

## **Appendix E**

### Scoping Comments Matrix

---



---

Issue Codes



| Issue Category   | Issue Code | Definition   |
|--|------------|--|
| Siting/Location  | AL1        | Alternative sites should be considered and analyzed; Not a good site                                     |
| Cumulative Effects   | CE1        | Concerned about cumulative effects of Whistling Ridge and Saddleback wind projects                       |
|  | CE2        | Concerned about cumulative effects of wind projects in Columbia Gorge area                               |
| Cultural Resources   | CR1        | Cultural resources comments  |
| Toxics and Chemical Contamination  | CX1        | Concerned about chemical use at the facility and the impacts on humans and the environment               |
| Documents  | DX         | Documents attached   |
| Energy Generation  | EG1        | Power output, Reliability, General need for wind power, ability of the grid to support                   |
|  | EG2        | Ability of the site to produce good power  |
| Environmental Impacts - General  | E11        | General environmental impacts  |
|  | ER1        | Comments regarding emergency response and resources available  |
| Form Letters - Each form letter includes five issues - CE1, E11, FW2, Vr1, Vr1 | F          | Form Letter A  |
|  | F1         | Form Letter B  |
| Fish and Wildlife  | FW1        | Comments regarding T&E and sensitive species   |
|  | FW2        | Comment regarding forests and forest dwellers in general   |
| Land Use   | LU1        | Land use consistency   |
| Mitigation   | MT1        | Mitigation and decommissioning plans   |
| Noise and Air Quality  | NQ1        | Noise impacts on people, towns, residences, and animals.   |
|  | NQ2        | Air quality impacts  |
|  | NQ3        | Residential setbacks   |
| General Comments   | PM1        | Comment Acknowledged; subject matter determined to not be substantive                                    |
|  | PM2        | Regulatory oversight and inspections, general legality questions   |
|  | PM3        | EIS procedures, structure, who will prepare EIS, is EIS preparer objective?, third party recommendations |
|  | PM4        | In favor of the project - general comment  |
|  | PM5        | Against the project - general comment  |
| Recreation   | RR1        | Comments on impact to recreational resources   |
| Socioeconomics   | SE1        | Concerned about socioeconomic effect on local area including tourism                                     |
|  | SE2        | Concerned about property values  |
|  | SE3        | Concern about cost benefit of the project  |
|  | SE4        | Economics - concern over jobs created  |
|  | SE5        | Impacts of the project on human health and welfare should be analyzed                                    |
|  | SE6        | Economics - concern over county tax base and general county economic relationship of project to county.  |
| Soil and Geology   | SG1        | Soil and erosion comments  |
|  | SG2        | Geology/Tectonics comments   |
|  | SG3        | Groundwater  |
| Surface Water  | SW1        | Comments on impact on surface water resources  |
|  | SW2        | Comments on impacts to wetlands  |
| Traffic and Transportation   | TT1        | Comments about impacts to roads and access roads   |
|  | TT2        | Concerned about safety issues during construction and operation/traffic related                          |
|  | TT3        | Impacts of road construction on private property   |
| Visual Resources   | VR1        | Visual impacts   |
|  | VR2        | Visual impacts - night time specific   |
|  | VR3        | Visual impacts - scenic act specific   |
| No Comment   | X          | No comment or duplicate comment  |



---

Letters



| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name          | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|--|------------|--|
| 1             | 1              | Johnson Meninick        | Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation           | CR1        | <i>The area for this project is located within the Ceded Territory of YN as defined in the Treaty of June 9, 1855 (12 stat 951). Therefore Yakama Nation is the affected tribe by this undertaking.</i>  |
| 1             | 2              | Johnson Meninick        | Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation           | CR1        | <i>As per Section 101(b)(2)(4) of the National Environmental Policy Act, in order to carry out the NEPA process you must consider the impact of the project to cultural sites. It should also be noted that the NEPA process does not exempt federal agencies (BPA) from the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the American Indian Religious Freedoms Act (AIRFA).</i>   |
| 2             | 3              | Wirt T. Maxey           | Peters, Maxey, Short and Maxey P.A. Attorneys at Law         | PM2        | <i>Strong objection to the May 6 scoping meeting location in Stevenson, as there is a suitable meeting location in Underwood, which is closer to the proposed project. The bottom line is that setting the meeting in Stevenson effectively diminishes or precludes meaningful participation by many of the affected residents of Underwood...holding the meeting in Stevenson is clearly illegal under RCW 80.50.090. Please comply with the statute and reschedule the meeting at either the Underwood Community Center or the Mill A school.</i>  |
| 3             | 4              | J. Richard Aramburu     | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | PM2        | <i>Notice for hearings as required under NEPA was inadequate. No public notice of the May 6 hearing was received by mailing list registrant.</i>   |
| 3             | 5              | J. Richard Aramburu     | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | PM2        | <i>Meeting location was not "as close as practical to the project site" as required by RCW 80.50.90 (Underwood facilities would have been appropriate).</i>  |
| 3             | 6              | J. Richard Aramburu     | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | PM2        | <i>The three-hour meeting time was inadequate. Meetings should have been held over a two-day period.</i>   |
| 4             | 7              | Nathan Baker            | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | PM2        | <i>The [public] notice inaccurately states that the project would be located outside of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area...the application expressly proposes certain project components within the National Scenic Area. Specifically, the application proposes road construction and use within the National Scenic Area. Application at 4.3-13-4.3-43.</i>   |
| 4             | 8              | Nathan Baker            | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | PM2        | <i>The proposed meeting location does not comply with the statutory requirement to be as close as practical to the project site. (RCW 80.50.90)</i>  |
| 4             | 9              | Nathan Baker            | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | PM2        | <i>The proposed agenda fails to allot sufficient time to hear from interested members of the public.</i>   |
| 4             | 10             | Nathan Baker            | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | PM2        | <i>The notice improperly connotes certainty that the project will be approved and constructed.</i>   |
| 4             | 11             | Sally Newell            | Underwood Community Council                                  | PM2        | <i>The proposed meeting location does not comply with the statutory requirement to be as close as practical to the project site. (RCW 80.50.90)</i>  |
| 5             | 12             | Jack Kapp               | Underwood, WA Resident                                       | LU1        | <i>Resident within approximately 5 miles of the project: We feel this project will have little if any effect on our home and the surrounding area. Any positive returns will greatly outweigh any downside. We very much support this project.</i>   |
| 6             | 13             | J. Richard Aramburu     | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | PM3        | <i>Objection to the applicant prepared DEIS, because it is applicant prepared. SOSA requests that the current Request for Proposals be withdrawn and replaced by one which calls for EFSEC and BPA to prepare the draft and final environmental impact statement through a consultant hired by the agencies.</i>   |
| 7             | 14             | J. Richard Aramburu     | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | PM3        | <i>Further objection to applicant prepared nature of EIS. "As described in my April 22, 2009 letter, relying on an "applicant prepared" draft EIS, with no oversight over the final EIS, as apparently contemplated by EFSEC, is not consistent with NEPA, its regulations or case law. BPA should insist on consistency with applicable federal regulations in the preparation of Whistling Ridge draft and final environmental impact statements. To not do so is to invite delay, additional expense and litigation, none of which serves the public interest or that of the applicant.</i> |
| 8             | 15             | Dave Thies              | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society                               | PM2        | <i>Columbia Gorge Audubon Society supports the Underwood Community Council in their request regarding proper notification and hearing location.</i>  |
| 8             | 16             | Dave Thies              | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society                               | PM2        | <i>We further suggest that the date of the hearing be delayed to allow for these changes, and that the community be allowed more than one hour to voice their concerns.</i>  |
| 9             | 17             | Helen Marie Paulus, DMD | Underwood, WA Resident                                       | PM4        | <i>Underwood resident in complete support of the project.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name        | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|---|------------|---|
| 10            | 18             | Sheila Pendleton-Orme | Washington Department of Ecology, Water Quality Unit, Southwest Regional Office | SW1        | <p><i>Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control, and WAC 173-201A, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action....Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction...Proper disposal of construction debris must be on land in such a manner that debris cannot enter storm drains draining to waters of the state or cause water quality degradation of state waters...Soil in stockpiles should be stabilized or protected with sediment-trapping measures to prevent soil loss...</i></p> <p><i>Perennial and non-perennial streams will require stabilization if the channels or stream banks are disturbed. Non-perennial streams in particular can be very sensitive to disturbance. Crossings of both types of streams require stabilization...Clearing limits and/or any easements or required buffers should be identified and marked in the field, prior to the start of any clearing, grading, or construction....A permanent vegetative cover should be established on denuded...areas at final grade if they are not otherwise permanently stabilized...All types of sediment control, such as sediment ponds or traps, should be constructed as a first step in grading and be made functional before any upslope disturbance takes place...</i></p> <p><i>All temporary erosion control systems should be designed to contain the runoff from the developed two year, 24-hour design storm without eroding...Provision should be made to minimize the tracking of sediment by construction vehicles onto paved public roads...Coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Waste Discharge General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities is required for construction sites which disturb an area of one acre or more and which have or will have a discharge of stormwater to surface water or a storm sewer.</i></p> |
| 11            | 19             | Kelley Beamer         | Portland, OR resident   | E11        | <i>The proposed project would cause significant negative impacts to sensitive wildlife and plant habitat and would degrade the outstanding scenic beauty of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 11            | 20             | Kelley Beamer         | Portland, OR resident   | CE1        | <i>The Whistling Ridge proposal includes more than 80 wind turbines in two counties, yet the application filed with EFSEC discusses only 50 turbines in Skamania County. The EIS must review the cumulative environmental impacts of all portions of the project, including both the Skamania Co. and Klickitat Co. portions.</i>   |
| 11            | 21             | Kelley Beamer         | Portland, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>This proposal is likely to have different and greater wildlife impacts than any other wind energy facility proposed in the State of Washington, because this project is proposed at a heavily forested site. The project would permanently disturb large areas of forested habitat and result in direct and indirect impacts to multiple wildlife species through habitat loss and displacement, direct collisions with turbine blades, and other factors. The potentially affected species include northern spotted owl, western gray squirrel, northern goshawk and other raptors, several species of bats, multiple migratory bird species, mule deer, black-tailed deer, and elk. Several of these species are listed as sensitive or threatened in Washington State.</i>  |
| 11            | 22             | Kelley Beamer         | Portland, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>Locating 426-foot-tall turbines on the ridgeline of the Columbia River Gorge would also degrade the scenic values of the Gorge. The turbines would be highly visible from several designated key viewing areas within the National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 11            | 23             | Kelley Beamer         | Portland, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>the proposed project would be located partially within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct, expand, and improve more than two miles of roads within the National Scenic Area in order to haul industrial materials with gross vehicle weights of up to 53 tons. This proposal to construct and use Scenic Area lands for industrial purposes is prohibited by the National Scenic Area Act and Management Plan, and must be denied.</i>   |
| 12            | 24-28          | Marilyn Lipko         | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 13            | 29-33          | Kim Brandow           | Gresham, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 14            | 34-38          | sharilyn cohn         | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 15            | 39             | Karen Carr            | Portland, OR resident   | PM4        | <i>I'm in favor of using the gorge for a wind project. This seems like a great idea.</i>  |
| 16            | 40-44          | Caroline Reyes        | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 17            | 45-49          | Janice Sherer         | Goldendale, WA resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 18            | 50-54          | Jeri Tess             | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 19            | 55-59          | Dave Miller           | Camas, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 20            | 60-64          | Larry Ewald           | Vancouver, WA resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 21            | 65             | Alex Prentiss         | King City, OR   | FW1        | <i>Too many endangered critters live too close to this site.</i>  |
| 21            | 66-70          | Alex Prentiss         | King City, OR   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 22            | 71-75          | Lawrence Nagel        | Ashland, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name          | Affiliation                | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|--|
| 23            | 76             | Richard Yarnell         | Beavercreek, OR resident   | F          | <i>Since the proposed project lies outside the Gorge Scenic Area, its approval should be based on an exhaustive environmental impact study, no shortcuts allowed. If there is not negative impact on wildlife, forest management practices mandated by the State or Federal governments, and provided creditable experts confirm that mammal and avian migratory routes are not impaired, then the project should be approved.</i>   |
| 23            | 77             | Richard Yarnell         | Beavercreek, OR resident   | MT1        | <i>I suggest that the developers be required to set up a bond that will insure the towers and all other equipment are removed in the future.</i>   |
| 23            | 78             | Richard Yarnell         | Beavercreek, OR resident   | PM3        | <i>While there may be some visual impact on parts of the Gorge Scenic area, it does not appear to be extreme. Whoever prepared the Google Earth based simulation should have put the vantage point on the ground rather than clumsily heightening the effect of the towers.</i>  |
| 23            | 79             | Richard Yarnell         | Beavercreek, OR resident   | CE1        | Same as 20   |
| 23            | 80             | Richard Yarnell         | Beavercreek, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>23 modified: The applicant proposes to construct, expand, and improve more than two miles of roads within the National Scenic Area in order to haul industrial materials with gross vehicle weights of up to 53 tons. This proposal to construct and use Scenic Area lands for industrial purposes is prohibited by the National Scenic Area Act. This rule should be upheld and the applicant instructed to find alternate means of delivering the material to the site that does not intrude on the CRGNSA. If the applicant cannot deliver the material without building roads within the CRGNSA, then the project should not be approved.</i> |
| 24            | 81-85          | Sandra Sellevaag        | Oregon City, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 25            | 86-90          | Robert Graham           | Bandon, OR resident        | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 26            | 91-95          | Linda Pesanti           | Saint Helens, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 27            | 96-100         | Judith Lienhard         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 28            | 101-105        | Barbara Bartel          | Estacada, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 29            | 106-110        | Karen Lee               | Underwood, WA Resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 30            | 111-115        | Saundra Whitten         | Cave Junction, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 31            | 116-120        | Carol Taylor            | Cascade Locks, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 32            | 121-125        | Rachel Kutschera        | Gresham, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 33            | 126-130        | laura hanks             | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 34            | 131-133        | D. Deloff               | Aloha, OR resident         | F          | Same as 21-23  |
| 35            | 134            | Ann Hollyfield          | Seal Rock, OR resident     | FW2        | <i>Problems with bird and bat deaths related to windmills must be solved</i>   |
| 35            | 135-139        | Ann Hollyfield          | Seal Rock, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 36            | 140-144        | Lewis Sternberg         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 37            | 145-149        | Linda Reedijk           | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 38            | 150-154        | brad bush               | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 39            | 155-159        | Mary Ellen              | Vancouver, WA resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 40            | 160-164        | Amber Dusk              | Ashland, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 41            | 165-169        | Robert Jones            | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 42            | 170-174        | Jenny Pompilio          | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 43            | 175-179        | Aria Jackson            | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 44            | 180-184        | steven near             | West Linn, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 45            | 185-189        | Robert Henry            | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 46            | 190-194        | Richard Gorringer, Ph.D | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 47            | 195-199        | Camille Hall            | Corvallis, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 48            | 200-204        | Robert Sullivan         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 49            | 205-209        | Rabecca Maxey           | Coral Gables, WA resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 50            | 210-214        | David Lawrence          | Springfield, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 51            | 215-219        | John Hamilton           | Junction City, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 52            | 220-224        | Elizabeth Schwartz      | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 53            | 225-229        | Larry Petersen          | Gresham, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 54            | 230-234        | Nate Jackson            | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 55            | 235-239        | David Tvedtd            | Eugene, OR resident        | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 56            | 240-244        | Trudy Margules          | Salem, OR resident         | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 57            | 245-249        | Lisa Peters             | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 58            | 250-254        | Jeffrey Richard         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 59            | 255-259        | Kristin Bott            | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 60            | 260-264        | Claudia Arabasz         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 61            | 265-269        | Glenn Blanchard         | Portland, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 62            | 270-274        | candace bolen           | Salem, OR resident         | F          | Same as 19-23  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                 | Affiliation                                 | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---|------------|---|
| 63            | 275-279        | Janice Taylor                  | White Salmon, WA resident                   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 64            | 280            | Ann Colonna                    | Portland, OR resident                       | AL1        | <i>It was so nice to have this unblemished area available to the public and I feel lucky as a 30 something to still have access to a pristine Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area...We must have a balance between our energy needs and that of the habitat for wildlife and native plants. I support renewable energy, but I am opposed to industrial-scale wind energy development within or adjacent to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, a designated national scenic treasure. This is one of the reasons Oregon and Washington are such valuable tourist attractions.</i>   |
| 65            | 281-285        | Kelly Dickinson                | Corvallis, OR resident                      | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 66            | 286-290        | Peter Branch                   | Eugene, OR resident                         | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 67            | 291-295        | Candace Shadbolt               | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 68            | 296-300        | Nicole Lawless                 | Eugene, OR resident                         | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 69            | 301-305        | Jean Wyman                     | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 70            | 306-310        | Renee Schrock                  | Salem, OR resident                          | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 71            | 311-315        | Steve Amy                      | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 72            | 316-320        | Steve Miesen                   | West Linn, OR resident                      | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 73            | 321-325        | Lynn Minneman                  | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 74            | 326-330        | Mary Lyda                      | Cave Junction, OR resident                  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 75            | 331            | Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey       | Beavercreek, OR resident                    | EI1        | Same as 19 plus: <i>MANKIND HAS BEEN TAKING ACTION WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE CONSEQUENCES FOR TOO LONG AND NOW OUR ERRORS ARE CATCHING UP WITH US., SO WE NEED TO CHANGE OUR WAYS AND CONSIDER DEEPLY WHAT WE DO. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT ARE TOO GREAT AND THE PROJECT would NOT GO FORWARD.</i>  |
| 75            | 332-335        | Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey       | Beavercreek, OR resident                    | F1         | Same as 20-23   |
| 76            | 336-340        | erika heins                    | Toledo, OR resident                         | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 77            | 341-345        | Michael Johnson                | Forest Grove, OR                            | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 78            | 346-350        | joan spearing                  | Lake Oswego, OR                             | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 79            | 351-355        | Paulette and Ron Tatum         | Aloha, OR resident                          | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 80            | 356-360        | Norma Friday                   | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 81            | 361-365        | Leslie Cohen                   | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 82            | 366-370        | Sue Doolen                     | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 83            | 371-375        | Carolyn Eckel                  | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 84            | 376-380        | Amy Chaumeton                  | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 85            | 381-385        | Lara and Michael Collins       | Hood River, OR resident                     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 86            | 386-390        | Cynthia Schwell                | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 87            | 391-395        | Hank Popiela                   | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 88            | 396-400        | Linden Gross                   | Bend, OR resident                           | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 89            | 401-405        | Claudia Curran                 | Corbett, OR resident                        | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 90            | 406            | David Waag                     | Hood River, OR resident                     | VR1        | <i>I support renewable energy, but I am opposed to industrial-scale wind energy development within or adjacent to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area....Seems to me that developing the wind farm in the view shed of the scenic area is in direct opposition to "protecting and providing for the enhancement of the scenic, cultural, recreational, and natural resources of the Columbia River Gorge". Building the towers within the view shed of the scenic area sets a bad precedent for future development. When the Scenic Act dictates what color you can paint your house and what type of roofing material can used, how can zoning allow towers with blinking lights within the same view area as a home that must adhere to strict zoning codes. Please do not allow the wind farm to extend into areas that impact the views in the Gorge.</i> |
| 91            | 407-411        | Christine Yun                  | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 92            | 412            | Larry Gohl                     | Adventure Cruises/White Salmon, WA resident | SE1        | <i>Please add my strongest "NO!" to the Whistling Ridge wind farm project. We depend on tourism for income in the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area. Our small business, Adventure Cruises, will be negatively impacted by any expansion of visible, industrial activity between Troutdale and The Dalles along the Columbia River.</i>   |
| 93            | 413-417        | Steven Wheeler                 | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 94            | 418-422        | Lester and Judy Hoyle          | Cave Junction, OR resident                  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 95            | 423-427        | Mauria McClay                  | Portland, OR resident                       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 96            | 428            | Dale F. Palmer, Superintendent | White Salmon Valley Schools                 | SE6        | <i>Economically this project has the potential to benefit the community and the school district by adding revenues without creating additional demands for services or impacts on the school system.</i>  |
| 97            | 429-433        | Erin Moore                     | Astoria, OR resident                        | F          | Same as 19-23   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name          | Affiliation                              | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|--|------------|--|
| 98            | 434            | Kelly Cooper            | Underwood, WA Resident                   | VR1        | <i>Locating the 300 foot tall turbines slightly outside the boundaries of the scenic area is in total disregard of the intent of the federal boundary and is an injustice to thousands of individuals and families that have paid the price to keep the scenic corridor intact. The small amount of power generated by the few turbines that are visible from the scenic corridor does not justify their degradation of the corridor's view and the resulting negative fiscal impact on the surrounding communities. Simply put any turbines that have any negative impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area need to be eliminated or relocated.</i>  |
| 99            | 435-439        | Jayne Lebsack           | Portland, OR resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 100           | 440-444        | Mary Anne Joyce         | Portland, OR resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 101           | 445-449        | Edward Craig            | Eugene, OR resident                      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 102           | 450            | Talia Hammond           | Cork and Bottle Catering, Hood River, OR | VR1        | <i>Opposition to project because of destruction of Underwood Mountain viewshed: If I didn't truly believe that these turbines would directly &amp; negatively impact hundreds of small businesses in the gorge, including mine, I would not be writing this email. Please consider the livelihood of the many members of our community when making your decision. I have to believe that there are options to move these turbines out of the scenic area, and still generate a similar amount of power.</i>  |
| 103           | 451-455        | Ofelia Bullock          | Portland, OR resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 104           | 456-460        | Richard Schramm         | Portland, OR resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 105           | 461            | John Tier               | Underwood, WA Resident                   | VR1        | <i>I believe the proposed location of this project would cause irreversible damage to the scenic beauty of the Columbia Gorge. The proposed giant windmills would dominate the Underwood, Bingen-White Salmon and Hood River viewing areas.</i>  |
| 105           | 462            | John Tier               | Underwood, WA Resident                   | NQ1        | <i>As a nearby home owner, I am also concerned about the impact on the physical and emotional health of my family and neighbors of constant exposure to windmill noises and flashing strobe lights..</i>   |
| 106           | 463            | Holly and Gene Griswold | Olympia, WA resident                     | VR1        | <i>Industrial wind plants should be kept out of the viewspace of the Columbia River Gorge National. Scenic Area. I believe that once ONE wind farm is approved along the CRGNSA, others will follow, until the entire Gorge is lined with wind turbines.</i>   |
| 107           | 464-468        | Linda Thompson          | Oregon City, OR resident                 | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 108           | 469            | Eric Zeigler, Chief     | Skamania Co. Fire District 3             | ER1        | <i>The area designated for the energy project is outside our district; DNR is the official service provider for these areas. The Project may have a generally positive impact on the ability of our department and DNR to offer fire protection services to the area because new roads, extensions, and improved existing roads will provide better access for all first responders. If necessary, Fire District 3 can provide service coverage to the Project area without any reduction in service capacity to our constituency. We do not have a contract to provide service to the area. The project does not present any challenges or requirements for which we are not already prepared to respond.</i> |
| 108           | 470            | Eric Zeigler, Chief     | Skamania Co. Fire District 3             | ER1        | <i>There is a potential negative road access issue we would like to note, as follows: during the construction phase, there is a concern that the main roads into and through our district (WA State Rte. 14 and Cook-Underwood Road) could be obstructed by heavy equipment vehicles. We would expect the contractor to allow for emergency vehicle access at all times.</i>   |
| 109           | 471            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident                   | VR1        | <i>Concern for: Visual impact to our national scenic treasure: Columbia Gorge Scenic Area. As it is currently defined the project will be visible from all of the nationally designated key viewing sites in the Mid Columbia region. This would be a horrible, inexcusable, degradation of our national scenic treasure. Site the turbines so they cannot be seen from these key viewing sites.</i>   |
| 109           | 472            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident                   | FW2        | <i>Concern for: Potential for elk and other large animal movement (deer, bear, cougar, etc.) to be redirected towards the south of the project, endangering the agriculture and residences in that area. Consider that when faced with the "wall" of turbines that will be running in the north-south direction, their movements will be more to the south and north. Please consider the potential effects to agriculture crops, and residential safety. I request eliminating the "A" array (southern most) to allow wildlife passage without encroaching on residential or agricultural land.</i>   |
| 109           | 473            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident                   | LU1        | <i>"land use" concerns are related to the turbine and construction vehicle traffic: 1) Regarding land use zoning, the project site is not zoned for industrial use. The public outcry against the last attempt for this type of zoning is well documented, by the county, during their public hearing process. Among many objections, 80% of ALL oral comments and 64% of ALL written comments on the proposed zoning demanded industrial setbacks from private property boundaries to be greater than one mile for ANY industrial facility. The only comment supporting the proposed setback was from Jason Spadaro of SDS.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name          | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 109           | 474            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident | TT1        | <i>The "no load limits" for the transportation route stated by the application does not indicate that the roads can withstand the heavy, wide vehicle traffic. I do not believe the limits have been determined or set into law. To avoid catastrophes the load limits of the route must be studied and necessary upgrades performed. I can still remember when Cook Underwood slide down the cliff over Broughton Mill and had to be reconstructed further to the north.</i>  |
| 109           | 475            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident | TT2        | <i>The planned route through Underwood is on residential streets, and in fact, on the ONLY residential arterial. Please consider limiting turbine and construction vehicle traffic to weekdays only, during non-commuting non-school bus, daylight hours. The 7am to 7pm, seven days a week indicated in the application is inconsistent with the residential nature of Underwood.</i>   |
| 109           | 476            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident | ER1        | <i>Special logistical considerations should be put into place for emergency vehicles during the transportation windows. Emergency services must be able to access all of Underwood, at all times.</i>  |
| 109           | 477            | Mike and Joyce Eastwick | Underwood, WA Resident | ER1        | <i>Enhanced/supplemented police enforcement of the construction traffic windows, compression braking laws, and other road safety laws would be required.</i>   |
| 110           | 478            | Michael a'Gorman        | Underwood, WA Resident | VR1        | <i>As a life long Washingtonian and 9 year resident of Underwood, WA I am against the Whistling Ridge wind turbine project. I support wind generated power production but feel strongly that the proposed site is not appropriate for wind turbines. The proposed site is too close to many residences and too visible from key viewing areas in and around the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 111           | 480            | Chico Bukovansky        | Underwood, WA Resident | VR1        | <i>I feel that the applicants are taking advantage of a National Scenic area boundary line that was created without regard to large, visually disturbing structures such as windmills. The Columbia River Gorge is a national Scenic Area, and I truly believe that windmills should not be visible from so many key viewpoints along " this National Scenic Area....Large scale industrial projects have their place, but not in the eye of every resident and visitor within the scenic area.</i>  |
| 112           | 481            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | CE2        | <i>Concern about cumulative impacts: To that end, a thorough and complete Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be done on the entire project geographical area so that we all can see and analyze the data and make good, sound decisions.</i>  |
| 112           | 482            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | PM2        | <i>Makeup of review committee is inappropriate; more representation from Skamania County is necessary on the review</i>  |
| 112           | 483            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | PM3        | <i>Project should be deeply and scientifically studied before proceeding any further</i>   |
| 112           | 484            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | SE5        | <i>It is deeply troubling that most wind farm projects do not adequately address the issues of the effects of turbines on public health and welfare. That should be a major concern of the EIS.</i>  |
| 112           | 485            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | CE1        | <i>This project area, which was previously called Saddleback, by SDS Lumber, already has a SEPA file 09-0r1302-- Saddleback Wind Power Project; DNR's (lead agency) proposal to lease 4 Common School Trust parcels totaling approximately 2,560 acres for Wind Power development in Western Klickitat County. Located in Sections 29, 30, and 31, Township 04 North, Range 10 East, WM, Klickitat County, and, in addendum: all of Section 32, Township 4 North, Range 10 East, WM, Klickitat County, WA, containing 640 acres more or less, and I would like this SEPA file to become part of the record and to be considered in your deliberations. previous proposal went to: [address]. Although the applicant now states that it is calling the Skamania County portion of the project Whistling Ridge, it was not too long ago that it was calling the Klickitat portion of the project "Saddleback", which happens to be the Saddleback located in Skamania County! Please let me know if I have to contact the DNR and ask that they submit the SEPA file 09-011302...so that it can become part of the record.</i> |
| 112           | 486            | Mary J Repar            | Stevenson, WA resident | CE1        | <i>Since the Saddleback project and the Whistling Ridge project are in the same geographic area, they should be considered together in terms of cumulative impacts, on a regional basis. Cumulative impacts considered must also be both additive and interactive....Not only should EFSEC consider the cumulative impacts of SDS's wind turbine proposals on the environment, it also behooves the EFSEC to study the cumulative and additive impacts of ALL the wind turbines in the 5-county Columbia Gorge Bi-State Renewal Energy Zone (CGBREZ), an entity that is in full operational swing, lobbying for more development, especially for wind farms, in the NSA...I believe cumulative effects analyses must also be done. Analysis methods are listed and defined in "Considering Cumulative Effects: Under the National Environmental Policy Act, Summaries of Cumulative Effect Analysis Methods," p. A-1 and I include a copy of the book, Attachment 4, for your reading pleasure..</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 112           | 487            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | CE2        | <i>It is well known that the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (CRGNSA) and its surroundings are used by many migratory species and other wildlife and the cumulative effects of wind turbine farms on their habitats, their migration patterns, life cycles, breeding, etc., have not been adequately addressed by a region-wide study. A region-wide resource study and region-wide cumulative impacts study should be mandatory before more wind turbine projects proceed.</i>   |
| 112           | 488            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | CE1        | <i>Any new or renewed contracts, permits, or leases for such activities cannot increase the level of take beyond this de minimis level. Since EFSEC would be, in essence, permitting a contiguous project, I think this de minimis requirement would cover the entire project area, even if there are "phases" to the project.</i>  |
| 112           | 489            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | PM3        | <i>I want to see a list of all the pertinent agencies that will be consulted and I want to see a very meaningful consultation process undertaken.</i>   |
| 112           | 490            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | CE1        | <i>DNR, when it issued the MDNS for the lease of the trust lands for SDS's wind farm in Klickitat, failed to take into consideration the impacts of all the cumulative effects of other proposed and existing wind farms upon the resources on State lands and also upon the natural resources in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Although DNR is a state agency, it; and other agencies, cannot ignore the impacts of these types of proposals on the region. A regional analysis should be done to understand cumulative effects on a regional basis.</i>  |
| 112           | 491            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW2        | The SEPA analysis on the Klickitat County lands that SDS wanted to lease as a wind farm did not include any analysis of building wind farms on forested lands. This must be addressed if an incidental take permit is to be granted/HCP to be modified to fit the current project.  |
| 112           | 492            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | CE1        | Cumulative impacts MUST include the additional properties that will be used in Klickitat County. This project is not separate from the one in Klickitat County.   |
