "...studies conducted at one location can rarely be used to extrapolate potential impacts or mitigation effectiveness at other locations..." The bird studies used for this power project may have been sufficient at another site, but not adequate for a migratory flyway.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I need you to finish up, Gloria.

MS. GLORIA BALDI: Okay.

"It appears when new windpower facilities are permitted, no one is considering the impact of wind power on a regional or 'ecosystem' scale that often spans governmental jurisdictions."

We, like others, support development of clean, renewable energy resources and believe that wind power has potential. However, the wind power facilities from Altamont to Mountaineer, West Virginia, have seen sufficient wildlife kill to warrant serious concern about the cumulative impacts.

Until reliable solutions are developed to minimize wildlife kill, Kittitas Audubon believes
high-risk areas for wind farms should be avoided. A migratory bird flyway is a high-risk area, and we strongly recommend denying this project.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Andrew Johnson?

MR. ANDREW JOHNSON: Thank you for hearing me. Andrew Johnson, 260 Lenes Road, Ellensburg.

I recommend very strongly against approving this project. Several reasons. We've listened to a number of claims brought forth this evening; and I looked at them, and there are some significant problems with them.

For example, there were claims of rather strong tax incomes to the county, but I have not heard anyone say anything what happens when the depreciation schedules are set on a rapid depreciation. We could very easily lose a lot of that tax revenue in a hurry.

Secondly, they talked about setbacks a number of times, and I heard it said tonight that, oh, that was decided years ago. And yet in earlier hearings I heard that bandied back and forth and discussed before it was a set figure.

Now, in the Impact Statement it stated that
there would be a fixed number of -- or a number
of turbines in this particular area, but I didn't
hear any guarantees that that figure would remain
at that figure in future years, and that bothers
me a lot.

I also heard about a week ago that there is
a sun-powered project that's getting started
here, and I know a little about that. There are
a number of cities around the United States, one
of them in Wisconsin that I know about, where the
entire town is on sun power.

Now, there's a significant advantage to
that. With wind power generating AC power, you
can't store it; it can't be stored. With sun
power generating DC power, it can be stored. In
fact, one of our local aviators has a system up
on the hill up near Tomahawk Lane where he's
doing exactly that. He's generating DC power,
storing it in batteries.

Thank you.

And finally, the advertisements in the
newspapers touted the wind power as being
low-cost energy. The question is, if it's
low-powered energy, why, why did Puget Power
raise their rates and state specifically that it
was because of the -- of the Wild Horse project?

Not once, but twice.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you. And Rich,

I don't know if you heard, do you still want to

skip until tomorrow?

MR. RICH BETTAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, thank you.

Joe Sheeran is on here but didn't want to

testify.

Douglas MacArthur?

MR. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR: My name's Doug

MacArthur. I live at 4661 Umptanum Road, which

is on the south side of the valley. And I'm a

photographer and I'm speaking for myself.

I am definitely against these wind farms in

that location. If they were in some other place,

it would be a lot better for everybody. Because

that mountain means a lot to this valley. You

put those wind farms up there, those turbines,

you can have something that's solid as all

get-out here, but as soon as you put some motion

if front of it, you'll never see it. And you'll
never see that mountain after you put those wind machines. Because you can't see after the

motion.

I went down to State Line down by Wallula to take pictures of those. Now, those machines down there are small compared to what they're going to put up here. The thing is, I had my aunt with me; I was driving her car, which is a Mercury Grand Marquis. I parked about 200 feet from the base of one of them towers, and that car looked like a toy. Looked like one of them little old Hot Wheels up against something that was about that tall (indicating).

And that to me was a little bit ridiculous. I mean, you can't see through them, you can't see around them. The thing is, my aunt is also -- my aunt's name is Lois Young, and she has a little bit of hard hearing. She was inside the car with the air conditioner on and the radio. Well, actually it wasn't a radio; it was a tape. And she could still hear and feel those wind machines at 200 feet. She could feel them here (indicating), the thump, thump, thump of those
machines. Not as a person that is -- pretty sensitive, yeah, and I love the dear and I love her so much.

But the thing is, why would you submit

people that live in that area to something like that 24/7? I strongly recommend that you deny the use -- or the wind machines. Because of the tourists and the mountain. That we need. We don't need those wind machine in that spot. Put them someplace else. Don't leave them up there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Ken Hartman didn't want to testify and told me earlier he was going home.

Robert Keller?

MR. ROBERT KELLER: My name's Robert Keller. I happen to be the project manager for Horizon Wind on the Wild Horse project. I want to say a few words.

