

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of) Public Informational
 Application No. 2009-01) and Scoping Meeting
 WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY, LLC.) Pages 1 - 132
 WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT)
 _____)

A Public Informational and Scoping Meeting in the above matter was held on Wednesday, May 6, 2009, at the Skamania County Fairgrounds, 710 S.W. Rock Creek Drive in Stevenson, Washington at 6:30 p.m., before the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council members.

* * * * *

CHAIR LUCE: Good evening, everyone. Today is May 6, 2009 and the time is 6:30 p.m. My name is Jim Luce, and I'm the Chair of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, and on behalf of the Council I thank you all for coming here tonight and participating in this meeting.

First, I would like to introduce the members of the Council, and we'll go from my right to the left and we'll start with Judy.

MS. WILSON: I'm Judy Wilson representing Skamania County.

MR. TAYER: I'm Jeff Tayer. I'm with the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

MR. BYERS: I'm Dick Byers with the Washington

1 Utilities and Transportation Commission of Washington.

2 CHAIR LUCE: As I said, I'm Jim Luce Chair of the
3 Energy Siting Council.

4 MR. FRYHLING: I'm Dick Fryhling and I represent
5 the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development.

6 MS. McDONALD: I'm Mary McDonald and I represent
7 the Department of Natural Resources.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Now we'll pass the microphone back
9 the other way so members of the staff and our legal team can
10 introduce themselves.

11 MR. CREWS: I'm Kyle Crews, Assistant Attorney
12 General.

13 JUDGE WALLIS: My name is Bob Wallis and I am an
14 Administrative Law Judge working with the Council.

15 MR. LA SPINA: Jim La Spina, EFSEC staff.

16 MR. FIKSDAL: Allen Fiksdal. I'm the EFSEC
17 manager.

18 CHAIR LUCE: And Tammy Talburt.

19 MS. FIKSDAL: Tammy Talburt with EFSEC.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Tammy is the go to person if you want
21 to get on the mailing list or we do work by e-mail as well.
22 So if you want to get documents associated with this
23 particular case, you want to make sure that Tammy Talburt is
24 the person you see this evening.

25 The purpose of tonight's meeting is for the

1 Council to provide you information about the Whistling Ridge
2 Energy Project, also about EFSEC's review process, introduce
3 the Counsel for the Environment, and most of all get your
4 comments on the project and the scope and the specific
5 issues to be addressed in the environmental impact statement
6 which will be prepared jointly by the Energy Siting Council
7 and the Bonneville Power Administration. So I would like at
8 this time if we could have the representatives of the
9 Bonneville Power Administration stand and introduce
10 themselves.

11 MR. MONTANO: I'm Andrew Montano. I'm the
12 environmental project manager with Bonneville Power, and
13 this is Rick Yarde also with Bonneville.

14 CHAIR LUCE: If people want to get a hold of you,
15 Andrew, how do they do that?

16 MR. MONTANO: I have business cards I can hand out
17 to anyone who would like to get a hold of me. We also have
18 a website address I can give you at the end of this meeting
19 if you'd like.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Maybe you could leave that website
21 address with Tammy Talburt so that people who come up to get
22 information from Tammy will also be able to get your e-mail
23 at that time.

24 MR. MONTANO: Sounds good.

25 CHAIR LUCE: We also have with us tonight the

1 Counsel for the Environment, an Assistant Attorney General
2 for the State of Washington. Counsel for the Environment,
3 where are you?

4 MR. MARVIN: Hi, I'm Bruce Marvin. I'm an
5 Assistant Attorney General. I've been appointed as Counsel
6 for the Environment, the statutory position that's
7 established as part of the EFSEC process. As the title
8 suggests, I'm Counsel for the Environment. My client is the
9 environment. I am very interested in hearing what the
10 public has to say about this project and its potential
11 environmental impacts, and I would invite you if you have an
12 issue that you would like to raise or run by me, I don't
13 have a position yet, and I can't say that I'll be taking up
14 everybody's position that's presented to me, but I would
15 like to hear from you and what your concerns are at the
16 start of this project, or if you like the project let me
17 know that too.

18 My work number is 360-586-2438 and feel free to
19 leave voicemail there. The preferred method of the
20 communication is through my e-mail dress which is
21 bruceml@atg.wa.gov, and I'll be available this evening after
22 the meeting if people would like to talk to me then as well.
23 I'll be here at tomorrow night's meeting as well.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Bruce, just to clarify, what I think
25 I heard you say was you're representing the interest of the

1 environment not particular interests; is that correct?

2 MR. MARVIN: Yes, sir.

3 CHAIR LUCE: If you could do me the favor of
4 leaving with Ms. Talburt your e-mail address for the benefit
5 of those people who may not have had a chance to get it down
6 or maybe didn't hear you.

7 In just a minute we're going to hear from Jason
8 Spadaro, project applicant; and Katy Chaney who is
9 representing and consulting with Mr. Spadaro. They're going
10 to give you a brief overview of the project. Before we do
11 that, however, I would ask Council members whether there's
12 disclosures for the record that they wish to make in terms
13 of any interests or involvement in the Columbia River George
14 issues, not all of which may be coming before us, probably
15 none of which would be coming before us, but any past
16 involvement in this community that they would like people to
17 be aware of and I'll start with Dick. Do you have anything?

18 MR. BYERS: No, I do not.

19 MR. FRYHLING: Sure. Back about eight years ago I
20 spent some time here in Skamania County representing my
21 agency in regard to grant funds that were given to Skamania
22 County so I have some background here.

23 CHAIR LUCE: I was a member of the Columbia River
24 Gorge Commission appointed by Governor then Gary Locke from
25 July of 1999 until September of 2001, and in that capacity I

1 met several people who may be participating or speaking this
2 evening, but I don't believe that presents any conflicts.

3 MS. McDONALD: Hi, I was a forest practice
4 forester for the Department of Natural Resources in Skamania
5 County probably about eight years ago and I was a forest
6 practice forester here for two years.

7 CHAIR LUCE: I think that's it in terms of
8 disclosures. The last thing I would say is tonight we're
9 going to get comments hopefully from new members of the
10 public, either orally or in writing, and we'll talk about
11 that a little later, and we're going to hear from you on
12 issues that you believe should be included in the Draft
13 Environmental Impact Statement.

14 We're going to have a hearing tomorrow night on
15 land use issues. One of the responsibilities of the Energy
16 Siting Council is to make a determination on land use
17 consistency. So while people may want to talk about that
18 issue tonight, I would ask them to keep those comments very
19 brief because we will be having a hearing tomorrow evening
20 with respect to that.

21 Now, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Spadaro, do you have an
22 overview of the project you would like to provide to the
23 people who are here this evening?

24 MR. SPADARO: Yes, Chair Luce. Mr. Chairman,
25 would it be your preference if I stand up and address the

1 crowd as well as present this information to the audience
2 or?

3 CHAIR LUCE: Your choice, but I think that the
4 audience is probably the best choice. We can hear you and
5 they may not be able to hear as well as we can because your
6 back is toward them.

7 MR. SPADARO: The other thing is I will project
8 the some slide show up on the screen behind you.

9 CHAIR LUCE: Well, that's consistent and our
10 regulations provide that you are to give us a demonstration
11 of exhibits I believe as well.

12 MR. SPADARO: All right.

13 CHAIR LUCE: Go for it.

14 MR. SPADARO: I just want to prepare you as I turn
15 this on. It might blind you.

16 CHAIR LUCE: We promise not to make shadow people
17 from the projector.

18 MR. SPADARO: Okay. I'll stand to the side so the
19 audience can see. Again, Mr. Chairman, Members of the
20 Council, thank you for the opportunity.

21 Members of the public, we look forward to open
22 dialogue and a public involvement process and your scrutiny
23 of the project as we begin here.

24 First, I'll state that my name is Jason Spadaro,
25 President of the SDS Lumber Company. The project is called

1 Whistling Ridge Energy Project. It is on the lands owned by
2 Broughton Lumber Company, SDS Lumber Company. SDS Co., LLC,
3 to be more specific. Our objective is to combine wind
4 energy with renewable energy -- excuse me, wind energy with
5 renewable forest products and timber production. It will be
6 the first project in the Pacific Northwest on commercial
7 forest land, and we believe that timber and wind are fully
8 compatible and can occur on the same site. I'll show a
9 little bit about how we intend to do that.

10 SDS lumber is in the renewable resource business.
11 Wind is a renewable resource as is our forest. Our approach
12 to resource management is to practice sustainable forestry
13 and manage our trees on longer rotations than typical. We
14 produce high quality building products as a result of that.
15 We already are in the renewable energy business with our
16 biomass plant at our lumber plant in Bingen, and we have
17 conducted long-term exploration of our lands for this wind
18 energy potential. This site that we have found is the one
19 site on our lands that has that type of potential.

20 We first began studying the site in 2002 gathering
21 meteorological data and doing wildlife studies.

22 SDS Lumber has been in the Gorge for over
23 60 years. It is a locally owned company. We have remained
24 committed to the community throughout those 60 plus years.
25 At full capacity we have 325 employees. Right now with the

1 downturn in housing and the national economy we are at 250.
2 At normal we are at over 14 million of annual payroll. This
3 project is important to us because it adds value to our
4 company owned lands, and it helps us to diversify and remain
5 stable for the long term. The project location is in
6 eastern Skamania County, White Salmon, community of
7 Underwood, just this traces the Cook-Underwood Road, and the
8 project site is here. This is the boundary line between
9 Klickitat and Skamania County that line. So it borders the
10 south edge of Klickitat County and it's outside of the
11 National Scenic Area.

12 The project is named Whistling Ridge for a reason.
13 There is a Ridge line called Whistling Ridge. We're at the
14 lowest southern end of Whistling Ridge and extends to the
15 north onto DNR property toward Nester Peak in that area. It
16 is seven miles northwest of White Salmon, approximately
17 2,100 feet elevation and in the western end of the Columbia
18 Gorge Wind Regime. Because of the wind regime in the Gorge
19 a number of wind energy have been built in the eastern parts
20 of the gorge. We are in the western part of that wind
21 regime.

22 The project is on commercial forest lands that
23 have been managed for commercial forestry production for
24 over 100 years. This is a view of standing on the project
25 site. Looking to the west this is Augspurgen Mountain, and

1 this is one of the Bonneville transmission corridors that
2 goes through the property. This little White Salmon River
3 is down in this valley. This is a view on the site with
4 here's one of the Bonneville towers, and this is the
5 southern edge, southern end of the project site. The
6 project overview is approximately 50 turbines. The estimate
7 is we will use 1.5 megawatt machines. That would generate a
8 75-megawatt project. That's enough power for 20,000 homes
9 in the Northwest for a year with an estimated construction
10 cost of 150 million. That's an estimated value of 150
11 million that will come into county taxable base somewhere.
12 It may be somewhere below that. It may be somewhere near
13 that. It all depends on how all the valuation occurs.

14 The project helps Northwest utilities in meeting
15 renewable energy standards that are mandated by voters in
16 the state of Washington. The project has a Bonneville
17 interconnection immediately available on the site, and we
18 are planning with Bonneville or exploring with Bonneville
19 how we can enhance local electrical service to Skamania and
20 Klickitat PUD through this project.

21 The project layout is as such it's the National
22 Scenic Area boundary here. What we call the project site is
23 outlined in this blue line, and the turbine corridors are
24 these mustard color areas. That's the area of study that we
25 will evaluate the impact for turbine siting. The site is

1 already as some of those photos have shown it is already
2 disturbed and been under commercial forestry management for
3 over a hundred years. It has existing roads, rock pits, a
4 cellular site up here on top of Underwood Mountain. This is
5 the Williams Pipeline Company natural gas line, and these
6 are the two Bonneville transmission corridors that go
7 through to the site.

8 We intend to match forestry production with
9 renewable energy reproduction depicted in this layout.
10 Particularly on a ridge site what you want is to have wind
11 flow through the zone where the turbine blades capture the
12 wind energy. With a ridge site like this these trees that
13 are out a distance away at a mature height do not disrupt
14 that flow of wind through the power generating zone of the
15 wind turbine. As you get closer to the turbine, the heights
16 need to be limited. This tree height ceiling is a 50-foot
17 ceiling from the base of the wind turbine. That extends
18 from in a quadrant centered 90 degrees on the up-wind and
19 down-wind direction. It extends out 500 feet that you have
20 this 50-foot tree height ceiling. In a 150-foot radius we
21 need a 15-foot maximum tree height ceiling so our intention
22 is to grow an alternative forest crop, perhaps Christmas
23 trees or biomass energy fuels, and then within a 50-foot
24 radius around the turbine that would be the permanently
25 cleared area.

1 So in this way we can still practice forestry
2 around the wind turbines. Some areas will be modified
3 forestry. Some will be alternative forest crops, but a
4 minimal footprint of permanently disturbed and converted
5 area.

6 The project benefits we believe we will provide an
7 average of 143 full-time workers over 12 months construction
8 period, 18 million of payroll, plus 13.2 million in local
9 purchases. The multiplier effect is 107 new jobs created
10 during the construction. And then ongoing economic benefits
11 are estimated at eight to nine permanent jobs, wind turbine
12 technicians and maintenance and operations personnel
13 generating 3.75 million in payroll annually, employee local
14 spending of 900,000 a year and 730,000 in new revenues to
15 Skamania County out of taxes.

16 In conclusion, our statement is this is the right
17 project, in the right place, at the right time. I'll
18 editorialize here for a moment. I know a number of you are
19 concerned about impacts of the project, but wind energy
20 projects need to go where the wind is. We've got wind in
21 this site, we've got transmission available on the site so
22 it is the right place and the right project at a time when
23 renewable energy has never been in greater demand. We're
24 grateful for the county support and participation in this
25 project. We're appreciative of EFSEC's open and rigorous

1 process. We look forward to that as I said in the outset,
2 and we'll work hard to earn the approval of EFSEC on this
3 project.

4 Would you like me to answer any questions,
5 Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIR LUCE: I don't have questions myself at this
7 point in time. I think the primary purpose this evening was
8 to allow you to explain the project to the public. We've
9 all received copies of your application. I think that maybe
10 if you are available later to answer questions from the
11 public that would be a good thing. Any Council members?

12 I thank you very much, Mr. Spadaro.

13 Katy Chaney has nothing to say at least at this
14 time. So what I think I would like to do now is to turn to
15 Allen Fiksdal. Allen is our manager. He is going to
16 explain to you the EFSEC process for those who are not
17 already familiar with it. Allen will be available as well
18 for questions. I would encourage you to go to the EFSEC
19 website which explains also the process very clearly, but
20 for now, Allen.

21 MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 I don't have a power point. I have a chart that
23 Jim will hold for us. I know all of you can't see.

24 Oh, he's getting chairs for people.

25 The Council was created back in the 1970s to look

1 at the proposal for nuclear power plants back in that time
2 and was created by the legislature. Through time EFSEC has
3 been given more authority to site different types of
4 facilities. Right now the threshold for thermal power,
5 which is not what we're looking at here, but it's
6 350 megawatts which is a very large facility, and a few
7 years ago the legislature gave EFSEC the ability to review
8 alternative energy facilities. That's wind, solar, tidal
9 wave, biomass facilities. However, what the legislature
10 said was these proponents of these facilities can opt into
11 the EFSEC process or they can go through the local
12 government, and in Washington State some proponents of wind
13 facilities and other renewables have gone through local
14 governments and some have gone through the Council's siting
15 process.

16 The siting process basically has three elements to
17 it. One is a land use consistency as Chairman Luce noted.
18 We're going to have that hearing tomorrow evening. The
19 Council will make a determination whether the project is
20 consistent with local land use and zoning ordinances.

21 The second track basically the Council has to go
22 through is we are the lead SEPA agency, the State
23 Environmental Policy Act. So we are the lead environmental
24 reviewer of this project. The third track -- well, I should
25 back up a little bit. Environmental review means that we

1 will be developing an Environmental Impact Statement.
2 First, there will be a Draft Environmental Impact Statement
3 and everybody can comment on that Draft EIS. We will be
4 back here after it is issued to hear comments on that draft
5 EIS so you will see us again.

6 The third track that the Council has is an
7 adjudicative proceeding. This is an extra track in most
8 governmental processes where at the appropriate time the
9 Council will open their process to petitions for
10 intervention. That means that any person or group can
11 petition the Council to intervene in their adjudicated
12 hearings. The adjudicated hearings are very formal hearings
13 where the proponents or opponents will bring expert
14 witnesses in front of the Council to testify in front of the
15 Council. Those expert witnesses are cross-examined by the
16 other intervenors similar to what happens in the courtroom
17 where you have testimony and cross-examination during that
18 time.

19 Based on those three tracks all the evidence
20 that's presented to them through the land use consistency
21 hearings, the SEPA review, and the adjudicative proceeding
22 the Council will use the record, all the evidence that's
23 presented to them and make a determination and a
24 recommendation to the Governor of the State of Washington.
25 The recommendation could be, "Governor, we think you should

1 approve this and here are the conditions we think that the
2 project should be built and operated under," and they will
3 list the conditions that they think are appropriate. They
4 could recommend to the Governor that, no, we have heard the
5 testimony and the evidence and the evidence to us is that
6 the Governor should reject the project. And the Governor
7 will take that recommendation. The Governor has 60 days to
8 review that recommendation and either make a decision or
9 remand it back to the Council for reconsideration. The
10 Governor has done that. In fact, different governors have
11 done that several times to look at specific issues.

12 Now, the timing element for this is in our statute
13 one year. The Council is suppose to make a recommendation
14 to the Governor in a year of receipt of the application. We
15 received the application I think it was mid March of this
16 year, and so by mid March next year we're suppose to make a
17 recommendation to the Council. However, if the applicant
18 requests the Council to extend the review period, the
19 Council has the discretion to extend it or not. So we'll
20 see where we are at this time next year.

21 As through the process I think if you see this
22 chart there's a -- you will have to see that later -- couple
23 heads in here. That means that there's public meetings. So
24 this is the first meeting that we're having, SEPA scoping
25 and land use consistency is the very beginning of this whose

1 process. We will be back to hear comments, public comments
2 for the DEIS. Through the adjudicated hearings not only is
3 there expert witness testimony, but we will hear testimony
4 from the public in a venue similar to this. So you will
5 have another opportunity to express your views to the
6 Council. And based on all of that the Council again will
7 make a recommendation to the Governor.