| 112           | 493            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW2        | There is no best available science (BAS) and impacts studies on threatened and/or endangered species, and impacts on habitats, for this type of turbine project. Also, it is highly improbable that SDS would get a written agreement from USFWS that their wind turbine proposal won't have negative environmental and cumulative impacts on threatened and/or endangered species and habitats. The EIS should include all best available science and delineate any BAS limitations that need to be addressed.   |
| 112           | 494            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | SG2        | <i>We live in a tectonically active area, especially in Skamania County. We don't know if there is potential for landslides or other types of geologic upheaval caused by wind farms and their attendant infrastructures, i.e., impermeable cement/gravel pads and impermeable roads that have to be maintained year-around for access...An EIS is mandated for this entire project area.</i>   |
| 112           | 495            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW2        | <i>A thorough study of impacts on waterways and watersheds should be done for the EIS. At this point we can't know if fish bearing streams would be or wouldn't be affected by construction because there is no EIS. LiDar work should be done to determine the location and extent of stream networks in the affected, remote areas. DNR's own Headwaters Stream Research modeling could be used here. See "Headwaters Stream Research - The Development of a Model to Predict the Location and Extent of the Headwater Stream Network for Western Washington;...DNR needs to do a better job of identifying waters in these areas.</i><br><br><i>They could be wrong about how many streams there really are in the woods...Headwater streams are often under-represented or incorrectly located on existing maps...More research needs to be done on what waterways actually exist in the project area(s) and what impacts wind farms would have on these waterways. An EIS is mandated.</i> |
| 112           | 496            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | SV2        | <i>What impacts would all these roads, turbine pads, sub-stations, etc., and other infrastructure (and impermeable surfaces) have on the recharging effect? Would they affect water flows? Are there basalt aquifers in this area? Do we know the extent of the watersheds? What the recharge rate is? An EIS should give us more data.</i>   |
| 112           | 497            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW1        | <i>There are listed plants in these sensitive areas where SDS is proposing to put wind turbines but we don't know their extent or the effects of wind farms on their habitat and the plants themselves-unless an EIS is done. The HCP should be consulted, Chap. 3 101 F. LISTED AND CANDIDATE PLANTS, Non-vascular Plants and Fungi, Vascular Plant Taxa of Concern: Federally Listed and Proposed Vascular Plant Species, Federal Candidate and Species of Concern.</i>   |
| 112           | 498            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW1        | This area has many threatened salmonid species. These should be strongly considered, particularly in terms of cumulative effects, in the EIS for this proposal.   |
| 112           | 499            | Mary J Repar   | Stevenson, WA resident | FW1        | Consider the Townsend's Big Eared Bat, a candidate for State listing in Klickitat and Skamania Counties.  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                      | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------|---|
| 112           | 500            | Mary J Repar                        | Stevenson, WA resident   | CE2        | Agreement with Friends of the Gorge statement: <i>"Industrial wind energy facilities require the permanent clearing of substantial areas of land for road construction, turbine installation, and turbine operation. For example, facilities in forested areas must clear 4 to 20 acres for effective turbine operation. Such impacts would permanently remove forest land from forestry uses. This type of forest land conversion would be inconsistent with current land uses." Also, the maintenance of roads is a year-round activity which contributes to compaction, run-off, and erosion, among other bad effects. An EIS must be done to quantify the cumulative impacts of these effects.</i>  |
| 112           | 501            | Mary J Repar                        | Stevenson, WA resident   | EI1        | RE: BPA portion the project: <i>I do believe that the EIS should examine the impacts of more transmission lines, more electricity traveling along transmission lines located in forests, the potential of fire hazard and the adequacy of fire control, the cumulative effects of transmission lines on the environment and on wildlife, the effects of new construction on habitat fragmentation, effects of construction on watersheds and waterways, etc.</i>  |
| 112           | 503            | Mary J Repar                        | Stevenson, WA resident   | DX         | Document Attached: 1)Copy of the Skamania County Hearing Examiner Findings, Conclusions, and Decisions related to No. SEP-08-35 dated February 19, 2009. 2)Letter from Skamania County Board of Commissioners to Mr. Jason Spadaro dated March 12, 2009. 3)Two compact disks related to 1. above. 4)Report titled "Considering Cumulative Effects" prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality (January 1997). 5)Copies of miscellaneous maps and newspaper articles.  |
| 113           | 501            | Mary J Repar                        | Stevenson, WA resident   | CE2        | An EIS must be done to quantify the cumulative impacts of these effects   |
| 113           | 504-508        | Susan Hartford                      | Hood River, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 114           | 502            | Mary J Repar                        | Stevenson, WA resident   | SG1        | <i>Also, the maintenance of roads is a year-round activity which contributes to compaction, run-off, and erosion, among other bad effects.</i>  |
| 114           | 509            | Anita Gahimer Crow                  | Mill A, WA resident  | PM4        | <i>I would like to express my support for the Whistling Ridge Energy Project....With a positive attitude this project can become an asset to every local resident and business! Even a marketing asset...I live on the Cook-Underwood Road, on the west side of Windy Ridge. I will have a view of the wind turbines from my property, and may or may not hear some noise as I lie in bed at night with the windows open...I will hear the turbines and sigh with content, being fortunate to live here in the mountains of the Columbia River Gorge hearing these faint sounds rather than screeching sirens of various sorts...The environmental impact is small, acceptable, and not detrimental in the long-term.</i>   |
| 115           | 510            | Rick May                            | Applebee Aviation  | PM1        | Offering helicopter/aviation services.  |
| 116           | 511            | Jim Ziegler                         | Underwood, WA Resident   | SE6        | <i>I am writing in support of the Whistling Ridge Energy Project. Skamania County is 8090% publicly owned. Many counties have far greater private ownership and therefore don't have the same difficulty in maintaining the revenues to run their counties. Unless we take advantage of opportunities like the Whistling Ridge Energy Project to grow the tax base, Skamania County will simply not have the means to support the level of government services demanded by citizens... This project would be beneficial to the school district, which is in dire need of additional funding...The project is outside of scenic area boundaries...If people are concerned about vibration noise from windmills they should be concerned about wind vibration noise from living in the gorge.</i>   |
| 117           | 512            | Diana L Ross/ DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area | VR1        | <i>There is a risk of significant impacts to protected scenic resources if the proposed energy project is built as currently planned. This letter is not meant to imply that the project outside of the Scenic Area is regulated by the Scenic Area Act. In a letter dated May 8, 2008, the Columbia River Gorge Commission provided technical assistance in response to a request by the Oregon Department of Energy regarding a similar project in Oregon. In that letter, the Gorge Commission explained that the National Scenic Area Act specifically prohibits the implementation of a buffer around the boundaries of the Scenic Area. However, the letter also explains how Scenic Area resources would be affected by the project and how they could be protected. It is clear that several of Scenic Area Viewsheds will be affected. 9 of the 21 viewpoints analyzed are also Key Viewing areas (#6 &amp; 9 were missing). • 1-SR 141 • 4 &amp; 22- Cook-Underwood Road • la-Panorama Point • 11-I-84 Westbound • 12-Koberg State Park (Columbia River) • 13-I-84 Eastbound • 14-Viento State Park (Columbia River) • 19-Historic Columbia River Highway</i> |
| 117           | 513            | Diana L Ross/ DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area | VR1        | <i>There are many unknowns in the summary of methods on page 4.2-30-31 of the application. For example, the methods section did not disclose the heights used for the turbines or whether the software placed and sized the turbines or whether this was done in Photo Shop as an art project. There are also several questions concerning the methods used to 1) choose viewpoints, 2) define visual quality and viewer sensitivity, and 3) represent and make conclusions about impact. 1) Choosing viewpoints in the Scenic Area should be based on Key Viewing Areas. Several of</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                      | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------|---|
|               |                |                                     |  |            | <p>these were missing from the discussion (SR-14, Tom McCall Point) and others are linear viewpoints where only one or no views were picked in the NSA (Columbia River, Hwy 35, I-84, Historic Columbia River Highway). Therefore, it is unclear whether the impacts to NSA scenic resources were adequately captured. 2) The NSA is a nationally known and protected landscape of high quality and high sensitivity. All KVA scenic analyses should reflect this. The results of the applicant's analysis are heavily weighted on the assignment of existing scenic quality and viewer sensitivity. These methods were not tracked and do not represent the reality of the Scenic Area.</p> <p>3) The conclusions made on the summary chart would more accurately be made using degree of contrast with the natural landscape both during the day and at night, and distance of the viewer from the project area. This assumes that the most visually impacted viewpoints have been found and that the simulations accurately depict the degree of contrast. The impact summaries starting on page 4.2-68 discuss these contrasts but the ratings do not reflect the discussion. For example the text for viewpoint #1 states that "the presence of the turbines would reduce the scene's degree of intactness by introducing a large number of highly visible engineered vertical elements" but the impact rating is low to moderate.</p> <p>The Summary of Existing Scenic Quality and Project Visual Impacts on page 4.2-67 did not rate any viewpoint as having a high level of impact defined as: turbines "highly visible in areas with a high number of sensitive viewers" and greatly altering levels of vividness, unity, and intactness. Viento State Park was rated as highest impact (moderate to high) but the photo print did not show any turbines (Figure 4.2-17). It is generally very difficult to fully depict the visual effect of viewing the landscape in a small photo and because of these limitations, pictures with clouds at the skyline should not be used. In addition, many non-NSA viewpoints and non-KVA viewpoints were added making it difficult to assess the effects in the Scenic Area. The scenic impacts both at night and during the day would be better depicted using photos of existing turbines in the Gorge.</p> <p>The existing development east of the Scenic Area provides a better indication of the impact on the scenic resource than represented in these visualizations. The visualizations are important for finding the number and location of the visible turbines, but have limited utility for assessing scenic impact. (see p.3 comments for included example table for KVA impacts).</p> |
| 117           | 514            | Diana L Ross/ DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area | VR1        | <p>In order to assure that the scenic resource impact is adequately analyzed, I recommend the following improvements to the scenic resource impact assessment: • Include a discussion or summary of the most visible turbines, • Include photographs of existing energy projects visible in the NSA, • Do not use visual simulations (at a small scale with clouds in the picture) to depict the visual impact of visible turbines, • Make certain that the most visible viewpoints have been covered, especially with respect to the linear viewpoints, and • Make certain to include the night-time effects in your analysis.</p>   |
| 117           | 515            | Diana L Ross/ DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area | VR1        | <p>In order to prevent the scenic impact of the turbines visible from the Scenic Area Key Viewing Areas, I also recommend that the applicant eliminate turbine locations found to be visible from Scenic Area KVAs. I am hopeful that close attention to these impacts will result in a solution which will fit the unique area that this project will potentially benefit.</p>   |
| 118           | 516            | Linda Short                         | Columbia gorge resident  | SE3        | <p>I have been an advocate for alternative energy for decades, including wind power. But my research has led me to discover there isn't as big of a return on wind power as there are from other energy sources. The ongoing projects in eastern Washington and Oregon have proven the construction employment isn't local, it's certainly not a "farm," there is noise pollution and possible negative health effects and they put migrating birds at risk. These industrial wind parks also have proven to create more environmental disruption with road building and the huge concrete platforms that must be installed.</p>  |
| 118           | 517            | Linda Short                         | Columbia gorge resident  | AL1        | <p>Putting such a business on the Whistling Ridge does not fit. It doesn't fit because of access and the degradation that it would cause in an environmentally fragile area, visibility and noise blight to many neighbors far and wide and the small return it would provide to the local community.</p>   |
| 118           | 518            | Linda Short                         | Columbia gorge resident  | LU1        | <p>And let's remember the intent in preserving the unique Columbia Gorge Scenic Area.. I'm not much into tourism, but I am into leaving a unique and natural legacy to my grandchildren.</p>  |
| 119           |                |                                     |  | X          | no comment  |
| 120           | 519-523        | Krista Bakke                        | White Salmon, WA resident                                      | F          | same as 19-23   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|
| 121           | 524            | Jeff Bardin     | Hood River, OR resident                             | PM4        | <i>I am happy to see SDS Lumber taking positive steps to make clean, renewable energy a reality. Provided the project meets standard building safety requirements, I see no reason why it should not be approved. I fully support SDS and its Future plans to build Windmills.</i>  |
| 122           | 525            | Dean Johnson    | Lake Tapps, WA                                      | PM4        | <i>I would like to express my support of the Whistling Ridge Wind Project. It would be an economic boon to the residents of Skamania County and help lift an already depressed area. The project is outside the Gorge Scenic Area and the developer's) should be able to proceed if they meet all regulatory requirements. The people of our State, misguided or not, place requirements for renewable energy and when a company tries to meet those needs, NIMBY's (probably the same people that made the requirements) fight to keep them out. Please allow the project to proceed.</i>  |
| 123           | 526            | Scot Bergeron   | Mill A, WA resident                                 | VR1        | <i>A ridge of wind towers with flashing red lights here in the gorge, visible from the scenic area, would put an unnecessary scar on this landscape and vista.</i>  |
| 123           | 527            | Scot Bergeron   | Mill A, WA resident                                 | AL1        | <i>Industrial development has its place, and the mountains of the Columbia Gorge are not the place. Wind farms belong out in the plains, (if they belong anywhere) away from residential centers, and in places where their footprint allows farming to take place all around them.</i>   |
| 123           | 528            | Scot Bergeron   | Mill A, WA resident                                 | ER1        | <i>We don't need more power, that is an illusion perpetrated by big business for big profits, but explanation of this would take hours. If people conserved energy and used energy efficient products, we would have an abundance of energy.</i>  |
| 123           | 529            | Scot Bergeron   | Mill A, WA resident                                 | SE4        | <i>The proposed wind farm would only provide a very few full time jobs, and yet cause the misery of hundreds of residents. I do not want county services at the expense of my environment and beautiful country vistas.</i>   |
| 123           | 530            | Scot Bergeron   | Mill A, WA resident                                 | SE6        | <i>SDS is seducing the county with the prospect of tax revenue to run the county. Where will it stop? What will be the next industry to invade the Columbia Gorge to provide tax revenue? What is needed is a sustainable society, not more big business and destruction of our environment and natural resources.</i>  |
| 124           | 531-535        | Marita Ingalsbe | Portland, OR resident                               | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 125           | 536-540        | Tom Hons        | Hood River, OR resident                             | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 126           | 541            | Sam Grimm       | Carson, WA resident                                 | SE6        | Potential revenues in the county have already been reduced because of reductions in logging and limitations from the Scenic Act. This project is a good potential source of revenue for the county.   |
| 126           | 543            | Sam Grimm       | Carson, WA resident                                 | PM4        | <i>SDS/Broughton has gone to great lengths and expense to review environmental impacts, and their project is outside the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The project would contribute to the success of Initiative 937 (15% new renewable energy by 2020), and the companies are setting an example of how to manage for multiple sustainable resources while minimizing environmental impacts.</i>  |
| 127           |                | Dean Johnson    | Lake Tapps, WA                                      | X          | Same comment letter submitted twice (comment #524).   |
| 128           | 543            | James Palmer    | CTED - International Trade and Economic Development | PM1        | Wants to be added to the mailing list. Looking for economic development opportunities.  |
| 129           | 544            | Ken Bales       | Glenwood, WA  | PM4        | <i>I support the Whistling Ridge Energy Project. It will provide jobs for the local communities and produce clean energy for the future. We need to look for safe and clean energy resources for the future and this project will get us one step closer to that goal.</i>  |
| 130           | 545            | Don Morby       | Unknown, letter says he is a gorge resident         | PM4        | (long letter that ends with) <i>please allow the windmills to help us real gorge residents and don't recommend any support to special interests.</i>  |
| 131           | 546            | Paul Pearce     | Skamania County Board of Commissioners              | VR1        | <i>We have heard and you will as well, that this application, if permitted, will be a blight on the Columbia Gorge Scenic area. Visible from a myriad of" Key Viewing Areas". What we believe is that Congress clearly understood what they were doing when they created the Scenic Area Act and drew a distinct border. In the Saving Clause of the Act they specifically said that there were to be no protective measures or buffer zones around the scenic area and went on to say; "The fact that activities or uses inconsistent with the management directives for the scenic area or special management areas can be seen or heard from these areas shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundaries of the scenic area or special management areas.</i> |
| 131           | 547            | Paul Pearce     | Skamania County Board of Commissioners              | PM4        | <i>The county supports this application and the EFSEC process and finds it appalling that at some point an Oregon Courts could be adjudicating any portion of the decision made in this process.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------|--|
| 131           | 548            | Paul Pearce    | Skamania County Board of Commissioners             | SE6        | Because of the loss of timber receipts (spotted owl, forest and fish), the county is in need of additional revenue streams. Alternative energy could provide the revenue the county greatly needs.   |
| 132           | 549            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | EG1        | <i>Industrial wind power development is land-use intensive creating a large disproportion of land required compared to power produced. Wind power facilities become the dominate feature of affected landscapes and thus, have the potential for significant impacts to natural systems and human communities.</i>   |
| 132           | 550            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | CE2        | <i>There's no regional or national coordinated planning; No regional or national siting standards even though wind power is the most heavily subsidized (with public funds) form of energy production. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service charged with protecting Threatened and Endangered species, migratory birds and eagles, etc. has yet to adopt permanent development guidelines. Often as not, local governments afflicted by cozy politics and an insatiable desire for a larger tax base make monumental decisions regarding placement and density of projects.</i>  |
| 132           | 551            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | EG1        | <i>We built dams on every suitable hydro head up the Columbia and Snake Rivers, and politicians and economic boosters rejoiced "it's renewable, it's green and it's good for business". We now know the rest of the story: the world's greatest anadromous fishery has been driven to near extinction and Celilo Falls, the great natural wonder and cultural epicenter of North America is no more! Are we making the same mistakes with wind energy?...Existing data strongly suggest that industrial wind power and human communities are incompatible. It is doubtful that industrial wind power will ever be erected in the Puget Sound area.</i> |
| 132           | 552            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | FW2        | <i>This proposed project is the first industrial wind power project in the Western US proposed in primary forestland where the impact is known to be much more severe. The Nature Conservancy considers industrial wind power to be the greatest threat to biodiversity of the American Great Plains. Habitat fragmentation, habitat avoidance and bird/bat/blade interactions are well documented.</i>  |
| 132           | 553            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | E11        | <i>Ridge top wind power facilities, such as Whistling Ridge, are tantamount to mountain top coal mining: ridge tops are leveled and permanently stripped of vegetation, sending sedimentation, lubricating fluids, tower cleaning fluids as well as herbicides and pesticides used to control competing vegetation and unwanted wildlife into down-slope water systems. These are very real and serious consequences of ridge top wind mining.</i>   |
| 132           | 554            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SE5        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: 1. Human health, both physically and psychologically, of reasonably affected parties;</i>  |
| 132           | 555            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SE5        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...2. Potential residential displacement...</i>   |
| 132           | 556            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SE6        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...3. Potential loss of county tax revenue from property devaluations...;</i>   |
| 132           | 557            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | VR1        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:... 4. The Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area;...</i>  |
| 132           | 558            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SW1        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...5. The White Salmon National Scenic River;...</i>  |
| 132           | 559            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SW1        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...6. Buck Creek, a municipal water source and recreation area;...</i>  |
| 132           | 560            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SW1        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...7. The Little White Salmon River and its role in anadromous fish production;...</i>  |
| 132           | 561            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | SE1        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...8. Other socio-economic impacts;...</i>  |
| 132           | 562            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | FW2        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...9. Wildlife, including Threatened and Endangered species such as the Spotted Owl and migratory and resident birds and bats &amp; their migration routes...</i>   |
| 132           | 563            | Jill Barker    | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | CE2        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...10. Cumulative impacts on physical, biological and social elements of the environment from all past, present and reasonably foreseeable wind energy facilities in the Northwest...</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name    | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|--|------------|--|
| 132           | 564            | Jill Barker       | Columbia Audubon Society (and Mosier, OR resident) | NQ2        | <i>Specifically: The [Audubon] Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following:...11. Increased CO2 emissions from required back-up fossil fuel-fired facilities....</i>   |
| 133           | 565            | Jame M. Hutchison | Washougal, WA resident                             | FW2        | <i>Impacts on timber production and wildlife are major concerns related to the proposal. SDS intends to reduce all vegetation to no more than 15 feet high within 150 feet of each turbine. Within the next 350 feet, vegetation would be kept less than 50 feet high. Nearly all timber harvest would thus be permanently eliminated for approximately 18 acres around each turbine. For a 100 turbine field; this would total 1,800 acres, or nearly 3 square miles, of lost timber production. Turbine access roads and appurtenant facilities would multiply this loss several fold. Numerous wildlife species, not just those threatened or endangered, rely of forest habitats. Bird mortality from wind turbines is fairly well documented, but most such studies have focused on turbines located outside of forest areas. Other wildlife concerns are associated with the SDS proposal; these concerns include seasonal use patterns, travel corridors, habitat alteration or removal, soil loss and associated stream sedimentation, and area abandonment by wildlife due to turbine noise. Many animals, with hearing more acute than ours, can be detrimentally affected by noise. Considering these and related concerns, the Washington Department offish and Wildlife's recommendation for a comprehensive cumulative effects analysis should be required for this or any wind turbine application, especially when proposed in a forest setting.</i> |
| 133           | 566            | Jame M. Hutchison | Washougal, WA resident                             | PM3        | <i>Various kinds of EIS studies are typically prepared and funded by the projects' proponents. However, for this and other wind power projects in Washington, your agency, the Energy Siting Council, prepares the EIS. That approach appears a most questionable use of public funds for this highly contentious proposed gorge project which the Governor may well not approve in the long run.</i>  |
| 133           | 567            | Jame M. Hutchison | Washougal, WA resident                             | PM2        | <i>A Skamania County representative will apparently join the Siting Council to consider the Whistling Ridge turbine proposal. That person should logically be as open-minded and nonbiased as possible. Yet, it should be stressed that Skamania County's Board of Commissioners is already on record as favoring this proposal, plus another controversial proposal by SDS for a large rural resort within the Gorge Scenic Area, plus a big tribe sponsored gorge gambling casino at Cascade Locks. Perhaps a bit of bias involved there!</i>  |
| 133           | 568            | Jame M. Hutchison | Washougal, WA resident                             | FW2        | <i>Impacts on wildlife and timber harvest in such [forest] locations are essentially little studied and unknown.</i>   |
| 133           | 569            | Jame M. Hutchison | Washougal, WA resident                             | AL1        | <i>Wind is a legitimate source of power production, but only if it does not conflict overly with other values. In this case, placing multiple wind turbines which would remove hundreds of acres of sustainable tree harvest on forest lands favored by many forms of wildlife immediately adjacent to the Gorge Scenic Area appears substantially unwise.</i>   |
| 134           |                |                   |  | X          | <i>Copy of comment letter #235</i>   |
| 135           |                | Mary Repar        |  | X          | <i>copy of same comments again. Question remains as to whether to include comments from attachments.</i>   |
| 136           | 570            |                   |  | AL1        | <i>The proposed location is not appropriate for wind power; the area is thriving from tourism that will be negatively affected....Economic engines that truly benefit a community are all-inclusive and long lasting. This is a short jolt of money that doesn't even trickle down in a meaningful way to local people here, then degrades rapidly over time while we are left with this legacy forever.</i>   |
| 136           | 571            | Unknown           | unknown. Appears to be a gorge resident.           | SE6        | <i>The long term tax revenue from property taxes on depreciating windmill equipment is dubious at best as a significant revenue source for our future. (\$150 million to construct) but (87.5 million tax base). Basically, even if you are for the windmills, our county government is getting hung out to dry on the long term revenue stream being collected while the huge profits and tax payer funded subsidies are going directly into the developers pockets.</i>  |
| 136           | 572            | Unknown           | unknown. Appears to be a gorge resident.           | TT2        | <i>The movement of heavy wide-load equipment up Cook-Underwood road will impact people's ability to get their jobs and go about their daily business, as well as block escape routes in a wildfire like the one that raced up the bluff only a few short years ago.</i>  |
| 136           | 573            | Unknown           | unknown. Appears to be a gorge resident.           | E11        | <i>[consider] proximity to local communities and residences and he fact that these windmills are being placed in forest land. ... This is not a farmers field or arid desert. This is a forest that has supposedly been sustainably logged to help protect the ecosystems it supports. It directly borders a community and residences as well as the protected national scenic area itself. t was interesting to find in the application that some of the protected species preferred [multi layered canopies and large trees, and the application said that no large trees existed on project site] Well they</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                              | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--|------------|--|
|               |                |                 |  |            | <i>were present a few short years ago until SDS decided to remove the last of them. There are still many species of large predator and prey that call it home or migrate past it, and birds such as Eagles, Owls, Osprey. The application also says that "The project has been planned and designed to eliminate or fully mitigate all environmental impacts." If the committee does end up recommending approval of this installation. I hope they will make every attempt to truly mitigate the effects of such a development on the surrounding communities and environment.</i>  |
| 136           | 574            | Unknown         | unknown. Appears to be a gorge resident. | LU1        | <i>Any regard to zoning should take into account appropriate areas for large scale industrial installations and expansion. Remember that 450 ft windmills are half the height of the bluff at it's highest point. They pierce the skyline and have bright red flashing lights at night.</i>  |
| 136           | 575            | Unknown         | unknown. Appears to be a gorge resident. | VR1        | <i>Everyone in this community pays a high price for the protection of the scenic area. To not include this as a significant factor in the approval process is to turn a blind eye. It weakens the foundation for protection of the entire area including it's burgeoning economy and this effect should be considered regardless of whether the windmills themselves are placed within it. Remember that SDS land was excluded from scenic area rules in order to protect timber jobs and timber resources. Maybe this land should revert to scenic area zoning if they are no longer going to keep this bargain.</i>  |
| 137           |                | Mike Eastwick   | Underwood, WA Resident                   | X          | Duplicate of comment letter 109  |
| 138           | 576            | Donna Rockwell  | White Salmon, WA resident                | VR1        | <i>I believe that siting a wind farm a mere 60 feet from the boundary line of the Scenic Area is incongruous with the Act and shows a complete disdain for the spirit behind implementation of the act... Therefore. I support the idea of moving seven of the towers of the "A" phase to another location. This would mitigate the scenic damage on the clear cut ridgeline.</i>  |
| 138           | 577            | Donna Rockwell  | White Salmon, WA resident                | SE1        | <i>As you have read and heard in other testimony, one of the main sources of revenue for gorge residents is derived from the tourism industry. People from all over the world come here for mostly the undisturbed beauty of this region, and in the mean time spend their money here. They do not come here to view the energy industrial complex proposed by SDS.</i>  |
| 139           | 578            | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | VR1        | <i>In order to give responsible mitigation of the "A Towers" a clear voice in these proceedings, and thereby safeguard the tremendous socio-economic value of Underwood, the Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association will petition this Council pursuant to WAC 463-30-091 for permission to intervene in these proceedings. However, the association has already taken a vote and the result is unanimous: if the Council, or the applicant of its own accord, makes a responsible mitigation decision and re-sites the seven "A Towers" to eliminate the negative impacts, the Association</i>  |
|               |                |                 |  |            | <i>intends to withdraw as a party and support the project...failure to re-site the seven "A Towers" would improperly force the blossoming Underwood Agri-Tourism industry to bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental and socioeconomic impacts of this project in violation of WAC 463-60085. Such a result is prohibited by WAC 463-47-110 which states that "[the overriding policy of the council is to avoid or mitigate adverse environmental impacts which may result from the council's decisions."</i>   |
| 139           | 579            | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | VR1        | <i>(includes figures showing visual impact of towers from several vantage points.) The seven "A Towers" sit alone on a clear-cut ridge at the very most southern portion of the proposed project. If installed they would dominate views, day and night, from far more locations than are depicted in the application submitted to Council. ...the Agri-Tourism Association hired a pilot to fly a photographer along the ridge where these towers are proposed. In Appendix 7 to our comments, you will find the results. [The photo taken at 300 ft] tells the story of who will see the seven A Towers. Also note that the photograph was taken 120 feet below the top of the proposed towers. Then take note of the next photograph that shows the locations of existing businesses along the Underwood Agri-Tourism Loop. The impacts are clear. The solution is also clear. The re-siting of the seven A Towers eliminates all visual impacts to the Underwood Agri-Tourism industry, as well as the visual impacts to a vast area throughout the Gorge.</i> |
| 140           |                |                 |  | X          | <i>copy of comment letter # 117</i>  |
| 141           | 580            |                 |  | DX         | <i>Copy of WA initiative 937 with no apparent direct comment, or commenter name/information.</i>   |
| 142           | 581            |                 |  | DX         | <i>Copy of Scenic Area saving provisions with no apparent direct comment or commenter name/information.</i>  |
| 143           | 582            |                 |  | DX         | <i>copy of RCW 19.285.020</i>  |
| 144           | 583            | Jesse Burkhardt | Article in <i>The Enterprise</i>         | DX         | <i>Newspaper article, no obvious direct public comment?</i>  |
| 145           | 584            |                 |  | DX         | <i>Klickitat Co. planning commission agenda.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
| 146           | 585            | Frank Backus    | White Salmon, WA resident | SE6        | <i>Economics. a. You need to look at Skamania County and the land base that is available to them to generate economic growth. Most of Skamania County is owned by the USFS and a large part of the private land is restricted by the CRGNSA.</i>  |
| 146           | 586            | Frank Backus    | White Salmon, WA resident | SE4        | <i>b. You need to annualize the importance for small private lumber companies like SOS to diversify their income stream. This is very easy to see in the current economic climate. SOS has had to reduce employment and has had to stop production for the month of March because they were unable to sell their products. SOS payroll is vital to the local communities.</i>   |
| 146           | 587            | Frank Backus    | White Salmon, WA resident | EG1        | <i>2. Energy. a. Please consider that Washington passed a referendum requiring utilities to use renewable energy and Skamania County passed it with a 54% majority. Wind is one of those sources.</i>   |
| 146           | 588            | Frank Backus    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR1        | <i>3. Columbia River National Scenic Area. a. You need to understand the compromises that led to the existing National Scenic Area. Originally the concept was that it would be a national park. This concept was discarded as it did not work in this kind of setting. What was settled on was an area with three different levels of protection, the Urban Areas that are exempt from regulation, the General Management Area with some regulation and the Special Management Areas with a high level of regulation. This concept never envisioned that there would not be any level of change i.e. the urban areas and more importantly there has never been any expectation that change could not occur outside the external boundary. The Boundary is the Boundary</i> |
| 147           | 589            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | CE1        | Why has the name of this project changed from Saddleback to Whistling Ridge?  |
| 147           | 590            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | CE1        | <i>There was a proposal by SDS to lease Whistling Ridge (which adjoins Saddleback to the north) from DNR, but that appears to be stalled. If the applicant intends to continue to pursue that lease, your organization should wait for that process to play out before moving the current application forward. The public interest is far better served if one EIS is applied to the entire project, rather than allowing a piecemeal approach to the first project of its kind to be proposed in the forested mountains of the Evergreen State. It is difficult to speak about scoping without knowing the total size of the project.</i>  |
| 147           | 591            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | PM3        | <i>You should study the environmental record of SDS. They have been cited by various agencies over the years, and those violations should be part of the EIS.</i>   |
| 147           | 592            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | PM3        | <i>While I do believe there are many natural resource concerns with this project, I am sure there are others who will address them at length. I support studies to assess impacts on natural resources, and I support your agency finding a disinterested third party to conduct all studies. For the record, I find studies performed by the applicant (or any applicant) suspect.</i>   |
| 147           | 593            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | SE5        | <i>There will be testimony about the effect of turbines on human health. I am concerned about potential health effects and want them studied as I said, by a third party.</i>   |
| 147           | 594            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | NQ1        | <i>I expect you will hear about noise from the turbines, and how it can echo in forested mountains. I hope you will find a disinterested third party to study that.</i>   |
| 147           | 595            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | LU1        | we get jets from Whidbey Island Naval Air Station flying low through here from time to time. The effect the turbines will have on their exercises should be addressed in scoping.   |
| 147           | 596            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | SE1        | <i>Our tourist season gets longer every year, but is still heaviest between Memorial Day and Labor Day. The EIS should include impacts of construction on the tourist experience, as well as the impact the aesthetics will have on the local tourism industry, on both sides of the river. Our economies are tied together. Underwood is influenced more by economic factors in White Salmon, Bingen and Hood River than by the economy in Stevenson.</i>  |
| 147           | 597            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | VR2        | Concern about nighttime aesthetic effect of blinking red lights.  |
| 147           | 598            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | SE2        | <i>You should study the effect the project will have on local real estate values, both during construction and after completion.</i>  |