I notice the faces change, but the arguments really stay the same. I've been doing wind turbines for over 20 years, and there's really -- it boils down to what is really the -- what is
the land zoned for and what economic benefits
does it give to the community. And I'm here to
to kind of address some of the economic benefits
that it gives to the community.
I'm not going to get into the tax benefits,
because I know nothing about that. What I can

give you is what we are contributing to the
community at this point on the Wild Horse
project.
If you look, we've -- since we started about
four months ago, five months, we've put in
$2 million into this community. I don't need to
go through the list of people we spend it on, but
everybody that's working on the project needs
housing, food, gas, clothing, things of that
nature. And so we spent a lot of money in this
community.
There's over 30 local hires so far that
we've hired. We have 20 people that is from out
of town working for contractors that came with
them, and we've got 16 management personnel on
site. This includes not only Horizon but RES and
all their subcontractors.
We're also going to be building a maintenance building which we're going to be using all local contractors from this valley down here. There'll be probably a dozen contracts that go out, will be electrical contracts, building contracts, excavation contracts, things of that nature to build the maintenance building at the Wild Horse project. They'll be all locally built. The building's going to be built in Yakima by Sun Buildings. So that's going to be a lot of money generated to the community before it's over.

If you turn to the second page, by June we'll probably be putting a million dollars a month into this community. We're just getting started. We should be over a hundred people by that time.

And if you look -- this second page is a page we pulled out of our monthly report, so it's published information on exactly how much money we've put into the community.

That's pretty much all I have to really say. I just want you guys to understand that we're
here putting in a project and we're kind of part
of the community while we're here. We try to fit
in, we try to leave the community better than
when we came, we try to leave it stronger
financially.

And when we build these projects, we build
them to pretty high quality. We make them last,
we make them run, we make them perform for the
design life. And once we do the construction and
leave, it should be approximately 16 to 20 people
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on site to do the maintenance. And so we're
going to be here for 20 years; the wind farm will
be here for well over 20 years in your community,
putting an economic benefit to it.

That's all I really have to say.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Diane Schwab?
MS. DIANE SCHWAB: I just have a few things
to say. Oh, my name is Diane Schwab, and I'm
here representing myself and my husband. The
address is 2600 Cricklewood Lane.

There's just been a couple of things happen
on the front, just to give you an update. We now
have more met. towers. We have some on the east
of us and we have them to the south of us. And
the Kittitas project that's -- they want to put
in now is going to the west and to the north,
which is going to put us in the middle. And
that's the new -- what's new on the front.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that
the mitigation, the setback mitigation, is that
per property line 1000 feet or from house? Some
of us don't have our homes yet. And I would like
to have that clarified.

Because basically all I can see that they've
done that's going to benefit anybody is they've
moved them around a little bit but, for us being
up there so close and on adjoining land, we're
going to see 32 of them up close. Which I think
is not good. That's all I have. I'd like to
turn in my paperwork.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you very much. I had
Albert Schwab not wishing to testify. Is that
still correct? Thank you.

Jeb Baldi?

MR. JEB BALDI: Thank you. Thanks for
another opportunity to share my views.

In the late '60s and early '70s, I was a promoter of alternative wind; alternative energy production and individual home wind generation was an option for independence from the corporate world. It gave individuals an option, and that option still remains today.

However, another option is the huge wind generating projects. And we are well aware that global warming is a real concern and the greenhouse gasses that we're producing with fossil fuels need to come to an end.

Our nation needs to be independent from foreign oil, but to do this with a local

large-scale wind generation, as suggested by the Kittitas Valley Wind Project, is not the solution.

6000 acres laced with roads, underground cables, overhead power cables, with foundations four stories into the ground to hold 410-foot wind machines will severely alter Kittitas Valley. All of this for less than 1 percent of the state’s energy needs.
Has anybody considered conservation? Just noticing what we are wasting -- and I have these big bright lights shining right in my eyes right out there in the parking lot -- just noticing what we're wasting, we can correct and we can conserve. We're talking about 1 percent.

Another issue with wind machines and one that developers choose to overlook is the impact on wildlife. They have done minimal studies on the birds for only one year. Most experts feel two years is more appropriate. Even though the time has been allowed for more studies, none have been done on this project.

Also no bat studies, as mentioned before, have been completed. At the West Virginia site, 44 turbines consumed approximately 1980 bats in a six-week period. We have 13 species of bats in eastern Washington, and studies need to be done to protect those bats.

And why aren't we discussing solar power? The city is going full bore on it. Perhaps because the government is not giving tax breaks on solar power.
So please, in your deliberations, consider
the big picture. Is it worth the environmental
effects on our beautiful valley, to people's
homes, to the natural habitat, and to the
wildlife just to generate less than 1 percent of
our state's energy needs? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Duane Fluent?

MR. DUANE FLUENT: Thank you for the
opportunity to speak. I'll be very brief. My
name is Duane Fluent, F-l-u-e-n-t. 650 Goat Peak
Ranch Road, Cle Elum.

I'm rather a newcomer to the area. I've
only lived here about six years; I've been a
property owner for sixteen. However, my
great-grandfather was buried about 1910 over in
Keller.