8 I want to go back to this Environmental Impact
9 Statement process. As we noted already we are working
10 cooperatively with Bonneville Power Administration so that
11 you don't have two different EIS's you have to look at. We
12 will be working with our friends at BPA in producing one
13 Environmental Impact Statement. And I want to note if you
14 comment on the scope of the EIS and BPA has some comment
15 sheets and they have a website where you can comment, we
16 have comment sheets and you can also e-mail us, you don't
17 have to send the comments to each one. We share the
18 comments. So don't worry if it goes to one entity, the
19 other entity will see it. So you don't have to send one to
20 Andrew and you don't have to send one to me. Just send one
21 to me or one to Andrew. Your choice.

22 And I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIR LUCE: All right. We had one question.

24 MR. FIKSDAL: Yes, sir.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The environmental counsel that's

1 something where people go to the environmental counsel is
2 there an attorney-client privilege there?

3 MR. MARVIN: Yes, the Counsel for the Environment
4 would be me is actually representing the environment and so
5 as strange as that may sound I don't represent people in
6 this proceeding. I represent the system so there is no
7 attorney-client privilege. If people approach me and want
8 to talk about these things, it would be as though you were
9 coming to an attorney and you're a witness to an event. And
10 I can certainly talk about things if you want to talk to me
11 and maintain your anonymity or if there's issues you want to
12 try out or present to me. If we discuss that up front and
13 you can make it clear to me that you don't want this
14 information disclosed, we can probably make arrangements for
15 that to happen. However, there won't be any formal
16 attorney-client privilege, attorney work product that would
17 attach to that.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

19 MR. FIKSDAL: Andrew, Rick, do you have anything
20 you want to say?

21 MR. MONTANO: No.

22 MR. FIKSDAL: He is here and you can talk to them.
23 I want to reiterate what the Council Chair
24 Mr. Luce said is that if you have questions or more interest
25 in our review process, the different projects, go to our

1 website which is efsec@wa.gov. We have the application on
2 the website. Once the Environmental Impact Statement is
3 developed and issued, we'll have it on our website. We try
4 to keep everything that is current. You know, we try to
5 keep the website current for all of our different projects
6 that we are reviewing and that we have under our
7 jurisdiction. So I highly encourage you to go to our
8 website and you can get lots of information. We will have
9 notices of meetings. And if you signed up tonight and
10 wanted to, you'll get on our mailing list and you'll receive
11 notices. But we will be posting notices on our website and
12 I think the same goes for BPA. They will be having notices
13 and information on their website for us.

14 And, Mr. Marvin, you have a website. The Attorney
15 General's Office also has a website that has your
16 information on it; is that correct?

17 MR. MARVIN: Right. If you enter the search words
18 Counsel C-o-u-n-s-e-l for the Environment and via the
19 Washington Attorney General's Office you should get a page
20 that has my name, contact information.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Great. Thank you very much.

22 Again, Council has decided that this particular project
23 does have a potentially significant adverse impact on the
24 environment and we are going to be receiving comments here
25 tonight in the scoping section and public comments. Any

1 written comments will be received must be postmarked by May
2 18. Now, I think you can e-mail those as well so it's not
3 necessary to go to the postal office if you don't want to as
4 long as they're in by close of business May 18.

5 We're going to start here in just a moment
6 receiving comments from members of the public who have
7 signed up. What I would ask is when people are speaking
8 please be quiet. If you have separate conversations, you
9 want to conduct it in the hallways for that. We do have a
10 court reporter to my immediate left, and court reporter
11 Shaun will be taking down everything you say and has taken
12 down everything we've said so far. So there will be and is
13 a record of these proceedings this evening.

14 I'm going to ask people to limit their comments to
15 four minutes and submit anything additional in writing. If
16 we end up having extra time, we will take additional
17 comments, but I want to make sure everyone that wants to
18 speak has a chance to speak. If by chance someone has just
19 spoken who you agree with, there is no need to repeat that
20 person's comments. You could simply tell Shaun and the
21 Council that you agree with Mr. Smith and Ms. Jones, and so
22 that would save you some time.

23 I will be calling three witnesses at a time. We
24 have two chairs. Do we have two chairs? We have two
25 chairs. We're going to get another chair. We're going to

1 have three chairs. One chair is for the speaker. The other
2 two chairs are the ready mode, the ready chairs, and I'm
3 going to ask when you come forward to state your name, spell
4 your last name, give us your mailing address and your title
5 if appropriate and please speak as clearly as you can.

6 So we're now going to begin, and the Chair has
7 exercised his prerogative. I'm going to start with Paul
8 Pearce, the Skamania Board of County Commissioners and then
9 we have Tribal Representatives here from the Yakama Nation
10 and then we will move into the rest of the testimony or
11 comments of the others.

12 Mr. Pearce.

13 COMMENTS BY PAUL PEARCE

14 Thank you very much, Chairman Luce. Paul Pearce,
15 P-e-a-r-c-e, Skamania County Commission District 1, P.O. Box
16 790, Stevenson 98648. Thank you very much for this
17 opportunity to speak on behalf of the commission. I have
18 just a couple of things that I would like to run over very
19 quickly and then I'll turn in written notes as well. Thank
20 you very much.

21 On the scenic area discussion we've heard and you
22 will as well that this application if permitted will be a
23 blight on the Columbia Gorge Scenic Area, visible from a
24 myriad of key viewing areas. What we believe is that
25 Congress clearly understood what they were doing when they

1 created the Scenic Area Act and drew a distinct border. In
2 the saving clause of the act they specifically said that
3 there were to be no protective measures or buffer zones
4 around the scenic area and went on to say I will quote: The
5 fact that activities or uses inconsistent with the
6 management directives for the scenic area or special
7 management areas can be seen or heard from these areas shall
8 not of itself preclude such activities or uses up to the
9 boundaries of the scenic area or special management area.

10 We often talk about the views in the Gorge as
11 either north or south but never east or west, and we mention
12 this because at the west end of the scenic area fully in
13 view from any number of key viewing areas sits the entire
14 town of Washougal and the smoke stacks of the Camas paper
15 mill. On the east end right on the boundary of the scenic
16 area is the Maryhill Winery & Amphitheatre and in the
17 distance a great many wind turbines.

18 We've found of late one of the new favorite
19 tactics of opponents is to take any piece of a project, no
20 matter how innocuous it may be, that lies within the scenic
21 area and push for a full project review both inside and
22 outside the area based on that innocuous piece. At this
23 very moment there's an attempt in Oregon to stop an
24 industrial development in an urban area where such
25 developments are clearly permitted because of an upgrade to

1 the water line which happens to run through the scenic area.

2 I want to take a moment to speak about the scenic
3 area permitting, although the Chair is fully aware of it. I
4 do so because for those who are not intimately involved it
5 can be a little deceiving. Most people believe that the
6 Gorge Commission manages permits in the scenic area. The
7 fact is that permitting is done by five of the six counties,
8 and those permits are based on adopted county ordinances.
9 And if a permit or decision is appealed, it is appealed
10 through our county hearing officer. Only when an appeal is
11 made of the hearing officer's decision does the Gorge
12 Commission sitting in an appellate role hear the case. What
13 is disturbing to most of us comes after the Gorge Commission
14 issues a ruling. Due to the bistate nature of the Gorge
15 Commission appellants are free to file further objections in
16 the court of either state. What this means practically is
17 that many of these have been filed in Oregon courts no
18 matter if they happen to be Washington decisions having to
19 do with Washington property decisions due to the Oregon land
20 use model which many believe is more restrictive for private
21 property rights.

22 The county supports this application, and we
23 support this process, all of this process, the entire
24 process of the EIS, the whole process. What we find
25 appalling is at some point an Oregon court could be making a

1 decision on this project. It causes the commission some
2 concern. So we simply say it is a permitting process that
3 the county has.

4 Finally on the economic discussion Skamania County
5 is about a million acres in size. The National Forest
6 covers 85 percent of that land mass. Additionally there are
7 80,000 acres within the scenic area. There are 60,000 acres
8 of State Forest Trust Land. All said the county has about
9 three percent of its lands available for development of any
10 kind from residential to industrial.

11 From 1970 through 1991, the National Forest
12 produced an average of 350 million board feet per year.
13 That resulted in about 10 million dollars revenue to the
14 county and schools in this county in today's dollars. The
15 State Forest Trust Land produced an average of 2 million
16 dollars for the county through the '80s and the early '90s.
17 Then the spotted owl was listed as an endangered species and
18 production shut down. During the '90s the federal
19 government gave us owl guarantee money on the basis that
20 once the owl recovered the logging and so on would continue.

21 By 2000 it was obvious that the country was taking
22 a different view of the National Forest production and
23 Congress passed Secure Rural Schools and Forest Counties Act
24 which paid us an amount equal to logging receipts and that
25 paid through 2006. Again, there was assumption that

1 receipts would increase, didn't occur. The act was
2 reauthorized with a yearly declining payment until 2011, at
3 which time the payment ends. Without this money the county
4 would have laid off half of our workforce and the schools
5 would have lost 40 percent of their funding within this
6 county. On the state front our first quarter payment for
7 our state timber trust receipts just received for the first
8 quarter of 2009 was one thousand dollars.

9 We spent a great deal of time working on
10 reauthorization efforts of Secure Rural Schools legislation.
11 I mention that because at the moment it is the lifeblood of
12 our county. Less than 17 percent of our total budget comes
13 from property tax. During the reauthorization fight we were
14 told repeatedly by senators, congressman, and the
15 administration, in fact both administrations, that rural
16 timber dependent counties need to transition their
17 economies. This Board of Commissioners has heard that loud
18 and clear, and we are working hard to make the transition
19 happen. We believe that renewable energy in all its many
20 forms is an extremely important part of that effort. Thank
21 you very much for your time and very much for your efforts.

22 CHAIR LUCE: We appreciate you coming here this
23 evening and making those remarks.

24 MR. PEARCE: Thank you.

25 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

1 We have the next speaker here Mr. Sampson and then
2 after that Wilbur -- I'm sorry. I'm bad on pronunciation.

3 MR. SLOCKISH: Slockish.

4 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. And Mr. Jackson after
5 that. So come forward and offer your comments and we
6 appreciate you being here this evening.

7 COMMENTS BY SIMON SAMPSON

8 Good evening, Members of the Washington Energy
9 Council. It gives me great pleasure and honor to be here
10 tonight and members of the Gorge community. My name is
11 Simon Lee Sampson. I'm a member of the Yakama Nation, alias
12 The Columbia River Warrior. I represent eight Columbia
13 River chiefs that are on this river, and for your
14 information my cell number is 509-901-1885.

15 The Columbia River or the Gorge has been the
16 homeland of our people for many, many years, and as the
17 original landowners not only the caretakers of the Columbia
18 River and adjacent lands to the Columbia River has been our
19 homeland. And it gives me great pleasure to give my
20 testimony before you tonight as a positive testimony.

21 I have been fortunate to visit the project called
22 Big Horn that's up in the Bickleton area and went up and the
23 administration did an on-site visit with a couple friends
24 that I have that have these wind machines on their property
25 and visually taken a look at what damage they may do

1 to our eagles or birds, and I was very impressed with that
2 project. The gentleman's house was no more than a hundred
3 yards and there was a wind machine there. And the sound and
4 everything there just wasn't, you couldn't hardly hear it.

5 Because, you know, it's that twirling of the wind
6 towers saying it's causing a lot of damage, but looking at
7 their project I didn't see that. It was very clean, sound
8 wind energy and there was no -- we don't see any effect that
9 would have on our people, our lands, and there's nothing
10 significant on the environment or the culture that I
11 witnessed there at this project site, and a greater distance
12 there was another wind project called White Creek. We
13 didn't get an opportunity to visit that one, but I've also
14 had the opportunity to go up and visit Whistling Ridge
15 Energy and do an on-site visit there to see if it had any
16 affects on our culture and see where it was at. It didn't
17 have any particular significance also.

18 So there's brief testimony, and I'm proud to say
19 that I have two of my Columbia River Chiefs here tonight
20 that live in that area Underwood and Klickitat. So without
21 further adieu I would like to invite Mr. Wilbur Slockish up.
22 Thank you for your time.

23 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much, and if you have
24 additional comments that the Yakama Nation or members, bands
25 of Yakama would like to submit for us to review you're more

1 than welcome to submit them.

2 Next speaker.

3 COMMENTS BY WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR.

4 Good evening, everyone. I'm grateful for this
5 opportunity to speak to you because this is a first for our
6 people to be able to address issues that affect our quality
7 of life and our lands. When these dams went in we weren't
8 informed of them until they were starting to be built. They
9 affected our lifestyle. So I am grateful for that; that we
10 do have a chance to voice our opinion on something. And I
11 think it is very positive my opinion of this site because I
12 hear a lot of things about nuclear power being developed and
13 brought back by the Bush administration and talked about
14 still now, but they don't realize the impacts of the nuclear
15 industry. It's clean energy. Yeah, clean because you can't
16 see it. You can't see the effects of the radiation.

17 And this one here has seen no harm, no
18 contaminants, no noise pollution, no pollution of any in the
19 air or any other things, and if anybody disputes this I
20 would like them to go and take a look at the health effects
21 from the nuclear industry that's done to our people through
22 the cancers, through arthritis, and other things, diabetes
23 that our people have suffered because of the industrial
24 practices that have gone on unchecked here.

25 So when you hear clean energy, remember it's not

1 clean because it's invisible, whether it's military waste or
2 commercial waste. It's still harmful for up to 240,000
3 years. There's no place to dispose of it and I see very
4 little contaminants within this area. I have been onto the
5 site, and there is no cultural aspects of any disturbing of
6 the area because of its very steep hillside. We would not
7 utilize it for anything that would culturally affect our
8 foods, our medicinal plants, or anything or our animals. So
9 I urge to you remember these things. When you hear clean
10 energy think of wind power. These dams aren't clean. They
11 kill a lot of animals and we had no voice in their placement
12 here.

13 This is my homeland. I haven't been here just for
14 80 years or 100. I have been here, my family has been in
15 this area long before there was anybody came to visit here
16 on this trail or up the river. We would not allow our
17 ancestry to be contaminated with any other waste any longer.
18 So I urge you to remember this. Nothing is free. Our
19 people's health has suffered for all of these things that
20 have happened from this energy industry. Our salmon have
21 suffered because of BPA, this dam.

22 So remember these things. I urge you to remember
23 that especially about clean energy because there is no
24 contaminants coming out of any of these wind turbines. I
25 have also stood under them and listened and they don't spin

1 that fast where they said they're going to kill birds. They
2 don't spin that fast to harm anything, and it's just very
3 little noise that you hear from them. So I strongly support
4 this project for those reasons and remember this is clean
5 energy because it doesn't harm the air, it doesn't harm the
6 land, it doesn't harm our health. Thank you.

7 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Spell your name
8 and your address.

9 MR. SLOCKISH: Wilbur Slockish, Jr. I'm the
10 Klickitat Chief. My grandfather is one of the consignments
11 of this federal document which gave up this land in this
12 area. My address is P.O. Box 84, Wishram, Washington 98673.

13 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

14 Mr. Jackson, if you could come forward and spell
15 your full name and your mailing address and offer your
16 comments. Thank you for coming this evening

17 COMMENTS BY JOHNNY JACKSON

18 I'm here tonight to express my feelings about
19 what's going on and what I'm seeing in front of me. I'm the
20 chief in this area. I'm the Cascade Chief of the Columbia
21 River Tribes and Bands. I've lived on the Columbia River
22 all my life. I've been a fisherman all my life, and my
23 people are from this area as well as where I live.

24 Traditionally when something doesn't agree with
25 me, I will object to it or I will bring it to my people and

1 discuss it with them. And going into this area where this
2 project is going to be I made two trips up there and looked
3 it all over and I couldn't see wrong with where those towers
4 are going to be. I've heard a lot of talk about what
5 happens with wind towers and wind projects. I've been to a
6 lot of places in California at places where they've had
7 towers that where they spin fast, but the towers that I
8 visited in this area over in Dufur, around that area, Grass
9 Valley, and I looked at the ones that were on Fort Bickleton
10 and I went under them, and I stayed around there to see what
11 effects they would have on anybody and I couldn't hear them
12 wind towers. And I asked questions about them, and I didn't
13 see anything to where they were harmful in any way because
14 they explained to me how them wind towers are controlled;
15 that anything that goes in their direction would easily see
16 the blades turning because they don't turn that fast, but
17 they're geared to where they generate a lot of electricity
18 and they're controlled computerly.

19 I've been all around these mountains, and I know
20 where a lot of our important cultural issues are, our foods
21 and plants out there, our medicines, and I watched this area
22 up there and looked at it, and I've also gone across the
23 river and looked up there and I don't think you can hardly
24 see it. And I can't see any possible way why these towers
25 cannot be put in this area to benefit the people of this

1 county and the people along this river.

2 You know, I've watched my people suffer along this
3 river for the past three years because what's happening to
4 the river, and I've watched that how much my people are
5 suffering over in Yakima Valley because there's a nuclear
6 facility right over the hill from where they live and I've
7 watched my people die from diseases and cancer and other
8 effects that's very harmful to them.

9 And I'm one that watches the news all the time.
10 I've gone into that because my dad used to do that, and I've
11 made studies on what is going on in our country. And I know
12 and I listen on what's being proposed for our country and
13 what's proposed for our energy and power and hear they want
14 to restart the nuclear plants over again for electricity is
15 something that I don't want to see because I've traveled in
16 countries where I've seen kids suffer, little babies that
17 couldn't even grow to be not even 8 or 9 or 10 years old and
18 they're gone from the effects of what nuclear power can do
19 to people. I don't want to see that happen to my people
20 here.

21 All this talk about what I would be looking at if
22 I went along this river here and seen people in that
23 condition. I've looked at our water and I studied at one
24 time we used to drink out of that river. We don't do that
25 no more because of what's happening. The things that

1 happen, the projects that go on up river has never helped
2 us, and then when I'm looking at these wind towers and the
3 way they're modified and done today now-a-days and I know
4 how they're controlled and they're silent, and I know that
5 they don't create no kind of a disturbance to the people and
6 that's what I would like to see, something clean that don't
7 bring no effects to our people or the animals or anything.

8 And that area up there that I looked at there's
9 nothing close to it where it's going to affect anything.
10 You look at it today on the news that's all you hear.
11 Everybody is going for wind power and if we have enough of
12 that I believe that there can be a clean up on some of these
13 here dams to where things could be controlled where we would
14 get a better environment and maybe we could do away with
15 these nuclear plants that they want to propose to be brought
16 back.

17 Some people can read and see on the news what
18 nuclear power does and what nuclear plants do and what waste
19 does, but they've never gone to a land like Arizona and
20 places down there that I have where I've witnessed and
21 looked at people and looked at their children and talked to
22 elders who can't move because they've been affected by
23 radiation and being around it and suffered from it. This is
24 what I don't want to see here.

