

**Verbatim Transcript of Public Hearing - Desert Claim
Wind Project**

Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

April 11, 2018



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



WASHINGTON STATE
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL MEETING
Ellensburg, Washington
Wednesday, April 11, 2018
6:30 p.m.

DESERT CLAIM WIND PROJECT
PUBLIC HEARING
Verbatim Transcript of Proceeding

Transcribed by: Jennifer A.P. Albino, CET
Court Certified Transcription

Page 2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 Councilmembers:

3 KATHLEEN DREW, Chair
4 JAMIE ROSSMAN, Department of Commerce
5 MIKE LIVINGSTON, Department of Fish and Wildlife

6 Attorney General's Office:

7 ANN C. ESSKO, Assistant Attorney General

8
9 EFSEC Staff:

10 JOAN AITKEN
11 AMI KIDDER
12 SONIA BUMPUS
13 STEPHEN POSNER
14 CHRISTINA POTIS

15 Applicant:

16 RICK MILLER, Director of Wind Business Development
17 EDF Renewable Energy

18 Community Speakers:

19 CHRISTINE COLE, Community member
20 JAMES C. CARMODY, Attorney with Meyer, Fluegge and Tenney
21 MARK PRITCHARD, Professor, College of Business,
22 Central Washington University
23 KATHI PRITCHARD, Member of Save Our Farms
24 RICHARD CARKNER, Director of Save Our Farms
25 PATTY KINNEY, Community member
26 TERESA SLOAN, Community member, local pilot
27 PAUL JEWELL, Kittitas County Commissioner
28 GINA JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN, Community member
29 KEN SATRE, Community member
30 EMILY SATRE, Community member
31 JANET NELSON, Community member
32 DAN MORGAN, President of Morgan & Son Earthmoving, Inc.

1 -o0o-

2 April 11, 2018

3 6:31:18

4

5 CHAIR DREW: -- everyone? Can you all hear me?

6 Oh, you already -- you took care of the phone?

7 MS. POTIS: I did, yes.

8 CHAIR DREW: My name is Kathleen Drew. And I am the chair
9 of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. Thank you
10 all for being here this evening. The first thing I want to
11 say is that we do have a speaker sign-in, so if you'd like
12 to speak, we'd like to be able to come up and have you
13 sign-in. Of course, you can continue to do that until we
14 close the public hearing. But I just wanted to let you know
15 it's to my right, to your left, if you'd like to sign in to
16 speak.

17 This is the public hearing on the Desert Claim Site
18 Certification Agreement Proposed Amendment in accordance
19 with Washington Administrative Code 463-66-030. I will ask
20 the other Councilmembers who are here joining me to
21 introduce yourselves.

22 And you have to give your mic a second to warm up. It's
23 the mute button. Yeah. That's it. Keep pressing. There
24 we go.

25 Is yours on? You got it?

Page 4

1 MR. ROSSMAN: Jamie Rossman with the Washington State
2 Department of Commerce.

3 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston, Washington Department of
4 Fish and Wildlife.

5 CHAIR DREW: Okay. And our agenda tonight is that we will
6 first hear from the applicant about the project overview.
7 This is an amendment to a site certification agreement. And
8 then our staff will talk about what that amendment process
9 looks like.

10 So if we can begin, then, with the representatives from
11 Desert Claim.

12 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council. Thank you very much
13 for this opportunity, and to the public as well for coming.
14 My name is -- and Staff as well, thank you -- my name is
15 Rick Miller. I'm the director of Wind Business Development
16 for the company EDF Renewable Energy. We're here tonight to
17 discuss the amendment we're proposing for the Desert Claim
18 Wind Project.

19 If you could flip to the next slide.

20 I'd like to take a quick second --

21 CHAIR DREW: If you could adjust the microphone up a
22 little bit --

23 MR. MILLER: Sure.

24 CHAIR DREW: -- more. There. You're --

25 MR. MILLER: Is that better?

1 CHAIR DREW: -- taller than average. There you go.

2 MR. MILLER: Okay.

3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

4 MR. MILLER: It doesn't help my basketball skills, though.

5 So for those of you that are not familiar with EDF
6 Renewable Energy, our name used to be enXco. That was the
7 name of the company. It's the same company, many of the
8 same people, but EDF Renewable Energy is -- and we have many
9 different aspects in our business all having to do with both
10 energy production and management. So we do things like
11 distributed solar and storage. We are the largest
12 third-party operations and maintenance provider in the
13 country for wind projects. You'll see later on a slide we
14 manage over 14 gigawatts of wind projects globally. We've
15 developed approximately 10 gigawatts of renewable power, and
16 we still own about half of that fleet, about 5 gigawatts.
17 There's 1,000 employees for EDF Renewable Energy. We cover
18 all of North America. We have a headquarters in San Diego,
19 California.

20 And then the larger owner of the company is the EDF Group.
21 They're basically the electricity company in France that
22 runs all the nuclear power plants over there. They've been
23 in business about 70 years, and so the company really has a
24 very strong expertise in engineering and research and
25 development. Probably enough on that.

Page 6

1 If you could switch the slide, please.

2 So, again, this is just a quick summary of the pipeline.
3 So EDF Renewable Energy is very active in the United States
4 and all of North America. We've put approximately
5 1,000 gigawatts of projects in the ground in the last few
6 years. In 2015 we did one and a half gigawatts. And our
7 current pipeline in North America is a little over
8 17 gigawatts.

9 You can go to the next slide.

10 So I've already run over many of these numbers. But I
11 think it would just be important to emphasize that we are a
12 company that builds projects for the long haul. We do
13 the -- everything from the very beginning, from the site
14 selection to the resource assessment, monitoring the wind
15 speed at the site or -- and we do the product design, the
16 permitting. And then we do all the procurement engineering
17 ourselves, the financing, and then construction, and then,
18 like I said, the long-term management. You saw that we keep
19 approximately half of the projects that we design and build,
20 and then we sell some of them to just recuperate our cap
21 backs (phonetic).

22 Okay. Next slide.

23 Okay. So what we all came here for. Look at that. Got
24 that out of the way. So the Desert Claim Wind Project, as
25 hopefully many of the people here are familiar with, has

1 been a concept for the Kittitas Valley for quite a long
2 time. The project originally submitted application back in
3 twenty -- in 2006 and then updated that in February of 2009.
4 And with our site certification agreement we have many
5 outstanding agreements that we intend to continue to follow
6 through with, with the Counsel for the Environment, with the
7 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, with Kittitas
8 County, and with the Yakima Nation. We have every intention
9 to both continue to follow those agreements that we have;
10 strengthen them, when and if they're going to be necessary,
11 as we do this amendment; and continue to abide by all the
12 original conditions as they may be updated in this process.

13 So we did submit a formal amendment in February just a
14 couple months ago, looking to update the project. And
15 you'll see in a couple slides how that update and
16 modification is being proposed.

17 So for those of you that aren't familiar with where the
18 Desert Claim Wind Project is proposed to be sited, it's on
19 private land. There's some Department of Natural Resources
20 State land involved in the project. And then there's -- the
21 project is generally laid out on the north side of
22 Smithson Road and to the east of Highway 97, as you can see
23 on this map.

24 So the project -- I think, actually, if you could just go
25 to the next slide. It's a little bit more telling.

Page 8

1 So the project boundary has been revised slightly in the
2 amendment. We've reduced the project boundary size in terms
3 of acres. Originally, the project size was approximately
4 5,200 acres; it's now 4,400 acres. And what you can see in
5 this diagram -- or map, rather, is that on the east side of
6 the project we're removing multiple pieces of property for
7 the project. We've added one small area to the northwest, a
8 half section up there. But on bounds, the project is
9 approximately 800 acres smaller. A lot of the -- originally
10 the project boundary, which is shown here -- this is the
11 full boundary, the reduced boundary is in blue. The biggest
12 geographical change to the project, really, is to eliminate
13 development of turbines and roads or facilities on the east
14 side of Reecer Creek, which is the water feature that runs
15 through, basically the east end of the project through, what
16 I think is shown there as Section 21.

17 Why don't you do me a -- okay. Yeah. That's great. I
18 was going to say if you go back one, it would show the
19 current boundary, but this one shows the current boundary as
20 well. So that's perfect.

21 So the project was originally approved for 190 megawatts.
22 We're reducing the request down to one hun- -- up to
23 100 megawatts [sic]. And we've shown two different proposed
24 layouts. One, to generate 80 megawatts of power using a
25 Siemens turbine technology. And then another proposal of

1 100 megawatts, and that would be using the Vestas turbine
2 technology. So this site plan here represents the
3 100-megawatt layout using Vestas turbines. And it's a
4 conceptual layout to show, in general, where turbines would
5 be placed and roads and electrical would be installed to
6 connect the turbine strings. And then you'll see there's a
7 proposed operations and maintenance building on the lower
8 southern half of the project there, kind of right in the
9 middle. And then there's an on-site to-be-built project
10 substation that will allow us to connect directly to the
11 230 kV Puget Sound Energy lines that run directly through
12 the project.

13 If you flip to the next slide, you'll see that this is,
14 honestly, a very similar looking layout, but this is what it
15 would look like on the 80-megawatt scenario utilizing the
16 Siemens turbines. For what it's worth, you'll see in the
17 amendment application that we're using a mixture of
18 different turbine types. There's a couple of reasons for
19 that. The first reason is that the project would qualify
20 for the federal production tax credit if it is installed by
21 December of 2020 by utilizing a 5 percent safe harbor. So
22 the machines that are PTC eligible, which make up
23 approximately 5 out of, say, 25 -- there would be five
24 2-megawatt turbines and approximately 25 of the larger
25 nameplate turbines, that are approximately 4 megawatts. And

Page 10

1 that's how the project would qualify for the production tax
2 credit. So you'll see in the application a range of
3 2-megawatt machines to 2- to 4.2-megawatt machines. And
4 that -- that is the reason why you'll see that. The
5 difference between the Siemens layout and the Vestas layout
6 is Vestas makes a machine with a larger nominal nameplate
7 capacity, up to 4 megawatts, whereas the Siemens are all in
8 the 2-megawatt variety. So utilizing the same footprint of
9 land, we can get up to 100 megawatts with the Vestas
10 machines.

