

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the matter of)
Application No. 2009-01) Hearing Volume IV
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY, LLC.) Pages 523 - 613
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT)
_____)

A hearing in the above matter was held on Wednesday, January 5, 2011, at the Underwood Community Center, 951 Schoolhouse Road, in Underwood, Washington at 3:30 p.m., before the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council with C. Robert Wallis, Administrative Law Judge, presiding.

* * * * *

JUDGE WALLIS: All right. This hearing will please come to order. This is an adjudicative session before the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council upon due and proper notice to all interested persons being held in Underwood, Washington on January 5 of the year 2011.

My name is Robert Wallis and I am an Administrative Law Judge appointed for this proceeding by the Council, and on behalf of the Council I would like to welcome everyone who is here today.

Also at the front table are EFSEC members, Council Members, and I would like to have them introduce themselves beginning on my right.

1 MR. FRYHLING: My name is Dick Fryhling and I
2 represent Department of Commerce.

3 MR. TAYER: Hi, I am Jeff Tayer. I'm with the
4 Department of Fish and wildlife.

5 CHAIR LUCE: I'm Jim Luce. I represent the
6 Governor's office.

7 MR. CREWS: Kyle Crews, Assistant Attorney
8 General's Office, counsel for the Council.

9 MR. MOSS: I'm Dennis Moss with the Washington
10 Utilities and Transportation Commission.

11 MR. HAYES: Hi, my name is Andy Hayes. I'm with
12 the Washington Department of Natural Resources.

13 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. I would like to
14 introduce EFSEC staff. We have Mr. Al Wright, the EFSEC's
15 manager; Stephen Posner, Jim La Spina sitting at the table
16 up front, and in the back helping everyone check in are
17 Tammy Talburt and Kayce Michelle.

18 The purpose of today's hearing is for the Council
19 to hear your comments, comments from the members of the
20 public on the proposed Whistling Ridge Energy Project.
21 Because this an adjudicative hearing and Council Members are
22 sitting as judges, it is not proper for them to talk with
23 individual people about the merits of the proceeding so we
24 ask that if you have any questions about the process or
25 about the proceeding itself talk with one of the staff

1 people either at the front or the back. If they are not
2 able to answer your question, they will find an answer for
3 you.

4 I'd first like to summarize the proposed project.
5 On March 10 of 2009 Whistling Ridge Energy, LLC, which is a
6 Washington limited liability company submitted an
7 application for site certification to the Siting Council to
8 construct and operate the Whistling Ridge Energy Project
9 which is a 75-megawatt electrical wind generation facility.

10 The proposed project will be located about seven
11 miles north of the City of White Salmon in Skamania County,
12 Washington. The proposed project site is privately owned
13 land currently used for commercial timber harvest. Up to 50
14 wind turbines ranging in size from 1.2 to 2.5 megawatts and
15 up to 426 feet tall would be installed for the project.

16 The project would include an operation and
17 maintenance facility and electrical substation and
18 underground collector line and system to bring the energy to
19 the substation, access roads, and other ancillary
20 facilities.

21 The revised site certification application was
22 submitted on October 12 of 2009 which changed the original
23 proposal by avoiding use of a Forest Service road located
24 within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

25 Tonight we will accept written comments. So if

1 you brought written comments with you, you can give them to
2 one of the staff people and they will be put in our
3 adjudicative record. If you want to speak and also have a
4 written summary or written document from which you're
5 speaking, you may present that and we will put that into the
6 record. You can refer to it without reading it in your
7 presentation, and we will then because you have submitted it
8 in writing have it for us to review before the decision is
9 made.

10 If you have a written document, we encourage you
11 not to read it. I think you will find that it is more
12 effective for you to summarize the document and hit or make
13 points as you go through. We have put up a time limit
14 tonight so that everyone has an opportunity to present your
15 comments to the Council. Tonight's comments will be a part
16 of the Council's adjudicative record in this proceeding, and
17 in front of me seated behind the speaker podium or beside
18 the podium is our court reporter Shaun Linse, and she is
19 taking a record of every word that is spoken here this
20 evening.

21 You're doing a wonderful job at being silent, and
22 we ask you to continue that throughout the session so that
23 everyone in the room can hear what the people addressing the
24 Council are saying. When you make a comment please be as
25 specific as possible in your comments regarding what it is

1 you're talking about with the project and what your views
2 are. We're going to limit the comments tonight to three
3 minutes in light of the number of people who have signed up.
4 And if you for some reason you choose not to speak tonight,
5 we will also be in Stevenson tomorrow night, and you will be
6 able to appear tomorrow night to present comments.

7 Finally, if there are several persons who are
8 supporting the commenter's position, you can choose one of
9 the people to present comments. Tell us how many you are
10 representing and we will allot the time accordingly, again
11 so that everyone in the room who wishes to present comments
12 can have those comments heard.

13 I'm going to call three people at a time. I'm
14 wondering if staff can pull some chairs up front so that we
15 have chairs for the witnesses to use while they are waiting
16 to speak.

17 The first person called will be the speaker, the
18 next two will follow, and we will continue calling people in
19 that order. So now we will begin the hearing comments from
20 the people who have signed up, and our first witness for
21 this evening is W.D. Truitt, T-r-u-i-t-t. Next we have John
22 Saulie-Rohman, if I'm reading that correctly, and then Tom
23 Rousseau.

24 ///

25 ///

1 W.D. TRUITT,
2 having been first duly sworn on oath,
3 testified as follows:
4

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

7 Q. Could you state your full name for the us and your
8 address or business address.

9 A. My name is W.D. Truitt. My address is P.O.
10 Box 215, Carson, Washington. I'm a life-long Skamania County
11 resident. I grew up right up the road here. Anyway I
12 support the Whistling Ridge Energy Project. Geography and
13 land use restrictions limits Skamania County's ability to
14 grow its economy and develop renewable energy resources.
15 Since the scenic area was passed in 1986, we weren't facing
16 now all the conditions we are today in global warming and all
17 the other things.

18 About the county and how much land we have, total
19 acreage in Skamania County is 1,070,000 acres. Of that
20 80 percent approximately 855,000 acres belongs to the
21 Gifford Pinchot. Eight percent, about 85,200 acres belongs
22 to the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area and nothing can
23 be done there. Six percent, about 59,000 or almost 60,000
24 acres belong to state forest. Four percent of it, roughly
25 39,000 acres, belongs to commercial forest practice, forest

1 lands. That leaves about two percent which is about 28,000,
2 a little more than 28,000 acres to do anything with, and
3 that's counting what's already been developed.

4 So, you know, we're really hurting for -- we can't
5 do anything. We don't have any industrial lands. There is
6 no opportunity. It's hard to do anything with the National
7 Forest. Two percent is like 28,000 acres. We have made all
8 of our money from the timber industry. We have no timber
9 industry now. This is a good chance. It's suppose to
10 projections are 143 construction jobs, 9 permanent jobs
11 afterwards, 5 supporting jobs for that. \$650,000 annually
12 would be generated to support the state and local taxing
13 districts and \$900,000 employee generated local spending.
14 That's a big thing.

15 I believe Whistling Ridge Energy is the right
16 project, the right time, and the right place. This project
17 creates green energy, economic development, and it's
18 environmentally prudent.

19 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you.

20 Mr. Saulie-Rohman.

21

22 JOHN SAULIE-ROHMAN,

23 having been first duly sworn on oath,

24 testified as follows:

25

1 TESTIMONY OF JOHN SAULIE-ROHMAN

2 First off, I'd like to thank yourself, Honorable
3 Judge, and the Committee for taking the time to come down
4 here and listen to what the community members have to say.
5 My name is John Saulie-Rohman. My address 101 S.W. Cherry
6 Blossom Lane, White Salmon, Washington 98672.

7 As a resident of White Salmon with generations of
8 family history, I have seen the ups and downs of my own
9 community, as well as the surrounding ones. Logging was
10 once a way of life for many families, including my own,
11 either directly or indirectly for many years. Schools and
12 community services were well funded and rivaled the best in
13 the state.

14 After legislation was passed restricting revenues
15 from harvesting timber on federal land this whole area
16 experienced an overnight depression that still exists today.
17 Well, now legislation has passed that dictates that
18 15 percent of the energy produced by 2020 needs to be
19 derived from renewable sources in Washington state. Many of
20 the people who once welcomed legislation limiting timber
21 harvest which this community depended on so much are now
22 attempting to prevent the very thing that could begin to
23 fill the massive void left by the disintegration of the
24 logging community.

25 Please bring clean local jobs to this area and to

1 families like my own that so desperately need it. Thank
2 you.

3 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you.

4 Now that Mr. Rousseau is stepping forward, Frank
5 Backus, Sally Newell, and Stephen Bronsveld are the next
6 three people in line.

7 TOM ROUSSEAU,
8 having been first duly sworn on oath,
9 testified as follows:

10

11

EXAMINATION

12 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

13 Q. Could you state your name for our record and tell
14 us your business or residence address, please.

15 A. Okay. My name is Tom Rousseau. I reside at 4179
16 Willow Flat Road in Hood River.

17 Like almost everyone in this room I strongly
18 advocate establishing diverse and environmental friendly
19 naturally renewable resources, including the wind power
20 generators. However, I'm opposed to this project because it
21 is the right project in the wrong place. The project should
22 be placed where the negative impacts to scenery and wildlife
23 are minimal.

24 There are good places and bad places to locate
25 wind generator farms. Good places, for example, include

1 Eastern Washington, Oregon, and in less scenic and sparsely
2 visited areas where scenic and habitat impacts are minimal.

3 Bad places are those that would detract from the
4 scenic quality of unique and special places or have unknown
5 tolls on habitat such as Yosemite or the Columbia Gorge.

6 There are three compelling reasons this project is
7 wrong. The first is the scenic impacts. This project
8 certainly violates the intent of the Columbia River National
9 Scenic Act which is to preserve the scenic views from
10 anywhere in the Gorge. Unsightly views would be further
11 exacerbated at night with the bright red lights flashing in
12 unison from in many places in the Gorge, the White Salmon
13 Range, and Hood River Valley.

14 If you doubt me, I invite you to an eastward view
15 of the east slopes from Goat Rocks, the wilderness from
16 Mt. Adams or Mount Hood. The application document
17 inadequately addresses the project's visual impacts
18 understating and totally ignores the nighttime lighting
19 issues. A good reason to deny the project.

20 Number two, human and wildlife impacts in the
21 words of the application document and I'm quoting here:
22 Ongoing forest management on the lands located within the
23 project site has reduced suitable habitat for these species
24 through fragmentation of mature forest.

25 This statement clearly admits poor forest

1 management in the past is not justification for continuing
2 in the future. This project should be denied in order to
3 allow the natural habitat to reestablish itself.

4 Number three, energy management. It has been
5 reported in the media and by BPA that a good plant managing
6 the energy provided by wind power has yet to be established.
7 The intermittent nature of wind power makes energy storage
8 essential; yet there is no plan to manage wind generation
9 storage and distribution. There are only notions. The
10 application document does not address this issue, and yet
11 another reason to deny the project.

12 If granted, the miniscule energy that would be
13 available from this project is not worth the scenic and
14 ecological damage that we ensue. Energy from these 50 wind
15 generators would be insignificant compared to the energy
16 from hundreds becoming thousands of generators in Eastern
17 Washington and Oregon. This is not a good tradeoff between
18 energy production and denigration of the NSA scenic
19 qualities in the area. Thank you.

20 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much.

21 Mr. Backus.

22

23 FRANK BACKUS,

24 having been first duly sworn on oath,

25 testified as follows:

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

3 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name
4 for the record, please.

5 A. My name is Frank Backus, B-a-c-k-u-s, 551 Highway
6 141, White Salmon.

7 I thank you, Commissioners, for coming today and
8 taking this testimony on the Whistling Ridge Project. I'm
9 in favor of this project, and I urge you to approve it as
10 it's been requested, and some of the reasons I believe that
11 it warrants approval are as follows:

12 Whistling Ridge will help the local economy with
13 new employment during and after the construction, new
14 property tax revenues for Skamania County, and very
15 importantly it will diversify and strengthen both SDS Lumber
16 Company and the Broughton Lumber Company to sustain poor
17 economic times and sustain the employment that they have.