25 I strongly support wind power, the way they build

1 them today and the way they're controlled. And how would I
2 know that they're built that they're sensitive? Well, I
3 watched the program. I've studied it and I've went out
4 there for myself. I didn't just go home and hear somebody
5 talk about it and assume that they're noisy and there are a
6 lot of problems and that they're, yeah, going to kill birds
7 and stuff because a bird would have to be pretty dumb to go
8 and fly through a slow turning turbine. I've known that,
9 I've traveled up there to all these turbines just to witness
10 myself before I go and make any sense of judgment against
11 anything, and I think what I'm saying tonight is I so
12 strongly support this project because I'd like to see
13 something to where we could benefit and not go back to where
14 we were before.

15 This is my area, my homeland. The chiefs that
16 were in this territory here were my great grandfathers, and
17 I have people buried down here in North Bonneville and
18 Stevenson area. My father was from here and I'm one of the
19 chiefs along the Columbia River and I go along with anything
20 that we as chiefs go along with and talk about and decide.
21 We look at things very carefully before we decide what we're
22 going to do or how we're going to go against it or go for it
23 or allow it, and this is why we are chiefs and I thank you
24 for listening to me.

25 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson. If

1 you have any other comments you would like to submit in
2 writing we will be appreciative of those, but your testimony
3 has been recorded and will be carefully considered by the
4 Council. Appreciate you coming this evening.

5 Mr. Dan Rawley, and after Mr. Rawley, Mr. Tom
6 Rousseau, and Peggy Bryan.

7 COMMENTS OF DAN RAWLEY

8 I guess I'll be the first to voice my concern over
9 the project. My name is Dan Rawley. I live at 621
10 Kollack-Knapp Road, and that's in Underwood, Washington.

11 I want to voice my concerns about the Whistling
12 Ridge Energy Project and the effect this does have on the
13 National Scenic Area, as well as the residents of Underwood.
14 As some may or may not have been able to travel throughout
15 the United States and the world, I did as a member of the
16 military, and I can say that there's very few areas that
17 rival the national beauty of the Gorge scenic area. And if
18 this project goes through, I feel like this is going to
19 forever change this area. Although this project is outside
20 the boundaries of the National Scenic Area, you would be
21 able to see these turbines from I-84, Hood River, and
22 throughout the National Scenic Area and that's going to
23 forever change the face of that.

24 And I really believe that this goes against the
25 spirit in which the NSA was created. I really hope that

1 this committee takes that into consideration because it's
2 going to affect your ability or you as well as your
3 children, as well as all the other individuals that come to
4 this area to view it. There's a reason why the National
5 Scenic Area was created because this area is absolutely
6 gorgeous. And I've lived all over and this is the area I
7 would like to spend the rest of my life, but I'm very
8 concerned about issues associated with the changes.

9 As far as from a personal standpoint, I know this
10 board does not really take into consideration the effects it
11 will have probably on the 20 families that live up there,
12 but I know this board is going to go up there and I believe
13 you're going to take a trip up to the area tomorrow; is that
14 correct?

15 And as you drive up there you will go up probably
16 Highway 14. You'll go up through Underwood Road and at
17 about three and a half miles you'll take a right on
18 Kollack-Knapp and go up to the junction of Kollack-Knapp and
19 Scoggins. And the reason why I tell you, outline this
20 because this is the area where the turbines will be brought
21 up. And as you do that, I want you to look over and you can
22 look back at the road project map back there, and there's
23 four areas or four intersections that have to be widened and
24 one of those has two round markers on that, and that's at
25 Kollack-Knapp and Scoggins.

1 Well, when you drive up there tomorrow, I want you
2 to take a look over to your right-hand side and there's a
3 house right there and that's mine. And I want you to think
4 about the effects or how you would feel because I know
5 that's going to have a huge impact on me probably more than
6 anybody, as well as the other individuals who would have to
7 live under those turbines.

8 So I appreciate you listening to my comments. I
9 hope you more from the standpoint of really look at what
10 effects this will have on the scenic gorge and the views
11 because I think it's going to also affect the amount of
12 people who come to this area as far as tourism. People do
13 not come to a scenic area to look at turbines.

14 Now, I want it on record that I am for alternative
15 energy and wind turbines is one of the things that I would
16 support, and I think it is probably a right type of project,
17 it's probably the right time, but it's in the wrong area.

18 CHAIR LUCE: Could you please if you didn't
19 already give us the spelling on your name.

20 MR. RAWLEY: R-a-w-l-e-y.

21 CHAIR LUCE: And your address?

22 MR. RAWLEY: 621 Kollack-Knapp Road, Underwood,
23 Washington.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Could you spell Kollack-Knapp.

25 MR. RAWLEY: K-o-l-l-a-c-k - K-n-a-p-p.

1 CHAIR LUCE: Your friend behind you says you
2 passed the test. Thank you very much.

3 Mr. Rousseau, spell your name and address, please.

4 COMMENTS BY TOM ROUSSEAU

5 My name is Tom Rousseau, R-o-u-s-s-e-a-u. I live
6 at 4179 Willow Flat Road, Hood River, Oregon 97031.

7 I have some prepared comments and some ad lib
8 comments based on comments that have been made, but they're
9 all adding up to three points that I want to make and that
10 is the visual impact that it will have on the National
11 Scenic Area. Energy storage has not been addressed. That's
12 a big issue with wind power. And this is the wrong place.

13 It is always difficult when one finds one's self
14 trapped between two passions as I currently am. I have a
15 long-term passion for protecting and enjoying the beautiful
16 Columbia Gorge. It's a unique and spectacular scenery,
17 geological formations of many rare species of flowers and
18 wildlife.

19 I'm also passionate about trading our dependence
20 on fossil fuel energy sources for more readily renewable
21 sources derived more directly from the sun such as wind
22 power, hydroelectric power, and solar panels. So that is my
23 conundrum, conflicting passions. In such situations one
24 must keep a balance to choose the least worse solution, and
25 I conclude that the best balance is not to place wind

1 generation facilities within visual range of the gorge.
2 Wind generators should not be visual either from the river
3 level or from the many trails along the ridges and peaks of
4 the Gorge.

5 This solution is certainly well within the intent
6 and the spirit of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Act.
7 Who could have predicted farms of 400-foot towers when the
8 NSA was created back in the '80s. The Northwest has plenty
9 of lower impact places in which to build wind generated farm
10 without adding further desecrate to the Gorge.

11 The photos back here don't adequately show the
12 impact of the proposed project. Many of the photos were
13 taken with very poor lighting conditions and don't show how
14 the wind generators would be impacting the visual. So one
15 of the recommendations is better visual that more accurately
16 show the impact. These pictures back here don't show the
17 impact from the important viewing points such as Mount
18 Defiance, Dog Mountain, the Wagon Trail, my front yard, and
19 many, many other places affected.

20 Wind generation energy is intermittent so the
21 project needs to effectively address the energy storage.
22 The generators are a good source of energy, but they're peak
23 loading. There are times when you don't need those peaks so
24 you need to have some way of storing that energy, and that
25 really needs to be addressed before we proliferate more and

1 more wind farms.

2 Regarding Mr. Pearce's comments about existing
3 blight already and he cited Washougal and other places this
4 is not justification to continue to add more blight and
5 desecration, especially with 50 more towers that are 400
6 feet.

7 We are living with poor decisions made over 50
8 years ago resulting in the Dalles Dam, the Bonneville Dam,
9 the loss of Celilo Falls, former spectacular salmon runs,
10 and sacred Indian fishing grounds. Let's not continue to
11 make those kinds of mistakes. This proposal is driven
12 primarily for official financial gains for a few individuals
13 and not for the balanced perspective of what is best for the
14 region. You would not build a wind generator farm at
15 Yosemite, Mount Rainier, or along the rim of Crater Lake,
16 and in my opinion you should not be able to let them in or
17 near the Gorge.

18 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

19 Ms. Peggy Bryan, spell your name, give us your
20 address, who you represent, if you represent somebody.

21 COMMENTS BY PEGGY BRYAN

22 My name is Peggy Bryan. I am the Director of the
23 Skamania County Economic Development Council. P-e-g-g-y
24 B-r-y-a-n. I am located at Post Office Box 436 in
25 Stevenson. I am also a county resident.

1 The Skamania County Economic Development Council
2 supports the Whistling Ridge Wind Energy Project. Skamania
3 County recognizes its responsibility in developing clean
4 renewable energy projects such as wind to protect our
5 environment and meet the state's mandate for renewable
6 energy development standard. Geography and land use
7 restrictions limits Skamania County's ability to grow its
8 economy and develop renewable energy projects. The
9 Whistling Ridge Wind Energy Project is proposed for a site
10 that is privately owned and consistent within land use
11 requirements. It is located entirely outside of the
12 Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and there are no
13 development restrictions imposed on this site by that
14 legislation.

15 Since the Scenic Area was passed in 1986 the
16 federal government has purchased over 20,000 acres of
17 private land in Skamania County moving this land from the
18 county tax rolls to be set aside for scenic protection.
19 When the Scenic Area Act was passed in 1986 we were not
20 facing catastrophic conditions such as global warming,
21 little or no timber harvest, and a legal dependency on
22 foreign oil. Let me hear briefly what percentage of
23 Skamania County is land based and available for development,
24 and I know that Mr. Pierce also went over this because we
25 shared notes.

1 There is about 1,070,000 acres in the county,
2 80 percent of it which is 855,000 acres is given to the
3 National Forest, eight percent or roughly 85,000 acres is in
4 the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area with
5 development restrictions. Six percent or roughly 60,000
6 acres is in other states' forest lands, four percent or
7 roughly 40,000 acres is in private forest commercial
8 resources land. This leaves only three percent or roughly
9 28,000 acres of the entire county's land base available for
10 residential, business, or commercial development. This
11 figure includes the land that has already been developed.
12 Historically Skamania County has relied on revenue from
13 timber harvest to provide necessary services to its
14 residents. The Secure Rural Schools as the county is
15 finding is declining annually and will end soon. Skamania
16 County must take advantage of equal opportunity it has to
17 grow its tax base and move toward fiscal sustainability.

18 This project would have a huge economic impact on
19 Skamania County. During the 12 months of construction the
20 project would provide an average 143 full-time workers with
21 an 18 million dollar payroll, approximately 13.2 million in
22 local purchases, another 107 new jobs in the area thanks to
23 the multiplier effects. During the project's 20 years of
24 operation, it will create nine new permanent jobs, employee
25 spending of approximately \$900,000 per year, \$731,000 in

1 property taxes, and included in that allocation would be
2 \$185,000 to county schools, \$149,000 specifically to school
3 District 405, and \$115,000 to the county road fund and
4 \$111,000 to current expense fund and another \$200,000 per
5 year in indirect tax revenues to the state and local
6 governments would then be created.

7 Again, the Board of Directors of the Skamania
8 County Economic Development Council supports Whistling Ridge
9 Wind Energy Project not just because it is a sound economic
10 development opportunity, but it is also a responsible and
11 environmental protection opportunity using nature's
12 renewable resource wind to provide clean energy to citizens
13 which will lessen our dependency on fossil fuel and reduce
14 our carbon footprint. Thank you.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

16 Next we'll hear from Bob Wittenberg, the Skamania
17 County Utility District, and then after that Scott Pineo, a
18 resident of Skamania County.

19 COMMENTS BY BOB WITTENBERG

20 Good evening. My name is Bob Wittenberg,
21 W-i-t-t-e-n-b-e-r-g. I live at 442 Ashley Drive, Underwood,
22 Washington 98651.

23 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

24 MR. WITTENBERG: I'm the manager for Skamania
25 County PUD and I dropped off two documents. Attached on the

1 cover is a resolution adopted by our Commissioners in full
2 support of this project. The second page is an engineering
3 one-line diagram of some of the BPA systems that serves our
4 county. We are the only electric utility provider in
5 Skamania County, although our utility service is in the
6 southern end of the county where folks live. I'll stand up
7 so that the audience can see some of this. I'll be
8 referring to this diagram quite a bit. Can you all hear me
9 if I talk a little louder?

10 CHAIR LUCE: We can hear you.

11 MR. WITTENBERG: Our concern is reliability. The
12 back row here will see this. This is a one-line diagram of
13 our system. Our source of power is Bonneville Dam, the old
14 powerhouse on the Oregon side. There are 215,000 old lines
15 across the river to the North Bonneville Substation, an
16 annex area and go west. They're known as Bonneville Alcoa
17 No. 1 and formally known as Alcoa Bonneville No. 2 now
18 Bonneville Camas. From that junction point to North
19 Bonneville is a single tap that goes east making up the
20 Stevenson substation, the Carson substation, the Underwood
21 substation, and terminating at a place called that Bald
22 Mountain substation in Klickitat County.

23 Klickitat County Bald Mountain Substation is also
24 located very close to a powerhouse with Condit Dam on the
25 White Salmon River. The purpose of our concern for

1 reliability to the county is tied to Condit Dam and
2 Powerdale Dams on the Hood River. At the Bald Mountain
3 substation is a step-down transformer from 115,000 volts to
4 69 kV. Pacific Power and Light serves the Hood River area,
5 takes delivery from Bonneville to 115,000, steps it down to
6 69, and at 69 kV that serves the Hood River area down to the
7 Powerdale Station over through Bingen and to the Condit
8 Power Station and back to Bald Mountain. Powerdale ceased
9 operation I believe November of 2006. The water intake was
10 washed out by a big flood event on the Mount Hood Highway.
11 It's gone. That six megawatts of generation no longer can
12 support us. Condit Dam was scheduled to be removed
13 originally at some earlier dates and then again October of
14 this year. Now that's pushed back no sooner than October of
15 2010. Our concern is I say it's reliability.

16 You've certainly heard of the Rock Creek slides
17 where parts of Stevenson are slowly coming down into the
18 creek and there's a great opportunity or likelihood of more
19 land coming into Rock Creek causing some problems. The land
20 is moving. Immediately to the west of that, on the west
21 side of Rock Creek an area near Ryan Allen Road is some more
22 land that is moving, and Bonneville towers, steel towers
23 both 230 kV and 115 kV that serve us are in that area.
24 Imagine what happens when a steel tower slides down the
25 hill. It's black in Skamania County. It's black in Rock

1 Creek Center. So that is a very scary likelihood to us and
2 now, well, we have this alternate feed from Hood River with
3 Powerdale Generation and Condit Generation and whoops
4 they're gone. We lost our back feed.

5 Then in February of I believe 2007, could have
6 been 2008 over at Augspurgen Mountain which was shown
7 earlier, that's between Carson and Underwood, that again our
8 lifeline the 115 kV line laid on the ground for 14 days.
9 Bonneville couldn't even get to it for three days for ten
10 feet of snow. Now imagine that happening again and Condit
11 Dam is gone from generation, Powerdale is gone. We have no
12 back feed. It's black. We don't have water service either
13 in Underwood because that's dependent on electricity. We
14 don't have water service on Carson if we lose that here. We
15 see this as a matter of health and human safety,
16 reliability.

17 Now why is it tied to this project? On the
18 diagram that Mr. Spadaro produced they're proposing to build
19 a substation attached to 230 kV which is in a common
20 corridor to the 115 kV that supplies our county. So here's
21 the place where a substation is going to be built. It's
22 going to have a fence to ground mesh control house protected
23 relay where you tap the 230 line, all of those facilities,
24 all we need, and it will be a ring bus which is engineering
25 terms for a four-sided square, and three squares for the

1 breakers and projects and the fourth square is blank. They
2 don't have a use for it. We do. Put a breaker there, 230
3 kV to 115 kV transformer, and the line is on the other side
4 of the right of way, the same common corridor. It's a very
5 inexpensive way to provide the reliability for electric
6 service to the county and it's not just Skamania County.

7 I'll speak a little bit about Klickitat County.
8 They also have a 64 kV line from that Bald Mountain sub that
9 serves their Husum, B.Z. Corner, Trout Lake, and Glenwood
10 areas. I think also it comes down into Bingen. So that's
11 our whole issue. Customer service reliability, health and
12 safety. Thank you.

13 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

14 Scott, can you spell your last name and give your
15 address and your testimony.

16 TESTIMONY OF SCOTT PINEO

17 Scott Pineo. My address 5302 Wind River Road,
18 Carson, Washington.

19 I'm speaking today as a resident, although I'm
20 also a member of the Stevenson Carson School Board and the
21 director of facilities for Skamania County.

22 I've lived in the county for 16 years, been on the
23 school board for eight years. In my history in the 1970s, I
24 was involved in an 8 kW wind generation project in a small
25 park in Northern California at the north end of Sea Ranch

1 which was a very restrictive private 12 miles of pristine
2 coastline, and I think that's when I learned that wind power
3 and the environment fit together very nicely.

4 It wasn't until about ten years later that I moved
5 to the San Francisco Bay area as a watershed manager for the
6 East Bay Municipal Utility District, and part of my route
7 was to travel over the Livermore area or Altamonte Pass, and
8 I got to watch the wind generation facilities be installed
9 along Altamonte Pass. And then most recently -- for the
10 most part actually for the last five years I haven't driven
11 to Spokane. I prefer to fly there whenever I go there. I
12 had the opportunity to drive to Spokane, and I have to admit
13 that I was excited to see the new scenery that cropped up
14 there in the last five years. It's really exciting to me.

15 My point being that wind generation can be
16 aesthetically pleasing, can be beautiful. It has symmetry.
17 It has motion. It's truly an art form, and wind power
18 exists in the environment just like other production means.
19 You can't condition farm country without barns and
20 irrigation equipment. River systems have responsible hydro
21 dams and supply water and power to our cities, and you have
22 to have harvesters when you're in wheat country. If you
23 have production you have things that aren't entirely native
24 to the landscape.

25 Our economy in Skamania County is dependent on

1 some kind of production. We had that with the timber
2 production we had. We've lost that. As was stated by other
3 speakers 90 percent of our county is tied up entirely and
4 can't be any kind of production. The other ten percent or
5 the other seven percent is tied up to primarily private
6 timber production leaving us three percent. We need an
7 industry. Wind is clean, safe, environmentally friendly,
8 and responsible. We can't have an economy without some kind
9 of production source of some sort.

10 I've been to Washington, D.C., six times for the
11 school district in an effort to pass the Secure Rural
12 Schools. That's a tough way to go without some kind of
13 production because as Paul Pearce mentioned earlier each
14 time you go to Congress they say basically when are you
15 going to get a job? When are you going to find some
16 production? I think that this project is that production.
17 It's welcomed, it's needed, and it's appropriate for this
18 county. Thank you.

19 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

20 Peter Cornelison.

21 COMMENTS BY PETER CORNELISON

22 My name is Peter Cornelison, spelled
23 C-o-r-n-e-l-i-s-o-n. I live at 1003 5th Street, Hood River,
24 Oregon 97031, and I'm speaking tonight as an individual.

