

Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project Scoping Summary

Prepared for:

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
925 Plum Street SE, Building 4
Third Floor
P.O. Box 43172
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Prepared by:

Shapiro and Associates, Inc.
101 Yesler Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98104

April 17, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. PROPOSED PROJECT	1
2. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	1
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/SCOPING	1
4. SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS AND TRANSCRIPTS	2
4.1 Project Description	2
4.2 Earth Resources.....	3
4.3 Plants and Animals	4
4.4 Water Resources.....	5
4.5 Health and Safety	6
4.6 Energy and Natural Resources.....	9
4.7 Land Use	9
4.8 Socioeconomics.....	10
4.9 Cultural Resources.....	12
4.10 Aesthetics/Light and Glare	12
4.11 Recreation.....	13
4.12 Traffic and Transportation.....	14
4.13 Air Quality	15
4.14 Noise	15
4.15 Public Services and Utilities	16
4.16 Cumulative Impacts.....	17
4.17 Alternatives.....	17
4.18 Decommission Process and Project Abandonment	19
4.19 Mitigation Measures.....	19
4.20 EIS Scope, Content, and Process.....	20
5. LIST OF SCOPING COMMENT LETTERS AND TESTIMONY RECEIVED	20
5.1 Written Comments (In Order of Comments Received)	20
5.2 Oral Comments (In Alphabetical Order).....	23
6. HOW THESE COMMENTS WILL BE USED	24

1. PROPOSED PROJECT

On January 13, 2003, Zilkha Renewable Energy LLC (Zilkha) through Sagebrush Power Partners LLC, its wholly owned subsidiary, submitted an Application for Site Certification (ASC) to the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to construct and operate an alternative energy facility, as defined in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50.020(17), consisting of up to 121 wind turbine generators with a total nameplate capacity of approximately 181.5 megawatts (MW). Associated with the proposed wind power project will be approximately 19 miles of new roads and improvements to roughly 7 miles of existing roads, approximately 23 miles of underground and 2 miles of overhead 34.5-kilovolt (kV) electrical power lines, a new substation(s), an approximately 5,000-square-foot operations and maintenance facility, and four permanent meteorological towers. The proposed project will occupy approximately 90 acres of land and will be located on open ridgetops on each side of U.S. Highway 97 in Kittitas County, roughly halfway between Ellensburg and Cle Elum.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

EFSEC is the lead agency under Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-11-938, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), for the environmental review of Zilkha's proposed wind power project. EFSEC will prepare a SEPA environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/SCOPING

When siting a new energy facility, EFSEC is required to hold a public information meeting in the county of the project's proposed location. Under SEPA, EFSEC is also required to conduct scoping pursuant to WAC 463-47-090. To meet both of these requirements, EFSEC hosted two scoping meetings on March 12, 2003—an agency scoping meeting and a public scoping meeting. The agency meeting was held at 10 a.m. at the Home Arts Building at the Kittitas County Fairgrounds in Ellensburg, Washington. Attendees at this meeting included representatives from the following agencies:

- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
- Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED)
- Washington State Attorney General's Office - Counsel for the Environment
- Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of Agriculture - National Forest Service
- Kittitas County Community Development Services

The public information and scoping meeting was also held at the Home Arts Building later that evening from 6:30 to 9 p.m. At both meetings, Zilkha presented a description of the project, reasons why the proposed location was selected, and a summary of anticipated environmental, social, and economic impacts. EFSEC staff described the state's siting process, which was

followed by a short presentation by Michael Lufkin, Counsel for the Environment, a Washington State Assistant Attorney General who represents the citizens of Washington State before EFSEC.

Agency and public comments were recorded during the meetings and are compiled in this summary report along with written comments submitted on forms provided at the meetings or by e-mail, fax, and letter. Comments are grouped by general topic and divided into subtopics, as appropriate. Approximately 25 people attended the agency meeting and approximately 150 people attended the public scoping meeting. Written public comments were received until March 14, 2003.

A summary of oral and written comments received from the agencies and the public through the end of the public comment period is provided below. For each comment, a source is provided that identifies a specific comment letter or comment card by number and/or a specific meeting (agency or public) where the comment was made. A key to the public scoping letters is presented at the end of the report.

Italicized comments preceded by the number one (1) represent substantive scoping comments that have not been addressed by the Applicant in the ASC and were not previously identified in Shapiro and Associates, Inc.'s March 21, 2003 Initial Completeness Report (ICR). These comments may require further input or response from the Applicant for preparation of the Draft EIS.

4. SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS AND TRANSCRIPTS

4.1 Project Description

Backup Facilities

- Provide technical details about the capacity factor of the project turbines and provide details about how or where firming power would be obtained and at what cost (Scoping Comments 75 and 83).

Setbacks

- Turbines should be placed a safe distance from property lines and wildlife habitats, at least 1 to 2 miles (Scoping Comment 7).
- Suggested project setbacks would be 1,500 feet from property lines, private roads, and wells, and at least 2,000 feet from residences (Scoping Comment 20, Public Scoping Comments).
- The minimum setback distance should be 1,500 to 2,000 feet from property lines and at least one-half mile from residences (Scoping Comments 33 and 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- No single turbine should be sited closer than 1,000 feet away from an adjacent, non-participating owner's property line, public or private road, or public pathway, or closer than 1,500 feet from an existing residence (Scoping Comment 49).
- Setbacks should be at least 1,500 feet from private roads and homes (Scoping Comment 52).
- Address project setbacks from homes, BPA lines, and Kittitas County road rights-of-way and provide a clear rationale for proposed setbacks (Scoping Comment 58).

- Identify a larger setback for the proposed structures from the project perimeter (Scoping Comment 82).
- Describe how close the turbines would be to the existing transmission lines (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Future Activities

- If more towers are proposed at a later date in the project area, explain whether the Applicant would have to apply for approval again or if the new towers would be allowed through the current permitting process (Scoping Comments 88 and 94). Explain if EFSEC would have any authority regarding the total number of turbines allowed on the site (Scoping Comment 88).

