

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of Application No. 2006-02

Desert Claim Wind Power Project

**DESERT CLAIM'S REQUEST FOR
PREEMPTION**

I. Introduction

The Applicant, Desert Claim Wind Power LLC ("Desert Claim"), hereby requests that the Council recommend preemption of local land use requirements and the issuance of a Site Certification Agreement authorizing construction and operation of the Desert Claim Project (the "Project"). The Council's rules require consideration of preemption requests along with the Application for Site Certification in its adjudicatory proceedings.

Accordingly, Desert Claim bases its request for preemption on the materials filed herewith, together with the testimony and evidence to be presented during the adjudicatory hearings to be held in this matter.

II. Factual and Procedural Background

In 2001, enXco, Inc. began evaluating potential sites in Kittitas County for a commercial scale wind project. Declaration of David Steeb ¶ 2 (hereinafter "Steeb Decl."). In January 2003, Desert Claim filed an application with Kittitas County seeking the

DESERT CLAIM'S
REQUEST FOR PREEMPTION – 1

LEGAL13073313.1

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 approvals necessary to construct and operate the Project. Steeb Decl. ¶ 5. For more than
2 two years, Desert Claim met with Kittitas County Community Development Services staff,
3 and attended hearings and meetings of the Board of County Commissioners ("BOCC")
4 regarding the Project. Steeb Decl. ¶ 6. In an effort to address concerns expressed during the
5 County process, Desert Claim made numerous revisions to the Project and to the conditions
6 and mitigation requirements outlined in a draft Development Agreement. *Id.* Nonetheless,
7 in April 2005, the BOCC issued a final decision denying Desert Claim's application. Steeb
8 Decl. ¶ 7. Desert Claim then made some additional changes to the Project to address the
9 expressed concerns further, and filed an Application for Site Certification with this Council
10 in November 2006. Following this Council's issuance of Order No. 826 recommending
11 certification of the Kittitas Valley Wind Project, Desert Claim announced its intention to
12 incorporate the setbacks and shadow flicker mitigation recommended by the Council in the
13 Kittitas Valley proceedings. Desert Claim has since met with Kittitas County's Community
14 Development Services, but has been unable to resolve one of the County's concerns about
15 the Project.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 **A. Desert Claim's Application to Kittitas County**

32 In 2001, enXco, Inc., Desert Claim's parent corporation, began evaluating potential
33 sites in Kittitas County for a commercial scale wind project. Steeb Decl. ¶ 2. At that time,
34 under Kittitas County Ordinance 2001-12, wind projects were allowed as a conditional use
35 in all Agricultural-20 ("Ag-20"), Forest and Range, Commercial Agriculture and
36 Commercial Forest zoning districts. Steeb Decl. ¶ 2.

37 In late 2002, the County enacted Ordinance 2002-19, which established the wind
38 power siting provisions now found in Kittitas County Code chapter 17.61A. According to
39 the chapter 17.61A, a wind project may be permitted in any area zoned as Ag-20, Forest and
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 Range, Commercial Agriculture or Commercial Forest. KCC 17.61A.020(4). However, it
2 requires a Wind Farm Resource Development Permit and Development Agreement with the
3 County, a site-specific amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designation map,
4 and a site-specific rezone of the project area. It is impossible to know whether a project at
5 any particular location would be able to obtain these required approvals without filing an
6 application and going through the County process to obtain a final decision.
7
8
9
10
11

