

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

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of Application No. 2006-02
Desert Claim Wind Power Project

**DECLARATION OF DAVID STEEB
IN SUPPORT OF WAC 463-28-030(1)
DETERMINATION**

David Steeb hereby declares:

1. I am the Project Director for the Desert Claim Wind Power Project (the "Project"), and have been its Project Director since 2001.
2. In 2001, enXco, Inc., the parent company of Desert Claim Wind Power LLC ("Desert Claim"), began evaluating potential sites in Kittitas County for a commercial scale wind project. At that time, under Kittitas County Ordinance 2001-12, wind projects were allowed as a conditional use in all Ag-20, Forest and Range, Commercial Agriculture and Commercial Forest zoning districts. In late 2002, the County enacted Ordinance 2002-19, which established the wind power siting provisions now found in Kittitas County Code chapter 17.61A. Under chapter 17.61A, a wind project may be permitted in any area zoned as Ag-20, Forest and Range, Commercial Agriculture or Commercial Forest, but it requires a Wind Farm Resource Development Permit and a development agreement, a site-specific amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designation map, and a site-specific rezone. After considering the wind resource, land availability, transmission access, potential

DAVID STEEB DECLARATION – 1

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

1 environmental impacts and neighboring land uses, Desert Claim selected a location for its
2 project, approximately 8 miles northwest of Ellensburg. The original project location is
3 shown on **Exhibit 1**.
4

5
6 3. After selecting a location for the project, Desert Claim considered its
7 permitting options. In 2001, the Legislature had amended EFSEC's statute to allow wind
8 projects to "opt in" to EFSEC jurisdiction, so Desert Claim had a choice of filing an
9 application with Kittitas County or with EFSEC. Looking at EFSEC's regulations, we
10 understood that, if we filed with EFSEC, the Council's proceedings would be stayed while
11 we tried to obtain County land use approvals. However, if we went through the County
12 process and obtained County approvals, we would not need to also obtain EFSEC's
13 approval. We concluded that the most efficient way to proceed was to file an application
14 with Kittitas County first. If the County did not approve the project, we could file an
15 application to EFSEC.
16

17
18 4. Prior to filing our County application, we met with Community
19 Development Services' planning staff to understand the County process, the application
20 requirements, and any issues or concerns about the project. After getting input from staff,
21 we finalized the Project design and prepared the application in a way that would satisfy
22 existing requirements and address concerns that had been identified.
23

24
25 5. Desert Claim filed an application with Kittitas County on January 28, 2003,
26 and the County accepted it as complete the following day. The application described a 180
27 MW wind power project, with 120 turbines spread out over a 5,237-acre project area.
28

29
30 6. The County process concerning Desert Claim's application took
31 approximately twenty-six months. A detailed chronology of the County process is attached
32 as **Exhibit 2**. The following is a summary. In April 2003, the County issued a SEPA
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 Determination of Significance. The County published a Draft EIS in December 2003 and a
2 Final EIS in August 2004. In September 2004, Desert Claim developed a "draft"
3 development agreement with the planning staff and County attorney. After circulating this
4 development agreement to the public, the Kittitas County Planning Commission and the
5 development agreement to the public, the Kittitas County Planning Commission and the
6 Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) held joint hearings on October
7 25-26, 2004. At the conclusion of those hearings, the Planning Commission recommended
8 denial of Desert Claim's application. For the next five and a half months, the BOCC held a
9 series of hearings and meetings to consider Desert Claim's application. After hearings held
10 on November 8, November 9 and December 7, 2004, the BOCC asked us to revise the
11 development agreement. On December 27, 2004, we submitted a revised development
12 agreement, and the BOCC said further revisions might be necessary, and deferred any
13 decision until January when two new commissioners would take office. The BOCC held
14 meetings on January 11, 20 and 27, 2005, at which we reported on modifications to the
15 revised development agreement that we had made based on discussions with the BOCC
16 during the January meetings. On February 15, 2005, we presented another revised
17 development agreement. The BOCC put this out for public comment and held public
18 comment hearings on March 1 and 9, 2005.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
7. At the conclusion of the hearing on March 9, the BOCC deliberated and
voted to deny Desert Claim's application. On April 5, 2005, the BOCC issued Findings of
Facts, and Resolution 2005-46 denying Desert Claim's application.

8. Desert Claim appealed the decision to Superior Court, but the court upheld
the decision. *Desert Claim Wind Power, LLC v. Kittitas County*, No. 05-2-00243-6, slip.
Op. at 11 (Kittitas Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 4, 2005).

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

9. Desert Claim then considered whether additional changes could be made to the Project to address concerns that were raised during the County process. We were able to obtain a lease on neighboring DNR land, and that allowed us to consolidate the Project on to contiguous parcels and eliminate portions of the Project that Sun East landowners objected to during the County process. We also made some additional changes to the Project and mitigation commitments to address concerns expressed during the County process.

10. On November 6, 2006, Desert Claim submitted an Application for Site Certification to EFSEC. The Application describes the Project that Desert Claim proposed for certification by this Council. It consisted of 90 2MW turbines, located on 4,783 acres of public and private land northwest of Ellensburg. **Exhibit 3** compares the Project Area to the area identified in the original application to Kittitas County.

11. Prior to filing the Application, Darin Huseby, enXco's Development Director for the Northwest Region met with each of the Kittitas County Commissioners to discuss the changes we made to the project. On November 6, 2006, I hand-delivered copies of the Application to each of the Commissioners and to the Director of Community Development Services. On November 30, 2006, we sent a follow-up letter to the Commissioners, a copy of which is attached as **Exhibit 4**. On December 5, 2006, we received a letter from Commissioner Bowen, a copy of which is attached as **Exhibit 5**.