Miscellaneous

- Identify how construction would proceed and how permanent structures would be placed to minimize impacts (Scoping Comment 12).
- Describe how existing infrastructure can be used to minimize new transmission lines and substations (Scoping Comment 12).
- Adopt an adaptive management framework for the project to expedite the process of making changes to the project in the future when and if a particular practice (e.g., specific turbine placement) is shown to have a detrimental impact (Scoping Comment 18).
- Discuss if the project generates sufficient power to meet the RCW 80.50 mandate (Scoping Comment 35).
- *(1) Describe the maximum number of wind turbines that can be constructed within the proposed project boundary (Scoping Comment 38).*
- *(1) If the turbines require replacement before the end of their expected service life, explain if they would be replaced by taller towers (This happened to previous wind power projects in California.) (Scoping Comment 94).*
- *(1) Using a map with a smaller scale, specifically identify where underground and overhead transmission lines would be built (Scoping Comment 72).*

4.2 Earth Resources

- Study the impacts of the project on soils, in both the buildout and reclamation phases of development. Required mitigation for impacts should involve preparation and implementation of a restoration plan, whose costs would be bonded to or deposited with the state prior to project approval (Scoping Comment 16).
- Address potential impacts on proposed facilities caused by earthquakes and describe to what standards proposed structures would be built (Scoping Comment 99).
- Address the potential for slope instability along the ridgelines where the turbines would be sited (Public Hearing Comments).

4.3 Plants and Animals

General

- Provide a complete biological assessment (Scoping Comment 12).
- Identify sensitive environmental and ecologically significant areas located within 5 miles of the project site including, but not limited to, the habitats and migratory paths of any known fish, bird, wildlife, or plant species, and independently study each area to assess potential project impacts (Scoping Comment 16).
- Prepare thorough and competent studies evaluating the project's impact on wildlife and on migratory bird species (Scoping Comment 16).
- (1) Conduct a more thorough study on the following species (Scoping Comment 20, Public Scoping Comments):
 - Endangered or threatened birds, including *American bittern*, common nighthawk, loggerhead shrike, Lewis' woodpecker, and *grasshopper sparrow*;
 - Endangered or threatened plants, including *mariposa lily*, golden corydalis, bristle flowered colomia, and gray crypthantha;
 - Reptiles such as *blue tailed skink* and rubber boa; and
 - Bats (several seen, but species unknown).
- Study how the project would disrupt local animal habitat and affect local plant life (Scoping Comment 63).
- Describe impacts on streams and fish (Scoping Comment 63).
- Analyze the direct loss of wildlife habitat due to project construction and facility siting (Scoping Comment 77).
- Analyze the direct loss of wildlife from project operations (e.g., direct bird and bat mortality) (Scoping Comment 77).
- Analyze the indirect impacts on wildlife habitat from project operations (e.g., through spread of noxious weeds and increased risk of wildfires) (Scoping Comment 77).
- Analyze the indirect impacts on wildlife from project operations (e.g., disturbance to wintering deer and elk from facility maintenance) (Scoping Comment 77).
- Describe how the proposed mitigation site would be managed (Scoping Comment 77).
- Determine if wildlife would be disturbed and would leave the area, thus upsetting the chain of life needed to balance the environment, including both endangered species and common ones such as deer, raccoon, coyote, and skunk (Scoping Comment 85).
- Disclose the project's impacts on species (both resident and migratory) that presently use the project area along with direct and indirect impacts on neighboring habitat (Scoping Comment 95).
- Mitigate the loss of animals killed as a result of the proposed turbines by providing additional nesting locations for resident species and additional roosting and feeding sites for migratory species (Scoping Comment 99).
- Explain why the project is so close to areas of biological abundance and diversity (Scoping Comment 100).
- Explain how the Applicant would provide forage and habitat for wildlife displaced by new roads, structures, and trenching (Scoping Comment 100).

- The Applicant proposes to reseed affected areas; note that this will not prevent invasive plants such as cheatgrass and knapweed from taking hold (Public Hearing Comments).
- Define who would be responsible for consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for this project (EFSEC or the Applicant), and whether consultation is in fact required (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Birds and Bats

- Define the avian protections built into the design of the project and equipment (Scoping Comment 12).
- Conduct a two-year study to monitor baseline bird and bat populations in the project siting area. The study should span all seasons and be carried out both at night and during the day. Studies should be designed by, and subsequent reports reviewed and approved by, the WDFW following standard scientific protocols. If the EIS includes a site-ranking process that shows areas of low bird density or little use or areas where serious detrimental impacts are unlikely, requirements of this study could be reduced or waived (Scoping Comments 18, 33, 63, 71, 87, 88, 90, 97, and 99, Public Hearing Comments).
- The project could create a serious health threat to individuals if raptors, whose population may decline if killed by the wind turbines, cease to control rodent populations that can carry diseases such as the hanta virus (Scoping Comment 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- The project towers should be fitted with devices that repel bats (Scoping Comment 88).
- The Applicant proposes to remove cow carcasses from the project area to prevent raptor deaths; note that raptors are attracted to not only cow carcasses but also to cow afterbirth left behind in the project area (Public Hearing Comments).
- Evaluate the long-term viability of raptor populations in the project area (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Big Game

- Evaluate the ability of WDFW to manage deer and elk if public hunting is precluded in and around the project area (Scoping Comment 77).
- Conduct sufficient studies, and possibly a pilot test turbine, to determine if the project would adversely affect big game such as elk and mule deer (Scoping Comment 97).

4.4 Water Resources

- *(1) Include drawings and calculations in development of the Storm Water Prevention Plan (Scoping Comment 72).*
- Discuss whether turbine vibration would affect local groundwater wells, and mitigate for the problem (Scoping Comment 99).
- Study the potential for the project to cause erosion in the area (Scoping Comments 63 and 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- Demonstrate why it is necessary to build the project in an area with high seasonal runoff and existing silt and erosion problems (Scoping Comment 100).
- The project would require fuel transport to operate diesel-fueled generators required when the wind turbines aren't operating; address how this equipment would increase the potential

for contamination (e.g., fuel spills) that could affect local aquifers (Public Hearing Comments).

4.5 Health and Safety

General

- Demonstrate how the project would provide adequate safeguards between proposed facilities and existing habitation and land use (Scoping Comment 100).
- Require participating landowners to fence off their property from the public (Scoping Comment 49).

Vandals

- *(1) Discuss the impact on wind generators caused by vandals shooting insulators on the towers and address how resilient the proposed facilities are to this type of vandalism (Scoping Comment 95).*

Electromagnetic Radiation

- Study the potential for electromagnetic radiation created by the project to result in adverse health effects such as increased cancer risk (Scoping Comments 62 and 63). Discuss whether turbines produce electric and magnetic fields (Scoping Comment 59).