25 I would ask EFSEC to consider in their scoping

1 requirements to consider the impacts on the City of Hood
2 River with regards to in particular tourism, night sky
3 issues, real estate issues. There's quite a discrepancy
4 about the beauty or the ugliness of wind turbines. It's
5 hard to reconcile that, but to me some mechanistic rotating
6 turbine played with flashing lights is not a beautiful
7 thing.

8 I'm also concerned that the images that were shown
9 in the book in the back don't fairly represent the impacts
10 because there's cloud banks in a number of them and the
11 clouds match the color of the turbine towers. They also
12 don't fairly represent the motion which will catch your eye,
13 and finally I would say that an additional 30 turbines have
14 been proposed that are not included within this application
15 and to me it would make sense to consider all of them at
16 once. That's it. Thank you.

17 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. We appreciate
18 that.

19 Mr. Perkins, Raymond Perkins. After Mr. Perkins,
20 Ann Lueders, L-u-e-d-e-r-s and Mary Repar.

21 COMMENTS BY RAYMOND PERKINS

22 My name is Raymond Perkins, P-e-r-k-i-n-s. I live
23 at 171 Cloverdale Avenue, Carson.

24 Thank you for letting me speak tonight. My
25 feeling is wind energy is a domestic rival, an energy source

1 that provides more jobs per dollar invested into any other
2 technology, more than five times that from coal and nuclear
3 power. Renewable energy project estimates for every
4 megawatt of installed wind capacity creates 4.8 job years of
5 employment both direct and indirect; meaning that a
6 50-megawatt project produces 240 job years of employment.

7 Because of the environmental and political
8 restrictions logging would be our main source in Skamania
9 County. Again, we must open our minds to 21st century
10 technology. Global warming believe in it or not, pumping
11 millions of ton poisonous gases in our atmosphere every hour
12 is a bad idea. I think we all can agree on this that it
13 will affect the beauty of this area more than anything else.
14 In the current recession energy consumption is down but the
15 economy will rebound. We need to build for that and for the
16 future. Electric cars are coming. Much better batteries
17 will be available the next two years. The price of cars are
18 coming down. The performance will be going up. Charging
19 these cars with non-green energy does not make sense.

20 Energy is our biggest national security threat.
21 Diversifying our domestic forces is essential. Wind power
22 technology has evolved with newer designs, spin slower,
23 quieter. They're higher off the ground, therefore have less
24 impact on wildlife. Millions of tons of pollutants,
25 pollutants in the atmosphere have much more impact on

1 wildlife than the environment. And soon as soon as wind and
2 solar are affordable for homes we plan on installing them on
3 our property as well.

4 This is a 20-year project. It would not be
5 forever, and as well as these things once they outlive their
6 usefulness they can be dismantled and recycled and just
7 basically go away. And from 84, I would imagine driving 70
8 miles an hour down 84 it would be quite challenging to see
9 these windmills in operation. Half the time it's windy,
10 cold, cloudy, rainy up there as well. So that's how I feel.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

13 Next, we're going to have Ann Lueders, please, and
14 after Ann has completed her testimony we're going to take
15 about a not to exceed and I do mean not to exceed ten-minute
16 rest break.

17 So Ann.

18 COMMENTS OF ANN LUEDERS

19 My name is Ann Lueders. I live at 11271 Wind
20 River Road in Carson, Washington. I'm a resident, a
21 lifelong resident in Skamania County. I wrote my comments
22 down because I sometimes get a little long winded.

23 An accomplished publisher once said an ounce of
24 hypocrisy is worth a pound of ambition. Unfortunate for
25 Skamania County one of the organizations that is most loudly

1 opposing the Whistling Ridge proposal is full of hypocrites
2 which leads to endless amounts of ambition. Meanwhile, the
3 residents who are in support of economic growth, sustainable
4 energy, and private property rights are unable to conquer
5 the mass lobbying and legal land mines that are thrown out
6 by SOSA, Friends of the Gorge, and other similar
7 organizations.

8 CHAIR LUCE: The only thing I would ask, we
9 appreciate your comments but let's try and keep it as a
10 personal as possible, but I understand your point of view
11 and please give it to the record.

12 MS. LUEDERS: I can do that. The majority of the
13 land in Skamania County is owned or controlled via Scenic
14 Area legislation by the federal and the state governments.
15 Of remaining property that is privately owned three percent
16 or less is available for development. Many of these
17 developable properties are owned by families generations
18 long who have strived to keep up with ever changing rules
19 and regulations that are imposed upon their private property
20 rights. They have gone from managing what was once solid
21 logging land to thinning, to now a push for more green or
22 tourist type use, all the while fighting the rules and
23 regulations that are imposed upon them.

24 Skamania County, the State of Washington, and the
25 federal government have a responsibility to pass the

1 lobbying of radical environmental groups whose sole intent
2 is to prohibit any type of development. They have a
3 responsibility to zone and allow use that protects private
4 property rights in the best interest of all their
5 constituents, not just the handful that are chanting not in
6 my back yard.

7 I encourage EFSEC, Skamania County, and the other
8 officials and agencies to support the efforts of SDS and
9 other private property owners who may wish in the future to
10 find a way to keep their land working for them. I look
11 forward to the day that this wind farm goes in.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. We're going to
13 take a break now. When we come back we will start with Mary
14 Rebar, and I will just say this to the members who are here
15 tonight of the public. Don't talk to us. We'd love to talk
16 to you, but we're now acting as judges in this proceeding,
17 and so if you have questions staff is available. Allen just
18 raised his hand. Tammy is over there at the desk. But
19 Council members are prohibited from speaking to members of
20 the public and I'm sure you will understand. So thank you
21 very much. Ten minutes. That's ten after eight, and we'll
22 start on time. We will take a short recess.

23 (Recess taken from 8:00 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.)

24 CHAIR LUCE: We are back in session.

25 State your name and give us your address and put

1 your glasses on like the rest of us.

2 COMMENTS BY MARY REPAR

3 My name is Mary Repar, R-e-p-a-r, and I live at
4 6971 East Loop, No. 2, Stevenson, Washington.

5 Can you hear me now?

6 Thank you. Good evening. Thank you very much for
7 this opportunity to speak to you. You don't know how much
8 this means to me because from now on I won't have to listen
9 to our commissioners say that they're the best stewards of
10 the land and that we know what we're doing here in Skamania
11 County; that we don't need an outsider to tell us what to
12 do. So you as an outside group coming in to tell us how
13 we're going to do land use in Skamania County is something
14 new for us and I won't have to listen to it anymore.

15 Thanks.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Just for the record, we're not going
17 to tell anyone. We're listening to you tonight.

18 MS. REPAR: Yes.

19 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

20 MS. REPAR: There was some draft that they said
21 was an ordinance which is just a cover for mastering
22 industrialization in Skamania County and didn't pass here.
23 It couldn't pass the test of judicial review. We have a
24 hearing examiner's hearing on it. The draft ordinance it
25 went to the commissioners and they couldn't deal with it so

1 they passed the buck and Mr. Spadaro on to you.

2 And I'm sorry for you, but I don't wish you good
3 luck. They are supporting this end around the public
4 process and the common citizens, and I don't think that's
5 right. I think they need to take better care of our
6 environment.

7 Briefly as part of my comments I have this packet.
8 I would like to introduce it into the record. I have my
9 supporting documentation. I will be making other comments
10 also. But one of the things that I would like you all to
11 really, really consider is the cumulative impacts and effect
12 and that will determine the efficacy of the proposed wind
13 project. I don't wish to see long-term environmental
14 degradation in return for 20 to 30 years of short-term
15 energy production. We must use the precautionary principle
16 and first do no harm. Better to be safe now than sorry
17 later.

18 As Chief Slockish said nothing is free. Wind
19 energy isn't free and there is a cost, and the cost is
20 environmental and public health and welfare, especially to
21 the environment.

22 To that end a thorough and complete environmental
23 impact statement should be on the entire project area,
24 geographic area so that we can all see and analyze the data
25 and make good sound decisions. I would urge you all to

1 coordinate with the Vital Indicator Project for the Gorge
2 Commission, and if there's any studies to be done for the
3 EIS they're in the middle of doing the Vital Indicators
4 Project. They are always looking for money and agency help
5 in doing it and perhaps there we can get good data to figure
6 out cumulative impacts of wind turbines on the environment,
7 another cumulative impact. Vital Indicators Project is 53
8 indicators.

9 I am extremely concerned about this project mainly
10 because I don't think that we're in the right place, at the
11 right time, and I don't think it's being done properly.
12 We're being left out of the process, the citizens, and we
13 can't unelect you in the process. I would like you all to
14 really concentrate on the cumulative impacts. I believe
15 that cumulative impacts are extremely important and what I
16 didn't see in the federal register for BPA's portion of
17 this, and assuming that I can make comments on BPA portion
18 tonight, was cumulative impacts. It's not considered in
19 their -- they have visual issues, noise level impacts,
20 cultural sources, socioeconomic ramifications, affects on
21 rare plant and animal species, impact on wildlife, including
22 migratory birds, bat, but what's not included is no human
23 public or no human health and public welfare or cumulative
24 impacts. I think those do need to be included.

25 In my packet here I included the hearing

1 examiner's findings of fact, and there was a lot of
2 testimony given from expert witnesses. I'm sure you will be
3 hearing from them in the future.

4 Secondly, when I talk about cumulative impacts and
5 geographic area this was the map that I was looking at. It
6 is a location of proposed Whistling Ridge Energy Project,
7 and it straddles Klickitat County and Skamania County. It
8 comes from the Bonneville Power Administration April 17,
9 2009. So somebody's got to get their site map fixed, and
10 really to me it doesn't matter if this is Klickitat or
11 Skamania County. This project itself will have cumulative
12 impacts on the Gorge.

13 And one other I didn't say. When I talk about
14 cumulative impacts, I'm talking that I would like you all to
15 do a cumulative impact study of all the wind projects in the
16 Gorge and how they are impacted in our scenic, natural,
17 cultural, economic, and recreational resources. Thank you.
18 And those are then called the SNECRs in the National Scenic
19 Area Act

20 Yes, we have a tough time here economically, but
21 it doesn't mean that we have to subsume our health and our
22 environment to subsidizing a corporation so that it can make
23 money and use our environment while it's doing it.
24 Corporations are creatures of the economic wind. If the
25 winds go that way, they go that way. If they go this way,

1 they go this way. Our commissioners would have done better
2 to propone for individual energy independence and we could
3 go on about that. But thank you very much. Again,
4 cumulative impacts and I'll be making more comments.

5 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. And you can submit those
6 documents if you want them included in the record to
7 Ms. Talburt. I think that would be the best way to do it.

8 Kate McCarthy, followed by Teresa Robbins, and
9 Keith Brown.

10 Kate, if you can spell your name, your last name,
11 your address, we'd appreciate it.

12 COMMENTS BY KATE McCARTHY

13 My name is Kate McCarthy, and I live in the Hood
14 River Valley at 909 Cooper Spur Road. That is all you need
15 to hear, isn't it, about where I live?

16 CHAIR LUCE: Is that your address?

17 MS. McCARTHY: What?

18 CHAIR LUCE: Your address.

19 MS. McCARTHY: 9095 Cooper Spur Road.

20 CHAIR LUCE: You got it.

21 MS. McCARTHY: Yeah, Parkdale, Oregon.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Tell us what's on your mind.

23 MS. McCARTHY: I didn't prepare a speech tonight.

24 I came to learn more about this process and what was
25 expected, but I would like to say that I am very concerned

1 about the project. I think the Gorge is a treasure that
2 belongs to everybody. I think it's priceless, and I have to
3 admit that I don't look forward to between 50 and 100 wind
4 turbines sticking up 400 feet along the ridges, especially
5 with their blinking red lights that you see day and night,
6 and we look at it. From Hood River we look towards this
7 great development. You look away from it over there where
8 you live there, and it's going to have a tremendous impact
9 on the visual quality of the Gorge for all time.

10 And I'm a believer in wind power. I think wind
11 power is part of our future, but it's location, location,
12 location, and I think this is not a responsible location to
13 ignore the Gorge which is a scenic treasure that belongs to
14 everybody. And I know there are acres, hundreds of acres,
15 thousands of acres in Eastern Oregon and Eastern Washington
16 where it's much more appropriate than in our treasure at the
17 Gorge. So I hope that you will consider this and I will be
18 following the process and may contribute more precise
19 testimony as time goes on. I understood that you are having
20 a tour of the area tomorrow; is that right?

21 CHAIR LUCE: We are having a tour. I believe it's
22 10:00 a.m.

23 MS. MCCARTHY: I would be very pleased to go on
24 such a tour.

25 CHAIR LUCE: I think Mr. Fiksdal is the person you

1 should speak to afterwards. Thank you very much, appreciate
2 it.

3 Teresa Robbins, spell your name, please, and your
4 address and offer whatever remarks you care to offer.

5 COMMENTS BY TERESA ROBBINS

6 I'm Teresa Robbins, R-o-b-b-i-n-s, 211 Malfait
7 Tracts Road, Washougal 98671.

8 Thank you for this opportunity. We have three
9 issues we wish to make sure are directly addressed within
10 the scope of the EIS. First, we have a deep concern about
11 the inappropriate siting of industrial wind turbines in
12 rural residential areas. Specifically we hope you will
13 ensure that such siting not take away residents' rights to
14 enjoy the peace and tranquility of their home site nor more
15 importantly negatively impact their health and well being.

16 A number of us have been working diligently hoping
17 to educate and inspire local government officials to
18 consider adopting appropriate noise/vibration limitations
19 and setbacks in the interest of preventing what would surely
20 become a significant problem.

21 We've done a fair amount of research and have
22 found the How-to Guide to Siting Wind Turbines to Prevent
23 Health Risks From Sound, authors George W. Cammerman and
24 Richard R. James 2008 to be extremely useful. They provide
25 the ecological and scientific sound approach which will

1 minimize the likelihood detrimental impact when industrial
2 wind turbines are to be sited near people's homes. As you
3 are undoubtedly aware the proposed Title 21 zoning draft for
4 Skamania County was recently appealed, and the hearing
5 examiner issued a decision requiring the county to conduct
6 an EIS. Quoting from page 22 of the findings, conclusions,
7 and decision of the hearing examiner: Washington noise
8 standards are based upon land use classification of both the
9 noise and the noise receiver...

10 Mr. Richard James, an acoustical engineer,
11 provided critical testimony that wind turbines generate a
12 type of noise that is not adequately measured by the dBA
13 scale used in the Washington standards. The dBA scale is
14 designed to detect noise as audible to humans. Wind
15 turbines generate low-frequency noise, 20 hertz or lower,
16 that might cause the body to resonate even if it is not
17 audible. Such effects are measurable on
18 the C-weighted scale, end quote. Another quote, Mr. James
19 recommended a minimum distance of 1.2 miles between turbines
20 and residences based on health effects research conducted by
21 Dr. Nina Pierpont, end quote.

22 We strongly feel that half-mile setbacks is
23 insufficient, especially in areas with canyons, bowls, and
24 mountains as the terrain which contain, amplify, and
25 transmit the sounds from the wind turbines greater distances

1 than in typically used flatter terrain. The simplistic
2 sound modeling using but two variables, output and distance,
3 is insufficient in determining likely impact. We request
4 that potential noise dBA and low frequency dBC impacts be
5 thoroughly investigated through baseline measurements and
6 computer simulations of worst-case conditions for producing
7 sound emissions such as recommended by Cammerman and James.
8 This would include ambient sound monitoring all residential
9 properties within and up to a mile of the project property
10 boundary. A sophisticated laser technology --

11 CHAIR LUCE: Is this in the record?

12 MS. MCCARTHY: Yes, we have all kinds of links and
13 information that I will put out.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Do you have a copy of the hearing
15 examiner's order that you're reading from?

16 MS. MCCARTHY: The other witness had it. It's in
17 your record.

18 CHAIR LUCE: All right. We will carefully
19 consider all of the information we receive.

20 MS. MCCARTHY: Okay. Where was I? A
21 sophisticated laser technology and highly reputable sound
22 propagation model should utilize computer simulations. An
23 independent qualified acoustical consultant that's an
24 unbiased third party with no financial or other connection
25 to SDS or related companies should perform all sound

1 monitoring simulation and projections. With great earnest
2 we encourage this be done prior to making decisions
3 regarding appropriate setbacks. Further, if industrial wind
4 turbines are as quiet as what's presented setting enhanced
5 noise standards should provide no difficulty for developers
6 to meet and yet would make a strong statement illustrating
7 the state's commitment to safeguarding the health of its
8 citizens. The how-to guide referenced above clearly
9 articulates how to go about setting such standards. Simple
10 reliance on the Washington State Environmental Noise Levels
11 Chapter 173-60 WAC is not enough. The acoustical expert's
12 approach is to locate a wind turbine so as to not increase
13 preconstruction/operation background sound levels by more
14 than 5 dBA along the property lines of receiving
15 nonparticipating property, and such that it would not exceed
16 30 dBA within a hundred feet of any occupied structure.

17 Additionally we refer you to a low frequency
18 sound, and this is also depicted on page 17. That's all
19 kept in here. We strongly represent that EFSEC become fully
20 informed of the growing documented potential health risks
21 from sound. There's an attached deputation by Dr. Robert
22 Labertry from April of 2009, as well as the approach
23 suggested in this how-to guide by inviting acoustical expert
24 Cammerman and James to present to EFSEC and this community
25 their approach to siting wind turbines in a manner of

1 proving health risks. This should be completed as part of
2 the EIS.

3 Also for your consideration we've attached a news
4 release dated March 4, 2009 from the medical staff at the
5 Northern Maine Medical Center regarding health concerns and
6 the need for careful siting of wind turbines. You've heard
7 me reference you to the book and work of New York Physician
8 Nina Pierpont, M.D., Ph.D., regarding wind turbine syndrome.
9 And I must be at four minutes.

10 CHAIR LUCE: That's a possibility.

11 MS. McCARTHY: My husband will be happy to read
12 you the remainder.

13 CHAIR LUCE: You can keep going, but if you do
14 have something to submit for the record just remember we
15 will read everything you submit.

16 MS. McCARTHY: Okay. Our secondary area of
17 concern relates to protecting the incredible scenic beauty
18 of the Columbia River Gorge. This area is a local and
19 national treasure and we feel that the Whistling Ridge as
20 proposed could have a profoundly detrimental effect on the
21 truly unique and exceptional scenic and recreational
22 resources wisely preserved and protected for the enjoyment
23 of all through Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area Act.

