WILD HORSE WIND POWER PROJECT

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the matter of:
WILD HORSE WIND POWER PROJECT
SITE CERTIFICATION AGREEMENT
AMENDMENT REQUEST

Public Hearing
Pages 1 - 41

A Public Hearing in the above matter was held in the presence of a court reporter on August 6, 2008, at 7:00 p.m., at 400 East University Way, in Ellensburg, Washington before Energy Facility Site Evaluation Councilmembers.

* * * * *

CHAIR LUCE: Good evening. My name is Jim Luce. I'm the Chair of the Washington State Energy Facility Siting Council. I want to welcome you here tonight. You all picked up a green sheet to tell you what we're going to do here tonight. If you haven't, they're available in the back. The purpose of tonight's meeting is a public meeting to hear from the public, public comments on the request of amendment to the Wild Horse Wind Power Project Site Certificate Agreement.

Tonight's meeting is being recorded by a court reporter, and as I said, my name is Jim Luce, and the process will be that Puget Sound Energy will make a presentation briefly with respect to their proposal. Mr. Fiksdal, our Energy Siting Manager to my right, will explain in more detail the process, we will then receive
public comment, and adjourn.

I would ask at this time that Councilmembers introduce themselves and we'll begin from the left with Hedia.

MS. ADELSMAN: Hedia Adelsman representing the Department of Ecology.

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

CHAIR LUCE: I'm Jim Luce.

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

MR. FIKSDAL: Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC staff.

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

CHAIR LUCE: And in the back?

MS. TALBURT: Tammy Talburt, EFSEC Staff.

CHAIR LUCE: Tammy is indispensable. So if you need any help with anything, documents or otherwise, see Tammy. The rest of us up here we're just face. Okay? The work gets done back there.

All right. Scott, you have a presentation to make.

MR. WILLIAMS: A brief one, yes. Thank you, Chairman Luce, Councilmembers. My name is Scott Williams with Puget Sound Energy. Thanks for making the trip
tonight, and I just want to take a few minutes and brief
the folks here as well as the Council about our request
and a little bit about who we are.

        So, again, Scott Williams with Puget Sound
Energy. First, I'm just going to tell you a little bit
about the company. PSE is the largest private utility in
the state of Washington. We have over a million electric
customers. I think about 16,000 roughly right here in
Kittitas County. Part of our mission, a big part of our
mission is to provide reliable low cost power for our
customers. We also take very seriously the will of the
voters as expressed in I-937 and are working diligently to
meet those requirements in an environmentally responsible
manner.

        A little bit about the Wild Horse Project.
The existing Wild Horse Project went on line in December
of 2006, and so it's well into its second year of
operation, and it's proven to be a very high quality wind
site as the Council hears every month from Jennifer Diaz.

        The project enjoys excellent support from
the community and provides positive impacts, economic
impacts, and we believe that the project is complying with
the conditions of the SCA, including formation of a
Technical Advisory Committee that includes membership from
the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the State Department
of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources, the local chapter of the Audubon Society, Kittitas County, the Farm Bureau, Friends of Wildlife and Wind Power, Field and Stream Club, and the Economic Development Group of Kittitas County. We feel this has been a great process and is doing what it's suppose to do which is to adapt to changes in the field and respond to them.

PSE has also funded and participated rather actively in the Coordinated Resource Management Plan for about the past two years that's intended to provide for sustainable grazing practice not only on the wind farm site but in a much larger area, about 60,000 acres.

We've helped to manage wildlife and hunting and recreation and an access to and through or site with DFW and DNR and the TAC and Big Game Management Round Table, and lots of other folks in the community.

We're also very pleased that many of the intervenors in the original application are still very active in all these groups, the TAC and the CRM, and we very much appreciate that and welcome that.

We are working with DFW, PSE is, to finalize the conservation easement on the lands that we own, and as stated in the application we will do that prior to the approval of the amendment for this expansion. We also
constructed a renewable energy center up on the site which is visited by thousands of people since it opened in April and we're very pleased about that.

A little bit about the expansion. Some of the maps in the back depict the proposal, but in short, it's 26 new turbines on 1,280 contiguous acres just north of the existing project site. This land is now owned in fee by Puget Sound Energy. The number of turbine total output will be within what was allowed in the existing SCA but will result in an amendment to the boundary of the project and additional disturbance, approximately 59 acres of temporary and 29 acres of permanent disturbance. All of the requirements of the existing SCA will, of course, apply to the expansion.