12. In May 2007, Desert Claim informed EFSEC that it would modify the Project's setbacks and shadow flicker mitigation to reflect EFSEC's recommendation on the Kittitas Valley Project. Using the four-time-height formula, the new setback from existing residences would be 1,656 feet, which would reduce the number of turbines from 90 to 82.

13. On May 17, 2007, Desert Claim met with Kittitas County Community Development Services. Desert Claim was represented at the meeting by Darin Huseby

1 (enXco Development Director Northwest Region), Karen McGaffey and myself.
2
3 Community Development Services was represented by Darryl Piercy (Director), Allison
4 Kimball (Assistant Director), Joanna Valencia (Planner) and Neil Caulkins (attorney).
5
6 During the meeting, Mr. Piercy explained that three issues led to the BOCC denial of Desert
7 Claim's original application: (1) inadequate mitigation of potential shadow flicker, (2) the
8 project configuration over several non-contiguous parcels, and (3) inadequate setbacks from
9 existing residences. Mr. Piercy indicated that the changes Desert Claim has made to the
10 Project fully addressed the first two of these issues. However, Mr. Piercy indicated that
11 Desert Claim's proposal to locate all turbines at least 1,656 feet (four times the turbine
12 height) from existing residences was inadequate; he believed the BOCC would require a
13 2,500-foot setback from existing residences unless there are site-specific reasons justifying a
14 lesser distance. Mr. Piercy stated that he did not believe the County had any other concerns
15 about the revised Project.
16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 14. We appreciated Mr. Piercy's candor during our March 17th meeting, and his
28 willingness to clearly state that he believes the County's only remaining concern about the
29 Desert Claim Project is the setback from existing residences. However, Mr. Piercy also
30 acknowledged that a decision to permit the Project under KCC chapter 17.61A would
31 ultimately be made by the BOCC, not Community Development Services. We, therefore,
32 asked to meet directly with the BOCC to hear their views about this first-hand. By letter
33 dated May 22, 2007, Mr. Piercy responded that the BOCC declined our request to meet with
34 them. Attached as **Exhibit 6** is a copy of that letter.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 15. Although Desert Claim and the County continue to disagree about the
44 appropriate setbacks from residences, it is an issue that Desert Claim has been attempting in
45 good faith to resolve since it filed its initial application with the County. In January 2003,
46
47

1 Desert Claim originally proposed a 1,000-foot setback from existing residences, and in
2
3 2004, Desert Claim submitted various iterations of a Draft Development Agreement to the
4
5 County, each of which proposed a 1,000 setback. At a BOCC hearing on January 20, 2005,
6
7 all three commissioners seemed to accept a 1,000 foot setback from the build line on
8
9 adjacent properties. Commissioner Bowen stated it "doesn't cause me any grief."
10
11 Commissioner Huston said that it was "an acceptable buffer" and that he had "no issue with
12
13 that." Commissioner Crankovich said "I can agree with that." Relevant portions of the
14
15 transcript are attached as **Exhibit 7**. However, on January 27, 2005, County Attorney Jim
16
17 Hurson advised the Commissioners that the turbines could be "visually dominant" from one-
18
19 quarter to one-half mile away. Relevant portions of the transcript are attached as **Exhibit 8**.
20
21 Then in April 2005, the BOCC issued Resolution No. 2005-46, in which it concluded that "a
22
23 minimum of 1/2 mile separation from wind turbines and residences would be necessary to
24
25 reduce significant adverse impacts to moderate adverse impacts." In November 2006,
26
27 Desert Claim filed its EFSEC Application, and configured turbines to ensure that noise
28
29 levels would not exceed 50 dBA at the boundary line of adjoining properties where
30
31 residences were or could be constructed. In this new configuration, the closest residence
32
33 was 1,106 feet from a turbine. Following the Council's decision on the K.V. Project, Desert
34
35 Claim has reconfigured the Project to ensure that all turbines are at least 1,656 (four times
36
37 tip height) from existing residences.

38
39 16. Like most wind power developers, enXco considers several factors in
40
41 identifying potential project sites:

42
43 (a) Wind Resource. The most important factor in selecting a site for a wind power
44
45 project is the available wind resource. enXco was looking for a site with an average wind
46
47 speed of 13 to 17 miles per hour. Potential sites are typically identified using published

1 wind maps, and then promising sites are evaluated more thoroughly, usually by collecting 1
2
3 to 2 years of on-site meteorological data.

4 (b) Access to Electrical Transmission. Access to existing electrical transmission
5
6 lines is a significant advantage in wind power project development. Access to nearby lines,
7
8 or in this case, lines that cross the Project itself, avoids or substantially reduces the cost
9
10 associated with constructing new lines, which can range from \$ 500,000 to \$ 1,000,000 per
11
12 mile. The presence of nearby transmission lines avoids the permitting complications of
13
14 constructing new transmission lines, and can eliminate the aesthetic concerns about
15
16 constructing new transmission lines to connect a wind project to the regional transmission
17
18 grid.
19

20 (c) Environmental Constraints. Wind power developers try to avoid areas of
21
22 significant known environmental concerns. Developers try to avoid lakes, rivers, wetlands,
23
24 wildlife refuges, and endangered species habitat.
25

26 (d) Available Real Estate. A commercial wind power development typically requires
27
28 about 5,000 acres of open land. Developers typically look for large, 10,000 to 50,000 acre
29
30 open tracks of land as potential areas for development, and then gradually focus in on
31
32 specific areas. Ultimately, project development requires rights to use the land, therefore, the
33
34 company's ability to negotiate leases with existing property owners is critical to site
35
36 selection.
37