I just want to go on record as being in
favor of the wind power project. It's

environmentally sound, it's economically sound,
it's a needed resource. And again, I'm in favor
of it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Thomas Maskal?

MR. THOMAS MASKAL: Tom Maskal, 420 Kern
Road, Ellensburg, 98926.

I don't think any of us in this room can argue with the fact that we need more power. I don't think any of us in this room can argue with the fact that conservation alone will solve all of our problems, whether it's Kittitas or the state or the nation or the world or the northern hemisphere or anything else that Erin from the project would like us to believe.

I don't think any of us can argue with the fact that even though in many instances to be an environmentist is to probably have things thrown at you because there are an awful lot of fringe environmentalists and everything else. However, I don't think there are very many of us in this room who would willingly trash our own environmentment, from throwing cans and bottles out the window if you're going down Badger Pocket Road or Bettas Road or any other road. I don't think very many of us in this room are going to throw refrigerators that we've used out into our yards or out into the county roads.

I think truthfully we are all
environmentalists whether we want to admit it or not. We're all proud of the fact that we have a resurgence in the bald eagle population and the general raptor population. We've talked about bats. And bats eat mosquitos and bugs, which unfortunately bats have a bad reputation also, just like environmentalists.

I don't think any of us can argue with the fact that global warming is a problem. Bush doesn't think so, but the rest of the world thinks so.

We need clean, renewable sources of energy. We need wind power projects, we need solar projects. We cannot trash the Columbia River anymore with any salmon-destroying slack-pool-creating dams like we have through beaurac and the Corps of Engineers and the PUDs.

However, this project is not Whiskey Disk Mountain. This project is a beautiful viewshed that we all are going to see from the Kittitas Valley, from the city of Ellensburg, and everybody driving up and down 97 and 90. Whiskey

Dick this is not.
Whiskey Dick is a fine place off the Vantage Highway for a wind power project. It's a nice big project, it's going to be good for the company; it's probably going to be good for everybody else's power production. It has a steady source of wind.

This location is what the problem is with this project. That is its probably main problem, from aesthetics, from, you know, the view, the noise, the people living around it, the property values. Everything the people have said about this project is what's wrong with it, in that one word: location, location, location. And no, I'm not a realtor.

I urge you strongly to be less civil and less hospitable, and throw these people out of our county. They've already got Whiskey Dick, they can go someplace else. Let's be less civil, let's be less hospitable. Throw them out, vote no. Thank you.


I had Sharon Holtz, but she didn't want to
testify.

Stephanie Johnson and Pat -- I'm not sure on the last name. On 3330 Cleman. They didn't want to testify. Is that still the case?

Takes us to William Erickson.

MR. WILLIAM ERICKSON: William Erickson, 6980 Wilson Creek Road, Ellensburg.

This is not -- any wind project within the valley is not good. The gentleman was saying about Wild Horse setting a precedent. This goes in, where is it going to stop?

These complexes are detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the rural residents of the Kittitas Valley. Some of the concerns are health problems caused by the wind generator projects, both physical and mental.

Noise, flicker, strobe lights, dust, sight are part of the problem.

Strobe lights are used to chase away all types of animals. I don't think anybody has really looked into that. I have an article that I'll give them that the -- in the Farm Show magazine that you can buy strobe lights to get rid of deer and elk and different things that are problems to your area. And so this would be
something that perhaps you won't see the wildlife
in that area if you put them in.

There are fire dangers being downwind. And
we know that this is windy, this area. And if
you get a dry situation, there's what, eighty to
a hundred gallons of hazardous oil in these
turbines? You get a collapse or something going
on in it, you're going to start a fire that no
one's going to stop if they're 400 feet high.

I don't know if you've been in a wind-driven
fire, but there was a little one out in our area
where somebody was burning in a ditch a couple
years ago. And then the wind came up. And you
don't want to be around them. We thought it was
going to take off and really go, but luckily they
got it out, but it took them a long time just to
get a little one out. If that happened at night,
forget it; the whole valley's going like
California.

The size of the turbines or feed line grid
has not been shown. A gentleman said they're
rocky. Well, if I remember on the previous one,
it said something like they had to go down -- if
they couldn't go down four feet, they had to go
up. And so your grid lines are not shown. And
there's a lot more of those, I think, than people would realize.

Property values, it's not just on what somebody has bought it and sold it, but what was the potential. It could have been a lot higher. These are our homes here. We've been here 37 years up there, and these aren't just houses; they're our homes. People have been there for a long time. And you don't want to put a potential danger in people's -- in the valley.

The setback I believe it said that from the a residence is 1000 feet. You realize that's less than a fifth of a mile, less than a quarter of a mile. 400 feet. And that's from the residence. That's not from the property line. The property line I believe is 541 feet.