18 No significant impacts to wildlife, vegetation,
19 soil, or water have been reported. No significant impacts
20 to cultural or tribal interests. The wind turbines are
21 compatible with the surrounding zoning which is agricultural
22 and forest.

23 And to the scenic issues Whistling Ridge is
24 located outside of the National Scenic Area boundary, and
25 the National Scenic Area Act should have no bearing

1 whatsoever on your decision. State Route 141 is the Lewis
2 Clark Highway. Whistling Ridge has limited visibility from
3 that highway, and that highway already has wind turbines
4 very close to the east of here. The Lewis and Clark Trail
5 and the Oregon Trail both of which are now 20 to 30 feet
6 underwater, and I don't think from submarine or a diving
7 mask you can see turbines 20 feet below the surface.

8 Last of all, the Whistling Ridge Project is
9 75-megawatts of power that has been mandated by the voters
10 of the State of Washington. Thank you very much, and this
11 document you have copies.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. Could you hand the
13 document to staff.

14 MR. BACKUS: I already have.

15 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. Sally Newell, Stephen
16 Bronsveld, Wirt Maxey, and Rebecca Maxey.

17 SALLY NEWELL,
18 having been first duly sworn on oath,
19 testified as follows:

20

21 EXAMINATION

22 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

23 Q. Could you pull that microphone to your mouth, and
24 that way I think everyone will be able to hear you. Could
25 you tell us your name and spell your last name and give us

1 your mailing address, please.

2 A. Okay. I'm Sally Newell, N-e-w-e-l-l. I'm at P.O.
3 Box 186, also 142 Dona Road, Underwood, Washington 98651.

4 I thank you all for coming here again. I would
5 remind the board members here present that it was only
6 because of the public outcry that you even came to Underwood
7 or recognized Underwood as a community. The documentation
8 still doesn't recognize Underwood as a community that
9 characterizes this project as seven miles north of White
10 Salmon which is not accurate at all. It lies wholly within
11 the community of Underwood as defined by the Underwood
12 Community Council documents that sort of gives a boundary of
13 the perimeter to the community.

14 I want to talk about the transportation during
15 construction. I think others will talk about the wildlife
16 and so on. I would throw in that I think doing wildlife
17 studies in the aftermath of a clearcut is probably not the
18 wisest way to figure out what habitat existed prior to the
19 clearcut or what habitat is being traded off for the sake of
20 windmills.

21 But I want to talk about transportation. I have
22 been out to the sites east of The Dalles, and they have huge
23 roads to accommodate these towers being moved up from the
24 highway. Underwood has no such road. There will be huge
25 disruption to our local transportation. I think I did try

1 through the county to find out what the population of
2 Underwood was. I failed. Maybe in your studies you can
3 figure that out, and then after you do that figure out how
4 many people's lives are going to be made perfectly hell for
5 the duration of the construction phase of this project.

6 And I suppose that's fine as long as it's not your
7 house that's burning, not your child that's choking, not
8 your dad that's having a heart attack. I would really urge
9 you to think hard about what you're imposing on this
10 community for the sake of these towers.

11 Our emergency response times are quite good at
12 this time, but if you have big wide oversized loads on the
13 roads and traffic being stopped, we're not going to have any
14 response times at all. There is one road in and one road
15 out of Underwood, and that is Cook-Underwood road, and that
16 is the proposed haul route. There's no getting around that.

17 Again I just want to thank you for coming to
18 Underwood and taking testimony. I really appreciate it. We
19 would really like to see some recognition that we are a
20 community somewhere in the documentation.

21 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.
22 Stephen Bronsveld.

23 STEPHEN BRONSVELD,
24 having been first duly sworn on oath,
25 testified as follows:

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

3 Q. Could you give us your name and spell your last
4 name for us, please.

5 A. My is Stephen Bronsveld. Last name is
6 B-r-o-n-s-v-e-l-d. I reside at 1111 Scoggins Road,
7 Underwood, Washington.

8 Q. Please proceed with your comments.

9 A. All right. Thanks so much for coming, you guys.
10 You were here before. I'm happy to see you again. I was the
11 guy who put the red ribbon around the house on the end of
12 Scoggins Road when you took the trip up there. Remember?
13 Well, that route's apparently been abandoned and we're now
14 the haul route is just Cook-Underwood all the way to Willard
15 Road; am I correct? Yes. So that's a great decision that we
16 got off our back county roads, kind of echoing what Sally was
17 just saying.

18 Because like we've said, the roads are our
19 community. The fact that they get smaller as they go
20 further away from the services is a trademark of them.
21 Putting a big road in will change the whole character of our
22 community. You know that? Okay.

23 The other thing is this: That during construction
24 even after routes in and out of this site are going to be
25 very important. There might be a special certification. We

1 have a community ed. program here teaching people how to
2 work on windmills, and maybe this will be a special
3 accreditation up here. Every operation up there may be
4 visited by dozens of college students at any given time for
5 years to come. See? So the official routes in and out are
6 critical, and I think that they should be determined, I
7 think that they should be mandatory, and that will keep
8 vehicles off of places they don't belong.

9 Perhaps the Counsel for the Environment should
10 take up that issue in terms of our local way that we live
11 here. And the other thing is that having everything
12 outlined like that would be an added security measure
13 because any vehicles off the given routes will attract the
14 attention of the number one security system that we have in
15 Underwood which is neighbors watching what's going on.

16 In fact, there was a group of six trucks that said
17 General Dynamics looking for the lookout towers, the cell
18 phone towers, and ended up at the end of Scoggins Road. It
19 was a total traffic jam with them all trying to turn around.
20 They're asking me for directions. I guess their navigation
21 system let them down. So that's what happens with those
22 navigation systems. It sends trucks all over the place. So
23 I hope that you will address that.

24 The one last thing I wanted to say was -- I wasn't
25 going to say anything about the project itself -- but

1 Mr. Backus did point out that this project has nothing to do
2 with the National Scenic Area. Unfortunately I believe if
3 you read the law, the law does allow the National Scenic
4 Area to control things that take place outside of the
5 National Scenic Area if there are impacts that may come into
6 the National Scenic Area. That's in the law. So there is
7 maybe the need for a buffer area so that, you know, a couple
8 hundred gallons of hydraulic fluid a few hundred feet up
9 might not leak into the National Scenic Area inadvertently.
10 Thank you very much for your visit here today.

11 JUDGE WALLIS: Wirt Maxey and Rebecca Maxey.

12 MR. MAXEY: I will be speaking for both of us.

13 WIRT MAXEY,

14 having been first duly sworn on oath,

15 testified as follows:

16

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

19 Q. Could you give us your name and spell your last
20 name.

21 A. Wirt Maxey, M-a-x-e-y. I live at 8992
22 Cook-Underwood Road just up the road here about a mile or
23 two.

24 Q. Please proceed with your comments, but if you could
25 bring the microphone a little bit closer to your mouth that

1 would help us.

2 A. I am speaking for myself and my wife so if
3 Mr. Posner would please set the clock for six minutes. Thank
4 you.

5 Mr. Chairman and Members of the Council, there's
6 two things that I want to speak with you about today. The
7 first is something that I believe has been overlooked which
8 go to the land use consistency issues. Specifically that
9 under Title 22 of the Skamania County Code, something that
10 nobody has really mentioned as far as I know in these
11 proceedings, the Whistling Ridge project is illegal.

12 The second --

13 Q. Mr. Maxey, I'm going to interrupt, and I apologize
14 for that, but we understand that it's difficult for people in
15 the back to hear and it's important that you take microphone
16 and hold it close to mouth.

17 A. How's that?

18 Q. Thank you very much.

19 A. If you could put a couple seconds back on the
20 clock.

21 The second and I believe the more important thing
22 that I want to speak with you about today has to do with
23 broad-based policy considerations and a precedent that this
24 Council would be setting by approving this project.

25 The Title 22 analysis is a simple exercise and

1 statutory construction. Time will not allow me to walk you
2 through this chapter and verse because it requires looking
3 at the various sections of the statute, integrating them,
4 and reading them together and characterize what lawyers
5 sometimes say. I have prepared a written memorandum with my
6 comments, and I believe I saw Tammy just handed it to each
7 one of you. I'd appreciate it if in due course you would
8 take the time to read that and analyze this ordinance.

9 Q. Mr. Maxey, I'm marking that as Exhibit 61.00 in
10 this proceeding and it will be part of the record.

11 (Exhibit No. 61.00 marked and admitted into
12 evidence.)

13 A. Thank you, Your Honor.

14 Suffice it to say, when one applies Title 22 to
15 the Cook-Underwood Road key viewing area or any other key
16 viewing area in Skamania County for that matter, Title 22
17 protects the view shed of the Cook-Underwood Road viewing
18 area. It requires any development which can be seen from
19 Cook-Underwood Road be visually supported.

20 Because the pros for Whistling Ridge Energy
21 Project cannot possibly meet the visual subordination laid
22 out in ordinance in detail, the project is simply illegal.
23 There's absolutely nothing in the ordinances which limits
24 the standard of visual subordination to developments within
25 the National Scenic Area. In fact, the ordinance is replete

1 with provisions that make it clear that key viewing areas
2 are protected from visual impacts arising within and without
3 the National Scenic Area. The proposed Whistling Ridge
4 Energy Project is illegal under Title 22 because it cannot
5 pass the test of visual subordination. Again, I've laid it
6 out chapter and verse for you that I hope you will find to
7 be a fairly cut and dry analysis. I ask you to look at it
8 in detail.

9 I want to close by talking to you about certain
10 broad policy considerations and the precedent that you as a
11 Council will be setting by approving this project. As a
12 society we have set aside certain very limited areas to be
13 preserved for scenic beauty: our state and national parks,
14 our wilderness areas indeed are scenic areas to name a few.

15 If this project is approved, it will establish a
16 precedent to the effect that there is no place, no place in
17 the state of Washington that is off limits to development of
18 430-foot tall turbines except specifically within the inside
19 of the boundaries of our national parks, our scenic areas,
20 our wilderness areas and so forth. If you approve this
21 project, you will not be able in the future to deny a permit
22 to a turbine project located just a few feet over the
23 boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park or Olympic
24 National Park or North Cascades National Park or a few feet
25 over the boundaries of any of our numerous state parks or

1 Mt. St. Helens, or any of the other places that we as a
2 society have set aside to preserve for their scenic and
3 their wilderness attributes.

4 It's important that the Council remember that this
5 is not a situation where Whistling Ridge is the last of the
6 only of the available project sites for a wind project in
7 the state of Washington. There are thousands and thousands
8 of acres in Eastern Washington with equal or better wind
9 resources and where there would be little and I dare say
10 zero scenic area impacts and far, far fewer wildlife
11 impacts.

12 What you've got to consider in determining, what
13 you've got to balance as a counsel is what is more important
14 in the long term for our society. Is it the preservation of
15 the scenic beauty of our state and national parks, our
16 wilderness and our scenic areas for ourselves, for our
17 children, for our grandchildren, or is it the desire for
18 private for-profit enterprise such as SDS Lumber to make a
19 buck off a project that they admit produces very little
20 energy, to make this buck at the expense of irreplaceable, I
21 stress that irreplaceable scenic expense?

22 In fact, according to my calculation it's about 30
23 million bucks just in federal tax credits which they're
24 going to take out of the taxpayer's pockets.

25 Also I ask you to keep in mind that you would be

1 setting a precedent for degrading the scenic assets of the
2 state of Washington to provide power that in all likelihood
3 will be sold to California. Most of you gentlemen realize I
4 sat through the last two days of hearings and Mr. Spadaro
5 would not commit otherwise.