11 So the key changes to the project, we've sort of touched
12 on them a little bit. But it is a smaller project. It is a
13 reduction in both the size of the land included; it's also a
14 reduction in the number of individual turbines. I believe
15 we had up to maybe 90 individual units in the original SCA.
16 We won't use more than 31 under any scenario in this project
17 revision.

18 Of course, you know, the turbine technology is not vastly
19 different than it was five years ago. But, you know, these
20 are newer, generally larger machines. And then in the
21 applicant's estimate, we think that the reduction or the
22 change in the project will also reduce impacts to county
23 residents by having less turbines and have them further
24 apart. And we also think there will be less impact on roads
25 to build the project. And then we also find that our

1 experts that have been doing a lot of the analysis that's
2 gone into the wildlife, vegetation, and habitat wetland
3 studies -- we also find that just having a smaller project
4 and a smaller footprint has also enabled us to reduce some
5 of the impacts to wildlife and vegetation.

6 So these are these numbers, which I hope I did okay off
7 the top of my head on earlier. But this is a chart to try
8 to make it obvious and easy to look at some of the changes
9 in numbers. So, yes, I accurately stated the project is
10 about 800 acres smaller. The turbines under the two
11 scenarios, which I've kind of described, we wouldn't use
12 more than 31 individual turbines; and before there was up to
13 95. And then, of course, we talked about the nameplate
14 capacity. The project is generally half the size in terms
15 of the power it will produce. We will have the need for
16 less roads because we'll have less turbines to connect. And
17 then the great -- one of the great benefits of the reduction
18 is the disturbance to the land will be significantly
19 smaller. You'll see the temporary disturbance there; we're
20 down to 224 acres for temporary impacts. And we were a
21 little over 300 before. And then the project footprint, you
22 can see those numbers there, a pretty large reduction in the
23 footprint.

24 Okay. So here's the turbine technology that I have sort
25 discussed previously. It's worth noting the tip height for

Page 12

1 these machines. They're -- they're still under 500 feet
2 tall, but you'll see the tip height is taller. And then the
3 rotor diameter for the individual turbines is also much
4 greater. But you'll see a little bit later on that we have
5 calculated sort of the rotor swept area. And because
6 there's less turbines, that has also been reduced.

7 Okay. So as I said earlier, the applicant is of the
8 opinion that the reduced and revised project will result in
9 less impacts to the local community. The reduction in the
10 number of turbines and the distance between the turbines has
11 been -- the number of turbines has been decreased. The
12 distance between them has been increased. And so we think
13 there will be less sort of visual clutter, if you will.

14 And so why don't we go to the next slide.

15 This slide is intended to sort of highlight some of the --
16 well, there will be some impacts to wildlife and vegetation
17 from the project, but the amended project -- revised project
18 should result in less impact. So we've got 30 percent less
19 disturbance to the habitat and vegetation during
20 construction, so a lot less land will be touched. We have a
21 40 percent less permanent loss of habitat and vegetation due
22 to the reduced footprint. We will have some wetland
23 impacts, but they have been kept below a half an acre of
24 permanent wetland impacts and less than two acres of
25 temporary impacts to wetlands and streams. And as I was

1 stating, we have larger turbines, longer turbine blades; but
2 when you look at the rotor swept area, the area where the
3 blades spin in space, we reduced that, under the different
4 scenarios, as much as by a third, even up to perhaps a half.
5 So, you know, that reduction of rotor swept area will result
6 in a reduction to hazards to things that fly in the air like
7 birds and bats.

8 And that would conclude our prepared presentation. We
9 would be happy to take any questions.

10 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions?

11 Go ahead.

12 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I have a couple questions. One,
13 so --

14 CHAIR DREW: I'm not sure if your microphone is --

15 MR. LIVINGSTON: Is it on?

16 CHAIR DREW: -- it's -- it looks like it's on, but maybe
17 you're not close enough.

18 MR. LIVINGSTON: One question I had was -- so I agree with
19 the reduction of the number of turbines. Your wind swept
20 area is less. The impacts are overall --

21 FEMALE SPEAKER: We can't hear back here?

22 MR. LIVINGSTON: Okay. How's that?

23 MALE SPEAKER: That (inaudible).

24 MR. LIVINGSTON: I'll move it up my mouth. The reduction
25 in the number of turbines does in- -- decrease the wind

Page 14

1 swept area, which will reduce the risk of collisions with
2 raptors and bats. I'm just curious with this new technology
3 and these larger turbines, what does -- what does the
4 research say about those relative to risk to flying birds
5 and mammals?

6 MR. MILLER: So, the -- so there has not been a lot of
7 study yet to compare some of the -- you know, the current
8 technology on land-based turbines is about 2-megawatt --
9 2- to 3-megawatt machines. We're going to see larger and
10 larger equipment installed in the U.S. The trend is still
11 heading towards much larger. We're seeing -- you know, now
12 we see multiple manufacturers come out with 4.2-megawatt
13 machines, but none of them have been installed yet, so
14 there's no way to really do a comparison in real time.

15 Having said that, we have done a tremendous amount of
16 pre-construction bird survey work, nest surveys, raptor
17 surveys, bird use counts over multiple years. And we've
18 seen a general -- relatively speaking the use -- the bird
19 use of the site is not excessive. It's not in a, quote,
20 "high-risk" area. So my assessment is that the new turbine
21 technology is no different than what you see installed in
22 projects today. And so we'll be doing post-construction
23 monitoring to see how our pre-construction estimates of
24 impacts fan out. We also have a proposal for a technical
25 advisory committee attack to be created. And so, I guess

1 what I would say is I don't think that we're going to have
2 vastly different results with the newer turbines than we
3 would with the turbines that are already in the permit. I
4 think it will be pretty similar.

5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

6 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.

7 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Rossman?

8 MR. ROSSMAN: Thank you very much for the presentation.
9 Looking at the map -- and I don't know if we could go back
10 to, I think it's, Slide 9 or 10. So the turbines that are
11 marked A1 to A4 there, they appear to be on a steeper
12 topographic area than most of the rest of the site. And
13 I'm not hugely familiar with the site, but could you say
14 anything about that? And are you familiar at all with
15 whether the research indicates anything different about
16 placing turbines on steeper versus shallower slopes?

17 MR. MILLER: Well, yeah. There's a little bit of a bench
18 there. So you'll see the road kind of hooks around. You
19 know, we'll have maximum gradients that we won't exceed on
20 those roads. So that's kind of why that road does that.
21 But once you get up on that area there, which is, you know,
22 the furthest west, the northwest area -- or the portion of
23 the project; it's relatively flat there. So we don't --
24 we've only done preliminary engineering and designing. But
25 we've been out there. We've had engineers out there and

Page 16

1 surveyors out there. So we don't see any issue with getting
2 to that part of the -- of the project, if that's -- if
3 that's what your question is. I mean, it's not steep in the
4 sense that, like, the foundation, is going to be sort of on
5 a hill or anything.

6 The thing that's funny about these maps is the turbines
7 look really big.

8 FEMALE SPEAKER: They are. Well, they are big. What do
9 you mean? (Inaudible) --

10 MR. ROSSMAN: And this a question --

11 CHAIR DREW: Excuse me.

12 FEMALE SPEAKER: -- (inaudible).

13 CHAIR DREW: You all will have an opportunity to speak.

14 FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh.

15 CHAIR DREW: Can we please have the courtesy of hearing
16 the presentation? And then we'll get to the your comments.

17 FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry. (Inaudible).

18 MR. ROSSMAN: This is a question perhaps for Staff. You
19 may have already answered part of it. But in terms of the
20 size of these larger turbines and how those compare to the
21 other wind farms in the valley, are those all at the
22 2-megawatt size, or are some of those something in between
23 the 2 and 4.2; do you know?

24 MR. POSNER: The two other projects that EFSEC has
25 permitted, the Kittitas Valley Wind Project and Wild Horse,

1 I believe, are 1.8 to 2 megawatts.

2 MR. ROSSMAN: And then a question for you, Mr. Miller.
3 You said that you're not aware of any other turbines of this
4 size being installed in the United States. Do you know if
5 they've been installed in other countries or installed on a
6 demonstration basis anywhere?

7 MR. MILLER: I can say with certainty that these larger
8 nameplate turbines have been used, certainly, offshore.
9 There's a lot of 4-megawatt machines. I don't know for sure
10 if 4-megawatt machines have been installed on land. I can
11 tell you that the technology, the way that the turbine
12 works, and the way that they generally work is no different
13 than the turbines that are installed here in the valley.
14 They're generally going to look very, very similar to what
15 you see. So I don't -- I mean, I wouldn't dwell on the fact
16 that they generate more megawatts. There is a -- you know,
17 a larger rotor, larger blades, but in general they look like
18 modern wind turbines.

19 MR. ROSSMAN: And just to make sure I'm understanding --
20 and I'm looking at Slide 13, which has the tip height and
21 rotor diameter comparison -- when it says "tip height," is
22 that the top of a rotor, you know, that's entirely vertical?
23 So that's the maximum height that any part of it reaches?

24 MR. MILLER: Yeah. Sometimes it's referred to as sort of
25 the 12 o'clock position. So that's correct. Yeah, one

Page 18

1 turbine blade sticking right up at a 12 o'clock position on
2 a clock.

3 MR. ROSSMAN: And so does the diameter of 136 meters
4 there -- that means that it -- at its height -- at its
5 lowest it's 14 meters off the ground?

6 MR. MILLER: Um --

7 MR. ROSSMAN: Or -- no, I guess --

8 CHAIR DREW: Is that the difference for the -- between the
9 different --

10 MR. MILLER: No, not necessarily. I don't think it --

11 MR. ROSSMAN: Okay. No, it --

12 MR. MILLER: -- I don't think I would draw that
13 conclusion.

14 CHAIR DREW: Are you looking at the tip height 134 to 150?

15 MR. ROSSMAN: No. I guess I'm just wondering if the --

16 CHAIR DREW: Oh.

17 MR. ROSSMAN: -- if the highest that -- if the highest
18 point it will get is 150 meters, and then I'm drawing a
19 diameter of 136 meters downwards, then that would seem to
20 only be 14 meters off the ground. But maybe I'm -- maybe
21 I'm not understanding something about it.