| 147           | 599            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident    | SE1        | <i>The folks in the gorge, especially this part of it, have begun to eat off the scenery. We have tourism, and a budding agritourism industry. We grew a world-class aircraft manufacturing business and, as a region, have helped it recruit and train a skilled labor force, fueling a long awaited replacement for the timber industry....We have only just begun to eat the scenery here please don't yank it out of our mouths.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 147           | 600            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE1        | <i>People here have sacrificed, often unwillingly and sometimes at great and unanticipated personal expense, to preserve the beauty of this place for the larger public interest. The State of Washington signed a compact with the State of Oregon because this place is special, and both states agreed that it should be protected. Taxpayers from both states have contributed a lot of money over the years to administer the complex management of the place, and taxpayers from all 50 states have shelled out millions for land acquisition, economic development and the administration of the federal role here. Your scoping should consider the impact the project will have on this huge public investment.</i> |
| 147           | 601            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>I hope you will consider the precedent that your approval would set for the National Scenic Area. Can you describe the effect of that in your EIS?</i>  |
| 147           | 602            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>In 1986, when Congress created the scenic area, the boundaries were drawn based on what could be seen from the river, the highways beside it, and various viewpoints. Nobody could have foreseen that anyone would want to erect a 400' tower at the boundary, let alone 50 of them. The history of the creation of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and its legislative history should be part of the scoping for the EIS</i>   |
| 147           | 603            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>Transportation of turbines to the site will be an immense burden for our community. As you have seen, our Cook-Underwood Road is narrow and curvy. There are homes built very close to it in places, and a cliff along much of it. . You'd better study the safety of our kids on buses.</i>  |
| 147           | 604            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT1        | <i>Will fixing up the road to accommodate those trucks require any condemnation of land? You should study the psychological effect that concept has on people in Skamania County.</i>  |
| 147           | 605            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ2        | <i>Please study how many tons of exhaust will be added to our air shed during construction</i>   |
| 147           | 606            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>There will be cars waiting on the Hood River Bridge (a whole other can of worms, potentially backing traffic onto Oregon's Highway 35 and 184), and on Alt 141 on the east bank of the White Salmon River. The EIS should study the accident rate between Bingen and Underwood on SR14. The impact of construction traffic on emergency response times should also be studied.</i>  |
| 147           | 607            | Sally A. Newell | Underwood, WA Resident  | CE1        | <i>[wind engineer in Wasco] He said that in his opinion, the [saddleback] project would never be built. The winds were too marginal and the engineering challenges of transporting the turbines to the site were too great to overcome, he said. That makes me wonder. Maybe the project just needs to be bigger to be financially feasible. Maybe it's not really feasible without Whistling Ridge, hence the name change. If that is the case, the public has a right to know what the whole project is going to cost us all in a single, scientifically independent EIS.</i>  |
| 148           | 608            |                 | No name given           | X          | <i>Wind turbines in Maui not invasive.</i>   |
| 149           | 609            | Sharon Ca?ymal  | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>Please consider the visual impact of the windmills from the Pine Grove area in OR.</i>  |
| 150           | 610            | Tom Rousseau    | Hood River, OR resident | VR1        | <i>Wind generators should not be viewable either from river level or from the many trails along the ridges and peaks of the Gorge. This solution is certainly well within the intent and spirit of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Act, and is common sense. It is the best way to preserve the Gorge. The West has plenty of lower impact places on which to build wind generator farms without having to further desecrate the Gorge.</i>   |
| 151           | 611            | Paula O'Gorman  | Underwood, WA Resident  | PM5        | <i>As an Underwood, WA resident I do not approve of this project (Whistling Ridge)</i>   |
| 152           | 612            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Commenter does not believe orchards or vineyards are scenic either.</i>   |
| 152           | 613            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>Noise issues: Background sound levels definitely come into play as well as wind speed. If rules are required, both could be taken into effect by measuring the background sound level at various wind speeds and relating the allowed sound levels to be some value equal or slightly above background. For example, a scale such as the Netherlands with an allowance like France of perhaps 3 dBA over the background sound levels for a site at the wind farm property line.</i>   |
| 152           | 614            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | FW2        | <i>Bird Kill. This was a problem with wind generators in the early 80's but is no longer a significant issue. . . Since they are still permitting additional hundreds of windmills [in eastern Oregon], the kill rate is obviously not of concern.</i>   |
| 152           | 615            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>Vibration is not an issue...If the vibration was of such magnitude that even the most sensitive human could feel it at the base of the tower or in the foundation. the entire \$3 million structure is at great risk.</i>   |
| 152           | 616            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>Low frequency sound - Some people may object to sound, but after many scientific surveys, there has been no physical effect ever found from sound frequencies either below or within human hearing range in the range of 80 decibels and below.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name     | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 152           | 617            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | CX1        | <i>Hazardous materials - The maintenance materials of paint, lubricating oils, transformer oils, diesel fuels, etc., that may be used or spilled is of less quantity and no different than the same materials stored and used by loggers, vintners, orchardists, and ordinary residents both inside and outside of the scenic area.</i>  |
| 152           | 618            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE5        | <i>Ice throw is not an issue because: The planned 1/2 mile offset from nearest occupied property is sufficient protection from ice throw.</i>  |
| 152           | 619            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>There is no question that construction of the wind farm will temporarily incur traffic problems and delays in the Underwood area. There will be construction equipment, concrete delivery trucks, trucks delivering the massive pieces of the windmills themselves and it will be disruptive to our normal travel routine. There are no regulations to avoid this and, it is after all, temporary.</i>  |
| 153           | 620            | LaDonna Pollard    | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>The route the components are traveling up to the proposed site is of great concern. Streets are narrow, many curves, and would impact many family homes. I am in complete agreement - we need this project! Please give the route problem more thought and open dialogue so we know what the result will be on this one small concern.</i>  |
| 154           | 621            | Adrienne Rudderman | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>In regard to the national scenic area, we've all been required to follow specific guidelines for building and developing our land with the main goal of limiting our impact to prime viewing areas within the scenic area. The land SDS is proposing, while legally outside of the scenic area are clearly not in compliance with the intent of the law. I believe any financial gains made will be short term and this project will ultimately hurt our community.</i> |
| 154           | 622            | Adrienne Rudderman | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE4        | <i>Economic diversity and development - it has recently been brought to my attention that other projects designed to bring a far higher number of long term jobs to this area (???) with over 2 million in the economic stimulus money. Why would this project be turned down while a project that was creating jobs be pushed through?</i>  |
| 154           | 623            | Adrienne Rudderman | Underwood, WA Resident  | SW1        | <i>Where is SDS going to get all the water it needs to run this project?</i>   |
| 155           | 624            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | LU1        | <i>Do you see any 42 story buildings in our area? These large turbines are industrial power generators that don't belong in a rural scenic area.</i>   |
| 155           | 625            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>It does not seem just or fair that a large powerful landowner can create a huge impact on a large area's 1)view...</i>  |
| 155           | 626            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE5        | <i>It does not seem just or fair that a large powerful landowner can create a huge impact on a large area's ...2)health...</i>   |
| 155           | 627            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE1        | <i>It does not seem just or fair that a large powerful landowner can create a huge impact on a large area's ...3)economic impact..</i>   |
| 155           | 628            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>RE: health please consider the growing number of well-documented serious health issues being published and studied due to low frequency vibration (being ignored by the wind energy companies). Please see (Google) Nina Pierpont MD to see numerous studies by her and others. Please cite these turbines no closer than 2 miles from residences.</i>  |
| 155           | 629            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>In considering the decibel levels/noise please consider the peak levels and not just the average.</i>   |
| 155           | 630            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | ER1        | <i>Please consider energy conservation as opposed to the need for energy</i>   |
| 155           | 631            | Mary Twombly       | Underwood, WA Resident  | FW2        | <i>Consider wildlife and bird flying areas...these studies must be done by an objective third party.</i>   |
| 156           | 632            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | PM4        | <i>I am in favor of this project. Skamania needs the jobs and tax base. The region needs additional electrical generation capacity and the location is ideal.</i>  |
| 156           | 633            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | PM4        | <i>Opponents to this project have cited problems with public health, vibration, hazardous waste, etc,...most can be disproven...Noise, toxic chemicals, health hazards, animal and human damage due to vibration, etc are false. There are much greater threats from orchards or vineyard operations that are promoted throughout the area.</i>  |
| 156           | 634            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>There are valid objections due to road congestion during construction.</i>  |
| 156           | 635            | Don Bradford       | Underwood, WA Resident  | CX1        | <i>Noise, toxic chemicals,</i>   |
| 157           | 636            | Eileen Garvin      | Hood River, OR resident | SE1        | <i>Oppose project because: it will negatively impact our tourism economy</i>   |
| 157           | 637            | Eileen Garvin      | Hood River, OR resident | SE2        | <i>Oppose project because: It will negatively impact property values</i>   |
| 157           | 638            | Eileen Garvin      | Hood River, OR resident | VR1        | <i>Oppose project because: Visual obstruction to the horizon violates the philosophy of the Scenic Act</i>   |
| 157           | 639            | Eileen Garvin      | Hood River, OR resident | VR2        | <i>Oppose project because: Night time lighting is an added concern.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 157           | 640            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | Oppose project because: <i>It will harm wildlife, including bats, birds, and endangered species</i>  |
| 157           | 641            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | SE4        | Oppose project because: <i>The project seems like it will offer short term gain to a few and long term gain to an even fewer</i>   |
| 157           | 642            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | ER1        | Oppose project because: <i>I worry about the lack of talk of energy conservation</i>   |
| 157           | 643            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | SG2        | Oppose project because: <i>I worry about the instability of land in the local area and the impact to rivers</i>  |
| 157           | 644            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | TT2        | Oppose project because: <i>The project endangers residents of the community during construction - especially kids</i>  |
| 157           | 645            | Eileen Garvin  | Hood River, OR resident   | CR1        | Oppose project because: <i>The whistling ridge energy project jeopardizes the cultural resources of this place.</i>  |
| 158           | 646            | Mary Repar     |                           | PM1        | Ms. Repar inquired whether the project was in Klickitat Co. Jim LaSpina responded that it is only in Skamania Co.  |
| 159           | 647            | Jake Culver    | Portland, OR resident     | AL1        | <i>The Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area needs protection from all such proposals. Were every developer marketing a "blue-sky" development proposal - big box stores, casinos, pipelines, etc - allowed unlimited access to this public treasure, it would quickly become unrecognizable. I support renewable energy, but I am opposed to industrial-scale wind energy development within or adjacent to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 160           |                | Erin Swayze    | Kinetics Inc.             | X          | Forwarded Anita Gahimer Crow's previous comments (letter #114)   |
| 161           | 648            | Ann Lueders    | Carson, WA resident       | SE6        | This project would benefit Skamania County in countless ways, such as: 1) it's a homegrown stimulus package that will provide much needed tax revenue and jobs;  |
| 161           | 649            | Ann Lueders    | Carson, WA resident       | EI1        | 2) <i>it's a project that uses a renewable resource and has little, if any impact on the environment;</i>  |
| 161           | 650            | Ann Lueders    | Carson, WA resident       | SE1        | 3) <i>it's a project that has the potential to ignite future, similar projects that are both good for the county and its residents.</i>  |
| 161           | 651            | Ann Lueders    | Carson, WA resident       | LU1        | <i>Skamania County, the State of Washington and the Federal Government have a responsibility to see past the lobbying of radical environmental groups whose sole intent is to prohibit any type of development. They have a responsibility to zone, and allow use that protects private property rights and is in the best interest of ALL of their constituents - not just the handful who are chanting "Not in my backyard."</i>   |
| 162           | 652            | Alan Wilcox    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR1        | <i>It appears to me that locating 426-foot-tall turbines on the ridgeline of the Columbia River Gorge would degrade the scenic values of the Gorge. The turbines would be highly visible from several designated key viewing areas within the National Scenic Area, including Interstate 84, the Historic Columbia River Highway, Cook-Underwood Road, and Panorama Point. Locating this type project in our communities should be done in such a way that it does not introduce highly visible industrial facilities into the natural, forested landscape, protruding above ridgelines and detracting from the natural scenic beauty of the Gorge. I support renewable energy at the Whistling Ridge project, as long as the turbines are not visible from the key viewing areas in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, a designated national scenic treasure.</i> |
| 163           | 653            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | AL1        | <i>I am in favor of the continued development of wind electric generation farms in the Northwest, but strongly believe that Saddleback Mountain is the wrong place build such a facility.</i>  |
| 163           | 654            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>locating in a mountainous forested area: this would be the first time that an extensive wind generator farm would be built in a heavily forested mountainous area. The EIS must address the impact on natural wildlife, including all the habitat (such as deer, elk, bears, cougars, small mammals, and the many birds).</i>   |
| 163           | 655            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | PM3        | <i>[EIS issues about locating in a mountainous forested area] These must be scientifically determined by a neutral and reliable study group such as a respectable university. Not SDS, its affiliates or contractors.</i>  |
| 163           | 656            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | NQ1        | <i>How will the noise (both audible and subsonic), vibrations, visual prominence, and high speed moving blades impact this wildlife?</i>   |
| 163           | 657            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>Will the animal populations decrease?</i>   |
| 163           | 658            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>Will the animal populations be forced to move, such as into nearby human settled areas (of particular concern with cougars and bears)?</i>  |
| 163           | 659            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>Will there be a neurotic impact on the animals?</i>   |
| 163           | 660            | Tom Rousseau   | Hood River, OR resident   | SG1        | <i>How will the control of vegetation (required for proper clearance around the towers) affect soil stability and erosion?</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name       | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
| 163           | 661            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | EG1        | <i>Energy reliability and storage: Contrary to the belief that seems to be held by some of the Skamania County residents, wind power is not a reliable, stable source of energy. Its production is highly dependent on the availability of suitable winds. Extended periods without wind is common, even in the region of the Columbia Gorge. Wind power cannot be relied upon to source local areas in times of broad power grid failures. This needs to be conspicuously noted in the EIS.</i>  |
| 163           | 662            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | EG1        | <i>Further, to be effective, wind power needs to have a means of storing the energy from peak generation periods to accommodate the periods with no or little generation. This must be addressed in the EIS.</i>  |
| 163           | 663            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>Wind generator farms should not be visible either from river level or the many trails and ridges of the Gorge. This requirement is certainly within the intent and spirit of the 1986 Columbia Gorge National Scenic Act, if not the written word. The NSA is very critical about viewable manmade contrivances, and would have also addressed wind generator farms with 400 ft towers, had that be anticipated at the time.</i>   |
| 163           | 664            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | SE1        | <i>Among other worthy benefits, the beauty of the Gorge attracts many tourists and visitors. Desecrating the views will discourage visitors and the tourist revenue that benefits the region. Certainly the folks of Skamania County appreciate the revenues brought by the presence of Skamania Lodge.</i>   |
| 163           | 665            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | AL1        | <i>The project plan must ensure that no towers are visible from any elevation or location in the Gorge. You would not build a wind generator farm on Half Dome in Yosemite, Mt. Rainier, or along the rim of Crater Lake. In like vein, you should not build one in or near the Gorge.</i>  |
| 163           | 666            | Tom Rousseau         | Hood River, OR resident   | PM3        | <i>Finally, the photos showing the proposed project that were presented at the Stevenson meeting on 6 May 09 were misleading, at best. Most of them portrayed the towers against a partly cloudy sky, the clouds being about the same color as the towers. This made the towers appear invisible. I hope that purposeful deception was not the intent, but this needs to be corrected in future presentations.</i>  |
| 164           | 667            | Ann and Dave Bronson | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>1. Even though it is physically just outside the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area, the turbines will have a severe detrimental visual effect to the beauty of the Gorge for visitors as well as for residents of the area.</i>  |
| 164           | 668            | Ann and Dave Bronson | Hood River, OR resident   | TT1        | <i>2. The improvement to logging roads in order to accommodate delivery of the turbines to the farm will be major. The weight and length of the huge towers plus the blades will require, as noted in the application, widening of these narrow roads plus stabilization of the road base. It is our understanding that this type of road improvement is not currently allowed in the National Scenic Area as the construction does not relate to forestry.</i>   |
| 164           | 669            | Ann and Dave Bronson | Hood River, OR resident   | SG2        | <i>3. The Landslide Hazard Areas, particularly the narrow ridge of the southern portion of Tower Line A needs further review. Recalling the Gorge landslides caused by the floods of 1996, this ridge could prove to be less stable than the application indicates. The precipitation records sited in the application seem to focus on years from 1951-1978 rather than more current records.</i>  |
| 164           | 670            | Ann and Dave Bronson | Hood River, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>4. The location of the wind farm in a forested area rather than on open rolling hills will undoubtedly have a negative impact on wildlife habitat. The SDS contracted surveys are still in progress so obviously are incomplete. The fact that the area has been used for logging in the past cannot compare to the habitat damage caused the clear cutting adjacent to a wind farm of 50 turbines much less the huge concrete foundations required for each turbine.</i>  |
| 164           | 671            | Ann and Dave Bronson | Hood River, OR resident   | VR2        | <i>5. Much of the application seems short of detail ... i.e., the FAA lighting required on the turbine blades which will create a visual blight on the Gorge. Many of the design details are still being developed. Also, zoning changes required for the wind farm, still under review, and are being challenged.</i>  |
| 165           | 672-676        | Mayra Avila          | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 166           |                |                      |                           | X          | * copy of letter 139  |
| 167           | 677            | Michael Eastwick     | Underwood, WA resident    | SW1        | <i>There is an unnamed creek, spring fed (at multiple places) which begins directly downhill and east of the "A" turbine array. This creek flows along the east side of the Chemawa Ridge into the "World Steward" (<a href="http://www.worldsteward.org/index.html">http://www.worldsteward.org/index.html</a>) property, and eventually into the Little White Salmon River. See attached annotated topographic map for your reference. I was unable to find any mention of this surface water entity, wet land existence, nor anything about protecting it from construction and maintenance of the facility. (map attached to comment)</i> |
| 168           | 678-682        | Joy Gohl             | White Salmon, WA resident | F          | Same as 19-23   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name   | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------|--|
| 169           | 683            | ronda crumpacker | Underwood, WA Resident   | VR1        | <i>While I am in favor of the project, I am opposed to the 7-8 "A" towers. These are completely visible to the entire Scenic Area and will be damaging to the business that we have spent so many years building. We started our Winery/Event Site a few years ago and have spent so much time and all our money in this endeavor. The windmills would forever change this. I have already had future brides ask me when the windmills were coming, as they would choose another venue where they would not see windmills.. My neighbors who were all opening wineries in the next 1-2 years have put their projects on hold after investing hundreds of thousands in property and grapes!</i> |
| 169           | 684            | ronda crumpacker | Underwood, WA Resident   | VR1        | <i>When it comes to the road impact studies, I suggest a third party is asked to evaluate the impacts, as the gentleman that SDS hired to do a road impact study is very pro windmills. The gentleman they hired stands at the door of all community meetings and harasses you as you walk out if you spoke against the windmills! I would say a third party is needed to really determine the impacts to the roads in our neighborhood.</i>   |
| 170           | 685            | Sarah Lukas      | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (SEPA regional lead) | SW2        | <i>The submitted scoping notice identifies the intent of preparing a floodplain and wetland assessment as part of the analysis used in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). The assessment should include: An inventory of all wetlands and areas of floodplain in the project area and within the vicinity of the proposal; the environmental values these aquatic features provide to the landscape; what and how the floodplain areas and wetlands will be impacted by the proposal; what environmental values will be lost from these impacts; and mitigation measures to offset the proposed environmental impacts that cannot be avoided.</i>                                |
| 170           | 686            | Sarah Lukas      | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (SEPA regional lead) | SW1        | <i>The DEIS should also include an analysis of all other surface water bodies in, and within the vicinity of, the project site. An equivalent documentation of existing environmental values, proposed impacts, and proposed mitigation measures to unavoidable impacts should be outlined in the DEIS as requested for the wetlands and floodplain areas above.</i>   |
| 170           | 687            | Connie Groven    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Toxics cleanup)     | CX1        | <i>If contamination is currently known or suspected during construction, testing of the potentially contaminated media must be conducted. If contamination of soil or groundwater is readily visible, or is revealed by testing, Ecology must be notified. Contact the Environmental Report Tracking System Coordinator at the Southwest Regional Office at (360) 407-6300. For assistance and information about subsequent cleanup and to identify the type of testing that will be required contact Connie Groven with the Toxic Cleanup Program at the Southwest Regional Office at the phone number given above.</i>   |
| 170           | 688            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | SW1        | <i>Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control, and WAC 173-201A, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action. Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soil and other pollutants into surface water or storm drains that lead to waters of the state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soil will damage aquatic habitat and are considered to be pollutants.</i>                     |
| 170           | 689            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | SW1        | <i>Proper disposal of construction debris must be on land in such a manner that debris cannot enter buffers and waters of the state or cause water quality degradation of state waters.</i>  |
| 170           | 690            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | CX1        | <i>During construction, all releases of oils, hydraulic fluids, fuels, other petroleum products, paints, solvents, and other deleterious materials must be contained and removed in a manner that will prevent their discharge to waters and soils of the state. The cleanup of spills should take precedence over other work on the site.</i>   |
| 170           | 691            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | SW1        | <i>Clearing limits and/or any easements or required buffers should be identified and marked in the field, prior to the start of any clearing, grading, or construction. Some suggested methods are staking and flagging or high visibility fencing.</i>  |
| 170           | 692            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | SW1        | <i>A permanent vegetative cover should be established on denuded areas at final grade if they are not otherwise permanently stabilized.</i>  |
| 170           | 693            | Roberta Woods    | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality)      | SW1        | <i>All temporary erosion control systems should be designed to contain the runoff from the developed two year, 24-hour design storm without eroding.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|
| 170           | 694            | Roberta Woods   | Washington Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office (Water Quality) | SW1        | <i>Coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Waste Discharge General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities is required for construction sites which disturb an area of one acre or more and which have or will have a discharge of stormwater to surface water or a storm sewer. An application can be downloaded from Ecology's website at [web] or you can contact Josh Klimek at [#] or an application form. To avoid project delays, we encourage the applicants to submit a completed application form and to publish public notice more than 60 days before the planned start of the project.</i>   |
| 171           | 695            | Chauna Ramsey   | Hood River, OR resident   | PM5        | <i>I would like to voice my strong opposition to SDS Lumber's "development" in the Columbia River Gorge. Please do not allow our landscape to be scarred by turbines which create significant adverse environmental impact.</i>   |
| 172           | 696            | Jennifer Wilson | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | Support of the scenic area and objection to the Whistling Ridge project based on scenic issues.   |
| 173           | 697            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | FW2        | <i>This project has the potential to have different and greater wildlife impacts than other wind proposals in Washington, because these turbines will be in a heavily forested area.</i>  |
| 173           | 698            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | ER1        | <i>Have you researched the fire dangers of having turbines? Is there a fire hazard possibility? If there is, then it would be wrong to place them so very close to houses and forests.</i>  |
| 173           | 699            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>I would like to emphasize my concern about the visual impact it would have on the first National Scenic Area in our county. The Columbia River Gorge area is not just a gem for Washington and Oregon residents, but for our county as well as foreign tourists who visit. There is no way that putting those turbines at the proposed site is not going to affect the scenic area.</i>  |
| 173           | 700            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | NQ1        | Concern about noise and vibration effects.  |
| 173           | 701            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | SE5        | Concern about ice throw.  |
| 173           | 702            | Amy Rosenthal   | Portland, OR resident   | PM5        | <i>I think a lot more research and study and independent environmental impacts studies need to be done. I appreciate that SDS Lumber Company is interested in developing new industry and helping with alternative energy. I don't think wind turbines in the Columbia Gorge are a good idea.</i>   |
| 174           | 703            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT2        | <i>During rush hours, traffic on Cook-Underwood Road will reach 250 cars per hour: That amount of traffic is 4.17 cars per minute or one car about every 14.4 seconds. If equal number traveling both ways at 40 mph (the speed limit), that means there is about 0.32 miles or 1,642 feet between cars on the average. Not a very high traffic density and this is only during a very short period during the day. If all are traveling the same way, then the average distance between cars is 820 feet. Traffic density on Oregon Hwy 18 (a two-lane road to the town of Dundee, Oregon) exceeds 26,000 cars per day for an average of over 1000 cars per hour for the entire 24-hour period and much higher than that at rush hour.</i> |
| 174           | 704            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | ER1        | <i>If there is a fire and one of the big trucks is going up Cook-Underwood, it completely blocks the road: Although the transport trucks are wide, they do not completely block the road. There must be enough road width for the truck to pass a vehicle going the opposite direction (even if stopped) and a fire truck has the right of- way, so there is enough room for the fire truck to pass the transport truck.</i>  |
| 174           | 705            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE1        | <i>Underwood has a thriving Agro-tourism industry and that will disappear if the windmills are erected, destroying the scenic view: Underwood has a thriving Agro-tourism industry? On what day of the year? There is none in the months November through April, because the trees and the vineyards are barren....(comment goes on...)</i>   |
| 174           | 706            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>The wind farm is outside of the National Scenic Area. If Congress in their vast wisdom wanted to condemn more private property and expand the scenic area, then they have the power to do so. The residents of Skamania County did not get to vote on whether the county should be included in the scenic area in the first place, and, had they been allowed to choose, Skamania County would not have been included. Now a vocal minority wants to extend the scenic area beyond the original boundaries established by Congress. Why should they get to vote on this? If it is to be a vote, let's put it on the ballot and have the entire county vote on it.</i>  |
| 174           | 707            | Don Bradford    | Underwood, WA Resident  | EG1        | <i>Response to idea that the power may not be needed and the windmills will be left: steel will be recycled, there is a global energy shortage and the power will most certainly be needed..In thirty years (projected life of the project), the gas-fired plant cost is 2, 16 and 16 for a total of 34 cents per kilowatt-hour and the wind power is 6 and 8 for a total of 14 cents. How do we know the power will be needed in 25 years? Look at the economics - not only will it be needed, it will be highly desired.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---|------------|---|
| 174           | 708            | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA Resident  | EG2        | <i>The Underwood project is ideal for three reasons - one, there is wind at the project location; two, there is convenient connection to a major power grid to transmit the power to where it is used; and three, there is an interconnected hydro system that can be (partially) regulated to match the wind generation to the load. This interconnected system stretches all of the way to Los Angeles via the Celilo converter station in The Dalles.</i>  |
| 174           | 709            | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT3        | <i>There was a valid objection- by a person who resides at the corner of Scoggins and Kollack-Knapp road. This is a hairpin turn and it is hard to see how a truck with a trailer upwards of 160 feet long will make that turn without road modifications across part of their property. I am opposed to the "taking" of private property just as I am opposed to the "taking" from SDS beneficial use of their land.</i>   |
| 174           | 710            | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA Resident  | TT1        | <i>There is another route to the wind project site. Asplund road, further west, connects to Kollack-Knapp and Kollack-Knapp extends with a minor curve into Scoggins road. The curve at Asplund to Kollack-Knapp is not as sharp as the presently proposed route and laying it out using the width of the roadway plus level shoulders indicates at a 10 feet wide load on a trailer 186 feet long can make that curve. These trucks have steerable rear axles on the trailers. No residences would be disturbed at either the intersection between Asplund and Cook-Underwood nor further up the route. The route would be approximately 2 miles longer than the presently proposed route.</i>   |
| 174           | 711            | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA Resident  | PM1        | Discussion about insitu, but no specific comment.   |
| 174           | 712            | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ3        | <i>Wind mills should not be allowed any closer than 2 miles to the nearest residence: This statement follows on SOSA's misinformation campaign about the hazards of windmills to people's health and welfare. If this rule were to be applied nationwide, it would essentially eliminate the potential of generating wind energy in vast sections of the states of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and major parts of South and North Dakota as well as any states east of the middle of the country.</i>  |
| 175           | 713            | Cris McEwen    | Klickitat County Board of Commissioners                       | VR1        | <i>Comments have been made by some area constituents with regard to the visual impacts of the turbines but we believe that the large majority of our constituents feel that the benefits far outweigh those concerns. Everyone recognizes the need for electricity.</i>   |
| 175           | 714            | Cris McEwen    | Klickitat County Board of Commissioners                       | NQ1        | <i>2. Noise does not seem to be a factor unless you are near the turbines; noting it is difficult to hearing anything above the wind.</i>   |
| 175           | 715            | Cris McEwen    | Klickitat County Board of Commissioners                       | FW2        | <i>3. Deer have been observed grazing under and around the turbines on various occasions. In recent months a small herd of elk have been seen ranging around a construction site along Hoctor Road which is south and east of the community of Goldendale. The turbines do not appear to have a negative impact on wildlife.</i>  |
| 175           | 716            | Cris McEwen    | Klickitat County Board of Commissioners                       | SE6        | <i>4. . The tax benefits not only on behalf of the County but also the various taxing districts, , library, schools, etc. are huge. Recently the small school district of Bickleton overwhelmingly passed a levy for construction of a new school. This was simply due to the increased tax base as a result of the wind farms that were constructed in their district which otherwise would never have been possible.</i>  |
| 175           | 717            | Cris McEwen    | Klickitat County Board of Commissioners                       | SE4        | <i>5. Lastly, the job creation as a direct result of the wind turbine projects is substantial both in bringing in outside workers as well as hiring of local residents. We have seen local businesses, i.e. motels, restaurants, etc. flourish in an otherwise difficult economic climate due solely to the number of construction workers the wind projects have brought to the area.</i>  |
| 176           | 718            | Brian Shortt   | Shortt Supply, Hood River business owner, Hood River resident | SE4        | <i>The impact photo visualizations rendering offered by SDS Lumber Company during public testimony for the Whistling Ridge Energy Project Scoping meeting indicated that of the 18 visualization locations, operating windmills would visually affect 60% or eleven of these locations switching or near the city limits of Hood River, Oregon. The scoping hearing process did not provide notice to offer public testimony from Hood River's constituency nor adequate 3D elevation modeling of the windmill project. This is fundamentally wrong and should be modified. As the planned transmission provider, Bonneville Power Administration represents a Federal agency whose responsibility it is to include a regional review as opposed to a single state EIS scope.</i> |
| 176           | 719            | Brian Shortt   | Shortt Supply, Hood River business owner, Hood River resident | VR1        | <i>The scope of the 75 Megawatt Whistling Ridge Energy Project is a significant visual impact to the visitations of the National Scenic Area vistas, the visitations to points of American historical significance and the tranquility and solace for over three million visitors and residents. This proposal represents a growing adverse affect to the values of the Northwest's natural landscape for all residence of Washington, Oregon and Idaho. This project requires a bi-state review process to adequately ensure that no adverse impacts to the environment and the affected communities are left out of the review. This includes, but not limited to, the City of Hood River, Oregon and the residents residing herein.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name       | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---|------------|--|
| 176           | 720            | Brian Shortt         | Shortt Supply, Hood River business owner, Hood River resident | CE2        | <i>As a U.S. citizen residing within Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, resident of Hood River, Oregon, I would request the scope of the Whistling Ridge Energy project EIS expand and include a socio-economic, environmental and public health assessment that would qualify and quantify the overall affect to the designated urban growth boundary of the City of Hood River, Oregon.</i>  |
| 177           | 721-725        | Martin Velez         | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 178           | 726            | Forrest Frantz       | Parkdale, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>Wind power is wonderful, but the scenic treasure of the Columbia River Gorge must be preserved from Hood River/White Salmon west. There should be no blades visible from the gorge west of Mosier. It is difficult enough to see the blades East of Mosier/Lyle, but compromise is needed.- Wind power can be concentrated east of Mosier/Lyle.</i>   |
| 179           |                |                      |   | X          | <i>copy of comment letter # 176</i>  |
| 180           | 727-731        | Neal Keefer          | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 181           | 732-736        | Pamela Braun         | Salem, OR resident  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 182           | 737-741        | Ann Watters          | Salem, OR resident  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 183           | 742-746        | Beth McCullough      | White Salmon, WA resident                                     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 184           |                |                      |   | X          | <i>Copy of letter #183</i>   |
| 185           | 747-751        | Debra Rehn           | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 186           | 752-756        | Daniel Richardson    | The Dalles, OR resident                                       | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 187           | 757-761        | Katelin Stuart       | Cascade Locks, OR resident                                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 188           | 762-766        | David M Brown        | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-24</i>   |