6 What legacy do you as a Council want to leave? Is
7 it the legacy of preservation?

8 Q. Your time has expired. If you want to submit
9 additional comments, you're certainly welcome to do that in
10 writing.

11 A. I would appreciate the courtesy to finish my one
12 thought here.

13 Q. We are again taking your exhibit that you provided,
14 and thank you very much for your appearance.

15 A. I did not intend to do so, but since you've issued
16 the invitation early on, I'd like to file this with the
17 Council too. Shall I hand it to you?

18 JUDGE WALLIS: Give it to one of the staff people,
19 please. Thank you. That also will be incorporated into our
20 record.

21 Next on the list is Teresa Robbins, Ann Dehaven,
22 and Dale Glasgow.

23 MS. ROBBINS: Your Honor, Ann Dehaven gave me her
24 time as well.

25 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. So we'll add six

1 minutes.

2 TERESA ROBBINS,
3 having been first duly sworn on oath,
4 testified as follows:

5
6 EXAMINATION

7 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

8 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name
9 for us and give us your mailing address, please.

10 A. Teresa Robbins, R-o-b-b-i-n-s, 211 Malfait Road,
11 Washougal, Washington 98671.

12 I wanted to make note of I guess a piece of
13 information that went out to this community sponsored by
14 Wind Works in relation to this project. I would have to say
15 that if I were a member of this community and this is all I
16 had to see, I would agree what a great project, what a great
17 idea. Unfortunately I've done a lot of study of this
18 project and the EIS so I can't do that. I think it was
19 Mr. Backus who was saying the EIS found no significant
20 impacts to wildlife or scenic area value or the environment,
21 and that's not at all what I found. I don't think that's
22 what you've been hearing the last few days, even the last
23 two years.

24 The pattern seems to be the EIS to understate the
25 harm and overestimate the benefits. Now I struggled with

1 what I might say this afternoon. Because if indeed you've
2 read the substantial testimony and documentation we
3 previously submitted as you know that we have invested
4 enormous energy and time in an attempt to provide the most
5 current and accurate research for the Council's
6 consideration. We still stand by that testimony. We've
7 followed closely the public comments, the expert testimony,
8 and the EFSEC decisions to this point during the past two
9 years.

10 I do want to acknowledge that your ears and rears
11 are probably as uncomfortable as mine given the last three
12 days of trying to sort out the veracity of this application.
13 This is a tedious and sometimes a painful process; however,
14 I feel important to keep the heart of the matter in site.
15 Credible evidence has been provided through expert opinions
16 witnesses and research and specifically calls into question
17 the inaccuracy of the application assessment of the proposed
18 project impact.

19 This project if sited will permanently and
20 negatively alter views from the National Scenic Area. It
21 matters little whether it's 38 turbine or 50 turbines. Even
22 T. Boone Pickens remembers well when he went out on a
23 massive advertising and was full of patriotism about the
24 need to go to wind energy. Needless to say placing turbines
25 on his 68,000 acre ranch and I quote because it's ugly.

1 Further, this project will inflict deleterious noise to
2 local residents and kill bats, birds, and raptors in excess
3 of the Applicant's estimates. These unacceptable
4 environmental costs are not balanced with clear convincing
5 evidence of benefit.

6 Secondly, proprietary or confidential cloak
7 prevents access to anything of substance that could verify
8 for potential to debunk the Applicant's claims. I too found
9 it interesting that Mr. Spadaro strongly refused to commit
10 to selling the energy in Washington. So it must be going to
11 California or the highest bidder. I guess this project
12 would permanently scar Washington and the National Scenic
13 Area views for no assist to Washington energy needs.

14 If this project is as good as the Applicant
15 purports, it should be able to stand on its own merit.
16 Instead the Applicant and county officials extended
17 considerable effort to shut down and thus disallow and
18 remove from the record the testimonies of the U.S. Forest
19 Service and National Park Service experts. It's an
20 inflexible project. It won't budge in area or megawatts.

21 Frankly it appears to me that the Applicant's last
22 minute offer for mitigating to 38 larger turbines, which
23 likely will do little to nothing at reducing impacts and may
24 actually exacerbate the negative impacts, could possibly be
25 more an attempt to use EFSEC's flexibility for holding

1 appropriate mitigation measures; for example, removing the
2 A-array or backing turbines away from spotted owl habitat or
3 my personal preference outright denial of this project.

4 I want to believe that EFSEC is not just an
5 automatic approval route but rather a discerning Council; a
6 Council whose members operate with the greater interest of
7 the public at heart; a Council that insists the best science
8 will be used in making determinations; a Council that
9 ensures the true impact of the project will be brought to
10 light. I want to believe that after a fair assessment of
11 this project you have the wisdom and the courage to outright
12 deny it.

13 By the way, you may remember this chart from my
14 previous testimony. Cadna/A which was being testified to
15 this very morning was a computer projection model used on
16 Mars Hill sufficiently under predicting noise levels that
17 actually would be experienced resulting in significant
18 health issues. There have been others so unpredicted.
19 Cadna/A is the computer projection model used to predict
20 noise for Whistling Ridge. Let's not make the same mistake.
21 Thank you very much.

22 JUDGE WALLIS: Ms. Robbins, if you could spare
23 that document, we will give it to staff and we will see that
24 that is put into the record in this proceeding as well.

25 MS. ROBBINS: Yes, I guess I don't need it

1 anymore. You have it already in your record.

2 JUDGE WALLIS: Okay. Thank you. Very much. Dale
3 Glasgow. After Mr. Glasgow, Scott Cook, and Mike Eastwick.

4 DALE GLASGOW,
5 having been first duly sworn on oath,
6 testified as follows:

7
8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

10 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name
11 for our record.

12 A. My name is Dale Glasgow. I live at 10221 Cook
13 Underwood Road. I'm a retired physicist who carries on the
14 business at this stage and I always like to play games with
15 numbers. And I will alert the residents of Underwood what's
16 going to happen, and the data that I'm speaking from was
17 presented in your documents.

18 There will be during this project there will be
19 5,000 truck loads of sand and gravel coming up
20 Cook-Underwood Road only one way to get there. There will
21 be 2,000 concrete trucks coming up Cook-Underwood Road, the
22 only way to get there. There will be 50 trucks of
23 structural steel. There will be many trucks bringing in
24 large cranes and so forth. There will be 150-foot long
25 trucks coming up bringing the propeller blades. There will

1 be 150 trucks bringing the sections of the tower to
2 Cook-Underwood Road. There's only one up and one way out.

3 Now I can't speak to the pros and cons whether
4 this project should ever be built or not, but I do want to
5 alert the citizens of Underwood, Washington you're going to
6 see a major industrial project taking place in juxtaposition
7 to your homes. That's all I have to say.

8 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

9 Scott Cook, and after Mr. Cook, Mike Eastwick, and
10 Cliff Jewell.

11 SCOTT COOK,
12 having been first duly sworn on oath,
13 testified as follows:

14
15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

17 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name.

18 A. My name is Scott Cook, C-o-o-k, 1403 Cross Creek
19 Lane, Hood River, Oregon.

20 I'm here to speak tonight about the Columbia River
21 with its damming and the adjacent damming of the Snake River
22 which to me parallel this sort of project between wind farms
23 in Eastern Oregon and these other proposed wind farms in
24 other places. Damming of the Columbia with 11 dams yielded
25 16,000 megawatts of power, and then the four dams added to

1 the Snake River in the '70s didn't increase much power
2 output for agricultural benefits, but it did benefit the
3 Tidewater Barge Lines, and so similar arguments were used in
4 that damming issue of benefits to a company, benefits to the
5 workforce of the day, the taxation. It seems like it goes a
6 lot along the lines of how this project looks.

7 There's 16,000 megawatts of power generated by
8 Columbia. This is supposedly to generate an additional
9 possible 75, less than half a percent. Of that 16,000
10 megawatts generated in Columbia possibly 4,000 to 5,000 are
11 used in the states of Washington and Oregon. That means
12 three-quarters of it already is exported to California,
13 Idaho, Nevada. Most of our green power already leaves the
14 area, and so to add insult to the scenic area and the
15 wildlife for such a pittance 75 proposed megawatts whereas
16 the eastern fields of Oregon and Washington of proposals
17 from wind experts is there's an additional possible 20,000
18 to 40,000 megawatts. This 75 megawatts proposed for the
19 hill right here this is just a drop in the bucket. It's
20 just the wrong -- it's a good idea. It's the wrong place.
21 Eastern Washington and Oregon are akin to the Columbia.
22 They're the right place to generate massive amounts of
23 power.

24 The hillsides around here to add just a little bit
25 are like adding the dams to the Snake River. They're not

1 adding much benefit at the harm to the wildlife and the
2 scenic values in the area. That's my perspective on it.
3 Thank you for being here and listening.

4 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much for your
5 comments.

6 Mike Eastwick. Afterwards Cliff Jewell and Loriley Drach.

7 MIKE EASTWICK,
8 having been first duly sworn on oath,
9 testified as follows:

10

11

EXAMINATION

12 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

13 Q. State your name and spell your last name and give
14 us your address, please.

15 A. Mike Eastwick, E-a-s-t-w-i-c-k, 62 Beach Lane,
16 Underwood.

17 Q. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments
18 on the project. I'd like you to understand I want the
19 project to succeed, but I have several concerns that I want
20 you guys to think about.

21 First, the Applicant's EIS and your Draft EIS were
22 not only very similar in words, but there was no analysis in
23 this. It was basically a sales pitch. I've seen enough of
24 these over my 35 years and professional. It was basically a
25 sales pitch. Everything was great, you know, wonderful.

1 This document should critically analyze this
2 project, its impacts, and address the public's comments.
3 Simply selling the project would be pure negligence.

4 Second, the process being followed to asses this
5 project is a well-designed bureaucracy, asks for public
6 comments, developing EIS versions, performing hearings, etc.
7 One valuable addition I would like to have would be to
8 provide transparency by producing a tracing that shows the
9 influence of public comments on the next version of the EIS
10 validating the public as being heard.

11 From the Applicant's version to the Draft EIS
12 version there appear to be no public comment influence.
13 This traceability would show our influence on the EIS and on
14 the process. Doing anything else would be
15 misrepresentation.

16 Finally there are many design aspects in both
17 EIS's which rely on current local law, provide limited data,
18 and/or lack of contradictory data. For example, the local
19 noise ordinance is very different than other places in the
20 country. For example, Oregon is being 32. Does that mean
21 our local ordinance is smarter or is it just plain wrong?
22 Other examples include the lack of business case for
23 different configurations, analysis of health impacts,
24 understanding of wildlife movement and health, actual
25 country only arterial road traffic calculations, worst-case

1 scenarios for visual and noise impacts, comparable tourist
2 impact analysis, tourism impact analysis, and real estate
3 valuation impacts consistent with this high value area, not
4 the type of ground they have out there in Eastern
5 Washington.

6 You need to perform this analysis based on current
7 transparently calculated and business scientific and
8 business knowledge. Anything else would be fraud.

9 I live and work in Underwood and have another
10 property close to the project. For the past five years I've
11 been investing hundreds of thousands of dollars and many
12 hours of labor to develop that property to allow me to build
13 a home within the rules of the National Scenic Area.
14 Negligence, misrepresentation, or fraud on your part
15 jeopardizes my investment and my dream. I'm confident that
16 you can define this project in a way that will address
17 everyone's concerns. Thank you.

18 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you.

19 Cliff Jewell, Loriley Drach, Gary Casady I believe
20 are the next ones.

21 CLIFFORD JEWELL,
22 having been first duly sworn on oath,
23 testified as follows:

24

25 EXAMINATION

1 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

2 Q. Would state your name and spell your last name and
3 give us your mailing address, please.

4 A. My name Clifford Jewell, J-e-w-e-l-l. I reside at
5 180 Snowden, White Salmon, Washington 98672.

6 I come here as a concerned property owner. I
7 don't live in the affected area. I don't live in Underwood,
8 Mill A, or anywhere that's going to be directly impacted by
9 this proposed project. I am here in support of private
10 property owners that live next to or very close to the
11 boundary of the National Scenic Area, myself being one of
12 them.