12 After considering the wind resource, land availability, transmission access, potential
13 environmental impacts and neighboring land uses, Desert Claim selected a location for its
14 project approximately 8 miles northwest of Ellensburg. Steeb Decl. ¶ 2. At that point,
15 Desert Claim considered whether to file an application with Kittitas County or with EFSEC.
16 Looking at EFSEC's regulations, Desert Claim understood that, if it filed with EFSEC, the
17 Council's proceedings would be stayed while Desert Claim tried to obtain County approvals.
18 See WAC 463-28-030(1). However, if Desert Claim went through the County process and
19 obtained County approvals, it would not need to obtain EFSEC's approval as well. Desert
20 Claim concluded that the most efficient way to proceed was to file an application with
21 Kittitas County first. If it did not obtain County approvals, it could then proceed with an
22 application to EFSEC. Steeb Decl. ¶ 3.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 On January 28, 2003, Desert Claim filed an application with Kittitas County to
35 obtain the approvals necessary to construct and operate a 180 MW wind power project. The
36 Project described in the original application to the County included 120 turbines spread out
37 over a 5,237-acre project area. Steeb Decl. ¶ 5.
38
39
40
41

42 For more than two years, Desert Claim's application worked its way through the
43 Kittitas County process. Steeb Decl. ¶ 6. The following is a summary of that process. A
44 detailed chronology is also provided as **Exhibit 2** to the Steeb Declaration.
45
46
47

1 In April 2003, the County issued a SEPA Determination of Significance. Steeb
2 Decl. Ex. 2. In December 2003, the County published a Draft EIS and in August 2004, the
3 County published its Final EIS. *Id.*

4
5
6 In September 2004, Desert Claim worked with Community Development Services
7 and the County attorney to prepare a draft Development Agreement, which the County then
8 circulated to the public. Steeb Decl. Ex. 2. On October 25 and 26, 2004, the Kittitas County
9 Planning Commission and the Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners ("BOCC")
10 held joint hearings. *Id.* At the conclusion of those hearings, the Planning Commission
11 recommended denial of Desert Claim's application. *Id.*

12
13 For the next five and a half months, the BOCC held at least ten hearings and
14 meetings to consider Desert Claim's application. Steeb Decl. ¶ 6, Ex. 2. In between them,
15 Desert Claim worked with staff to revise the Development Agreement and try to address
16 concerns that had been raised. Steeb Decl. ¶ 6. On March 9, 2005, the BOCC deliberated
17 and voted to deny Desert Claim's application. Steeb Decl. ¶ 7. On April 5, 2005, more than
18 twenty-six months after Desert Claim had filed its application with the County, the BOCC
19 issued Findings of Facts and Resolution 2005-46 formally denying Desert Claim's
20 application. *Id.*

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
Desert Claim appealed to Superior Court, but the court upheld the BOCC's decision.
Desert Claim Wind Power, LLC v. Kittitas County, No. 05-2-00243-6, slip. Op. at 11
(Kittitas Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 4, 2005). In doing so, the Superior Court noted that "Desert
Claim made extraordinary efforts to satisfy two different boards of county commissioners
over the process of the application it submitted to the County." *Id.* at 10-11.

1 **B. Revised Project Description and EFSEC Application**

2
3 Following the BOCC's decision, Desert Claim considered whether additional
4 changes could be made to the Project to address concerns that were raised during the County
5 process. Steeb Decl. ¶ 9. After obtaining a lease on neighboring DNR land, Desert Claim
6 was able to consolidate the Project and eliminate the eastern portion of the Project. *Id.*
7
8

9
10 On November 6, 2006, Desert Claim submitted an Application for Site Certification
11 ("the Application") to EFSEC. The Application described the Project, which consisted of 90
12 turbines (2.0 MW capacity each), located on 4,783 acres of public and private land
13 northwest of Ellensburg. **Exhibit 3** to the Steeb Declaration compares the Project Area to
14 the area identified in the original application to Kittitas County.
15
16

17 The revised Project described in the November 2006 Application has several
18 advantages over the original proposal:
19
20