Power from the new turbines will flow to the existing project substation which will be expanded and will flow out onto the grid on the existing transmission line without any alteration.

We have also in the application proposed some additional mitigation measures in addition to the requirements in the existing SCA to apply lessons that we learned, that we all learned I think during construction of the Wild Horse Project and which will minimize the impacts of construction which we're trying very hard to do.
We've also asked for an amendment to the requirements of the existing SCA that relate to fencing of the springs and of the mitigation parcel which is Section 27. We're asking for this change really at the request of the CRM group to allow for some flexibility in how these measures are implemented and really I think to reflect the collective wisdom of the group. And I think when the original SCA was approved not a lot was known about how grazing was going to be managed and now we know a lot more about that to the extent that this group goes forward. There are different ideas about the best way to achieve the intent of the mitigation measures. We certainly aren't asking or I should say we're very willing to implement comparable mitigation measures in lieu of what's in the SCA, just asking for the flexibility so the group can decide what's the best thing to do.

In short, we believe that this proposed expansion will produce low risk and low cost power for our customers compared to other things that we can do, and that's a big part of what we're about. I'm certainly happy to try and answer any questions the Council has, but that's all I have.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

Mr. Fiksdal, I believe you are going to explain to everyone who is here the provisions of Chapter
463-66 Washington Administrative Code that pertain to the amending of site certificate agreements, and so I'd appreciate you doing so at this point in time.

MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Correct, under the Washington Administrative Code Chapter 463-66 entitled Amending, Transferring, and Terminating a Site Certification Agreement lays out the procedures and the process for the Council to review a request for amendment to the site certification agreement among other things. There's, oh, probably four or five different sections of that chapter that deal with this amendment, and I'm going to paraphrase quite a bit of what it says. If you want to read it in its entirety, I highly encourage you to do that. You can go to almost any website and type in search engine and get that or go to our website at www.efsec and you can get a link to our laws and rules as with the application for the amendment and many other things that the Council does.

The Council upon receiving an amendment or a request for amendment to a site certification agreement can if it wishes for further understanding hire a consultant to review any of the information that it receives. If it deems necessary that it's such a nature that either staff or the Council can't or feel it's appropriate, they can go out for an outside third-party
consultant to help them review the application.

Also, the Council is required to hold at least one public meeting and thus we are here. Not that we have to but it's always nice to come to Ellensburg to the dry side of the mountains and enjoy your country over here. The Council can hold other meetings if they feel it is appropriate.

Under the amendment review under WAC 463-66-040 the Council in their consideration shall look at whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the intention of the original site certification agreement, applicable laws and rules, the public health and safety and welfare, and whether the provisions of our chapter on site restoration preservation continue to be part of the project in its site restoration.

If you don't know, the Council not only goes through a siting process, it also regulates the facility for the life of the facility through site restoration. There's a requirement in our rules that the project submit site restoration plans and at the end of the project will restore the site or restore the site to a condition that the Council approves.

Not only do they have to consider the intent of the original SCA and all the laws and rules and public health and safety, there's some other specific ones in
environmental conditions.

Another process that the Council has to go through is the State Environmental Policy Act Review or SEPA. The applicant filed a SEPA checklist with the Council. We will be looking through that checklist plus any additional information we deem necessary, and the Council will issue either a determination of nonsignificance, a mitigated determination of nonsignificance, or a determination of significance.

If there is a determination of significance, that would require an amendment to the existing environmental impact statement. The Council hasn't issued that yet. I think they will be doing that soon. I am the lead SEPA official for the Council. I will be offering my recommendation before too long to the Council on my determination.

The Council has to also look at are there other reasonable alternative means by which the purpose of the proposal might be achieved and the availability of funding to implement the proposal. Under the Council Determinations WAC 463-66-060 based on all the information that they have received through the application, through any additional studies, all the public comments that they receive both orally and written the Council may accept the amendment, reject the amendment, or reject the amendment
and state conditions or terms under which the amendment might be reconsidered.

The Council if they're going to approve the application or the request for amendment can approve it if it does not substantially alter any substance of any provision of the SCA or which is determined not to have significant detrimental effect upon the environment. And if this is the case the Council itself can approve the amendment. However, if the amendment substantially alters the substance of any provision of the SCA or which is determined to have a significant detrimental effect upon the environment, the Governor of the State of Washington has to approve the amendment. So it's up to the Council to determine what conditions apply and whether it's approved by the Council or would be recommended up to the Governor for the Governor to approve.