13 My property on Snowden Road is less than a half
14 mile from the scenic area boundary, and it concerns me
15 greatly when people or groups of people try to extend the
16 scope or the jurisdiction of the scenic area beyond the
17 boundary of the scenic area. Thousands and thousands of
18 hours of planning, plotting, and study were put into
19 establishing the scenic area boundary. And when they
20 established that boundary it was very cut and dry. You're
21 either in and or you were out of it. There is no buffer
22 zone. There is no implied buffer zone.

23 If you have a property within the scenic area and
24 you wish to do development on it, then you have to follow
25 the rules and regulations of the Scenic Act and Gorge

1 Commission. That's exactly how it should be. If you live
2 outside of the scenic area, you should be allowed to do
3 whatever the county and state planning zoning and use laws
4 allow you to do, and you should be able to do this without
5 any hindrances whatsoever from anyone trying to extend the
6 jurisdiction and scope of the existence of the scenic area
7 boundary. Thank you for being here today.

8 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.
9 Loriley Drach?

10 MS. DRACH: I am going to decline at this
11 particular time.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: Gary Casady?

13 Okay. Mark King, then Mark Schmidt and then Janet
14 Warren.

15 MARK KING,
16 having been first duly sworn on oath,
17 testified as follows:

18

19 EXAMINATION

20 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

21 Q. State your name and spell your last name for us and
22 give us your mailing address, please.

23 A. My name is Mark King, K-i-n-g. My address is 172
24 Upper Lakeview Road, White Salmon, Washington. I'm here as
25 the President of the Northwestern Lake Development

1 Homeowner's Association. I represent approximately 25
2 property owners who own about 17 full-time homes. Our
3 community is located at the base of Little Buck Creek
4 Watershed where Little Buck Creek Flows into the Northwestern
5 Lake. This is located two miles east of where the turbines
6 would be on the project, the turbines at the head of the
7 Little Buck Creek Watershed. So it's straight up the hill
8 from our community. I would like to remind you that 17 homes
9 there could be affected by this.

10 Our community has obviously several concerns about
11 this. Probably our biggest concern would be the impact of
12 noise. The EIS suggests that the noise impacts will not be
13 a big concern for us. We don't know that. We don't feel
14 like there is nearly enough direct evidence telling us what
15 the noise impacts are to be in our situation. The
16 discussion of noise in the EIS seems to be extremely vague
17 and nothing specific to our area, particularly given that we
18 are in a valley coming down the hill from where the turbines
19 are going to be. I don't believe there's much information
20 on noise effects in that type of environment.

21 And also if you recall the prevailing winds in the
22 summertime when we will be impacted most by the noise
23 because our windows are open at night. That's when we're
24 going to hear it. The prevailing wind is from the west, and
25 it blows straight into our community. So that's another

1 concern is the noise will be pushed down to us more than in
2 other situations. We have asked in our scoping comments to
3 the EIS and the EIS itself that these issues be addressed
4 more directly, and we haven't seen that yet.

5 We're also concerned about the blinking lights at
6 night. We have beautiful skis from where we are, and this
7 is a big concern for us. We're concerned that the project
8 could possibly double or is likely to double in size if it
9 gets approved. Work plans are in the works already to
10 double the size by leasing land from DNR prior to the
11 application that's currently before us. If this gets
12 approved it's very likely that's going to fall on the heels
13 on this. So whatever the impacts are to us are down the
14 road they'll probably be doubled.

15 Lastly, we're very concerned because of all these
16 issues of the impacts to property values of our properties.
17 In summary we have put a lot into our properties, our heart
18 and souls. We love them. We love our homes. We hope you
19 do as well and to keep that in mind in considering your
20 decision on this project. We feel this is just simply in
21 the wrong place for this project. Thank you very much.

22 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you, Mr. King.

23 Mark Schmidt.

24 ///

25 ///

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

MARK SCHMIDT,
having been first duly sworn on oath,
testified as follows:
TESTIMONY OF MARK SCHMIDT
I'm Mark Schmidt, 120 Westwinds Road, White
Salmon, Washington, S-c-h-m-i-d-t.
I have lived here for a number of years. It's
amazing as I drive east looking down the Gorge to Maryhill
the number of windmills that I see. I have always supported
the wind projects. I believe in alternative energy;
however, I think there is a time and place for them to go
and a time and place for them not to be. There was a level
of energy the went into developing the National Gorge Scenic
Area, and this is a gorgeous place that we live in. I love
this area, and I would hate to see the nature of what they
tried to build be destroyed with the addition of wind
projects on top of the mountaintops.
These will be visible from many areas throughout
the entire Hood River, White Salmon, and Underwood areas.
We've never had anything like this before, and what you're
suggesting us to do is to change forestland into industrial
land and suggesting as other people have that want you to
make that decision, it's going to be very hard to stop it
from occurring elsewhere. I think it's a terrible, terrible
thing to have this project go forward.

1 When we look out east as you drive out what you
2 see is movement. You see the windmills going around and
3 around. If I was moving my hand, you would be looking at my
4 hand. You wouldn't be looking at me. The beauty is lost.
5 There's been so much that has gone into the development of
6 the Gorge Scenic Area to where houses have to be a certain
7 color or trees can't be cut trees. Trees have to be
8 planted. This would totally, totally demolish what has been
9 achieved in this area. I realize it's private property, but
10 you're being asked to basically rezone to industrial use,
11 and I suggest that you not do that very strongly. Thank
12 you.

13 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

14 Janet Warren. Following Ms. Warren is Marlene
15 Woodward and Jurgen Hess.

16 JANET WARREN,
17 having been first duly sworn on oath,
18 testified as follows:

19

20 EXAMINATION

21 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

22 Q. Would you state your name and spell your last name
23 for us and give us your mailing address.

24 A. My name is Janet Warren, and it is spelled
25 W-a-r-r-e-n. I live at 120 S.W. Westwinds Road, White

1 Salmon, Washington and I am a registered voter in the state
2 of Washington, and I first want to say that I really much
3 appreciate the opportunity to see that Governor Gregoire's
4 office is here and that her representative is able to be
5 here. So thank you very much.

6 I'm here for several reasons, but specifically I
7 want to speak from a different point of view that has been
8 addressed at this point. I am a recently retired
9 professional educator. I taught in the state of Washington.
10 I taught in the state of Oregon. I worked in two counties
11 and school districts on the Oregon side and the Oregon
12 Department of State. I sat on the second floor of the
13 administrative building of the community college over in The
14 Dalles where windmill projects are going up like
15 gangbusters.

16 I talked with them a while ago about a little bit
17 of interest about what they were doing because of my
18 experience in the '70s. In the late 1970s I was part of a
19 pilot project by the federal government in conservation,
20 solar energy and other forms of green energy. I was in
21 Omaha, Nebraska.

22 I have lived in eight states in my lifetime. I am
23 now 55 years old. In each state I have lived I have learned
24 a great deal about the motivation behind folks who want to
25 do the right thing but don't have necessarily all the

1 information. One of the things that I came here to say from
2 my hat as an educator that I really impressed upon my
3 students and the principals and superintendents that I
4 worked with, as well as the Department of the State of
5 Oregon is pay attention, do your homework, due diligence to
6 the majority and minority opinions. In all of these states
7 I've worked and lived I have seen a number of different
8 projects such as this one move forward in which that has not
9 been done. Promises have been made and we have been left
10 with the incredible desire of why didn't we pay attention.

11 So I ask you to do that because as we know if we
12 don't listen to our history, we will not be able to move
13 forward into the future in a more effective manner. I
14 believe that this can occur well, but it needs to be done
15 with due diligence, and with so many different questions and
16 concerns this has not yet happened. Thank you

17 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much.

18 MARLENE WOODWARD,

19 having been first duly sworn on oath,

20 testified as follows:

21

22 EXAMINATION

23 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

24 Q. Please pull the microphone close to your mouth.

25 Could you give us your name and spell your last name for us,

1 please, and give us your mailing address.

2 A. Marlene Woodward, W-o-o-d-w-a-r-d, P.O. Box 218,
3 Husum, Washington 98623.

4 I would like to speak in opposition to the
5 proposed wind farm project. I live in Husum, Washington
6 which is in the White Salmon Valley, and I strongly believe
7 that the wind farm that is proposed is against the intent of
8 the National Scenic Area. There will be negative visual
9 impacts for us over where we live on Oakridge Road looking
10 over here, and that I think will be true for all the
11 tourists that visit this area, and tourism is a major
12 economic development interest for this area. The noise
13 levels I'm sure will be a strong impact here on the
14 residents, and the blinking lights and flashing wind blades
15 promote the industrialization of a rural area. And many
16 people have talked about driving east, and I think that
17 anyone that has can see how our rural area is being
18 industrialized.

19 There will be also environmental damage and
20 additional public costs that have not been calculated. Just
21 the transport of the component parts will adversely impact
22 the transportation infrastructure of the Columbia Gorge.
23 The roads, bridges, the traffic congestion that will all
24 occur from the construction. I guess I want to ask what's
25 the true cost benefit for ratio of this project? How much

1 will the public pay through subsidies to generate the power?
2 What will be the long-term quality of life and who will
3 benefit?

4 I am in support of appropriate alternative energy
5 proposals, but we all know that wind turbine farms are
6 uneconomic without their government subsidy, and this is the
7 reason that it will be done because the public funds that
8 will go into it.

9 There are many more less costly ways to generate
10 green energy such as energy conservation, decentralized
11 geothermal, solar, and windmill projects. Those would be
12 the ones I think we should be looking at.

13 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

14 While Mr. Hess is stepping forward, let me ask
15 again if there is Gary it looks like Casady? Then Rex
16 Johnston would be the next people in line.

17 JURGEN HESS,
18 having been first duly sworn on oath,
19 testified as follows:

20

21 EXAMINATION

22 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

23 Q. Would you pick up the microphone and tell us your
24 name and spell your last name and give us your address.

25 A. My name is Jurgen Hess, H-e-s-s. I live at 412 -

1 21st Street, Hood River. I'm a landscape architect with 42
2 years experience in virtual resource management. I've done
3 countless visual simulations. I've directed the planning for
4 the U.S. Forest Service in the Columbia River Gorge National
5 Scenic Area when I was with the Forest Service. I have no
6 monetary interest in this project. I'm not working for
7 anybody other than myself and the Gorge.

8 My interest is in protecting Gorge scenery and
9 making sure that the visual simulation work is done
10 accurately. I did talk to Mr. Tom Watson, who is the
11 consultant who assessed these techniques. This was April
12 30, 2010. He didn't know what I was talking about when I
13 said, "Have you figured out the sensor size effect?" Well,
14 I guess I was a good teacher because in his rebuttal
15 statements now he includes that. So appreciate that.

16 I do support the testimony of Dean Apostol and
17 also the Forest Service Landscape Architect Diana Ross who
18 did the work.

19 I want to talk about a couple things, key viewing
20 areas. Key viewing areas are all equally important. There
21 is no differentiation that some are less important than
22 others. I do also believe that Mitchell Point should be
23 included. It will be built as a very important recreation
24 site on the Historic River Highway, and also one of the
25 points on the Historic Highway that they did not analyze

1 they should use the point that I established. The visual
2 monitoring point just east of Hood River that has a much
3 better visibility. The one they used is very obscure.

4 The lens focal length Mr. Watson pretty much got
5 it right except for three visual points that I've addressed
6 in my paper. Points 19, 20, and 20C are not correct. They
7 should be redone. They need to show all project impacts.
8 There will be clearing around the towers so there will be
9 like a linear along those ridge tops. That's not in the
10 simulations. It must be. The red lights at night are not
11 in the simulations. The stripe down Highway 97 coming
12 across the border at night you will see a flood of red
13 flashing lights.