24 426-foot tall wind turbines lining the scenic area
25 would surely denigrate the scenic experience and we feel

1 certain was not remotely foreseeing when determining the
2 scenic area boundaries; thus, it would undermine the intent
3 of the act. As clearly articulated in the above hearing
4 examiner's quote, Landscape aesthetics have measurable
5 objective standards, it is possible to map aesthetically
6 sensitive areas and use such information when making zoning
7 decisions. Quote: 415-tall wind turbines in the southeast
8 portion of Skamania County but outside the National Scenic
9 Area would be visible to a six-foot tall observer from
10 Cook-Underwood Road within the National Scenic Area and from
11 Interstate 84.

12 Again quote: A view shed analysis was prepared
13 specifically for the Saddleback Project. The turbines would
14 be visible for several miles and would be particularly
15 visible to areas to the west and north of the project and
16 from the south side of the Columbia River Gorge.

17 We ask that the scope of the EIS include a
18 thorough assessment of the aesthetic impact of the proposed
19 placement of wind turbines within the Whistling Ridge
20 Project so that appropriate mitigation measures in said
21 places can be required.

22 Thirdly, the scope of the EIS for the Whistling
23 Ridge Project must necessarily perceive the requirements
24 including considering SDS's proposed lease of four common
25 school trust parcels on adjacent DNR land in western

1 Klickitat County. This would be essentially an extension of
2 the company's proposed Whistling Ridge Project, formally
3 known as Saddleback. Therefore leasing of the school trust
4 parcels would essentially create one large project with 92
5 proposed turbines. The EFSEC EIS scope and analysis need to
6 consider the impact of the entire project fully built out
7 with wind turbines as opposed to considering individual
8 parts more favored separately. As DNR indicated on page 13
9 of the checklist of the trust lands, quote: The entire area
10 of this proposal is environmentally sensitive, unquote.
11 Portions of the proposed leased land are designated as one
12 of those spotted owl conservation areas. Additionally,
13 SDS's application indicates other sensitive species such as
14 western gray squirrel and Northern Goshawk both have a
15 potential to occur within the project site, unquote.

16 This proposed project is reportedly the first of
17 its kind in forested habitat in Washington. This begs to me
18 for intelligent planning, caution, and due consideration
19 given the potential and profound impact on watersheds,
20 wildfire risks, bats, and Indian species, mammals, and
21 humans.

22 Our dream is that Washington State can and will
23 become a leader for the nation in the development of wind
24 energy that is in harmony with the environment and the
25 health and quality of life of all its residents. Thank you

1 so much.

2 CHAIR LUCE: Do you have those comments to submit
3 for the record, please? The testimony you just read as
4 well. Thank you.

5 Keith Brown.

6 MR. BROWN: She covered me.

7 CHAIR LUCE: Oh, she got you. Okay. And I'm
8 going to really -- Sally? I'm sorry. Your handwriting
9 looks like mine.

10 MS. TUCKER JAMES: It's bad, isn't it?

11 CHAIR LUCE: Well, it's not bad. It just looks
12 like mine.

13 MS. TUCKER JONES: Sallie Tucker Jones.

14 CHAIR LUCE: If you could spell your name and give
15 us your address, please.

16 COMMENTS BY SALLIE TUCKER JAMES

17 S-a-l-l-i-e Tucker T-u-c-k-e-r Jones, and I live
18 at 882 Tuna Narrow, Washougal, Washington. I'm a resident
19 of Skamania County.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

21 MS. TUCKER JONES: I think just a short thing.
22 People have addressed a lot of my concerns already,
23 including the aesthetic issues. I'm really concerned that
24 the siting will affect residents. I know there is a growing
25 body of information that indicates that there may be harmful

1 effects from low frequency noise that's generated by the
2 wind turbines. I think the gentleman that brought up the
3 issues of widening the roads in order to accommodate
4 delivery of these materials that will be required is a very
5 legitimate one. It can be quite a difference to a few
6 people, and I think it doesn't matter if it's a few or a
7 lot. I think that's really a legitimate concern if people
8 are going to be impacted, that their property is going to be
9 impacted or loss of their yard or whatever that might be.

10 I don't know specifically, I may be wrong on this,
11 but the Columbia River flyway is a big area of bird
12 migration and bat migration as well, and I know that hawks
13 and other migrating birds use ridges and the wind generated
14 there to travel. And I think that's a concern for me and
15 the fact that SDS is collecting the data on the bird and bat
16 issue is in question. I don't think they should be the ones
17 to collect that data. You will analyze it, of course, but I
18 would think that the Fish and Wildlife Service or other
19 appropriate agencies that would be able to do studies in an
20 unbiased way would be more appropriate people to do those
21 kinds of studies.

22 I think the issue of reliability was mentioned
23 earlier and that bothers me a little bit. Even through wind
24 turbines can be or the generating capability can be put into
25 the power grid, it can't be stored and wind power is

1 certainly reliable on the presence of the wind. So in that
2 sense it's not as reliable as one might think. If the wind
3 isn't blowing you're not generating any power to do anything
4 with, and then there may be circumstances when the winds are
5 too heavy. I don't really know the specifics on that
6 particular area. I'm sure you have the data on that
7 already, but if there is too much wind the blades will have
8 to be feathered and they won't be generating anything
9 either. My understanding also on maintenance that I don't
10 know what arrangements have been made, but I think a
11 maintenance crew has to actually come to the site if there
12 aren't people available there all the time to actually
13 perform that maneuver. So people would have to come and do
14 that

15 Let's see. I guess the only other thing I had
16 that people haven't addressed was the fact that on the back
17 board it's mentioned that it will cost \$150,000,000 to
18 complete this project, and that seems like an awful lot of
19 money for a 20- to 30-year lifespan of particular projects.
20 So it's just something to think about in that respect, and I
21 think that covers it. Everybody else covered everything
22 else that I wanted to say. Thank you

23 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Appreciate you
24 coming here.

25 Paul Smith, followed by Dan Morby, followed by

1 Jill Barker.

2 COMMENTS BY PAUL SMITH

3 Hello, my name is Paul Smith, and I live at 1482
4 Mabee Mines Road in the west end of Skamania County.

5 Like Sallie had mentioned I have several items
6 that some of the people have touched on already. I
7 apologize for any redundancy, but I think I can whip through
8 this within my four minutes or less. So I'd like to think
9 that I'm not as young as I used to be so I'm going to take
10 my glasses off.

11 Thank you for the opportunity to express my
12 thoughts and concerns which I would like to have entered
13 into the public record and addressed directly within this
14 scope for this proposed Whistling Ridge Energy Project. I
15 have eight concerns here. I've added some text to this so
16 should I add that? Should I give this to you at a later
17 date since it's not exactly the same as the printouts that I
18 had?

19 CHAIR LUCE: If you give it to Tammy, everything
20 can go into the record. So you can either choose to give it
21 to us now with your text added or you can retype it and send
22 it into Tammy by May 18.

23 MR. SMITH: Okay.

24 CHAIR LUCE: So either way.

25 MR. SMITH: Okay. Fair enough. Thanks.

1 Number one is this large scale wind turbine
2 project located within Washington State designated spotted
3 owl species emphasis areas sandwiched between the National
4 Scenic Area (NSA) and National Forest Land. Given this
5 designation coupled with the NSA and NF being in conduit for
6 wildlife corridors a thorough EIS is warranted which should
7 include the cumulative impacts that was mentioned earlier.

8 Number two, there needs to be a low-frequency
9 noise analysis done. Teresa also mentioned that earlier.
10 This project will be probably evaluated using Washington
11 State noise standards which only measures in dBA audible by
12 humans, but there needs to be analysis done measuring at
13 minimum either simply just a presence or absence of LFN
14 which could be measured using a C-weighted scale dec not
15 audible to humans but can still have deleterious effects on
16 humans.

17 Number three, a half-mile setback is inadequate
18 when considering the topography of the Columbia River Gorge
19 where the drainage is canyons and mountains that can amplify
20 and transmit sound from wind turbines greater distances than
21 in typically used flatter landscapes. For instance, many of
22 the European nations having over 20 years of experience with
23 industrial wind facilities have implemented regulations
24 having setbacks at one to one and a half miles. The
25 location of the actual residence home itself on adjacent or

1 nearby properties to wind turbines must be taken into
2 account, not just the property line.

3 Number four, according to the Travis Nelson Wind
4 and Water Energy Section Manager for WDNW quote: This
5 project is the first of its kind in forested habitat
6 Washington State, unquote. The Columbia River Gorge
7 provides habitat for more than 300 bird species, and it's a
8 major stopover for many migratory bird species. Industrial
9 wind turbines can lead to a loss of habitat, fragmentation
10 of habitat, and increased fatalities due to contact with
11 wind turbines. Several Washington State listed bird species
12 could be affected: The spotted owl which is listed as an
13 endangered specie in Washington State, Northern Goshawk and
14 affiliated woodpecker both listed candidate species, and the
15 bald eagle in Washington State sensitive species, as well as
16 numerous migratory birds, bats, the gray squirrel which is a
17 state threatened species and many mammals.

18 Number five, EFSEC does the Environmental Impact
19 Statement. Why was this not required by the applicant as
20 most projects like this? Why is this not required by the
21 applicant of the project like most environmental impact
22 statements? This is a private development that Washington
23 State taxpayers which I'm one of should not have to pay for.
24 SDS's application to EFSEC runs over 900 pages. How much
25 money is that going to cost me?

1 Number six, the Whistling Ridge southern boundary
2 abuts the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The
3 wind turbines will be over 420 feet high which is nearly the
4 same height as a 42-story building. These would be visible
5 from several key viewing areas throughout the Gorge to
6 include I-84, Hood River, Husom, White Salmon, not to
7 mention many trails throughout the Gorge.

8 Number seven, the SDS application states that the
9 Whistling Ridge site is managed for timber harvest. Wind
10 turbines need to be sited as far away from buildings or
11 trees as possible which can block the wind and cause
12 turbulence. How much timber production will now be taken
13 out of production due to the wind turbines? How much state
14 revenue for schools will be lost on the DNR section in
15 Klickitat County? Will SDS make up for that?

16 And finally, number eight, SDS originally named
17 the project Saddleback Wind Power and it was for
18 approximately 50 wind turbines. Now there has been an
19 additional 30 plus wind turbines added to that with the
20 change in name to Whistling Ridge.

21 They held a preapplication meeting with Skamania
22 County Planning Department to determine the zoning
23 requirements which would regulate the project. The county
24 did not have their ordinances updated though, Skamania
25 County and zoning. Skamania County planned to implement the

1 zone changes required without an Environmental Impact
2 Statement first. Several concerned parties appealed and
3 even the hearing examiner ruled against the county. Two
4 weeks later SDS submitted an application to EFSEC for the
5 project now renamed Whistling Ridge. EFSEC's authority
6 supersedes all other state, county, and city agencies
7 including local land use regulations. The county makes
8 the -- the Council makes a recommendation to the Governor
9 who makes the final decision. This circumvents public
10 concerns to how our rural character of life will end up.
11 This take all aspects of the public process and tosses it to
12 the wind, no pun intended. No offense to your group. I
13 appreciate that, but the applicant basically didn't get what
14 he wanted going through the county and so he went an end
15 around local land use ordinances and zoning which once in
16 place could be restricted to his agenda.

17 I am not opposed to alternative energy development
18 at all, but to deface this unique beautiful area which is
19 the only National Scenic Area in the United States of
20 America is wrong. This is the right time but definitely the
21 wrong place. Thank you.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Our next
23 speaker will be Don Morby.

24 MR. FIKSDAL: Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

1 MR. FIKSDAL: Council Member Wilson wanted me to
2 correct one misconception about the funding of the project.

3 CHAIR LUCE: The funding is not by taxpayers.
4 Project applicants pay all costs for the project, including
5 the cost of the Council, including all the environmental,
6 including all costs, and we bill accordingly. So there are
7 no taxpayer funds being used to process this application.
8 So just to be clear on the record. Thank you.

9 Mr. Morby.

10 COMMENTS BY DON MORBY

11 Don Morby. I currently live -- that's, M-o-r-b-y,
12 Don -- 715 Jessup Road, Mill-A, Washington, which is a
13 community below Willard, next to Underwood, and a lot people
14 ask us or me where is Mill-A and it's across the river from
15 Mill-B.

16 So I want to bring my perspective as a citizen
17 that lives up there. I grew up in Underwood, born and
18 raised there. My family homesteaded that whole area in the
19 late 1800s so we've been here a long time, not as long as
20 our neighbors the chiefs back there, but pretty long time.

21 I am in favor of this windmill project because our
22 small county desperately needs something to bring into this
23 county. Some of these special interest groups have
24 introduced the spotted owl and everything else and pretty
25 much devastated my family's way of life and income, and I

1 think it needs to stop. We need to take a stand and say,
2 look, bring something here that brings it to us. We have a
3 small school. We have 52 kids in that school and four
4 teachers and one part-time superintendent principal. The
5 only fallback to this whole thing is some of this money is
6 going to District 405 which is Klickitat County School
7 District and not to my school. So that's sad and I'll work
8 on it later. We need some more of the younger kids to come
9 to the Skamania County schools.

10 But I'm in favor of this because I think it will
11 bring some money into this community and will create some
12 jobs, and I just want to go on record that I was an
13 individual who's lived in this county all their life. I
14 spent 30 years in the military and maintained a residence
15 here because I wanted to come back here because it was my
16 home. And there's times I can't come back to Mill-A because
17 I can't afford to live in Underwood anymore. My military
18 retirement wasn't that great. After two tours in Vietnam I
19 know statistics can be maneuvered and worked around and come
20 up with the numbers you need.

21 If they're worried about noise, then maybe you
22 just should try listening to a low impact sound of a bullet
23 that goes past your ear. I don't see the windmills doing
24 this to me so I'm for them. Thank you for your time.

25 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

1 Jill Barker.

2 COMMENTS BY JILL BARKER

3 Good evening. My name is Jill Barker. Can you
4 hear me?

5 CHAIR LUCE: We can hear you.

6 MS. BARKER: I live at 3375 Vensel Benson Road,
7 Mosier, Oregon, 97040.

8 I thank you for this opportunity to make comments.
9 This evening I'm providing comments for the Columbia Gorge
10 Audubon Society regarding the environmental impacts scoping
11 for Whistling Ridge Wind Energy facility proposal.

12 The society is a Washington nonprofit with bistate
13 membership founded in 1988. Our mission statement is: The
14 Columbia Gorge Audubon Society seeks to promote and enhance
15 the enjoyment, understanding, and protection of our natural
16 world. Our interests are worldwide. Our focus is the
17 scenic beauty and ecological health of the Columbia River
18 Gorge and its tributaries.

19 Our organization has long been involved in the
20 environmental issues in the Columbia Gorge Region. The
21 society has challenged every wind power proposal that has
22 threatened scenic and ecological integrity to the Gorge,
23 beginning with Kenetech and CARES proposals in the east
24 Gorge and most recently a proposal on Sevenmile Hill near
25 the Dalles where the developers eventually thought better of

1 it and moved on. The Society coined the phrase "industrial
2 wind power" in the early '90s that has become part of the
3 popular vernaculars describing modern industrial wind power
4 facilities.

5 Founding members of the Society were centrally
6 involved in the establishment of the Columbia River Gorge
7 National Scenic Area and the White Salmon National Scenic
8 River as federally protected landscapes. We believe both of
9 these protected areas would fundamentally and irreparably be
10 damaged by this proposed project.

11 Industrial wind power development is land-use
12 intensive creating a large disproportion of land required
13 compared to power produced. Wind power facilities become
14 the dominant feature of affected landscapes and, thus, have
15 the potential for significant impacts to natural systems and
16 human communities.

17 There's no regional or national coordinated
18 planning; no regional or national siting standards even
19 though wind power is the most heavily subsidized (with
20 public funds) form of energy production. The U.S. Fish and
21 Wildlife Service charged with protecting threatened and
22 endangered species, migratory birds, and eagles, etc., has
23 yet to adopt permanent development guidelines. Often as
24 not, local governments afflicted by cozy politics and an
25 insatiable desire for a larger tax base make monumental

1 decisions placement and density of projects.

2 We built dams on every suitable hydro head up the
3 Columbia and the Snake Rivers, and politicians and economic
4 boosters rejoiced, "it's green, it's renewable, and it's
5 good for business." We now know the rest of the story. The
6 world's greatest anadromous fishery has been driven to near
7 extinction and Celilo Falls, great natural wonder and
8 cultural epicenter of North America is no more. Are we
9 making the same mistakes with wind energy?

10 With the advent of numerous projects in various
11 geographic locations, important and useful data is now
12 available as to their impacts on human health and the damage
13 to property including valuations. Existing data strongly
14 suggest that industrial wind power and human communities are
15 incompatible. It is doubtful that industrial wind power
16 will ever be erected in the Puget Sound area. We suspect
17 that the residents and their elected representatives have a
18 visceral feeling for this incompatibility. But as long as
19 decision makers can foist this menace, as with toxic waste
20 and garbage, on rural communities and Indian reservations,
21 all is well for industrial wind power developers and
22 speculators.

23 The tremendous scale of modern wind power
24 facilities can have profound effects on natural flora and
25 fauna and their physical environment. This proposed project

1 is the first industrial wind power project in the Western
2 U.S. proposed in primary forestland where the impact is
3 known to be much more severe. The Nature Conservancy
4 considers industrial wind power to be the greatest threat to
5 biodiversity in the American Great Plains. Habitat
6 fragmentation, habitat avoidance, and bird/bat/blade
7 interactions are well documented. Ridge top wind power
8 facilities such as Whistling Ridge are tantamount to
9 mountain top coal mining. Ridge tops are leveled and
10 permanently stripped of vegetation sending sedimentation,
11 lubricating fluids, tower cleaning fluids, as well as
12 herbicides and pesticides used to control competing
13 vegetation and unwanted wildlife into the down-slope water
14 systems. These are very real and serious consequences of
15 ridge top wind mining.

16 A surprising (to some) result of wind energy
17 development is the increase in atmospheric CO2 (carbon
18 dioxide) implicated in global warming and generated from the
19 backup fossil fuel fired facility developments required to
20 offset a destabilization of the energy grid caused by wind
21 power's famous unreliability, inefficiency, and generation
22 intermittency.

23 Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the
24 project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:

25 One, human health, both physically and

1 psychologically on reasonably affected parties.

2 Two, potential residential displacement.

3 Three, the potential loss of county tax revenue
4 from property devaluations.

5 Four, the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.

6 Five, the White Salmon National Scenic River.

7 Six, Buck Creek, a municipal weather source and
8 recreation area.

9 Seven, the Little White Salmon River and its role
10 in anadromous fish production.

11 Eight, and all other socioeconomic impacts.

12 Nine, wildlife, including threatened and
13 endangered species such as the spotted owl and migratory and
14 resident birds and bats and their migration routes.