Those are the conditions of that chapter, Mr. Chairman and Councilmembers, that apply for a site certification agreement amendment.

CHAIR LUCE: That's correct, Mr. Fiksdal, and I'd just note for the record that, Mr. Fiksdal, the SEPA determination will be based in part on what we hear here tonight.

So we would hope that any comments you had that would affect that determination would be offered here
and I believe there is a time frame.

Mr. La Spina, is there a time frame within which public comments are stopped by?

MR. LA SPINA: Yes. Public comment will be accepted up until Friday, August 8, at 5:00 p.m., and your written comments can be postmarked that late also.

CHAIR LUCE: Are comments accepted by e-mail as well?

MR. LA SPINA: Yes, yes.

CHAIR LUCE: So thank you very much. We will now move to the public comment portion of tonight's meeting. I have seven people who have signed up to speak.

Tammy, do you have others in the back?

MS. TALBURT: Another one.

CHAIR LUCE: Another one.

The first speaker tonight will be Helen Wise. Helen, welcome. We can probably get the mic to you if you want to just--

MS. WISE: This is all right?

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

COMMENTS BY HELEN WISE

I am Helen Wise, 1106 East Third, Ellensburg. I've been here a long time. I have followed the process of permitting wind farms from June 2002. As
an environmentalist by nature I've been very concerned. I've studied all the things, the papers and SEPA's and all that. I am impressed. And I have been a very strong supporter of wind power, alternative power, and could go on and on about that but I won't.

What I want to say is that here we have Wild Horse. Have you been there? Of course, you have. Have you been impressed? My God, to see it and it's working, and those people, that Puget Sound Energy Company has been carrying through with what you've said should be done. I'm proud of what I see up there. I'm proud of the fact that finally we are harvesting one of our great resources of this county, the wind.

I urge you to approve the expansion of this site and the construction of the requested 26 more turbines. Please support this amendment.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much, Helen. Appreciate your comments.

The next commenter we have is Milt Johnson from the Department of Natural Resources. Milt.

COMMENTS BY MILT JOHNSON

Good evening. Again, I'm Milt Johnson with the Department of Natural Resources. The Department of Natural Resources would like to provide comments on the Puget Sound Energy request to amend the Wild Horse Wind
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Power Project Site Certification Agreement.

DNR leases state lands for both wind power and grazing within this area, and our comments are based upon our perspective as a land manager. Specifically DNR urges EFSEC to amend the existing site certification agreement, to waive the requirement for permanent fencing at springs and mitigation parcel. The water developments do need to be protected; however, the landowners should be encouraged to develop site-specific plans to protect the water developments in order to protect the resource while providing benefits to wildlife and livestock. This may or may not include fencing but should be based upon a site-specific plan developed by the landowners.

PSE is an active member of the Wild Horse Coordinated Resource Management Planning Group. The CRM group is implementing a new grazing plan for the area designed to maintain and improve wildlife habitat and resource conditions. The CRM also monitors these conditions prior to and following each grazing season. This plan for livestock grazing is significantly different than the grazing plan in place at the time the SCA was written. Participation in the CRM process provides superior habitat mitigation across the larger landscape without the need for permanent fencing of the mitigation parcel. Thank you for your consideration.
CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Appreciate that and we'll take that letter and put that into the record. We have another spokesman here from DNR Brent Billingsley.

COMMENTS BY BRENT BILLINGSLEY

Thank you. My name is Brent Billingsley. I'm the Department of Natural Resources Representative on the TAC, and I'd also like to urge the Council to approve the proposed amendment to the site certification agreement.

As DNR's member on the TAC I'd also like to make several comments regarding the performance of the TAC and our ability to work with the certificate holder, Puget Sound Energy. First of all, I believe the TAC is functioning well. We are kept well informed by PSE staff, and it's been a productive process.

Secondly, the TAC has reviewed and unanimously recommended for approval the following plans: the post-construction management and grazing plan, the hunting plan, the post-construction avian monitoring plan, and we're in the process of reviewing the implementation of the post-construction restoration plan.

The TAC has and continues to successfully address wildlife habitat issues. For example, we encouraged PSE to aggressively control the Cheatgrass in
their native restoration seeding and they stepped up to do that. Another example is the time and resource they have contributed to the CRM process on a much larger area than just the power project area itself. Through this process we have worked on wildlife habitats on like a 60,000 acre area, and finally the TAC has been able to reach consensus on each of these recommendations that we've made to EFSEC which is I think an accomplishment with a fairly diverse group.