22 MR. MILLER: If it's okay, I'd prefer to follow up with
23 the Council on that or Staff. But I can certainly get some
24 minimum blade-tip-to-ground distances for the different
25 turbines.

1 MR. ROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you.

2 MR. MILLER: That's no problem.

3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

4 MR. ROSSMAN: And that was my last question. Thank you.

5 MS. BUMPUS: Councilmember Rossman, I was just going to
6 add that in the existing SCA the applicant is required to
7 develop -- and EFSEC would also review and approve this -- a
8 post-construction avian monitoring plan to look at impacts.
9 This plan would basically help them to identify any impacts
10 that are a result of the operation of the facility.

11 MR. ROSSMAN: Thank you.

12 CHAIR DREW: Thank you very much for your presentation.

13 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

14 CHAIR DREW: Next we will have Sonia Bumpus give us an
15 overview or talk about our process.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Drew and
18 Councilmembers.

19 So in light of the request by Desert Claim to amend their
20 2010 Site Certification Agreement or SCA, Staff would like
21 to discuss the SCA amendment process with the Council just
22 to give you a sense of what to expect as Staff continues to
23 review the amendments that are proposed. EFSEC's rules and
24 WAC 463-66 provide information about EFSEC's SCA amendment
25 process and what to consider when we receive an amendment

Page 20

1 request.

2 In terms of approving such an amendment request, the
3 Council may either accept it, reject it, or reject it with
4 conditions determined to be acceptable by the Council. In
5 order to make such a determination, the Council must review
6 the proposed changes. EFSEC rules, specifically
7 WAC 463-66-050, specifically note that the Council consider
8 whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the public
9 health, safety, and welfare as well as considering the
10 short-term and long-term environmental impacts of the
11 proposed changes.

12 So when we look at impacts of the amendments, I'm
13 referring to rules in WAC 197-11, for the State Environment
14 Policy Act, which in EFSEC rules we promulgate in 463-47.
15 So under SEPA rules we will need to evaluate the proposal
16 and any new information to determine if there are any
17 substantial changes to the proposal that are likely to have
18 significant adverse environmental impacts. Existing SEPA
19 documents, such as the Supplemental Final EIS that was
20 prepared by EFSEC in 2009 could be updated with an addendum
21 if new analysis is done. We could also develop a SEPA
22 threshold determination. So there are some options once
23 we've identified what the impacts are.

24 The point is that we need to do SEPA. And once we have an
25 understanding of the impacts associated with the proposed

1 changes, we can decide what we need to do to document the
2 analysis, whether that be in a new threshold determination
3 or in an addendum to one -- to the existing SEPA document.
4 In this case, the supplemental Final EIS.

5 So I want to go back to the SCA amendment WAC that I was
6 talking about at the beginning. So once we've made a
7 determination on SEPA and we understand the impacts and the
8 extent of those impacts, we would look at the changes to the
9 provision in the original SCA. If the amendments do not
10 substantially alter the provisions of the SCA and there are
11 no significant detrimental effects on the environment, the
12 Council could approve the request for the amendment in the
13 form of a resolution. However, if the amendment
14 substantially alters any provisions of the SCA or we
15 identify detrimental environmental effects, the amendment
16 would require approval by the Governor.

17 So that's sort of the -- those are the highlights, you
18 know, as far as options -- places where we may go as we do
19 our review. Right now Staff is working with our consultant
20 and other agencies to review the SCA proposed changes.
21 We're also reviewing an updated SEPA environmental
22 checklist. And so we're going to keep you posted as that
23 review continues. We'll also keep you posted on how the
24 results of that review are going to affect our process
25 moving forward.

Page 22

1 Are there any questions about that overview?

2 CHAIR DREW: Question? Okay.

3 Thank you very much.

4 At this point we will call forward anyone who would like
5 to speak that is here with us tonight.

6 And do we have a speaker sign-up? Okay.

7 So some more --

8 MS. POTIS: Okay. If --

9 CHAIR DREW: -- some more people are --

10 MS. POTIS: -- you --

11 CHAIR DREW: -- signing up, but, Christina --

12 MS. POTIS: Sure.

13 CHAIR DREW: -- will start with the first ones on the
14 list.

15 MS. POTIS: Can you hear me?

16 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

17 MS. POTIS: Okay. We're ready for the first five
18 speakers. So if you want to move forward. Speaker No. 1 is
19 Chris Cole.

20 You can come up and talk.

21 CHAIR DREW: And the microphone at the podium is a little
22 high, so you might want to bring that down a little bit.
23 There you go.

24 MS. COLE: Hi, my name is -- my name is Christine Cole.

25 I'm here representing myself and my partner Roger Binette.

1 We live at 7430 Robbins Road. And my first inkling that
2 something suspicious was afoot was when two men were looking
3 for something at the edge of my property along the road next
4 to my fence. My partner Roger drove down to find out what
5 they were doing. And the answer was that they were seeking
6 markers and photographing the turbines.

7 On contacting the former president of the Sun East
8 Property Owners Association where we reside, he had also
9 noticed and had questions about markers and -- that were up
10 above on the shared road for the owners about a mile north
11 of my place and at a higher elevation. It appears that
12 these men had traversed and apparently trespassed beyond a
13 very visible warning sign at the Sun East entrance that
14 states that only property owners are allowed. I don't know
15 whether or not permission to enter had been granted.

16 We wonder again if our statements are just another effort
17 in futility. With the County and most of the residents
18 opposed to the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project site --
19 the final decision that was left up to Governor Gregoire,
20 who is soon to leave office and not be living here -- our
21 fate was sealed. And we are now left with the constant
22 eyesores in view and now with more to come. My feeling is
23 that the Governor was viewing the east side of the Cascades
24 with the eyes of the west side overpopulated and harried
25 occupants, but without the view and insight of local folk

Page 24

1 that cherish the open spaces that are anything but desolate
2 and certainly not land to be exploited. In addition, the
3 site, now inundated with turbines, is above a
4 forever-spoiled scenic highway that once was incredibly
5 beautiful landscape.

6 One woman who wrote a letter to the editor of the Daily
7 Record complained that the turbines obscured her view of
8 Mount Stuart. Where was she during the public testimony is
9 unclear. But my response would be, "We told you so. Where
10 were you before with the years' long struggle to oppose
11 these towers?"

12 The photos that were taken from my yard with my permission
13 for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project Informational
14 Layout show -- showing how the turbines would appear from my
15 elevation were, at most, panoramic photos, deceptive as
16 compared to the actual perception from our eyes. A half
17 mile distance is nothing in this open country. But the
18 photos depicted the turbines are a long way away. From my
19 kitchen window they are enormous. That is how they appear.
20 And my home is several miles and a canyon away. It's all in
21 the perception, depending on how a photo is projected and
22 the reality witnessed. The folks with homes on Reecer Creek
23 may most likely have the worst of its impact. More larger
24 and powerful turbines proposed and in place and the reality
25 of the potential disturbance is to us overwhelming. Our

1 prior arguments, backed up with testimony from a variety of
2 scientists and folks already subjected to the effects of
3 turbines, were sadly deemed irrelevant.

4 The smoke from the Taylor Bridge Fire resulted in many
5 forced evacuations across the northern slopes here,
6 including Sun East residents, along with many farm and ranch
7 animals trailered out with the generous help of friends and
8 family and anyone available in search of the (inaudible)
9 equipment. Information from the firefighters and pilots
10 operating helicopters and the retardant-dumping airplanes
11 should be consulted as to how -- how the smoke-shrouded
12 turbines affected their efforts.

13 The placement decisions for these towers was taken from us
14 and imposed by others with the same result. As we stated
15 many, many times there are less offensive areas to place
16 these turbines. Wild horse is one of them. Desert Claim
17 Territory is not one of them, and it isn't even desert. I
18 believe that it is the perspective of those not living here
19 subjected to the towers.

20 During the previous public testimony, our local county
21 representative on the Council asked if the Kittitas Valley
22 Wind Power Project bird kill had been documented. The
23 representative was unable to provide the answer at the time
24 and would look into it. How can the dead birds and bats be
25 counted it? They are most likely easy meals and edible

Page 26

1 treats for coyotes and other wildlife that consume them.
2 The count becomes uncountable, invisible, and obscure and
3 tossed away by the important facts of impact.

4 Perhaps none of us that oppose these turbines matter, but
5 at least our voice has been raised to hopefully be
6 documented, even if not heard nor taken seriously. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

9 FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

10 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead. Next speaker.

11 MS. POTIS: Okay. Our next speaker is James Carmody.

12 MR. CARMODY: Good evening and thank you, Councilmembers,
13 Staff. My name is James Carmody. I work at the firm of
14 Meyer, Fluegge and Tenney in Yakima. My address is
15 230 South Second Street, Yakima. I'm here tonight
16 representing a group of local citizens and property owners
17 who have particular considerations in the preservation and
18 protection of agricultural farmlands and prime farm
19 properties, as well as preservation of rural character.
20 We're eight-plus years into this process, and the original
21 SCA is a ten-year authorization. So we're at the tag end,
22 and I think we can see why --

23 MS. POTIS: Can you --

24 MR. CARMODY: -- we're here.

25 MS. POTIS: -- turn it up?

1 MR. CARMODY: I think we can see why we're at this point,
2 and that has to do with production tax credits, which is
3 what always drives these projects.

4 I've got some background. I was the attorney that
5 represented local citizens and argued in the Supreme Court
6 in the Residents against Kittitas Turbines litigation that
7 went to the Supreme Court. I've been involved in this
8 community, grew up in this community, and have been a
9 participant in these projects. I've also represented both
10 developers and citizen groups in wind farm projects
11 throughout the state.

12 What I think is significant in this case and significant
13 for your concerns, and it's even broader than this
14 particular application, it's issues facing this valley with
15 respect to alternative energy projects. You have a Columbia
16 Solar Project, which is being proposed in agricultural prime
17 farmlands, disruptive of rural character. And you have
18 this -- this project as well. So they offer and present
19 issues that are different than we've seen before.

20 Now, what has changed and what we believe to be
21 significant in this process is this county has gone through
22 a very difficult and long process in complying with the
23 Growth Management Act. In the amendment process, the Chair
24 mentioned the standards that you consider. There's an
25 additional standard, and that is compliance with applicable

Page 28

1 laws and rules as they apply. And the Growth Management Act
2 is very clear in the decision-making needs to bear upon and
3 respect the preservation and protection of prime farmlands.
4 And it also needs to be considerate and -- in looking at the
5 impact on rural character.