38 (e) Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Wind projects not considered an outright
39
40 permitted use anywhere in the County, but are potentially allowed in all areas zoned A-20,
41
42 Forest and Range, Commercial Forest or Commercial Agriculture.
43

44 17. Desert Claim's parent corporation enXco initially identified the Kittitas
45
46 Valley, extending from Lookout Mountain on the west to the Columbia River on the east,
47

1 and between the National Forest Lands in the north and I-90 in the south as an area worth
2 further investigation. It then looked for large tracts of land and contacted landowners about
3 the possibility of obtaining wind leases. As a result, enXco identified a project area of over
4 5,000 acres owned by eight private land owners located northwest of Ellensburg, and
5 obtained leases for those properties. After performing further on-site meteorological
6 evaluations, we designed the Desert Claim Project at this location and submitted an
7 application to Kittitas County concerning that project area. Since then, Desert Claim has
8 been able to obtain wind leases on DNR land, and has reconfigured the Project to utilize a
9 group of contiguous parcels, removing eastern portions of the original Project area.
10 Although enXco and Desert Claim considered other properties and locations in the County,
11 we were not able to identify other commercially available properties that provided a
12 comparable combination of wind conditions, transmission access and minimal
13 environmental impacts and available land.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25


26 18. The Kittitas County Planning Commission and BOCC are currently
27 considering changes in the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code that would designate an
28 area of approximately 500 square miles in the eastern portion of the County as a pre-
29 identified Wind Farm area. **Exhibit 9** is a map of this area proposed for the overlay.
30 Approximately 90% of the land included in the proposed overlay is not available for wind
31 project development because it is either part of the United States Department of Defense's
32 Yakima Training Center or one of several wildlife areas designated by the Washington
33 Department of Fish and Wildlife (the Colockum Wildlife Area, the Quilomene Wildlife
34 Area, the Wenas Wildlife Area and the Whiskey Dick Wildlife Area). Of the remaining
35 land, most is already occupied by the Wild Horse Wind Project or is under lease by one of
36 our competitors, Invenergy, for the possible development of a wind power project. There is
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47


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

not sufficient remaining land within the proposed overlay area to develop another commercial wind power project.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 27 day of June, 2007, at Woodinville, Washington


David Steeb



Kittitas County
Desert Claim Wind Power Project EIS



Project Vicinity Land Ownership

EXHIBIT 2

Date	Summary of Activity
August 6, 2002	Desert Claim attends pre-application meeting with Kittitas County Community Development Services (CDS).
September 25, 2002	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding application and permit process.
November 14, 2002	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding application and permit process.
January 15, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS, Building Department and the Public Works Director.
January 28, 2003	Desert Claim files an application with Kittitas County.
February 19, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding application.
February 27, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding mitigation issues.
March 25, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS.
April 8, 2003	Desert Claim meets with County's EIS consultant.
April 23, 2003	Kittitas County publishes Determination of Significance and EIS Scoping Notice.
May 7, 2003	Kittitas County holds EIS scoping meeting.
May 14, 2003	Kittitas County holds Open House and community meeting regarding the Project.
June 24, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the draft EIS.
August 12, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the draft EIS.
September 3, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the draft EIS.
September 9, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the draft EIS
September 24, 2003	Kittitas County holds Open House regarding the Project.
October 29, 2003	Desert Claim meets with CDS and County attorney regarding the Development Agreement.
December 1, 2003	Desert Claim meets with County EIS consultant regarding the draft EIS.
December 15, 2003	Kittitas County publishes the draft EIS.
January 16, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding mitigation.
January 20, 2004	Kittitas County holds public hearing on the draft EIS.
February 10, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the SEPA process.
March 16, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS and Public Works Director regarding airport and Smithson Road issues.

May 3, 2004	Desert Claim meets with Public Works Director regarding Smithson Road issues.
May 4, 2004	Desert Claim meets with Bowers Field Airport Advisory Committee, CDS and Public Works Director regarding airport issues.
May 26, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS and County attorney regarding the EIS.
June 1, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding Pheasant Lane issues.
June 15, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding Pheasant Lane issues
August 10, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding the EIS.
August 16, 2004	Kittitas County publishes the Final EIS.
September 13, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding the Development Agreement.
September 16, 2004	Kittitas County publishes a draft Development Agreement for public comment.
September 30, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding the Development Agreement
October 11, 2004	Desert Claim meets with County EIS consultant regarding the Development Agreement.
October 20, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS, County attorney and EIS consultant regarding the staff report and Development Agreement.
October 25-26, 2004	Kittitas County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) hold joint hearings regarding the Desert Claim application. Desert Claim presents a revised Development Agreement.
October 27, 2004	Kittitas County Planning Commission recommends denial of the Desert Claim Application.
November 8, 2004	BOCC hearing.
November 9, 2004	BOCC hearing.
November 11, 2004	Desert Claim meets with Public Works Director regarding mitigation.
November 18, 2004	BOCC hearing.
November 29, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS and County attorney.
December 7, 2004	BOCC hearing.
December 8, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS.
December 14, 2004	Desert Claim meets with County EIS consultant regarding the Development Agreement.
December 15, 2004	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding the Development Agreement.
December 20, 2004	Desert Claim submits a second revised Development Agreement.
December 27, 2004	BOCC Hearing.
January 11, 2005	BOCC Hearing.
January 20, 2005	BOCC Hearing.
January 25, 2005	Desert Claim meets with CDS regarding the Development Agreement.

