



Respondent No: 22

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jan 12, 2026 11:42:42 am

Last Seen: Jan 12, 2026 11:42:42 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Chad Bartram

Q2. **Email address** cbartram1@charter.net

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

The Ferruginous Hawk Nest Mitigation Plan submitted for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm fails to adequately protect Washington State–listed endangered ferruginous hawks and does not meet the intent or conservation standard of Spec-5 of the Site Certification Agreement. The Plan relies on off-site and monetary mitigation, allowing impacts within core nesting territories to be offset elsewhere or through payments rather than through on-site, in-kind habitat protection. This approach is incompatible with ferruginous hawk ecology, which depends on localized territory fidelity and prey dynamics. Off-site mitigation cannot reasonably replace lost habitat function within affected nesting areas. Key mitigation measures are presented as optional, speculative, or discretionary, including artificial nest platforms and operational curtailment exceptions. These measures lack binding commitments, defined performance standards, and enforceable success criteria. Similarly, the monitoring program is limited in duration and scope, does not require long-term tracking of nesting success or productivity, and lacks clear adaptive-management triggers tied to measurable outcomes. Beyond the deficiencies of the Mitigation Plan itself, I am deeply dissatisfied with the overall Horse Heaven Wind Farm approval process. The Governor’s override of EFSEC’s original recommendation, combined with limited meaningful public involvement, has eroded confidence in the integrity, transparency, and fairness of this decision-making process. Public participation has too often appeared procedural rather than substantive, with critical decisions made in advance of full disclosure, independent analysis, or genuine consideration of public and scientific concerns. The cumulative effect has been a process that prioritizes project advancement over environmental protection, open governance, and public trust. For a project of this scale, with irreversible impacts to endangered species and irreplaceable shrub-steppe habitat, the lack of transparency and meaningful public engagement is unacceptable. This process sets a troubling precedent and warrants serious reconsideration.

Q5. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q8. **What is the title of your video?** not answered