Dust

- *(1) Address health hazards to humans, livestock, and wildlife caused by increased turbulence and circulation of dust and pollen in the air (Scoping Comments 50 and 85).*

Ice Throw

- Address the potential for ice to form on turbine blades and subsequently be thrown off, endangering both humans and animals (Scoping Comments 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 16, 32, 33, 49, 50, 52, 59, 63, 71, 90, and 98, Public Hearing Comments). Determine what setbacks are required for safety (Scoping Comment 63). Recommended setback distance from property lines and traveled roads (public or private) is at least 1,500 feet (Scoping Comment 1).

Tower Collapse

- Address potential dangers and impacts associated with a broken, falling, or collapsed turbine tower caused by high/gusting winds or other sources such as poor tower or foundation design (Scoping Comments 7, 8, 16, 33, 49, 52, 58, 63, and 71, Public Hearing Comments). Determine what setbacks are required for safety (Scoping Comment 63). Describe proposed emergency response plans to address such dangers (Scoping Comment 58).

Blade Throw

- Address the potential safety impacts associated with broken and thrown turbine blades caused by high/gusting winds or other sources (Scoping Comments 8, 16, 33, 49, 52, 59, 63, 67, 71, 90, and 98, Public Hearing Comments). Determine what setbacks are required for safety (Scoping Comment 63).

Shadow Flicker

- Address the project's strobing effect (shadow flicker) at sunrise and sunset caused by long shadows from rapidly turning blades and assess how it would affect humans and perhaps livestock and wildlife (i.e., potential health hazards such as vertigo) (Scoping Comments 3, 7, 9, 20, 33, 49, 52, 57, 58, 59, 63, 71, 86, and 97, Public Hearing Comments).
- Produce a scientific or statistical study proving that the flicker effect from blade rotation causes health concerns such as disorientation (Scoping Comment 11).
- Provide an industry-published simulation of the range of shadow flicker (Scoping Comment 49). Use wind development software to predict and model the shadow-flicker effect on adjacent properties by using the sun azimuth and elevations of turbines and surrounding properties (Scoping Comment 97).

Light Flicker

- *(1) Address the possible health problems caused by light flicker (Scoping Comment 62). The view of strobe lights or of a red glow all night long is expected to affect migraine sufferers (Scoping Comment 91).*

Noise

- *(1) Address the potential health effects (to humans, livestock, and wildlife) resulting from continuous exposure to low frequency thumping noise made when blades pass the tower (Scoping Comments 49, 62, 63, 71, and 85, Public Hearing Comments); determine what setbacks are required to ensure residents and livestock are not affected (Scoping Comment 63).*

Fire

- Address the safety impacts attributable to the increased risk of fires being started in the project area, particularly given dry summer conditions and consistently high winds in and around the project area. Fire can be caused by construction activities, mechanical breakdown (e.g., loss of a blade), electrical breakdown, carelessness, or lightning strikes (Scoping Comments 1, 7, 8, 16, 20, 32, 33, 49, 50, 52, 63, 71, 85, and 90, Public Hearing Comments).
- Firebreaks are not a sufficient deterrent to wind-driven fire prevention or control. Make the Applicant either build and staff a fire department district or supply funds to allow Kittitas County to build a new "wind farm fire district" (Scoping Comment 49).
- *(1) Discuss if other recent wind farms in the Northwest have caused fire problems (Scoping Comment 54).*

- Discuss whether the turbines have lightning protection built into them and explain if this is considered a lightning prone area (Scoping Comment 54).
- *(1) Determine what setbacks from forested areas are required for safety and what else can mitigate increased fire risk (Scoping Comment 63).*
- Describe who would be responsible for responding to fires in areas not served by a fire district (Scoping Comment 85).
- Explain whether the Applicant would carry liability insurance to cover potential fire hazards the project may create (Scoping Comment 85).
- County fire prevention requirements for the project to be implemented during project construction include (Scoping Comment 14):
 - Contracting with the closest fire district for fire suppression services at all sites, whether in the fire district or not;
 - Noting that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is not equipped or trained for anything other than wildland fires;
 - Agreeing to terms for training, equipment, and expertise with the Ellensburg Fire Department (Emergency Medical Service provider) to allow for safe rescue in an emergency at the project site;
 - Establishing an address plan to allow emergency responders to find emergency sites without delay;
 - Complying with equipment rules and regulations required by DNR for work conducted in wildland/forested lands (e.g., fire extinguishers and shovels will be required on each piece of equipment);
 - Establishing designated smoking areas for workers;
 - Limiting parking areas for vehicles;
 - Establishing water supplies for fire fighting;
 - Providing garbage containers;
 - Implementing restrictions on burning;
 - Properly storing flammable liquids; and
 - Instituting a fire prevention program for workers.
- County fire prevention requirements for the project to be implemented during project operation involve an agreement with the closest fire district to provide fire suppression on sites not located within a fire district (Scoping Comment 14).
- Address fire prevention measures to be taken during project construction (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Telecommunication Interference

- Describe how the project would interfere with communication systems, including cell phones, radios, and televisions in the project area (Scoping Comments 7, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 58, 59, 63, 71, 90, 97, and 99, Public Hearing Comments) and evaluate whether cell phone interference could pose a risk to residents or recreation users in the area who rely on them during an emergency (Scoping Comment 97).
- The wind turbines should comply with the Code of Federal Regulations pertaining to radio frequency interference (Scoping Comment 39, Public Hearing Comments).

- The Applicant should be required to resolve any degradation of local telephone service, television reception, or ham radio reception up to and including removal of offending equipment (Scoping Comment 49).
- If the project disrupts microwave telecommunications systems, the Applicant should be required to implement mitigation measures imposed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) (Scoping Comment 97).
- The Applicant must mitigate potential project effects on cell phone service by providing for a cellular connection that would not be affected by the turbines (Scoping Comment 99).

4.6 Energy and Natural Resources

- Consider the baseline environmental impacts of energy production in the Northwest, the broader benefits of renewable energy, and what types of impacts renewable resources help to avoid (e.g., health and environmental impacts) (Scoping Comment 12, Public Hearing Comments).
- Explore the positive effect this project would have on the energy needs of Kittitas County and the state (Scoping Comment 83).