15 Ten, cumulative impacts on physical, biological,
16 and social elements of the environment from all past,
17 present, and reasonably foreseeable wind energy facilities
18 in the Northwest.

19 And the last one is 11, increased carbon dioxide
20 emissions from the required backup fossil fuel fired
21 facilities. Thank you for your attention.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Leave those
23 comments if you wish with Ms. Talburt.

24 Moving onto the next page of presenters there was
25 someone I think from the Skamania County Agri-Tourism

1 Association. Is there somebody? Would you be Mr. Collins?
2 Come forward. Just wasn't a name next to it from the
3 Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association.

4 MR. CRUMPACKER: It's John Crumpacker.

5 CHAIR LUCE: All right.

6 COMMENTS BY JOHN CRUMPACKER

7 C-r-u-m-p-a-c-k-e-r. My first name is John and
8 I'm a member of the Board of Directors of the Skamania
9 County Agri-Tourism Association, and I'm here to provide
10 information.

11 CHAIR LUCE: And your address is?

12 MR. CRUMPACKER: Our address is, the Association
13 is P.O. Box 100, Underwood, Washington, and that's my
14 address as well.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

16 MR. CRUMPACKER: Before I move on if I could just
17 direct everyone to the chart for a second and walk over
18 there. It might be helpful because we have a focused issue
19 here. Our interest is in talking about these seven towers.
20 They're on the southern portion of the site, and I'm going
21 to refer to them as the "A Towers" throughout our comments.
22 So if you could just look at that, that would be great.
23 There's been a lot of questions about and comments about
24 what are the visual impacts. That's our primary concern and
25 so we, the Association, hired a pilot and we flew the ridge

1 line from various angles and I have some photos that you
2 will be able to see, and one of the things that we did is we
3 flew directly over the "A Tower" ridge at exactly 300 feet
4 elevation above the ridge surface and directly over it and
5 we took some photos. So I've got those.

6 I think the answer to the questions about what is
7 the visual impact we're particularly interested in that as
8 it relates to the Agri-Tourism Association and the members'
9 businesses that are affected. So I'm going to submit an
10 appendix to our comments tonight, one copy, and then present
11 my comments at some point here in the next couple days, and
12 I'll have a couple loose pictures with that appendix right
13 now that I will be referring if you could circulate and look
14 at them and it will give you an idea.

15 CHAIR LUCE: All right. We're going to try to
16 work the four or five minute rule so to the extent that
17 that's possible I'd appreciate it. Go ahead.

18 MR. CRUMPACKER: Thank you. In the interest of
19 time I will speed read.

20 CHAIR LUCE: The reporter is having trouble with
21 speed reading. You can also submit anything for the record.
22 Go ahead.

23 MR. CRUMPACKER: Thank you. I won't submit this.
24 It's in rough form.

25 As I said, my name is John Crumpacker. I live in

1 Underwood, Washington. I am a member of the Board of
2 Directors of the Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association.
3 The Skamania Agri-Tourism Association is a Washington
4 non-profit corporation dedicated to promotion and
5 improvement of sustainable agri-tourism in Skamania County.
6 Our mission is to create and maintain favorable business
7 conditions for our association members. All members own and
8 operate agriculture businesses in Underwood, Washington
9 located in eastern Skamania County. Our unincorporated
10 community sits directly across the Columbia from Hood River,
11 Oregon. Members of the Skamania County Agri-Tourism
12 Association include: Acadia Vineyards, a 75-acre vineyard
13 and orchard; Crooked Acres Vineyard, a 20-acre vineyard; The
14 Davis Family Farm, a 50-acre farm and orchard; Energeia
15 Vineyards, a 64-acre vineyard; Gorge Crest Vineyards &
16 Winery, a 41-acre vineyard, winery, and commercial event
17 site; Gorge Estate Vineyards, a 95-acre vineyard and winery;
18 Lamonti Vineyards, a 32-acre vineyard; Pearblossom
19 Vineyards, an 18-acre vineyard and orchard; Sanctuary Herb
20 Farm, an 18-acre herb farm and vineyard; Soluna Vineyards, a
21 34-acre vineyard; Underwood Gardens, a 6-acre lavender farm;
22 and Wine Spring, a 40-acre vineyard.

23 As a group these farms and vineyards; farms,
24 vineyards, and wineries currently give thousands of people
25 each year a reason to visit our community and share in the

1 awe inspiring beauty we call it bucolic charm. Some bring
2 the entire family and 50 of their closest friends to say "I
3 do." Some come to taste wine and touch grapes on the vine.
4 Some come to buy an organic-free range pig for a
5 celebration, and others simply come because the views of the
6 river, the Gorge, and the Hood River Valley are unsurpassed.
7 But more importantly for purposes of this hearing, each of
8 these people bring with them a domino effect of economic
9 activity that benefits our entire region.

10 The Agri-Tourism Association is here today to
11 provide the Council with our comments on the proposed
12 Whistling Ridge Project and the potential impact on our
13 members and on agri-tourism in Underwood as a whole. We
14 respectfully request that the negative impacts of
15 agri-tourism in Underwood be addressed in the forthcoming
16 EIS. Our comments focus on providing the Council with a
17 clear understanding of the following five factors:

18 One, that tourism is the lifeblood of Skamania
19 County and all communities throughout the Columbia River
20 Gorge.

21 Two, that agri-tourism is the present day driver
22 of tourism in the famous Hood River Valley and that
23 Underwood is well on its way to duplicating that economic
24 success in eastern Skamania County.

25 Three, that Underwood's historic transformation

1 from pear orchards to agri-tourism and to one of the premier
2 wine producing regions in the world has enormous present-day
3 socioeconomic value.

4 Four, that the very real present-day economic
5 value of Underwood agri-tourism as well as its future
6 potential would be severely impacted by the seven "A Towers"
7 as currently sited.

8 And, finally, five, that this Council has the
9 authority and responsibility to put the reins on this
10 project by requiring a responsible re-siting of the seven "A
11 Towers", towers that will otherwise dominate the skyline and
12 become Underwood's new calling card.

13 In order to give responsible mitigation of the "A
14 Towers" a clear voice in these proceedings and thereby
15 safeguard the tremendous socioeconomic value of Underwood,
16 the Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association will petition
17 this Council pursuant to WAC 463-30-091 for permission to
18 intervene in these proceedings.

19 However, the Association has already taken a vote
20 and the result is unanimous. If the Council or this
21 applicant of its own accord makes a responsible mitigation
22 decision and re-sites the seven "A Towers" to eliminate the
23 negative impacts, the association intends to withdraw as a
24 party to support the project.

25 As we detail in our written comments, failure to

1 re-site the seven "A Towers" would improperly force the
2 blossoming Underwood agri-tourism industry to bear a
3 disproportionate share of negative environmental and
4 socioeconomic impacts of this project in violation of WAC
5 463-60-085. Such a result is prohibited by WAC, which is
6 Washington Administrative Code I think, sorry, to 463-47-110
7 which states that the overriding policy of the Council is to
8 avoid or mitigate adverse environmental impacts which may
9 result from the Council decisions. So here are the facts on
10 our five points.

11 First, tourism is the lifeblood of the Gorge.
12 Skamania County is more dependent on tourism than any county
13 in the state of Washington. You can see Appendix 1 of our
14 supporting data. In 2007, 47 percent of all retail and
15 lodging tax collection in the county came from visitors, the
16 highest percentage in the state. Almost 11 percent of all
17 Skamania County was travel related, over 58 million dollars,
18 the highest percentage in the state. Where do these figures
19 come from?

20 In December 2008, the State of Washington through
21 the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development
22 (CTED), which also employs a staff of this Council, released
23 these findings in a report on the importance of travel
24 impact of the economy in the state. The state concluded
25 that the travel industry generates tax benefits for

1 Washington residents, generates job opportunities for
2 Washington residents, and benefits all regions of the state.
3 The study found that in particular rural counties, including
4 Skamania County, have a greater number of travel-generated
5 jobs in relation to total employment, and that we are more
6 dependent on the travel industry. They determined that over
7 ten percent of Skamania County's jobs are generated by
8 tourism. Maybe this is no great surprise since we live in
9 one of the most beautiful places on earth.

10 The State of Washington also released a report in
11 2002 titled Travel Industry Employment. It's Appendix 1.
12 It was released by the Washington Department of Business and
13 Tourism Development. They reached the same conclusions and
14 found specifically that this is because some rural areas are
15 recreation destinations and/or have little employment in
16 manufacturing other industries. Once again topping the list
17 of counties were those in the Columbia River Gorge.

18 The two key conclusions of this study: The travel
19 industry develops and thrives to the extent it has
20 comparative advantages in the Northwest relative to other
21 locations in the U.S. High-quality natural and outdoor
22 recreation resources are an example of such an advantage.
23 Why does this matter, this hearing? Because any development
24 proposal could have a potential to cut off the lifeblood of
25 our economy. It needs to be closely monitored, carefully

1 studied, and mitigated in a manner that eliminates damaging
2 impacts.

3 Number two, the facts about agri-tourism and the
4 fact it drives Hood River County and eastern Skamania
5 County. Hood River is a tourist mecca just like Skamania
6 County. The Hood River Valley is famous worldwide for its
7 breathtaking beauty in its farms, orchards, and vineyards.
8 In fact, Hood River is a case study in the economic power
9 and sustainability of agri-tourism. You need to look no
10 further than the front page of the Hood River County Chamber
11 of Commerce website which is in Appendix 2. The image of
12 Hood River is agri-tourism. It's plastered everywhere:
13 pictures, events, festivals and links to other sites
14 dedicated to agri-tourism in its many forms.

15 The other marketing push in Hood River?
16 Recreation and scenery, of course. Just as the State of
17 Washington has concluded in its studies that high quality,
18 natural, and outdoor recreation resources are our primary
19 asset and must be leveraged. They must also be carefully
20 guarded to assure our economic health and well being.

21 Why is Hood River important in this area? Because
22 Underwood which is in eastern Skamania County and which is
23 the site of this proposal sits directly across from Hood
24 River and is inextricably tied to Hood River
25 topographically, economically, and even evolutionarily.

1 Although our county seat is 30 miles here in
2 Stevenson, we have a uniquely different set of issues and
3 opportunities, issues and opportunities that county
4 government has failed to understand. This is evident in
5 light of the county's decision to publicly endorse this
6 project without consideration of the impacts to Underwood
7 agri-tourism. Agri-tourism holds the key to Underwood's
8 economic future if it is responsibly cared for.

9 Fact relating to number three, Underwood
10 agri-tourism is growing quickly. The primary driver of
11 agri-tourism in Underwood is its far reaching reputation as
12 one of the premier wine producing regions in the world. The
13 information is in Appendix 3. Amazing as it may sound, the
14 new Columbia Gorge Wine Appellation was recently recognized
15 as one of the best emerging regions in the world along with
16 Paso Robles, California and Maule Valley, Chile. The same
17 accolades were earned in Seattle Magazine.

18 In fact, the Washington Wine Industry is now
19 ranked as the second largest premium wine producer in the
20 U.S. Washington Winery of the Year in 2009 was Maryhill
21 Winery, a Columbia Gorge operation located here in the
22 Gorge. Winery of the Year in 2007 in the State of
23 Washington was Cathedral Ridge Winery in Hood River, also
24 located directly across the river from Underwood and often
25 touting Underwood wines which you'll see in the image of

1 their front page in Appendix 3.

2 Even more directly to the point, Celilo Vineyards
3 in Underwood is consistently ranked as one of the top ten
4 vineyards in Washington which as mentioned is ranked second
5 actually in the production of premium wines. The entire
6 south slope of Underwood Mountain is considered the cream of
7 the crop. If any question remains regarding the value of
8 the wineries in Underwood, we need look no further than the
9 seal of approval of SDS Lumber who recently informed the
10 community that it had purchased potential vineyard land in
11 Underwood.

12 Facts related to number four, socioeconomic value
13 of the Underwood agri-tourism. Agri-tourism is of the
14 reality in Underwood as we sit here today. There are over
15 30 large-scale agricultural operations within the community.
16 Some of these enterprises were started generations ago and
17 others have broken ground within the last year. In many
18 ways the Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association owes its
19 new found status to the proposal before you. We have
20 formally come together for the first time out of necessity,
21 a necessity born from the threat that this project poses to
22 our very existence.

23 Although our members have each made extraordinary
24 commitments of time and capital to the common vision of
25 making Underwood the premier agri-tourism destination in the

1 Gorge, until recently we were working in parallel rather
2 than in concert. The threat that this project poses to that
3 vision, however, immediately galvanized farm, winery, and
4 vineyard owners across the community. We now stand here
5 with consensus of opinion, not just on this project but on
6 the future lobbying goals, marketing strategies, and product
7 offerings.

8 The Association has two primary marketing
9 strategies; one, to promote the agri-tourism movement in a
10 manner similar to the Hood River fruit loop. You'll find
11 all the information in the supporting data and maps.

12 The Hood River Fruit Loop is considered a national
13 model of successful agri-tourism. In Appendix 2 you'll see
14 all the information about the fruit loop and in Appendix 4
15 all the information about the Underwood Agri-Tourism Loop.

16 Number two, establish the Underwood Vineyard Trek
17 as a "can't be missed" one-of-a-kind opportunity to hike
18 through 12 of the county or the country's premier vineyards
19 while sampling world class wines and views. Nowhere else in
20 the U.S. has 12 contiguous vineyards collectively developed
21 a private trek situated in the heart of the National Scenic
22 Area. See Appendix 4 for maps of the trek and where we're
23 situated.

24 Underwood agri-tourism is not just about wine
25 though. Other members offer produce, free-range organic

1 livestock, lavender viewing, and organic herbs. One of the
2 original visionaries in Underwood is Hank Patton who founded
3 World Steward which is located in the upper Underwood
4 agri-tourism loop and is committed to environmental
5 stewardship, sustainable farming, and research and
6 education. All the information about that is in Appendix 4.

7 In addition, three wineries are already in
8 operation in Underwood. One of those wineries is now
9 considered by many to be the premier commercial event site
10 in the Columbia Gorge. A number of other vineyards located
11 in the upper loop have future winery plans which have been
12 put on hold as a result of the potential negative impacts of
13 this project.

14 As set forth in Appendix 4 to our comments the
15 economic and socioeconomic value of the existing Underwood
16 agri-tourism industry is significant and quantifiable. It
17 is diverse and sustainable and benefits citizens and
18 governments throughout the region. The tremendous future
19 potential is also quantifiable and dwarfs the tax benefits
20 of the seven "A Towers" as projected by SDS Lumber. It's
21 all in Appendices 1, 2, 3 and 4, hard facts including the
22 economics of wine in Underwood, both winery development,
23 infusions to the economy and vineyard development, facts
24 related to agri-tourism and the fact that agri-tourism and
25 40-story turbines don't mix.

1 SDS once told the Underwood community that wind
2 turbines are beautiful and we've heard that from others
3 tonight. We are all welcome to our personal opinions, but
4 in these proceedings facts should rule, and the fact is that
5 tourists and especially tourists in the gorge don't want to
6 see industrial development. The facts are set forth clearly
7 in studies conducted by the U.S. government and the State of
8 Oregon which are attached to your comments as Appendix 5 and
9 6. These facts are undisputed and really need no further
10 discussion.

11 Moving the "A Towers" mitigates tourism impacts,
12 and our comments are focused specifically on the seven "A
13 Towers". The facts: The seven "A Towers" sit alone on a
14 clearcut ridge at the very most southern portion of the
15 proposed project. If installed they would dominant views
16 day and night from farm or locations that are depicted in
17 application submitted to Council. To remove any uncertainty
18 of that visual impact of the seven "A Towers", the
19 Agri-Tourism Association hired a pilot to fly a photographer
20 along the ridge where the towers are proposed. In Appendix
21 7 to our comments you will find the results. Take note of
22 the photograph that was taken directly over the ridge at an
23 elevation of 300 feet above the ridge. This photograph
24 tells the story of who will see the seven "A Towers". Also
25 note that the paragraph or the photograph was taken 120 feet

1 below the top of the proposed towers. Then take note at the
2 next photograph that shows the locations of the existing
3 businesses along the Underwood agri-tourism loop. The
4 impacts are clear. The solution is also clear. The
5 re-siting of the seven "A Towers" eliminates all visual
6 impacts to the Underwood agri-tourism industry in upper
7 Underwood as well as the visual impacts to the vast area
8 throughout the Gorge.

9 When you consider our fate please keep in mind the
10 following statement of SDS Lumber Company which was made in
11 reference to the decision to expand this project to 80
12 turbines by leasing adjacent DNR lands: "Expansion also
13 gives more flexibility. If we have more flexibility, we
14 could use that to optimize the site and minimize impacts."
15 That was in the Hood River News on February 25, 2009. We're
16 glad to see that SDS is realizing that the impacts of this
17 project must be mitigated, but the seven "A Towers" should
18 be mitigated whether or not this project is expanded, and
19 that mitigation decision should be based on balancing of the
20 negative impacts of "A Towers" alone.

21 In conclusion we're thankful that the Council
22 brings to this process a broad perspective of the benefits
23 and impacts of wind development, a perspective that is
24 understandably missing from the county government in
25 financial crisis. We are also confident that this Council

1 will use its broad mitigation powers, its depth of
2 experience, and basic common sense to draw a line in the
3 sand, a line that will make it clear to people throughout
4 the country that in the Northwest turbines don't have the
5 right to dominate every ridge line just because the wind
6 blows.

7 We feel fortunate, fortunate that each of you is
8 here in the Gorge and fortunate that during your site visit
9 you will have the chance to experience the extraordinary
10 beauty of our agricultural community and understand why it
11 is a priceless resource in and of itself, not just for those
12 of us that live on the Gorge, but to people throughout the
13 Gorge who benefit economically from the snowballing
14 reputation as one of the premier wine producing destinations
15 in the United States.

16 We ask you to take a moment, a moment to make sure
17 you visit the southern most portion of the site where you
18 will decide whether the "A towers" should be a boundary or
19 should have bought the boundary for the National Scenic
20 Area. Taking a sweeping view of the vineyards below, of the
21 Columbia River Gorge, and of the vast panoramas of the Hood
22 River Valley in the background and then take a moment to
23 transport yourselves from the prominent ridge line where you
24 stand to any one of the places you see below you. Now, from
25 that spot imagine looking back to the Underwood skyline.

1 What will catch your eye first? Would it be the 40-story "A
2 Towers" spinning of each tower from the clearcut ridge?
3 That image will be Underwood's new calling card. Will
4 turbines beckon the million of tourists who come to the
5 Gorge every year for the "beautiful national parks" and
6 "protected environmental areas"? Will tourists be inspired
7 to drive the agri-tourism loop at Underwood and walk from
8 vineyard to vineyard and winery to winery on the vineyard
9 trek below a complex of 40-story towers?