| 189           | 767            | Cyndi & Pete Biltott | Hood River, OR resident                                       | VR1        | <i>For CHRIST'S SAKE already! This is a NATIONAL SCENIC AREA: PLEASE READ MY LIPS! Of course, we support alternative wind energy. There are thousand of miles of uninhabited land, NOT in the scenic area or near towns, and inhabited areas where these projects can be considered. Please! I can't even believe this is proposed.</i>  |
| 190           | 768-772        | A Murray             | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 191           | 773-777        | Brian Beinlich       | North Plains, OR resident                                     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 192           | 778            | Erik Hauge           | Underwood, WA Resident  | LU1        | <i>Inconsistent with zoned use: Large-scale industrial power generation is not consistent with the forestry zoning. This area and areas close by are zoned for forestry and agriculture. Industrial power generation is not consistent with the surrounding uses. The A towers would be very close to homes and farms in the area. There should be a greater buffer between projects like this one and existing uses.</i>  |
| 192           | 779            | Erik Hauge           | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE2        | <i>2. Negative effect on local land values: The Underwood area is home to some of the most prized real estate in Skamania county, due to it rural feel and unparallel views. The Saddle Back Mt/Whistling Ridge Wind Turbine development will have negative effects on our land values and tax revenue for the county.</i>   |
| 192           | 780            | Erik Hauge           | Underwood, WA Resident  | VR1        | <i>3. Negative effect on National scenic area: Saddle Back Mt/Whistling ridge have a huge effect on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic area. A 380 foot tower with red strobe light will negatively effect the whole Columbia River Gorge. There is no buffer between the project and the scenic area. a. It will affect the economy: The natural beauty and the views of the Gorge will be disturbed by the wind turbines and associated strobe lights. b. The tourist industry will be affected. We have visitors because of the natural beauty and the wind turbines will ruin part of the Gorge. The local economies will be negatively affected and any tax revenue will not make up for the loss in tourism. c. This project will affect many people, as it is so visible (sited on a ridge top, adjacent to a gorge) to the surrounding communities. This project is not sighted in a wheat field in an area with low population density.</i> |
| 192           | 781            | Erik Hauge           | Underwood, WA Resident  | NQ1        | <i>Unknown health effects: The effects of sound and low frequency vibrations are not fully understood. The A towers in particular are to close too existing residential areas. We should not gamble with the health of a community when the effects are not fully known.</i>   |
| 192           | 782            | Erik Hauge           | Underwood, WA Resident  | SE1        | <i>5. Hurts economic development: Saddle Back Mt. Whistling Ridge Wind Turbine development would hurt economic development in Skamania county. The Underwood region is becoming a tourist destination due to it rural and agricultural character, it is the only such area in Skamania County. The wine industry and agric tourism are burgeoning and this development would hurt the chances that our area would become a destination for these tourists. Eco tourists want nature not industrial wind development.</i>   |
| 193           | 783-787        | Angelique Moore      | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 194           | 788-792        | Peny Gibbons         | Washougal, WA resident  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 195           | 793-797        | Evelyn Bishop        | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 196           | 798-802        | Betsy Hege           | The Dalles, OR resident                                       | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 197           | 803-807        | Frances Hann         | Vancouver, WA resident  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 198           | 808-812        | tanya nevarez        | Grants Pass, OR resident                                      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 199           | 813-817        | David Griffith       | Portland, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                 | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 200           | 818-822        | Maria White                    | Beaverton, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 201           | 823-827        | James Minick                   | Lyle, WA resident       | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 202           | 828-832        | Linda Ogden                    | Valencia, CA resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 203           | 833-837        | Barbara Hopp                   | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 204           | 838-842        | Karen Lamson                   | The Dalles, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 205           | 843-847        | Sarah Lincoln Pattee           | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 206           | 848-852        | Kendrick Simila                | Salem, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 207           |                |                                |                         | X          | Copy of comment letter #206  |
| 208           | 853-857        | Rita Heinz                     | Talent, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 209           | 858-862        | Cyndi and Cleve Ellis          | Vancouver, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 210           | 863-867        | Susan Drew                     | Sandy, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 211           | 868-872        | Joel Thorson                   | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 212           | 873-877        | Patricia Arnold                | Trout Lake, WA resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 213           | 878-892        | chuck ware                     | Vancouver, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 214           | 893-897        | Rick Ray                       | Springdale, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 215           | 898-902        | Mary Heath                     | Roseburg, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 216           | 903-907        | John Hammond                   | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 217           | 908-912        | marie uhlir                    | Hood River, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 218           | 913-917        | Thomas Marney                  | Salem, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 219           | 918-922        | John Goeckermann               | Hood River, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23 (with colorful language added at beginning,  |
| 220           | 923-927        | Hall White                     | Fairview, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 221           | 928-932        | Ninian Blackburn               | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 222           | 933-937        | John Zachman                   | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 223           | 938            | Mary Jokela                    | Spokane Audubon Society | FW2        | Spokane Audubon Society's Board of Directors, by unanimous direction supports Seattle Audubon Society's position on the above-entitled proposal.   |
| 224           | 939-943        | Barbara Tombleson              | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 225           | 944-948        | Lauren Miller                  | Eugene, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 226           | 949-953        | donna Mooney                   | Troutdale, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 227           | 954-958        | Cliff Snell                    | Vancouver, WA resident  | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 228           |                |                                |                         | X          | Copy of letter #227  |
| 229           | 959-963        | Nancy Platner                  | Hood River, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 230           | 964-968        | sherry meier                   | Hood River, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 231           | 969-973        | Sue Layton                     | Fairview, OR            | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 232           | 974            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident  | PM1        | Question about attachments missing from submitted comments.  |
| 233           | 975            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident  | LU1        | <p>First, we have a deep concern about the inappropriate siting of industrial wind turbines in rural residential areas. Specifically, we hope you will ensure that such siting not takeaway a resident's right to enjoy the peace and tranquility of their homesite, nor more importantly, negatively impact their health and well-being. A number of us have been working diligently, hoping to educate and inspire local government officials to consider adopting appropriate noise/vibration limitations and setbacks in the interest of preventing what would surely become a significant problem.</p> <p>We've done a fair amount of research and have found "The 'How To' Guide To . Siting Wind Turbines To Prevent Health Risks From Sound" (authors: George W. Kamperman and Richard R. James, August 28 2008, at <a href="http://www.savethebluffs.ca/archives/files/kamperman-james-8-26-08-report.pdf">www.savethebluffs.ca/archives/files/kamperman-james-8-26-08-report.pdf</a>) to be extremely useful. It provides an ecological and scientifically sound approach, which will minimize the likelihood of detrimental impact when industrial wind turbines are to be sited near people's homes.</p> |
| 233           | 976            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident  | NQ3        | <p>We strongly feel the half-mile set back is insufficient, especially in areas with canyons, bowls, and mountains, as the terrain will contain, amplify and transmit the sound from the wind turbines greater distances than in typically used flatter terrain. A simplistic sound modeling using but two variables, output and distance, is insufficient in determining likely impact; We request that potential noise (dBA) and low-frequency (dBC) impacts be thoroughly investigated through baseline measurements and Computer simulations of worst case conditions for producing sound emissions, such as recommended by Kamperman and James, 2008.</p> <p>This would include ambient sound monitoring on all residential properties within and up to a mile of the project property boundary (pages 26-29). A sophisticated, latest technology, and highly reputable sound propagation model should be utilized in the computer simulations. An Independent Qualified Acoustical Consultant (unbiased third party with no financial or other connection to SDS or related companies) should perform all sound monitoring, simulations and projections.</p>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                 | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
|               |                |                                |                           |            | <i>With great earnest, we encourage this be done prior to making decisions regarding appropriate setbacks. Further, if industrial wind turbines are as "quiet" as represented, setting enhanced noise standards should provide no difficulty for developers to meet...and yet, would make a strong statement illustrating the state's commitment to safeguarding the health of its citizens.</i>  |
| 233           | 977            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | NQ3        | <i>The "How To" Guide referenced above clearly articulates how to go about setting such standards. Simple reliance on the Washington State Environmental Noise Levels, Chapter 173-60 WAC, is not enough. The acoustical experts' "How To" Guide approach is to locate a wind turbine so as to not increase preconstruction/operation background sound levels by more than 5 dBA along the property lines of the receiving non-participating property. And, such that it would not exceed 35 dBA within 100 feet of any occupied structure. (Page 16) Additionally, we refer you to the low-frequency sound limits also depicted on page 16.</i>  |
| 233           | 978            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | NQ1        | <i>We strongly recommend that the EFSEC become fully informed of the growing documented potential health risks from sound (find attached "Deputation (by Dr. Robert McMurtry M.D., PR.C.S (C), F.A.C.S) to the Standing Committee on General Government Regarding Bill C-150 April 22, 2009 www.wind-watch.org/documents/iwp-content/uploads/mcmurtry-deputationto-standing-committee.pdf), as well as the approach suggested in this "How To" Guide, by inviting acoustical experts George W. Kamperman and/or Richard R. James to present to the EFSEC and this community, their approach to siting wind turbines in a manner to prevent health risks. This should be completed as part of the EIS.</i><br><br><i>cFor your onsideration, we have attached a news release (March 4, 2009 www.windaction.org/documents/20306) from the Medical Staff of Northern Maine Medical Center regarding "Health Concerns and the Need for Careful Siting of Wind Turbines". We further reference you to the book ("Wind Turbine Syndrome A Report on a Natural Experiment" published by K-Selected Books) and work of New York physician Nina Pierpont M.D., Ph.D. at www.windturbinesyndrome.com.</i> |
| 233           | 979            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>We ask that the scope of the EIS include a thorough assessment of the aesthetic impact of the proposed placement of wind turbines within the Whistling Ridge project, so that appropriate mitigation measures in said placement can be required.</i>   |
| 233           | 980            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>the scope of the EIS for the Whistling Ridge Project must necessarily (via SEPA requirements) include considering SDS's proposed lease of four common school trust parcels on adjacent DNR land in western Klickitat County for the purpose of wind power development....as this would make the project total 92 and not 50 windmills.</i>   |
| 233           | 981            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | FW1        | <i>As DNR indicated on page 13 of the SEPA checklist (File no. 90-011302), "The entire area of this proposal is environmentally sensitive". portions of the proposed lease land are designated as Northern Spotted Owl conservation areas. Additionally, SDS's application indicates other sensitive species such as Western Gray Squirrel and Northern Goshawk "have the potential to occur within the project site".</i>  |
| 233           | 982            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | FW2        | <i>This proposed project is reportedly the first of its kind in forested habitats in Washington. This begs the need for intelligent planning, caution and due consideration given the potentially profound impact on watersheds, wildfire risk, bats, avian species, mammals and humans.</i>  |
| 233           | 983            | Keith Brown and Teresa Robbins | Washougal, WA resident    | NQ1        | <i>We have contacted acoustical experts Richard R. James and George W. Kamperman and have received permission to submit specifically for your use, the complete and latest version (2.1) of The "How To" Guide to Siting Wind Turbines to Prevent Health Risks from Sound. (See attached) - Discussion follows of what to reference in the attachment provided</i>  |
| 234           | 984-988        | Elizabeth Gardner              | Gresham, OR resident      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 235           | 989-993        | Ann Lemon                      | Lake Oswego, OR           | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 236           | 994-998        | scott hulbert                  | White Salmon, WA resident | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 237           | 999-1003       | Jane Garbisch                  | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 238           | 1004-1008      | Peder Bisbjerg                 | Lake Oswego, OR           | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 239           | 1009           | Jim Newell                     | Bingen, WA                | VR1        | <i>As a Gorge resident who invested heavily in order to live in the NSA and within its restrictions, the bases of my objection are among those already articulated by others. Primarily, when the Act was formulated (pre-wind turbine era) the predominant types of view-spoiling structures that were envisioned were homes and conventional buildings. The arrays of large wind turbine towers are NOT structures which are "visually subordinate from key viewing areas."</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name        | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 239           | 1010           | Jim Newell            | Bingen, WA                | EG1        | <i>Such an extensive landscape and habitat incursion should not be made hastily. Already, renewable energy analysts are beginning to conclude from scientific and economic data that wind power will likely go the way of the recent ethanol "wave of the future" craze. Once these wind installations are in place the damage will be done and not be inexpensively remediated.</i>   |
| 240           | 1011-1015      | Patricia Bitner       | Eugene, OR resident       | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 241           | 1016-1020      | Gene Johnson          | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 242           | 1021-1025      | Catherine dornor      | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 243           | 1026-1030      | Paul Torrence         | Williams, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 244           | 1031-1035      | Earl Switzer          | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 245           | 1036-1040      | Frank Mele            | Silverton, OR resident    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 246           | 1041           | Kathleen Fitzpatrick  | Mosier, OR resident       | VR1        | <i>Large scale, industrial development does not belong in National Scenic Areas. Scenic Areas are federal treasures and these treasures belong to the American People. Your job is to protect the public trust. Filling the scenic views of the Columbia Gorge with large .scale industrial equipment would betray the public trust. Would you put a wind farm in the Grand Canyon? Yosemite? How about up the face of Mt. St. Helens or Mt. Rainier? The answer to these questions are obvious. What is more important to the American people--SDS corporate profits or the preservation of one of the most beautiful areas in the world?</i> |
| 247           | 1042-1046      | Marianne Platt        | Bend, OR resident         | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 248           | 1047-1051      | Dustin Micheletti     | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 249           | 1052-1056      | Paula Kuttner         | The Dalles, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 250           | 1057-1061      | James Nielson         | Portland, OR resident     | VR2        | <i>Please do not forget the red lights that will be flashing all night every night for the foreseeable future</i>  |
| 250           | 1062-1066      | James Nielson         | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 251           | 1067-1071      | Karen Kantor          | Chicago, IL resident      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 252           | 1072-1076      | Margo Dameier         | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 253           | 1077-1081      | Jerry Rosenkoetter    | Salem, OR resident        | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 254           | 1082-1086      | Kathleen Archer       | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 255           | 1087-1091]     | Ann Waugh             | Boring, OR resident       | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 256           | #VALUE!        | Brian Harris          | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 257           | #VALUE!        | Katie Pearmine        | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 258           | #VALUE!        | Jim Hulbert           | White Salmon, WA resident | AL1        | <i>While I support renewable energy projects in general, the Columbia River Gorge is not the place to locate this kind of project. The Gorge is recognized as one of our most outstanding natural areas by the establishment of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. While the project is not technically within the CRGNSA, it will have serious impacts on the values for which it was established. Not only will outstanding scenic values be compromised, but important wildlife habitat will be lost.</i>   |
| 258           | #VALUE!        | Jim Hulbert           | White Salmon, WA resident | EG2        | <i>It would be easier to accept the proposed location if it had really good wind conditions. However, it is my understanding that the area has only marginal conditions for a wind farm.</i>   |
| 258           | #VALUE!        | Jim Hulbert           | White Salmon, WA resident | RR1        | <i>I am especially offended that the SOS Company has been able to influence the DNR and include some of our public lands in the proposal. These lands, now available for all to recreate in, would be forever changed and public access to them compromised. These state lands are important timber producing areas and are used by me for hunting and mushroom picking. They should not even be considered for this poorly conceived project.</i>   |
| 259           | 1057-1061      | Julie Steiner         | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 260           | 1062-1066      | Mamie McPhee          | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 261           | 1067-1071      | John Laptad           | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 262           | 1072-1076      | Jeffrey Block         | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 263           | 1077-1081      | Will McKamey          | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 264           | 1082-1086      | Unknown (blacked out) | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 265           | 1087-1091      | cass estes            | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 266           | 1092           | Ellyenne Kutschera    | Gresham, OR resident      | VR1        | <i>in a time of needed energy alternatives, it may seem somewhat trivial to argue for keeping the "great views". However, we are also in a time when those natural things we still have are increasingly precious; degrading them, picking piece by piece at what we have left that is still magnificent, is just not right.</i>   |
| 266           | 1093           | Ellyenne Kutschera    | Gresham, OR resident      | FW2        | <i>Also, if the proposed project would cause significant negative impacts to sensitive wildlife and plant habitat in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, the trade-off is simply not worth it.</i>  |
| 266           | 1094-1098      | Ellyenne Kutschera    | Gresham, OR resident      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 267           | nothing.       |                       |                           | X          | <i>no comment attached.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name              | Affiliation              | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------|---|
| 268           | 1099           | Tom Gauron and Beth Rogers  | Kittitas Audubon         | FW1        | <i>This wind farm should not be approved just based on its proximity to Northern Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Areas (SOSEA). While there are multiple threats to the recovery of Northern Spotted Owl (NSO), habitat is the one aspect over which we have the most control. Failure to maintain future habitat for a species already in precipitous decline will lead to the failure of the NSO Recovery Plan currently in its beginning stages before it 'has a chance to get started. With NSO at or near genetic bottleneck we should strive to maintain ALL available habitat. Even "incidental take" could lead to its extinction. Since there is no data about how NSO will interact with turbines this wind farm adds to the risk of their extinction.</i>             |
| 268           | 1100           | Tom Gauron and Beth Rogers  | Kittitas Audubon         | FW2        | <i>This project represents the first wind farm proposed for construction on forested lands in the State of Washington and the northwest. As such, there are what we consider to be two major wildlife concerns associated with Whistling Ridge Energy Project The Northern Spotted Owl and Migratory Bats and Birds.</i>  |
| 268           | 1101           | Tom Gauron and Beth Rogers  | Kittitas Audubon         | FW2        | <i>Large bird and bat kills have been experienced on wind farms on the east coast situated in migratory areas located in forests. Little is known about the migration of either birds or bats in Washington. Virtually nothing is known about bat migration or how bats interact with wind turbines. It is possible that large bat kills might occur here since the wind farm would be in a forested area. The reason for previous large bat kills has not as yet been determined, nor ways to prevent, or mitigate for, large losses.</i>  |
| 268           | 1102           | Tom Gauron and Beth Rogers  | Kittitas Audubon         | FW2        | <i>On this project no nighttime surveys have been done for birds to rule out a potential negative impact to migratory birds. The wind farms already built in Washington are in areas of open habitat, none within forests.</i>  |
| 269           | 1103-1107      | Gail Streicker              | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 270           | 1108-1112      | Joseph Witt                 | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 271           | 1113-1117      | Sandra Siegner              | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 272           | 1118-1122      | ellen maddex                | Eugene, OR resident      | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 273           | 1123-1137      | J.G. Zettergren             | McMinville, OR resident  | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 274           | 1128-1132      | Robert and Dolores Scheelen | Medford, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 275           | 1133           | Laila and James Tedford     | Hood River, OR resident  | VR1        | <i>It is not responsible in any way to place a wind turbine farm in the key viewing area within a National Scenic Area. (Discussion of real estate, scenic value, and social responsibility values)...Do not allow a corporation to so totally disregard the intent of the National Scenic Area provisions and to act so irresponsibly with this turbine project. The livelihoods of thousands of families in the Gorge are tied to the tourist industry, which is tied inextricably to our beautiful scenery and breathtaking views. These turbines would forever mar the landscape, views, and quality of life in the Gorge. Please say "NO" to the Whistling Ridge Energy Project if it remains visible from locations within the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.</i> |
| 276           | 1134-1138      | elena efoli                 | Gresham, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 277           | 1139-1143      | Peggy Kirkendall            | West Linn, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 278           | 1144-1148      | Judith Arcana               | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 279           | 1149-1153      | Charles Baker               | Salem, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 280           |                |                             |                          | X          | Copy of letter 279  |
| 281           | 1154-1158      | Paul Wilson                 | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 282           | 1159-1163      | Kathie Phillips             | Gresham, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 283           | 1164-1168      | Jan Polychronis             | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 284           | 1169-1173      | Jackie Bollinger            | Sandy, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 285           | 1174           | Loreley Drach               | Underwood, WA resident   | VR1        | <i>Please EFSEC, help society protect this place and other special places for generations to come. Do not allow this Industrial Energy Development to degrade the CRGNSA and blow the door open for other industrial development to further mar the Scenic Views of a National Scenic Area. Some places are too special to destroy, for any reason.</i>   |
| 286           | 1175-1179      | Delores Porch               | Gresham, OR resident     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 287           | 1180-1184      | Jann Lane                   | Lake Oswego, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 288           | 1185           | Thomas and Marlene Woodward | Husum, WA resident       | VR1        | <i>As long time residents of the White Salmon Valley we would like to express our opposition to the proposed Whistling Ridge Energy Project. This industrial wind turbine project violates both the letter and the spirit of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area Act. These massive turbines will forever alter the scenic landscape which the Gorge Act seeks to protect. It also has the potential to degrade wildlife habitat, negatively impact forests, and will result in extensive road construction within the Scenic Area.</i>   |
| 289           | 1186-1190      | Marshall Goldberg           | Portland, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 290           | 1191-1195      | Nancy O'Harrow              | Canby, OR resident       | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 291           | 1196-1200      | Evelyn Bejarano de Kiraly   | Woodburn, OR resident    | F          | Same as 19-23   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name     | Affiliation                          | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|---|
| 292           | 1201           | Willemina Van Pelt | Hood River, OR resident              | VR1        | <i>I am opposed to having wind turbines being placed in the area of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic area on the Washington side. These would ruin the beautiful and natural look of the Gorge which should be conserved to appreciate the nature and animal life that exists. Please say NO.</i>   |
| 293           | 1202           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | AL1        | <i>What little planning that has occurred for regional siting of wind power, has emphasized the importance of dispersing wind power projects throughout the Northwest in order to limit the environmental impacts to anyone area. (Source: the WIF Document, "Northwest Wind Integration Action Plan," March 2007, by the Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest Power and Conservation Council.) Just the opposite has happened do to lack of proper oversight and planning. A vast majority of the projects have been sited along the Columbia River Gorge and surrounding Columbia Plateau. This focuses the environmental impacts of wind power on a very sensitive area for birds: the cross roads of the Pacific Flyway and the east - west flyway used by birds for easy passage through the Cascade Range. As you know, proper siting has long been declared the key to green wind power. So far, the two words that best describes Northwest wind power siting are: Huge Mistake.</i> |
| 293           | 1203           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | CE2        | <i>Both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Washington Department of fish and Wildlife have consistently expressed the need for regional planning and cumulative impact studies for Northwest wind power. They have expressed this need for almost the last twenty years. But it has never happened. We believe the reason for this is that if planning or cumulative impact studies had occurred, wind power would have been limited, and the energy companies are to powerful to let that be allowed.</i>  |
| 293           | 1204           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | EG1        | <i>As you well know, Northwest transmission lines are now at capacity. A lot of the time wind towers are "turned off" to avoid overloading the system. This certainly brings into question the need for even more power production. (Source: The WIF Document, "Northwest Wind Integration Action Plan," March 2007.)</i>   |
| 293           | 1205           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | NQ2        | <i>The impacts of wind power should include: The C02 and other emissions from the new conventional back up power sources that are known to be needed;</i>   |
| 293           | 1206           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | EG1        | <i>the potential for significant damages to power producers due to wind power variations overloading the system;</i>  |
| 293           | 1207           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | EG1        | <i>the building of extensive new power transmission lines; the addition of new "smart" equipment to adapt the entire transmission system to the inconsistent nature of wind power;</i>  |
| 293           | 1208           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | FW2        | <i>and the known need for huge earthen dams, like those being proposed in Klickitat County in the Columbia Hill Important Bird Area, so that wind power can be stored when transmission lines are at capacity. It should be noted that adding large unnatural lakes in or near areas where wind power is being developed will only aggravate the bird problem by increasing the desirability of the area for birds.</i>   |
| 293           | 1209           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | LU1        | <i>We also believe the fact that border to border wind power development is being allowed in the National Audubon Society designated Columbia Hills Important Bird Area in Klickitat County demonstrates very well the failure of proper siting for wind power.</i>   |
| 293           | 1210           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | PM2        | <i>In Klickitat County there seems to be a five year grace period on taxes, planning expenses, liability insurance, and decommissioning bonding for wind power. These are impacts and should be recognized as such. We suspect that these practices are standard operating procedure for wind power proponents. We believe some of these practices to be illegal.</i>   |
| 293           | 1211           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | PM2        | <i>We believe that the primary purpose of dividing projects into smaller components is to avoid proper State Environmental Policy Act regulation and state level oversight. We raised this issue with you in an earlier letter in which we requested information about your responsibilities and information on whether there is a size level for projects to trigger state oversight. We have never received a reply from you regarding this matter.</i>   |
| 293           | 1212           | Tom Thies          | Columbia River Gorge Audubon Society | PM2        | <i>We wish to bring to your attention the fact that members of the SDS company tried to permit a large permanent power plant on their mill site using a permitting process for a much smaller (less expensive and less restrictive) mobile power plant. That permit almost went through DOE. before the deception was discovered by a local citizen. At that point, the permit application was dropped and later proper permitting was applied for. We believe this story serves to demonstrate two things: the proponent is very powerful and has successfully manipulated an important state oversight agency in the recent past, and they are willing to bend any rule to their own benefit. You should be alert to this.</i>  |
| 294           | 1213           |                    |                                      | X          | <i>nothing - cover letter</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 295           | 1214           | Gretchen Starke     | Vancouver Audubon Society | FW2        | <i>we request that the following be included. • A careful evaluation must be done of all wildlife in the area, especially the birds. It is not enough to go out just once or twice and count birds. There must be numerous surveys over the course of a year. This is a minimum. The surveys must be done in all seasons. Nesting and wintering birds must be noted. It is particularly important to determine whether or not the site is part of a migration area. The species and numbers of raptor and owl prey species must especially be determined.</i>  |
| 295           | 1215           | Gretchen Starke     | Vancouver Audubon Society | FW1        | <i>As a listed species, the Northern Spotted Owl must be given particular consideration. It is not enough to determine whether or not owls are present. The presence of potential owl habitat needs to also be determined. As the NSO is declining in Washington at an alarming rate, potential habitat must be kept available for young owls to disperse in. This is particularly the case on public land, as publicly owned forests belong to the people of the state.</i>   |
| 295           | 1216           | Gretchen Starke     | Vancouver Audubon Society | CE2        | <i>Cumulative effects of this project in relation to any other development, both present or possible future, must be considered. Too often I have seen EISs either ignore or treat lightly the potential cumulative effects of a number of projects. The impact of a project of this magnitude must be analyzed in relation to other development, such as timber harvest. Even the possibility of disastrous wipeout of habitat from natural causes such as fire must be analyzed.</i>   |
| 295           | 1217           | Gretchen Starke     | Vancouver Audubon Society | MT1        | <i>It must be stated in the EIS that there will be a need for long term monitoring to determine if the turbines are causing any mortality. Monitoring must include observations at night as well as in the daytime. Carcasses of birds and bats killed by turbines do not stay on the ground long. Scavengers find them quickly.</i>   |
| 295           | 1218           | Gretchen Starke     | Vancouver Audubon Society | CE1        | <i>The EIS must cover the environmental impacts of developing the project and of long term operation of the project. Impacts on birds in both phases of the project must be included.</i>  |
| 296           | 1219           | Lee Lloyd           | Underwood, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>To me, there are few untouched landscapes left in this world, due to large scale projects like the one proposed. I feel like we receive many visitors to this area to appreciate the natural beauty of the Gorge and tourism is a very large part of our economy.</i>   |
| 296           | 1220-1221224   | Lee Lloyd           | Underwood, WA resident    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 296           | 1225           | Lee Lloyd           | Underwood, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>The project would introduce highly visible industrial facilities into the natural, forested landscape, protruding above ridgelines and detracting from the natural scenic beauty of the Gorge. The wind towers would have daytime and nighttime warning lights, which would worsen the aggravate scenic impacts. The other night I discovered that from my deck of my home in Underwood, I am able to see the flashing lights of the windmills that are significantly farther down the Gorge. The lights that we saw we all the way in Maryhill. How will this impact people who live in White Salmon, Underwood, and Hood River? Also I am surprised to hear of a project so close to a National Scenic Area. It took us about 2 years to have the plans for our home approved and there is no way that our home is visible from Hwy 84. I feel like this is a huge contradiction.</i> |
| 297           | 1226-1230      | Don Stephens        | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 298           | 1231-1235      | John and Polly Wood | Hood River, OR resident   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 299           | 1236           |                     |                           | X          | <i>copy of letter #298</i>   |
| 300           | 1237-1241      | Cherie Hunton       | Oregon City, OR resident  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 301           | 1242-1246      | Tom Quinn           | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 302           | 1247           | Dee Hurlburt        | White Salmon, WA resident | AL1        | <i>I live in White Salmon, Washington, and the turbines will be visible from my property. I have lived here for 20 years and enjoyed the Gorge and the wonderful views of the Columbia River and Mt. Hood. This project just doesn't make any sense to me putting it in this location. To have 426 foot turbines with red flashing lights on them in a scenic area that attracts tourism is baffling to me. This is a recreation area that generates an economy for lots of local people. Don't get me wrong, I support the wind generated power but think it should be in less populated areas. Two weeks ago we camped at Maryhill Campground and saw what the turbines in that area look like--they have a huge impact....White Salmon is a poor little town that needs the tourism to help its economy, tell SDS to build their turbines in a more appropriate location.</i>           |
| 303           | 1248-1252      | Cheyne Cumming      | Portland, OR resident     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 304           | 1253-1257      | Steven Erickson     | White Salmon, WA resident | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 305           | 1258           |                     |                           | F          | <i>Copy of letter #304</i>   |
| 306           | 1259           | Tood Douglass       | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>I am outraged that what has already been declared a National Scenic Area - to protect unique scenic beauty, history, wildlife, forests, plants and views - is being threatened by this large scale project.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|---|
| 306           | 1260           | Tood Douglass  | Hood River, OR resident | VR1        | <i>PLEASE LOOK AT THIS RESPONSIBLY FOR THE LONG TERM -- PROTECT WHAT LITTLE SCENIC TREASURES ARE LEFT. COME SEE HOW BUSY THE TRAILHEADS AND ROADS AND RIVER IS THROUGHOUT THE GORGE ON A BEAUTIFUL WEEKEND. THOUSANDS TRAVEL HERE AND TREASURE ITS RARE BEAUTY.</i>   |
| 307           | 1261           | RICHARD POTTER | Underwood, WA resident  | PM4        | <i>We need green energy, even if it is in my backyard. Our President has told us that green energy, including wind, is the future. We also need renewable energy to comply with a recently approved Washington state initiative. This is clean and renewable power</i>  |
| 307           | 1262           | RICHARD POTTER | Underwood, WA resident  | SE4        | <i>This project will give Skamania County an economic boost which will include construction jobs, permanent maintenance jobs, and a substantial increase in tax revenue for the county and schools.</i>   |
| 308           | 1263           | James Milling  | Hood River, OR resident | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 309           | 1264           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | EG1        | <i>First, a comment was made that storage of electrical energy was a precondition to development of wind-based power generation. This is not true. Storage is an adjunct concern with respect to very large-scale deployment of wind turbine generating systems. We're not close to such a situation. At this point in the game, the intermittency of wind is a non-factor, because wind-generated electrical power merely supplants some portion of supply from expensive peak-power-generating facilities.</i>  |
| 309           | 1265           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | EG1        | <i>At this point in the game, the intermittency of wind is a non-factor, because wind-generated electrical power merely supplants some portion of supply from expensive peak-power-generating facilities.</i>   |