- 21
22
23
24
- 25 • The Project Area has been consolidated from four separate parcels to one
26 contiguous area.
 - 27
28 • The Project Area has been reduced from 5,237 acres to 4,783 acres.
 - 29
30 • The total number of turbines has been reduced.
 - 31
32 • There are only 32 non-participating residences located within 3,000 feet of a
33 proposed turbine.
 - 34
35 • Sound from the Project will be no more than 50 dBA at adjacent properties.
 - 36
37 • Shadow flicker at adjacent residences has been substantially reduced. For
38 those residences (if any) that are affected by perceptible shadow flicker,
39 Desert Claim will stop the blades of the wind turbine that causes the flicker
40 during those hours and conditions when shadow flicker occurs, or offer a
41 voluntary waiver agreement to the landowners in lieu of stopping the turbine.
 - 42
43 • The Project will not result in any temporary or permanent impacts to
44 wetlands, stream or their buffers.
45
46
47

- 1 • Daytime white strobe lighting has been eliminated and nighttime red lighting
2 has been reduced.
3

4 *See* Desert Claim Wind Power, Application for Site Certification (Nov. 2006).
5

6 Both before and after filing the Application, Desert Claim made efforts to
7
8 communicate with Kittitas County about the changes it had made to the Project. In summer
9
10 and fall 2005, Joe Fahrendorf (enXco Vice President Business Development) attempted to
11
12 contact the Commissioners to discuss changes Desert Claim was considering to address the
13
14 County's concerns, but his calls were not returned. Steeb Decl. Ex. 2. On October 24, 2006,
15
16 Darin Huseby (enXco Development Director Northwest Region) met individually with each
17
18 of the Commissioners to explain the changes made to the Project. Steeb Decl. Ex. 4 (Letter
19
20 from D. Huseby to Commissioners dated Nov. 30, 2006). On November 6, 2006, David
21
22 Steeb (Desert Claim Project Director) hand-delivered copies of the Application to each of
23
24 the Commissioners and to the Director of Community Development Services. Steeb Decl.
25
26 ¶ 11. Thereafter, Mr. Huseby attempted to contact each of the Commissioners again, but his
27
28 calls were not returned. Steeb Decl. Ex. 4.
29

30 By letter dated December 5, 2006, Kittitas County Commissioner David Bowen
31
32 explained the County's position that Desert Claim was required to submit an application to
33
34 the County to seek the approvals required by the County's Wind Overly Ordinance. Steeb
35
36 Decl. Ex. 5. Commissioner Bowen stated unequivocally that the County had "no interest" in
37
38 "making a decision about the project" outside the process outlined by chapter 17.61A. *Id.*
39
40 Nonetheless, he did offer to arrange a public meeting to discuss the Project changes with
41
42 Desert Claim, but also emphasized that "[i]n that we do not have an application the Board
43
44 will not, however, be able to make any decision on your project. As such, a meeting like
45
46 this would be an information meeting only." *Id.* In light of the position set forth in this
47

1 letter, Desert Claim did not believe a public meeting would be productive and did not take
2
3 Commissioner Bowen up on his offer at that time.

4
5 **C. EFSEC Land Use Consistency Process**

6
7 On January 30, 2007, the Council held a Land Use Consistency Hearing in
8
9 Ellensburg regarding the Desert Claim Project. During the hearing, Desert Claim and
10
11 Kittitas County agreed that Desert Claim had not obtained the approvals required by Kittitas
12
13 County Code chapter 17.61A. The Council therefore found that the Project was not
14
15 consistent with the Kittitas County land use requirements in existence at the time Desert
16
17 Claim filed its application with the Council. *See* Council Order No. 825.

18
19 Soon thereafter, Desert Claim filed a motion with the Council seeking a
20
21 determination that it had satisfied WAC 463-28-030(1)'s requirement that it make reasonable
22
23 efforts to cure the inconsistency with local land use requirements and, therefore, could
24
25 proceed to submit a request for preemption. The Council heard argument on the motion
26
27 during its Council meeting on April 10, 2007, and requested supplemental briefing on
28
29 certain issues. Desert Claim submitted additional briefing, and in doing so, also offered to
30
31 spend another thirty days meeting with the County to try to identify and resolve any County
32
33 concerns about the revised Project. *See* Desert Claim's Supplemental Briefing re WAC 463-
34
35 28-030(1) (April 17, 2007).