10 We feel that it's this Council's responsibility to
11 make sure that we never know the answers to these questions.
12 With the stroke of a pen the "A Towers" should simply be
13 moved elsewhere in the matrix of this project.

14 The information presented at this hearing and our
15 comments will be posted on the news page of the Skamania
16 County Agri-Tourism Association website which is located at
17 www.scaassn.org. Thank you for this opportunity to comment
18 and welcome to the Gorge.

19 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. We will hear
20 next from Mr. Gary Collins, then Tom Linde, and Walt
21 Loehrke. I want to say early on we asked the County
22 Commissioner and Tribal representatives to hold it to four
23 minutes, and I really appreciate that people want to give us
24 the full benefit of their views. But if you have something
25 in writing, we will read it so it's not necessary to be all

1 of your testimony. If you can summarize it and then again
2 if someone else has already made your points, agree with
3 them and then we'll move ahead. So thank you very much.

4 Mr. Collins.

5 COMMENTS BY GARY COLLINS

6 Yes. My name is Gary Collins. My address is 381
7 Erickson Road, Stevenson, Washington. Thank you for letting
8 us speak here.

9 I'd just like to say -- I'll make it short. I'm
10 in support of the project, and I think it's very good for
11 the community. I'm a third generation in this community.
12 I'm a lot like Don Morby. My grandfather homesteaded a
13 property up on the Underwood Road on the west end, and I've
14 just got to say he'd be pretty proud of it, a windmill,
15 because he didn't have electricity.

16 But the economic part of it I think it's great. I
17 think it's good. This county needs it. I've been here all
18 my life, and I've watched how its went and we definitely
19 need this. Anything would be good in the county here.
20 Personally I don't think -- in fact, I think it's an asset
21 to have the windmills up on the hill. I like them.

22 I've been by them. I stopped like going to Walla
23 Walla. There is no noise. I couldn't hear no noise. And
24 everyone's worried about the color of them or you can see
25 them. To me why don't you paint them an earth tone so, you

1 know, they won't be as visual if that's the problem. And I
2 just think there's a workable deal here and I hope that the
3 Council will understand that. Thank you

4 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Appreciate
5 that. Anything else you would like to submit for the record
6 by May 18 we will be glad to read and we will read.

7 Mr. Linde.

8 MR. LINDE: To speed things up, I will present my
9 comments in writing.

10 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

11 Mr. Loehrke.

12 COMMENTS OF WALT LOEHRKE

13 My name is Walt Loehrke and I live at Hemlock Road
14 in Carson, Washington, and I'm speaking today as a Skamania
15 County resident.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Please spell your name, Mr. Loehrke.
17 If you can for the benefit of the court reporter.

18 MR. LOEHRKE: That was the first question that the
19 teacher asked me. L-o-e-h-r-k-e.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

21 MR. LOEHRKE: I'm sitting here and I figure I must
22 suffer from I don't know what: the classic education. I
23 remember back in 1965 while I was still attending high
24 school being able to attend hearings held in Coos Bay,
25 Oregon on a wind farm that was proposed down there that

1 actually failed due to lack of transmission lines. There
2 was no place they could sell the power to at the time, and
3 it hasn't been reintroduced. I've always thought that as a
4 conundrum because on the state wind maps that still locates
5 that area as a high potential.

6 I see this development as a positive thing for
7 Skamania County. It's private land and it's disturbed soil.
8 It adds a boom to our PUD's ability to have a back feed into
9 the county which is since we are losing Condit Dam puts our
10 power situation here in a very precarious situation, makes
11 it a very precarious situation, and also provides a
12 guaranteed revenue stream for the county. It's unfortunate
13 for the tourist people. I love to hear them talk and I love
14 to go on their wine tours, but we're still waiting for them
15 to guarantee revenue stream from tourism. That was promised
16 to us 22 years ago with the National Scenic Area.

17 With that said, I don't personally and my wife and
18 I have tried to make windmills ugly. We have taken trips by
19 ourselves anecdotally to go get those things to be noisy and
20 cause vibration. I personally am very familiar with
21 subsound vibration and what it does to heavy construction
22 workers and have seen it on the job site and I am quite
23 concerned with that. I feel that this commission does have
24 the expertise available to them to make these kinds of
25 decisions and I welcome your guys' involvement in this

1 proposal. With that, good success and thank you for letting
2 me comment.

3 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

4 Mr. Jim Hutchison followed by Mike Rockwell and
5 Leanne Haight.

6 COMMENTS BY JIM HUTCHISON

7 Good evening, my name is Jim Hutchison,
8 H-u-t-c-h-i-s-o-n. I'm a retired biologist. Mailing
9 address is Post Office Box 749, Washougal, and today is my
10 birthday. Until the last speaker we pretty much lacked any
11 levity so I would like to demonstrate this card that my wife
12 gave me this morning for my birthday. On the cover it says
13 you're not old until the fat lady sings, and then you open
14 it up and --

15 (The fat lady is singing.)

16 CHAIR LUCE: That's fantastic. And just for the
17 record I'll look forward to that date. I'll let you know
18 that earlier this week I got my Medicare Card.

19 MR. HUTCHISON: I do have some serious comments
20 that I want to make.

21 CHAIR LUCE: All right.

22 MR. HUTCHISON: The SDS proposed wind turbine
23 field you are now studying is unique in several respects.
24 It would be the first such project located directly adjacent
25 to the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area and would introduce

1 turbine towers visible from various locations within the
2 Scenic Area. The Gorge Act, though it did not visualize
3 tall towers that would impact views from the Gorge, is very
4 specific about aesthetics. Since the Act's implementation
5 even single nonconforming houses have generated extensive
6 debate.

7 Impacts on timber production and wildlife are
8 major concerns related to the proposal. SDS intends to
9 reduce all vegetation to no more than 15 feet high within
10 150 feet of each turbine. Within the next 350 feet,
11 vegetation would be kept less than 50 feet high. Nearly all
12 timber harvest would thus be permanently eliminated for
13 approximately 18 acres around each turbine. For a 100
14 turbine field, including the other 50 on DNR land that's
15 been proposed, this would total 1,800 acres or nearly three
16 square miles of lost timber production. Turbine access
17 roads and appurtenant facilities would multiply this loss
18 several fold.

19 Numerous wildlife species, not just those
20 threatened or endangered, rely on forest habitats. Bird
21 mortality from wind turbines is fairly well documented, but
22 most such studies focused on turbines located outside of
23 forest areas. Other wildlife concerns are associated with
24 the SDS proposal. These concerns include seasonal use
25 patterns: travel corridors, habitat alteration or removal,

1 soil loss and associated stream sedimentation, and area
2 abandonment by wildlife due to turbine noise. Many animals
3 with hearing more acute than ours can be detrimentally
4 affected by noise. Considering these and related concerns,
5 the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's
6 recommendation for a comprehensive cumulative effects
7 analysis should be required for this or any wind turbine
8 application, especially when proposed in a forest setting.

9 Various kinds of EIS studies are typically
10 prepared and funded by the projects' proponents. However,
11 for this and other wind power projects in Washington, your
12 agency, the Energy Siting Council, prepares the EIS. That
13 approach appears a most questionable use of public funds --
14 I stand corrected but I still have questions about this
15 subject -- for this highly contentious proposed Gorge
16 project which the Governor may well not approve in the long
17 run.

18 A Skamania County representative will apparently
19 join the Siting Council to consider the Whistling Ridge
20 turbine proposal. That person should logically be as
21 open-minded and nonbiased as possible. Yet, it should be
22 stressed that Skamania County's Board of Commissioners is
23 already on record as favoring this proposal, plus another
24 controversial proposal by SDS for a large rural resort
25 within the Gorge Scenic Area, plus a big Gorge gambling

1 casino at Cascade Locks. Perhaps a bit of bias is involved
2 there.

3 This wind power application involves several
4 precedents: No large wind power installations are in or
5 next to the Gorge Scenic Area and none in the Pacific
6 Northwest are located on forest lands. Impacts on wildlife
7 and timber harvest in such locations are essentially little
8 studied and unknown. Wind is a legitimate source of power
9 production, but only if it does not conflict overly with
10 other values. In this case, placing multiple wind turbines
11 which would remove hundreds of acres of sustainable tree
12 harvest on forest land favored by many forms of wildlife
13 immediately adjacent to the Gorge Scenic Area appears
14 substantially unwise. Thank you.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much for your
16 comments. You can provide those to Ms. Talburt and we'll
17 get those in the record as well.

18 The next speaker will be Mike Rockwell.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He took off.

20 CHAIR LUCE: He took off. All right. Mike, if
21 someone knows Mike ask him to submit his comments in
22 writing.

23 Leanne Haight.

24 COMMENTS BY LEANNE HAIGHT

25 My name is Leanne Haight, H-a-i-g-h-t, P.O.

1 Box 1207 in Carson 98610. My comments are going to be
2 fairly simplistic and short at this point.

3 I am a strong supporter of developing renewable
4 energy in Skamania County. As a county we chose to help
5 create and be part of a bistate renewable zone, and as such
6 we have a responsibility to not just talk the talk but to
7 make use of and develop those renewable energy sources
8 available to us. Wind is one.

9 The site of the proposed wind farm is the
10 appropriate one, as there are very few if any other places
11 in the county where a wind project of any size and substance
12 can be located, and that's considering wind flow patterns
13 and the boundaries of the National Scenic Area.

14 This project would also put us one step closer to
15 reaching the state mandate that requires that 15 percent of
16 our energy come from renewable sources by the year 2020, and
17 it will be us walking our talk.

18 Additionally and as importantly it will provide a
19 boost to our county economy. Not only do we need to wean
20 ourselves from nonrenewable and foreign energy sources, we
21 need to wean ourselves from the subsidies of our forest as
22 those federal timber payments will be gone in short order.
23 This wind project would be one piece of a matrix we need to
24 construct to responsibly grow our economy and sustain a
25 healthy community in the future. I support the development

1 of the Whistling Ridge Project.

2 CHAIR LUCE: That you. Thank you very much.

3 Kevin Herman.

4 MR. HERMAN: I'm leaving you. I'll come back
5 tomorrow.

6 CHAIR LUCE: Great.

7 MR. HERMAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Steve Andruss.

9 COMMENTS BY STEVE ANDRUSS

10 Good evening. My name is Steve Andruss and I live
11 at 842 Little Rock Creek Road in Bingen, which is on the
12 east end of the county here, and I think there's a lot of
13 experts here that talked tonight.

14 CHAIR LUCE: The spelling of your last name is?

15 MR. ANDRUSS: A-n-d-r-u-s-s.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

17 MR. ANDRUSS: I guess it's just more of sort or a
18 gut feeling I have. I remember -- well, I grew up on the
19 river and my grandfather and great grandfather and everybody
20 said they'd live here forever, and our family has too. But
21 our view of this beautiful place is to preserve it and don't
22 alter it too much because it's a recreational paradise, and
23 I'm really pretty opposed to the wind turbine project as it
24 will affect me every time I go for a walk I'm going to be
25 looking at wind turbines and they're going to be hanging

1 over the valley. And it seems a little bit unfair to me
2 because we just bought this piece of property a couple years
3 with the intent of getting out of town and I have a few
4 friends that come and visit me and when they came they went
5 out around Bickleton and did stuff we always used to do when
6 we were kids. And they came up to me and said, "Well, we
7 live in the city, we come here to appreciate the outdoors,
8 and what's happened to this country out here? It's totally
9 altered."

10 I mean there's these giant towers everywhere and
11 these blinking lights all night, and you see them all day
12 long. And I don't know if you drive down the Gorge at night
13 or not but out east it's like a slurry of lights in the sky
14 at night, and it's aesthetically really not very nice. And
15 so I just think it's kind of a bad idea. I know everybody
16 needs the money and SDS they're nice guys and all that, but
17 I just don't think it's a great idea to put it out in that
18 beautiful part of the country. I guess that's about all.

19 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. I appreciate
20 that.

21 Steve Curley followed by Sally Newell.

22 COMMENTS BY STEVE CURLEY

23 Hi, there.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Hi, there.

25 MR. CURLEY: Thanks for being here. Steve Curly,

1 C-u-r-l-e-y. I live at 10381 Cook-Underwood. When you go
2 to do your tour tomorrow, you go right past my house and
3 take a left on Kollack-Knapp Road and go up the hill. I
4 live less than two miles from this proposed project.

5 It sounds like we're suppose to be afraid because
6 we're going to run out of energy if we don't get this wind
7 turbine project, which to me seems quite ridiculous because
8 we live on the second largest river in the country with a
9 hydroelectric project every 40 to 60 miles as far as they
10 go. There's a coal-fired plant in Boardman. There's a
11 nuclear project up there in Hanford that's been there since
12 the forties. I think we have energy coming out our wazzus.
13 It all goes somewhere else is what happens. I'm all for
14 alternative energy and green energy, and things like that
15 and for teaching people how to conserve energy, which at my
16 house there is not one light on because I shut my lights
17 off. I'm very diligent about shutting everything off when
18 I'm gone.

19 It's interesting how SDS Lumber Company can do
20 pretty much whatever they want to do. Our County
21 Commissioner said something about buffers zones with the
22 Gorge National Scenic Area. Well, you know what? If you
23 drive across the Hood River toll bridge, you look up on
24 Underwood Mountain and there's a big old clearcut up there.
25 You know, if I want to cut one limb off a branch in my yard

1 or if I want to paint my house technically I'm suppose to go
2 jump through some hoops with the Gorge Commission. Now,
3 that's what I'm suppose to do; that's what we're all suppose
4 to do in the Gorge Scenic Area.

5 I'm less than two miles, one to two miles from
6 this project, and the windmills are clearly going to be
7 visible from the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.
8 I didn't make up the rules. I think Mark Hatfield and
9 everybody else who was in power at the time did that stuff
10 and I'm quite happy they did. You know, it's an
11 unbelievable beautiful place where we do live here.

12 It's the wrong place for a wind farm within a few
13 miles of the Columbia National Scenic Area. You can put
14 this farm in Eastern Washington, Bickleton, Maryhill.
15 There's tons of wind farms out there, and it's not bothering
16 anybody out there. This is only good for the SDS Lumber
17 Company. It's a win-win for those guys and it's not good
18 for local residents. I have no idea what's going to happen
19 with my property value, you know. They're going to collect
20 extra taxes from these windmills, yeah, but what happens to
21 my property value if it goes down? I have no idea what's
22 going to happen. I mean that's obviously one of the
23 variables here.

24 If this project wasn't so close to the Columbia
25 Gorge National Scenic Area and it's like a mile or two away,

1 it's right there, I wouldn't have such a problem with it.
2 But you know what? I can't put the wind turbine at my house
3 one or two miles away so why should they be able to? I
4 think they should put it in Eastern Washington. Thank you
5 very much.

6 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

7 Sally.

8 MS. NEWELL: Well, I'll try to scale my comments
9 quite a bit. Others have covered it.

10 CHAIR LUCE: That's okay. You can just say you
11 agree with them. Sally, spell your last name and give us
12 your address.

13 COMMENTS BY SALLY NEWELL

14 I'm Sally Newell, N-e-w-e-l-l for the record. I
15 want to thank you all for travelling down here and I want to
16 particularly thank you for having the hearing in Underwood,
17 Washington tomorrow. I've been asking for that from the
18 git-go, and I'm pleased as punch that you're going to come
19 and actually see the site. And I would encourage you please
20 to be sure and drive the stretch from the mill all the way
21 up to the site because one of my major concerns is the
22 transportation of these things over those roads.

23 We were promised actually at a county commission
24 meeting in Underwood on the record by Jason Spadaro that
25 nothing would have to be condemned in order to accomplish

1 this project and I look at those pictures and I wonder, I
2 really wonder if they're going to have to condemn some
3 property in order to get some of those big trucks of theirs
4 around some of the corners.

5 I guess I was planning to give you some background
6 on myself. I have lived my whole life in the Columbia River
7 Gorge. I was born in the Dalles, Oregon. In my lifetime
8 Celilo Falls was still around. My dad every time company
9 came to town my dad would take us all out to the dam and
10 you'd think he built the thing himself. He was so proud of
11 it. You know, he would talk about all the power that it
12 sent to California and everything. And, you know, at this
13 point I look at all that the people of the Gorge have given
14 and given and given for energy in this country and it's all
15 gone somewhere else. And now we're going to be asked to
16 give some more, just a little bit more.

17 And I love this place passionately and I love the
18 democratic process and I so appreciate that you folks are
19 here and are listening because our county commissioners did
20 not listen. They did not listen to the people of Underwood
21 and they forced the zoning project on the county that the
22 hearing examiner even though they were signing her paycheck
23 she couldn't swallow it. So they're having to go back and
24 do some work on that.

25 I am so ready to roll the dice with EFSEC over

1 Skamania County you cannot believe. I would support what
2 others have said about independent studies. I don't want
3 studies that are being financed by the proponent. I want
4 truly neutral studies of the wildlife and human impacts.
5 But that transportation piece has me very worried. Also I
6 know your chair formally served on the Columbia River Gorge
7 Commission. That's a real small club and I actually belong
8 to that club too.

9 The National Scenic Area is a major concern to me
10 because I think there's a potential for a precedent here.
11 This whole Gorge is windy, and it's windy on both sides of
12 the river, and it wouldn't take a whole lot of the blinking
13 red lights to really trash it. I have to confess I'm very
14 ambivalent about wind energy in general. I like the idea of
15 it and even this project I thought, well, you know, I've
16 seen those things. The first time I heard about it I ran
17 out to Klondike in Wasco and looked at the turbines there
18 and listened to them, and I decided, you know, that wasn't
19 all that bad. And then last summer I had occasion to be in
20 Goldendale all day, a really long day with kids and horses,
21 and I came home at night and that was an eye opener for me.
22 I had never seen those wind farms at night, and it really
23 changed the way I felt about them.

24 So I'm glad you're here and thank you so much for
25 listening and I'll have more to tell you tomorrow in

1 Underwood. I also look forward to seeing you at 10:00 in
2 the morning.

3 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Those who have testified
4 tonight I'm not encouraging people to show up tomorrow and
5 testify unless there's new material that you haven't covered
6 tonight. So we are having two hearings and the purpose of
7 that was to make time available for those who couldn't
8 travel from Underwood and that was what we were told and
9 that's what we believe so I just want to get that on the
10 record that that is something we're going to look at
11 tomorrow.

12 Willemina.

13 MS. NEWELL: For the record, I was told that if I
14 come back that I could testify.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Well, the Chair will rule on that
16 tomorrow, but we don't want repetitive testimony, Sally, and
17 I know you'll appreciate that having been a former member of
18 the Gorge Commission.