January 27, 2005	BOCC Hearing. Desert Claim submits a third revised Development Agreement.
February 15, 2005	BOCC Hearing. Desert Claim submits a fourth revised Development Agreement.
February 16, 2005	Kittitas County publishes the revised Development Agreement for public comment.
March 1, 2005	BOCC Hearing
March 9, 2005	BOCC Hearing. At hearing's conclusion, BOCC votes to deny Desert Claim's application.
March 29, 2005	BOCC Hearing.
April 5, 2005	BOCC adopted Resolution No. 2005-46 and Findings of Fact.
Summer-Fall 2005	Desert Claim attempts to contact Kittitas County Commissioners by telephone to discuss possible changes in the Project. Messages are not returned
November 4, 2005	Kittitas County Superior Court upholds BOCC decision.
October 24, 2006	Desert Claim meets with each of the Kittitas County Commissioners individually to discuss changes being made to the Project.
November 6, 2006	Desert Claim files its Application for Site Certification with EFSEC, and hand-delivers copies of the Application to CDS and the Kittitas County Commissioners.
November 30, 2006	Desert Claim sends a letter to the Commissioners requesting to meet with them to discuss the revised Project.
December 5, 2006	Commissioner Bowen responds by letter, indicating that the County has "no interest" in "making a decision about the project" outside the process outlined by Kittitas Code chapter 17.61A, but offering to arrange a public information meeting.
January 30, 2007	EFSEC Land Use Consistency Hearing.
May 8, 2007	EFSEC grants Desert Claim's motion and rules that Desert Claim is not required to file a new application with Kittitas County.
May 17, 2007	Desert Claim meets with CDS and County attorney regarding the revised Project, and requests an opportunity to meet with the BOCC.
May 17, 2007	EFSEC sends a letter to the BOCC encouraging the Commissioners "to use your best efforts to work with the Applicant and to resolve as many issues as possible in advance of any adjudication."
May 22, 2007	CDS Director Darryl Piercy letter indicates that the BOCC respectfully declines to meet with Desert Claim.




Exhibit 3



Darin Huseby
Director, Northwest Region
5015 NE Cleveland Avenue
Tel: 503-493-2270
Fax: 503-493-2268

November 30, 2006

To: Commissioners Bowen, Crankovich, and Huston,
and Commissioner-Elect Mark McClain
Kittitas Board of County Commissioners
205 W 5th Ave, Suite 108
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Dear Commissioners and Commissioner-Elect,

I am sending this letter as follow up to my meetings with each of you on October 24, 2006 (except Commissioner-Elect McClain). As you are aware, enXco has since submitted an Application for Site Certification to Washington EFSEC for the Desert Claim Wind Project. We have provided each of you with a copy of that application. I have attempted to reach each of you individually by phone in hopes of receiving feedback regarding our EFSEC application and perhaps engage in a positive discussion about the current state of the Desert Claim Project. Unfortunately, I have not received any responses to my voice mail messages.

As is evident in our EFSEC application, enXco has worked diligently to improve the project since the time of the County's denial. We have made a concerted effort to specifically address the concerns raised during the County process. The application to EFSEC includes the following improvements, which we feel should please the County:

- The project is now contiguous with regard to land parcels;
- The project now consists of fewer turbines;
- The project has been altered to address noise & shadow flicker issues.

I welcome the opportunity to visit with each of you in person to discuss our EFSEC application in more detail. It has always been enXco's hope to attain County approval for the Desert Claim Wind Project. This hope is in no way diminished by our application to EFSEC. While we do not intend to submit a new application to the County, we do feel there is ample opportunity for enXco and the County to work together within the context of the EFSEC process. I hope you will call me if you would like to schedule a meeting in Ellensburg.

Kindest regards,

Darin Huseby
Director, Northwest Region
503-493-2270



Kittitas County, Washington

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

District One
David B. Bowen

District Two
Alan Crankovich

District Three
Perry D. Huston

December 5, 2006

Dear Mr. Huseby:

We have received your letter of November 30, 2006 offering to discuss the enXco application to EFSEC. As you are aware, the current County comprehensive plan does not allow a wind farm in the area you have recently proposed to EFSEC. Likewise, the zoning in that area does not allow a wind farm in the area of your recent proposal. Despite this fact, you have told us in phone messages and in your recent correspondence that enXco does not intend to submit a land use change application to the County.

For your project to be consistent with our local land use regulations, enXco would need to obtain an amendment to the comprehensive plan and zoning through the county land use laws that were adopted under the GMA. That would require that enXco submit an application to the County to seek those changes. It is through the County's public hearing land use process that such county land use changes are considered.

If your decision to not submit the necessary application to the County is your final position on that point, such a position would be in clear contradiction of the EFSEC rules. Those rules require that an applicant act in good faith to resolve land use inconsistency. We have a lawfully adopted process in place for your company to seek consistency. We have no interest in violating the legal process by making a decision on a project outside of the lawfully adopted processes already established. To do so would be a violation of both the law and the public trust.

Since the Board of County Commissioners are the ones who make the local land use decision, we want to make sure that our local public process is not tainted. If you want to meet with the Board we could arrange a public meeting for you to discuss this with us. In that we do not have an application the Board will not, however, be able to make any decision on your project. As such, a meeting like this would be an information meeting only.

If you do submit an application we could then make the previously mentioned public meeting and its contents a part of the record. If you would like to set up such a public meeting please let us know and our staff will coordinate a time and location that can accommodate all of those who may want to attend.