Now, you think about that, you're -- prevents the neighboring property owners full use of their land. And it should be a lot further away. Because it is -- it would cause your flicker and different things like that; it should be half a mile away from property lines.

The construction of wind generators is exempt from state sales tax. So the county --
the other taxpayers in the county are going to be footing some of the bill for the services used by the construction, okay?

A large tax base around the county, I mean, it's grown quite a bit, and so we have a lot larger tax base. But you know, my tax bill is going up instead of going down. So I don't always buy this that it's -- the tax bill is going to be less.

That's pretty much it; thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

Next is Mick Steinman.

MR. MICK STEINMAN: Hello, my name is Mick Steinman. I'm from -- I live over in Lynnwood, but I have property up Cricklewood Lane.

This wind power, it's a renewable energy that can be -- will be there tomorrow, the next year, the year after. This wind does not stop in Ellensburg. I've owned property up there for 20 years, and one of my first thoughts when I was building some roads up there and stuff on those ridge tops, that wind doesn't stop.

I mean, it just -- it just howls and it
on top; and at that time, 20 years ago, I thought that this area would be good for wind farms.

So at that time I wasn't even even thinking of developing any wind farms, nor am I, but I was approached and I signed on. I literally went down before I signed on with this thing, went down and looked at the wind power projects in Oregon and things. And you know, I thought they were very graceful, I really -- I thought they were nice. They would be a nice thing to have in the area.

But anyway, the wind is better than producing coal, nuclear power, or building another dam. I mean, these options are not out there. The -- you know, this area, I mean, for the wind, you've got -- you've got wind, you have power grid right there.

If you moved it to the other side of the valley or somewhere else, you don't have a power grid like you have up there in the area where

just -- it's a cutting, cold wind that -- you know, it scrapes away the topsoil, it's a very rocky soil, but it's very -- very windy up there
they're proposing to put this. I mean, the high
energy power lines are going right straight
through that area. They don't have to build new
power lines. If you were to try and find another
place that was as windy as this, you would have
to build 20 to 50 miles of power grid to get back
into the BPA system or whatever system you have.
So you know, this is -- this is one of the best
places for it.

This is, you know, this stuff, you know, if
you go and put cattle up there or other things,
sheep, et cetera, that drains the land. The wind
turbines, they don't take away any of the
resources off the land. You know, I mean, we
aren't bothering the land at all. I mean, the
only thing you've got is a little bit of concrete
foundation and a tower going up. So you know,
it's kind of a good thing.

Many of these turbines are on Department of
Natural Resource lands. And that be -- all of
the revenue for that goes to the schools,
et cetera. I mean, it's a good base for that to
go.
So if -- I don't know how many of you commissioners have been within a mile of a turbine. Have you guys ever visited a wind farm?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I have visited one.

MR. MICK STEINMAN: You have?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I have visited one.

So anywaYt I'm in favor. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Next is Karl Krogstad; he had marked no. Is that still appropriate?

Shirleen Sterkel, also marked no.

Leonard Scheele?

MR. LEONARD SCHEELE: Good evening. My name is Leonard Scheele. My family and children and I have property on Elk Springs Road. We live in Seattle.
I have several questions. I noticed tonight that it appears that the statement in the agenda is that Sage Brush Partners has executed an Option to Purchase agreement from the DNR. I'd like to know if that's correct and if the terms of such a contract and long-term land use outcomes are known to the public and have they been discussed.

My second question is, what is the project's security plan and how will that impact the residents and the public. Will passing through the gate be equivalent to entering a military facility? If this industrial project is built, I think it should be like that.

My third question is likewise. If this project is built, will there be a no-shooting ordinance within the line-of-site radius of the towers? Does that go to the interstate? What impact would that have on the county sportsmen, people who come for weekend holidays and so forth?

One more question would be, is there a government equivalent of the FAA for aircraft,
mandating maintenance and time between overhaul,
government inspectors checking the laminations on
the rotors? These things are pretty massive.

My family likes to walk around in the area, and will we have a governing body that's going to
let us feel safe? One traversing -- I don't think there's any other way for us to get to our
property than to drive under them.

And lastly, not a question, I'd just like to go on record for myself and my family as being
against. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Takes us to Greg Harrington didn't mark whether he wanted to
testify or not. Is Greg still here?

Kathy Schumaker? Or "Shoe-maker"?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She went home.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay. Barbara and Jerry Newman. They marked no. Are they still here, did they change their minds?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: They're gone.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: And I have Rick and Colleen Hawley also marked no. Did they change their mind? I'll leave their names for tomorrow just
in case they do.

Takes us to Joseph Powell? Is he still here? Doesn't look like it.

Kathy Caraway signed in but said no as far as testifying. Hasn't shown up.

Okay, I'll keep close to the mic.

Fred Brune? Signed up, also said didn't want to testify. He's left.