4.7 Land Use

Land Use Compatibility

- Study the potential for the project to conflict with adjacent land uses, particularly if the project occurs near existing or planned residential or commercial development and is in or around sensitive environmental and ecologically significant areas (Scoping Comment 16).
- Describe how the location of the proposed turbines can affect future plans for adjacent landowners to develop neighboring properties (Scoping Comment 33, Public Hearing Comments).
- *(1) Reassess the geographic radius of the land use survey and consider using a distance greater than 1 mile (Scoping Comment 97).*
- Demonstrate why it is necessary to displace people in an area supporting diverse activities that are incompatible with wind generation (Scoping Comment 100).

Relationship to Plans and Policies

- Address consistency between the project application and local (Kittitas County) land use regulations (Scoping Comment 58).
- The application states that the County does not anticipate zoning changes in the project area; note that a zoning change would be necessary at the project site prior to any wind farms being placed within the county (Scoping Comment 58).
- The application states that the County's comprehensive plan does not contain policies specifically related to wind power projects. Note that placing a "wind farm" without a land use designation change from Rural to Wind Farm Resource Overlay District would violate the County zoning code and comprehensive plan, as well as the Growth Management Act (GMA) and RCW 80.50 (Scoping Comment 58).

- Identify and discuss the project's relationship to existing land use plans (Scoping Comment 76).
- *(1) Consider the relationship of the proposed project within the context of the GMA, including the siting criteria associated with the GMA (Scoping Comments 76 and 90, Public Hearing Comments).*

4.8 Socioeconomics

General

- Address the project's economic impacts and benefits (Scoping Comments 12 and 83, Public Hearing Comments).
- *(1) Address impacts on Kittitas County if out-of-area contractors build the project; this could have a negative impact on local public services (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).*
- *(1) Address the impacts if the majority of construction work is performed by local contractors and local craftsmen (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).*
- *(1) Explain if the developer and County Commissioners would provide assurances that local craftsmen would perform the majority of construction work (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).*
- *(1) Explain if the developer would require that construction workers be paid prevailing wages set by the state for Kittitas County (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).*
- *(1) Explain if the developer and County Commissioners would require that state-approved training be made available to local residents (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).*
- Calculate the lifetime economic contribution in terms of jobs, services, taxes, etc. of four people who would not move to Kittitas County if the project were built versus the contribution of one wind tower (Scoping Comment 43).
- Prepare a socioeconomic impact study with particular attention and analysis of project impacts on adjoining property values, housing, and related adverse impacts (Scoping Comment 76).
- *(1) The community has made a commitment to recreation as an economic development component. As part of the economic analysis, assess the environmental or economic impacts associated with tourism and scenic corridors (Public Scoping Comments).*
- Provide evidence of economic benefits from other wind farms (Scoping Comment 79).
- Consider the positive environmental benefits and economic impacts the project would bring to the County (Scoping Comment 89, Public Hearing Comments).
- Conduct an independent economic impact study (Scoping Comments 33, 71, and 97, Public Hearing Comments).
- Analyze the actual benefit to Kittitas County compared with the projected income to out-of-state developers, out-of-county contractors, and out-of-county landowners, as well as how much public money would be applied to the project over the next five years (Scoping Comment 97).

- The Applicant's study showed substantial economic benefits to the County; explain if this would be a factor in considering the application (Scoping Comments 79 and 102, Public Scoping Comments).

Property Values

- Include information on the probability and amount of change expected to local property values affected by the project (Scoping Comments 38 and 58).
- Provide verifiable data to support the claim that land values would plummet when the project is constructed (Scoping Comment 11).
- Aesthetic values must be considered in an economic analysis; aesthetics and viewsheds affect property values (Scoping Comment 41).
- Only tax assessors were interviewed for the property value study; also interview real estate brokers and bankers as part of this study (Scoping Comment 59).
- For a more realistic assessment of potential project impacts on property values, conduct an analysis of properties surrounding the proposed site and incorporate elements of contingent valuation to provide a baseline for potential mitigation procedures (Scoping Comment 75).
- *(1) Address mitigation for lowered property values (Scoping Comments 75 and 99).*
- Explain why a decline in property values of up to 10% does not constitute a negative impact (Scoping Comment 75).

Tax Revenues

- *(1) Describe how a compatible commercial use would be taxed on land currently designated as open range. Describe if project area lands would be reclassified to reflect the new commercial use and discuss if the tax base would increase and if any increased tax revenues would stay in the area (Scoping Comment 31).*
- *(1) Address impacts on revenue to Kittitas County and explain if reduced revenue can ever be recouped and if so how long it would take (Scoping Comment 38).*
- *(1) Explain if property taxes would go down if the project is built under Initiative 747 (Scoping Comments 79 and 102, Public Scoping Comments). Obtain a ruling regarding the status of Initiative 747 and provide accurate tax revenue projections in the EIS (Scoping Comment 75).*

Project Costs

- Provide details on the terms of the Applicant's long-term power-purchase agreement (Scoping Comment 75). Identify the proposed buyer(s) of the project's generated electricity and discuss if there is a signed agreement (Scoping Comment 90).
- Based on project information and current rate information from BPA and Puget Sound Energy (and others, if applicable), calculate the delivered price of electricity from the project. Describe the projected net monetary benefit to Kittitas Valley and the state (Scoping Comment 75).

Social Impacts/Quality of Life

- Include a social impact assessment addressing social (qualitative) issues in conjunction with quantitative ones. Specific topics to address include the way people feel about the natural environment in which they live and its importance to their identity and the identity of their community, as well as the change of venue for siting the project from the County to EFSEC (Scoping Comment 75).

4.9 Cultural Resources

- Consult with the Yakama Tribe regarding the Applicant's historic property survey to determine the Tribe's views on its adequacy.