So based on PSE's performance in complying with the conditions of the permit and their commitment to improving habitat and their active participation in the CRM we would like to urge EFSEC to approve their request.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Appreciate your comments. Do you have something in writing that you're going to hand that we can include in the record? If you do, that would be helpful. If you don't, that's all right to.

The next commenter we have is Marc Eylar. Marc it sounds like Kittitas County Noxious Weed. Welcome, Marc. Just state your name, spell it, and your address for the record.

COMMENTS BY MARC EYLAR

Good evening. My name is Marc Eylar, M-a-r-c E-y-l-a-r. I'm the assistant coordinator for the...
Kittitas County Noxious Weed Control Board and a member of the CRM involving the Wild Horse Wind Power Project.

I've currently worked in the Wild Horse Wind Power Site for last eight years and also with the previous landowner in the area for proposed expansion for noxious weed management, and I just would like to take this time and the Noxious Weed Control Board would like to take this time to acknowledge the fact that the implementation of PSE's noxious weed management plan in that area has been a very successful one in our opinion. They have been very devoted and committed to noxious weed management, and I also think they kind of took it a step further. Brent mentioned it. The cheatgrass control that's something that very few landowners of that size will endeavor. It's a tough commitment and it's actually been a pretty successful one.

Based on the surveys that we've done this year it looks like they have pretty successful control, but we also, the Noxious Weed Control Board would also like to stress the fact that the implementation of this noxious weed control plan that they have be even more strongly in place for the expansion areas because this is a little more of a weedier area. There's a lot more invasive species presently located at that site. It was an area that burned a few years ago and because of this
there's a little bit more stress; and we strongly urge that the implementation of a noxious weed management plan in that area be a little more aggressive to control some of the musk thistle and cheatgrass in that area.

We also would like to stress that the continuation of this implementation continue for the long term in the future. Noxious weed management isn't something that can happen in just two years and you can walk away from it. Even if it looks good, you always get more disturbance and you get reseeding from vehicles. So that is something that we strongly encourage that the commitment be there for as long as the project lasts and as long as PSE is a landowner.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Do you have any specific recommendations that you're going provide to the Council in terms of the plan which you just told us?

MR. EYLAR: I would just stress that PSE staff Jennifer just meet with us and she has done that.

CHAIR LUCE: Appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Robert Kruse, Friends of Wildlife and Wind Power. Good Evening, Mr. Kruse.

MR. KRUSE: Good evening, Chairman.

CHAIR LUCE: Name, address, spelling, all the usual.
COMMENTS BY ROBERT KRUSE

Robert Kruse, 8885 42nd Avenue S.W.,
Seattle, 98136. I'm Chairman of the group known as
Friends of Wildlife and Wind Power, and I'm a member of
the TAC committee and the CRM and also the Washington
State Department of Fish and Wildlife Wind Power
Guidelines Renewal Committee.

I'm here tonight representing our group
Friends of Wildlife and Wind Power but also am
collaborating in communication with the Council this
evening along with the Kittitas Audubon group and the
Kittitas Field and Stream Club. We have assembled a
communication letter here to the Council, and we'd like to
present that to you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. That would be
helpful if you want to read the letter into the record or
if you just want to submit it for the record.

MR. KRUSE: No, I'm sorry. It's too lengthy
for that, but I would like to touch on the high points.

CHAIR LUCE: We will pay very careful
attention to it.

MR. KRUSE: Okay. Thank you.

We endorse and support the expansion project
conditionally. Under the current circumstances we do not
endorse the approval of the project, and I'd like to touch
on the reasons why and some of the elements of hope for our ultimate approval for the project because we do think that ultimately that will come to pass.

Our concerns fall into three categories. First, mitigation for the original project, the original Wild Horse Wind Power Project that have not been met yet. The second category is the mitigation for the new project, and the third category is concerns that have developed over witnessing the operation of the existing Wild Horse project so far.

In the first category of mitigation not yet satisfied the principal item is a conservation easement for the lands of the project area its present configuration. The SCA and the EFSEC Council promised the public via the SCA and through other communication elements that a viable conservation easement would be placed on the lands of the project and that has not happened yet. We congratulate the Department of Fish and Wildlife on their efforts in the endeavor thus far, but we're still not there. There is work ongoing with the conservation easement presently. We are yet hopeful that ultimately an easement that embraces the meaning of the intention of the agreement between the public and the EFSEC Council and the developer will ultimately be reached, but right now we fall short of that.
The easement being circulated presently allows for expansion of the Wild Horse Wind Power Project far beyond wind energy development. Wind energy development was supposed to be what the project was all about initially, and now it appears that there is an interest in wanting to predispose future industrial expansion of the project area far beyond wind energy development and we're concerned about that. We don't feel that that element of the conservation easement at this time is what we bargained for initially, and we'd like to have that problem corrected.