36
37 Shortly before Desert Claim submitted its supplemental briefing, the Council issued
38
39 Order No. 826 recommending certification of the Kittitas Valley Wind Project on March 27,
40
41 2007. In its Supplemental Briefing, therefore, Desert Claim informed the Council that it
42
43 would be amending its Application to incorporate two mitigation measures that the Council
44
45 had included in the recommended K.V. Site Certification Agreement. Specifically, Desert
46
47 Claim indicated that it was re-configuring the Project to ensure that all turbines would be

1 located a distance from existing residences equal to at least four times the tip height of the
2 turbine (4 x 414 feet = 1,656 feet). *See* Desert Claim Supplemental Briefing at 7.¹ Desert
3 Claim also indicated that it would mitigate potential shadow flicker in the same manner
4 specified in Article VII, Section I of the Kittitas Valley Site Certification Agreement. *Id.*
5
6

7
8 On May 8, 2007, the Council granted Desert Claim's motion and ruled that Desert
9 Claim is not required to file an application with Kittitas County under Kittitas County's
10 Wind Overlay Ordinance, KCC chapter 17.61A. *See* Council Order No. 830 at 7 (May 8,
11 2007). The Council also sent a letter to the Kittitas County Commissioners encouraging
12 them "to use your best efforts to work with the Applicant and to resolve as many issues as
13 possible in advance of any adjudication." Letter from J. Luce to Commissioners dated May
14 17, 2007.
15
16

17
18 On May 17, 2007, Desert Claim met with Kittitas County Community Development
19 Services. Steeb Decl. ¶ 13.² During the meeting, Community Development Services
20 Director Darryl Piercy explained that he believed three issues led to the BOCC denial of
21 Desert Claim's original application to the County: (1) inadequate mitigation of potential
22 shadow flicker, (2) the Project area included several non-contiguous parcels, and
23 (3) inadequate setbacks from existing residences. *Id.* Mr. Piercy said that the changes
24 Desert Claim has made to the Project addressed the first two of these issues. However, Mr.
25 Piercy indicated that Desert Claim's proposal to locate all turbines at least 1,656 feet (four
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 ¹ Desert Claim is now evaluating the revised configuration in light of the Governor's
42 decision last week regarding the K.V. Project.
43

44 ² Desert Claim was represented at the meeting by Darin Huseby (enXco Development
45 Director Northwest Region), David Steeb (Claim Project Director) and Karen McGaffey (attorney).
46 Attending from Kittitas County Community Development Services were Darryl Piercy (Director),
47 Allison Kimball (Assistant Director), Joanna Valencia (Planner) and Neil Caulkins (attorney).

1 times the turbine height) from existing residences was inadequate; he believed the BOCC
2 would require a 2,500-foot setback from existing residences absent site-specific reasons
3 justifying a lesser distance. *Id.* Mr. Piercy stated that he did not believe the County had any
4 other concerns about the revised Project. *Id.*
5
6
7

8
9 Desert Claim appreciated Mr. Piercy's candor and his willingness to clearly state that
10 he believes the County's only remaining concern about the Desert Claim Project is the
11 setback from existing residences. Steeb Decl. ¶ 14. However, as Mr. Piercy acknowledged,
12 the BOCC has the responsibility for making decisions under KCC chapter 17.61A. Desert
13 Claim, therefore, requested to meet directly with the BOCC to hear the Commissioners'
14 views about the Project first-hand. *Id.* In effect, Desert Claim asked to take the BOCC up
15 on the offer that Commissioner Bowen had made back in December to hold a public meeting
16 about the Project.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 However, the BOCC denied Desert Claim's request. In a letter dated May 22, 2007,
25 Mr. Piercy explained:
26
27