4.10 Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Aesthetics

- For significant impacts on scenic resources, the County should impose scenic setbacks as mitigation. Any view of a wind farm or commercial wind energy facility from a state highway or county road should constitute a scenic impact requiring a scenic setback (Scoping Comment 16).
- U.S. Highway 97 should be classified as a scenic highway. Suggest a minimum setback of 1 mile from U.S. Highway 97 to protect this scenic corridor (Scoping Comments 20, 52, and 71, Public Scoping Comments).
- Describe how the Applicant would mitigate impacts on neighboring landowners whose views would be obstructed by the project facilities (Scoping Comment 34).
- Address the need to set wind farm siting standards to protect scenic values and vistas (Scoping Comment 36, Public Scoping Comments).
- The wind turbines should be clustered together, away from rural residents, to present an asymmetrical appearance (Scoping Comments 47 and 95).
- Address the project's impact on the viewshed from U.S. Highway 97 and State Highway 10 (Scoping Comments 50 and 52).
- *(1) Describe the project's visual impacts on properties east of the project area along Reecer Creek and Upper Green Canyon Roads. There does not appear to be a visual barrier preventing visual impacts (Scoping Comments 56 and 97).*
- Consider what setbacks are appropriate to protect the project area's viewshed (Scoping Comment 63).
- Address the project's visual impact on users of the National Forest system lands located approximately 0.25 to 0.5-mile from the nearest proposed project boundary and possibly other impacts (Scoping Comment 95).
- Disclose the coloration requirements of the proposed towers; towers should be darker, light-absorbing earth tones (Scoping Comment 95).
- Design the maintenance facilities and substation in a rural American construction style (e.g., to resemble traditional barns in the area) to complement the immediate surrounding landscape (Scoping Comment 95).
- The project would entirely change the visual character of the area; undertake further assessment of the project's visual impacts (Scoping Comment 97).

- (1) Provide views from where actual residents would be viewing the project every day, not from various roadside locations (Scoping Comment 97).
- (1) Correct the photosimulations so that they do not overemphasize the foreground while de-emphasizing the background objects (due to use of a wide-angle lens) and so they present an accurate representation of the proposed turbines (Scoping Comment 97).
- (1) The project's potential level of visual impact from Bettas Road is identified as "moderate." Describe the visual impact from an elevation 1,000 feet above Bettas Road, where all the turbine strings would be visible (Scoping Comment 99, Public Hearing Comments).
- Include the viewshed as an important part of the environment (Scoping Comment 103).
- (1) Take into consideration how the project's visual impacts might be affected by seasonal variations such as the presence of snow or different types of seasonal vegetation (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).
- Include height comparisons of the project to existing structures such as the BPA transmission lines illustrated in a side-by-side example (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Light and Glare

- (1) Describe how the Applicant would compensate for lost sleep and loss of enjoyment of property caused by strobe lights. Offer mitigation options for this impact. Describe methods to mitigate for light pollution at residences that do not have window coverings. Discuss whether other types of visual barriers could be installed (Scoping Comments 34 and 97).
- Address environmental impacts attributable to proposed flashing lights on the wind turbine towers (Scoping Comment 50, 52, 59, 71, 76, 82, 86, 90, 91, and 97, Public Hearing Comments).
- (1) Study how to shield the effects of the tower lights, particularly the strobing effects, from the ground near the structures (e.g., within 1 mile) (Scoping Comment 82).
- Keep all lighting to a minimum and directed downward to minimize light pollution; use lights that generate the least amount of offsite light transmission (Scoping Comment 95).
- Use non-glare and non-reflective materials (Scoping Comment 95).
- Reference the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) permits granted for this project when considering its visual impacts (Scoping Comment 103).
- Address the requirements for nighttime lighting of the turbines and describe impacts; sky glow is a major concern to local residents. Explain the FAA's lighting requirements for safety and the operational requirements for this type of project. Describe how the substation and operations and maintenance facility would be lighted (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

4.11 Recreation

- Describe recreational properties affected by construction and operation of the facility (not just recreational facilities) (Scoping Comment 33, Public Hearing Comments).
- Identify the proposed radius where firearms discharge would be prohibited (i.e., hunting) around the proposed facilities; recommend using a "line of sight" standard for high-powered rifles (Scoping Comment 43).
- Address project effects on recreation (Scoping Comment 58).

- Disclose the potential to displace current public recreation uses such as hunting at the project site and identify impacts on areas that would absorb this displaced use (Scoping Comment 94).
- *(1) Describe what percentage of the turbines would be placed on DNR land and address what the project's impacts would be to existing recreational and commercial uses of DNR lands (e.g., grazing, hunting) (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).*
- *(1) Describe how access restrictions onto DNR lands would be implemented (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).*

4.12 Traffic and Transportation

General

- A portion of U.S. Highway 97 is scheduled for pavement restoration in February 2004 (Scoping Comment 6).
- Explore impacts of tourism on county roads, specifically Hayward Hill Road and Bettas Road (Scoping Comment 72). Address how tourism-generated traffic could affect local traffic patterns and road safety (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).
- Address transportation impacts along State Route 10 (Scoping Comment 72).
- Describe the Transportation Management Plan (Scoping Comment 72).
- Analyze the project's impact on State Route 970 from Cle Elum to the junction of U.S. Highway 97 if this road is to be used as a project transport route (Scoping Comment 74).
- There is a vertical height restriction on I-90 at Exit 62; loads over legal height must exit at the eastbound ramp and reenter via the eastbound on-ramp (Scoping Comment 74).
- U.S. Highway 97, north of I-90, is classified as an "Urban-Principal Arterial" (Scoping Comment 74).
- WSDOT does not foresee a need for a lane closure on U.S. Highway 97; traffic control requests affecting state highways are required to be coordinated and approved by WSDOT's regional traffic engineer (Scoping Comment 74).

Access

- Access to the project's operation and maintenance facility would be required from Bettas Road; no direct access to U.S. Highway 97 would be allowed (Scoping Comment 6).
- The Applicant is encouraged to use county roads to access the project site (Scoping Comment 6).
- Use of existing private approaches would likely require improvements to access connections (Scoping Comment 6).
- Address how emergency access would be provided on Hayward Hill Road (Scoping Comment 72).
- Address the project's impacts on access along U.S. Highway 97, State Highway 10, Bettas Road, and Hayward Hill Road (Scoping Comment 72).
- Prepare traffic studies at project access points and address the impact from resident, project maintenance and construction, and tourism traffic (Scoping Comment 72).