We do, however, appreciate that Puget Sound Energy has presented by this amendment that's before you now the recognition that a conservation easement needs to be in place before approval of this project is given and we appreciate that.

The second important mitigation item was fencing of the mitigation parcel and the springs. We have heard comments from the others so far this evening. We appreciate them. We do recognize that the science and the data and the information related to the concepts for fencing the mitigation parcel and the springs was different at the time of original approval of the project than it is now. There's better ideas out there and fencing apparently does not fall into that category. So
based on good information we recently received from the Department of Fish and Wildlife our views have changed. We don't sanction the use of fencing necessarily, but, however, the mitigation parcel was presented to the public as a very significant mitigation item under the original SCA. The mitigation parcel also, however, is part of the project. There's 12 turbines on the one square mile landscape. If the parcel is not fenced and it is presently part of the project and it doesn't become the sanctuary for ground nesting birds and for prevention of hazards as a result of that migration, then actually it is no longer a mitigation parcel. It has become something different. And so part of our proposed mitigation remedies is to identify ideas for a new or different mitigation parcel that satisfies the intent of the benefits for wildlife under the original project proposal.

In the case of the springs we agree that individual designs go for each individual spring circumstance is necessary that likely does not include fencing, and also we appreciate Puget Sound Energy's apparent willingness to provide mitigative benefits in a form different than the fencing that was originally intended that could take the form of native plant material restoration and vegetation restoration in lieu of the fencing, and ideas along those lines are something we
would promote and we would hope for in order to provide the mitigative benefit that was originally intended under the SCA.

Our schedule proposed expansion mitigation principally it includes the restoration of the springs themselves and the water development capability for the springs. We feel that the acknowledgment in the original SCA of the importance of the springs in the overall project development and the health of the project and the landscapes that were suppose to be cared for fell far short of recognition of the value of the water resource contained in the existing Wild Horse area, and we feel that an element of mitigation for the impacts that are going to be felt as a result of the project expansion that Puget Sound Energy should undertake the responsibility for restoring the springs in the existing project area, as well as the two springs that are in the expansion area, the Basalt spring and Spike Spring; and those water resources need to be preserved in a way that they will be available long term for wildlife and for the grazing program should it continue to go ahead.

Landscape restoration we now have the benefit of two years of restoration efforts. We applaud Puget Sound Energy's efforts in restoration. They've really tried to go the extra mile to restore this landscape under
the intention of the original intentions. Regrettably after two years the restoration effort is not what everyone would have hoped, but it was recognized going in that restoration of shrub steppe habitat is a very difficult prospect. I think we need to learn from the restoration effort thus far, but more importantly we need to recognize that the SCA does not require Puget Sound Energy to carry the restoration effort beyond three years. And clearly if restoration of the areas, particularly the areas that were suppose to be temporary impact areas, does not go beyond three years, those areas will not be restored. It's clearly that that's the case.

So as perhaps a mitigation element we believe that continued ongoing restoration efforts in the original project area to restore the landscape at least to some median level of shrub steppe restoration should be requested by the Council of Puget Sound Energy and for restoration effort to carry forward. What has been learned in the restoration effort of the original project should be translated into the expansion area and a different specification for the expansion area should become part of the approval process. The restoration effort for the original area it was not a performance-based specification. There was no target for what we were trying to achieve. There needs to be a
target for the expansion area. There's enough known about what to do to make it right and that needs to be part of the approval of the new project.

Other environmental impacts and concerns that we have based on the experience of the project thus far, turbine placement. In the original project we expressed concern about the close proximity of turbine placement to water. Regrettably our concerns weren't acknowledged and acted upon under the original project proposal. We'd like to have them revisited in the new project proposal recognizing the turbines have been designed close to water forces and we'd like to have the expert commentary on what that means to us at this point.

For this project, but apparently for all projects nationwide there isn't a lot of science on what the impact of turbine placement close to water resources for wildlife is. Whatever the information is that's available it needs to be studied carefully and we don't think it was studied carefully enough in the original project. We'd like to have that addressed now.