Eric Prater. Did I see him?

MR. ERIC PRATER: My name is Eric Prater, and I live at 3740 Cove Road.

I am for the wind farms. And specifically for reasons that we're not going to need any more services in that area. Sheriffs, the hospital.

The wind farm is going to take care of the roads.

Property taxes, according to the ones that are against the wind farm, they say that values will go down so the property taxes will go down. I'm for that.

I'm a long-term resident, fourth generation.

I didn't even paint my house last year; my taxes went up. And that was because of people moving in. And I'll tell you what, man, we have got
lots of people moving into this valley. There's no shortage. So I'm not worried about people being offended by things, because they're going to take what they can get and be happy with it. That's how a lot of us ended up under the power lines anyway. That was a lower-priced area, that's where you went. If you couldn't -- I live on irrigated ground and I'm very thankful for it, because when we have water, it rains and snows, I can irrigate. I have to depend on my neighbors also for their return flow.

But up in that area, the values of land, agricultural land were lower, and I am for agricultural land. I am not for preserving this ground for residential property. I'm sorry, I just can't support the realtors anymore. And they're always going to have work. I'm not worried about them making money.

And property values have increased so much, I think that we're making money hand-over-fist. It may not seem that way if you just moved in in the last ten or twenty years, but I'm seeing things in a longer frame.
So anyway, I'm looking forward to hopefully -- I know you guys probably won't vote for it; it's a political reality. You guys got to stay away from that. But I'm looking forward to seeing a black spot on that hillside from my house on Cove Road, because I can see it and I can see everyone's houses in Sun East and all across the whole range of the valley. In fact, the wheat fields to the west of me, crowder's fields, have got houses on them. You want to talk about scarred fields? Anyway, I won't go there about that.

If this thing goes in, it's going to be Forest and Range for 25 more years. Isn't that what it is? It's Forest and Range. It's supposed to be logged and cows. I haven't heard one man or woman tonight say, You wouldn't believe the cows I got off my range land up here. All I've heard is, My property values are going to drop if this goes in; I'm worried about being able to look at a view.

I'm tired of it. If you're going to live in the ag zones, grow something, raise something.
That's our heritage. If you're going to retire here, live in town. Live in Seattle. There's beautiful neighborhoods for you. We have a great downtown. I love it. I'm looking forward to Artwalk in a week and a half.

And if I want to see my new neighbors that are moving in from the west side and the bigger urban areas, I'll go to Wal-Mart in Yakima, because I'll see more of them there than I will at the Safeway here in town. Or I'll go to Target. That's an honest reality. They're urban, they're sophisticated; two people working. They don't shop here; they shop out of town. They're at Lowe's hardware. Their houses have new everything; it didn't come from Knudson's; it came from out of town.

I'm sorry if I'm speaking loudly. This is more from the heart than it is from statistics and that.

Also I work for Midstate Co-op in the summertime the last three years. This year I won't be working there. But I deliver fertilizer to farmer's fields. And I see houses on the
fields that I used to deliver two years ago and last year.

In fact, the farmland on the Passmore Road is known as Windy Ridge. The trees up there -- my cousin Roger Weaver, we're distantly related, used to own that, and the name of it's Windy Ridge; it's known for the wind. Look at the trees up there.

Let's see, also I think that's the community -- Mr. Crankovich, you suggested that these -- the wind farm buy the property impacted by its nature; is that correct? I guess that would be a developer's impact fee?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: No, it would be -- I just suggested that in their -- in their information that they gave that that was a solution that came out of one other project. And that -- would that be considered here.

MR. ERIC PRATER: I appreciate your suggesting that, because I kind of took that and ran with that. I've got 13 acres and I'm getting houses all around me. I'm going to start charging to look at my place. If you buy a --
put a mansion on the hillside and want to look
across me, I'll use that idea. Instead of
selling my place, I'm going to sell a view.

That's just a thought. Because as it is
now, these people that own the land there, they
can't do what they want to with it. They're
being told, You can't have that. Now, if I lived
in Issaquah, on one side of Issaquah, and
somebody put a Costco in my view, I don't have
any control over that if I'm five miles away.
Time's up? Thank you, sir. Thank you for your
time, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Takes us to
Tony Helland.

MR. TONY HELLAND: My name's Tony Helland.
I live 414 Alpine Drive, Ellensburg. Even though
I do live in Kittitas. That's my mailing
address.

Pretty much everything I was going to talk
about was covered. Except I hear little bits and
pieces, and people are talking about tourists.
Right now I'm employed by Hurling Construction.
They're a subcontractor up at Wild Horse wind
project, and I'm a gate person up there.

I get two to three cars a day of tourists coming to look at the wind farm. There's nothing to look at, but they're still coming to look at it. Two to three most every day, as high as five and six carloads of people just out driving around. And that's kind of out of the way to go look at something.