- *(1) Describe future uses of maintenance roads and determine if they can be used as residential access routes through the leased property (Scoping Comment 72).*
- *(1) Address the project's impacts on maintenance of roads that are currently closed for the winter (Scoping Comment 72).*
- Consider accident data in the transportation analysis (Scoping Comment 72).
- Disclose if project site access would come from State Route 970 via Hidden Valley Road or from Hayward Road (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).
- *(1) Describe how site access would be provided onto access roads that are locked and gated and how access would be coordinated with existing residents who use these roads (Agency Scoping Meeting Comment).*
- *(1) Provide detailed site maps and describe the system to be used to provide access into the project site in cases of emergency response (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).*

Permits

- Crossing permits are required for highway utility crossings, and no open cutting of the highway(s) (e.g., U.S. Highway 97 or State Highway 10) would be permitted (Scoping Comment 6).
- Loads transported on WSDOT rights-of-way must be within the legal size and load limits or have a valid oversize and/or overweight permit (Scoping Comment 6).

Traffic Safety

- Address how ice-throw impacts can affect transportation safety (Scoping Comment 72).
- The project would increase the danger of passing vehicles at the intersection of Bettas Road and U.S. Highway 97; make the Applicant pay for a left-hand turn lane to access Bettas Road from U.S. Highway 97 (Scoping Comment 99, Public Scoping Comments).
- Make sure that roadway access/safety is not compromised by the project (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

Air Traffic

- Prepare air space studies and describe the project's impact on current and proposed approaches and departures for public and private airfields in the county (Scoping Comment 72).
- Include copies of previously completed aeronautical studies from October 2002 (Scoping Comment 72).
- Address impacts on air traffic communications (Scoping Comment 72)

4.13 Air Quality

- Describe how much air pollution would be generated by diesel generators when the wind does not blow (Scoping Comments 5 and 71, Public Hearing Comments).

4.14 Noise

- Describe how much noise pollution would be generated by diesel generators when the wind does not blow (Scoping Comment 5).
- Address the project's noise effects from spinning propellers and other turbine equipment (i.e., increased noise pollution) (Scoping Comments 7, 8, 16, 20, 28, 33, 49, 52, 59, 70, 71, 76, 86, 90, 97, and 98, Public Hearing Comments).
- *(1) Address the project's noise impacts taking into consideration the effects of wind, which can exceed the decibel threshold boundaries (Scoping Comments 20, 71, and 97, Public Hearing Comments).*
- Demonstrate that the project complies with all applicable noise regulations and produces no unacceptable impacts on the existing ambient noise environment by conducting an independent noise study. If noise impacts are identified, deny the project unless setbacks are imposed to reduce noise impacts below the appropriate threshold of significance (Scoping Comment 16).
- Describe how impacts on neighboring landowners who are affected by noise generated by the project would be mitigated (Scoping Comment 34). Explain what the Applicant would do if the project causes noise impacts greater than the models predict (Scoping Comment 97).
- If noise is an issue, the Applicant, or other future owner of the turbines, should plant trees for property owners to buffer noise impacts (Scoping Comment 99).
- *(1) Describe the project's noise impacts on properties east of the project site along Reecer Creek and Upper Green Canyon Roads (This area is downwind part of the time.) (Scoping Comment 56).*
- Address the project's potential vibration impacts that could disturb residents and animals (Scoping Comments 52, 63, and 71, Public Hearing Comments).

4.15 Public Services and Utilities

General

- Address fire protection services for the project (Scoping Comment 58).
- If out-of-area contractors and workers undertake the majority of project construction, explain if the developer would mitigate the resulting negative impacts by providing local public services (Scoping Comment 25, Public Hearing Comments).
- Already strapped resources of Ellensburg and Kittitas County would be used for this project. Explain if the Applicant would pay to repave roads used during project construction and whether the community would pay for other community services, such as fire protection (Scoping Comment 90).

Blasting

- Address the potential impact of blasting activities on local groundwater wells (Scoping Comments 50, 52, 63, 71, and 82, Public Hearing Comments) and native wildlife, domestic animals, and humans (Scoping Comment 97).
- If the project damages wells, explain if there would be any economic recourse (Scoping Comment 82).

4.16 Cumulative Impacts

- Consider the cumulative impacts of the proposal in its context as they relate to geology, soils and topography, habitat and migration routes, scenic resources, noise, existing land uses, transportation, and public services (Scoping Comment 16).
- Within the context of Kittitas County, consider cumulative impacts associated with the permanent loss of wildlife habitat and with annual mortality of birds and bats striking project facilities (Scoping Comment 77).
- Consider the cumulative environmental impacts that the proposed project and the enXco project would create, including cumulative increases in avian mortality (Scoping Comments 18, 71, and 97, Public Hearing Comments).
- *(1) Consider the cumulative effects of the enXco project along Reecer Creek Road (Scoping Comment 56).*
- Evaluate the project's cumulative impacts on regional bird populations within the interior Columbia Basin, taking into account other existing wind energy projects, existing and reasonably foreseeable projects, and future development trends (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

4.17 Alternatives

General

- Provide decision criteria to be used to compare disparate alternatives incorporating both qualitative and quantitative information. Present information on the environmental and social impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in comparative form (Scoping Comment 75).

Alternative Sites

- Present and study project alternatives that evaluate other locations such as non-ridge areas or different configurations within the same geographic area and that achieve the project purpose (Scoping Comments 71 and 76, Public Hearing Comments).
- Explain why the wind turbines aren't being placed in unpopulated areas such as the Columbia Basin, the Quilomene, or the Federal Firing Range near Yakima (i.e., places where the wind blows just as hard but where no one lives so negative effects on human population can be limited) (Scoping Comment 3).
- Explain why the wind machines aren't placed in the desolate, unpopulated land east of the Kittitas Valley (Scoping Comments 4 and 85). There are transmission lines in the east end of the valley and the wind is stronger and more consistent than on the west end (Scoping Comment 85).
- A better location for this project would be south of I-90 and east of Ryegrass where there is wind and power line access, but it is out of sight (Scoping Comment 20, Public Hearing Comments).
- The turbines should be placed on rangeland away from the population. Explain why the turbines aren't being developed in the states of California or Texas or on more isolated land (Scoping Comment 22).