28
29 In our meeting you requested we consider the possibility of conducting a
30 public meeting with the Board of County Commissioners, prior to
31 application, to provide you with an opportunity to hear directly from the
32 Commissioners any concerns or issues they may have in regards to your
33 project. The Commissioners have considered your request but must
34 respectfully decline. It is felt that to hold a public meeting where some
35 measure of approval or rejection seems to be the goal may leave the
36 community and applicant to believe the Commissioners have prejudged a
37 specific project without full and fair opportunity for public participation.
38 Such discussion is best conducted as part of the public hearing process on
39 your application where the full details of the project are known and the
40 Commissioners can take specific action consistent with the County code.
41
42

43 Steeb Decl. Ex. 6 (Letter from D. Piercy to D. Steeb and D. Huseby dated May 22, 2007).
44
45
46
47

1 Short of filing an application under the County's Wind Farm Overlay Ordinance,
2 which this Council has already ruled is not required, there appears to be nothing further
3
4 Desert Claim can do to reach resolution of outstanding issues with the County.
5
6 Accordingly, Desert Claim now files this request for preemption.
7

8 **III. RCW Chapter 80.50 Preempts Local Authority**

9
10 Through RCW chapter 80.50, the Legislature established a one-stop process for
11 permitting certain energy facilities. A Site Certification Agreement, recommended by
12 EFSEC and approved by the Governor, authorizes the construction and operation of energy
13 facilities covered by RCW chapter 80.50. The decision of EFSEC and the Governor takes
14 precedent over local land use requirements.
15
16
17
18
19

20 The Legislature unequivocally expressed its intention to preempt local regulation of
21 energy facilities that fall within the Council's jurisdiction:
22
23

24
25 The state hereby preempts the regulation and certification of the location,
26 construction, and operational conditions of certification of the energy
27 facilities included under RCW 80.50.060 as now or hereafter amended.
28

29 RCW 80.50.110(1). The Legislature further provided that a Site Certification Agreement
30 would supersede and take the place of all state and local permits that would otherwise be
31 required for these projects:
32
33

34
35 The issuance of a certification shall be in lieu of any permit, certificate or
36 similar document required by any department, agency, division, bureau,
37 commission, board, or political subdivision of this state.
38

39 RCW 80.50.120.
40

41 In its recent decision regarding the Kittitas Valley Wind Project, the Council
42 explained the tension between the Legislature's command in RCW chapter 80.50 and the
43 wind power siting process created by ordinance in Kittitas County:
44
45
46
47

1 In an Application for Site Certification filed with EFSEC, site-specific details
2 are not for a county or city to negotiate and impose, but are firmly within the
3 jurisdictional realm of this Council. EFSEC is charged with unitary
4 permitting authority for energy facilities seeking its site certification,
5 allowing for a streamlined siting process. EFSEC's preemptive statutory
6 power to certify and regulate the location, construction, and operation of
7 energy facilities such as the proposed KVVPP simply cannot be usurped by
8 local governments seeking to impose their own imprimatur on the siting
9 process.

10
11 Council Order No. 826 at 17.
12

13
14 Despite the Legislature's clear intention to preempt local regulation, the Council has
15 for many years had regulations that require an applicant to "request preemption" when a
16 project is not consistent with all of the local land use requirements that otherwise apply to
17 development of the project site. *See* WAC 463-28-040, -050, -060. Thus, Desert Claim
18 requests preemption.
19
20
21
22

23 **IV. EFSEC Should Recommend Preemption**

24
25 Desert Claim will present testimony and other evidence during the Council's
26 adjudicatory proceedings demonstrating that approval of the proposed Project is in the
27 State's best interests, and that approval is justified under the Council's governing statute and
28 regulations. The Council should, therefore, recommend that the Governor issue a Site
29 Certification Agreement, preempting local land use regulation of the Project.
30
31
32
33

34 The Council's regulations require an applicant to submit a written request for
35 preemption that addresses the following points:
36
37

- 38
39
40 (1) That the applicant has demonstrated a good faith effort to resolve the
41 noncompliance issues.
42
43 (2) That the applicant and the local authorities are unable to reach an
44 agreement which wills resolve the issues.
45
46
47

1 (3) That alternative locations which are within the same county and city
2 have been reviewed and have been found unacceptable.