There is a small element of information available for the Wild Horse project now, and they've had one year of avian monitoring for the Wild Horse project. The second year is required by the SCA, but when that will begin has not yet been decided by the TAC committee. The
first year's information indicates that there might be a difference in avian mortality in turbines or with turbines closer to water than further away. There's a small increase in avian mortality at Reynolds Spring and Thorn Spring turbines. The sampling is very small. It's much too small to lend any scientific weight to, but there is an indication that there are more birds being killed at turbines closer to water, and we'd like to have that recognized and taken into consideration in the expansion proposal.

There is new science or at least commentary involving concern about the relationship of bat mortality and turbine blades. It's been written in scientific forum reports that there may be an attraction of bats to turbine blades, and at the minimum we would like to have all that is known presented in a supplemental EIS for the expansion area so that if nothing else the public knows what is known by the scientific community right now about that particular problem.

The layout for the new project includes overhead wires. In the original project the use of overhead wires was shunned and it was discussed rather heavily in the application for site certification, the certification agreement, the draft and final environmental impact statement. There are good reasons not to have
overhead wires, and there's overhead wires designed into
the project now. We understand that it may be because of
leasehold or access or right-of-way problems might exist
in property ownership between the Department of Fish and
Wildlife and Puget Sound Energy. We would like to try to
promote a resolution of that so that feeder lines from the
turbines could be placed underground as opposed to
overhead. The overhead lines are right across the end of
the Skookumchuck Canyon, and I for one would appreciate
not walking up Skookumchuck Canyon to the end and
witnessing overhead lines across the end when it's not
necessary, and I don't think it is. We hope the property
ownership elements could be taken care of, if that's what
the problem was that precipitated that design element.

I think that the greatest problem so far with
the existing project, and this may be perhaps more of a
personal feeling on my part than widely held in the
community, although I do think it is widely held in the
community, and that is the width of the roads that were
constructed for the original project. We feel that the
width of the roads and the amount of destruction that the
landscape was subjected to as a result of the width of the
roads is actually shameful, and we think we may understand
some of the reasons why the roads had to be so wide.
Maybe it was because the passage of two large pieces of
equipment at the same time in order to save time on the project to haul turbines or bring cranes out. Time saving mechanisms may have been a big part of why the roads are so wide. If so, on the new project we'd like to slow the construction of the project down so we don't have to have roads that are just as wide as Interstate 90 through a shrub steppe landscape. So it's actually rather pathetic. We'd like to have what caused that problem in the first place addressed in a supplemental EIS in some form.

To conclude, a supplemental environmental review of the importance appropriate to the expansion project should be undertaken. A supplemental EIS or some method of review of the project given the gravity of the impacts that are going to be undertaken there would be appropriate, but it would also greatly facilitate the basis to have the necessary discussions for mitigation and ultimately the final design for the project. We appreciate the Council's consideration in all of these matters. Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you so much, Mr. Kruse. We appreciate your comments.

It's public comment. You want to engage in some dialogue now?

MR. TAYER: No, I just want to ask a question.
Robert, I wanted to clarify. I thought I heard you say at the beginning of your comments that this was a consensus statement with your group, Kittitas Audubon, and Kittitas Field and Stream.

MR. KRUSE: That's correct.

MR. TAYER: Did I hear that correctly?

MR. KRUSE: Yes, you did.

In addition to the letter that I have submitted to you a supplemental commentary from our Counsel David Bricklin is attached.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. We appreciate your comments, Mr. Kruse.

Mr. Piercy, I seem to remember that name. Mr. Piercy, good evening. Would you state your name and spell it and give your address for the record, please.

COMMENTS BY DARRYL PIERCY

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. For the record, Darryl Piercy. I'm Director of Community Development Services for Kittitas County. My address is 411 North Ruby Street, Ellensburg, 98926.

I'd like to preface my remarks to the Council this evening by complimenting Puget Sound Energy on the achievement that they've undertaken at Wild Horse Energy Facility. They have been a wonderful working partner with Kittitas County. They have demonstrated that
they do what they say, and in our relationship in working with Puget Sound Energy at the Wild Horse site it's been one of mutual cooperation and respect and we do appreciate the attitude and the process that they've brought to the development of the Wild Horse site. And we recognize that that is a facility that should appear and show as an example of how public and private facilities can work together to create something that truly has benefit to the community. So we would like to express our thanks and our appreciation to Puget Sound Energy for their efforts and their cooperation with Kittitas County.