| 309           | 1266           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | EG1        | <i>Base supply - generally, hydro-driven, nuclear heated, or coal-fired - remains just that: base supply. Wind-power is not currently pervasive enough in any country to constitute abase supply. Instead, when the wind blows sufficiently, the power generated by wind turbines can be used to meet some portion of peak demand. This reduces the need for energy-system managers to call up supplemental generating capacity (usually gas-fired) - sometimes called "peaker" plants. From a market-cost standpoint, the energy from these plants is substantially more expensive than base supply and vastly more costly than that delivered from wind turbines. Therefore, the wind-based power is added preferentially over the conventional "peaker" plant power. The upshot is that storage is not an issue, until wind-derived power is a major factor in the regional power system.</i>  |
| 309           | 1267           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | EG1        | <i>The second comment - of a similar nature - was that wind turbines require an equivalent amount of non-wind-driven generating capacity as back-up (gas-fired facilities, as I gathered from the commenter)....We're not close to that situation as yet.</i>   |
| 309           | 1268           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | NQ1        | <i>Disbelief in the two main medical wind turbine vibration health effects studies -Pierpoint and the one from England based on lack of evidence and small study group sizes. As to such warnings - we should all admit that there are risks in every endeavor, so the point should be that, lacking strong data signals, we should proceed with due caution and monitor for possible problems. This includes the possibility that low-frequency vibration can impact health negatively. However, "monitor" is the key word here, not prevent...In this regard, here is an arrangement from a recent siting decision in Maine: "... Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention 'finds no evidence in peer-reviewed medical and public health literature of adverse health effects from the kinds of noise and vibrations associated with wind turbines other than occasional reports of annoyances.' First Wind [the developer] must pay for and 'implement an operational compliance assessment methodology for use during very selective, meteorological and background sound conditions' to ensure its compliance with state regulations.<br/><br/>If the project breaches its limits of 55 decibels at daytime and 45 dBA nightly, First Wind would have 60 days to submit a remediation plan or face fines...." This could serve as a template for similar rule's) regarding the Whistling Ridge project.</i> |
| 309           | 1269           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | FW2        | <i>My fourth objection is to a class of statements regarding danger to animal life. I think that I can safely assume that this subject is an important facet of your EIS and will require substantial fieldwork, plus literature review. Some commenter's, however, seemed to assume that existing studies falsely understate current damage to birds and bats - or that the life of a single bird or bat is grounds for a siting denial. I think that the same argument applies to this issue as applies to the human health issue. So the question becomes, what is the threshold at which the damage is viewed as too costly to proceed with the project? It seems to me that EFSEC should answer such questions early-on, in order to establish criteria for the various related studies.</i>   |
| 309           | 1270           | Paul Spencer   | Stevenson, WA resident  | VR1        | <i>I like the looks of wind turbines. I think that they are aesthetically pleasing - majestic, if you will.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name     | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 309           | 1271           | Paul Spencer       | Stevenson, WA resident  | VR1        | I have a great view of the gorge, and the wind turbine lights will not bother me.  |
| 309           | 1272           | Paul Spencer       | Stevenson, WA resident  | SE6        | <i>your EIS must include socio-economic effects. I know that you know, but I will repeat it anyway: Skamania County is a poor county. We are hamstrung by federal agencies that control 85% of our land base. Outside forces have 'locked up' the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (78% of the land in the county) to the point that the last vestiges of timber-related industry here buy logs from distant locations in, for instance, Idaho.</i>   |
| 309           | 1273           | Paul Spencer       | Stevenson, WA resident  | VR1        | <i>Then there's the National Scenic Area. Mr. Luce may remember that, when the related legislation was proposed, more than 80% of county residents opposed it. Nonetheless, here we are with another 7% of county land tied up by NSA restrictions.</i>  |
| 310           | 1274           | Rebecca Dondlinger | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 311           | 1275           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | SE4        | <i>We oppose this project as to its scope and necessity. Our family has lived in Underwood for 22 years. The typical type of stress we face on a daily basis is getting stuck behind the school bus on the way down Cook-Underwood Road. This project will change everyone's way of life here in a negative way.</i>   |
| 311           | 1276           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | TT1        | <i>We live within 150 yards of the intersection of Kollock-Knapp and Cook Underwood. The applicant proposes reconfiguring the intersection and removing trees. Many families in our neighborhood take walks on a daily basis through that area, and we wonder why we must subsidize the applicant by destroying our peace and quite, having flagging crews near our driveway and thus ruining our lifestyle.</i>   |
| 311           | 1277           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | TT1        | <i>We also drive through the intersection and the 3.5 miles down Cook-Underwood road at least 6 times per day to get to work, to take children to school, to attend extra curricular activities, all of which are time sensitive. Why should we, as a community, have to schedule around road closures just so the applicant can make a dime. 20 minute delays or an alternate route triples a normal 10 minute drive to White Salmon.</i>   |
| 311           | 1278           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | TT1        | <i>The applicant has shown little sensitivity in their historical projects that affect what the public must view. Given the opportunity to leave limited tree buffers along popular biking and other public roadways, they chose not to. While this is their choice on their land, it speaks to how sensitive they will be if allowed to rip up intersections and clog our roads..</i>   |
| 311           | 1279           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | SE1        | <i>Underwood has become a place where people come to see the expanse of the Gorge and the Hood River Valley. Cook-Underwood Road is a major sightseeing attraction as evidenced by the large numbers of bikers and motorcycle groups that travel through from one end to the next. Why ruin that?</i>  |
| 311           | 1280           | Kristi Reynier     | Underwood, WA resident  | FW2        | <i>We also are concerned about the negative effects to personal health and wildlife. The area is diverse with wildlife. We have elk, bear, bobcat and a variety of birds of prey. Why risk this refuge for the applicant's corporate gain?</i>   |
| 312           | 1281-1285      | Glenn Johndohl     | Portland, OR resident   | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 313           | 1286-1290      | Maureen Busby      | Hood River, OR resident | F          | Same as 19-23  |
| 314           | 1291           | Adrienne Ruderman  | Underwood, WA resident  | EG2        | <i>1. Wind Power in the current location - as I understand, due to the wind in current location wind generation would occur about 40% of the time. natural Gas would be required as a backup. Looking at this from a purely objective stand point, this is not a good location for a wind powered facility. I think that people are jumping on the band wagon for wind power when this is an old technology that is extremely expensive and not efficient. There is a need for clean/green energy but I don't think that this is it.</i>   |
| 314           | 1292           | Adrienne Ruderman  | Underwood, WA resident  | SE4        | <i>Jobs - this project looks to create 8 long term jobs. The project is being presented as a way to bring "jobs" to a depressed community/county. There has been other projects/developments proposed that would have brought hundreds of jobs to our community - these were turned down by the local councils..... this project will be a positive for SDS but not for the local communities.</i>   |
| 314           | 1293           | Adrienne Ruderman  | Underwood, WA resident  | VR1        | <i>Scenic area - I keep hearing the argument that you should be able to do what you want to on your property. Those of us who live in this area have all had to abide by certain rules pertaining to how we can develop our land in order to preserve the National Scenic Area. We did this in order to maintain the beauty of an area unsurpassed in this world. Once this has been compromised there is no going back. The 50S lumber company has thus far been exempt from following the guidelines of the National Scenic Area. I think that it is time to change this the rules should apply to everyone.</i> |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name    | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|---|------------|---|
| 314           | 1294           | Adrienne Ruderman | Underwood, WA resident                                | SE3        | <i>I believe that the estimates for "clean/green" power are being greatly overestimated along with the projections for economic growth and job creation. I feel that the downsides to the environment and the destruction of the National Scenic Area will have a far more negative impact on our community and it's future growth.</i>   |
| 315           | 1295-1299      | Tyler Bech        | Hood River, OR resident                               | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 316           | 1300-1304      | Pat Hazlett       | Portland, OR resident                                 | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 317           | 1305-1309      | John Christensen  | Corbett, OR resident                                  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 318           | 1310-1314      | Liz Kingslien     | Lyle, WA resident                                     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 319           | 1315-1319      | Dave bisset       | Hood River, OR resident                               | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 320           | 1320           | Wirt T. Maxey     | Peters, Maxey, Short and Maxey P.A., Coral Gables, FL | SG2        | <i>The EIS for the referenced project should include in depth studies of environmental impacts in connection with (1) unstable lands in the project area; Attached is FPA # 2702754 The second page of the document ( Office Checklist and Summary) indicates the project area has " Unstable Slopes", "High Erosion Potential" and "High Mass Wasting Potential" and that the project is within a Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area (SOSEA). . The Notice of Decision (second to last page of the document) disapproves the application because: "This application is disapproved due to unstable land features. Four shallow landslides and earth flows were identified, including a shallow landslide with bedrock hollow and Perennial Initiation Point, and inner gorge"</i> |
| 320           | 1321           | Wirt T. Maxey     | Peters, Maxey, Short and Maxey P.A., Coral Gables, FL | FW1        | <i>The EIS for the referenced project should include in depth studies of environmental impacts in connection with (2) endangered or threatened species in or in close proximity to the project area; Attached is FPA # 2702754...The second page of the document ( Office Checklist and Summary) indicates the project area... is within a Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area (SOSEA)...As well the Notice of Decision indicates that; "Bull Trout, a federally listed threatened species, may occur in the area..."</i>   |
| 320           | 1322           | Wirt T. Maxey     | Peters, Maxey, Short and Maxey P.A., Coral Gables, FL | VR1        | <i>The EIS for the referenced project should include in depth studies of environmental impacts in connection with ((3) scenic impacts...It is beyond argument that the project, if allowed to proceed, would completely dominate the viewshed of the National Scenic Area, day and night, with turbines that are 450 +/- feet tall, equipped with strobe lights on top. Measure 937 (codified as RCW 19.285) provides for "appropriately sited" renewable energy projects. Please see below.. (text of RCW 19.285 copied).</i>  |
| 320           | 1323           | Wirt T. Maxey     | Peters, Maxey, Short and Maxey P.A., Coral Gables, FL | VR1        | <i>In light of the Whistling Ridge Project's potential enormous impact on the NSA's scenic resources, it is urged that EFSEC adopt the Gorge Commission's standard of" Visual Subordination" as the standard for determining if this project is "appropriately sited" as required by RCW 19.285.020. There is only one NSA. It cannot be picked up and moved elsewhere. On the other hand, there are numerous alternative places in Washington where wind projects can be sited.</i>  |
| 321           | 1324           | Barbara Miller    | Portland, OR resident                                 | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 322           | 1325           | Sharon McCormack  | White Salmon, WA resident                             | SE1        | <i>ARE YOU CRAZY? Have you even seen a MAP of Klickitat County??? Can you see the VAST AMOUNT OF EMPTY SPACE to the east of our very populated and highly treasured tourist/scenic area? Maybe you should take a drive!!! Don't you see the reason this area has become more popular (expensive/desirable) is BECAUSE OF THE NATURAL BEAUTY???? MY PROPERTY TAXES DOUBLED, because of this scenic beauty. Values will certainly be lessened as a result, I.E. TAX dollars will be lessened. Tourism will be lessened.</i>   |
| 322           | 1326           | Sharon McCormack  | White Salmon, WA resident                             | AL1        | <i>There is an ENORMOUS amount of empty space in the east of the county, windmills are GREAT out there; PLUS there is MORE WIND OUT THERE!</i>  |
| 323           | 1327-1331      | Charlotte Nuessle | Ashland, OR resident                                  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 324           | 1332-1336      | Pepper Trail      | Ashland, OR resident                                  | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 325           | 1337           | Mary Repar        | Stevenson, WA resident                                | DX         | <i>Document attached: Skamania County Comp Plan</i>   |
| 325           | 1338           | Mary Repar        | Stevenson, WA resident                                | LU1        | <i>...then EFSEC, a non-elected, selected group of WA State government paid officials gets to preempt OUR zoning laws, even if there is no consistency between the Zoning laws and our Comprehensive Plan</i>   |
| 325           | 1339           | Mary Repar        | Stevenson, WA resident                                | FW2        | <i>[SDS] would, with this project, decimate and fragment wildlife habitat, kill birds and bats, pollute our waters, and endanger the health, well-being, and welfare of our human community, in our backyard for 20 years?!?</i>  |
| 325           | 1340           | Mary Repar        | Stevenson, WA resident                                | PM2        | <i>I've decided that EFSEC needs to be disbanded and our legislature and public need to re-assert their authority on the body politic....EFSEC's "one-stop shop" for siting facilities, available to anyone with enough cash and influence, seems to me to be very un-American and downright subversive.</i>  |
| 325           | 1341           | Mary Repar        | Stevenson, WA resident                                | SE5        | <i>The Precautionary Principle still stands true—First, do no harm. Better to be safe than sorry is the best axiom to employ wherever any new grand technology comes before us.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 325           | 1342           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | SE3        | <i>Immediate so-called benefits don't necessarily pan out in the long run. And, some new technologies have been shown to have long-term disastrous effects.</i>  |
| 325           | 1343           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | PM2        | <i>WA State Constitution and Eminent Domain. How does pre-emption by EFSEC jive with the State constitution?? I don't think it does, but I guess we will leave that to the lawyers. Preemption of local land use laws by EFSEC affects all county residents one way or another. This preemption is a "taking" and the WA Constitution should apply. This is a preemption for public use since EFSEC's mission is to improve the energy status of the State, a public entity. Even though EFSEC is dealing with a private entity, that entity would be helping EFSEC achieve its State mission, the promulgation of alternative energy technologies and uses. And, CTED also supports this mission. The WA State Constitution, SECTION 16 EMINENT DOMAIN, states..</i>  |
| 325           | 1344           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | LU1        | <i>BOCC fails to follow County Comprehensive Plan. Our own Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) did not follow the County Comprehensive plan goals for public participation! They were so busy trying to ram this SDS Wind Farm Project through that they forgot that the people elected them and they are responsible to the people of Skamania County. Goal LU 6 of the Comp Plan states: To provide opportunities for citizen participation in the government decision process and in planning activities regarding land development.</i>   |
| 325           | 1345           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | LU1        | <i>EFSEC on 07 May. The EFSEC asked no pertinent questions and that was the extent of any public "review" of the Certificate of Land Use Consistency for an alleged project that is inconsistent with the land use laws of Skamania County!! Why didn't EFSEC ask any questions or review the document while the public was present at this public hearing so that all of us could have been included in the public process and could understand it better?</i>  |
| 325           | 1346           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | LU1        | <i>So, the public had no chance to view either the Resolution 2009-22...the proposed industrial wind farm that is not allowed under our Comprehensive Plan, and an underhanded attempt to subvert the public participation process for the SDS Lumber Whistling Ridge Wind Farm Project. There was no effort by the BOCC to give the public their rightful opportunities to comment on the CLUC document. This is a failure of leadership. It is also illegal under the letter, intent, and spirit of our County's Comprehensive Plan.</i>   |
| 325           | 1347           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | LU1        | <i>The citizens of Skamania are not the only ones who think that rural character should be preserved. Our legislature also thinks so. RCW 36.70A.011, Findings — Rural lands, states: citation]...I could not have said it better myself. Large-scale wind farms are not part of rural character and are certainly not consistent with the land use laws in our Comprehensive Plan. [Comp Plan attached.]</i>  |
| 325           | 1348           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | LU1        | <i>Since Skamania County does not fall under GMA total planning, the siting issue cannot be addressed under GMA rules. It is plain that the legislature intended that rural lands "develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; foster opportunities for small-scale, rural-based employment and self-employment; permit the operation of rural-based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns; be compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; foster the private stewardship of the land and preservation of open space; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life." RCW 36.70A.011</i> |
| 325           | 1349           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | PM3        | <i>Comments related to the legality of CTED/EFSEC's authority, CTED's goals, consistency of wind farms with the Skamania County Comprehensive Plan, intent of GMA.</i>   |
| 325           | 1350           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | SE3        | <i>A cost-benefit analysis should be done to see what the impacts would cost our community, and what benefits there may be. In order to make an informed decision, a cost-benefit analysis is imperative.</i>  |
| 325           | 1351           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | AL1        | <i>Will EFSEC include a "no action" alternative?</i>   |
| 325           | 1352           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | SW1        | <i>A thorough study of the existing, known, and unknown water bodies should be made.</i>   |
| 325           | 1353           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | SW1        | <i>Pollution rolls downhill. Water rolls downhill. We don't need pesticides and herbicides in our water ways, especially in the Columbia River which is already on the watch list for toxins loads. A TMDL study should be done on the project site and surrounding areas (areas of recharge and water sources) to ascertain environmental pollution loads, water sources, recharge rates, etc.</i>  |
| 325           | 1354           | Mary Repar     | Stevenson, WA resident | PM5        | <i>Hopefully, once EFSEC has all the facts you will deny the Whistling Ridge aka Saddleback application and we can all go back to fighting our commissioners about preserving the rural character of our county and keeping industrialization at bay!!</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---|------------|---|
| 326           | 1355           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | NQ3        | <i>Noise: Although we are located two miles from the Project, we are concerned that this distance will not protect us due to our geography and wind patterns...We are concerned that sound from the Project will echo off valley walls and have an amplified effect on us.</i>  |
| 326           | 1356           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | NQ1        | <i>In addition, the prevailing winds in the summer (when we are outside most) blow from the Project straight to our homes. So we are also concerned that the wind will carry more noise from the Project to us.</i>   |
| 326           | 1357           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | NQ1        | <i>SDS's application has a sound map suggesting that our area will receive 20+ dB of sound from the Project. It is not at all clear to us how this map was produced or whether it is reliable. Perhaps more important, based on reports we have read from residents located near active wind farms, specific decibel measurements might not be the best way to determine whether noise from wind turbines will have an adverse effect. Some of the strongest complaints about wind turbine noise are due to the low-frequency sounds - a constant "whumping" similar to the bass beat that can be heard (and felt) from certain car stereos even from a great distance, and even with the windows rolled up. We have heard that these low frequency sounds can sometimes have much greater impact at a distance than they do at the point of creation. We are therefore very worried about how such sounds might affect us.</i> |
| 326           | 1358           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | NQ1        | <i>It is our understanding that few if any wind projects have been built in terrain with valleys and ridges like ours. So it seems there is very little track record for predicting how noise from the Project might affect us. We therefore request that the EIS make very extensive studies of how sound from the Project will affect us and other residents. In particular, we think tests should be conducted that reproduce, at the Project site, the noise from a project of this size as accurately as technologically possible. Measurements of the noise should be taken not only with instruments, but more importantly, with surveys of the subjective impressions of all affected residents. Unless such surveys are taken, we do not believe an accurate prediction can be made regarding noise effects of the Project.</i>  |
| 326           | 1359           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | NQ1        | <i>Lastly, in evaluating whether such noise effects' (or any other effects to people) are considered "adverse", we request that EFSEC and BPA rely not on statutory definitions based on decibel levels. Rather, a conclusion that an effect will be "adverse" should be determined by whether the effect will unreasonably diminish the enjoyment of day-to-day life.</i>  |
| 326           | 1360           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | VR2        | <i>We request that the EIS Investigate what types of light (color, synchronization, quantity, etc.) would have the least impact to people and wildlife. We also request that the EIS evaluate what, if any visual effects aviation lights will have on the night sky in our community (for example, will we see reflections of the lights in the sky on cloudy nights, or even on clear nights?) Likewise, we have read of complaints about "shadow-flicker" from wind turbines. We request that the EIS evaluate whether late afternoon "shadow flicker" will affect our residences, or be visible on the ridges to the east of our community.</i>   |
| 326           | 1361           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | FW2        | <i>There are many items that should be considered from an environmental and ecosystem perspective regarding a large project like this...In particular, we are concerned that, due to this Project's location in a forest ecosystem, far more wildlife will be negatively affected or harmed than if it were located in a wheatfield or open plain environment. We are also concerned about whether there will be effects to groundwater and surface water. We request that the EIS carefully evaluate what effects the Project would have on wildlife and the ecosystem.</i>  |
| 326           | 1362           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | SE2        | <i>While proponents of the Project have correctly emphasized that it could bring some welcome jobs and tax revenues to the area, our Members are quite concerned that if the Project adversely affects our homes, our property values will also be adversely affected. The EIS should evaluate all financial effects of the Project, including specific estimates of diminished property values (region wide) due to reasonably foreseeable adverse effects of the Project.</i>   |
| 326           | 1363           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | VR1        | <i>Our Members have mixed opinions as to whether they would necessarily object to views of the wind turbines, however, most believe that structures of this nature are not in keeping with the spirit or beauty of a National Scenic Area even though such structures are built on land that is just outside of the boundary.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---|------------|--|
| 326           | 1364           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | AL1        | <i>It would appear that there are much better places to site a project of this magnitude. There are thousands of acres of farmland in Eastern Washington that can (and do) support this type of development. The land to the East is vast, it's close to transmission lines, it is many miles away from homes, has limited recreational value, limited wildlife (as compared to a forest), limited renewable resource (as compared to the timber resources here), there is limited damage to the ecosystem due to installation and it would not detract from views of a National Scenic area.</i>  |
| 326           | 1365           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | E11        | <i>We believe it is critical that the EIS address the potential precedent that would be set by approval of this Project. Because it is the first wind farm in Washington to be located in a forest environment (we are told), adjacent to a National Scenic Area, and close to so many residences, a very detailed and thorough analysis of its potential impacts must be provided.</i>  |
| 326           | 1366           | Mark King      | Northwestern Lake Development Homeowners' Association | CE1        | <i>However, we are worried that if this Project is approved now based on it's smaller size, it will be very difficult to prevent expansions that might initially have been rejected based on an upfront perspective of the total impacts. Consequently, we request that the EIS take the broadest possible view when evaluating the impacts of this Project.</i>   |
| 327           | 1367           | Mark E. Kelch  | Mosier, OR resident                                   | VR1        | <i>If windmills are located within the Columbia Scenic area or are visible from scenic area soil; they should have to be constrained to the same conforming restrictions that home owners have to endure</i>   |
| 328           | 1368           | James Trentner | LUMBERMEN'S UNDERWRITING ALLIANCE                     | EG1        | <i>Unlike several other energy options, wind power is clean, costs nothing to extract, and is waste free. In addition wind energy goes hand in hand with the new Obama administration goals and expectations to grow clean energy.</i>   |
| 328           | 1369           | James Trentner | LUMBERMEN'S UNDERWRITING ALLIANCE                     | SE4        | <i>Whistling Ridge Energy Project will provide many new renewable energy jobs</i>  |
| 328           | 1370           | James Trentner | LUMBERMEN'S UNDERWRITING ALLIANCE                     | SE6        | <i>Whistling Ridge Energy Project will...provide more income from local spending and property taxes...</i>   |
| 328           | 1371           | James Trentner | LUMBERMEN'S UNDERWRITING ALLIANCE                     | EG1        | <i>Whistling Ridge Energy Project ...and provide a cleaner use of energy.</i>  |
| 328           | 1372           | James Trentner | LUMBERMEN'S UNDERWRITING ALLIANCE                     | SE4        | <i>The Whistling Ridge Energy project will help improve the Skamania County and Washington unemployment rate</i>   |
| 329           | 1373           | Michael Ritter | WDFW  | FW2        | <i>Based solely on the data contained in the application. and subsequent data that will likely be presented in the EIS, the proposed Whistling Ridge Wind Energy Project could have adverse impacts to birds and bats. Therefore, WDFW recommends additional studies, as identified in section 2.17.2, specifically, northern goshawk and bat surveys. However, it is uncertain that the additional. data on northern goshawks, northern spotted owls, and bats coupled with the existing avian and bat data will alleviate WDFW concerns with potential impacts to birds and bats with this wind energy project. The habitat is predominately managed coniferous forests, a characteristic that has likely resulted in the high raptor, bat, and bird use/occurrence recorded at this site, and a habitat type that has little to none avian and bat data, impacts, and conclusions associated with wind energy development.</i>                                      |
| 329           | 1374           | Michael Ritter | WDFW  | FW2        | <i>There is a lack of comparable wind power projects in coniferous forests any where in the U.S. from which we can assess preconstruction avian and bat data with operational fatality. However, based on the data and statements such as, "thus, based solely on the presumed relationship between pre-construction bat activity and post-construction fatalities, bat mortality rates at SWRA may be higher than many other wind resource areas in the US" and "based on data collected during this study, raptor use of the Saddleback project area is...moderate to moderately high compared to most other WRAs evaluated .throughout the western and Midwestern US" our approach to this project at this point in time is to proceed cautiously, carefully consider, protect, and conserve the natural resources of the site and adjacent lands, and slow down the incentivized green energy freight train that is barreling through the State of Washington.</i> |
| 329           | 1375           | Michael Ritter | WDFW  | FW1        | <i>We recommend that the information presented on the Northern Goshawk, a State Candidate Species for listing and a Federal Species of Concern, be consistent throughout the application. For example, on Page 1-8 it states that "although no goshawks were detected during protocol surveys, individuals were spotted during general avian migration and breeding surveys." This is in contrast to the information in Section 2.17.2 that states "no goshawks were found on the project site, nor were any observed on any surrounding properties. It is highly unlikely that goshawks will be</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|
|               |                |                 |   |            | <i>found on the project site.. .' However, the data in Appendices B-5 and B-6 indicate that northern goshawks were recorded during both the Fall 2004 and Summer 2006 surveys. Additionally, Section 2.17.2 states that goshawk, and other avian species surveys were conducted ion 2004, 2005, and 2008. The appendices indicate that these surveys were also conducted in 2006.</i>   |
| 329           | 1376           | Michael Ritter  | WDFW  | FW2        | <i>We recommend that any statements addressing raptor mortality of operational wind power projects in shrub-steppe and agricultural habitats with the anticipated raptor mortality of this site be removed from any future reports as they are misleading. They are misleading because "other new wind plants in the Pacific Northwest" are in shrub steppe and agricultural habitats; not coniferous forest..." We appreciate that an attempt was made to suggest that raptor mortality "is expected to be low.' However, based on information in the application, raptor use of the site is high. In fact, ... "raptor use of the Saddleback area in Fall is approximately 1.5 times higher than mean fall use at the other WRAs:' (in east Oregon and Washington) and that. ...'raptor use of the Saddleback project area...is moderate to moderately high compared to most other WRAs evaluated throughout the western and Midwestern U.S.'</i> |
| 329           | 1377           | Michael Ritter  | WDFW  | FW1        | <i>Comprehensive auditory surveys were conducted for northern spotted owls and goshawks in 2004 and 2008. While the 2004 goshawk surveys appears to include the proposed turbine string to the east of the "Cedar Swamp" the 2008 survey does not. Interestingly, one bird species, the Barred Owl, was recorded frequently during the northern spotted owl surveys, but was not included in any of the avian reports. Additionally, while no spotted owls were recorded, we question the suitability of a wind farm within one of the few spotted owl special management areas in the State of Washington.</i>   |
| 329           | 1378           | Michael Ritter  | WDFW  | FW2        | <i>Table bat data is extremely interesting and alarming in that "no data on bat mortality levels associated with wind energy developments in western coniferous forests are available to help predict risk to bats at the Saddleback Wind Re...source Area." The data in Table 4 in Appendix B-8 should serve as warning that the Whistling Ridge Project could result in bat mortality 3-4 times higher than any other wind power project in the U.S. From Table 4, bat activity is a fairly good predictor of bat fatality. Fatality is presented in total number of bats/turbine. Using the Saddleback bat activity data from the table (138.4 bats) with the proposed SO turbines, almost 7,000 bats could potentially be killed on an annual basis. However, "bat fatality patterns may differ from those in open habitats as well as in eastern deciduous forests."</i>   |
| 329           | 1379           | Michael Ritter  | WDFW  | MT1        | <i>The Turbine Timber Buffer (Figure 2.3-4), may reduce the typical open turbine string corridor, thereby reducing its appearance as all avenue for bird and bat travel, but may also attract birds and bats as a roosting, foraging, and nesting habitat. At this point, we recommend that additional discussions occur to develop the most suitable management actions along the turbine strings.</i>   |
| 329           | 1380           | Michael Ritter  | WDFW  | FW2        | <i>We also recommend that sensitive features such as such as snags, water, Oregon white oak, and talus be identified as an aid to impact assessment.</i>  |
| 330           | 1381           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | CE2        | <i>Whistling Ridge is the first wind turbine farm to be sited in a forested area in the State of Washington. If approved and constructed, it will likely set a precedent for future development of wind turbine farms in forested habitat. Accordingly, the EIS should identify and carefully scrutinize all significant environmental impacts likely to result from the project, as well as all reasonable means of mitigating for, or avoiding, these impacts.</i>  |
| 330           | 1382           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | AL1        | <i>Alternatives to the Whistling Ridge project and cumulative impacts should also be fully explored.</i>  |
| 330           | 1383           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | FW1        | <i>CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following: 1. Rare and endangered plant species.</i>   |
| 330           | 1384           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | FW1        | <i>CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...2. Avian species and avian habitat, including endangered and threatened species and species of concern.</i>   |
| 330           | 1385           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | FW2        | <i>CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...3. Bats and bat habitat</i>   |
| 330           | 1386           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | FW1        | <i>CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...4. Wildlife and wildlife habitat, including endangered and threatened species, and species of concern.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|
| 330           | 1387           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | FW1        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...5. Fish and aquatic habitat, including endangered and threatened species and species of concern.  |
| 330           | 1388           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | SW2        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:... 6. Wetlands.   |
| 330           | 1389           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | SW1        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...7.Surface water.  |
| 330           | 1390           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | SV2        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...8.Ground water.   |
| 330           | 1391           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | NQ2        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...9.Air quality.  |
| 330           | 1392           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | NQ1        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...10.Noise.   |
| 330           | 1393           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | ER1        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...11.Wildfire.  |
| 330           | 1394           | H. Bruce Marvin | Counsel for the Environment, Office of the Attorney General | TT1        | CFE believes that the EIS, at a minimum, should analyze construction and operation impacts to, or arising from, the following:...12.Traffic.   |
| 331           | 1395           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | PM3        | I am very concerned about potential conclusions from an EIS where the fundamental data derived for analysis is prepared by the applicant. I have concerns that too much temptation exists to create data which favors a specific outcome.  |
| 331           | 1396           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | FW1        | Bald Eagle: This information needs to be included in great detail. Area has over wintering and year round population of Bald Eagles. Nesting sites, roosting sites, feeding sites and movement between the three sites need to be thoroughly addressed in relation to the proposed project. Migratory routes need to be addressed. Assessment should include the potential future lost recruitment from the loss of each adult.  |
| 331           | 1397           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | FW2        | Bat Survey: Bats are present in the area as early as March. We see bats frequently between the months of March and late September feeding in the perennial creek and around the forest fringes of our property. (Our property sits 2500 feet from the proposed project's southern area border.) The bat surveys should include the entire season for bat activity in the area (not just July-Sept). Also, particular emphasis should be placed on using methods that can positively identify the Townsends Big Eared Bat, a sensitive species residing in the nearby Lava Beds and reported to inhabit the White Salmon and Little White Salmon River valleys. More information needs to be known on the numbers, distribution, movement and status of this species prior to introducing a potentially significant cause of mortality into an important breeding area. |
| 331           | 1398           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | FW2        | Other Birds: All other birds of prey, migrating songbirds, and important candidate and sensitive species such as the Pileated Woodpecker need to be identified and the immediate and long term impacts on each species addressed.  |
| 331           | 1399           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | FW2        | Deer and Elk Over Wintering Range: Impacts on the migratory routes and over wintering range of wildlife needs to be addressed. The 1977 Skamania County Comprehensive Plan, page 75, graphically identifies heavy winter concentrations of wildlife to either side of the proposed project area.   |
| 331           | 1400           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | SW1        | Water Resources: The applicant omits the existence of a Perennial Stream in the immediate proximity to the A-Array in their maps. A DNR Forest Practices Application (FPA #2704293), submitted by SDS Lumber, the project applicant, clearly identifies this stream as adjacent to the project. (NP stands for Non-fish, Perennial) All streams in the proximity to the project need to be clearly identified and related impacts 'included in the EIS assessment.   |
| 331           | 1401           | Loreley Draeh   | Underwood, WA resident                                      | FW2        | Owl Survey: I have reviewed the preliminary application and find it very concerning the absence of owl responses. The area of the perennial stream mentioned above and not identified in the application contains significant owl habitat and needs to be included in the survey. Our suggestion is that all further EIS work needs to include extensive independently conducted owl surveys in this area beginning immediately.   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 331           | 1402           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | SG2        | <i>Geologically Unstable areas: The proposed project site contains unstable slopes. These need to be addressed in greater detail than identified in the application.</i>   |
| 331           | 1403           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | VR1        | <i>Scenic Impacts Visuals: Need to be performed to the USFS recommendations for assessment of NSA scenic impacts by qualified landscape architect. The application photo simulations were completely inadequate as were the assessment stated in the text. Furthermore, even the best still images can not communicate the visual dominance that rotating Turbine blades have on the scenic Viewsheds, regardless of their proximity to the National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 331           | 1404           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | SE1        | <i>Economic Impacts: Needs to address the long term economic impacts of degrading the outstanding scenic views. Comparable information from other sites such as World Heritage and National Parks of outstanding geology and low development indexes need to be included with National Scenic Area analysis. Economic Impact needs to address the long term implications, for example, when the novelty of wind turbines has dissipated and they are viewed as massive industrial energy complexes.</i>  |
| 331           | 1405           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | PM3        | <i>Maps: General area maps are not placed or scaled properly. Maps on land use are in many cases absolutely incorrect. These need to be corrected.</i>   |