19 MR. SLOCKISH: You said the land use issues.

20 CHAIR LUCE: We're going to have a second public
21 meeting comment session like tonight, scoping.

22 MR. SLOCKISH: That was for land. I never
23 addressed the land use.

24 CHAIR LUCE: That's correct, and you'll have a
25 chance to do that tomorrow. The public comment session

1 tomorrow begins at, Allen, 2:30?

2 MR. FIKSDAL: 2:30.

3 CHAIR LUCE: 2:30 and it is intended for those
4 people who could not travel from Underwood or east of
5 Stevenson. If people have already made comments for the
6 record tonight, we are not encouraging people to show up
7 tomorrow and repeat those comments. We will consider
8 everything that everybody said and you can write anything
9 additional that you want to and submit it to us.

10 Willemina.

11 MS. NIOSI: I was the fat lady and I've already
12 sang.

13 CHAIR LUCE: Well, you sang very beautifully. I'm
14 glad my wife didn't get me that card.

15 Scott Hulbert.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But we will be able to speak to
17 it on the land use issues.

18 CHAIR LUCE: Yes, absolutely.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 6:00 or 6:30?

20 CHAIR LUCE: 6:30. So there's two different
21 hearings. One is the public comment which you attended
22 tonight and the second one is land use hearing.

23 Scott Hulbert, welcome.

24 COMMENTS BY SCOTT HULBERT

25 Yes, my name is Scott Hulbert. I live at 742

1 Northwest Lincoln in White Salmon, and in the spirit of full
2 disclosure I don't own property that will be majorly
3 impacted but minorly impact, I mean personally property that
4 will be impacted. I'm mainly here just sort of in the
5 defense of the National Scenic Area.

6 CHAIR LUCE: Just one question, Scott. Is that
7 H-u-l-b-e-r-t?

8 MR. HULBERT: Correct.

9 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

10 MR. HULBERT: So the purpose of I feel like I'm
11 here to sort of help represent some of those other people in
12 the U.S. who are not able to come here and probably have no
13 idea maybe even that a National Scenic Area exists here.

14 I think what really drove me to come here is one
15 evening I was coming down from Goldendale late at night and
16 I was just completely blown away once we approached the
17 Maryhill area and saw the impact that those red lights had
18 on just visually it was amazing the way that they were all
19 synchronized. It wasn't just a random flashing of lights.
20 It was a line of strobe of just flashing in one continuous
21 line, and, you know, I guess I can after learning more about
22 wind power I can accept that out in that area where there's
23 not a lot of people and, you know, there's a need for some
24 green energy. But the thoughts of this occurring occur in
25 our area this National Scenic Area is what drove me here

1 tonight.

2 So I have two main concerns and one comment and I
3 think I'll be finished. I'm going to reiterate this. I
4 think from Hood River and from coming from the Dalles and
5 coming from driving up from Portland at night this is going
6 to be a major distraction, and I drive this road everyday to
7 Portland and back and I know exactly where they're going to
8 be and it's a huge concern for me.

9 My second concern is that key provision of the
10 National Scenic Act is the idea of manmade objects being
11 visually subordinate to the natural resources, especially in
12 these key viewing areas. I don't feel this project would
13 fit that definition.

14 And referring to Section 4 of the application, I
15 really was seeking more information and I didn't feel that
16 the photos were an accurate representation of what impact
17 this will have visually from key viewing areas. The
18 problems I have with the application were that they seemed
19 less than accurate in regards to ratios of height. You
20 know, some of the trees looked like they were not much
21 shorter than these towers. I know they're 400 plus feet
22 tall.

23 The problem I have with the photos again is that
24 it really doesn't show the visual contrast that these
25 windmills will have. They were all, I mean most of the

1 photos were taken in the late to mid afternoon, some of them
2 almost directly into the sun, and there's no visual contrast
3 there. So I really can't get a good grasp on what impact
4 visually this is going to have. So I would ask the Council
5 to take the time to go to these areas that are in these
6 photos.

7 I don't think this requires a major computer
8 analysis. I would love for you to go to these places,
9 either go over out to Rowena Crest and on an afternoon if
10 you look out 30 miles east you'll see the wind farms out
11 there, and, you know, so the bottom line for me here is to
12 ask you to not approve this application. We don't need this
13 type of thing in the National Scenic Area. Thank you.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

15 Stephen Bronsveld. Welcome.

16 COMMENTS BY STEPHEN BRONSVELD

17 Thank you very much. My name is Steven Bronsveld.
18 That's B-r-o-n-s-v-e-l-d.

19 CHAIR LUCE: And Stephen's with a p-h.

20 MR. BRONSVELD: P-h, yes. Thank you very much. I
21 live at 1111 Scoggins Road in Underwood, Washington. My
22 house is about probably two miles from the site because I'm
23 a little further east and you get into Scoggins. And I
24 won't be seeing any of the towers from my house because I
25 look primarily southeast on the south side of Underwood

1 Mountain.

2 I really am grateful that you came here tonight to
3 check this all out and listen to us talk. We've had several
4 meetings about this kind of stuff before, and one thing I
5 wanted to point out to you is that any community -- by the
6 way, I've been here 23 years and I've lived in the area for
7 30 years, and we have a longstanding existing plan for
8 long-term economic stability. It's been in effect for
9 approximately a hundred years. It's been worked on by
10 countless generations of people and it is a longstanding
11 benefit to our community. It's provided jobs, resources,
12 income, and stability for our community for like I said
13 about a hundred years.

14 There has been no mention of this plan in any of
15 these presentations, and there's been no rationale given for
16 abandoning that plan for a new plan. It's very risky. It
17 might have some merit to it, but it is contrary to the
18 existing plan we have now which is based on resources in the
19 higher elevations being collected and transported downhill,
20 how convenient, to processing centers further down by the
21 river where transportation is available. Like I said, it's
22 been working for a long time, and we have a good thing
23 going. Now things are changing and we have need for more
24 income in the county because the diminishing income from
25 other sources, and that's understandable and those are

1 changing circumstances.

2 I have not seen any presentation in all of these
3 things about this that has demonstrated conclusively that
4 the county will make one thin dime net off of this project.
5 In fact, I propose that this project will actually be a
6 money losing proposition for the county when all of the
7 expenses and the diminishing of revenue generated by this
8 thing are calculated completely and looked at thoroughly
9 which haven't been done yet.

10 And we just lived through a time in this country
11 where a lot of math wasn't done very well so I suggest you
12 do the math and we look at these things. The proposal says
13 we'll get 700 and some odd thousand dollars in property tax
14 revenues, but we need to look at the expenses as well. Our
15 local fire call down in Underwood is looking at what kind of
16 facilities and manpower and equipment is going to be
17 necessary for dealing with these new structures that have
18 never been part of our plan before. There is no evolution
19 of any infrastructure or sources that deal with 400-foot
20 tall anything in our community, let alone these huge
21 buildings that they are going to build.

22 The other thing I wanted to mention we have no
23 guarantees about how long these things will be in place, how
24 long they will generate property tax revenues for the
25 county. This is the crux of PSE up in Seattle that's

1 funding the thing, but it's now been purchased by a Canadian
2 concern. So where's the crux of the international monetary
3 exchange rates and tax incentives for these kinds of things
4 which are subject to change with political pressures and
5 fluctuations in markets which may lead to this income stream
6 not being guaranteed in the future? What happens when it's
7 more convenient to take the towers down and move them
8 someplace else for tax benefits elsewhere? We have no
9 guarantees about that, and that's a concern of mine.

10 Like other people mentioned we might have loss of
11 other potential development, commercial event sites. We
12 have a big ordinance, you know, a zoning thing that allows
13 for these commercial event centers, and who's going to build
14 one if they get a bad write-up in a magazine about the area,
15 the scenic impacts? So there are commercial influences like
16 that that could affect the income stream also. And I'm
17 concerned about that because the county needs a project that
18 will make the country money. That's what we need. If it's
19 a money losing operation, we don't need the project. That's
20 digging the hole deeper we're already in. We don't want to
21 do that as a community. That's not good for us
22 economically.

23 I've mentioned some other things in here that I've
24 taken note. I'm concerned where we're going to get the
25 birds. They cover in here it said 1.9 birds killed per

1 tower. So I'm just saying if that's true where do we get
2 the birds? We've only got so many of them in Underwood and
3 I'm concerned. We might have to import from someplace else
4 and my concern is how many. So I'm concerned about that.

5 The county makes money. I'm just looking at my
6 notes here. The noise center. Someone mentioned that. It
7 was very interesting.

8 The other thing that I wanted to talk about was
9 the road access. The map over here shows widening necessary
10 at the intersection of Scoggins and Kollack-Knapp Road. You
11 will go through there on your tour tomorrow. The applicant
12 came to a meeting at Underwood Community Center which was a
13 hearing of the Skamania County Commission and the Underwood
14 Community. That applicant assured us -- I asked about it
15 three separate times, three separate questions -- that this
16 project could be accomplished within the existing rights of
17 way of the existing public roads and thoroughfares that
18 connect the major thoroughfares with this project, and the
19 County Commissioner Jamie Tolfree told us that no
20 transportation plan would be approved that did not meet that
21 standard.

22 Now I'm concerned that the applicant is requesting
23 that this project would require the condemnation of private
24 land to widen this intersection. And if that's the case,
25 that would be contrary to what's been promised and presented

1 to the community, and actually that would be important. The
2 idea that some commercial concern being able to trespass on
3 private property or even take it was assured that it
4 wouldn't happen, and I would think that that would be a deal
5 breaker right there. So they would have to get small towers
6 or something, figure out some way to make the turn and they
7 can do that.

8 So that was the -- oh, one last thing was that,
9 you know, I knew some people that were country club owners
10 in Hood River and the Meredith Motel used to be right there
11 on 84. It's now I think the Intertribal Horse Agency. But
12 their office there is at the Meredith Club. Now the people
13 over there don't talk about that finally when that 20-foot,
14 25-foot tall red neon light up there was shut down for the
15 last time and removed. They talk about when the city passed
16 an ordinance 30 years ago that got it to stop blinking.
17 That's what they talked about. That's when they got their
18 lives back, when the sky, the underside of the clouds quit
19 throbbing with that incessant alarm, that warning signal,
20 that tremulous cadence bringing in the internal mood of
21 sadness as we all grow upset. That's what it is. It's a
22 warning signal to aircraft. So what is that going to do to
23 us who to live in that warning signal? I think that that's
24 something we ought to think about, and we don't need that.
25 And I will be able to see that at my place unfortunately.

1 So I hope you consider all of those things. I'm
2 looking forward to your visit in our little community over
3 there. I hope you have a good time. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you and we will look forward to
5 being in Underwood tomorrow.

6 Is there anyone else present tonight who has not
7 signed who would like to offer testimony tonight?

8 Up all right. Second time. Is there anyone else
9 who wants to offer testimony tonight?

10 MR. SLOCKISH: I would like to make one additional
11 comment.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Yes, sir.

13 MR. SLOCKISH: For the record, the Columbia Gorge
14 Audubon Society has no authorization to speak on any of our
15 own tribal issues. That is our own internal affairs.
16 Celilo Falls died. It's under deep water. We don't like to
17 talk about it. It's dead. We want it to rest in peace. So
18 all of these issues are not authorized by our people to
19 speak on our behalf. That has been done too many times in
20 the past. We speak for ourselves. No one else.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

22 Now --

23 MR. BARKER: I would like to comment.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Is it a response to another comment?

25 MR. BARKER: No.

1 CHAIR LUCE: Oh, sure. Come forward and give us
2 your name, spelling, address. Try to observe the
3 four-minute rule.

4 COMMENTS BY CHARLES BARKER

5 My name is Charles Barker, B-a-r-k-e-r. I live in
6 Mosier, 3375 Vensel Road, and I'd like the EFSEC to consider
7 that renewable energy is only capable in this region up to
8 6,000 megawatts. In other words, we have enough hydro and
9 hydropower in place right now to effectively carry
10 6,000 megawatts of power renewable. After that point we
11 will be saturated and we have to start building more
12 gas-fired turbines. That's by the renewable impacts
13 statement by Bonneville, and I'd like to know what you're
14 going to do now that we are at almost 6,000 just here in the
15 Columbia Basin. The region is Northern California, Oregon,
16 Washington, Idaho, and Montana. That is the region,
17 6,000 megawatts for that region. We are approaching
18 6,000 megawatts in the Columbia Basin.

19 When you get to 6,000 megawatts then we're
20 saturated and we're going to be penetrated with more wind
21 power up to 30,000 megawatts. Every 1,200, every megawatt
22 of renewable energy is required to have a megawatt of backup
23 power provided by gas-fired turbines in this region. So for
24 6,000 megawatts we will be building -- well, let's see.
25 6,000, 1,200, that's five new gas-fired plants right there,

1 and you'll be asked to okay or not okay sometime here very
2 shortly in the future. Then when we go to 30 megawatts
3 renewable, 30,000 megawatts of renewable energy that's going
4 to another 25 more gas-fired power plants to back up the
5 renewables. Have you thought about this? We've asked this
6 question to the EFSEC in Oregon before and they said, "Well,
7 when we get to that threshold, we'll worry about it then."
8 We are at that threshold. You're the same region, you have
9 the same responsibility as the EFSEC in Oregon, Idaho,
10 Montana. It's all one big region.

11 You've got you're approaching the 6,000 megawatts
12 here. I hate to be redundant, but you're going to be in big
13 trouble because you have to build these gas plants. Where
14 are you going to put all these, people, when it comes time
15 to start building all the gas plants and to plug in these
16 units that are already out here and putting them into a new
17 grid? We're going to have to build a whole new grid. It's
18 going to run through the taxpayer, that will be run through
19 the taxpayer. Rates are going to increase astronomically,
20 and on top of all this when we get to the saturation or the
21 penetration point, which is after saturation at 6,000
22 megawatts, up 30,000 at penetration, then all of a sudden
23 natural gas is going to go through the roof. So we're going
24 to be screwed, hard. Thank you.

25 CHAIR LUCE: All right. I appreciate your

1 comments. I think Bonneville probably has a spot in its
2 environmental impact statement or elsewhere, other
3 Bonneville documents that looks at this wind integration
4 issue that you're referring to.

5 MR. BARKER: There is a document that was put out
6 in the beginning and it says that -- actually it says in the
7 very first paragraph that wind energy is totally
8 unsustainable.

9 CHAIR LUCE: I think that's a good issue for
10 Bonneville to wrestle with.

11 MR. BARKER: That was in the very first paragraph.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. That's a good Bonneville
13 issue.

14 So I want to talk briefly about tomorrow. We have
15 a tour commencing at 10:00 a.m., Allen. That would be in
16 Underwood at 10:00 a.m. Where are we going to be in
17 Underwood?

18 MR. FIKSDAL: Underwood Community Center.

19 CHAIR LUCE: So those of you who want to come
20 along on the tour it's tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. at the
21 Underwood Community Center. You're welcome to come. We
22 can't talk to you. We're going to be observers, and you
23 shouldn't as you know talk to us and we'll try to make it
24 possible for everyone who wants to come.

25 Then tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 we're going to

1 have -- I want to be clear about this -- another public
2 comment session for the benefit of those people who could
3 not travel from Underwood down here tonight.

4 MR. FIKSDAL: About the tour tomorrow?

5 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

6 MR. FIKSDAL: I want to remind people that we are
7 not providing transportation for anybody that would come on
8 the tour, and we've been warned that you probably need a
9 four-wheel drive vehicle because of the wet weather and the
10 dirt roads. So be aware that the roads aren't in great
11 condition I've been informed so you have to take that into
12 consideration if you want to go along on the tour.

13 CHAIR LUCE: So 2:30 the public comment session
14 for people who were not able to come here tonight. 6:30 we
15 will have a land use hearing. I'm just going to say
16 something very briefly about the land use hearing. It's
17 required as part of our process, and I'll just read from the
18 WAC.

19 At the commencement of the public land use hearing
20 the Council shall explain the purpose of the hearing to
21 determine whether at the time of the application the
22 proposed facility was consistent and in compliance with land
23 use and zoning ordinances. So that's the issue. There is
24 also a procedure to be followed where certificates affirming
25 consistency with land use are offered and the WAC provides

1 that the rule -- I'm just reading the rule -- contemplates
2 that applicants will enter as exhibits at the land use
3 hearing certificates from local authorities attesting to the
4 fact that the proposal is consistent and in compliance with
5 zoning plans and zoning ordinances. If that's done, then
6 such certificates are prima facie evidence on their face
7 proof of consistency and compliance.

8 So what we're going to be looking for tomorrow is
9 to find out if there's anything from the county that offers
10 consistency with land use, and other people who want to
11 comment on the land use will have an opportunity to do so.
12 And we will not make a decision tomorrow on land use, but we
13 will consider all of the comments, hopefully anything that
14 local authorities want to offer, and we will take the matter
15 under advisement.

16 So don't expect a land use consistency decision
17 tomorrow, but you should expect the right to comment on that
18 issue.

19 So thank you very much. Is there anything else
20 now?

21 All right. We're adjourned.

22 * * * * *

23 (Public comment meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.)

24

25

I N D E X

		PAGE
1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	
3	PAUL PEARCE	21
4	SIMON SAMPSON	26
5	WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR.	28
6	JOHNNY JACKSON	30
7	DAN RAWLEY	35
8	TOM ROUSSEAU	38
9	PEGGY BRYAN	40
10	BOB WITTENBERG	43
11	SCOTT PINEO	47
12	PETER CORNELISON	49
13	RAYMOND PERKINS	50
14	ANN LEUDERS	52
15	MARY REPAR	55
16	KATE McCARTHY	59
17	TERESA ROBBINS	61
18	SALLIE TUCKER JONES	68
19	PAUL SMITH	71
20	DON MORBY	76
21	JILL BARKER	78
22	JOHN CRUMPACKER	83
23	GARY COLLINS	99
24	WALT LOEHRKE	100
25	JIM HUTCHISON	102

I N D E X

1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	PAGE
3	LEANNE HAIGHT	105
4	STEVE ANDRUSS	107
5	STEVE CURLEY	108
6	SALLY NEWELL	111
7	SCOTT HULBERT	115
8	STEPHEN BRONSVELD	118
9	CHARLES BARKER	125
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 In re: Whistling Ridge Energy Project

2

3

4

5

6

7

A F F I D A V I T

8

9

I, Shaun Linse, CCR, do hereby certify that the
foregoing transcript prepared under my direction is a
full and complete transcript of proceedings held on
May 6, 2009, in Stevenson, Washington.

10

11

12

13

14

15

Shaun Linse, CCR 2029

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25