14 The photographs must be done under the best visual
15 conditions for photographers. Many of the visual montages
16 have white clouds right on the ridge lines. They're shot
17 with back lighting. They are just not very high quality.
18 They also need to show blade movement, and I have a video
19 that I've entered in the record.

20 So in terms of my conclusions for this assessment,
21 I looked at all of their work and there will be a number of
22 points that will have very high to high visual impact.
23 Three of the best qualified people with the most experience
24 in the Northwest doing this say it will have visual impacts
25 between them. I just want to say please don't whistle in

1 the dark of this project. Go out and take a look and drive
2 to the east Gorge and see for yourself. Thank you.

3 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much for your
4 comments.

5 Next is Gary Casady and then Rex Johnston and
6 Larry Keister.

7 GARY CASADY,
8 having been first duly sworn on oath,
9 testified as follows:

10

11

EXAMINATION

12 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

13 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name.

14 A. Gary Casady, C-a-s-a-d-y, 2500 Badger View Drive,
15 The Dalles, Oregon 97058.

16 I have followed this project with interest even
17 though I live in The Dalles, Oregon. A similar project was
18 proposed west of The Dalles and had similar types of issues
19 involved in environmental which included wildlife and also
20 the visual impacts, the economic impact, the efficiency of
21 the project, the need for having a backup project as well,
22 and the residential concerns. And it was shown that it was
23 not a good place to site that on 7 Mile Hill.

24 I think similarly the issues are here on the
25 Whistling Ridge project, and so I think it would be better

1 to site that at another place rather than where it is
2 proposed now because of the issues, and I have some specific
3 things stated in writing, and I will stop my comments there.
4 So Thank you very much for the chance.

5 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments. Rex
6 Johnston, Larry Keister, and Tom Wood.

7 REX JOHNSTON,
8 having been first duly sworn on oath,
9 testified as follows:

10

11

EXAMINATION

12 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

13 Q. State your name, spell your last name, and give us
14 your mailing address, please.

15 A. Rex Johnston, J-o-h-n-s-t-o-n, 560 N.W. Country
16 View Road, White Salmon, Washington.

17 Q. Please proceed with your comment.

18 A. As a Klickitat County Commissioner I would like to
19 testify here that every county in the state of Washington is
20 desperate for jobs and desperate for funds, revenues, tax
21 revenues. Whistling Ridge can provide both of these for
22 Skamania County, and I hope you will keep that in mind when
23 you make your decision. Thank you very much.

24 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

25 Larry Keister, Tom Wood, Chris Lloyd in that

1 order.

2 LARRY KEISTER,
3 having been first duly sworn on oath,
4 testified as follows:

5
6 EXAMINATION

7 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

8 Q. State your name, spell your last name, and give us
9 your mailing address.

10 A. My name is Larry Keister, K-e-i-s-t-e-r. I live at
11 4402 S.W. Zitzelberger Road, Washougal, Washington 98671.

12 My wife and I are residents of the Gorge and we
13 live within the Scenic Act. When the National Scenic Act
14 was established huge wind turbines were not even an idea to
15 be considered. When rules were being made for the building
16 of new homes great care was given to make clear that new
17 homes must be visually subordinate. Ridge lines must not
18 break the horizon, trees and topography must help the
19 structures blend with the surrounding landscape. The whole
20 intent of the National Scenic Act is to protect the National
21 Scenic beauty of the Gorge, including the skyline.

22 There is nothing natural or scenic about a wind
23 turbine. When the boundary lines were made for this scenic
24 area, and I'm positive that they would have been made
25 further away from the river had they known that these towers

1 would be threatening the scenic beauty of the Gorge.

2 Taking from the Final Draft Management Plan
3 July 1971 description of the visibility of a structure, that
4 structure does not noticeably contrast the surrounding
5 landscape. The structures are not to be visually dominant
6 in their relationship to their surrounding. There is
7 established current policy about wrecking the skyline. The
8 proposed windmills will have a visual effect by design.
9 Although the land is outside the scenic area, the structures
10 will have a visual effect affecting that scenic area.

11 The project should be denied because it will harm
12 the natural and scenic resources of the Gorge. The Columbia
13 Gorge Future Forum submitted in their vision to work to
14 ensure that our communities protect and enhance their
15 identity and quality of life through governments sound
16 planning and sustainable development. This proposal does
17 not meet that goal. Thank you.

18 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

19 Tom Wood.

20 TOM WOOD,
21 having been first duly sworn on oath,
22 testified as follows:

23
24 TESTIMONY OF TOM WOOD

25 My name is Tom Wood, W-o-o-d, and I live at 950

1 Pomona street in The Dalles. First let me say that I am in
2 favor of wind power but not this project, and I'm coming at
3 it from my ornithologist viewpoint. It has been claimed by
4 some that this project would not kill birds, especially
5 raptors, and I want to show why that claim is false. The
6 organization Hot Watch International some of you may have
7 heard about that has been monitoring raptors in this general
8 area for nearly 20 years. There is a location up by Chelan
9 Lake and you follow the ridge line down and you come to
10 Bonney Butte which maybe some of you folks have been there
11 to see the raptors in the fall.

12 If you look at a map, a topographic map, I know
13 you folks can't see that from this distance. I can hardly
14 see it from here, but you will see that there is a ridge
15 line that comes from northern Washington all the way down to
16 almost Highway 41 to Highway 35 on The Dalles side hugs that
17 eastern slope of the Cascades and continues on south. And
18 that's why those stations are there to monitor raptor counts
19 are located where they are.

20 The map also shows that this is a major flyway,
21 part of the Pacific flyway for migrating birds of all kinds
22 and especially raptors. That's because of the way the wind
23 hits these cliff sides and rises up these birds can
24 virtually slide down there without a flap in their wings at
25 all, and that's why they've selected to come down in this

1 area. And now we find that Whistling Ridge is almost a stop
2 sign or a hazard rather right in the middle of this flyway.
3 The count at Bonney Butte this last fall just a couple
4 months ago is nearly 3,500 raptors. Included in that were
5 several golden eagles, and then many other birds that we all
6 like to see.

7 The height of the turbines are a real concern.
8 Typically raptors, large raptors fly in the range of above
9 the ground to 500 feet. It's also not just the raptors or
10 the golden eagles and migration birds. We have if you
11 noticed on the river last week I counted 29 bald eagles all
12 on one sandbar in the Klickitat River. We have the Little
13 White Salmon, We have White Salmon, We have Kickitat River,
14 and these are gathering places for these large raptors at
15 this time of year. They stay here all year many of them.

16 I will jump off of that and come right to the
17 conclusion. It is my hope that we will have learned from
18 our past mistakes that have damaged our environment because
19 of our rushing ahead before consideration of all the costs.
20 The project must not be approved. It's directly in a major
21 flyway that will kill birds. This project will scar the
22 National Scenic Area in more ways than just visible. Thank
23 you.

24 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your testimony.

25 Chris Lloyd. Next after Mr. Lloyd is Sherry Meier

1 and Holly Griswold.

2 CHRIS LLOYD,
3 having been first duly sworn on oath,
4 testified as follows:

5
6 EXAMINATION

7 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

8 Q. State your name spelling your last name, please.

9 A. Chris Lloyd, L-l-o-y-d. I live at 81 Scenic
10 Heights Road, Underwood.

11 First of all, thanks for letting me present to the
12 Council today. This is a slightly different perspective,
13 but this is really directed to the Governor's office. I
14 think that Whistling Ridge will truly be a poster child for
15 the future of wind energy in Washington State. I think it
16 will be held up as an example of the current limits of where
17 wind farms should be sited and how they should be evaluated.

18 The decision of this Council will surely be
19 scrutinized at both the local, national, and international
20 press. The results of this wide discussion of impacts in
21 the future of wind not only Washington and Oregon but also
22 national. If controversial enough it will likely result in
23 new guidelines or processes for evaluation of wind siting.

24 The Hood River area is nationally renown. It is
25 often mentioned in the national press in Outside Magazine

1 2004 Best Towns to Live in, then again in 2006 Top 20 Dream
2 Towns. A quick Google on New York Times there was at least
3 five articles on the Hood River area. So if we want to put
4 wind energy right smack dab in the middle of the national
5 spotlight this project definitely is going to do that.

6 Those who ignore history are destined to repeat
7 it. The Bonneville Power Administration hydroelectric power
8 in the Columbia was born in another energy boom also driven
9 by a federal push for new energy. We put a great dam on the
10 Columbia and for sure hydroelectric continues to give us a
11 great benefit, but we also did something else. We made sure
12 to go that last mile and also dam up the smaller tributaries
13 placing smaller and larger hydro dams there as well.

14 Hood River and White Salmon are great examples.
15 The dam on the White Salmon has been numerous years that
16 we're trying to renew it and federal funds are going to be
17 used to do that.

18 You know wind power is obviously going to be an
19 important part of our green mix, but it needs to be sited in
20 a location that produces the largest with the least amount
21 of environmental impact.

22 Actually I think that the other presenters have
23 covered some of the topics already so I'm going to skip
24 right to the conclusion. I encourage the Council to come up
25 with a decision that's on true merits and detriments of

1 aspects concerning this wind farm siting. It's two unique
2 to be a rubber stamp, especially with an approval process
3 that takes years, produces a multi-hundred page
4 environmental review and takes so much time of the public
5 members. I encourage the Council to make the right and
6 courageous decision of rejecting this project as it stands
7 without significant changes to reduce or remove the impacts
8 of this wind farm. Thank you very much.

9 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.
10 Sherry Meier or Merz.

11 MS. MEIER: Sherry Meier.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: I would accept that.

13 SHERRY MEIER,
14 having been first duly sworn on oath,
15 testified as follows:

16
17 EXAMINATION

18 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

19 Q. State your name and spell your last name for the
20 record and give us your mailing address.

21 A. Sherry Meier, M-e-i-e-r, 4161 Post Canyon, Hood
22 River.

23 Q. Could you pull the microphone up a little bit.
24 When you hear yourself through the PA system, that's a good
25 sign that you're going through to the people in the last row.

1 A. Okay. Thank you. I'd like to start out by saying
2 I am an advocate of alternative energy; however, the number
3 of wind energy sites currently operating approved or pending
4 approval and the availability of other sites with less
5 environmental resource impacts make the Whistling Ridge
6 Energy Project unnecessary, inappropriate, and incongruent
7 for this area. There's only one National Scenic Area on this
8 entire planet. This tiny parcel has been set aside,
9 federally protected providing for the enhancement of the
10 scenic cultural, recreational, and natural resources of the
11 Columbia River Gorge. 426-foot wind turbines immediately
12 adjacent to this area within the viewing areas of the Scenic
13 Area are not enhancement of the spectacular natural area.

14 Aside from visual impacts wind turbines towering
15 over both 75- to 100-foot indigenous firs, this project has
16 a myriad of impacts. To emphasize the view consider the
17 following: The use of our taxpayer dollars in government
18 subsidies that's funding this. In effect we will pay for a
19 private facility to send power to other areas and then pay
20 again to power our own homes. So no one gains except the
21 owner of this facility.

22 Whistling Ridge is a very small project generating
23 power of less than one percent and located in an inefficient
24 area for wind generation. According to the energy studies
25 anticipated wind power in this area is already sufficient by

1 the available pending projects; plus the grid can't handle
2 more power.

3 There's potential health issues for residents
4 living in this area. Underwood Road has poor access being
5 narrow, winding, creating safety issues for residents and
6 emergency. Wildlife populations are at risk. In addition,
7 we rely on tourism in this area. National Geographic
8 Traveler ranked the Gorge sixth in the world as an iconic
9 world destination. Most business are sustained by the
10 tourism and will suffer if the decimation of these scenic
11 vistas goes on.

12 It's personal accountability that each and every
13 one of us be responsible stewards of our national treasures,
14 including the scenic awe-inspiring vistas here. This is not
15 about subjective personal preference for the visual liking
16 and disliking of wind turbines rather it's about preserving
17 the wild, scenic forested area of the industrial development
18 plus those underlying issues many of which are never
19 apparent at the onset.