| 331           | 1406           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | NQ1        | <i>Impacts on Human Health and Well Being: The project is proposed in complex topography and this factor needs to be included in any sound propagation modeling. Maximum sound levels (i.e. worst case scenarios) need to be modeled and reported honestly. The dBC range should be included. The latest information from qualified independent Medical Doctors and Researchers and Acoustical Engineers should be incorporated into study design and analysis. The applicant's preliminary report on Sound appears to use a rudimentary logarithmic decay model for sound attenuation based on standardized or idealized assumptions. Due to the complex topography and the proximity of non-participating landowners living in low-pressure zones below the proposed Turbines, a 3-dimensional sound propagation analysis is justified. Many engineering universities would have the infrastructure and capacity to undertake the analysis.</i>  |
| 331           | 1407           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | PM3        | <i>Forestry: The information as presented by the applicant attempts to show minimal impacts to forest operations. A perfect curved hillside is depicted as an example. This scenario would result in the smallest loss of trees for future forestry operations. Unfortunately, the presented scenario is not reality on the ground. The forestry operations are on the leading edges of ridges and on more gradually sloping ground where much more significant deforestation will need to be maintained. The EIS needs to map airflow and vegetation height for each string of turbines as it relates to topography and the actual acres that will be lost from forestry.</i>   |
| 331           | 1408           | Loreley Draeh  | Underwood, WA resident | LU1        | <p><i>Land use: The Applicant makes erroneous and contradictory assertions about the current and "proposed" land use. The Applicant should be required to completely redo the land use portion and depict it in a consistent and correct manner. As the application stands, the land use portion is filled with inaccuracies and misrepresentations. The impacts of this project as it relates to land use cannot be adequately assessed by anyone if only based on the information contained within the proponent's application material. Just a few examples: <b>Asserts:</b> 2.1.4. Pursuant to the locally adopted land use plans and ordinances in effect at the time of this application.... three to four turbines would be located on property zoned</i></p> <p><i>Residential 10... Actual: Turbines AI-A? are all located in For/Ag20 zone in the current zoning. This language may have been included when the applicant was writing and assuming the proposed zoning language would be passed. Asserts: 2.1.4. In the current draft ordinance, the entire project area is proposed for Forest Land 20 (FL-20) zoning. Actual: In the current draft ordinance, nearly the entire project is in lands zoned Commercial Resource Lands (CRL-40) and the first four turbines of the</i></p> <p><i>A-Array, sited in the adjacent section, are zoned Residential 10 (R-IO) and "Large-Scale Wind Energy Facilities" are not allowed in residential zones, period. This assertion also contradicts the assertion below. Asserts: Appendix E. In the proposed Title 21 zoning the Project would be entirely on lands proposed for inclusion in a new Commercial Resource Lands (CRL 40) zone. Actual: In the proposed zoning, the Project would</i></p> <p><i>NOT be entirely on lands proposed for inclusion in Commercial Resource Lands (CRL-40). A portion of the project is also proposed in a Residential zone where such a facility (or portion thereof) cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be sited! The proposed zoning states a half mile setback to residentially zoned lands. If a closer setback were allowed, turbines could NOT be any nearer than the height of the turbine plus 50 ft to a residential zone. This requirement removes the A-Array completely. The maps do not display this requirement of the proposed zoning.</i></p> |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                                       | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|
| 332           | 1409           | Rick Aramburu   | Save Our Scenic Area (SOSA)/Aramburu & Eustis LLP | X          | <i>*Copy of Comment Letter #6, also includes many attachments as supporting documentation (check to be sure the same are included in #6).</i>   |
| 333           | 1410           | Ann Frodel      | Gorge View Bed and Breakfast, Hood River, OR      | PM5        | <i>I am writing to request that the EFSEC deny this proposed construction of a wind farm that would allow up to 50, 426 ft tall wind turbines.</i>  |
| 333           | 1411           | Ann Frodel      | Gorge View Bed and Breakfast, Hood River, OR      | SE1        | <i>Hood River's number one industry is tourism and much of that is the draw of the wonderful natural beauty created by the protection offered through the Gorge National Scenic Act. One hundred and fourteen miles of wind turbines with flashing red lights on Saddle Back Mountain, (some of which are even in the Scenic Area), and visible from Hood River, White Salmon and Interstate 84, would be completely adverse to the purpose of the Scenic Act. Instead we would have an industrial site with towers and electrical lines highly visible night and day.</i>  |
| 333           | 1412           | Ann Frodel      | Gorge View Bed and Breakfast, Hood River, OR      | FW2        | <i>I also understand this is a highly forested area, rich in wild life and even two or three federally protected species. This proposal which includes miles of new roads, and cutting down 80 to 100 year old trees, clearing brush, and installing concrete pads would likely have a large adverse impact on this heavily forested area.</i>  |
| 334           | 1413           | Glenda Ryan     | Underwood, WA resident                            | TT1        | <i>I have concerns about the impact on our rural roads; major road reconstruction will have to take place to accommodate the large construction equipment necessary to build this project.</i>  |
| 334           | 1414           | Glenda Ryan     | Underwood, WA resident                            | SW1        | <i>My biggest concern is the amount of water needed for this project; water use to reduce dust on the roads, but .more importantly the amount needed to mix cement for the many concrete footings. We have a spring fed water system which during heavy use is depleted and takes time to recharge. Our exposure to wildfire makes it necessary to have a reliable source of water. The ongoing water problems of our neighboring community of White Salmon, Wa. makes this an issue that cannot be ignored.</i>  |
| 334           | 1415           | Glenda Ryan     | Underwood, WA resident                            | SW2        | <i>The "Cedar Swamp" northeast of the proposed site is a possible water source, but is also a very important wetland area for the many animals (deer, elk, cougars, &amp; birds) that live on Underwood Mountain.</i>   |
| 334           | 1416           | Glenda Ryan     | Underwood, WA resident                            | VR1        | <i>The project may be outside the scenic area, but it has a very large impact on the National Scenic Area and those of us living within those boundaries.</i>   |
| 334           | 1417           | Glenda Ryan     | Underwood, WA resident                            | AL1        | <i>Though I understand and support the need for renewable energy, there are many wide open, unoccupied areas in eastern Washington, that could better accommodate wind turbines. Those areas should be utilized first before we, consider industrial wind projects in residential communities.</i>  |
| 335           | 1418           | Matt Ryan       | Underwood, WA resident                            | AL1        | <i>...siting of this project is inappropriate. Proximity to numerous residential areas, water use issues, visual impacts from both turbines and navigation lighting, potential negative impacts for local agri-business and property values- these are just some of the many important reasons voiced during the public meetings which question the wisdom of siting a major energy project of this magnitude in this area. For these reasons I oppose the WREP.</i>  |
| 335           | 1419           | Matt Ryan       | Underwood, WA resident                            | NQ3        | <i>most objective commentators recommend a 2 mile set-back from habitable dwellings for large scale wind turbine installations. Many residences fall within this set back area and have a significant chance of negative health effects if this project is approved</i>   |
| 335           | 1420           | Matt Ryan       | Underwood, WA resident                            | AL1        | <i>There is a lot of potential sites for wind, solar, and other new energy developments in Washington that are not near residential areas- lets explore these sites before we start building on top of existing communities.</i>  |
| 335           | 1421           | Matt Ryan       | Underwood, WA resident                            | VR1        | <i>I would propose that if this project is approved, the seven most southerly turbines (the so-called "A Group") be eliminated or moved to the north end of the project. This "A Group" removal would allow for a reasonable set back for those property owners most affected, and would have a positive influence on the overall visual impacts to the scenic area. I realize this project is outside the boundary of the scenic area, and technically meets the legal requirements. But the boundaries were drawn With the reasonable assumption that dozens of skyscraper-height structures would nor be built-in the middle of the forest. This project may meet the letter of the law, but would certainly break the spirit of the Scenic Act.</i> |
| 336           | 1422           | Arlene Bradford | Underwood, WA resident                            | VR1        | <i>The view from Underwood Mtn has changed many times over the years with orchards being removed, vineyards going in, and residential development in Hood River. The view of wind turbines is also a change we must accept. (Photos of changing view over the years included as attachment)</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|------------|--|
| 336           | 1423           | Arlene Bradford | Underwood, WA resident     | CX1        | <i>We watch, several times a year, as the orchards and vineyards within our scope (several acres) are sprayed by workers wearing Hazmat suits and full protective face gear. We close our windows, bring in our pets and wait for the pesticide smell to go away. Oregon and SW Washington have the highest breast cancer rates in the nation (check several sites on internet, including the Susan B. Koman Breast Cancer site). All pesticides cause a type of cancer (EPA) and most farms in our area are not organic...I cannot believe that SOSA or the "Friends" group would consider concrete, steel and fiberglass hazardous to the health of those miles away or even next door.</i>  |
| 336           | 1424           | Arlene Bradford | Underwood, WA resident     | NQ1        | <i>Vibration, noise, wildlife kills, etc. are invalid and proven not problematic. Vibration would mean equipment malfunction and an expense the owners would correct immediately. Last weekend we carried out a very normal conversation right under one of the wind turbines in operation near Rufus without raising our voices.</i>  |
| 336           | 1425           | Arlene Bradford | Underwood, WA resident     | SE6        | <i>In the 17 years we have lived here, our home and land value has increased 165% while our taxes increased 206%. East Skamania county has no industry or tax-relief allowable sites to date. The only group benefiting from the growing recreational use in the NSA are the businesses in Hood River - hotels, restaurants and sports' rental agencies. We here, in Underwood, have been allowed no benefits and must pay for the cleanup of their use on our side of the river.</i>  |
| 337           |                |                 |                            | X          | <i>*comment letter #337 not included</i>   |
| 338           | 1426-1430      | John McIntosh   | Portland, OR resident      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 339           | 1431           | Jerry Powers    | Underwood, WA resident (?) | VR1        | <i>We are a retired couple who took their life savings and built a retirement home in the mountains free of noise and light pollution approximately two miles from the proposed site for these wind mills. Now in our beautiful area with the animals and birds you want to add noise and lights to upset our area. We oppose this site because of the our national scenic area will be upset.</i>   |
| 340           | 1432           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | FW1        | <i>I support this project, provided that the completed environmental studies safeguard or minimize adverse affects to threatened or endangered species.</i>  |
| 340           | 1433           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | SE4        | <i>Key benefits of the project as I see it include providing substantial short term construction employment in an economically depressed area...</i>   |
| 340           | 1434           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>Key benefits of the project as I see it include ...use of existing, strategically placed BPA power lines that would otherwise be extremely difficult and expensive to access, providing clean, renewable power to help avert global warming...,</i>   |
| 340           | 1435           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>Key benefits of the project as I see it include ...and the project's proximity to the greater Portland/ Vancouver area.</i>   |
| 340           | 1436           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | VR1        | <i>It does not bother me that the project would be sited just outside the Columbia Gorge National Scenic area, as long as the turbines are not actually inside the Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 340           | 1437           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | EG2        | <i>Somewhere I once read that the highest measured annual wind speed in the state of Washington was in this vicinity; given all the other advantages, I can see no reason not to exploit this resource in an environmentally sensitive fashion. Those who object to the appearance of wind turbines on the ridge tops above the National Scenic Area do not fully comprehend or appreciate the shocking advance of the detrimental effects of global warming...If significant emission reductions are delayed 1 -5 years or more, by not building out wind power projects in favorable sites like Whistling Wind as rapidly as possible, it will be very difficult to prevent global temperatures from exceeding 3.6 degrees F. This change would produce significant economic, social, political, and environmental disruptions..</i> |
| 340           | 1438           | North Cheatham  | Hood River, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>Collectively, our power consumption is increasing in the order of 1.1 - 1.3% annually, according to the US Department of Energy. We need the additional power Whistling Wind would contribute, we need it produced from environmentally benign sources, and we need it now. Washington's Renewable Energy Portfolio would be well served by this project.</i>   |
| 341           |                |                 |                            | X          | <i>*duplicate of comment letter #325</i>   |
| 342           | 1439-1443      | Mary Wiley      | Portland, OR resident      | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 343           | 1444-1448      | Jill Cooper     | Seattle, WA resident       | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>   |
| 344           | 1449           | V.R. Budworth   | unknown                    | PM5        | <i>Please no Wind Turbines on Underwood Mountain.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation         | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|--|
| 345           | 1450           | Jill Barker    | Mosier, OR resident | NQ1        | <p><i>Provides information from Rick James, a Sound Engineer from Michigan, to Wendy Todd, a resident of Mars Hill, Maine who is living with the tremendous negative effects of an industrial wind power project with turbines about 1/4 of a mile from her house...Rick James "1) The first form of harm from wind turbine noise is economic and aesthetic. The outdoors near homes within about a mile of a wind turbine has sound levels of 45-55 dBA. This is no longer the natural sound of the outdoors in a rural setting. That is, the wind turbine noise masks the normal soundscape and so</i></p> <p><i>the sounds of nature which were present 24/7/365 are now covered by the noise of the whooshing wind turbine blades. This has an annoyance effect and thus limits the use of outdoor properties since the soundscape that made the rural home's outdoors "special" has been destroyed. With wind turbines in place an outdoor walk or party is not much different than if one lived near a busy highway in an urban area. It is not a stroll through nature anymore. Sitting around at an outdoor party is not the same either. Instead of listening to the sounds of nature that</i></p> <p><i>make the outdoors so refreshing and enjoyable like the birds, tree frogs and other sources of natural ambient sound; one hears wind turbines. Thus, whatever economic and psychological assets one has in a 'country home' are lost. This is reflected in lower property values and loss of use of one's property for the purposes it was originally purchased. Thus, the outdoor noise from wind turbines does harm a local property owner boost economically and psychologically primarily due to annoyance at the loss of the pre-turbine conditions and being forced to 'live' with the same negatives as suburbanites without any of the benefits of suburban living (if there are any)."</i></p> |
| 345           | 1451           | Jill Barker    | Mosier, OR resident | NQ1        | <p><i>There is much new science emerging regarding industrial wind turbine noise, both at the audible and the low frequency levels, and its role in affecting the health of residents (and even domestic and wild animals) who live near these turbines. Since this impact can be so devastating and severe on humans and other species, this issue must be carefully studied BEFORE local, state or federal governments make irreparable decisions on the siting of industrial wind power projects that will negatively affect more populations.</i></p>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation         | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|---|
| 345           | 1452           | Jill Barker    | Mosier, OR resident | NQ1        | <p>Quote in Jill Barker Comments from Rick James "2) <i>The second form of harm is that the sound of the wind turbines can easily penetrate modern wood frame homes with little or no loss in intensity. Inside one's home, especially with windows closed, the wind turbine sounds are predominantly the lower frequency sounds. Most homes, especially at night when appliances and entertainment equipment are off, are much quieter than the outside. I have measured bedrooms in homes near highways where the nighttime sound levels are less than 20 dBA. I have measured sound levels of less than 30 dBA inside bedrooms during the daytime, with windows open, a TV on in a room down the hall, and with the refrigerator running in the kitchen. This quiet interior condition can lead to the wind turbines seeming to be as noisy or even noisier inside a home than outside. The wind industry likes to say that a turbine is no louder than a conversation or a refrigerator. While they may be able to point to data to support that statement (carefully cherry-picked data) they do not continue their 'example' by asking how many people would like to</i></p> <p><i>have a refrigerator in their bedroom or a conversation being held right outside their bedroom window every night. This is explained in more detail in the "The 'How to' ... Guide" by Mr. Kamperman and James available on Dr. Pierpont's web site, but to sum it up, the wind turbine sound inside a home leads to sleep disturbance. People who are subjected to repeated sleep disturbance find that it leads to physical and mental health risks that are not trivial and if not address can lead to permanent, pathologies that affect one's quality of life and other aspects of overall health. The group most at risk includes children, especially those six and under; people with pre-existing health issues, especially if that includes sleep disorders; and seniors who are healthy but susceptible to sleep disturbance. One only needs to look at how many commercials are for products to help get a good night's sleep to understand that this 'sensitive' group is not small, it may even be a majority of those who are young or old."</i></p> |
| 345           | 1453           | Jill Barker    | Mosier, OR resident | NQ1        | <p>Quote in Jill Barker Comments from Rick James " 3) <i>The third form of harm is from the very low frequency sounds that are generally in-audible, even inside a home, but may be perceived as a vibration or physical movement of a body organ, like the chest cavity, heart or eyes. The very lowest frequency sound emissions from wind turbines (0 Hz to about 50 Hz) penetrate all Dome walls and roofs without any attenuation. This frequency range is also where the majority of the acoustic energy is located in the wind turbine sound. Compared to other health issues, very little research has been done on how low frequency sound, at the levels found in homes near wind projects, affects health over long periods of time. Most other sources of similar low frequency sound are not part of the normal soundscape in residential areas on a 24/7/365 basis. Further, these low frequency sounds can interact with the shape and size of interior rooms resulting in a resonant condition where the sound energy from the wind turbines builds up to levels that can be significantly higher than what would be measured if the room did not resonate. Thus, each home [reacts differe</i></p>   |
| 345           | 1454           | Jill Barker    | Mosier, OR resident | NQ1        | <p>Quote in Jill Barker Comments from Rick James "Please read the web version of Dr. Pierpont's work for the details. It should be noted that Dr. Pierpont's prior work was discounted by the wind industry (not the medical community, just the pro-wind non-medical promoters) on the basis that it was not 'peer' reviewed. This new study has been thoroughly peer reviewed and the comments of the peer reviewers are both favorable and available as part of the published study. At this time, it is no longer true to say there is no evidence that wind turbines cause health risks. That position, often stated by the wind industry, is no longer supportable given the work of Dr. Pierpont, the VAD team, and others. This means that wind turbine siting should include oversight from the State's Public Health agency. The risks to public health from wind turbines are well enough established that your local public health agency and your local doctors should be involved in developing any siting standards. It also means that attempts by the wind industry to get setbacks of anything less than one mile are ignoring current medical research."</p>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name     | Affiliation                               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|---|------------|---|
| 346           |                |                    |   | X          | <i>no comment letter #346 included</i>  |
| 347           | 1455           | Chris Lloyd        | Underwood, WA resident                    | AL1        | <i>The communities of Underwood, White Salmon and Bingen are much more closely tied to the success of Hood River than that of Skamania County as a whole. This area is a shiny jewel that should not be tarnished with such carelessness. It is both a state and national treasure. SDS's direction represents the exact opposite direction the state should be headed in for development in these communities. Would you support the communities or a single corporation in defiance of the community. If the latter than we can imagine what the many tourists visiting from Seattle, the power base of WA politics will think when they see this treasure defiled in such a manner. I promise this will be the poster child for wind energy that shows people where to draw the line on siting for turbines.</i> |
| 348           | 1456-1460      | Susan Dornfeld     | Portland, OR resident                     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 349           | 1461           | Rebecca Maxey      | Underwood, WA resident                    | AL1        | <i>We have too many politicians in Skamania County who want to impair the value of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area for the next generation...Industrial energy facilities do not belong in this, or any other national scenic area.</i>   |
| 350           | 1462           | Blue Ackerman      | Hood River, OR resident                   | AL1        | <i>The windmills are not a match for the Gorge Scenic Area. with blinking lights, extra noise and the possibility of killing our beautiful birds of prey.</i>   |
| 350           | 1463           | Blue Ackerman      | Hood River, OR resident                   | AL1        | <i>I'm a proponent of wind generated energy...and it's not that I just don't want it in my beautiful backyard ...there are Plenty of other more sensible areas East of Hood River, White Salmon (Gorge) area that would be a much better match ...places that are more barren, more wind driven and probably need the revenue...</i>  |
| 350           | 1464           | Blue Ackerman      | Hood River, OR resident                   | SE1        | <i>Tourists come here to the Gorge to see some last remaining wild beauty. Please block this proposal.</i>  |
| 351           | 1465           | Maryanne Csizmazia | Underwood, WA resident                    | AL1        | <i>I am totally opposed to the Whistling Ridge wind turbine project-this is an inappropriate location for a wind project. A much more appropriate location is East of the Gorge past Maryhill.</i>  |
| 352           | 1466-1470      | Jeremiah Leipold   | Troutdale, OR resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 353           | 1471-1475      | Eileen Garvin      | Hood River, OR resident                   | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 354           | 1476-1470      | Lisa Hauge         | Underwood, WA resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 355           | 1471           | Patricia C Dixon   | Underwood, WA resident                    | VR1        | <i>I believe this project, only thirty feet outside the Scenic Area boundary and over 400 feet high with red lights atop each structure does not meet, in ANY WAY, the same restrictions. Please help us continue the compromise that living in a NSA demands. I applaud the Gorge Commission for all they have accomplished in protecting The Gorge for generations to come. I believe the Saddleback Wind Turbine project is the right project at the right time but IN THE WRONG LOCATION.</i>   |
| 356           | 1472-1476      | Saylor Hauge       | Underwood, WA resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 357           | 1477-1481      | Leif Hauge         | Underwood, WA resident                    | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 358           | 1482           | Loreley Drach      |   | X          | <i>Copy of comment letter #331</i>  |
| 359           | 1483           | Loreley Drach      |   | DX         | <i>Attachment for comment letter #347/331 (SDS forest practices)</i>  |
| 360           | 1484-1488      | David Harrison     | Salem Audubon Society                     | F          | <i>Same as 19-23</i>  |
| 361           | 1489           | Monica R. Lash     | unknown                                   | AL1        | <i>Opposition...There are many other far less exquisite areas in the Columbia River Gorge with equal or better winds that should be considered for this project.</i>  |
| 362           | 1490           | John Audley        | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | PM4        | <i>The Whistling Ridge siting application contains the following critical elements: Multiple years (between 2004-2008) of surveys for critical species, avian migration and bats; Detailed habitat mapping; Micrositing intended to avoid sensitive plant and habitat populations, and riparian areas; Minimization of new road development; Restoration of impacted areas and noxious weed management; Use of Best Management Practices during project construction; Two years of post-construction mortality surveys; Establishment of a Technical Advisory Committee to work with the developer and WDFW regarding post-construction survey reviews, and; Proposed collaboration with WDFW regarding mitigation of potential impacts</i>   |
| 362           | 1491           | John Audley        | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | EG1        | <i>As a utility-scale wind energy generation facility, the proposed Whistling Ridge project is expected to offer a competitively priced renewable electricity source. Increasing amounts of new renewable electricity will be needed to achieve renewable energy standards, greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals established in Oregon and Washington and future legislation at the federal level.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|
| 362           | 1492           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | EG1        | <i>Another reason utilities are attracted to renewable energy like wind is because the price of the electricity is stable and predictable for an extended period of time. While wind energy developers are able to sign twenty-year supply contracts at a fixed price, fossil fuels are subject to global market forces that subject customers to volatile energy prices. ..Stable and predictable sources of renewable energy are good for utilities and consumers alike.</i>   |
| 362           | 1493           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | CX1        | <i>The proposed Whistling Ridge Energy Project would produce electricity without generating air or water emissions or hazardous waste.</i>   |
| 362           | 1494           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | EI1        | <i>Wind energy does not deplete natural resources such as coal, oil, or gas, or cause environmental damage through resource extraction, transportation, or use.</i>  |
| 362           | 1495           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | EI1        | <i>Wind power is a clean, renewable form of electricity.</i>   |
| 362           | 1496           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | MT1        | <i>When wind farms are decommissioned, they leave no air pollution legacy and a minimal footprint on terrestrial surfaces</i>  |
| 362           | 1497           | John Audley     | Renewable Northwest Project, Portland, OR | PM4        | <i>In summary, the proposed Whistling Ridge project has the potential to meet the region's increasing demand for reliable and affordable renewable energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce air pollution that negatively impacts our environment and public health.</i>  |
| 363           | 1498           | Robert Carnahan | White Salmon, WA resident                 | AL1        | <i>Bad idea to locate along White Salmon Rivet, heart of Scenic Columbia Gorge. Too much political influence and lobbying by SDS. They already control too much development and don't need more subsidized investment. There are better locations, windier in Klickitat county that can access power distribution.</i>   |
| 364           | 1499           | Nathan Baker    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | CE1        | <i>SDS applied for the Klickitat turbines first. On December 4, 2008 SDS filed an application with the DNR proposing "development ... of approximately 35 turbine locations" on DNR land. Ex. A. More than three months later, on March 10, 2009, SDS applied for the Skamania portion, by filing an application with EFSEC for "up to 50 wind turbines." EFSEC Application at 2.3-3. The entire project, previously called the "Saddleback" wind project, is now called the "Whistling Ridge" project. The SDS-generated map shows that more than 40 of the turbines would be sited in a single, lengthy array along Whistling Ridge. Ex. B....As further evidence that SDS proposes a single project with 84 wind turbines in two counties,...Mr. Spadaro states that proposing all 84 turbines now "gives [SDS more flexibility," which in turn allows the company to "optimize the site and minimize impacts." Ex. D at 2....SDS's application to EFSEC never once mentions the 35 turbine sites proposed in Klickitat County, even though those turbines were applied for first. It appears that SDS is attempting to piecemeal the project and avoid full environmental review of the entire project now. This approach is unacceptable and in violation of SEPA....The nature, scope, and potential environmental impacts of the Whistling Ridge project are sufficiently apparent to trigger preparation of an EIS for the entire 84-turbine wind project now. The EIS must evaluate the likely environmental effects of the full project, including development of the entire wind facility and the various alternatives that might address environmental concerns. Failure to do so violates SEPA's mandate to consider environmental impacts and alternatives at the earliest possible time...By failing to even mention the Klickitat portions of the project, the applicant is asking EFSEC to improperly segment the project into multiple pieces. SEPA prohibits a project from being artificially segmented into different components to avoid comprehensive environmental review....In sum, the EIS must review the entire 84-turbine project- including all of its component parts and various alternatives to those parts. EFSEC cannot make an informed decision on this proposal until the full project and its impacts are reviewed.</i> |
| 364           | 1500           | Nathan Baker    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | CE1        | <i>The applicant has publicly stated that it has proposed all 84 turbines now in order to give it "more flexibility" in "optimizing] the site and minimizing] impacts." Ex. D at 2. In accordance with this statement and with SEPA, the alternatives analysis must evaluate the full 84-turbine project, as well as various .alternatives to the project.</i>   |
| 364           | 1501           | Nathan Baker    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | FW1        | <i>For example, the EIS should quantify how many of the 84 turbines are proposed within a designated Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area ("SOSEA"), and should evaluate one or more alternatives that would remove these turbines from the SOSEA.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| 364           | 1502           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>the EIS should consider one or more alternatives that would move OT eliminate all turbines visible from designated key viewing areas within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Such an alternative was recommended by the National Scenic Area office of the Forest Service in its May 6, 2009 letter to EFSEC.</i>   |
| 364           | 1503           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>the EIS should consider one OT more alternatives that would remove all portions of the project from the General Management Area of the National Scenic Area, where the project is prohibited by law. SAC § 22.10.020(A); 16 U.S.C. § 544d(d)(6).</i>  |
| 364           | 1504           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>In a number of respects, the application fails to provide information about the project sufficient to evaluate its environmental impacts.</i>   |
| 364           | 1505           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>the application discusses two alternative road configurations within the National Scenic Area (Application at 2.19-3), but evaluates only one of them (Route 2) with any detail.</i>  |
| 364           | 1506           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT3        | <i>The application also fails to explain whether either of these alternatives would require the condemnation of any private land along the roadways and intersections in order to provide sufficient width and turning radius for hauling the turbine components.</i>  |
| 364           | 1507           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>The applicant's Pavement Engineering Report contains little to no information about the existing pavement and base thickness along the haul route, as well as the existing average daily traffic volumes along the haul route.</i>  |
| 364           | 1508           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>The application fails to state an upper limit for vehicle weight, and merely states that many of the vehicles will exceed the WSDOT legal load limit of 52.75 tons. EFSEC Application at 4.3-37.</i>  |
| 364           | 1509           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>Finally, the application also fails to provide sufficient data regarding the number of vehicular trips likely to result from the project, especially during the construction phase.</i>   |
| 364           | 1510           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>The application also proposes a new electrical substation and interconnection tower located immediately outside the boundary of the National Scenic Area, yet provides little to no detail about these components of the project, such as their proposed heights, footprints, exterior colors, and potential visibility from key viewing areas within the National Scenic Area.</i>   |
| 364           | 1511           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>The studies for vegetation and rare plants included in the application were conducted six years ago and are no longer valid. Moreover, these studies were apparently never finished. Appendix B-1 is expressly labeled as a "draft," and all of the figures are missing from both of these Appendices. The missing figures would have depicted, among other things, the geographic areas that were studied for occurrences of rare and sensitive plants. This is crucial information, given that the studies were apparently conducted for a previous project configuration that included DNR lands in Skamania County, and thus likely contained different lands than the current project. The applicant should-be required to conduct current vegetation and rare plant studies specific to this project.</i> |
| 364           | 1512           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>The applicant proposes to haul tens thousands of tons of construction materials and turbine components through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The application contains little to no information about the number of vehicular trips likely to result from the project during the construction phase. The application does state that more than 500 heavy haul truck trips would be required "for the towers only," but does not clarify whether this figure includes the blades, and does not provide trip numbers for hauling construction materials and equipment, warning cars accompanying heavy haul trucks, and construction workers' vehicles.</i>   |
| 364           | 1513           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | TT1        | <i>Nor does the application provide any data regarding the number and frequency of proposed barge trips, which appears to be the applicant's preferred method of transport to, and through a portion of, the National Scenic Area.</i>   |
| 364           | 1514           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>The EIS must review the air quality impacts of transporting and hauling turbine components and construction materials from the locations) at which they would be constructed to the construction sites. This may include international trips if the turbines would be manufactured abroad. Under SEPA, the regional scope of environmental impacts is to be broad</i>   |
| 364           | 1515           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>Without definitive numbers of barge, truck, and/or rail trips, it is impossible to conclude with any certainty the exact environmental impacts these trips would produce. However, given the scope of this project, it is likely that the air pollution created by this project would have a significant adverse impact on the environment.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Committer Name | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| 364           | 1516           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>The environmental analysis of the proposal must in particular focus on the air emissions of the tugboats used for hauling the barges. (data cited) The environmental analysis must consider the cumulative effects of the emissions from barge transport already occurring on the Columbia River, as well as the individual impacts from this proposal.</i>  |
| 364           | 1517           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>Because of the considerable impact that soot has on climate change, and the large scope of this project, a thorough analysis of these impacts [the impact of barge/tugboat created soot during project construction on global warming] must be conducted.</i>  |
| 364           | 1518           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>Without a thorough analysis of the types of transport methods to be used, the exact number of proposed trips, and the potential impacts of air emissions, this project should not go forward.</i>  |
| 364           | 1519           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>Also, considering that all emissions from the project would be new emissions, alternatives must be considered that would reduce the impacts of emissions on the environment.</i>   |
| 364           | 1520           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | NQ2        | <i>The Gorge now stands among the most polluted places in the country, including Pittsburgh and Los Angeles [air quality]...The Forest Service studies demonstrate that air quality and visibility are already degraded in the Scenic Area to the point of adversely affecting scenic, natural, and potentially cultural and recreation resources. (If EFSEC or the applicant would like copies of any of these studies, Friends would be happy to provide them.) The applicant must analyze the impacts of further increases in air pollution in the National Scenic Area.</i>   |
| 364           | 1521           | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | CX1        | <i>The application provides insufficient information about the risk of fire and explosion, the environmental consequences that would flow from such an occurrence, and the applicant's plans to prevent and respond to such an occurrence. This is the first wind energy facility proposed on forested lands in the Pacific Northwest. Thus, the risk of catastrophic fire for this project is significantly greater than other regions where wind energy systems have been sited in the past. In addition, the proximity of the proposed wind facility to existing BPA lines increases the risk that a fire at the site would interfere with the transmission of electricity.</i>  |
| 365           | 1522-1526      | Patricia Meeks | White Salmon, WA resident     | F          | Same as 19-23   |
| 366           | 1527           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident        | FW1        | <i>This is a large scale wind turbine project located within Washington State designated Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Areas sandwiched between the National Scenic Area (NSA) and National Forest land. Given this designation, coupled with the NSA and NF being conduits for wildlife corridors, a thorough EIS is warranted.</i>   |
| 366           | 1528           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident        | NQ1        | <i>There needs to be a low frequency noise (LFN) analysis done. This project will probably be evaluated using Washington State noise standards which only measures in dBA (audible by humans) but there needs to be analysis done measuring, at minimum, either the presence or absence of LFN which would be measured using a C-weighted scale dBC (not audible to humans but can still have deleterious affects).</i>   |
| 366           | 1529           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident        | NQ3        | <i>A 0.5 mile setback is inadequate when considering the topography of the Columbia River Gorge where the drainages, canyons and mountains can amplify and transmit sound from wind turbines greater distances than in typically used flatter landscapes. For instance, many European nations having over 20 years of experience with industrial wind facilities, have implemented regulations having setbacks of 1-1.5 miles. The location of the actual residence (home) on adjacent or nearby properties to wind turbines must be taken into account.</i>  |