I heard something about inspections. There are inspectors coming out of the ears up there. We have environmental inspectors, we've got cultural inspectors, we've got Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife inspectors, and they've probably got somebody out there to inspect them also. So the place is pretty well inspected, and so I don't think there should be any safety concerns on that -- that case.

I, I like I said before, everything's pretty much been covered. I would like to say in closing I saw maybe about 200 people here tonight. Some are for this project, some are against it. And the other 20-some-thousand people living in the county really don't care.

So what you need to do is -- and I really don't envy you guys having to do this, because
it's going to be a really difficult, difficult
decision to make. But I, I do really urge you to
consider approving this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Mark Schober?

Still here or he decided to --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He left.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: -- vacate? Okay.

Takes us to Holly Pinkart.

MS. HOLLY PINKART: My name is Holly

Pinkart. I'm here representing both myself and
my husband Wes. We reside at 5900 Robbins Road
in Ellensburg.

I'd like to go on record as being against
approval of this project for many of the reasons
that have already been stated. One of the things
that wasn't brought up is some of the things
about our bird and bat populations, about the
ecological value and product that they do for us
in controlling the rodent and inspect
populations.

This has not been well studied enough to
make really any kind of real decision on what
kind of impact this particular farm is going to
have on those populations. It could be
devastating. We don't have any numbers on night
creatures, the bats and the night birds that really do a wonderful ecological service for us.

I think to go ahead with this would be a bit irresponsible at this point. We have a wonderful opportunity with the Wild Horse project to sit back and see what effect a wind farm will actually have on the county, on the ecology, and the economics. I think it's irresponsible to go forward until that's up and running and we can get some idea of what that's going to do for our county.

Thank you for your time; I appreciate the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. Mark Holloway.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: My name is Mark Holloway. I live at 1581 Thomas Road.

I had the opportunity to actually visit the Dayton wind farm, which has, I believe, like 128 wind towers. And I was actually surprised at actually how slow the wind turbines seemed to move. They, they, they told us that they rotate 16 to 18 revolutions per minute. I observed redtail hawks flying around, hunting, choosing not to perch on the wind turbines, actually perching
were there.

I realize -- I'm also a falconer and have been since I was 16 years old, a member of the Washington Falconry Association and North American Falconry Association. I realize that there -- there will be a physical impact -- or can be a physical impact with these turbines. I imagine there will be animals killed.

But when you look at the -- what we have -- what we -- the opportunity we have is a section of land, 6000 acres, with no houses, with adequate fire suppression, roads by the -- paid for by the company that wants to put these in. Open -- open land, pretty much left as it -- as it is for 25 years; and then when they're removed, there should be some -- at the end of their lease terms, there should be some, I guess, provisions for how to restore the land to its previous use.

Like at least at the Dayton project what they did is in their plan they removed the, the wind towers and they dig down and remove the
first -- I believe it was four feet of the columns that hold these towers up.

6000 acres, that's a lot of houses, that's a lot of wells, that's a lot of cats, that's a lot of dogs, if that ends up being changed in use from range land to ranchettes. That's a big impact. Far bigger impact than what I personally saw at the site.

As far as the wind goes or the sound effects, I stood next to the turbine, I actually touched it. You could feel, it felt like a refrigerator, like the refrigerator in your house as far as a vibration. Held a conversation with the other people that were there. Didn't have a problem with that.

You can hear it, you definitely can hear it at the base. 300 feet away you can hear the sound separate from the actual wind. You can tell what direction the sound is coming from.

By the time we walked out 700 feet away, I couldn't hear it. It was -- it was -- I could not distinguish the sound of the wind from the sound of the turbines moving. There was no
difference. You know, if they're proposing 1500 feet, it seems like a reasonable range.

The other thing at this Dayton project, they -- the person who was -- who was taking us to tour it said that they're now working on

allowing -- okay, allowing hunters to be able to use the property but they have to figure out the logistics of making it work.

Basically I'm for it. I do think that we -- that there needs to be more studies as far as how it's going to actually affect the birds if we've only done a short -- short-term study. So we need to work more on that. But I think it's a good thing. A large tract of land saved for its current use. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. We have Kevin Persson, marked he wasn't going to speak.

Dale Lee Jr., also not to speak.

Bret Brower, also listed not to speak.

Scott Nicolai?

MR. SCOTT NICOLAI: Mr. Chair, members of the commission, thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Scott Nicolai. I live at
510 North Mt. Stuart here in Ellensburg, and I'm
testifying on behalf of myself.

I have a couple of things in a packet I'd
like to ask your permission to submit to each of
the commissioners.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Certainly.

MR. SCOTT NICOLAI: I appreciate your

willingness to take a look at that. I know
you're all on information overload probably every
day of the year, and this is just one more
matter.