6 Kittitas County had a case that went to the Supreme Court
7 subsequent to the approval of this project in 2009 and '10.
8 And that litigation and the Supreme Court directed this
9 community to adopt and protect those particular resource
10 lands through amendments to their comprehensive plan and to
11 their development of regulations. They found that the
12 County was not compliant in not registering and providing
13 the appropriate level of projection for those.

14 I say that because I understand in the context the idea
15 that there's preemptive authority at the EFSEC level. But
16 that exercise of authority needs to be undertaken in the
17 context of what Growth Management is telling people: And
18 it's clearly preserve and protect.

19 This is the opportunity of the amendment where there's
20 changes that I think the amendment process requires that you
21 undertake that review in consideration with respect to
22 whether the amendment is appropriate or it continues to be
23 compliant with applicable laws with the clarity that the
24 Supreme Court and Growth Management has brought to this, and
25 the clear fact that you're going to have a transition and no

1 preservation of farmland. So I think that's an important
2 component in your review and decision-making process.

3 I was also struck by the fact that the question posited by
4 Mr. Livingston with respect to the impacts in study and
5 analysis of the new turbines that are being used resulted
6 in, really, no knowledge at all for you to assess the
7 impacts in that regard. And that is a huge change. So you
8 talk about a shrinking of the size of the project. That's
9 fine. I get that. But the fundamental change in the
10 turbine and the size going from 1.8- or a 2.0-megawatt
11 machine to a 4, 4.2 is significant. There's absolutely no
12 study or analysis that's available for you, and that was
13 admitted tonight.

14 And I think that's what SEPA is all about. There was
15 discussions about post-construction avian studies, and
16 that's part of what Fish and Wildlife have always required
17 as a part of their wind power guidelines and attack
18 committee for that that's fine. But that doesn't change the
19 SEPA responsibility that you have, which is to analyze the
20 impacts in advance of construction, not afterwards. So I
21 think that the review and environmental review process needs
22 to undertake, either through an addendum or process that you
23 choose that has some meaningful study and analysis of the
24 change in the equipment that's being proposed for the
25 project.

Page 30

1 So those are a few of the points that people that I
2 represent would like you to consider. They're real and
3 important in this valley. This is a farming community. The
4 land is going away. Growth Management came about because of
5 the Kent Valley and the loss of farmland there. And the
6 courts and the legislature have been clear about
7 responsibilities and land decision-making to preserve and
8 protect those lands. And we ask you to consider those in
9 the context of this process.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

11 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 3, Mark Pritchard.

12 MR. PRITCHARD: Thank you for traveling over. My name is
13 Mark Pritchard. I'm a professor in the College of Business
14 at Central Washington. I've been involved in, obviously,
15 rural development for some years. I was down at Arizona
16 State for a decade before coming here to Central for a
17 decade. Including rural development, I've been involved in
18 tourism development. And some of the amendments that are a
19 part of this I wanted to bring before the committee for your
20 consideration tonight. So I'll just go through a couple of
21 points that I've listed here for you, and I've provided a
22 sheaf of documents that I'll hand over to Tammy when I'm
23 done. So if you could take a look at them, that would be
24 great, and consider them in your decision-making here
25 tonight.

1 All right. Let me get to the point of the matter in that
2 we've got a code that the Council considers in evaluating
3 these. And there are four provisions that are a part of
4 that consideration. One of the ones that I think is
5 particularly relevant to what I wanted to address tonight
6 was the public health, safety, and welfare of the county in
7 which this development is taking place. And I wanted to
8 expressly target the idea of economic welfare.

9 And let's, first of all, start out by saying larger
10 turbines lead to greater impacts. And that's actually
11 documented with some documents that I'll provide tonight.
12 Even though the -- it wasn't particularly forthcoming
13 relative to the height of the towers, these things are as
14 tall as the Seattle -- as the Seattle Space Needle. And so
15 we've got some significant impacts.

16 But let's look at the first concern: welfare of the
17 community. Economic data collected from 2010 to 2016
18 designates Kittitas now as an economically distressed
19 community. Poverty rates, housing, vacancy rates, change in
20 establishments, median incomes, and change in employment set
21 this county apart as actually having a little more fragile
22 economy than some of the west side counties that you may
23 well be more familiar with. Facility developments can
24 produce economic impacts that undermine the public welfare
25 of Kittitas. And Kittitas economic welfare is at risk when

Page 32

1 local industry profits and jobs are threatened. And this
2 particular amendment has that potential, that's why I wanted
3 you to consider it.

4 Basically, we've got a fledgling tourism industry that the
5 Chamber of Commerce and also the Downtown Development
6 Association have been working on for some time. It ties in
7 nicely with the recent development that (inaudible) would
8 know with the Governor's approval of a tourism marketing
9 plan and also the funding of tourism for the state, which is
10 a first for a long time.

11 What we have with the development of these really tall
12 towers is that we have diminished visitor appeal, diminished
13 visitation rights, and diminished tourism dollar revenue
14 potentials for this valley. When we have rural development,
15 we have agriculture as a base. But tourism is this nice
16 secondary industry that starts to be a fruit over time. And
17 actually the Chamber has done a wonderful job with a very
18 small budget of actually make- -- punching outside of its
19 weight and actually having a big impact in trying to shift
20 the dial relative to growth in this area.

21 I think probably what we need to do is look at the profile
22 of the county economically. And Don Meseck, who is the
23 labor statistician, gives us a pretty good outline of that
24 particular detail. Let me just read a little bit about what
25 Don had to say about this.

1 "If one analyzes the employment changes in Kittitas County
2 in the past 12 years from 2004 to 2016 using Washington
3 State Employment Security Department's annual average
4 Quarterly Census of Employment and Wage data, one observes
5 the total covered employment increase from 12,000 to 14,000
6 in 2016, 1,900 jobs and 15 percent expansion. Of that -- of
7 these sectors, the ones that made the most impact were in
8 accommodation and food services," which is an industry
9 related to tourism. "It provides 1,500" -- oh, sorry.
10 Backing up to this. "Many of these jobs are at local hotels
11 and restaurants. Accommodation and food services account
12 for 54 percent of all covered jobs added to this -- these
13 sectors in Kittitas. Between 2004 and 2016, looking at
14 these data, it's safe to say" -- and in Don's words -- "that
15 tourism is extremely important to the Kittitas County labor
16 market. Conversely, state government, which includes jobs
17 at Central Washington, decreased in the same period from
18 1,900 to 1,500, 439 jobs in total, a 22 percent reduction in
19 employment opportunities in what is already a distressed
20 county."

21 Now, one might be forgiven for thinking maybe the wind
22 turbines, there's only 31 of them, isn't going to have a
23 significant impact. Well, if you look at data that comes
24 out of Germany from an evaluation, a benchmark study of the
25 impact of tourism on 2,200 municipalities where they studied

Page 34

1 the number of jobs that diminished alongside of wind farm
2 development, you see a significant impact on the number of
3 tourism jobs, the number of tourism dollars coming into
4 those counties.

5 You've got the same sort of research and trends happening
6 in Scotland. You've got the same sort of research and
7 trends happening in the U.K. where they're looking at the
8 adverse affects of wind farms on tourism industries,
9 especially scenic landscapes. So the basic two -- the two
10 basic fundamental features of tourism attraction are the
11 destination image and that deals with the quality of the
12 landscape. And what we find is that over 55 percent of
13 visitors don't go to areas that have wind farms in them.
14 They don't want to see manmade constructed turbines on
15 natural landscapes. And so we're having some difficulties.

16 Now, the developer actually mentioned that he didn't know
17 too much about the towers being 460 feet or something of
18 that stripe. But actually what's happened is the U.K.
19 refuses to put those towers on their land. They now move
20 them into the North Atlantic. They won't have them on the
21 land base. So it's a very interesting shift that a European
22 developer, who would know that the impacts are actually
23 being rejected in Europe, is able to bring those here and
24 place them on Washington State land in prime landscape, in
25 prime scenic viewpoints and, yet seems to do it with

1 impunity. So I would really ask you to look at those
2 documents relative to the German study. It's a landmark
3 study on tourism impacts as it results from turbines.

4 One of the interesting quirks of this is this idea of
5 density of turbines versus height of turbines. And what
6 they find is that of the two, it's not about density. It's
7 about the height. It's about the size. That's the thing
8 that actually moves the dial relative to people not going to
9 these areas or not being tourists in these regions. So you
10 need to really think about what's going in here. You really
11 need to the think about that these amendments are
12 significant changes. They're not just a little cosmetic
13 change. That deals with other physiological things. We've
14 only talked about things that are above ground, let alone
15 things that go on below ground. I've said nothing about
16 hydrology or anything else relative to these entities.

17 All right. Moving on. So this -- you've got your
18 profiles relative to the county. You've got some of the
19 impacts in Germany, some of the impacts in Scotland that
20 those are listed in. You've also got the Governor's bill
21 protecting tourism: the idea of identifying landscapes that
22 are worth protecting, that are worth conserving as part of
23 the State's mission. So please look at that bill again and
24 look at the mandate that's part of that for preserving
25 landscapes, preserving Washington State for both its

Page 36

1 residents and for potential visitors down the road.

2 In addition to that and a final piece, and I'll close
3 because I know I've probably spoken for way too long, and it
4 has to do with property values. And I know that we haven't
5 really spent that much time, and it sounds like a NIMBY kind
6 of argument to say, "Oh, it's going to affect property
7 values." A landmark study out of the London School of
8 Economics surveyed over 200,000 homes. It actually covered
9 the sale of homes in the U.K. and Wales for a period of ten
10 years. It was published in 2015. But the German article
11 and this one are published only three to four years ago, so
12 most of the data wasn't available when you made the decision
13 in 2010 to move forward with this project. But this one
14 here on valuing property values is significant. We've got
15 another one that I've provided on Ontario, Canada, where
16 they also talked about property values.

17 In the British study, you'll see from this survey of over
18 several hundred thousand sales over that ten-year period
19 throughout all of those different counties they looked at
20 the proximity of wind farms to those things and found
21 significant disadvantages accrued to local residents that
22 own those properties. So please look at the numbers. The
23 numbers are even more significant in Canada. They noted a
24 33 to 38 percent average median drop in price values to
25 properties that were adjacent to these things.