- There are many places along the Vantage Highway and Columbia Basin where very few people live or would be affected by the project (Scoping Comment 23).
- Explain why the area east of Manastash Ridge to Yakima County or Hanford wouldn't be a better place for the project (Scoping Comment 24).
- There are other locations in Kittitas County that have more wind, that are near the Bonneville Power lines, and that are not in populated or view areas (Scoping Comment 27).
- There may be a better location (the Gorge perhaps) for this project (Scoping Comment 46).
- Wind farms should be built out of sight and far away from people's homes (Scoping Comment 49).
- The project should be located in an area of unpopulated open spaces such as east of Kittitas off the Vantage Highway (Scoping Comments 52 and 80, Public Hearing Comments).
- There are better places to put wind farms in Kittitas County, such as east of Ellensburg (Scoping Comment 59).
- There are far better remote locations throughout the state without impacts on local residents that would be a more appropriate site for this project (Scoping Comment 64).
- There must be other places that windmills could be situated that would not be offensive, such as the area west of Vantage, in a more desolate location (Scoping Comment 68).
- The southeast corner of the state is where the wind blows and there is ample uninhabited land there to site a wind farm (Scoping Comment 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- Ryegrass is a better location for the project (Scoping Comment 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- The Columbia River corridor has more wind consistency than the Kittitas Valley (Scoping Comment 85).
- The project should be sited in a more remote location (Scoping Comment 91).
- Consider a site that affects fewer property owners; a prime location for wind farms may be east of Whiskey Dick Mountains toward the Columbia River (Scoping Comment 92).
- The project should be sited in other parts of the county in a non-residential area (Scoping Comment 94).
- There are numerous wind sites available along the Columbia River from Wenatchee to the TriCities that are far less inhabited with humans and wildlife. Although the Yakima Firing Range was been dismissed as incompatible with wind development, oil and gas have been actively explored in this area (Scoping Comment 100).

No Action Alternative

- Address the effects of the No Action Alternative (Scoping Comments 71 and 76, Public Hearing Comments).
- As part of the No Action Alternative, discuss alternative energy conservation measures that achieve the same economic and environmental benefits that would purportedly be attained by the project. Also, describe the advantages of providing power through a gas-fired power plant, such as low cost per megawatt-hour produced (Scoping Comment 75).
- Compare impacts from the proposed project to those that are being avoided by bringing wind online as a marginal resource (Scoping Comments 12 and 69, Public Hearing Comments). Include evidence of the project's avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions and its positive

effects on the state and discuss how the project avoids negative environmental impacts that a gas-powered plant would cause (Scoping Comment 81).

Alternative Technologies

- Present a complete analysis of alternative generating technologies in the EIS.

4.18 Decommission Process and Project Abandonment

- Describe why other countries that use wind power are abandoning them (Scoping Comment 3).
- There is a need to ensure the structures are removed when they are no longer used; there must be assurances that they would not be abandoned in place if they are no longer economically or mechanically viable (Scoping Comments 8 and 30, Public Hearing Comments).
- If turbines are left in place after they are operational, they would become an eyesore and a hazard; there needs to be a plan to remove or restore the turbines, when necessary (Scoping Comments 48, 49, and 50).
- A cash deposit should be made to an Ellensburg bank to fully fund a decommissioning plan in case the project fails or is sold (Scoping Comments 33 and 71, Public Hearing Comments). This cash deposit should be 125% of the estimated cost for decommissioning the turbines (Scoping Comment 49) and should be held by an independent third party (Scoping Comment 49).
- Describe what would prevent a wind farm owner/operator from claiming the site was operational (and not subject to decommissioning) even when the wind turbines were inoperative and in disrepair. To guarantee the "health" of the wind farm operation, a performance bond and/or monthly fine should be assessed to the wind farm operator per turbine for inoperative machines (Scoping Comment 49).
- *(1) Present the amount of the decommissioning bond in fiscal year 2029 dollars (Scoping Comment 72).*
- *(1) Describe if project decommissioning would require plans or bonds (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).*

4.19 Mitigation Measures

- If appropriate setbacks are not required, negatively affected non-participating property owners should have their property purchased by the developer at replacement costs (Scoping Comments 7 and 71, Public Hearing Comments).
- The Applicant should be required to purchase properties (at current assessed value pre-wind farm) within a 2-mile range of the project area if landowners feel they cannot live or recreate on their properties as planned (Scoping Comment 33, Public Hearing Comments).
- Develop a process for property owners adjacent to the site (or elected County authority) to require the Applicant to mitigate impacts discovered later if the project is built (Scoping Comment 49).
- EFSEC must retain the ability to require additional project mitigation should unforeseen problems arise in the future (Scoping Comment 99).

- Private landowners around the project should have a mechanism to petition EFSEC to oversee mitigation of both new and unforeseen concerns, as well as to express concerns that have not been adequately addressed (Scoping Comment 99).
- If the Applicant is bought out, the new company must be held to the same mitigation conditions (Scoping Comment 99).
- The Applicant should be required to buy out or provide alternative mitigation to those significantly affected by the project and they would need to fund independent, objective, ongoing monitoring receptive to landowners around the project (Scoping Comment 100).

4.20 EIS Scope, Content, and Process

- For each alternative, discuss how the significance of an impact is represented by identifying the reasons for determining why one kind of impact is more significant than another (Scoping Comment 75).
- Make public all data and methodologies used so they can be independently verifiable. State all assumptions and identify wherever possible sources of uncertainty. Present all numerical estimates as ranges rather than point estimates (Scoping Comment 75).
- Because of the unique impacts of the structure on adjoining properties, roadways, and the environment, focus the EIS impact analysis and mitigation measures on each individual turbine and turbine location (Scoping Comments 71 and 76, Public Hearing Comments).
- Look at the most intense and/or intrusive structures available under reasonably foreseeable technology over the life of the project (i.e., a worst-case assessment of turbine design, configuration, and location) (Scoping Comments 71 and 76, Public Hearing Comments).
- Identify all phases of the proposal, their timing, and available environmental analysis on this or related proposals. Specifically consider contemplated or potential sales to BPA and assessments appropriate to DNR determinations (Scoping Comments 71 and 76, Public Hearing Comments).
- The proposed project is similar to the enXco proposal; they have common aspects that provide a basis for evaluating their collective consequences in a single environmental document including timing, types of impact, alternatives and geography (Scoping Comment 76).
- Search Web sites to learn about people's complaints against existing wind farms and determine if the studies undertaken for this project address these concerns (Public Hearing Comments).
- What is the deadline for scoping comments (Agency Scoping Meeting Comment s)?
- Discuss if other EIS documents have been prepared for similar wind farm projects (Agency Scoping Meeting Comments).