But please, if you would, take a look at --
starting with the last page, and I'm going to
actually come out of the closet tonight for the
first time and support wind power in Kittitas
County. It's the first time publicly that I've
expressed my support, and the reason is expressed
in these documents.

And on the last page you're going to see a
graph that was compiled by the University of
Washington's Climate Impacts group. And this
shows you what has happened to the global average
temperature in the last 140 years.
This is -- this is why I'm here tonight, because we are having profound impacts on our climate. And the preceding page, if you could please turn to that now, you'll see another graph that shows what's happened to the carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere over the last 60,000 years.

And the reason we know what the levels were like tens of thousands of years ago is because they look at bubbles in glacial ice, they look at bubbles that are in newly formed rocks, and they can actually measure the CO2 levels from those.

And you'll see that we've virtually shot up from an average of around 260 parts per million to 360 parts per million, just since the dawn of the industrial revolution.

Well, what's that done for the climate? Well, it's had profound impacts. My neighbor is a 70-year-old avid outdoor person, and he tells me that the high routes that he used to claim up and around Mt. Daniel in the middle Cascades, a lot of those are virtually unavailable now because the snow fields and the glaciers are gone.
or they are receding.

Look at the picture on the front page. It shows you what's happened to glaciers since 1928. You know, less than 80 years. It's retreating at a rate of 180 feet per year.

So the question is, how do we produce our power? We're going to need more power. One of the energy program employees for the city, Gary Nystadt, told me two weeks ago that there are 93 new coal-fired power plants proposed in the United States right now.

Last month's National Geographic had a special on coal. Showed a picture of a train, a trainload of coal headed for one coal-fired power plant in Montana. This train was a mile and a half long. How long do you think that lasted? Just over one day. A trainload of coal a mile and a half long, the caption said this serves that one power plant for just over a day.

We can make coal cleaner, but there is no way you can prevent it from contributing to this (indicating). Because it takes carbon that's been stored for millions of years and releases it
into the atmosphere.

Conservation; conservation is great. I would love it if we could do conservation, but we're humans. Here's some comic relief. Tonight I have turned the bathroom light off in the men's room seven times. Not because I had too much coffee for dinner; just because we are human. I can't get my wife to turn the light off. I mean, that's how we are. We don't think about those things.

Hydro; there's no new sites. The solar project in Ellensburg is great. It provides enough electricity when it's built for eight homes. Eight conservation homes, eight homes that don't use electricity for heat. It requires a $52,000 contribution from private sources.

There's going to be wildlife impacts from this project. There can't be -- and I would love it if we didn't have to build it. But the reality is the project you already approved has more wildlife impacts than this one does. That's what all the public entities -- the biologists say, because it's out there in Whiskey Dick.
Mountain that's relatively pristine.

Your Comprehensive Plan and your zoning code says for these zones, Ag 20, Forest and Range, that uses -- that protect and tend to preserve natural resource-based industries are preferred and uses that degrade those are to be discouraged.

Wind power, as you guys know, protects natural resource-based industries. And there's a consortium now of folks, 70 interest groups, mostly farm bureau types, timber industry types, who are promoting 25 percent renewables in the United States by the year 2025. Right now we produce 4 percent.

You guys are in an opportunity -- are in a place to deal with this problem (indicating) and help us to get to that goal, and we produce 4 percent today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. We're going to stop for a second. I'm down to five yesses. And I did promise you 10:30. I realize we have to come back tomorrow.

THE COURT REPORTER: If you can give me a
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, I'll give you five or ten minutes --

As long as she needs, and then we'll go and address the last five and see if they're still here. Anybody who didn't speak or has left already, we'll give them up to tomorrow night and we'll reconvene at six o'clock. I know several have left, based on that direction.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, I've got --

Mr. Knudson has graciously said he'll do his part tomorrow.

Judith Kleck, are you still here and would you like to still testify? I don't see Judith. We'll leave her for tomorrow night.

Debbie Boddy or "Body," B-o-d-d-y? Is no longer here either.

Milt Johnson, did you want to testify tonight or do you want to do this tomorrow? I saw you in the room earlier. There you are.

Before you start, let me see who else wants to --
We also have Neal Houser. Are you still here, did you want to testify tonight as well?

Okay.

And George Matheson from Tacoma Street.

Didn't say whether he wanted to testify or not.

Is he still here? Don't see him.

And I had one last name over by the door, which was Catherine Clerf. Are you still here and did you want to testify tonight?

MS. CATHERINE CLERF: Yes, I am still here, and if possible I'd like to testify tonight.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Okay, so we've got three.

I think we can do this.

Milt, you're up.

MR. MILT JOHNSTON: Okay, thank you very much. I'm Milt Johnston. I talked to you before as a representative of the Department of Natural Resources. We've provided written comments to the Board already.