3
4 (4) Interests of the state as delineated in RCW 80.50.010.

5
6 WAC 463-28-040.³ Desert Claim addresses these criteria in the following sections, and will
7 present additional evidence regarding each of these factors during the adjudicatory
8 proceedings.
9

10
11
12 **A. Desert Claim has made good faith efforts to resolve inconsistency with local**
13 **land use requirements.**
14

15 As the Council is aware, Kittitas County has established a siting process for wind
16 power projects. Under Kittitas County Code chapter 17.61A, a wind project may be
17 permitted in any area zoned as Agricultural-20, Forest and Range, Commercial Agriculture
18 or Commercial Forest. However, Chapter 17.61A requires an applicant to obtain a Wind
19 Farm Development Permit and development agreement, a site-specific amendment to the
20 Comprehensive Plan land use designation map, and a site-specific rezone. The process of
21 obtaining these approvals amounts to a site-specific siting process, not a change in the
22 general zoning requirements for the property at issue.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Desert Claim has made good faith efforts to obtain local land use approvals. In
32 January 2003, Desert Claim submitted an application for these approvals to Kittitas County.
33 Desert Claim then spent the next 26 months trying to obtain the required approvals. That
34 lengthy process is discussed above and outlined in greater detail in a chronology attached as
35 **Exhibit 2** to the Declaration of David Steeb. In summary, Desert Claim attended numerous
36 hearings and meetings before the BOCC, provided requested information and repeatedly
37 revised a proposed Development Agreement in an effort to address concerns about the
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

³ The Council has formally proposed to repeal this regulatory requirement.

1 Project. The Kittitas County Superior Court found that Desert Claim made "extraordinary
2 efforts to satisfy two different boards of county commissioners over the process of the
3 application it submitted to the County." *Desert Claim Wind Power, LLC v. Kittitas County*,
4 No. 05-2-00243-6, slip. op. at 11 (Kittitas Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 4, 2005).
5
6

7
8 Following the BOCC's decision in 2005, Desert Claim made several changes to the
9 Project in an effort to address concerns raised during the County process further, and those
10 changes are reflected in the Application filed with this Council in November 2006. Since
11 filing its Application, Desert Claim has made additional efforts to resolve the County's
12 concerns about the revised Project. Most recently, in a meeting with Community
13 Development Services on May 17, 2007, Director Darryl Piercy indicated that the County's
14 only remaining concern about the Project is the length of the setback from existing
15 residences. Steeb Decl. ¶ 12. Desert Claim proposes a 1,656-foot setback, based on the
16 four-times-height standard EFSEC recommended in the Kittitas Valley proceedings, and
17 Kittitas County apparently believes a 2,500 foot setback is appropriate.
18
19