1 So those are documented impacts that go with these kinds
2 of developments. And they too, just like the tourism side
3 of things, are significantly impacted when you move from
4 small turbines to large turbines.

5 I think I can stop there. I've got a copy of the points
6 that I raised. Thank you for hearing us out tonight. We
7 appreciate you taking the time and coming over.

8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

9 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 4, Kathi Pritchard.

10 MS. PRITCHARD: Good evening, Chair Drew and Council.
11 Thank you for visiting our area and listening to our
12 concerns about this amendment.

13 My name is Kathi Pritchard, and I am a resident of
14 Ellensburg. I am also a member of a grassroots community
15 group called Save Our Farms. But this is -- these are
16 comments I drafted myself. I have two -- along with my
17 husband, who just spoke -- years of experience in tourism
18 marketing. And so I agree with a lot of things he said.
19 But I'll be addressing you about economic interests.

20 RCW -- am I speaking loud enough for everyone? RCW 80.50
21 assigns you the task of balancing increasing energy demand
22 with the broad interests of the State, yet the energy supply
23 picture has changed dramatically since this legislation
24 empowered EFSEC, and more importantly, since Desert Claim
25 was approved in 2010. The demand for energy in the

Page 38

1 Northwest has been flat for the last few years and will
2 remain so in the future, according to the Northwest Power
3 and Conservation Council.

4 Not only is the demand for energy flat here, demand is
5 flat in California. The big change since 2010 is the surge
6 in California's energy output due to the industrial and
7 rooftop solar. California is giving away excess energy to
8 neighboring states in the west. This is documented in an
9 award winning article I've included for you from the
10 Los Angeles Times environmental reporter Ivan Penn. In part
11 because PSE joined California's energy imbalance market
12 recently, the amount of energy available in the Northwest is
13 abundant.

14 Several new additional industrial scale projects -- wind
15 in Thurston and Lewis Counties and new industrial solar
16 projects near Spokane, Centralia, and the Tri-Cities -- will
17 add to this supply. With so many new industrial-sized
18 additions our state may be -- may experience California's
19 current problem: congestion. But the congestion is not on
20 their freeways. It's in their transmission lines. What
21 will excess supply do to existing power companies like
22 Kittitas Valley Wind who already lacks customers? What will
23 this do to homeowners in our state who want to install solar
24 onto their rooftops? The State's latest energy report says
25 rooftop solar has increased so much that most utilities have

1 exceeded the cap for new connections. Local residents are
2 already affected by this since Kittitas PUD is not accepting
3 new connections into the grid.

4 Into a market of oversupply of energy and flat demand, you
5 are being asked to consider an amendment with major changes.
6 Changes in location and size of turbines are beyond the
7 scope of a simple amendment. The effects will be
8 far-reaching. Thirty-one turbines the height of the
9 Space Needle will hinder Ellensburg's award winning tourism
10 program and the new State Tourism Program, which will add
11 natural vistas to attract visitors. Homeowners may have
12 rooftop solar contracts canceled if large utilities find no
13 room on the grid for net metering. Environmental impacts
14 are numerous, including harms for threatened species,
15 including eagles and bats. And also impacts to ground
16 water.

17 I respectfully submit several documents to you,
18 documenting the points I've made in this testimony.
19 Included in that is a monthly report documenting the effect
20 to birds already in this region from Wild Horse Wind
21 Facility. Wild Horse is being very responsible in going
22 forward to the U.S. Forest -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
23 in arranging an eagle permit plan for the take of four
24 eagles. But these cumulative effects, along with effects
25 that might be occurring from Columbia Solar need to be taken

Page 40

1 into account in the environmental impact of this project and
2 any other project that this Council is considering.

3 I appreciate your listening to my comments and concerns
4 and thank you for your attention.

5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

6 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 5, Richard Carkner.

7 MR. CARKNER: Good evening, Chairman Drew and the Council.
8 I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to share a few
9 thoughts, a lot of which are quite similar to what you just
10 heard, but I think it's worth repeating. My name is Dick
11 Carkner. I'm the director of Save Our Farms organization
12 and a resident of Kittitas County. Save Our Farms has
13 concerns that this project and other proposals before the
14 EFSEC Council exceed the amount of peak power needed in the
15 State of Washington and further that the EFSEC Council has
16 not considered the current or future statewide demand for
17 wind and solar power. And the Energy Council has not
18 balanced the increased demands for energy in terms of
19 location and operation through the state.

20 To repeat, I'm sure you're familiar with this, RCW 80.50
21 provides the guidelines, the legislative guidelines for the
22 intent of putting together the EFSEC Organization. And,
23 again, balancing increased demand -- energy demand with the
24 broad interests of the public. And one of those, of course,
25 that we've talked about tonight is tourism. It's an

1 important part of the public interest. It simply hasn't
2 seen much light of day in the discussions up to this point.

3 As my call my colleague spoke about problems in
4 California, how excessive peak power generation affects the
5 distribution of power, we're concerned that in Washington
6 the Council is approving projects without examining the
7 demand for power or balancing the public interest related to
8 that. And, again, Steve Simmons from the Northwest Power
9 Council just in 2017 said, "The demand for inform is flat."
10 Puget Sound Energy report in 2015 said that their energy
11 demand, the demand for electricity is less in '15 than it
12 was in '13. So despite the flat demand for power, the
13 continued permitting of projects in Washington has caused a
14 decline in some electric utilities, and Kittitas PUD in
15 particular, to allow net metering.

16 This is an important opportunity for people in this
17 community and others to participate in the process through
18 personal investment, achieving a return on that investment,
19 rather than have this only with the -- or primarily the
20 opportunity for large corporations. In approving the Desert
21 Claim Project or any other proposals, the Council should
22 develop a statewide plan that shows the output of any new
23 proposals that's compatible with the -- well, for example,
24 these were mentioned as well. It seems like there's just a
25 haphazard process of siting projects. We've got the

Page 42

1 Chehalis coal mining site on-site. We have got a new
2 projects coming on near Lind.

3 Somehow these needs to be coordinated. We need a
4 big-picture look at this, rather than allowing incremental
5 power production with all the -- all the impacts that you've
6 heard about tonight. We need to allow some time for
7 technology to catch up. Storage technology, in particular,
8 is going to have a, you know, a big role in the decisions as
9 we look ahead in the green energy future. We should also
10 look at other options like community-based green energy
11 systems designed to benefit local residents, not
12 foreign-owned corporations.

13 This permit for Desert Claim and any other Kittitas power
14 production proposal should not be approved unless and until
15 the EFSEC Council can justify energy production in terms of
16 balancing the demands for energy with the broad interests of
17 the public, not just the interests of utility companies.
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

20 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 6 is Patty Kinney.

21 MS. KINNEY: I brought some visual aids, and so I'm just
22 going to -- if you'll bear with me for a second.

23 My name is Patty Kinney. I live at 2362 Smithson Road,
24 and it's on the southern border of the project. My comments
25 are in two parts. They're about the amendment that's

1 proposed right now and the specific things that I think
2 warrant a new look at the size or whatever process you
3 choose to use on that. And my other comments are about the
4 past and when the wind farm was approved in 2010.

5 So I brought some pictures because I felt that our
6 comments about the visual impacts of turbines on the
7 neighborhoods in the area were not given the weight that
8 they deserved. So I'll read from my comments here.

9 The pictures I have taken over the years of the landscape
10 as viewed from my property, and I brought these to share
11 with you. These are not just my views, but people east,
12 west, and south of me have very similar views of this
13 landscape. I want to share these photos with you because I
14 want you to understand the sense of place that we feel here,
15 the rural character. Each of these photos is typical of any
16 given year. And I think they accurately portray the beauty
17 we see in this landscape.

18 Picture No. 1 is from early spring. Table Mountain and
19 Lion Rock have just received a dusting of snow. In a couple
20 of years this view could be full of wind turbines obscuring
21 these two popular landmarks from view.

22 Picture No. 2 -- I'm okay. Picture No. 2 is from late
23 spring where everything is greening up. But the pastels of
24 spring will soon be painted with wide strokes of white
25 turbines.

Page 44

1 Picture No. 3 is from a typical summer evening with the
2 sun low in the sky and the curvature of the canyons and the
3 hills is accentuated. The turbines will be much higher than
4 the top of the hills, and that's what will command our
5 attention, not the rolling curvature of these hills.

6 Picture No. 4 is late summer, early fall. It's rustic
7 flavor is what we love about this place. The BPA towers are
8 in this picture and every picture I've shown you so far.
9 They're hardly noticeable, if at all. They blend into their
10 surroundings because they are not white and also because
11 they are not taller than the top of the hills.

12 Picture 5. This is what it looks like when the hills are
13 burning. This is the Naneum Fire in 2014. And I just
14 want -- if you can see in the middle ground, there are two
15 power poles.

16 And in this next picture, Picture No. 6, is an airplane
17 dropping retardant. If you look between those power poles,
18 you'll see it. There's also another plane up in the corner
19 of the picture. And there was also that day a yellow plane
20 that was dropping retardant. This day was the day after the
21 2012 Taylor Bridge Fire. I don't think these planes could
22 have done what they did if turbines were in this area.

23 This is Picture 7. It was taken April of 2009. It
24 replicates one of the viewpoints from the Final SEIS. It's
25 two miles from the project from Hayward Hill. I used a

1 50 millimeter focal length on my camera. The BPA towers are
2 the in the background. They're 170 feet tall. What would
3 492-foot tall turbines look like? Between this brown --
4 this brown house with the green roof to the north of
5 Smithson Road there are about 26 other homes that would be
6 looking at the white massive turbines, instead of noticing
7 how blue these hills are.

8 Picture 8 is typical of late winter, early spring. It's
9 from Smithson Road. I did zoom in to about 130 millimeters
10 and these raptors are near the berm of the north branch
11 canal. There are about nine of them in here. Three eagles
12 on the ground, one in flight. I believe that's a golden
13 eagle flying in flight and maybe one on the fence post. I
14 see more and more eagles every year up here. And they often
15 perch in a tree on my property. If they're lucky, they'll
16 go away when the turbines come.