Sincerely,

David B. Bowen
Kittitas County Commissioner
District # 1, Chairman



KITTTITAS COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

411 N Ruby St., Suite 2, Ellensburg, WA 98926

CDS@CO.KITTTITAS.WA.US

Office (509) 962-7506

Fax (509) 962-7682

May 22, 2007

David S. Steeb
Project Director
Desert Claim Wind Power
PO Box 4
Woodinville, WA 98072

RECEIVED
MAY 25 2007

Darin S. Huseby
Development Director
Enxco
5015 NE Cleveland Ave.
Portland, Oregon 07211

Dear Mr. Steeb and Mr. Huseby,

Thank you for meeting with Kittitas County Staff on May 17, 2007 for a pre-application meeting to discuss the requirements for a new application for the Desert Claim Wind Power Project.

As we understand your proposal, the project is a 180 Megawatt (MW) wind power project located on approximately 4,783 acres of land approximately 8 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg. You have indicated the project will incorporate REpower MM92 model turbines, a tower height of 80 meters (262.5 feet), and a rotor diameter of 92.5 meters (303 feet) for a total height of 126.5 meters (414 feet). Each turbine has a nameplate generating capacity of 2.0 MW. You propose a total of 90 turbines.

As we discussed, Kittitas County views this current project as a new project application. The following will be required under Kittitas County Code:

1. Amendment to the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan through the development of a Sub-area Plan for the proposed site.
2. A rezone of the property to Wind Farm Resource Overlay Zone.
3. An Approved Development Agreement
4. An approved development permit.

In addition, the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) has assumed lead agency status for this application. EFSEC will be responsible for coordination of all environmental review documents including the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and other environmental review and analysis. We have a model of the coordination of this environmental review between EFSEC and Kittitas County with the successful application of the Wild Horse Wind Power Project in which Kittitas County incorporated environmental review under the lead agency status of EFSEC.

As we discussed, Kittitas County will not have the ability to control this element of the application process and as such, can make no prediction as to the length of time it may take for EFSEC to complete the draft SEIS. Completion of the draft SEIS will be necessary prior to Kittitas County conducting public hearings on your application.

DARRYL PURDY, DIRECTOR

ALLISON KIMBALL, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

COMMUNITY PLANNING • BUILDING INSPECTION • PLAS REVIEW • ADMINISTRATION • PERMIT SERVICES • CODE ENFORCEMENT • FIRE INVESTIGATION

In addition to the issues that will be addressed as an element of the environmental review, we also discussed three specific issues that were instrumental in the denial of your previous application. These were:

1. Disconnected property locations that did not meet the sub-area plan requirements.
 - a. Your new proposal has a single consolidated land area with no disconnected parcels.
2. Shadow Flicker impacts that were proposed to be mitigated off site.
 - a. Your new proposal indicates that individual turbines that result in shadow flicker impacts will be shut down during periods of potential impact.
3. Inadequate setback of towers from residential structures on non-participating land.
 - a. You have indicated that your new proposal has been modified to provide for a set back of 4 times the height of the tower or 506 meters (1656 feet) to structures on non participating lands. Consistent with environmental analysis, Kittitas County has indicated a setback of 2,500 feet is needed to mitigate significant visual impacts to a moderate level. We have also suggested a site specific visual analysis be conducted in those circumstances where the 2,500 feet may not be necessary due to topographical or other influences that would reduce the impacts to moderate levels.

Kittitas County Staff provided you with the necessary application forms to begin the review process. As has been demonstrated in the successful Wild Horse Wind Power Project, the County process need not be long nor difficult. Completion of this process in less than six months is a realistic goal as was demonstrated with the Wild Horse Project. As discussed earlier, the only variable to the time frame is the time necessary for EFSEC to complete the DSEIS.

In our meeting you requested we consider the possibility of conducting a public meeting with the Board of County Commissioners, prior to application, to provide you with an opportunity to hear directly from the Commissioners any concerns or issues they may have in regards to your project. The Commissioners have considered your request but must respectfully decline. It is felt that to hold a public meeting where some measure of approval or rejection seems to be the goal may leave the community and applicant to believe the Commissioners have prejudged a specific project without full and fair opportunity for public participation. Such a discussion is best conducted as part of the public hearing process on your application where the full details of the project are known and the Commissioners can take specific action consistent with County code. We suggest however that Desert Claim conduct a community open house to present your project to the community and provide information and respond to specific questions members of the public may have. This effort should provide for a better informed public and a productive public hearing regarding your application.

Thank you again for your time in meeting with us. If we can be of further assistance in submittal of your application please do not hesitate to contact either Joann Valencia or myself.

Sincerely,



Darryl Piercy
Director

cc: Commissioners
EFSEC
Honorable Chris Gregoire

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COUNTY OF KITTITAS

KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY)
 COMMISSIONERS SPECIAL MEETING) NO. 2-2003-01
 RE DESERT CLAIM WIND POWER)
 PROJECT.)

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

January 20, 2005
 6:00 p.m.
 Kittitas County Fairgrounds
 Ellensburg, Washington

BEFORE THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
LOUISE R. BELL, CCR NO. 2676

1 perspective, rule this a completed document until
2 those agreements are attached and completed. And I
3 think we have an understanding with that.

4 Commissioners, is that your understanding of
5 where we are in this process?

6 COMMISSIONER BOWEN: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Okay, very good. Let's
9 go ahead and talk about buffer, because that's been
10 an important point.

11 Now, we've all along had essentially two
12 buffers under discussion. One is safety buffer, and
13 then the other that I define as the noise buffer.
14 And I do that for a specific reason, because it's
15 contained in Section 3, Page 211, I believe it is,
16 in the discussion of noise in the environment impact
17 statement. Where one of the mitigation measures --
18 the second one, I believe if, I remember my research
19 correctly -- was a 1000-foot setback from the
20 existing residences.

21 Now, specific language contained in SEPA, the
22 SEPA was ruled final, the SEPA was not appealed. So
23 I'm operating with that as -- albeit some don't
24 agree -- but as a codified statement contained
25 within the official document which we're operating

1 from in our decision-making process.