I'm here tonight as a personal citizen in the county. I just want to comment that I am in favor of the project for many of the same reasons that have been talked about tonight. We're
clearly in an energy hole. As a nation we need
to work on our energy production. It's
economically viable, it'll improve our tax base
for all those reasons.

I'll keep my comments short and sweet
because I know the night's late. Thank you very
much.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you, Milt.

Neal Houser?

MR. NEAL HOUSER: Hi, my name's Neal Houser.

I live at 2065 Lawrence Road out at Badger
Pocket. Grew up in a small town in Michigan,
similar to Kittitas for that area, as a farmer,
and I have a small farm out here, about 40 acres.

I look right across the valley right now at
the Wild Horse wind farm; I can see it with my
naked eyes, even in this time see the bases from
our house. I know it's probably ten miles away,
something like that.

We look up the valley at Mt. Stuart and
yeah, every night we comment there's more and

more lights out here in the valley as people move
in. And putting up several hundred wind towers,
whether it's this project or the one after it or
the one after it to finally equal that, I don't
know how many lights are going to go on those
things, but it's going to be pretty amazing, I'm
sure. Just to keep airplanes from hitting them.

As far as tax base, you know, they come in
here for a year and they give lots of jobs and
that's great for a lot of the local contractors
and things like that, but then they're going to
leave and they're going to -- they say 16 people
to maintain this one up here after, you know, a
hundred jobs leave the valley.

You know, they keep saying that the tax
rates are going to -- we're going to benefit by
having all this great tax money coming in, but
I've yet to see taxes go down anywhere when
there's more money brought in. I just don't
foresee that happening; it's not done.

I'm against the wind farm. But the one out
here, you know, we're stuck with one here on Wild
Horse, and I think we should look at it for about
a year or two until we decide if we want another
one. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you. That takes us to Catherine Clerf.

MS. CATHERINE CLERF: Catherine Clerf currently at 60 Moe Road, Ellensburg, which is out in the Badger Pocket. Fourth generation of the Clerf family that came to this county in the 1880s.

And historically speaking, my father and his father and my grandfather were a long time, oh, hundred and some years in the community; and during World War II and in the aftermath of World War II there were rangeland that they either gave up at zero cost or pennies on the acre. That was the farming range, and the figure to ranch was lost because it was behind Wanapum Dam.

Things have changed radically. We are now in the year two hundred and six (sic) and we're in the same project, only 150 years ago there would be, (a) fewer people in the community living who were living and making -- earning a living ranching and farming in the first place, and they would be looking at it as they would have the dam: It would have provided cheap, economical power.

The wind happens to blow where it happens to
blow. My engineering is in chemical engineering and mechanical engineering mathematician, and I worked for a project that was trying to get clean oil -- excuse me, clean coal technology fired plants in the United States, and that's for another discussion. So my background is trying to balance what the needs of our society are with trying to protect the environment.

I've also traveled extensively in other parts of the world, especially the behemoths of India and China; and if this country does not address the issues of alternative powers, diversification, we will literally be left in the economic dustbin of history.

Because you have the Asian power horses going to be sucking up hydrocarbons, coal at a rate that we won't be able to afford. I grew up in this valley and I agree when you come down off of Yakima, the lights in the valley is striking.

It may not be to someone who recently moved here, but I'm 52 years old and I remember that even at the peak of Central, 12,000 people in the valley happened during the school year. There were, you know, six, seven thousand people who lived here.
1 The valley is going to change because people
2 are going to move in. They will buy property
3 here to get out of the three-county area, where I
4 left after 20 years; taxes drove me out. And
5 they will come here even if there is a wind
6 turbine. Because if you compare it to the life
7 and quality of life in the three-county area just
8 120 miles away, living here is still
9 preferential.
10 I simply would state that there are people
11 who want to wait for the other farm to be
12 developed. Well, things get more expensive and
13 our power is going to become more expensive.
14 There will be less of it. Washington is one of
15 the states that's going to gain population in the
16 next ten years. I'm a baby boomer; I'd want to
17 move here too, not Florida. And you need to
18 address this issue now. Postponing it doesn't
19 solve the problem.
20 I thank you for your time.
21 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.
22 Okay, that does conclude our list, so thank
23 you all for staying so late. Thanks to my
24 seatmates, too, for their indulgence, for kind of
25 shooting -- sitting here a little longer than
they expected, so.

Any closing thing we need to do with staff at all?

I guess with that I would entertain a motion to continue this hearing until tomorrow at six o'clock.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we continue this public hearing to tomorrow at six o'clock here in the Kittitas Valley Event Center.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's been moved and seconded to continue this public hearing to 6:00 p.m. here in the Kittitas Valley Events Center. The record will remain open to written and oral testimony.

And thank you all.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any discussion to the motion?

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

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Aye.
COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Aye.

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

(The proceeding was adjourned at 10:33 p.m.)
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