17 Picture 9 was taken in January of this year from my back
18 deck. Those are cattle going down Smithson Road. You never
19 know when there's going to be a cattle drive down Smithson.
20 And even those it's a slow-moving process, it's exciting to
21 watch. This is the essence of our place.

22 I don't know how this message was lost on EFSEC in 2009.
23 On page 18 of Order 843 that recommended approval of the
24 wind farm it stated, quote, "Affected nonparticipating
25 homeowners did not express specific concerns about the

Page 46

1 effect of nearby turbines on view or aesthetics," end quote.
2 That interpretation of what happened is completely
3 inaccurate. I reread the comments from the public hearing,
4 which I attended, as well as the land use hearing, and many
5 people spoke of the aesthetics of turbines near their homes.
6 Perhaps words such as "monstrosity" or "industrial" were not
7 interpreted as applying to visual impacts. Perhaps since
8 the words "view" or "viewshed" were not used so much or at
9 all, our concerns were not considered specific enough for
10 the EFSEC author of Order 843. But I read many articulate
11 informed comments that were specific.

12 The next paragraph on page 18 of Order 843 states, quote,
13 "Few commenters at the public hearings mentioned visual
14 aspects of nearby turbines, and the comments were not
15 expert," end quote. Again, there were plenty of commenters
16 who spoke of visual concerns. That's how I interpreted what
17 I saw and read. The idea that the comments were not expert
18 is anathema to this whole process of public hearings. Why
19 even involve the public if our comments have no rank because
20 they are not considered expert.

21 It seems that interpretation plays as important a role in
22 this process as the rule of law. The conclusion on page 24
23 of Order 843 states, quote, "One of the Council's principal
24 duties is to ensure that the location of energy facilities
25 will produce minimal adverse effects on the environment,"

1 end quote. Another part of that same law is that EFSEC,
2 quote, "assure for all people of Washington safe, healthful,
3 productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing
4 surroundings," end quote.

5 In 2009 the Council, in my mind, gave very little weight
6 to this part of the law. Our voices, imploring that we love
7 and want to protect not just our views but also our rural
8 character, were completely lost on the people who were on
9 the Council at that time. Placing turbines right in front
10 of the Wenatchee mountains and right in the middle of a
11 large number of homes should be a last resort, not a first
12 resort.

13 Our representative, Mr. Ian Elliot's response to Order 843
14 stated in part, quote, "We have not adequately dealt with
15 the visual effect of multiple turbines on relatively flat
16 terrain as it pertains to local residences," unquote. I
17 hope the Council will deal with the visual impacts on nearby
18 residences adequately this time around. And what I mean by
19 "nearby" is not just those within 2,500 feet. I mean within
20 two to three miles of the project. These turbines are so
21 huge there will be visual impacts on anyone within a two- to
22 three-mile radius of the project. The National Academy of
23 Sciences concurs with this; quote, "The most significant
24 visual impacts are likely to occur within three miles of the
25 projects with impacts possible from sensitive viewing areas

Page 48

1 up to eight miles of the project."

2 Can I keep going?

3 CHAIR DREW: Uh-huh.

4 MS. KINNEY: Okay. I want to start with the current
5 project and the visual simulations. All the visual
6 simulations that are in the amendment use an uncommonly wide
7 angle of view of 124 degrees. I think I copied one off. I
8 will show you in a second here. But what we really need to
9 comprehend the size of turbines near our homes is something
10 quite different. When I saw the simulations from
11 Viewpoint 6 in the amendment, I didn't trust that it was
12 accurate because I know the area, and it didn't look right
13 to me. So I went to Viewpoint 6, which is about a mile east
14 of my house on Smithson Road. As soon as I got there I
15 discovered I was right. The white house is much closer in
16 person.

17 So I photographed the area, taking in the same view as the
18 simulation. I took four photos with my Nikon D7200, which
19 has an APS-C sensor, which means it's slightly smaller than
20 a full-frame sensor, therefore, I used 44 millimeters as my
21 lens focal length rather than 50 millimeters, which is what
22 I would have used if I had a full-frame sensor. Next I
23 sized the photos so that they had the same vertical
24 measurement as the photo simulation I retrieved from the new
25 project description, which is 2.2 -- 6.25 inches. I lined

1 up the photos and made one photo that I printed in two parts
2 due to paper size limitations. I'll show you what I did. I
3 know this is a -- may be a little bit hard for you to see
4 from where you're at, but this is just a copy of what's in
5 the amendment. And when I saw this picture, this
6 simulation, I just thought the white house was way too far
7 away.

8 CHAIR DREW: So --

9 MS. KINNEY: So my four pictures that I put together, you
10 can see the white house, probably, from where you're
11 sitting. It's much closer and bigger, and it's more
12 realistic. And I don't know how they did their simulations,
13 but all -- every simulation must start with a photograph.
14 And a photograph has to be made with a 50 millimeter lens if
15 you have a full-frame sensor. If you don't, objects look
16 smaller and farther away. And the very first time this
17 project was proposed, that's what they used was a camera
18 with a 35 millimeter lens. And they had to go do all their
19 simulations over using a 50 millimeter lens. And I think
20 these simulations need to be examined, and we need to find
21 out how they were done because I believe that when we look
22 at these simulations the towers look so much smaller and
23 farther away than what they really will look like.

24 If a wind turbine is within a half a mile it will likely
25 dominate a person's field of view. And peripheral vision

Page 50

1 will be just that, peripheral. We won't be interested in a
2 180-degree view. We'll be looking at what's right in front
3 of us. According to the National Academy of Sciences,
4 quote, "Photographs should be taken with a 50 millimeter
5 lens or digital equivalent that creates a 38.6 degree angle
6 of view, which most closely matches human visual
7 perception." There are a lot of people who live within a
8 half mile of one or more turbines. We need to see how big
9 they're really going to look. So I hope new simulations can
10 be done.

11 The number of viewpoints is also inadequate. There should
12 be more views from areas where there are the most people
13 nearby who will see turbines. I believe a viewpoint should
14 be added at Howard Road, perhaps a quarter mile west, like
15 the view used in the 2009 Final SEIS. It should be looking
16 north, as that's where most of the turbines will be located.
17 This will actually be the view of many people not shown on
18 the maps of the project. The maps cut off at Smithson Road.
19 If you look at those maps right back there, the bottom of
20 the project is right at Smithson Road, and you see nothing
21 below that. But you do see homes -- they have a map of the
22 nearby homes in the amendment, and you can see houses to the
23 east and to the northeast of the project that are probably a
24 mile or a mile and a half away. But none of the homes that
25 are south of the project are shown on the map. There are

1 27 residences along Howard Road that are not shown. That's
2 about a third of the total residences that surround that
3 project. So there is going to be a significant number of
4 people impacted by this, even though they say there's only
5 21 [sic] turbines.

6 In addition to these visual impacts I just want to go
7 through some things very quickly here, if I can, that I
8 think might warrant either immunity or making a new SEIS.
9 One, there's a new section of land in the new SCA that
10 wasn't in the previous SCA. Of course, the turbine size has
11 changed. I have a letter to the editor to the Ellensburg
12 Daily Record that I will submit that talks more in-depth
13 about that. The attorney general in the draft SEIS comments
14 called for a scale diagram with points of reference to allow
15 the reader to easily comprehend the turbine size. This has
16 never been done. Instead a photograph in the 2018 project
17 description shows, quote, "a typical turbine in use." That
18 is not adequate. We need to see scale drawings of what
19 these turbines with look like and have a frame of reference
20 so we know how big is it really going to be.

21 And when I was trying to figure out the size of the rotors
22 and so forth, I came up with a measurement of 50 feet from
23 ground to the tip of the rotors when they're rotating. I
24 don't know if that's right or not. I just subtracted the
25 numbers that they put on, you know, their turb- -- on the

Page 52

1 chart. So is that right that when that turbine -- those
2 rotors are rotating the lowest it will be is only 50 feet
3 off the ground? We don't know because they don't give us
4 any drawings.

5 The configuration of turbines is very troubling to me.
6 Local residences will view the turbines from closest to
7 farthest rather than a string of turbines along a ridge top.
8 This will lead to visual disorder on relatively flat but
9 sloped terrain. The spacing is not consistent creating
10 visual clutter from front to back and side to side. It's
11 inconsistent because of the number of wetlands in the area
12 and the attempts to avoid crossing them. For example, there
13 is one road -- you can see it right back there -- it's about
14 1.7 miles long that services only two turbines in one
15 configuration and three in another. And I thought that
16 might be really inefficient use of the roads that they're
17 building.

18 CHAIR DREW: If I could ask you to wrap up. And perhaps
19 if you have additional written comments -- and we can also
20 have the staff talk to you more because we have about a half
21 hour left and --

22 MS. KINNEY: Okay.

23 CHAIR DREW: -- another six speakers. I wanted to --

24 MS. KINNEY: Yes.

25 CHAIR DREW: -- give people as much time as I could,

1 but --

2 MS. KINNEY: Okay. I will --

3 CHAIR DREW: -- that's fair.

4 MS. KINNEY: -- skip to my conclusion. Is that good?

5 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

6 MS. KINNEY: All right.

7 CHAIR DREW: And we're happy to get written documentation.

8 And --

9 MS. KINNEY: I do have that.

10 CHAIR DREW: -- I think your comments are well-taken --

11 MS. KINNEY: Okay.

12 CHAIR DREW: -- and very well-researched. So we
13 appreciate that.

14 MS. KINNEY: Okay. Let me see here.

15 MR. ROSSMAN: And copies of the photos.

16 CHAIR DREW: Oh, copies of the photos are being requested.

17 MS. KINNEY: I do have those two digital copies for you --

18 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. KINNEY: -- for your convenience.

20 Okay. I just want to get to my -- okay. I'll try not to
21 take too much longer.

22 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

23 MS. KINNEY: The last thing I have, then, is Desert Claim
24 has not demonstrated the need to site this wind farm in this
25 location. EFSEC has stated in its report to the Governor

Page 54

1 recommending rejection of the Tesoro Savage Petroleum
2 Terminal on page 59, quote, "Tesoro Savage has the burden of
3 demonstrating that -- the need for the VEDT at the proposed
4 location. As discussed in Section VIII, even if one accepts
5 the premise that there is a 'pressing need for energy
6 facilities,' the Council must determine the appropriateness
7 of the proposed location and operation of the proposed
8 facility in light of the need for energy from that
9 facility." Not once in Order 843 did EFSEC require Desert
10 Claim to address the need for a wind farm in this particular
11 location over all others.