2 Now, there was discussion by the applicant that
3 that was offered up more as a good neighbor measure,
4 if you will. But I have to take it from the
5 perspective, because it was listed as a mitigation
6 measure, that it carries weight. So the 1000 foot
7 is etched in my mind -- and I didn't create the
8 numbers; it's part of the process -- as an
9 acceptable buffer to mitigate noise of the wind
10 power project.

11 Now, where it's a bit different is because in
12 the SEPA it indicates from existing residences,
13 which is a bit different in terms of how we usually
14 determine setbacks.

15 That gives rise to my past discussion, and I'll
16 carry it forward and ask for comment. If in fact
17 the mitigation is necessary from existing structures
18 to mitigate noise, then I would have to assume it is
19 also necessary to have that same setback from any
20 future residences. Otherwise you're dealing with an
21 issue where now folks are being asked to either not
22 enjoy the full use of their properties as otherwise
23 allowed by statute, or they would have to build
24 within this 1000-foot buffer and arguably suffer
25 some -- some impact due to the noise.

1 Now, there was discussion of a voluntary
2 variance process. We'll come back to that. What
3 I'm doing in terms of how I'm approaching this is,
4 is I cannot make the distinction between future and
5 existing residences. A 1000-foot is necessary from
6 residences, be they existing or future, and we need
7 to deal with that.

8 In terms of the variance question, I would ask
9 applicant and Legal to make comment to is whether
10 the County can actually even entertain the notion of
11 a voluntary variance from what is arguably a public
12 health and safety setback. I don't know, to be
13 perfectly honest with you.

14 We have setbacks for the well head protection
15 program. We do not accept variance to that. You
16 cannot voluntarily put your well within your septic
17 drain field because you don't think it's a problem.
18 We don't allow that.

19 We do allow certain measures whereby property
20 owners can agree to move those lines on their own
21 property. For instance, a person can voluntarily
22 encumber their own property for 100 feet, which
23 allows the other person to set 50 feet from their
24 line as opposed to 75, which is the halfway point.
25 So we have some precedent, at least, for that

1 discussion.

2 But what I do need is some -- some level of
3 certainty that by allowing that -- that variance
4 process, we're not setting up the County for some
5 subsequent suit whereby someone who even voluntarily
6 waived their right to that 1000-foot setback but
7 then comes back with damage claims for hearing loss
8 or whatever.

9 So I mean, I realize we're in new ground, so
10 I'd be really surprised if you found a case that
11 actually spoke to that point. But some discussion
12 or at least from an ancillary perspective in terms
13 of other voluntary waivers, speaking to that sort of
14 a buffer that I can try to wrap my arms around and
15 see what kind of liability, if any, I'm creating for
16 the County.

17 Now, in terms of the setback not applying from
18 public land, I don't know that I have any heartburn
19 about that, and I'll solicit comments from my other
20 commissioners obviously. Public land land does not
21 lend itself to residential development. I think we
22 still need to adhere to safety setbacks. I haven't
23 heard any notion that we can vary from them,
24 although I suppose that door is now open, if there's
25 some discussion you can voluntarily waive the safety

1 setback. And that's the 487-foot, if memory serves
2 correctly, for blade throw, tower collapse, ice
3 throw, that sort of thing, then now I suppose I need
4 to hear that. But I don't have an issue with the
5 different zone -- setback, rather, from the public
6 land. But I do need a little -- a little discussion
7 about the whole variance process.

8 The 1000-foot build line, I have no issue with
9 that. There's precedent for that, back to the well
10 head protection program. The well head protection
11 requires I believe it's 150 feet, so it's 75 feet
12 from each property line, spread evenly between the
13 two parcels. Albeit I think in Ag 20 the sideline
14 setback is five feet.

15 Where are my building experts? Yes, five feet.
16 So I suppose theoretically from that line it would
17 be 995 feet. That's fine; I have no issue with
18 that. That's completely consistent with how we
19 generally use setbacks. But I do need that
20 discussion in terms of the voluntary variance.

21 In terms of who decides on that variance, I
22 have no issue with the process that's outlined.
23 Community Development Services director is certainly
24 able -- since if it's a voluntary setback, it has to
25 be accompanied by the documents appropriate to that,

1 your CCRs or whatever form that takes. Permanent
2 easement, whatever.

3 So that shouldn't be much to rule on. Those
4 documents either exist or they do not. So I don't
5 know that I need a board to read whether those
6 documents exist or they do not. So I don't have any
7 issue with that process.

8 That's my comments on the buffer at this time.
9 I suppose I've essentially spoken to Alternate 2, I
10 guess it is. Commissioners, observations?

11 COMMISSIONER BOWEN: On the buffer with the
12 public land, I think -- I don't know, maybe
13 Commissioner Crankovich can clarify. It sounded
14 like he was asking if they'd been talked to about
15 it, is all, more so than anything else.

16 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Yeah, I was just
17 curious as to if DNR's involved in this at all,
18 because they are a bordering landowner, even though
19 it is a public land. I was just wondering if they
20 had been addressed at all.

21 COMMISSIONER BOWEN: And then the 1000 foot, as
22 you mentioned, from the build line doesn't cause me
23 any grief. It's the noise that kind of created the
24 setback in the first place. I'm wanting to make
25 sure we measure and understand just exactly what

1 that means.

2 I realize you're in a rural area, you're going
3 to have balers out there, you're going to have
4 tractors out there making noise on occasion. I
5 don't know if it's 30 percent of the time that you
6 live out there, but you do it, and I'm as guilty as
7 anybody of that, having put mufflers on my swather
8 that weren't exactly correct.