The EFSEC Board may recall you found that the Wild Horse Wind Power Project was consistent with local land use requirements of Kittitas County, and in fact as part of that process in developing consistency with the rules and regulations of Kittitas County, Puget Sound Energy entered into a development agreement among other things with Kittitas County to be consistent with the requirements found both in our comprehensive plan and within our development code.

Since the time of approval for the Wild Horse Facility we have had some modifications to our development code which actually allows for an expedited process for local review of wind power projects that are located in the preidentified areas for siting. What I
have passed out to the Council this evening is the amendments to our code that shows where those preidentified sites and locations are and the process for review at the local level of those preidentified sites, and you can find that in Kittitas County Code 17.61A.035.

The process of that we review now within these preidentified sites, and I think it's important to note that the proposed expansion area for the Wild Horse Wind Farm is in one of these preidentified sites for wind power projects so it would be subject to that code citation that I just mentioned. Our local process requires that Puget Sound Energy would enter into a development agreement. In this case since one already exists we would look for an amendment to that development agreement, and with that amendment and the environmental review that's being conducted by EFSEC that would lead towards approval of the project if that in fact was the case for Kittitas County and it met the requirements that are outlined in our code.

We have been assured by a representative of Puget Sound Energy that they intend to come to the county and ask that the project and expansion be reviewed through our local process to ensure consistency with Kittitas County code and our comprehensive plan. We would ask the EFSEC Board to make that a requirement of your approval.
that you seek local consistency with our code. We have an applicant that appears to be very willing to do that, and we believe that you have an obligation to ensure that it's consistent with those local requirements. We ask that you would do that.

We also would like to identify within the SEPA documentation there is a lack of indication that a local process is required into the SEPA documents and that amendment to our development code would be one of those requirements in terms of the permitting process for this applicant. So we would like that to be noted within the SEPA documentation that in fact that it is a local process and an amendment to the existing development agreement with Kittitas County that would be required for this project to move forward.

But, again, we believe that Puget Sound Energy has the ability and the direction to come into compliance with the local requirements. You'll note within our code that the local requirements are a much expedited process from those in the past, particularly for this site. There are few requirements that are asked of the applicant in order to be in compliance with our code, but we believe that those are very reasonable expectations, and again I believe that that's also the sense from the applicant in this case, and they appear to
be very willing to work with Kittitas County. So I thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Council and would be happy to respond to any questions if you so have them.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you for coming here, Mr. Piercy.

MS. ADELSMAN: I have a question.

CHAIR LUCE: Yes, Hedia.

MS. ADELSMAN: When you say expedited can you give us a range of what time frame it would be?

MR. PIERCY: For example, we just recently approved a siting of a wind energy facility directly south and to the east of the Wild Horse site by a company named Invenergy. That was a 60-plus turbine site. We received the application for that in October. I believe our approvals came sometime in March the following year so within a six-month period, and keep in mind that that also spanned the process of the holidays. So we believe that that demonstrated a real ability within our code to look at a project critically and to have it meet substantial requirements under that review and yet be done in a very expedited period of time.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Mr. Piercy.

MR. PIERCY: Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: The next commenter I have is
Bill Essman, Kittitas County Field and Stream. Bill, you want to come forward and tell us what's on your mind.

COMMENTS BY BILL ESSMAN

Mr. Chair, Councilmembers, my name is Bill Essman, E-s-s-m-a-n. I'm president of the Kittitas County Field and Stream Club. I'm also a member of the Wild Horse TAC, and I'd like to say that I think our TAC is very productive. We have a good group of folks, and we seem to get things done without very much effort. I'd also like to say that I wish that the process was a little more adaptive, but I think time will go on. This is a learning process for everything.

Our club would like to have a little bit more than what's offered right now by PSE, but I think eventually that will come, and I would like to without going into a whole lot of detail just affirm that we have joined with Robert Kruse's organization and the Kittitas Audubon Society in drafting this letter that you have before you. Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.
Catherine Clerf. Good evening, Ms. Clerf.

COMMENTS BY CATHERINE CLERF

Good evening. Catherine Clerf, C-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, last name C-l-e-r-f. Address is 60 Moe, M-o-e, Road, Ellensburg, Washington 98926. Speaking
on behalf of myself as a long time fourth generation
cattle ranching and farming member family of Kittitas
County.

Not too many citizens came forward, just
Helen. Everyone else spoke on behalf of an institution or
an organization so I guess I'll speak for the generation
of the baby boomer I represent and that of my daughter, a
generation behind me, and grandkids I hope to have
someday.