20 It's a tragic end to spoil this splendid region by
21 allowing it to be turned into an industrial zone. Please
22 deny the project. Thank you for your time.

23 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your time.

24 Holly Griswold.

25 ///

1 HOLLY GRISWOLD,
2 having been first duly sworn on oath,
3 testified as follows:
4

5 TESTIMONY OF HOLLY GRISWOLD

6 Holly Griswold, G-r-i-s-w-o-l-d, 2385 Dry Creek
7 Road, Mosier, Oregon.

8 I'm hoping that you will not approve siting on
9 this project on Whistling Ridge. I think we need to think
10 ahead seven generations and think about what the impact of
11 having the Columbia Gorge aligned with wind turbines and be
12 the intent of the Columbia Gorge Scenic Area. I think that
13 what was intended was that the land kept in a natural state,
14 natural horizon for the community that preexisted and is
15 still is prosperous within the Scenic Area boundaries. I
16 don't think anybody ever imagined when we made the scenic
17 area that we would be considering putting in 430 feet tall
18 industrial wind turbine farms along the scenic area. So I
19 think that you guys have a difficult decision because we
20 didn't imagine them or would be thinking about this.

21 So I urge you to not approve because of the impact
22 on wildlife, the negative impacts on tourism. I think you
23 would lose more in tax dollars because of the decrease in
24 real estate value than you would gain in electricity income.
25 I think it would be sacrificing the intent of the scenic

1 area for a few more megawatts when the project would be
2 better located in the eastern part of the state. I think we
3 should exhaust all other energy generation possibilities
4 before we put industrial wind turbines to our National
5 Scenic Area and national parks. I think we would be
6 sacrificing a place for people in metro areas across the
7 country who come to renew their spirits, and I think that
8 would be a huge loss.

9 So I'm here today just to speak from the heart
10 because I couldn't live with myself if I didn't come here
11 and say this.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments. Jacob
13 Anderson, then Bill Anderson, and John Tyler will follow.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Also Bill Anderson is also giving
15 me his time.

16

17

JACOB ANDERSON,

18

having been first duly sworn on oath,

19

testified as follows:

20

21

EXAMINATION

22

BY JUDGE WALLIS:

23

Q. Please state your name spell, spell your last name,

24

and give us your mailing address.

25

A. Jacob Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n, 52 Anderson Road,

1 White Salmon, Washington 98672.

2 Q. Thank you. Let me first start by saying that this
3 project is to be sited on private forestland that's managed.
4 Now everybody talks about this being an industrial project.
5 Well, so is managed private forestland. If you have been on
6 a clearcut or any timber sale recently that is industrial
7 land. It is managed. Not to mention that managing
8 forestlands is one of the few things that you can do within
9 the Columbia National Scenic Area currently. If you want to
10 log, it's one of the few things you can do. If you want to
11 put up a house, you have to plant trees in front of it and
12 jump through all kinds of other hoops.

13 That brings me to the National Scenic Area.
14 Currently if you drive east you will see when you're within
15 the National Scenic Area wind turbines. The view shed of
16 the National Scenic Area has already been interposed by wind
17 turbines if you go to the eastern end of the Columbia River
18 Gorge. I didn't see a lot of problems when those were being
19 placed close to the trails and the highway of Lewis and
20 Clark, but yet those are there, and they are already within
21 the view shed of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic
22 Area.

23 Second of all, I like many of the locals believe
24 that the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area stops at
25 the boundary line. We bought property on the other side of

1 the boundary line for a reason so that we are not under the
2 jurisdiction of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic
3 Area.

4 Currently if I buy land outside of the Columbia
5 River Gorge National Scenic Area, I can build a house within
6 the view shed, and they can't say anything about that. But
7 what you're hearing in essence and what I've heard tonight
8 people saying that I should be under the jurisdiction of the
9 Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area if I want to build
10 a house right on the outside of the Columbia River Gorge
11 National Scenic Area if it happened to be within the view
12 shed or go above the view line.

13 Second, the environmental costs. Every time that
14 I'm on the logging sale, I'm having an environmental impact,
15 whether it be positive or negative or neutral in the long
16 term. It is still an environmental impact. Placing
17 industrial turbines on the ground is going to have an
18 environmental impact. It's a guarantee. In the long run
19 they will have a negative, positive. That's to be
20 determined, but it's still an impact just the same as what
21 the land currently is being used with its environmental
22 impacts because it's an industrially managed forestland.

23 So let me move onto the Department of Commerce.
24 This area does need jobs. You've heard people talk a little
25 bit about how many trucks will be moving up and down the

1 road which is a concern of mine as well. But remember less
2 than 20 years ago we saw logging trucks running up and down
3 those roads, many of them. We do need jobs.

4 Utilities. It's been said to everybody here that
5 we're about tax breaks. Well, those tax breaks are there
6 for a reason because the federal government believes in
7 alternative energy much as many of the people here believe
8 in alternative energy. Using tax breaks is an excuse to not
9 agree to the program is saying that we shouldn't have those
10 tax breaks for any of the wind turbines who are on the east
11 side of the hill.

12 Which also brings up the matter we're talking
13 about people's view sheds, and that's what most people talk
14 about. Due to the farmers on the east end of Klickitat
15 County or the east side of both of these states their view
16 sheds are being interrupted just as much as anyone's here
17 would be, but yet we're still building wind turbines because
18 that's what the general public believes in. That's what we
19 believe in when we pass legislation to require alternative
20 energy.

21 And let me move onto natural resources because
22 that is important, and what is important with that is that
23 the Applicant has shown that they cannot only have
24 industrially sized wind turbines on their land, but they can
25 also manage those forestlands for forest resources as well.

1 To me that sounds like that's making those two things
2 compatible, and that is what we all really are talking about
3 here when we talk about commerce is keeping jobs in this
4 area and keeping people employed. And if I as a business
5 owner can diversify my operation to keep other people
6 employed and still within the natural resources sector,
7 that's something that matters to me because that's what will
8 matter to my children is to be able to have kids -- or my
9 kids being able to have jobs, sorry.

10 But that brings me to the issue of road safety.
11 It's been brought up multiple times, and I think it is very
12 important. I hope that when you look into the issue of road
13 safety you do ask that additional resources for fire
14 fighting and EMS, as well as police be involved during the
15 construction phase because that is what the public is
16 requesting for. Thank you for your time.

17 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

18 John Tyler?

19 Glen Holmberg, Anita Gahimer, and John harden.

20

21 GLEN HOLMBERG,

22 having been first duly sworn on oath,

23 testified as follows:

24

25 ///

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

3 Q. Please proceed. Give us your name, spell your last
4 name, and your mailing address.

5 A. Glen Holmberg, H-o-l-m-b-e-r-g. Address is 212
6 Sooter Road, Underwood, Washington.

7 Q. Please proceed with your comments.

8 A. I'd like to say that I oppose this project mostly
9 due to the visual impacts it will have to the Columbia River
10 Gorge area. Thousands and thousands of people come here each
11 year to take in the view, and this is a unique place in the
12 world. Many people have changed their lives to move here for
13 the lifestyle, and viewing wind turbines from the mountain
14 ridges, hiking trails, and other areas will conflict with our
15 lifestyle.

16 Also I haven't heard about any of these meetings
17 in Hood River, and that's an area where I believe these
18 turbines will impact greatly the businesses there who rely
19 on the scenic views for tourism dollars. I think it does
20 and it is going to be affecting that side of the river quite
21 a bit also, and I would like to see one of these meetings
22 held over there. Those are the people who will get hit
23 financially.

24 I've also been looking into the environmental
25 impact statement a little bit and I have a couple issues

1 with that. Well, most of the impact studies are moderate to
2 high, and there's one that's rated as low and that's from
3 the Hood River Hospital area. That is mostly because this
4 is an urban residential area, but what it doesn't take into
5 account is that the same view is also being viewed from many
6 other points in the Hood River area, the whole entire rural
7 or downtown area and a lot of restaurants and hotels that
8 share that same view, and I wouldn't consider them an urban
9 area.

10 It also doesn't mention views from hundreds of
11 recreation areas throughout the Gorge, Trail heads and
12 mountaintops that I think a lot of people come here to see.

13 I also believe this will lower property values in
14 Underwood. I have a house not far from here, and I probably
15 wouldn't consider buying here again if I knew there were
16 turbines next door.

17 So I would ask that these wind farms be put
18 somewhere else that will have less of a financial impact and
19 impact on people's lifestyles and the view. Finally I
20 haven't heard about, and I haven't been to all the meetings,
21 but I've heard SDS say in the past that this project would
22 not be financially viable unless all the wind turbines were
23 all put in. I heard something to that effect. That may
24 have changed. But as a possible compromise to take out the
25 turbines that can be seen from the Gorge. And they're

1 saying it's not financially viable, but I would like to see
2 some hard data that supports that instead of just because I
3 said so. Thank you.

4 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

5 Anita Gahimer Crow, then John Hardham, Dave Thies
6 is a possibility.

7 ANITA GAHIMER CROW,

8 having been first duly sworn on oath,

9 testified as follows:

10

11 TESTIMONY OF ANITA GAHIMER CROW

12 My name is Anita G-a-h-i-m-e-r C-r-o-w. I live at
13 161 Fouts Road, Mill A/Cook, Washington which is just off
14 the Cook-Underwood Road, on the west end of the
15 Cook-Underwood Road and the west side of the Little White
16 Salmon River. My family has been here since the 1930s. We
17 have lived successfully in partnership with our land. We
18 own approximately 80 acres of forestland. We have logged
19 that land, harvested that timber, regrown that timber and
20 harvested it again.

21 The wind power project I think is an opportunity
22 for those folks living here in the Columbia River Gorge to
23 be a model of what we can do to produce alternative energy
24 in an area that is the National Scenic Area area that we all
25 love. I think it should be a successful model project, and

1 I think we should all work together to make it happen.

2 Of course, I would love to live the way it was
3 here when Lewis and Clark came through. I would like to be
4 the only one that lives here with no neighbors. You know,
5 we would all love that, but we have successfully made what
6 we have to do work in order to be humans to live in this
7 area of the world.

8 Mother nature has a role and humans have a role.
9 We have successfully lived with our railroads which have
10 come in, with the roads which have come in, the barges on
11 the river, everything that has happened to make humans have
12 a successful life, which by the way is a matter of choice
13 and a matter of our own personal perceptions of everything
14 that we see.

15 For we see things that denigrate our life on a
16 regular basis. We listen to the train whistles at night; we
17 wake up. We hear generators going and sirens going, and I
18 live way up in the woods. I can hear the airplanes and the
19 jets, but I also have very, very healthy elk, deer, cougar,
20 birds of all kinds, including eagles, all kinds of things on
21 our property, and they are very happy. And I do everything
22 I can to make them happy in spite of the impact I have on
23 their land, and that's the way we should look at this
24 project.

25 Let's make it a success. We have a responsibility

1 to protect our environment, to protect our earth in the best
2 way possible. Alternative energy is not something we should
3 send to our neighbors in Eastern Washington. There happens
4 to be a lot of beauty in Eastern Washington, and the people
5 there love their land just as much as we do. We shouldn't
6 send them away. We should work to make it happen. We
7 should set an example, and I appreciate the effort you are
8 taking so that everyone's viewpoint are heard and taken into
9 consideration, and we can make this a model project. Thank
10 you.

11 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments. John
12 harden, Dave Thies, and then Jim Minick M-i-n-i-c-k.

13 JOHN HARDHAM,
14 having been first duly sworn on oath,
15 testified as follows:

16
17 EXAMINATION

18 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

19 Q. Please state your name and spell your last name,
20 please.

21 A. My name is the John Hardham, H-a-r-d-h-a-m. I am a
22 resident of Underwood. I live at 391 Ashley Drive. On
23 behalf of the Skamania County Economic Development
24 Commission, I would like to state my support for the
25 Whistling Ridge project. I'm a member of the Skamania County

1 Economic Development Commission.

2 I think that you have received testimony on
3 already to the specific benefits Skamania County will
4 receive as a result of this project, primarily in tax
5 revenues, job creation. And these tax revenues will help
6 support valuable services that the county provides to all of
7 our residents.