9 But anyway, the -- I don't have a lot of grief
10 with that. I just wanted to make sure we don't have
11 the equivalent of a drone on a small plane next door
12 to somebody having a 1000-foot away. That's my
13 concern.

14 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Okay, I'll try to give
15 some -- some additional guidance in terms of the
16 setback from public land, and then I'll take
17 liberties with your comments and then you can
18 correct me if I'm wrong.

19 I guess the discussion of DNR's being consulted
20 I'm hearing as an underlying notion that the 1000
21 feet should apply to all, quote, build lines,
22 unquote, and that the DNR would be subject to the
23 voluntary variance process; or do I hear some
24 agreement that there could be a different setback
25 from public land?

1 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I think there could
2 be a different setback from the public land, but I
3 mean, I -- my concern is that -- is has the DNR been
4 involved in the process? I mean, you can't just
5 assume because it is public land that they have no,
6 you know, no input in what goes on. If they could
7 negotiate something less than that, that's fine.
8 But as long as -- as long as they're involved in the
9 process, I don't think they should be ignored just
10 for the fact that it's public land.

11 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Okay, let me rephrase my
12 question, then. Listening to your comments, what I
13 hear -- and I guess let me back up. Certainly DNR
14 could give testimony if we go back out with a
15 Development Agreement for public comment. That's
16 certainly not inappropriate and perfectly
17 acceptable.

18 At this point I guess I'm trying to determine
19 what that Development Agreement draft will say.
20 The -- we can establish as a board arbitrarily,
21 frankly, a different setback for public land, or we
22 can establish one setback with the idea that
23 anybody -- certainly DNR, as the owner of the land,
24 be it public or otherwise, could participate in the
25 variance process.

1 So in terms of direction to staff and
2 applicant, what would be the predisposition of the
3 board to which DNR could then comment? The 1000
4 foot, which is the number that has been batted
5 around at least to this point, that's the one
6 contained in the SEPA document, 1000 feet from
7 everybody's build line, and then anybody could
8 participate in the voluntary waiver process. Or we
9 can establish a separate setback from public land.

10 Which is your predisposition, Commissioner?

11 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Well, until you get
12 definite on the legality of the buffer waiver, it
13 would probably be best to approach it from creating
14 a separate setback for public land, as a difference
15 than the buffer created for the 1000 feet from the
16 residential.

17 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Commissioner Bowen?

18 COMMISSIONER BOWEN: One of the oddities about
19 thinking in front of people, I hadn't thought about
20 this before, and the first I heard about it is when
21 Mr. Crankovich brought it up earlier.

22 So I guess potentially public land could
23 eventually be private land at some point in time,
24 but anybody purchasing it would know that that
25 setback was there. I don't believe tying it to the

1 variance is a good idea at this point with the
2 information we have, since we don't know if we can
3 even do that. And I guess frankly I don't know that
4 I would change the setback any different than the
5 487 feet that's proposed at the moment to other
6 boundary lines.

7 I'm trying to think of what it says exactly.
8 The safety zone setback from utilities, property
9 lines, roads, and KRD. It's still listed in Option
10 2, unless I wrote that down wrong.

11 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I guess what I'm
12 trying to avoid is the assumption that DNR, even
13 though it is public land, is agreeable to everything
14 that goes on or is silent, and then the closer you
15 get to an agreement or reaching an agreement that
16 somebody raises their hand and says, Well, I'm not
17 really sure about that. You know, I just want
18 something clear that everybody knows what's going
19 on.

20 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I appreciate that, and I
21 guess maybe in terms -- and again, we play by the
22 rules handed us, so this isn't necessarily the way I
23 would create the world if I were king. But we are
24 in a position where we are dealing with the record
25 that's before us.

1 Certainly when we go out with a draft document,
2 that reopens it for public comment; DNR at that
3 point can weigh in. What we need to avoid is
4 bringing a representative of DNR and taking
5 additional testimony, creating essentially a
6 supplement to the record to try to deal with the
7 issues that you have. And they're legitimate
8 issues, don't misunderstand me.

9 But as the orchestrator, if you will, of this
10 process, we have to be somewhat conscious of that.
11 So what I'm looking for -- now, let me say it this
12 way, and I'll borrow the language out of SEPA --
13 what I'm looking for is the preferred alternative,
14 the preferred language that this board is prepared
15 to go back out to public comment with. In terms of
16 in this case we're talking specifically about
17 setback.

18 So -- and I guess the fundamental question is
19 do we wish to just use the 1000-foot setback from
20 the build line, essentially Alternative 2 as
21 presented, but apply that to the public lands as
22 well, take comment from that perspective; or does
23 the board wish to create some lesser setback, be it
24 to adhere to the safety setback, or something in
25 between, from public lands. Again, in terms of

1 preferred alternate, in terms of going back out to
2 the public for comment to a specific proposal.

3 COMMISSIONER BOWEN: Since this Development
4 Agreement is site-specific, that particular public
5 land, I guess I would -- I'm leaning towards Option
6 2, obviously. And I think the verbiage in there
7 addresses the concern as long as that 487 feet
8 applies to the boundary line of that DNR property at
9 this point. Off the top of my head.

10 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I can agree with
11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Okay, it sounds like I
13 have some consensus, then, that the 1000-foot
14 setback from the build line -- and I use the phrase
15 private property -- and then the safety setback,
16 which is identified in the documents as 487 feet
17 from public parcels. Is that --

18 Now, keeping in mind what we're talking about
19 is the language that we'll go back out for public
20 comment with. So at this point that's the
21 predisposition, if you will, of the board that we're
22 offering for public comment when we have the
23 document put together to go back out. Keeping in
24 mind we always reserve the right to change our mind
25 or to have our minds changed for us, based on public

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF KITTITAS

KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY)
COMMISSIONERS SPECIAL MEETING) NO. 2-2003-01
RE DESERT CLAIM WIND POWER)
PROJECT.)