| 366           | 1530           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident        | FW1        | <i>According to Travis Nelson, Wind and Water Energy Section Manager for WDFW/W, "This project is the first of its kind in forested habitats in Washington State". The Columbia River Gorge provides habitat for more than 300 bird species and is a major stop-over for many migratory bird species. Industrial wind turbines can lead to loss of habitat, fragmentation of habitat and increased fatalities due to contact with wind turbines. Several Washington State listed bird species could be affected: the Spotted Owl (listed as endangered in Washington State), northern goshawk and piliated woodpecker (both listed candidate species) and the bald eagle (Washington State sensitive species) as well as numerous migratory birds, bats, gray squirrel (State threatened species) and many mammals.</i> |
| 366           | 1531           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident        | PM3        | <i>The EFSEC does the environmental impact statement-why is this not required by the applicant of the project like most environmental impact statements? This is a private development that Washington State taxpayers, which I am one of, should not have to pay for. SDS's application to EFSEC runs over 900 pages---how much is that going to cost me?</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 366           | 1532           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident | VR1        | <i>The Whistling Ridge southern boundary abuts the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The wind turbines will be over 420 feet high, which is nearly the same height as a 42-story building. These would be visible from several key-viewing areas throughout the Gorge to include 1-84, Hood River, Husum, White Salmon not to mention many trails throughout the Gorge.</i>   |
| 366           | 1533           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident | SE6        | <i>The SDS application states the Whistling Ridge site is managed for timber harvest. Wind turbines need to be sited as far away from buildings or trees as possible, which can block the wind and cause turbulence. How much timber production will now be taken out of production due to the wind turbines? How much state revenue for schools will be lost on the DNR section in Klickitat County? Will SDS make up for that?</i>   |
| 366           | 1534           | Paul Smith     | Washougal, WA resident | VR1        | <i>Part of the project is within the boundary of the National Scenic Area (NSA). In order for this project to happen, the applicant would have to expand and improve over 2 miles of roads which are within the NSA. According to the National Scenic Area Act, it is prohibited to use scenic area lands for industrial purposes.</i>   |
| 367           | 1535           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW2        | <i>As one of the first wind power projects to be considered for a forested landscape in Washington state, this environmental review will need to include a more detailed analysis of several issues that make this proposal different from other wind power projects located on agricultural and/or shrub steppe habitat; experience and knowledge gained from existing projects in the state may not be "transferable" to a project such as this being . proposed for a very different environment.</i>   |
| 367           | 1536           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>While the application provides information on background status and recent project site survey data on this federally listed threatened species, much more detailed analysis needs to be conducted. The summary statement on page 3.4-29 in the application "No impacts to northern spotted owls are expected" should have much greater documentation in order to Support such a claim.</i>   |
| 367           | 1537           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>We could not locate any mention or evaluation in the application of the proximity of the project to the state designated Columbia Gorge Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area (SOSEA) and the federally delineated Conservation Support Area (CSA)...As such, the environmental review of this project should include a detailed evaluation of the potential impacts of this project on current and future owl habitat in areas designated by the state and federal government for private forest lands to provide support for owl conservation and recovery.</i>   |
| 367           | 1538           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>Given the noted presence of Barred Owls in the project site, the adequacy of the survey data to support the assertion that no NSO are present is questionable. Additional surveys with revised protocols should be considered.</i>  |
| 367           | 1539           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>Even if NSO are determined to be absent from the project area, the environmental review should evaluate the potential for NSO to utilize the area in the future. As one of the guiding principles in the 2009 Wind Power Guidelines states "From a wildlife conservation perspective, a species in decline may be absent from an area ... yet the habitat remains important for the conservation or recovery of that species." (page 8) The EIS should include information on "site fidelity" of NSO and occurrence of NSO re-occupying a site center even after several years of absence.</i>  |
| 367           | 1540           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>While the application states that "limited suitable habitat exists" for NSO in the proposed project site (page 3.4-29), it does not quantify the amount. In addition, the application does not discuss the potential for existing "degraded" habitat to develop into suitable habitat during the projected 30 year life span of the project. A more detailed inventory of the existing habitat conditions would provide a better understanding of potential for suitable owl habitat, including information on stand age, tree species diversity, snags per acre, etc. The EIS should also evaluate the impact of the proposed project on dispersal habitat for NSO from nearby federal lands that can provide nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat for NSO.</i> |
| 367           | 1541           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon        | FW1        | <i>The application includes useful information regarding avian surveys conducted at the project site in Fall 2004 and Spring 2006. The surveys were limited, however, in their scope and duration. As a result, they may not adequately capture the number of species that utilize the site nor the abundance of any given species, Much more robust surveys, conducted in every season and in multiple years would provide much greater degree of confidence regarding the likely avian species use of the project site. The fact that this proposed project is among the first</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
|               |                |                |                           |            | <i>forested sites in Washington to undergo environmental review, it is particularly important that adequate surveys be conducted. In addition, the application includes unsubstantiated comments regarding bird mortality, ...(page 3.4-30, emphasis added) The EIS should more fully investigate this issue and document the facts underlying these type of statements.</i>  |
| 367           | 1542           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon           | MT1        | <i>A detailed mitigation and monitoring program should be developed prior to project approval, not left to be determined after the fact.</i>  |
| 367           | 1543           | Shawn Cantrell | Seattle Audubon           | MT1        | <i>We also believe that in addition to the government agencies to be included TAC, opportunities for' public involvement in the TAC is also essential.</i>  |
| 368           | 1544           | Betsy Frazier  | Hood River, OR resident   | PM5        | <i>"NO" on the wind turbines that are being considered 60 feet outside the beautiful Mid Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area boundary on Whistling Ridge. That is what it is - a National Scenic Area. It is defeating the purpose of the Scenic Area - no outside lights, no outstanding visual markings, and defeats the quality of life with noise.</i>  |
| 369           | 1545           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | CE1        | <i>The Scoping Notice for the project states that the applicant is proposing to construct and operate up to fifty 1.2- 2.5-megawatt (MW) wind turbines with a maximum generating capacity of 75 MW on a 1,152-acre site in Skamania County. However, that Notice does not reflect the full scope of the project contemplated by the applicant....SEPA and NEPA do not allow a piecemeal approach to project evaluation. ...It is not too early to evaluate the project proposal in its entirety...It appears that SDS is attempting to avoid full review by holding back the Klickitat County portion of its project, possibly because the company expects a more lenient review process in Klickitat County than in Skamania County.</i>   |
|               |                |                |                           |            | <i>Changing the name of the project from Saddleback to Whistling Ridge has only added confusion to the review process. Regardless of what the project is called, or whether all of the turbines within the project are erected simultaneously, it is clear that SDS plans a large wind project that spans Klickitat and Skamania Counties, and includes 80 or more wind turbines. That is the full scope of the project that should be evaluated in the EIS.</i>  |
| 369           | 1546           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW1        | <i>All of the DNR land proposed for lease within the Klickitat County portion of the project falls within critical habitat for the northern spotted owl, a species that is not only endangered but has continued to decline since the adoption of the DNR's Habitat Conservation Plan. ...It should be obvious to all concerned that a commercial wind energy project is not appropriate for habitat that is designated as a nesting, roosting and foraging area for a federally endangered species. It is within EFSEC's and BPA's power to forestall a tremendous amount of unnecessary work by the project proponent,</i>  |
|               |                |                |                           |            | <i>Klickitat County, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Washington Department of fish and Wildlife, local residents and a host of other stakeholders by evaluating the impacts of the DNR portion of the Whistling Ridge wind project within the scope of its SEPA review. To do otherwise is irresponsible, and has already resulted in the construction of wind projects on state-owned lands where they are completely inappropriate (for example, golden eagle nesting territory within the Windy Point project in Klickitat County).</i>  |
| 369           | 1547           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW1        | <i>The EIS commissioned by Klickitat County for its Energy Overlay Zone stated (on page 2-15 of the Final EIS) that "forested areas host higher concentrations of owl and other sensitive species habitats." The EIS recommended that areas with high concentrations of forested habitats be excluded from the Energy Overlay Zone because of their "higher potential for use by sensitive species and avian species likely to be impacted by wind turbines." Despite this recommendation and acknowledgement that spotted owl habitat is not appropriate for wind. power development, Klickitat County erroneously included some of this habitat within the Energy Overlay Zone-paving the way for companies such as SDS to gain access to these lands for wind development.</i> |
| 369           | 1548           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW1        | <i>As stated in the SEPA checklist for DNR's Whistling Ridge lease, "the entire area of this proposal is environmentally sensitive." The state's Habitat Conservation Plan for the area, which includes protections for northern spotted owls, must be considered as part of your scoping.</i>  |
| 369           | 1549           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW2        | <i>Spotted owls are not the only species likely to be significantly impacted by the proposal. Klickitat County's Energy Overlay Zone EIS also found high use of forested habitats by other raptors. The SDS map for the proposed project shows ridge-top locations for turbines, and these are typically the worst possible locations from an avian perspective- i.e....., likely to result in the highest number of bird collisions.</i>   |
| 369           | 1550           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW1        | <i>There are also reports of bald eagle nests at the proposed wind site. Your scoping should include an aerial nest survey to ascertain whether raptor nests are present and active.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 369           | 1551           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW2        | <i>Scoping must include avian and bat studies to find out what species are present at the site, and in what numbers. However, please bear in mind that all of the previous studies done in the local area have grossly underestimated the impacts on raptors and bats.</i>   |
| 369           | 1552           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW2        | <i>Bat populations in the Whistling Ridge area have not been carefully studied, but scientists have learned that turbines cause bat deaths through air-pressure effects on the animals' lungs, as well as direct strikes.</i>  |
| 369           | 1553           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | FW2        | <i>Drainage to the White Salmon river and Mill Creek...Wind projects also have indirect impacts on fish, and these too must be considered.</i>   |
| 369           | 1554           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | EG1        | <i>The hydropower system is already "oversubscribed" by multiple wind projects and further integration of these two energy resources is likely to mean that water is released from Columbia River pools at times that are not optimal for salmon and other endangered fish. We have already seen some of these impacts from nearby wind projects, which tend to produce much of their energy in the months when there is plenty of water in the river, and have at times required excessive spill that can give fish "the bends."</i>  |
| 369           | 1555           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | EG1        | <i>Wind is an intermittent power source, and wind turbines typically operate at only 30 percent of capacity. When the wind isn't blowing, power must come from another energy source capable of supplying 100 percent of that power at any given moment. As part of your scoping, EFSEC and BPA should consider what will be the backup power source for the Whistling Ridge Energy Project.</i>   |
| 369           | 1556           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | EI1        | <i>The impacts from roads, power lines, substations, meteorological towers, quarries and other infrastructure may be even more significant.</i>  |
| 369           | 1557           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | MT1        | <i>If EFSEC is going to allow development of towers, it should require fatality monitoring at these towers.</i>  |
| 369           | 1558           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR2        | <i>Those of us who live here have worked long and hard, and many have made personal sacrifices, in order to preserve the scenic value of these lands for all to enjoy. It would not be right for one company to destroy those values purely for its own commercial benefit. The view at night may be even more altered than the daytime view.</i>  |
| 369           | 1559           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | TT1        | <i>The public and private roads in the Underwood area are not well suited for the heavy equipment and traffic required to construct and service wind turbines. The Cook Underwood Road is narrow, winding and located on steep slopes in places. SR-14 is one of the most dangerous of state highways, with the river on one side and cliffs on the other. Rock falls are common and many people are afraid to drive this road even without the possibility of meeting a huge truck carrying an oversize load. The Hood River Bridge is also narrow and outdated, and cannot accommodate oversize loads without closing traffic from one direction. In Klickitat County we have seen road closures and heavy damage to public roads from wind project construction. These impacts on public safety and traffic must be evaluated as part of the EIS.</i> |
| 369           | 1560           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | NQ1        | <i>Your review should include a noise modeling study that looks at the micro-siting of the turbines and the topography of the area. Please bear in mind that noise downwind from turbines is different than upwind so measurements need to be made accordingly.</i>  |
| 369           | 1561           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | RR1        | <i>the wind project could mean the end of public access to the Whistling Ridge trail and other recreational opportunities in the area.</i>   |
| 369           | 1562           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | LU1        | <i>Please consider compatibility with surrounding land uses and county zoning when conducting your environmental assessment. Within the Skamania County portion of the proposed Whistling Ridge project, for example, industrial-scale wind projects are not allowed under the current zoning.</i>   |
| 369           | 1563           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | AL1        | <i>Any SEPA NEPA analysis must look at the full range of alternatives to the proposed project, including the no-action alternative. SDS owns huge tracts of land within Skamania and Klickitat Counties, some of which may be better suited for wind development than these lands containing spotted owl circles.</i>  |
| 369           | 1564           | Dawn Stover    | White Salmon, WA resident | CE2        | <i>Your analysis should include a look at the cumulative impacts of wind projects in our region. The BPA's own interconnection queue shows dozens of projects that are either permitted or awaiting permits. There are many other projects that are in the works but not yet in the queue. From Whistling Ridge all the way to Walla Walla, wind developers are erecting a wall of turbines along the hills on both sides of the river. BPA and EFSEC have a much better understanding of the scope of planned development than other agencies, and I hope you will consider these cumulative impacts as part of your review.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name            | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| 370           | 1565           | Greg MacDonald            | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>As an Underwood property owner, I am opposed to windmills on Underwood Mountain. The environmental impact as well as the visual impact, as they would be located so close to, and visible from, the boundary of Scenic Area makes them inappropriate.</i>  |
| 371           | 1566           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | FW1        | <i>Although we are supportive of finding alternative ways of producing energy, we are concerned by the lack of sound monitoring in this area for Northern Spotted Owl and Bats.</i>   |
| 371           | 1567           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | FW2        | <i>We are also concerned by the location as the land is very near the boundary of the Gifford Pinchot Task Force. Clearing land for large scale wind projects and increasing road usage can have a substantial edge effect on our public forest lands.</i>  |
| 371           | 1568           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | FW1        | <i>We are concerned by the lack of adequate monitoring of Northern Spotted Owl...The EIS should include updated monitoring data for existence, as well as suitable breeding or foraging habitat. The project scope should be limited to exclude any suitable habitat to protect potential suitable forest habitat for the spotted owl.</i>  |
| 371           | 1569           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | FW2        | <i>Additionally, wildlife are also present in this area and monitoring should be done 'IS to the type of wildlife present and effects this project will have on suitable habitat. Clearing forest habitat will fragment ranges and disperse wildlife to other areas. These effects should be adequately studied and included in the EIS.</i>  |
| 371           | 1570           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | SG1        | <i>Roads also have a tremendous impact on the environment. Roads wash sediment into streams, they fragment habitat, and they can fail causing more damage to stream environments by heavy sediment impacts. Please include a thorough discussion of roads and their impacts in the EIS.</i>   |
| 371           | 1571           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | SG1        | <i>In order to comply with NEPA, "the discussion of alternatives 'must go beyond mere assertions' and provide sufficient data and reasoning to enable a reader to evaluate the analysis and conclusions and to comment on the EIS." Citizens Against Toxic Sprays v. Bergland, 428 F. Supp. 908, 933 (D. Or. 1977). A detailed and careful analysis of the relative merits and demerits of the proposed action and possible alternatives is of such importance in the NEPA scheme that it has been described as the "linchpin" of the environmental analysis.</i> |
| 371           | 1572           | Jessica Walz              | Gifford Pinchot Task Force    | CE2        | <i>We would like to see a thorough discussion of the [cumulative] impacts of this project and the impacts of future projects that are under discussion.</i>   |
| 372           | 1573           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | CE2        | <i>The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must include thorough analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to wildlife and aesthetic resources. To obtain accurate information on the likely impacts, both EFSEC and BPA must consult with agencies that have expertise or jurisdiction in managing the resources that would be adversely impacted.</i>   |
| 372           | 1574           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>The industrial-scale development can cause direct mortality from collisions with wind turbine blades and through barotraumas when bats fly too close to spinning blades.</i>   |
| 372           | 1575           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>Facilities can also cause indirect impacts through displacement and habitat fragmentation.</i>   |
| 372           | 1576           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW1        | <i>The EIS must include analysis of how the facility would impact sensitive and listed species such as the northern spotted owl and northern goshawk.</i>   |
| 372           | 1577           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | MT1        | <i>EFSEC and BPA must thoroughly analyze how the proposed facility would impact wildlife. This analysis must include avoidance measures, including relocating or removing turbines from the project. Only after avoidances considered should EFSEC or BPA analyze mitigation measures.</i>  |
| 372           | 1578           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>The EIS must indicate all bird species that may or do occur within the Project Site that are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 703-712, and any other state or federal legislation designed to protect avian species.</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name            | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| 372           | 1579           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | CE2        | <i>The EIS must analyze the likely cumulative impacts of wind energy development in the region. Currently approximately 1,800 megawatts of wind energy has been permitted in Klickitat County alone. To date, no cumulative impacts study has been conducted to ascertain the region-wide impacts of wind energy facilities on wildlife. During review of other wind energy facilities in the region both the Washington , Department of fish and Wildlife and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have called for cumulative impacts analysis. See USFWS Letter, attached as Exhibit A. To date, no cumulative impacts analysis has occurred. This must be included before EFSEC and BPA permit additional wind power development, especially development in forested areas where there is a higher probability of adverse impacts to wildlife.</i> |
| 372           | 1580           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | AL1        | <i>Based on this analysis [Big Horn Avian Mortality Report] the EIS should evaluate alternative siting options that would avoid or reduce wildlife impacts. The EIS should also evaluate potential post-construction mitigation measures in case actual mortality exceeds predicted mortality.</i>   |
| 372           | 1581           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>Facility design and operating conditions must also be considered in the EIS. Brightly lit substations have been associated with large clusters of bird fatalities at wind facilities. The EIS must include detailed analysis of lighting at all turbines and other facility structures and how this lighting would impact birds and bats. Also, the wind speeds at which turbines operate may correlate to when specific species of bats or birds may be at the highest risk of collision. Creating operating protocols for what wind speeds turbine blades will be allowed to operate may provide opportunities to craft mitigating conditions that will avoid adverse impacts.</i>  |
| 372           | 1582           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | FW2        | <i>Finally, the EIS must provide detailed analysis of how the proposed facility complies with the Washington Department of fish and Wildlife Wind Siting Guidelines.</i>   |
| 372           | 1583           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>The proposed facility is proposed to be immediately adjacent to the National Scenic Area. As a threshold matter, the EIS must ascertain the precise location of the Scenic Area boundary to evaluate whether the proposed industrial facility would be located within the Scenic Area. To do so, EFSEC and the PBA must determine whether the NSA boundary has been formally surveyed. The results of such a survey must be approved by the Forest Service.</i>   |
| 372           | 1584           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | CE2        | <i>Many of the individual turbines may be highly visible, both during the day and the night, from within the National Scenic Area...The EIS must thoroughly analyze the impacts of individual turbines on the viewshed as well as the cumulative impacts of all visible turbines.</i>  |
| 372           | 1585           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>The preferred methodology for evaluating aesthetic impacts in the Scenic Area is the Forest Service's Scenic Management System. This system creates a formal process for ascertaining viewer expectations in relationship to the complexity of the viewed landscape. EFSEC and the BPA should also consider the National Academy of Sciences' recent document entitled, Environmental Impacts of Wind-Energy Projects (National Academies Press, 2007), which includes methodology for analyzing possible impacts from wind development on aesthetic resources.</i>   |
| 372           | 1586           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>SEPA also requires that the impacts analysis include an evaluation of whether the proposed action would be consistent with the goals and purposes of laws and regulations. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(iii).</i>   |
| 372           | 1587           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | CE2        | <i>EFSEC must also consider possible cumulative impacts from other projects proposed along the Scenic Area boundary. These include the Windy Point and Windy Flats facilities in Klickitat County.</i>   |
| 372           | 1588           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | LU1        | <i>Potential conflict between the planned additional restoration work on the Old Highway and the fact that the wind towers are in the viewshed of the planned tunnel restoration.</i>  |
| 372           | 1589           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>The EIS must also address the degree that he proposal would frustrate the purpose of regulatory mechanisms that are designed to protect this viewshed. The Underwood Bluffs designated Open Space.</i>  |
| 372           | 1590           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>The EIS must also document the likely impacts to views from 1-84. In addition to the length ofl-84 from Viento State Park to Hood River, there must be thorough analysis of impacts to views from the stretch of 1-84 from Hood River, Oregon, to approximately Mosier, Oregon. Turbines in northern portion of the project would highly visible from the east bound lanes ofl-84. The EIS must include detailed analysis of how this view would be altered, including avoidance and mitigation measures.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name               | Affiliation                               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------------|---|------------|---|
| 372           | 1591           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | VR1        | <i>The aesthetics impacts analysis must include a linear analysis of views from linear key viewing areas and overlapping historic trail Viewsheds. This. includes views from the Columbia River, Interstate 84, the Historic Columbia River Highway, including abandoned sections that are slated for restoration, Cook-Underwood Road, and Washington State Route 141. Analysis must include the length of the KVAs where the proje9t would be visible, the number of turbines that would be visible for each length, the distance from the project for each length, and whether nighttime lighting would be visible.</i>  |
| 372           | 1592           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | VR2        | <i>Finally, the EIS must document the likely impacts from both daytime and nighttime lighting. While lighting is required by the Federal Aviation Administration, the location of required lighting must be documented in the EIS. Based on this information impacts can be documented and appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures can be reviewed;</i>  |
| 372           | 1593           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | PM2        | <i>EFSEC must consult with and obtain comments from agencies that have jurisdiction or expertise regarding the impacted environment. RCW 43.21C.030(2)(d); see also WAC 197-11-920. ...Columbia River Gorge Commission, the National Scenic Area office of the USDA Forest Service, the Gifford-Pinchot National Forest, the National Park Service, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, the Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Washington State Department of fish and Wildlife. Washington Department of Natural Resources</i> |
| 372           | 1594           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | PM3        | <i>The application at Figure 4.2-4 includes a mapping error. The entire area within T3N, Role, Section 18 that lies south of the BPA transmission lines is zoned For/Ag 20. The application depicts part of this area as unmapped. EFSEC and BPA must correct this error in evaluating the proposed project for consistency with laws and regulations.</i>  |
| 372           | 1595           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | EG1        | <i>The BPA must include cumulative impacts analysis of how the BPA will be able to integrate additional intermittent power sources into the grid. ..This cumulative impacts analysis must be incorporated into the EIS for the subject proposal.</i>  |
| 372           | 1596           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | E11        | <i>The EIS must evaluate the relative impacts of lower probability storm events that are reasonably foreseeable.</i>  |
| 372           | 1597           | Nathan Baker/Richard Till    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | SW1        | <i>The EIS must address impacts to the White Salmon and Little White Salmon, fish bearing rivers, including impacts on restored salmonids after removal of Condit Dam in 2010.</i>  |
| 374           | LATE1          | Rick Till                    | Friends of the Columbia Gorge             | DX         | <i>Attachment to comment #364/372: Skamania Co zoning update</i>  |
| 375           | LATE2          | Donna J. Nickerson           | Black Hills Audubon Society               | FW2        | <i>we concur with the comments of Seattle Audubon on the above project.</i>   |
| 376           | LATE3          | Alison Bryan                 | Hood River, OR resident                   | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>  |
| 377           | LATE4          | Sheila Dooley and Phil Swaim | The Dalles, OR resident                   | VR1        | <i>We are opposed to the plan to place wind turbines adjacent to the National Scenic Area. The visual effect from key viewing areas from the east is not acceptable.</i>  |
| 377           | LATE5          | Sheila Dooley and Phil Swaim | The Dalles, OR resident                   | FW1        | <i>This also a flyway for migratory birds including endangered species. This project would result in a large number of bird and bat kills.</i>  |
| 377           | LATE6          | Sheila Dooley and Phil Swaim | The Dalles, OR resident                   | AL1        | <i>What is the overriding need to place the turbines in this location when there are many other windy locations that do not involve these issues?</i>   |
| 378           | LATE7          | Vicki Roberts                | Mosier, OR resident                       | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>  |
| 379           | LATE8          | Judy West                    | Seattle, WA resident                      | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>  |
| 380           | LATE10         | Jerryann Devlin              | Seattle, WA resident                      | EI1        | <i>All the hubbub about birds, noise, etc is way out of control, usually by people who have never been around them.</i>   |
| 380           | LATE11         | Jerryann Devlin              | Seattle, WA resident                      | PM2        | <i>I do also realize that if the SDS and Stevenson faction has anything to do with it , it will be only to their good, they are not good guardians of anything.( this may be a little harsh).</i>   |
| 380           | LATE9          | Jerryann Devlin              | Seattle, WA resident                      | VR1        | <i>About elec. generating windmills, I lived in Calif. when they first started testing and using them. I think it is a great idea and I like the beauty of the gentle giants.</i>   |
| 381           | LATE12         | Mary Henderson               | Northwest Pipeline, GP, Battle Ground, WA | LU1        | <i>We have a high pressure natural gas transmission line located in the gorge in the area where they plan to put the wind turbines. I am attaching a developers handbook for further plans if near our gas easements. Let me know if there is anyone I need to contact or have them contact me if there are any conflicts.</i>  |
| 382           | LATE13         | Lisa Hargrave                | Hood River, OR resident                   | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name        | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|------------|--|
| 383           | LATE14         | Sharon McCormack      | White Salmon, WA resident                                      | AL1        | <i>Please add this map to my email regarding the VAST SIZE of our county. It shows the STUPIDITY of putting windmills in the middle of the WRONG place. There is A LOT MORE WIND, NO PEOPLE, NO TREES in the vast eastern portion of the county.</i>   |
| 384           | LATE15         | Planet Glassberg      | Eugene, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 385           | LATE16         | Lisa Provost          | Vancouver, WA resident   | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 386           | LATE17         |                       | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                  | X          | <i>Comment previously submitted - #364/372</i>   |
| 387           | LATE18         | Forrest Jones         | Hood River, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 388           | LATE19         | Eric and Mary Bokovoy | Hood River, OR resident  | VR1        | <i>If roof color of a home or small commercial property is that important, how can we overlook the disastrous impact of a 400'+ tall wind turbine just a few feet outside the boundary. With so many other places to develop this kind of energy please don't allow the "Whistling Ridge Energy Project" to spew out all the "visual pollution" it will undeniably create.</i>   |
| 389           | LATE20         | Jeff Horne            | Portland, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 390           | LATE21         | Adam Kauffman         | Portland, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 391           | LATE22         | Brooke Jacobson       | Portland, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 392           | LATE23         | Judy Anderson         | Cottage Grove, OR resident                                     | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 393           | 1598           | Jill Barker           | Mosier, OR resident  | DX         | Attached articles for committee to consider: "Profit, Not Power, the Major Goal Behind Wind Farms by John Droz" and "Engineer Questions Wind Energy Claims" and "about wind power" and "Lack of 'viability' makes wind power a poor choice" and "A Problem With Wind Power" and "Denmark: no new wind energy since 2003" and "National Wind Watch supports European call for wind energy moratorium" and "Tuning and sensitivity of the human vestibular system to low-frequency vibration" and "Windmills in Oregon 2009.2 complaints about noise, possible health effects" and "Wind power: the "green" myth" and "Green Backlash: The Wind Turbine Controversy"   |
| 394           | 1599           | Steven Bronsveld      | Underwood, WA resident   | LU1        | The Underwood community's plan is to maintain its rural nature. Residents do not want industrial scale development. Please do not disrespect residents plan for their area. Preserving the rural nature of this area is what residents want and encourages the industries they want - logging, agriculture, tourism...   |
| 394           | 1600           | Steven Bronsveld      | Underwood, WA resident   | VR1        | The scenic act CAN prevent uses outside of the scenic area boundaries that are inconsistent with the act.  |
| 395           |                | H. Bruce Marvin       | Counsel for the Environment,<br>Office of the Attorney General | X          | <i>*duplicate of comment letter #330</i>   |
| 397           | LATE24         | DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service  | VR1        | <i>I want to reiterate the fact that the National Scenic Act does not provide any statutory authority to me as the Federal Area Manager to regulate activities outside the boundary of the National Scenic Area. The Act specifically addresses this under Section 17 (a) (10) Savings Provisions which states: Nothing in this Act shall... (10) establish protective perimeters or buffer zones around the scenic area or each special management area. The fact that activities or uses inconsistent with the management directives for the scenic area or special management areas can be seen or heard from these areas shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundaries of the scenic area or special management areas.</i>   |
| 397           | LATE25         | DANIEL T. HARKENRIDER | USDA Forest Service  | VR1        | <i>I also want to emphasize that as the Federal Manager for the National Scenic Area I have the responsibility to provide input regarding potential effects outside activities may have within the NSA. In this case potential scenic impacts associated with the siting of wind turbines. My May 6, 2009 letter was submitted with the intent that I am asking that your office include in its analysis of effects those potential scenic effects as viewed from within the National Scenic Area and to the extent that you may do so consider means by which to minimize those effects.</i>  |
| 398           | LATE26         | Tom Wehrley           | Portland, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 399           | LATE27         | Ron Martin            | Hood River, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 400           | LATE28         | Douglas Hanes         | Portland, OR resident  | F          | <i>same as 19-23</i>   |
| 10BPA         | 55             | Nathan Baker          |  | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #364</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 56             | Elaine Somers         | EPA Region 10  | PM3        | <i>The EIS should include a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the stated purpose and need for the project and that are responsive to the issues identified during the scoping process. This will ensure that the EIS provides the public and the decision-maker with information that sharply defines the issues and identifies a clear basis for choice as required by NEPA. The Council on Environmental Quality recommends that all reasonable alternatives be considered, even if some of them could be outside the capability of the applicant or the jurisdiction of the agency preparing the EIS for the proposed project. EPA encourages selection of feasible alternatives that would (1) be environmentally sustainable, (2) maximize environmental benefits, and (3) avoid, minimize, and/or otherwise mitigate environmental impacts.</i> |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|------------|---|
| 11BPA         | 57             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 11 | SW1        | <i>The EIS should identify all water bodies and aquatic resources that may be affected by the project, the nature of the potential impacts, and the pollutants likely to impact those waters. The EIS should include appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be used to minimize impacts. For construction activities that would disturb more than one acre (40 CFR 122.26 (b)), a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required. The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) would be the NPDES permitting authority for Washington and should be contacted to obtain the NPDES permit. The EIS should include information about this permit.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 58             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 12 | SE1        | <i>the EIS should address the compatibility of the project with current forestry operations, and evaluate the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the forest land base, including the associated socio-economic effects.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 59             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 13 | CE2        | <i>Cumulative effects would include past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, including any potential future expansion of the wind project, which would also affect the forest land base and associated ecosystem functions and services.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 60             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 14 | FW2        | <i>All project phases (construction, operation, and maintenance) should be described with respect to their potential impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat. The EIS should describe the current quality and capacity of habitat, its use by wildlife in the project area, and the potential to affect resident and migratory species, including bats and birds as well as mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and invertebrates.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 61             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 15 | MT1        | <i>For example, wind energy projects have the potential to disrupt important wildlife habitat, such as flyways, migration corridors, and foraging areas. Project related roads and traffic may result in avoidance of certain areas, in wildlife-vehicular collisions and mortality, disturbance, and increased vulnerability to dangers associated with human contact and activities. Wind projects commonly result in mortality of birds and bats due to collisions with rotor blades. These and other impacts should be avoided, minimized, and mitigated. For example, road kill could be prevented by avoiding important habitats and species movement corridors, or by providing suitable wildlife crossing structures where corridors cannot be avoided. The project could also be designed to prevent potential animal contact with rotor blades.</i> |