8 Personally I believe that we have to make some
9 sacrifices to do whatever we can that's necessary to wean
10 ourselves from the dependence on fossil fuel. I support the
11 National Scenic Area, and I'm proud to have participated in
12 the initial hearings to establish the scenic, area and I'm
13 very happy to see that it is successful.

14 My home is within the scenic area. I live about
15 two miles from the Whistling Ridge Project. One aspect of
16 the National Scenic Area Act is that it must provide for
17 economic development. There is a seemingly overwhelming
18 amount of effort that would seem to contradict the sense of
19 this project, and I would hope that the developers would do
20 everything possible to alleviate the possible negative
21 impacts to our community and to our environment or even the
22 construction and operation of this project.

23 However, we do face a difficult problem in
24 Skamania County that we need the tax revenue and the jobs
25 that will be provided through this project which gives us an

1 opportunity to test our ability and our resolve to integrate
2 economic development with environmental protection, and I do
3 believe that we can make this work and become model for the
4 rest of the nation in how best to integrate these two
5 aspects. Thank you.

6 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.
7 Dave Thies, then Jim Minick and Polly Wood.

8 DAVE THIES,
9 having been first duly sworn on oath,
10 testified as follows:

11
12 EXAMINATION

13 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

14 Q. State your name and spell your last name, please,
15 and your mailing address.

16 A. My name is Dave Thies, T-h-i-e-s, P.O. Box 64,
17 White Salmon, Washington 98672. I'm the President of the
18 Columbia Gorge Audubon Society. I've been involved in
19 monitoring wind power in the gorge area for over 15 years.
20 The original intent of wind power development was to spread
21 that development throughout the region. That has not
22 happened. It is being focused on the Gorge and in the
23 Columbia River basin. That's very unfortunate because the
24 Columbia River Gorge is in the cross-hairs of the east-west,
25 north-south bird corridors.

1 I have looked at a lot of wind power mitigation
2 measures. I can tell you that I am hard pressed to find any
3 measures that prevent the death of one bird. You do not
4 site wind power in this kind of location and expect to
5 mitigate your way out of disaster. It is already happening
6 in Eastern Klickitat County. The Big Horn Wind Power
7 Project has already experienced 7 to 15 times the number of
8 anticipated bird kill, and frankly we think that's low. We
9 believe that it's standard operating procedure for project
10 proponents to underestimate bird kills in order to get
11 permits.

12 At the northern end of this project is DNR
13 property that is valuable to spotted owl habitat. The DNR
14 had originally gone ahead and approved an extension of the
15 project onto that site, but they got caught. We believe
16 that if wind power is allowed on Underwood Mountain that
17 will denigrate that spotted owl habitat, and that it will be
18 used as an excuse to move on into the DNR property. We
19 oppose wind power in the area of residential use.

20 Finally they don't call wind power LLCs for
21 nothing. Limited liability corporations in Klickitat County
22 we have over 600 towers going and not a penny for
23 decommissioning. We believe that the public is going to end
24 up taking these machines down when it's all over. Thank you
25 very much.

1 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your time.
2 Jim Minick, Polly Wood, and Will Bloch after that.

3 JIM MINICK,
4 having been first duly sworn on oath,
5 testified as follows:

6
7 TESTIMONY OF JIM MINICK

8 My name is Jim Minick, M-i-n-i-c-k. I live at 5
9 Wilkins Drive, Lyle, Washington 98635. Thank you for
10 allowing my comments.

11 I've lived here in the scenic area for 23 years.
12 I'm a property owner and a taxpayer in Klickitat County.
13 I'm completely opposed to the Whistling Ridge Wind Turbine
14 Project. The Columbia River Gorge is set aside as a special
15 management area by an act of Congress designated as a
16 National Scenic Area. My objection to this project is the
17 visual impact is completely unacceptable.

18 People come here to spend money as tourists.
19 Others live here because of the scenic character. An
20 industrial wind turbine farm on a prominent ridge in the
21 middle of the Columbia Gorge destroys these scenic
22 qualities.

23 If this were approved, it would only be the
24 beginning, the foot in the door. The Stevenson family owns
25 thousands of acres of forestland on both sides of the

1 Columbia River. A few years from now numerous ridge tops
2 and the entire Gorge will be covered with wind turbines if
3 they have their way. They will cut the forest as they have
4 with Whistling Ridge to build their wind farm, make lots of
5 money, and the rest of us have to look at this new
6 industrialized scenic area for the rest of our lives here.

7 This is not about being a good neighbor as the pro
8 materials suggests. It is about making as much money as
9 possible. That's fine. But if I owned the land just down
10 the hill from the Stevenson's home, and I wanted to put wind
11 turbines right in the middle of their beautiful view of
12 Mount Hood, and what if they objected and I said too bad, is
13 that being a good neighbor? How about the SDS gravel pit
14 slide on the east end of Bingen the summer before last.
15 They lined outside their permit area. They slid a section
16 of their neighbor's property down the hill destroying what's
17 grazing there. They did announce that next day that all was
18 well. There was no danger.

19 Washington State came in the day after that,
20 announced that this was in fact a very dangerous situation,
21 and they shut down their gravel operation. By proposing
22 this project in order to be good neighbors, in spite of
23 hundreds of our neighbors' objections, the residents
24 everyday will have to pay for their profits by looking at
25 their wind turbines.

1 If I were a tourist-related business in Hood River
2 or White Salmon, I would be completely terrified. There is
3 a good place for wind turbines. Put those out in Eastern
4 Klickitat County. If there are 50 additional wind turbines,
5 they will hardly be noticed. This is good technology
6 located in exactly the wrong place. Thank you.

7 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

8 Poly Wood, Will Bloch. After Mr. Bloch we have
9 two additional names. Vince Ready and Dawn Stover. If
10 there's anyone else who would like speak, you can sign up in
11 back and we will call for comments.

12 WILL BLOCH,
13 having been first duly sworn on oath,
14 testified as follows:

15
16 EXAMINATION

17 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

18 Q. Please state your name and spell your last name.

19 A. I'm will Bloch, B-l-o-c-h, living at 75 El Camino
20 Real, White Salmon, 99672.

21 I'm completely aware of the prospects of global
22 warming, and I'm a strong proponent of green energy, but I
23 do think this is the wrong place to put wind turbines. My
24 prominent concern is with the degradation of scenic values,
25 but today primarily I want to talk to economic issues, what

1 I think are unrealistic impressions of the job benefits and
2 of the contribution to Northwest green energy as a whole.

3 With regard to jobs the first speaker suggested
4 that the project would deliver nine permanent jobs. I think
5 that's an overestimate by a factor of three. Upon cruising
6 the web to get some information, I do have the job data for
7 other project in this area, and I came up with three
8 figures. One for the Big Horn Project near Goldendale, and
9 there's a couple other projects in Central Oregon and one
10 from Shepherd Flats Project in Central Oregon. All three
11 sites for rather a large range of project sizes come up with
12 a fairly uniform number for the number of permanent jobs
13 created per turbine. That number comes to it turns out that
14 it requires about one permanent worker for every 10 to 13
15 turbines independent of the project site. So scaled to the
16 Whistling Ridge Project that implies that we might have no
17 fewer than three, nor more than five permanent workers.
18 That number will not have any affect on the grim
19 unemployment problems we have in this area.

20 The data on temporary workers is much more sparse,
21 but the Big Horn Project scaled to this site would suggest
22 that there would be a maximum of about 75 temporary workers.
23 Presumably their jobs would last no more than a year. At
24 the Big Horn site only 60 percent of the temporary workers
25 were local.

1 I'm also interested in the contributions of
2 Whistling Ridge to the Northwest Green Energy Economy. It
3 appears from cruising the web that from the planned through
4 the operating stages there is about 3.8 gigawatts of wind
5 power in Washington and 5.4 gigawatts of wind power in
6 Oregon. Crunching the numbers that comes out that the
7 Whistling Ridge Project would have less than a one percent
8 distribution to Northwest wind power alone. Thank you.

9 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

10 Vince Ready and then Dawn Stover.

11 VINCE READY,

12 having been first duly sworn on oath,

13 testified as follows:

14

15 EXAMINATION

16 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

17 Q. State your name and spell your last name.

18 A. My name is Vince Ready. That's R-e-a-d-y, and I
19 live at 1337 Columbia Street, Hood River.

20 My comments will be brief, but I'm here tonight as
21 a concerned citizen, and I wanted my opposition to the
22 project to be heard. My family and I moved to the Columbia
23 Gorge about 18 months ago, and one of the primary reasons
24 that we did so was that we value the scenic, recreational,
25 and natural resources in this area. In fact, the unique

1 National Scenic Area protects those for future generations,
2 and the primary concern that I wanted to convey tonight is
3 the fact that the proposed Whistling Ridge facility would
4 essentially undermine the intent of the National Scenic Area
5 by creating massive industrial structures that break the
6 ridge line and with fans that as I understand it would have
7 spans as wide as Boeing 747 jets.

8 From where I live based on the GIS the latest I've
9 seen it's estimated that I would see between 6 and 15 of
10 those towers from my home just looking out my window.

11 I feel that the proposed location is in exactly
12 the wrong place because it's right in the heart of the
13 Gorge, both literally and figuratively. It's in a place
14 where the Columbia River bisects the Cascade Range. It's
15 visible from at least three key viewing areas. It's a place
16 where people come to escape just the kind of visual
17 interference that such a project would create.

18 Based on what I've heard, but I'm not an expert,
19 it sounds like this project would have nominal energy return
20 relative to other possible sites, and I just believe that
21 the cost is too high for too small a gain. It sets a bad
22 precedent that would negatively impact decision making for
23 future projects and eventually degrade the quality of life
24 and the scenic beauty of the Gorge. Thank you.

25 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

1 Dawn Stover.

2 DAWN STOVER,

3 having been first duly sworn on oath,

4 testified as follows:

5

6 EXAMINATION

7 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

8 Q. Could you state your name, please.

9 A. My name is Dawn Stover and I live at 1208 Snowden
10 Road in White Salmon, Washington 98672.

11 Q. Could you spell your last name, please.

12 A. S-t-o-v-e-r.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 A. I did do a lot of hearings like this over the last
15 15 years, and I think at every one I probably started off by
16 making a remark about the support for renewable energy, and
17 tonight I'm not so sure about that. And I think the reason
18 for that is cumulative impacts.

19 Fifteen years I've been visiting wind farm
20 projects in Oregon, Washington, and California and studying
21 up on them and read a lot of fatality monitoring reports, a
22 lot of predictions made from other projects that were
23 projects were built. And I'm very, very concerned about
24 what this particular project is going to add to the
25 cumulative impacts that we are already seeing in our region.

1 We know that turbines kill birds and bats, and the big
2 question is how many are too many. I think there are really
3 two answers to that question. If you're talking about
4 endangered species like the spotted owl, then the answer is
5 one is too many. When you're talking about species that are
6 not listed, then what the concern is, is how many animals
7 are killed before you see population level impacts. And
8 here in the Gorge we are reaching, if we haven't already
9 reached, that point.

10 I ask that you look at Whistling Ridge in the
11 context of how many projects are already built, permitted,
12 or in the planning stages on both sides of the river in this
13 Columbia plateau ecoregion. What I see when I look at the
14 map is a great wall of wind turbines stretching for miles
15 and miles along the river, and that's the gauntlet of bad
16 birds migrating those projects. It's also a hazard to even
17 raptors that live in this area and that hunt back and forth
18 in contours along those very same ridge lines when these
19 turbines are going in. Wind is a resource that raptors seek
20 out just as wind developers do, and I'm particularly
21 concerned about raptors because they are long-lived species
22 and incremental deaths can have a major impact on
23 population.