12 Does anyone remember the uproar over the Vantage Wind Farm
13 in 2010? No. Because they worked with the County in the
14 overlay zone, and the process worked. The Ellensburg Daily
15 Record quoted Invenergy director of development at the time,
16 quote, "County staff and commissioners did a good job at
17 presenting the fair and reasonable conditions in the
18 development agreement," unquote. The project manager at the
19 time construction began was also quoted as saying "We're
20 moving right along right on schedule." And Commissioner
21 Alan Crankoich said, "The County put a thorough wind farm
22 review process in place, and it worked."

23 So it's time to say that this is not an appropriate place
24 for a wind farm. Desert Claim has had over a decade to get
25 it right in siting this wind farm in this area. And now

1 that the SCA is about to expire in 2020, they want EFSEC to
2 hurry up and approve their latest amendment. And I say it's
3 time to say, "Not in this place."

4 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

5 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 7, Teresa Sloan.

6 MS. SLOAN: I don't know if the mic will go low enough.

7 Hi, my name is Teresa Sloan. I am a local pilot. I'm
8 instrument rated. That means I can fly in the clouds. I
9 have an airplane at the Ellensburg airport and I work at the
10 Ellensburg airport. And my concern is I saw the words
11 "transportation considerations" on the board back there, but
12 we didn't see anything that specifically mentioned the FAA.
13 Unless there's been an additional long-term study on any
14 potential impact on the instrument approaches coming into
15 Bowers Field, I recommend that this project not move forward
16 until that's done.

17 If we look at the original wind farm and how it was
18 approved and how our minimums were raised for our instrument
19 approaches after that wind farm went in to the east of us,
20 basically, there was some input sought from the FAA --
21 didn't quite get the answer they wanted and went to a
22 retired person from the FAA, and got approval for putting in
23 the turbines that are out there. One of my colleagues,
24 while executing an instrument approach in visual conditions,
25 coming in on what's called the intermediate segment coming

Page 56

1 into Ellensburg was actually looking up at the wind towers
2 to the side of him. They were higher than the airplane.
3 And if you can imagine that being a problem when you're in
4 the clouds and you can't even see those wind farms.

5 We had just received that instrument approach, which
6 lowered the minimums that airplanes could go down to. And
7 we no sooner got those lower minimums when the FAA came and
8 said, "Oh, golly gee, those towers are taller, we need to
9 raise your minimums back up even higher." And we're afraid
10 that that might had an again.

11 As you may know, we've recently had one of our two runways
12 closed, which means we've lost one of our instrument
13 approaches to runway 25. We have a very new instrument
14 approach for runway 11 that comes in from the northwest for
15 landing towards the southeast. And you may have noticed
16 we've been having quite a bit of wind from that direction
17 lately. That particular approach -- I just pulled up the
18 approach chart and looked at it, and the proposed wind farm
19 comes pretty close to some of the segments of that
20 instrument approach.

21 I believe that there's a minimum of 2,000 feet clearance
22 between the altitude of the approach and the terrain or any
23 obstacles on it within a 4-nautical-mile radius on either
24 side. And my concern is, has anybody really researched
25 exactly where these towers are going to go in and their

1 relation to that instrument approach, or are we going to
2 lose another instrument approach or have our minimums jacked
3 up so high that it's difficult for an aircraft to get down
4 low enough to be able to get below the clouds in time to see
5 the runway.

6 Keep in mind we do have some medevac flights coming in.
7 That actually has been a little bit curtailed because of the
8 short runway that we have right now, although the plan is to
9 extend that runway in the not-too-distant future. But
10 lowering those minimums to that instrument approach could
11 further prevent medevac flights from being able to come into
12 Ellensburg. So I do highly recommend that the FAA be
13 completely researched on this subject and that it is only
14 active FAA members that are giving the recommendations.
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

17 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 8, Mr. Paul Jewell.

18 MR. JEWELL: Good evening.

19 CHAIR DREW: Good evening.

20 MR. JEWELL: My name is Paul Jewell. I'm a Kittitas
21 County commissioner. I can't even work my own equipment.
22 Sorry about that. I also apologize for my appearance this
23 evening. I wasn't planning to speak, but as I was
24 evaluating some of the -- listening to some of the remarks
25 and evaluating some of the paperwork on this, I had a couple

Page 58

1 of -- a couple of things to add. I won't take up a lot of
2 your time, so I'm going to limit it to two main remarks.

3 First of all, before I get to those, though, certainly are
4 appreciative of all the folks who have shown up tonight and
5 are making some really good comments. We really appreciate
6 how thoughtful they're being. And we hope you appreciate
7 that as well.

8 Now, to my two main comments. First of all, I want to
9 support the comments that were just made about the Bowers
10 Airfield operations and the concerns about the operating
11 minimums and how these turbines, especially with the
12 increased height, might affect aeronautical operations at
13 Bowers Field. You have some really strong language in the
14 site certification agreement that requires FAA approval or
15 certification that installation of the turbines won't affect
16 Bowers Field in any way, shape, or form. If there's a way
17 to strengthen that even further to make sure that the proper
18 certification and the proper authorization is received by
19 the FAA prior to construction of any of the turbines, we
20 would definitely support that.

21 Bowers Field hosts a flight training program from Central
22 Washington University. I don't know if the previous speaker
23 mentioned that. But it's a very important flight program,
24 not only for the University, but also regionally here for
25 making sure we have the next crop of professionals out there

1 to take us all on vacation and otherwise.

2 She mentioned the medevac flights and how important those
3 are. Another really important thing to point out, though,
4 is it also serves as a wildfire base during the summertime.
5 DNR operates out of there with a Helitack crew as well as
6 several other flight operations for the wildfires that tend
7 to occur regularly in they area. So flight operations,
8 regular operations not being affected at Bowers Field is
9 really important for us on a regular basis.

10 The second thing I'd like to mention is what I really see
11 as a pretty stark omission in the site certification
12 agreement. And that is any mitigation requirements around
13 local roads. There's a lot of discussion about project
14 roads and a lot of discussion about internal roads within
15 the project, construction of those, what they might look
16 like, how wide they'll be, access, et cetera. But there's
17 not a lot of discussion about public and state roads. The
18 reason I bring that up is we've got some experience now with
19 some of these wind farms. We've had three major projects
20 here in the county, and with at least two of them we
21 experienced major damage and other issues associated with
22 our roadways. The most recent project in the Vantage area,
23 I think it was the Invenergy project, we're still trying to
24 recover Vantage Highway from some of the road damage that
25 occurred.

Page 60

1 With the larger turbines, it sounds like larger trucks; it
2 sounds like heavier loads. We might see some more impacts.
3 So I would like you to include some pretty strong language
4 around pre and post road condition, monitoring, and
5 certification. And to work with the County to make sure
6 that if there is damage that has been caused by these
7 projects on our roads, that the applicant is responsible for
8 that. If you need us to provide you some specific language
9 for some appropriate conditions, we'd be happy to do that.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

11 MR. JEWELL: Thanks very much.

12 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

13 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 9, Gina Jefferson-Lindemoen.

14 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Hi, I am a resident at the end
15 of Reecer Creek. I was involved in three of the fires. It
16 was really scary. I don't know how a plane or -- can you
17 all hear me?

18 FEMALE SPEAKER: Can you lower the mic? There you go.

19 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: I don't know how a plane or a
20 helicopter could even operate. The telephone poles that
21 burned and fell on the horse trailers trying to get my horse
22 out during the Taylor Bridge Fire -- it was scary. I
23 couldn't even leave. I had to go up over the mountain
24 through the back woods to leave my property and go to
25 Wenatchee. I couldn't even leave and go down Reecer Creek.

1 So that to me is a very big concern.

2 I really didn't even realize that this is an amendment. I
3 thought maybe this is to reject this project. And I still
4 haven't even seen what's going to happen here. Is this just
5 to amend the project?

6 CHAIR DREW: The proposal from the applicant is to amend
7 the project --

8 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Okay.

9 CHAIR DREW: -- yes.

10 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: So it's actually approved to go
11 in.

12 CHAIR DREW: No. Oh, the project had been approved, yes.

13 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Right.

14 CHAIR DREW: There's an existing site certification
15 agreement.

16 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Right. But it -- they didn't
17 comply up to 2015; is that correct? They were supposed to
18 do all their permitting before 2015, and they did not do
19 that? So we all thought it was gone and done and over with.

20 CHAIR DREW: I'll see if our staff is prepared to answer
21 that question. If not, we will get back to you --

22 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Okay.

23 CHAIR DREW: -- but --

24 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: That was the assumption of all
25 us on Reecer Creek: That it was done; it was over. So now

Page 62

1 it's all put us all back in a frenzy.

2 CHAIR DREW: Do you want to wait just one second? I'll --

3 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Okay.

4 CHAIR DREW: -- see if we have a response for your
5 question on the process.

6 MR. POSNER: We can check on that, but I'm not aware that
7 their -- they had to have all of their permits in place.
8 They have not even submitted any plans that need to be
9 approved for it -- before any sort of site preparation or
10 construction would begin.

11 CHAIR DREW: So we will take that comment and then get an
12 answer.

13 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Okay. Is --

14 MR. POSNER: So I'm not sure where you're getting that --

15 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: From the Daily --

16 MR. POSNER: --- information from.

17 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- Record. It was -- came from
18 the Daily Record --

19 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Oh. Okay. So not necessarily --

20 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- that they had to have all
21 their --

22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- permitting done before 2015,
24 and nothing was presented.

25 The other thing I'd like to say is has anybody noticed the

1 cost of electric prices in Ellensburg? The cost increase
2 for your utilities for your electric is because of
3 Bonneville. Because of the fight that they've had with the
4 dams and the wind turbine companies. I work for the utility
5 companies, for one in particular. And this year alone we
6 had 8.1 percent increase in our utilities. Last year we had
7 3.7. Since 2010 we've had almost 37 percent increase. When
8 Bonneville went to court with the other wind tower company
9 that hasn't sold all their power, of course, the courts went
10 against Bonneville and our transmission lines had to be used
11 for the wind power, which affected our fish and affected our
12 electrical costs. So all the utility companies had to raise
13 their costs because Bonneville had to sell their power at a
14 more expensive price. So 8.1 percent this year.