5. LIST OF SCOPING COMMENT LETTERS AND TESTIMONY RECEIVED

5.1 Written Comments (In Order of Comments Received)

Scoping Comment 1: Hubert and Maren Sandall
 Scoping Comment 2: Randall Thomas
 Scoping Comment 3: Linda Schantz
 Scoping Comment 4: Barbara Foster

Scoping Comment 5: Chris Cole
 Scoping Comment 6: Washington State Department of Transportation
 Scoping Comment 7: Emilia Burdyslaw
 Scoping Comment 8: Jeff and Thuan Howard
 Scoping Comment 9: Lee Bates
 Scoping Comment 10: Lyle Ware , Mary Belbeck
 Scoping Comment 11: Daniel and Marcia Green
 Scoping Comment 12: Renewable Northwest Project
 Scoping Comment 13: Washington State Department of Transportation
 (duplicate of No. 6)
 Scoping Comment 14: Kittitas County Community Development Services
 Scoping Comment 15: Glen Staloch
 Scoping Comment 16: Steve and Amy Oslund
 Scoping Comment 17: Pautzke Bait Company, Inc.
 Scoping Comment 18: Kittitas Audubon Society
 Scoping Comment 19: Noel Andrew
 Scoping Comment 20: Earle Price
 Scoping Comment 21: Helen Wise
 Scoping Comment 22: Robert Peterson and Edna Fry
 Scoping Comment 23: Darlene Young
 Scoping Comment 24: Phyllis Whittick
 Scoping Comment 25: Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters
 Scoping Comment 26: Elizabeth Greal
 Scoping Comment 27: Richard Fischer
 Scoping Comment 28: Michael and Patsy Ptaszynski
 Scoping Comment 29: Michael and Louise Genson
 Scoping Comment 30: Duane Fluent
 Scoping Comment 31: Felicia Persson
 Scoping Comment 32: Jeff and Thuan Howard
 (duplicate of No. 8)
 Scoping Comment 33: Ed Garrett
 Scoping Comment 34: Woody Woodcock
 Scoping Comment 35: Roy Chance
 Scoping Comment 36: Gloria Lindstrom
 Scoping Comment 37: Melissa Bates
 Scoping Comment 38: Walt Farrar
 Scoping Comment 39: Jim Stewart
 Scoping Comment 40: Rosalyn Gordon
 Scoping Comment 41: Eric Wickwire
 Scoping Comment 42: Rick Weiler
 Scoping Comment 43: Leonard Scheele
 Scoping Comment 44: John Pickett
 Scoping Comment 45: Jerry and Patricia Jarnagin
 Scoping Comment 46: Kathy Bell
 Scoping Comment 47: Ginny and David Archambeau
 Scoping Comment 48: Jaime Janus

Scoping Comment 49: Michael and Elizabeth Robertson
 Scoping Comment 50: Maren Sandall
 Scoping Comment 51: Ed Garrett
 Scoping Comment 52: H.S. Sandall
 Scoping Comment 53: Hal Lindstrom
 Scoping Comment 54: Ginger Morrison
 Scoping Comment 55: Pam Hillemann
 Scoping Comment 56: Suzanne Larsen
 Scoping Comment 57: Lee Bates
 (duplicate of No. 9)
 Scoping Comment 58: Kittitas County Community Development Services
 Scoping Comment 59: Al and Diane Schwab
 Scoping Comment 60: Emilia Burdyshaw
 Scoping Comment 61: Karl Krogstad
 Scoping Comment 62: Linda Waits
 Scoping Comment 63: Geoff Saunders
 Scoping Comment 64: Phil Boyd
 Scoping Comment 65: Jeff and Thuan Howard
 Scoping Comment 66: Tim Jones
 Scoping Comment 67: Chris Cole
 Scoping Comment 68: Jo Anne Gaskell
 Scoping Comment 69: Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter
 Scoping Comment 70: Dolly Orr
 Scoping Comment 71: Lee Bates
 Scoping Comment 72: Kittitas County Department of Public Works
 Scoping Comment 73: Ed Garrett
 (duplicate of No. 33)
 Scoping Comment 74: Washington State Department of Transportation
 Scoping Comment 75: Charles Wassell, Jr.
 Scoping Comment 76: Velikanje Moore & Shore, P.S.
 Scoping Comment 77: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Scoping Comment 78: Leigh Dobbins
 Scoping Comment 79: Desmond Knudson
 Scoping Comment 80: Tom, Carol, and Lester Conner
 Scoping Comment 81: Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter
 Scoping Comment 82: Slim Jorgensen
 Scoping Comment 83: Guy Schober
 Scoping Comment 84: Eldon Ball
 Scoping Comment 85: William Erickson
 Scoping Comment 86: Woody Woodcock
 Scoping Comment 87: Hal Lindstrom
 Scoping Comment 88: J.E. and Gloria Baldi
 Scoping Comment 89: Northwest Sustainable Energy for Economic Development
 Scoping Comment 90: Jill Kuhn
 Scoping Comment 91: Art Depalma
 Scoping Comment 92: Todd Schnebly

Scoping Comment 93: Edwin Littlefield
(duplicate of No. 90)
Scoping Comment 94: Gloria Sharp
Scoping Comment 95: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
Scoping Comment 96: Phoenix Group Economic Development
Scoping Comment 97: Eric Larsen
Scoping Comment 98: Joseph R. G. Binette
Scoping Comment 99: Chris Hall
Scoping Comment 100: William Hall
Scoping Comment 101: Bernice Best
Scoping Comment 102: Bernice Best
Scoping Comment 103: Tom Crawford

5.2 Oral Comments (In Alphabetical Order)

Loran Allen
Noel Andrew
Lee Bates
Bernice Best
James Carmody, representing Residents Opposed to the Kittitas Turbines
James Cole
Duane Fluent
Kevin Fullerton, representing Northwest Sustainable Energy for Economic Development
Ed Garrett
Bill Hall
Chris Hall
Jeff Howard
Keith Johnson
Jill Kuhn
Suzanne Larsen
Gloria Lindstrom
Hal Lindstrom
Sonja Ling, representing Renewable Northwest Project
Skip Littlefield
Rocky Marshall, representing the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters
Holly Pinkart
Earle Price
Sandy Sandall
Geoff Saunder
Diane Schwab
Leigh Soutter
Doug Stalder
Jim Stewart
Helen Wise

6. HOW THESE COMMENTS WILL BE USED

All the comments received will help identify the key issues to be addressed in the EIS and the impacts of most concern. Everyone who attended the meetings was given the opportunity to be added to the project mailing list.