24 I have served on the Technical Advisory Committee
25 for three large wind projects in Klickitat County so I've

1 spent a lot of time reading these monitoring reports and
2 going over them. And these surveys and studies of technical
3 advisory committees are not mitigations for population
4 effects. They help us understand what kills wildlife. In
5 theory they help us site wind turbines better, but in the
6 practical sense not what I've seen. What I've seen is that
7 we have a lot of projects like this one proposed in very
8 environmentally sensitive areas, and we have seen raptor
9 fatalities that are much higher than was predicted. These
10 wind turbines are killing in some cases up to 16 times as
11 many raptors as anticipated at these projects and twice as
12 many bats. The closer you get to Whistling Ridge the worse
13 it gets.

14 So the reason I'm concerned about this is the same
15 methods used to make predictions are being used by the same
16 people to predict how many birds and bats will be killed at
17 Whistling Ridge.

18 Secondly, these excess fatalities add up to so
19 many raptor kills that now we're looking at population level
20 impacts in our region. And finally these studies that have
21 been done so far have been in habitat that was considered
22 much safer for birds and turbine interaction than Whistling
23 Ridge habitat.

24 Klickitat County Planning Department we've already
25 got a map of at least 15 major projects signed. The BPA

1 project map shows more than 45 proposed projects, and if you
2 look at BPA's spreadsheet of their connection requests you
3 will see proposals from more than 100 wind projects just in
4 the last three years, and that's not even counting
5 transmission lines and storage projects.

6 So I just want to end my remarks by saying I hope
7 you look at cumulative impacts, and that includes the
8 impacts of transmission lines and backup power sources
9 because it's not going to be hydropower. It's tapped out.
10 We need to look at what this means in terms of natural gas
11 peaking power projects too. Thank you.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

13 That concludes the list of people who have signed
14 up. If there are others -- I see one gentleman. Please
15 come forward.

16 DAVE BERGER,
17 having been first duly sworn on oath,
18 testified as follows:

19
20 EXAMINATION

21 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

22 Q. Could you pick up the microphone and put it close
23 to your mouth.

24 A. Yeah, my name is Berger. I live in Klickitat
25 County.

1 Q. Could you spell the last name for us.

2 A. B-e-r-g-e-r.

3 Q. Thank you.

4 A. Yeah, originally I wasn't planning on testifying.
5 I've been a renewable energy advocate all my life. I
6 volunteer for a group called Solar Energy International.
7 They consider me what's called an International Development
8 Director, and I'm working on a wind project right now with
9 Messiah World Area in Africa. I think wind is just like
10 business. You know, location, location, location. And
11 unfortunately this is not a good location. I'm deeply
12 concerned about the damage to raptors and especially owls and
13 hawks and to the wildlife corridor. I think that's something
14 that needs to be taking -- a strong look has to be taken, and
15 I basically don't support this project mainly because of
16 those reasons.

17 Other concerns of mine are noise, and what I've
18 seen with wind generator companies when they look at
19 projects like this, people advocate for projects like this
20 they tend to take the data from the laboratory. They run
21 the jenny in the lab, they get noise data, and they project
22 it onto the land. Well, these generators have been out for
23 a long time now, and I don't see any reason why you couldn't
24 be taking data from generators it in field and then
25 projecting it to your topography. I think that would give

1 the residents here a better look at what's real, and this
2 thing really shouldn't be jammed through.

3 And I think when you look at corporate interests,
4 their job is a make money. The history of SDS is fighting
5 the Endangered Species Act back in the '80s. It's logging.
6 It's making money. That's their job. Their job is to
7 advocate this project and to make money. I don't fault them
8 for that, but I certainly wouldn't follow their data or
9 believe their data.

10 As far as the jobs program is concerned, we're all
11 a big country. This power is going to benefit people in
12 California, and hopefully if it does go in it will augment
13 coal and that's good thing, but I don't care where the power
14 goes. But as far as jobs are concerned, if the American
15 people need a certain amount of billions and mega billions
16 of megawatts, wherever we make them the jobs are going to be
17 created. So to worry about a whole country and then bring
18 it down to a little area is really unnecessary. We are
19 going to create the jobs wherever we create energy. This
20 project beats the hell out of coal and it beats the hell out
21 of nuclear, but it's also going to beat the hell out of the
22 birds.

23 And I think you really need to site this in a
24 place that makes more sense. We're advocating this
25 nationally and we should continue to do so, but this is not

1 the right place, and it's not the right time. And if we
2 want some tourists to come in and we do this project, heck,
3 let's put beautiful psychedelic lights on the things and
4 peace signs and bring in people and sell beautiful T-shirts.
5 But really is that what the scenic area is about? That's a
6 question we need to ask. Do we want those red lights
7 flashing at night? Anyway, thanks for your time.

8 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much.

9 MR. BERGER: Oh, can I say one more thing? On my
10 house I had a choice of including wind generators or PV
11 panels, and we have a very similar location to this ridge
12 where we are by lot. Now we chose for more expense, the
13 solar panels, because we looked at those owls and those
14 eagles flying over our house just like they're over here and
15 we put the 40 grand in, but we could have saved a lot of
16 money for doing wind a lot cheaper and getting the same
17 power. So our message is that. Thank you.

18 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you.

19 SIMON SAMPSON,
20 having been first duly sworn on oath,
21 testified as follows:

22

23 EXAMINATION

24 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

25 Q. Could you state your name and spell your last name

1 for us.

2 A. My name is Simon Sampson, S-a-m-p-s-o-n, 512 South
3 Alder Street, Toppenish, Washington.

4 Q. Thank you. Please proceed with your comments.

5 A. Members of the Council, I come here today, I've
6 listened to quite a few words that have been said in regards
7 to this project. I represent the Columbia River Chief
8 Council, and on our behalf I would like to make a few
9 statements to your board here and the community.

10 My people have lived along this river for a number
11 of years. Myself personally have been 62 years coming to
12 this river from Yakima Valley to enjoy what I call the
13 fishing nets. And, you know, I've heard a lot of concern as
14 to why this should not be allowed, but I also from the
15 standpoint of our river people we support this project. And
16 some of the reasons that I've seen happen are what's going
17 on with this project it's pretty well open. We've attended
18 these hearings or meetings in the past, and I know for a
19 fact the windsurfers that are on this river they interrupt
20 our fishing, our livelihood, and we have to say to tourists
21 that's generated from this activity, you know, maybe they
22 wouldn't be here, and my people would be on this river.

23 But in the name of progress treaties were signed
24 by my people with the federal government, state government,
25 county government, city government. It's called progress.

1 I'm a man that's educated to the point where if I could see
2 something that will benefit not only my children, my
3 grandchildren, you know, I need to make that decision on
4 behalf of them. They're not able to speak for themselves.
5 And I really think truly deep down the animals and the other
6 interests that they're talking about, these birds that will
7 be killed from this, I don't really see any facts or, you
8 know, real figures that say that. It's a personal opinion
9 in my view point.

10 And in conclusion I really think for this economy
11 to turn around we need jobs, employment for our families,
12 whether we're poor, rich, or we can afford to come down to
13 this beautiful Columbia River. So in conclusion I ask your
14 committee to vote favorably toward this project. Thank you
15 very much.

16 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments.

17 Okay. Last call?

18 One more person. As this young lady is
19 approaching, I will ask for a final indication for you to
20 step forward, please.

21 Are there any others who would like to testify?
22 Going, going, okay.

23 GLORIA KRANTZ OF DEE,

24 having been first duly sworn on oath

25 testified as follows:

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

3 Q. Could you give us your name and spell it and your
4 mailing address.

5 A. My name is Gloria Krantz. The last name is three
6 words. Krantz K-r-a-n-t-z, second word o-f, the third D-e-e.
7 I Live at 5000 O'Leary Road, and the address is Hood River,
8 but I don't live there. The post office put me there.

9 Q. Please proceed with your comments.

10 A. Thank you so much for coming and listening to the
11 people speak. I guess what I wanted to speak to is the
12 people who live close to this, and I have some personal
13 experience I would like to share. I live across the river on
14 the way to Lost Lake.

15 The city of Hood River gets their water beyond
16 where I live, and because of state money they were able
17 renovate the water project and it sounds like a good deal.
18 But, of course, they overran their projection and, of
19 course, the impact to the community that I live in was
20 dramatic. And they had anticipated what it would cost to
21 us, and I'm glad the people of Hood River can get good clean
22 water, but I'm not sure that it was worth the impact to my
23 business and to my life this summer.

24 And, you know, it was suppose to be complete
25 before fall, before all the fruit that is growing in my

1 neighborhood would have to go to the packing house. That
2 didn't happen. And you know what? It's still not done. So
3 with everyone's best intentions you can project what you
4 think the impacts are going to be on a community, but when
5 you live through it, it's much more. And, you know, we are
6 people and you can hear us and what we think, but there are
7 a lot of other entities out there that don't have a voice,
8 and we need to think of them too. So that is my message.
9 Thank you.

10 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you for your comments. There
11 was another person who wanted to speak. Please step
12 forward.

13 VICTORIA WARTALSKI,
14 having been first duly sworn on oath,
15 testified as follows:

16

17 BY JUDGE WALLIS:

18 Q. Please proceed.

19 A. Thank you. My name is Victoria. The last name is
20 W-a-r-t-a-l-s-k-i. My address is P.O. Box 8, White Salmon.
21 I actually live at 777 Upper Lakeview at Northwestern Lake.

22 I do not share the opinions of Mark King. I live
23 in a completely solar home with panels and we are putting up
24 wind turbines, and I support this project because I feel
25 it's good for Skamania County, and I am part of Skamania

1 County. And to hear all the people make the comments that
2 this isn't the right place, it really is. We don't have a
3 lot of area here in Skamania County that could be developed
4 and what can be developed should be allowed to be developed.
5 Thank you.

6 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. I want to thank
7 everyone who came today to speak at the hearing. We will be
8 at Rock Creek Center tomorrow beginning at 6:30. People who
9 testified tonight will not be able to testify again, but
10 you're certainly welcome to come listen to the comments that
11 will be presented there.

12 Thank you again for coming tonight. We are
13 adjourned.

14 * * * * *

15 (Whereupon, the public hearing was adjourned at
16 5:59 p.m.)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

		PAGE
1		
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES	
3	W.D. TRUITT	528
4	JOHN SAULIE-ROHMAN	530
5	TOM ROUSSEAU	531
6	FRANK BACKUS	534
7	SALLY NEWELL	535
8	STEPHEN BRONSVELD	538
9	WIRT MAXEY	540
10	TERESA ROBBINS	546
11	DAVE GLASGOW	550
12	SCOTT COOK	551
13	MIKE EASTWICK	553
14	CLIFF JEWELL	553
15	MARK KING	557
16	MARK SCHMIDT	560
17	JANET WARREN	561
18	MARLENE WOODWARD	563
19	JURGEN HESS	565
20	GARY CASADY	568
21	REX JOHNSTON	569
22	LARRY KEISTER	570
23	TOM WOOD	571
24	CHRIS LLOYD	574
25	SHERRY MEIER	576

I N D E X

1		
2	PUBLIC WITNESSES	PAGE
3	HOLLY GRISWOLD	579
4	JACOB ANDERSON	580
5	GLEN HOLMBERG	585
6	ANITA GAHIMER CROW	587
7	JOHN HARDHAM	589
8	DAVE THIES	591
9	JIM MINICK	593
10	WILL BLOCH	595
11	VINCE READY	597
12	DAWN STOVER	599
13	DAVE BERGER	602
14	SIMON SAMPSON	605
15	GLORIA KRANTZ OF DEE	608
16	VICTORIA WARTALSKI	609
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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 re: Whistling Ridge Energy Project
Application No. 2009-10

A F F I D A V I T

I, Shaun Linse, CCR, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript prepared under my direction is a full and complete transcript of proceedings held on January 5, 2011, in Underwood, Washington.

Shaun Linse, CCR 2029