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

January 27, 2005
6:00 p.m.
Kittitas County Fairgrounds
Ellensburg, Washington

BEFORE THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
LOUISE R. BELL, CCR NO. 2676

1 determination if the mitigation measures were in
2 fact appropriate to the project and whether or not
3 the TAC recommendation was appropriate and should be
4 implemented.

5 At that point, then, as I read the agreement,
6 it would be the responsibility of the applicant to
7 implement those mitigation measures if it was so
8 deemed appropriate by the Board of County
9 Commissioners.

10 I believe that can take place without a
11 specific amendment to the Development Agreement.
12 It's already called out and identified in terms of
13 the process of how that would be accomplished.

14 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Steeb, would you
15 concur with that recital of the process?

16 Applicant indicates yes at this point. We'll
17 save you the walk.

18 Commissioners, other questions?

19 Please proceed.

20 MR. PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, for Items 7 and
21 Items 8 I'm going to call on Jim Hurson, Chief
22 Deputy Civil Prosecutor, to address these.

23 MR. HURSON: Jim Hurson, Deputy Prosecutor.

24 I guess just backing up on the Item 6 thing.
25 That was one of the issues we discussed staff-wise,

1 was that enforceability process too. And I think
2 there's a note here about putting in a presumption
3 of, you know, an appropriate remedy or not an
4 appropriate remedy so that you have the proof.

5 And obviously I think the County's perspective
6 would be if the Director says that this is something
7 that needs to be done, it's -- the presumption is
8 that that is something that needs to be done and
9 then they'd have to prove that that's an inadequate
10 remedy.

11 You just create burdens and who has the
12 presumption and who doesn't. That makes the
13 contracts easier to enforce and work with, because
14 people understand the roles better.

15 On the -- Item 7 is setback issue. That --
16 that's come up in context of the buffer. There's
17 another -- we have been having some discussions
18 about the 1000-foot turbine buffer and, you know, is
19 this supported by the -- the EIS and what is the
20 basis for it.

21 And in looking at this, what I thought was
22 maybe the thing to do and particularly with having
23 two new commissioners and maybe explain the process.
24 It would probably take me a couple minutes to go
25 through it. But in essence what I hope to show you

1 is that in your policy role, you have the right to
2 make an assortment of choices here. And basically
3 the EIS is part of that mechanism for you to make
4 those choices.

5 The 1000-foot buffer, for instance -- and I was
6 going through parts of the document with the EIS.
7 Under Section 3.10.6 that deals with the esthetics
8 of the visual analysis. And this is on visual
9 impacts, which isn't a quality of life issue; it's
10 actually an environment issue.

11 It's analyzed, they did all sort of studies
12 based upon the quality of the view, the number of
13 people who'll see it, the distance, to figure out
14 what impact it'll have.

15 And what the EIS found is that the development
16 of project as proposed would result in significant
17 unavoidable adverse impacts to the visual
18 environment, especially for nearby rural residents
19 in the northwest quadrant of the Kittitas Valley.

20 And what they did is they did some studies from
21 various locations, and four of the locations showed
22 four -- after the analysis that four of them had a
23 high level of visual impact. I think about six had
24 moderate, and then the rest had low. So they tried
25 to quantify those issues as far as the overall

1 impact.

2 And the summary part of this said, In summary
3 the degree of long-term visual impacts created by
4 the project would be largely dependent upon location
5 within Kittitas County and proximity to the project.
6 The project would be most apparent in many rural
7 residences in the northwest quadrant of the Kittitas
8 Valley, particularly those with foreground viewing
9 distances approximately one-quarter or one-half mile
10 of large concentration of the wind turbines. The
11 view from most adjacent and nearby residences, the
12 project would be visually dominant due to the size,
13 number, and arrangement of the turbines. In this
14 area the visual impacts would be significant.

15 And because there's different terms used in
16 here, I looked up -- I actually looked up "dominant"
17 in case that was a question. So the one quarter to
18 one half it said was visually dominant, that's where
19 you had the high impact findings. And dominant,
20 according to Merriam-Webster online, means
21 commanding, controlling, or prevailing over all
22 others, overlooking and commanding from a superior
23 position. So that -- so basically they were saying
24 that.

25 And then they also went on to say, however, in


1 this that out to a distance of about three miles,
2 turbines would be prominent from many or most
3 viewpoints but would not dominate the scene.

4 So during that sort of middle area you have
5 prominent, and prominent would mean standing out or
6 projecting, readily noticeable. So the EIS
7 identified visually dominant high visible impacts in
8 that quarter- to half-mile. Further out you have
9 the prominent, which is less significant.

10 And so what you have is you have -- the EIS has
11 said you have a -- you have, as proposed,
12 significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the
13 environment.

14 Now, what that does is it gives you the tools
15 when you make your analysis. Because what -- what
16 SEPA does is its well-established agencies are
17 authorized to deny a project or condition it based
18 upon those that are identified. So you can do that.

19 And the real question in law is whether there's
20 a duty or not, and there's kind of some questions
21 there. But what you have right here, I think,
22 there's the -- it -- the bottom-line analysis as you
23 go through a lot of the cases, it seems to be that
24 you -- you don't have a duty to deny; you have a
25 choice.



**Pre-Identified Wind Farm Area
Boundary**

Wild Horse Wind Project

Invenergy Wind Project

Source: DNR Major Public Lands Map