It's about time America got up and realized
the fact that we have allowed all the infrastructure that
was built as far back as 120 years ago. People need to
realize that the original oil impregnated a line laid by
Westinghouse and Edison is still in the ground serving all
the major municipalities in the United States of America
120 years. This is advent of a paradigm shift that needs
to take place in our country as well as the world. For
all the people who harbor either resentment or concerns or
fears about what happens to large expensive hundreds if
not thousands of acres of land with regard to energy
production had just better be mindful that we fly in
airplanes now and thinking of it think about what the very
first people did and the same way with every other
technology that has come along. How many speakers has
said this was a learning process? It was.
We are a shrub-steppe terrain in Eastern Washington from our borders to our foreign country above all the way down to the spine of the Cascades. More will be in place. I am in the renewable energy business, but I'm speaking here just for myself, and this is going to be a global phenomenon. We're not going to be able to attack any of our transportation problems which require energy. If you're going to switch to hybrid electrical, you're going to have to have energy production. We can no longer bank or count on the hydroelectric system. We can't add anymore. There are people who would like to reduce them in fact.

You can create water in the desert believe it or not chemically, but you do need cheap power. The only way we're going to allow any offset of huge population growth on the other side of the state is to solve the water problems on this side of the state without robbing the in-stream flows. And, of course, having to work around the fact it doesn't snow at 125 percent snow pack every year. We are totally at the whims of mother nature.

Again, as a 54-year-old, I'm excited that my state is going to be leading the charge of the 50 states that need to address what needs to be done, and the bottom line is we do not have a civilization nor do we have an...
economy, whether it's local county, state, or federal, unless we have energy. Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments.

The last commenter I have listed—it doesn't mean it's the last commenter—is Steve—I'm going to struggle with Verhey.

MR. VERHEY: I can do that for you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thanks, Steve.

COMMENTS BY STEVE VERHEY

My name is Steve Verhey. That's spelled V-e-r-h-e-y, and my address is 1801 North B Street, Ellensburg, 98926.

I'd like to start with a really practical comment. I note here that the modification of the SCA calls for alterations of the existing substation. I'm a very strong supporter of alternative energy, but half the time up at the Wild Horse site it's dark, and there's only one thing that bothers me about looking at that site day or night, and it's lighting on the substation. I like the look of the turbines in the daytime. I think they're magnificent. I like the cool, synchronized red strobos on the turbines at night. I think that's very cool, but the lighting at the substation bugs the heck out of me. The hillside that used to be completely dark now has this
substation. I understand that it's probably required by code to light the substation. I'm hoping that it's not necessary that the light be visible off site. If there is something that could be done about that as part of this expansion, that would be a wonderful thing. That was the main thing that I wanted to say.

I also wanted to echo the comments of Mr. Kruse. I think that he exhibited very well that it's possible to be a strong supporter of alternative energy but not be willing to throw the baby out with the bath water. As we go to do this expansion of energy we need to, of course, remember conservation, and we need to be careful as we go along and not simply grasp at any form of energy just because it's energy. We need to think about what we're doing and do it as carefully as we possibly can. Wild Horse has done an admirable job and it's time to take it to the next level.

I was actually surprised to hear that some of the requirements of the earlier permit hadn't been completed and particularly the mitigation on the section that Mr. Kruse is talking about. It would surprise me if this expansion were approved without the initial project being completed, but maybe I don't understand the process very well.

Finally, to return to my original point, can
we please do something about the lights on the substation. Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Appreciate your comments.

Are there other commenters here this evening? Are there other commenters here this evening?

MR. FIKSDAL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate there are sheets up there for written comments if you want to submit those tonight, and we again as Jim La Spina mentioned we'll accept written comments until 5:00 p.m. Friday.

MR. LA SPINA: Or e-mail.

MR. FIKSDAL: Or e-mail and I think the e-mail address is listed in the information sheet.

CHAIR LUCE: So public meeting requesting amendment to the Wild Horse Wind Power Project Site Certification Agreement No. 5 is hereby concluded.

MR. KRUSE: I just wanted to mention there will be copies of our letter on the back table for anyone who is interested.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, again.

Tammy is the person who makes things happen around here so if you need help with any documents or anything else or if you need to get a hold of EFSEC get a hold of Tammy. Thank you. We stand adjourned.
(Whereupon, the public hearing was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.)
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