15 Someone brought up that we don't even need this because
16 the utility -- the need for the utilities, we don't have it;
17 that it's flat. So what's that going to do to our City of
18 Ellensburg or the surrounding area for the cost increases?

19 I deal with people every day that cannot pay their utility
20 bills and then have to look for federal money to help them
21 through programs such as HopeSource. We have a median
22 income here of around \$12 an hour in this county. How can
23 we afford to force all of our citizens with these increases
24 in their electricity? You're all asking us to pay for more.
25 Because when the subsidies go away, we pay for it. No one

Page 64

1 else but us pays for it. And I have to hear all the stories
2 every day about how they can't pay for it. People haven't
3 each gotten their bill yet from the City of Ellensburg with
4 the 8.1 increase in their utility rate cap (phonetic).

5 The other thing I would like to say is no jobs will be
6 local. They can tell you whatever they want, but they bring
7 plants from Oregon and other sites for batch plants to do
8 their gravel and all of that. They don't ask for anybody
9 local. They had one person that had two trucks come in and
10 help, but there were no local jobs. Ellensburg Cement
11 Products did supply some of the gravel that was needed, but
12 not near the amount that they had thought that they were
13 going to get because they brought the batch plants from
14 Oregon. And the people that install them travel all the way
15 around the country. Nobody local it getting those jobs.

16 The other thing is the property values, which was brought
17 up. I'm going -- I live at the very end of Reecer Creek,
18 and my home is now valued \$400,000. Who's going to give me
19 that amount of money if I had to sell? Are any of you all
20 going to buy my house?

21 FEMALE SPEAKER: No.

22 CHAIR DREW: Please, please, if you can address the
23 Council in this hearing.

24 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: I am addressing --

25 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

1 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- the Council. But I'm
2 addressing my neighbors as well.

3 CHAIR DREW: Right. You -- the (inaudible) --

4 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: So also the thing I would like
5 to --

6 CHAIR DREW: -- Council.

7 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- say about this is I went
8 through all of it before. I had the assistant attorney
9 general at my home. And what he told me -- this is before
10 Christine Gregoire approve it. They knew before the Council
11 did anything. He was at my home with all my neighbors, and
12 he said, "Gina, it's not if; it's when."

13 And we told him, "Well, the County hasn't approved it."

14 He said, "I'm telling you. It's not if; it's when." So
15 what is -- what are people hiding from us? If you all are
16 the ones that are doing this, how come you all didn't come
17 out and tell us sooner when they came forth with it in 2009
18 or 2010? Because he was at my home and he told us it wasn't
19 if; it was when. That's my other thing.

20 The other thing I'd like to know is why aren't they
21 approaching North Bend? North Bend has a whole bunch of
22 wind. Why aren't they being built in King County? I'd like
23 to know that.

24 Well, that's about all I really have to say. It's like I
25 feel like we've all been storied to, but I can't imagine why

Page 66

1 anyone would allow something to go in where there are
2 homes -- that many of them and that tall. That's all I have
3 to say.

4 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

5 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 10. Give me a second.

6 CHAIR DREW: Your microphone is --

7 MS. POTIS: Testing?

8 CHAIR DREW: We'll have the speaker introduce himself.

9 MR. SATRE: Hello, Council. My name is Ken Satre. And I
10 actually retired from Snohomish County Pud. And I was a
11 senior energy manager there. And my position there was
12 working with commercial, industrial, and agricultural
13 customers doing conservation work. And we actually saved
14 quite a bit of energy. I worked with Boeing, dairy farmers,
15 pretty much everybody. And, you know, the biggest bang for
16 your buck is in conservation. Building the wind towers and
17 things like that.

18 You know, the other problem we have is the grid. You
19 know, there's only so many electrons you can run through the
20 wires. It's kind of like a hose, there's only -- you know,
21 a certain size hose will only take so much water. So with
22 the increase in gigawatts, you know, you're going to be
23 looking at massive expansions of the grid also.

24 And then I also live at the very end of Reecer Creek Road,
25 and, you know, we live at the north end. And right now we

1 have a beautiful view at night, you know, when we look down
2 over the town of Ellensburg. And we're not looking forward
3 to seeing a bunch of red blinking lights like we see off to
4 the west, and the towers being as tall as they are.

5 The other thing I've noticed in the area is we have had an
6 increase in bald eagles, owls, and hawks in the area. Um --
7 yeah. I guess -- you know, the biggest thing is I would
8 think we could do a lot more with conservation work and --
9 you know, with that. We're doing good for the customers.
10 You know, we're helping more industries, businesses to
11 improve their efficiencies and things like that. And the
12 money just goes for a better cause. So that's all I've got
13 to say.

14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

15 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 11, Emily Satre.

16 MS. SATRE: Hello, Council. My name is Emily Satre and
17 I'm Ken's wife. And I've lived with him a long time to know
18 that he knows what he's talking about. We don't need these
19 wind turbines. We have too much power. When we have an
20 excess amount of anything it creates a problem. No one is
21 creating a problem for me. I'm just a concerned property
22 owner.

23 I had a really hard life, even though it doesn't mean
24 anything to you or anybody involved with this project. But
25 for what I had to survive and get through in life to move to

Page 68

1 where I live right now out on Reecer Creek Road, I feel like
2 I was blessed finally with a beautiful place to live. These
3 wind turbines are going to (inaudible). They're going to
4 devalue my property. They're going to devalue my life, my
5 quality of life, and my choice of life. I did not choose to
6 have this monstrosity of a wind generator come in and take
7 over the land. I chose to live in a place that was
8 peaceful, free, has wildlife. It has beautiful landscape.
9 It means something to me. It means something to everybody
10 that bought property where we live out there.

11 This is an intrusion in our life, and it will devalue our
12 quality of living. And I am asking, please, do not allow
13 for this to be taken away from us because it will force me
14 to have to move again. And I don't want to have to move. I
15 don't want to loose what I worked my entire life for. It
16 means that much to me. It means that much to everybody that
17 lives here. This is a beautiful community. Why let it be
18 destroyed by somebody who just wants to make more money?
19 They don't live here. We do. Thank you.

20 MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 12, Janet Nelson.

21 MS. NELSON: My name is Janet Nelson, and I live here in
22 town after many years up at Lake Kachess where we had a
23 beautiful view. I really wasn't going to speak, but I have
24 been trying to research online information about
25 supplemental environment studies that might be going to be

1 done. And I couldn't find anything. This was on the EFSEC
2 website. I understand there are studies going on. But I
3 wanted to alert you to the fact that there probably have
4 been changes in the last nine or ten years, environmentally,
5 on this area.

6 One thing that I became aware of while I was trying to
7 research it online is that there is an animal called the
8 Townsend's ground squirrel, which, evidently, is or may be
9 an endangered animal that's found in this area. It's --
10 actually, I think he's probably found on all the wind farms
11 here. And I think that he -- it's an animal of concern
12 because I think it's a prey species for golden eagle. You
13 know the bald eagles live primarily on fish, whereas the
14 golden eagle is -- eats closer to the ground and is living
15 on various types of rodents and whatnot. And this, I think,
16 is a rodent.

17 But anyway, I saw it mentioned that there was going to be
18 some kind of a special study on this wind farm of that
19 animal, and I wasn't really aware of where that came from.
20 But evidently this is an -- something that needs to be
21 researched thoroughly. In fact, I really think -- well,
22 evidently there's going to be -- there's a specialist hired
23 who's going to compare what was done in 2010 with what's
24 going on there now or go out in the field and examine it.
25 So that's something that definitely needs to be researched.

Page 70

1 And then the other thing is that we now have had golden
2 eagles killed in this valley. Four of them were killed just
3 15 miles away on the Wild Horse Wind Farm. And they've gone
4 through all the appropriate studies through the U.S. Fish
5 and Wildlife Service that are required because of the laws
6 that protect golden and bald eagles. But anyway, that has
7 happened here. So I would like to see -- I don't know --
8 maybe special studies. I think U.S. -- or WDFW can advise
9 on that -- what could be done supplemental for that on --
10 for this wind farm if it's approved.

11 And then the other thing I'm more aware of now is, hearing
12 about the height of these towers, is that no one really
13 knows what the impact will be to the wildlife, to the birds
14 and bats. So I definitely feel that there needs to be
15 two-year studies done post-construction for birds and maybe
16 bats. If you're going to do one, you might as well do the
17 other. So that's primarily -- my concerns are
18 environmental, since that's what Kittitas Audubon is all
19 about. That's it. Thank you.

20 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

21 Is there anyone else?

22 MS. POTIS: Uh, yes. We have one final speaker, Dan
23 Morgan.

24 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

25 MR. MORGAN: Hi. My name is Dan Morgan. I'm president of

1 Morgan & Son Earthmoving here in Ellensburg. I'm a
2 third-generation owner of our company. And we have been
3 involved with the construction, operation and maintenance,
4 environmental compliance of all three of the existing wind
5 farms here in Kittitas County. We employ local people. We
6 all live here. We've lived here forever. And I'm able to
7 keep year-round employees now, where I couldn't before.
8 Renewable energy has been very good for us. And I'm in
9 favor of the project. Thank you.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

11 Ma'am, you already had an opportunity to --

12 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Can I say one --

13 CHAIR DREW: -- speak.

14 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: -- more thing?

15 CHAIR DREW: No. Thank you.

16 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Can I ask about the noise level
17 of these new ones? What will the noise level be?

18 CHAIR DREW: I will direct you to talk to Staff after the
19 hearing here.

20 MS. JEFFERSON-LINDEMOEN: Okay.

21 CHAIR DREW: If we are now completed with our sign-up
22 sheet, this hearing is adjourned.

23 Thank you all for participating.

24 (Meeting is adjourned.)

25 (8:22:55)

Page 72

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH)

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings, recorded statements, hearings and/or interviews were transcribed under my direction as a certified transcriptionist; and that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability, including any changes made by the trial judge reviewing the transcript; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of April, 2018.

Jennifer A. Albino



Jennifer A.P. Albino, CET-661