20 Over the almost four and a half years since Desert Claim filed its initial application
21 with the County, Desert Claim has attempted to resolve this setback issue. In January 2003,
22 Desert Claim originally proposed a 1,000-foot setback from existing residences. Steeb Decl.
23 ¶ 14. In 2004, Desert Claim submitted various iterations of a Draft Development Agreement
24 to the County, each of which proposed a 1,000 foot setback. Initial comments by the BOCC
25 about the proposed setback seemed to focus primarily on noise impacts, and at a BOCC
26 hearing on January 25, 2005, all three commissioners seemed to find a 1,000 foot setback
27 from the build line on adjacent properties to be acceptable. Commissioner Bowen stated it
28 "doesn't cause me any grief." Commissioner Huston said that it was "an acceptable buffer"
29 and that he had "no issue with that." Commissioner Crankovich said "I can agree with that."
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 Ex. 7 at 48-57. However, on January 27, 2005, County Attorney Jim Hurson advised the
2 Commissioners that the turbines could be "visually dominant" from one-quarter to one-half
3 mile away. Ex 8 at 47. Ultimately, in April 2005, the BOCC issued Resolution No. 2005-
4 46, in which it concluded that "a minimum of 1/2 mile separation from wind turbines and
5 residences would be necessary to reduce significant adverse impacts to moderate adverse
6 impacts." In November 2006, Desert Claim filed its EFSEC Application, and configured
7 turbines to ensure that noise levels would not exceed 50 dBA at the boundary line of
8 adjoining properties where residences were or could be constructed. In this new
9 configuration, the closest residence was 1,106 feet from a turbine. Following the Council's
10 decision on the K.V. Project, Desert Claim reconfigured the Project to ensure that all
11 turbines were at least 1,656 (four times tip height) from existing residences. Desert Claim is
12 now evaluating the revised configuration in light of the Governor's decision last week
13 regarding the K.V. Project.
14

15
16 In attempting to resolve this disagreement, Desert Claim has acted in good faith.
17 Likewise, Desert Claim does not question the good faith of the County. The parties simply
18 disagree about the length of setback that is necessary and appropriate. Under RCW chapter
19 80.50, EFSEC should resolve this siting issue.
20

21
22 In its recent decision regarding the Kittitas Valley Wind Project, this Council
23 explained the "good faith effort" requirement as follows:
24

25
26 [T]he Council believes this requirement to mean that an Applicant must work
27 through local government land use processes to resolve inconsistencies as
28 extensively as possible, but not to the point where further efforts would be futile.
29 Further reasonable compromises in position must be explored by both sides. Finally
30 a good faith effort to resolve a land use consistency dispute need not result in actual
31 resolution of all underlying matters.
32

33
34 Council Order No. 826 at 17-18.
35

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
DESERT CLAIM'S
REQUEST FOR PREEMPTION – 14

LEGAL13073313.1

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 Desert Claim has demonstrated good faith efforts. WAC 463-28-040 does not
2
3 require an applicant to make every conceivable effort to cure local land use inconsistencies,
4
5 or to simply agree to whatever conditions a local jurisdiction proposes. Given the
6
7 Legislature's clear intent that EFSEC preempt local siting authority and that the EFSEC
8
9 process avoid duplication and delay in the siting process, the Council should not require
10
11 Desert Claim to make any further effort to obtain local land use approvals.

12 **B. Desert Claim has been unable to reach agreement with Kittitas County.**

13
14 Desert Claim has applied for and been denied local land use approvals by the Kittitas
15
16 County Board of County Commissioners. Since the BOCC's April 2005 decision, Desert
17
18 Claim has made changes in the Project to try to address the concerns raised during the
19
20 County process. According to the County's Director of Community Development Services,
21
22 the changes made by Desert Claim have resolved all of the County's concerns other than the
23
24 setback from existing residences. As explained above, Desert Claim has been unable to
25
26 reach agreement with the County on that issue.

27
28
29 **C. Alternative locations were considered and found to be either unavailable or**
30 **inferior to the Project site.**

31
32 WAC 463-28-040 requires a request for preemption to address the extent to which an
33
34 applicant has evaluated other sites in the county and found them to be unacceptable. As a
35
36 threshold matter, there are no areas in Kittitas County where wind power is an outright
37
38 permitted use. Wind power projects may be permitted on any lands, such as the Project
39
40 Area, zoned Ag-20, Forest and Range, Commercial Forest or Commercial Agriculture, but
41
42 only if the Board of County Commissioners grants the necessary approvals following an
43
44 extensive project siting process. KCC 17.61A. This is not a situation in which an applicant
45
46 has selected a site that is not zoned for wind project development despite the availability of
47