| 11BPA         | 62             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 16 | FW1        | <i>The EIS should identify any federal or state threatened, endangered, candidate, or sensitive species, identify their habitat, and any potential impacts to these species or their habitats.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 63             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 17 | FW2        | <i>The EIS should also describe how all requirements under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Endangered Species Act (ESA), including consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) would be met, and how BPA would contribute to the recovery of listed species. Any State listed species should also be addressed in consultation and coordination with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).</i>   |
| 11BPA         | 64             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 18 | FW2        | <i>Ground disturbing activities create opportunity for establishment of non-native invasive species. In compliance with NEPA and with the Executive Order 13112, analysis and disclosure of these actions and their effects, as well as any mitigation to prevent or control such outbreaks should be included. We urge that disturbed areas be re-vegetated using native species and that there be ongoing maintenance (wholly or primarily non-chemical means) to prevent establishment of invasives in areas disturbed by project activities.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 65             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 19 | CX1        | <i>If any pesticides or herbicides would be used as part of proposed project activities, the EIS should address any potential toxic hazards related to the application of the chemicals, and describe what actions would be taken to ensure that impacts from toxic substances released to the environment would be minimized.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 66             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 20 | NQ2        | <i>If vegetation would be burned, then the EIS should include a smoke management plan that would be followed to reduce public health impacts and potential exceedances of ambient air quality standards.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 67             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 21 | VR1        | <i>The proposed project would be located adjacent to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The EIS should fully analyze and disclose potential visual impacts to the National Scenic Area and to communities within and near the Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 68             | Elaine Somers  | EPA Region 22 | SE1        | <i>The social and economic impacts that could potentially result from visual impacts should also be included, such as, effects on aesthetics and tourism.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|
| 11BPA         | 69             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 23   | CE2        | <i>The project evaluation should consider the effects of the proposed project when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and outside the project area, including those by entities not affiliated with BPA. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant actions taking place over time. For example, the proposed project may have the potential to contribute to cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts of concern to communities and businesses.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 70             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 24   | FW2        | <i>There is also potential for cumulative impacts to migratory birds, many species of which are in decline. The EIS should analyze the cumulative effects of potential bird mortality from this proposed wind project, from other current and reasonably foreseeable wind projects, combined with other causes of bird mortality.</i>   |
| 11BPA         | 71             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 25   | PM1        | <i>EPA has issued guidance on how we are to provide comments on the assessment of cumulative impacts in Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents, which can be found on the EPA web site at: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/nepa.html">http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/nepa.html</a></i>   |
| 11BPA         | 72             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 26   | CE2        | <i>Indirect effects are those that are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable....These indirect effects must also be analyzed in the NEPA document.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 73             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 27   | SE3        | <i>The NEPA process should also effectively engage the public in dialogue about the proposed project and its potential environmental, social, historical, cultural, and economic impacts - both positive and negative.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 74             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 28   | CR1        | <i>In compliance with NEPA and with E.O. 12898 on Environmental Justice, actions should be taken to conduct adequate public outreach and participation that ensures the public and Native American tribes truly understand the possible impacts to their communities and trust resources.</i>   |
| 11BPA         | 75             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 29   | TT1        | <i>Public health and safety impacts, such as those associated with project construction and new, expanded, or otherwise improved roads and increased traffic volumes and speeds should be analyzed and disclosed in the EIS.</i>  |
| 11BPA         | 76             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 30   | E11        | <i>Other impacts of concern to the public should also be disclosed and analyzed in the EIS.</i>   |
| 11BPA         | 77             | Elaine Somers   | EPA Region 31   | CR1        | <i>Government-to-government consultation with federally recognized Indian tribal governments is required.</i>   |
| 12BPA         | 78             | Arlene Bradford | Underwood, WA resident  | X          | *Copy of letter # 336   |
| 13BPA         | 79             | Brian Shortt    | Shortt Supply, Hood River business owner, Hood River resident | X          | *Copy of letter #176  |
| 14BPA         | 80             | Mary Henderson  |   | PM1        | Requesting more information on which exact parcels project will be located.   |
| 15BPA         | 81             | Rick Aramburu   | SOSA  | X          | *Copy of letter #3  |
| 16BPA         | 82             | Rick Aramburu   | SOSA  | PM2        | <i>...the email from Mr. Montano to Mr. Baker of today says: Thanks for the information, but the meeting being held on the 7th is being sponsored only by WA EFSEC, not BPA. ...This statement is directly contrary to the plain language of the notice that states that BPA will be a participant in both meetings. We believe that the May 7 afternoon meeting should be held as a BPA scoping meeting as the notice actually states. CEQ guidance regarding scoping from 1981, emphasizes that scoping should be open and thorough and notices be accurate. It would be an affront to residents that attend the May 7 Underwood meeting to find out that BPA is not participating, when the notice- states it will. This is especially true since the Underwood meeting is specifically for those closest to, and thereby most effected by, the Whistling Ridge project. If BPA persists in its position, then it is up to EFSEC and BPA to amend the notice to clarify the differences between the two meetings. This should be done to allows sufficient time for distribution of the notice. [if not] then these meetings need to be rescheduled.</i> |
| 17BPA         | 83             | Nathan Baker    | SOSA  | X          | Previous email in chain leading up to comment letter #16  |
| 18BPA         | 84             | Nathan Baker    | SOSA  | X          | Previous email in chain leading up to comment letter #16  |
| 19BPA         | 85             | Herb Dye        | Underwood Research, Inc                                       | PM2        | <i>I do have a problem with such short notification of the meeting in Underwood. have plans, made 6 months ago, to be out of the country the first week in May. There was little pre-notification and it seems that there is a lot of pressure to rush the project through which seems to have the sponsor of the project's backing. This is an important issue and should be viewed from all sides.</i>  |
| 19BPA         | 86             | Herb Dye        | Underwood Research, Inc                                       | AL1        | <i>The grid should have wind power but there are thousands of square acres located just a few miles to the East which are not supporting forest and watershed. They also do not have a community right in their shadow.</i>   |
| 1BPA          | 1              | Andrew Montano  | BPA   | PM1        | Cover letter for BPA comments   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name    | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|--|------------|---|
| 1BPA          | 2              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | PM3        | <i>If mitigation for damage to the wildlife or watershed is deemed necessary, will there be money for land banks paid for by WRE or will WRE pay SDS for land set aside for mitigation. That is like pulling money out of one of your hip pockets and putting it in your other hip pocket as a tax dodge for SDS/WRE.</i>   |
| 1BPA          | 3              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | SW1        | <i>How will you protect the 3 watersheds in this area? Little Buck Creek (both forks), Lapham Creek, and Little White Salmon?</i>   |
| 1BPA          | 4              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | PM2        | <i>Who has the final say in the project? Fact BPA and Washington EFSEC are preparing a joint NEPA and SEPA on WREs proposed wind project.</i>   |
| 1BPA          | 5              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | PM3        | <i>Who is actually conducting the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)? Seems like this should be a 3 party with no fiduciary interest. If this is being conducted by 2 power companies it represents only those vested in the interest of this project and not the people of the United States.</i>  |
| 1BPA          | 6              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | PM3        | <i>Fact There will be a public meeting once the EIS is completed. Question: Will this be held locally so local people can be involved? If not, why not?</i>   |
| 20BPA         | 87             | Herb Dye          | Underwood Research, Inc                                | PM1        | <i>Please add our names to the list of people concerned about the above listed project</i>  |
| 21BPA         | 88             | Rick Aramburu     | SOSA   | X          | <i>*Copy of comment letter#3</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 7              | Ruth Dye          | Underwood, WA resident                                 | DX         | <i>Is the site for the proposed WRE project within the WA Department of Fish and Wildlife guidelines "DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES FOR SITING, CONSTRUCTING, OPERATING AND MONITORING WIND TURBINES"? In July 2002, the USFWS Turbine Siting Working Group held a three-day meeting with fifteen Service representatives. The meeting resulted in the creation of draft interim voluntary guidance for wind power development. The guidance was critically reviewed by all Service Regions, later by the Washington Directorate, and finally by the department of the Interior. The interim voluntary guidance for land-based wind turbines was completed and approved in July 2003, when it was announced in the Federal Register. The complete guidelines can be found at: [web]</i> |
| 2BPA          | 8              | Dr. Helen Paulus  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | PM4        | <i>I support this project totally</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 9              | Jack Knapp        | Underwood, WA resident                                 | X          | <i>*Copy of letter #5</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 10             | Catherine Dickson | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation | CR1        | <i>Plans for compliance with the NHPA?</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 11             | Catherine Dickson | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation | FW2        | <i>Include inventory of traditional plants</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 12             | Catherine Dickson | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation | CR1        | <i>Assess impacts to all types of historic properties, including those of religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 13             | Catherine Dickson | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation | VR1        | <i>Analyze viewshed impacts</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 14             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | VR1        | <i>Visual impact to the scenic area</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 15             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | TT1        | <i>Truck traffic impact on residential roads of Underwood</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 16             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | ER1        | <i>Emergency vehicle access in Underwood during truck traffic</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 17             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | FW2        | <i>Elk and other large animal movements once the wall of turbines are in place I believe this will endanger the agriculture and residences to the south.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 18             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | EG1        | <i>Potential for Underwood to get cross connection to turbine substation in order to provide backup power source?</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 19             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | VR1        | <i>I don't want to see them from the scenic area viewpoints and byways</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 20             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | NQ3        | <i>Increase setback from property to one mile</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 21             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | TT2        | <i>I want trucks limited to weekdays and not during commuting and school bus times</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 22             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | ER1        | <i>I want emergency vehicles to be given priority access on roads</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 23             | Michael Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident                                 | TT1        | <i>I want extra police enforcement for trucks for speed and compression brake limits</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 24             | John Tyler        | Underwood, WA resident                                 | AL1        | <i>While I support wind power development I believe the proposed location of this project would cause irreversible damage to the scenic beauty of the Columbia Gorge.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 25             | John Tyler        | Underwood, WA resident                                 | VR1        | <i>The proposed giant windmills would dominate the Underwood, Bingen-White Salmon and Hood River viewing areas.</i>   |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 2BPA          | 26             | John Tyler                    | Underwood, WA resident | SE5        | <i>As a nearby home owner, I am also concerned about the impact on the physical and emotional health of my family and neighbors of constant exposure to windmill noises and flashing strobe lights.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 27             | John Tyler                    | Underwood, WA resident | AL1        | <i>There are other sites within Washington and elsewhere where wind power is available. To irrevocably deface a national treasure such as the Gorge Scenic Area would be shortsighted and irresponsible.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 28             | John Tyler                    | Underwood, WA resident | PM5        | <i>Please stop the Whistling Ridge Energy Project or have it moved to a suitable location.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 29             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | CE2        | <i>While the NPS is supportive of the development of environmentally-sound, alternative energy technologies, we are concerned about the potential direct and cumulative effects of this renewable energy project on recreation and aesthetics in the Columbia River Gorge area.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 30             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | PM3        | <i>On page 4.2-76, the Application states that "no national trails are within 5 miles of the proposed facility." However, this statement is incorrect. Both the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail and Oregon Pioneer National Historic Trail, administered by the NPS, pass through the Columbia River Gorge and are within 5 miles of the proposed facility.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 31             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>When Congress designated these trails, it also authorized auto tour routes along Interstate 84 and Washington Route 14. The viewshed from both the river and auto tour routes is a critical part of the visitor experience.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 32             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>In addition to the national historic trails, the visual quality of the region is specifically protected by designation of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area (CRGNSA) in 1986. These three national resources are independently significant, but the close proximity of all three to each other creates a unique recreational opportunity for visitors to the region.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 33             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | LU1        | <i>Construction of wind turbines in this area will require a conditional use permit from Skamania County, partially due to the fact that the proposed wind turbines are taller structures than currently allowed in these zones. (FOR/AG-20 and R-10)</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 34             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>We disagree with the level of severity for view impacts suggested in the Application. First, the Application cites dated information regarding viewer perception. In 1987, a survey reported by Thayer and Freeman, reflected both positive and negative attitudes to wind generators, page 4.2-28. This information is inadequate, because at that time, the combined national capacity was less than 2,000 MW. As of 2006, capacity exceeded 12,000 MW, and has likely increased since then, especially given increased emphasis on renewable energy development at both the national and state levels. Moreover, since 1987, the size of turbine infrastructure has increased. Towers are now taller. With taller and more prolific wind turbines, the potential for negative impacts to viewsheds is greater.</i> |
| 2BPA          | 35             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>Second, the actual size of a feature on the landscape is not the only component in considering viewshed impacts. The Columbia River Gorge area is significant because of the area's scenic and historic qualities. Man-made structures, especially when movement of a structure acts as an additional point of focus, depreciate the scenic and historical qualities that originally warranted national protection. We are concerned with the cumulative impacts to the viewshed resulting from numerous uniform wind turbines extending beyond the horizon line within an open, natural landscape.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 36             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>the Application did not adequately cover all of the important viewpoints that should be considered. The Draft EIS should include all of the local Key Viewing Areas identified within the CGNSA, as well as address key viewpoints from the Columbia River that may be potentially impacted. Linear viewpoints from the designated scenic drives and auto tour routes should also be fully considered in the Draft EIS.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 37             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>The methods used for the visual analysis (Section 4.2) were unclear in some respects. It was not disclosed what heights were used for turbines in generating the simulated scenes, and whether those were placed in the photos by the analytical software or within a photo editing program. Photos used for simulation should not include cloudy or hazy conditions; a clear, blue sky will better illustrate the extremes of contrast between towers and the background.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 38             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>Impacts to views are not purely subjective and are not merely "perceived," but can be agreed upon and very real. We believe it is clear, even at this early stage, that visual impacts to the CGNSA and the national historic trails will degrade the core scenic and historic landscape values of these resources. We strongly recommend at minimum removing turbine corridor A1-A7 from further project consideration. This would help reduce the impact to visual resources within the CGNSA and along the national historic trails</i>  |

| Letter Number | Comment Number | Commenter Name                | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment   |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--|------------|---|
| 2BPA          | 39             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | CR1        | <i>Natural and cultural resource surveys suggest that few negative impacts are likely to result from the proposed project.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 40             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | SE1        | <i>Most of the property will remain in commercial forestry operations. Access to BPA transmission lines obviates new line siting and construction.</i>  |
| 2BPA          | 41             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | SE6        | <i>The potential enhancement to local employment and property tax revenues, while small, are still important in this economically depressed county.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 42             | Rory D. Westberg/Kelly Powell | National Park Service  | VR1        | <i>Slightly decreasing the total turbines through removing turbine corridor AI-A7 of the proposed project will likely not hinder its viability while alleviating some of the negative visual impacts.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 43             | Johnson Meninick              | Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation           | CR1        | <i>The location of the project falls within the Ceded Lands of the Yakama Nation, the legal rights to which were established by the Treaty of 1855, between the Yakama Nation and the United States Government.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 44             | Johnson Meninick              | Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation           | CR1        | <i>The proposed project location is in close proximity to Little Buck Creek as well as numerous archaeological, traditional, and sacred sites. Given this, there exists a heightened potential to encounter cultural resources at the project location. We request that an extensive cultural resources survey be conducted during the EIS process and should include, but not necessarily be limited to, an archaeological survey, identification of traditional-subsistence, medicinal, and culturally important plants, and identification of Yakama Nation Traditional Cultural Properties.</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 45             | Johnson Meninick              | Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation           | CR1        | <p><i>Many archaeological surveys conducted on previous projects have focused on site integrity and eligibility based upon the scientific data the sites may yield (National Register of Historic Places, Criterion D). Furthermore, mitigation measures often include, or are limited to data recovery and excavation. It must be remembered, however, that data recovery is the interest of science only, and does not serve the interest of the Yakama Nation. Therefore, archaeological site value and appropriate mitigation measures must not only be determined on a scientific level, but also on a cultural level.</i></p> <p><i>Archaeological sites have deep meaning and cultural value to the Yakama People, and it is not uncommon for sites to have strong associations with events and people significant to Native American history and legends (National Register of Historic Places, Criterion A &amp; B). We further suggest the use of Yakama Nation Cultural Resources Program staff in identifying the above mentioned cultural resources.</i></p> |
| 2BPA          | 46             | Nathan Baker                  | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #364</i>   |
| 2BPA          | 47             | Richard Till                  | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #372</i>   |
| 3BPA          | 48             | Dave Burlingame               | Cowlitz Indian Tribe   | CR1        | <i>The Cowlitz Indian Tribe concurs with the recommendations of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and of the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation. We also recommend an Inadvertent Discovery Plan be attached to the permit; we have included language for your consideration. (language attached)</i>  |
| 4BPA          | 49             | Nathan Baker                  | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #372</i>   |
| 5BPA          | 50             | H. Bruce Marvin               | Counsel for the Environment                                  | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #330</i>   |
| 6BPA          | 51             | Nathan Baker                  | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #372</i>   |
| 7BPA          | 52             | Nathan Baker                  | Friends of the Columbia Gorge                                | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #364</i>   |
| 8BPA          | 53             | Dawn Stover                   | White Salmon, WA resident                                    | X          | <i>Duplicate of letter #369</i>   |
| 9BPA          | 54             | Rick Amarabau                 | Save Our Scenic Area/Aramburu & Eustis, LLP Attorneys at Law | X          | <i>Duplicate of SOSA letter</i>   |



---

May 6, 2009 Transcripts



| Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation  | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|---------------------|--|------------|---|
| 1              | Paul Pearce         | Skamania County Commission District 1                | VR1        | <i>What we believe is that Congress clearly understood what they were doing when they created the Scenic Area Act and drew a distinct border. In the saving clause of the act they specifically said that there were to be no protective measures or buffer zones around the scenic area. Discussion about other noncompliant things that are viewable from inside the scenic area i.e. Maryhill</i>  |
| 2              | Paul Pearce         | Skamania County Commission District 1                | PM4        | <i>The county supports this application, and we support this process, all of this process, the entire process of the EIS, the whole process.</i>  |
| 3              | Paul Pearce         | Skamania County Commission District 1                | SE6        | Discussion of loss of funds in Skamania county in recent history due to loss of timber receipts...Renewable energy would be a valuable step in rebuilding the County's economy  |
| 4              | SIMON SAMPSON       | Yakama Nation  | CR1        | <i>No impact apparent to his people from Big Horn or White Creek wind projects...I've also had the opportunity to go up and visit Whistling Ridge Energy and do an on-site visit there to see if it had any affects on our culture and see where it was at. It didn't have any particular significance also.</i>  |
| 5              | WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR | Yakama Nation  | EI1        | <i>this one here [Whistling Ridge] has seen no harm, no contaminants, no noise pollution, no pollution of any in the air or any other things, and if anybody disputes this I would like them to go and take a look at the health effects from the nuclear industry that's done to our people through the cancers, through arthritis, and other things, diabetes that our people have suffered because of the industrial practices that have gone on unchecked here.</i>                                       |
| 6              | WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR | Yakama Nation  | CR1        | <i>I have been onto the site, and there is no cultural aspects of any disturbing of the area because of its very steep hillside. We would not utilize it for anything that would culturally affect our foods, our medicinal plants, or anything or our animals.</i>   |
| 7              | WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR | Yakama Nation  | CX1        | <i>there is no contaminants coming out of any of these wind turbines.</i>   |
| 8              | WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR | Yakama Nation  | FW2        | <i>I have also stood under them and listened and they don't spin that fast where they said they're going to kill birds.</i>   |
| 9              | WILBUR SLOCKISH, JR | Yakama Nation  | NQ1        | <i>They don't spin that fast to harm anything, and it's just very little noise that you hear from them.</i>   |
| 10             | JOHNNY JACKSON      | Cascade Chief of the Columbia River Tribes and Bands | LU1        | <i>I couldn't see wrong with where those towers are going to be...And that area up there that I looked at there's nothing close to it where it's going to affect anything.</i>  |
| 11             | JOHNNY JACKSON      | Cascade Chief of the Columbia River Tribes and Bands | SE5        | Expressed that he is not concerned about effects of the towers on people or animals. The towers do not spin fast enough or make enough noise to do harm.  |
| 12             | JOHNNY JACKSON      | Cascade Chief of the Columbia River Tribes and Bands | PM4        | <i>And I can't see any possible way why these towers cannot be put in this area to benefit the people of this county and the people along this river.</i>   |
| 13             | Dan Rawley          | Underwood, WA resident                               | VR1        | <i>I want to voice my concerns about the Whistling Ridge Energy Project and the effect this does have on the National Scenic Area, as well as the residents of Underwood.</i>   |
| 14             | Dan Rawley          | Underwood, WA resident                               | VR1        | <i>there's very few areas that rival the national beauty of the Gorge scenic area. And if this project goes through, I feel like this is going to forever change this area. Although this project is outside the boundaries of the National Scenic Area, you would be able to see these turbines from I-84, Hood River, and throughout the National Scenic Area and that's going to forever change the face of that. And I really believe that this goes against the spirit in which the NSA was created.</i> |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name   | Affiliation                                  | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|------------------|--|------------|--|
| 15             | Dan Rawley       | Underwood, WA resident                       | TT3        | Concern about road widening on Knollack-Knapp road, as the proposed widened location is adjacent to his house.   |
| 16             | Dan Rawley       | Underwood, WA resident                       | SE1        | <i>I think it's going to also affect the amount of people who come to this area as far as tourism. People do not come to a scenic area to look at turbines.</i>  |
| 17             | Dan Rawley       | Underwood, WA resident                       | AL1        | <i>I think it is probably a right type of project, it's probably the right time, but it's in the wrong area.</i>   |
| 18             | Tom Rousseau     | Hood River, OR resident                      | VR1        | [concern over the <i>visual impact that it will have on the National Scenic Area...Wind generators should not be visual either from the river 3 level or from the many trails along the ridges and peaks of the Gorge.</i>   |
| 19             | Tom Rousseau     | Hood River, OR resident                      | EG1        | <i>Energy storage has not been addressed...Wind generation energy is intermittent so the project needs to effectively address the energy storage.</i>  |
| 20             | Tom Rousseau     | Hood River, OR resident                      | AL1        | <i>And this is the wrong place...The Northwest has plenty of lower impact places in which to build wind generated farm without adding further desecrate to the Gorge.</i>  |
| 21             | Peggy Bryan      | Skamania County Economic Development Council | SE6        | <i>The Skamania County Economic Development Council supports the Whistling Ridge Wind Energy Project. Skamania County recognizes its responsibility in developing clean renewable energy projects such as wind to protect our environment and meet the state's mandate for renewable energy development standard.</i>                                |
| 22             | Peggy Bryan      | Skamania County Economic Development Council | LU1        | <i>The Whistling Ridge Wind Energy Project is proposed for a site that is privately owned and consistent within land use requirements.</i>   |
| 23             | Peggy Bryan      | Skamania County Economic Development Council | VR1        | <i>It is located entirely outside of the Colombia River Gorge National Scenic Area and there are no development restrictions imposed on this site by that legislation.</i>   |
| 24             | Peggy Bryan      | Skamania County Economic Development Council | SE6        | <i>Historically Skamania County has relied on revenue from timber harvest to provide necessary services to its residents. The Secure Rural Schools as the county is finding is declining annually and will end soon. Skamania County must take advantage of equal opportunity it has to grow its tax base and move toward fiscal sustainability.</i> |
| 25             | Peggy Bryan      | Skamania County Economic Development Council | SE4        | Discussion of positive impact on Skamania co from permanent and temporary jobs   |
| 26             | Bob Wittenberg   | Skamania County PUD                          | EG1        | PUD has lost their backup power feed from Condit and powerdale dams...Proposing that the PUD could get backup power from the Whistling Ridge project...if so this would be a public safety and welfare benefit for both power and water which depends on power in Skamania Co.   |
| 27             | Scott Pineo      | Carson, WA resident                          | VR1        | <i>My point being that wind generation can be aesthetically pleasing, can be beautiful. It has symmetry. It has motion. It's truly an art form, and wind power exists in the environment just like other production means.</i>   |
| 28             | Scott Pineo      | Carson, WA resident                          | SE6        | Skamania county needs some kind of industry to survive economically, and since timber has been lost, wind make sense.  |
| 29             | Peter Cornelison | Hood River, OR resident                      | SE1        | <i>I would ask EFSEC to consider in their scoping requirements to consider the impacts on the City of Hood River with regards to in particular tourism, night sky issues, real estate issues.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name   | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 30             | Peter Cornelison | Hood River, OR resident | PM3        | <i>I'm also concerned that the images that were shown in the book in the back don't fairly represent the impacts because there's cloud banks in a number of them and the clouds match the color of the turbine towers. They also don't fairly represent the motion which will catch your eye,</i>  |
| 31             | Peter Cornelison | Hood River, OR resident | CE1        | <i>and finally I would say that an additional 30 turbines have been proposed that are not included within this application and to me it would make sense to consider all of them at once.</i>  |
| 32             | Raymond Perkins  | Carson, WA resident     | SE4        | <i>My feeling is wind energy is a domestic rival, an energy source that provides more jobs per dollar invested into any other technology, more than five times that from coal and nuclear power. Renewable energy project estimates for every megawatt of installed wind capacity creates 4.8 job years of employment both direct and indirect; meaning that a 50-megawatt project produces 240 job years of employment.</i>   |
| 33             | Raymond Perkins  | Carson, WA resident     | PM4        | <i>Energy is our biggest national security threat. Diversifying our domestic forces is essential.</i>  |
| 34             | Raymond Perkins  | Carson, WA resident     | EG1        | <i>Wind power technology has evolved with newer designs, spin slower, quieter. They're higher off the ground, therefore have less impact on wildlife. Millions of tons of pollutants, pollutants in the atmosphere have much more impact on wildlife than the environment.</i>   |
| 35             | Raymond Perkins  | Carson, WA resident     | VR1        | <i>And from 84, I would imagine driving 70 miles an hour down 84 it would be quite challenging to see these windmills in operation.</i>  |
| 36             | Ann Lueders      | Carson, WA resident     | SE1        | <i>I encourage EFSEC, Skamania County, and the other officials and agencies to support the efforts of SDS and other private property owners who may wish in the future to find a way to keep their land working for them. I look forward to the day that this wind farm goes in.</i>   |
| 37             | Mary Repar       | Stevenson, WA resident  | CE2        | <i>I would like you all to really, really consider is the cumulative impacts and effect and that will determine the efficacy of the proposed wind project. I don't wish to see long-term environmental degradation in return for 20 to 30 years of short-term energy production....Wind energy isn't free and there is a cost, and the cost is environmental and public health and welfare, especially to the environment... More comments relating to the importance of considering cumulative effects.</i> |
| 38             | Mary Repar       | Stevenson, WA resident  | PM5        | <i>I am extremely concerned about this project mainly because I don't think that we're in the right place, at the right time, and I don't think it's being done properly.</i>  |
| 39             | Mary Repar       | Stevenson, WA resident  | CE1        | <i>Consideration of whether there are additional facilities in Klickitat Co - these need to be considered as well.</i>   |
| 40             | Mary Repar       | Stevenson, WA resident  | CE2        | <i>I'm talking that I would like you all to do a cumulative impact study of all the wind projects in the Gorge and how they are impacted in our scenic, natural, cultural, economic, and recreational resources.</i>   |
| 41             | Mary Repar       | Stevenson, WA resident  | SE6        | <i>Yes, we have a tough time here economically, but it doesn't mean that we have to subsume our health and our environment to subsidizing a corporation so that it can make money and use our environment while it's doing it.</i>   |
| 42             | Kate McCarthy    | Parkdale, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>I am very concerned about the project. I think the Gorge is a treasure that belongs to everybody. I think it's priceless, and I have to admit that I don't look forward to between 50 and 100 wind turbines sticking up 400 feet along the ridges, especially with their blinking red lights that you see day and night, and we look at it.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 43             | Kate McCarthy       | Parkdale, OR resident  | AL1        | <i>And I'm a believer in wind power. I think wind power is part of our future, but it's location, location, location, and I think this is not a responsible location to ignore the Gorge which is a scenic treasure that belongs to everybody.</i>  |
| 44             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | LU1        | <i>First, we have a deep concern about the inappropriate siting of industrial wind turbines in rural residential areas. Specifically we hope you will ensure that such siting not take away residents' rights to enjoy the peace and tranquility of their home site nor more importantly negatively impact their health and well being.</i>   |
| 45             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | NQ3        | <i>consider adopting appropriate noise/vibration limitations and setbacks in the interest of preventing what would surely become a significant problem. (cited How-to Guide to Siting Wind Turbines to Prevent Health Risks From Sound, authors George W. Cammerman and Richard R. James 2008)</i>  |
| 46             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | VR1        | <i>We strongly feel that half-mile setbacks is insufficient, especially in areas with canyons, bowls, and mountains as the terrain which contain, amplify, and transmit the sounds from the wind turbines greater distances than in typically used flatter terrain. The simplistic sound modeling using but two variables, output and distance, is insufficient in determining likely impact. We request that potential noise dBA and low frequency dBC impacts be thoroughly investigated through baseline measurements and computer simulations of worst-case conditions for producing sound emissions such as recommended by Cammerman and James. This would include ambient sound monitoring all residential properties within and up to a mile of the project property boundary. A sophisticated laser technology and highly reputable sound propagation model should utilize computer simulations....Discussion of methods for analysis, cited health effects of wind turbine noise, etc.</i> |
| 47             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | PM3        | <i>An independent qualified acoustical consultant that's an unbiased third party with no financial or other connection to SDS or related companies should perform all sound monitoring simulation and projections.</i>  |
| 48             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | VR1        | <i>Our secondary area of concern relates to protecting the incredible scenic beauty of the Columbia River Gorge. This area is a local and national treasure and we feel that the Whistling Ridge as proposed could have a profoundly detrimental effect on the truly unique and exceptional scenic and recreational resources wisely preserved and protected for the enjoyment of all through Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area Act.</i>  |
| 49             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | MT1        | <i>We ask that the scope of the EIS include a thorough assessment of the aesthetic impact of the proposed placement of wind turbines within the Whistling Ridge Project so that appropriate mitigation measures in said places can be required.</i>   |
| 50             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | CE1        | <i>Thirdly, the scope of the EIS for the Whistling Ridge Project must necessarily perceive the requirements including considering SDS's proposed lease of four common school trust parcels on adjacent DNR land in western Klickitat County. This would be essentially an extension of the company's proposed Whistling Ridge Project, formally known as Saddleback.</i>  |
| 51             | Teresa Robbins      | Washougal, WA resident | FW2        | <i>This proposed project is reportedly the first of its kind in forested habitat in Washington. This begs to me for intelligent planning, caution, and due consideration given the potential and profound impact on watersheds, wildfire risks, bats, and Indian species, mammals, and humans.</i>  |
| 52             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident | NQ3        | <i>I'm really concerned that the siting will affect residents. I know there is a growing body of information that indicates that there may be harmful effects from low frequency noise that's generated by the wind turbines.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation              | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|--|
| 53             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident   | TT3        | <i>I think the gentleman that brought up the issues of widening the roads in order to accommodate delivery of these materials that will be required is a very legitimate one.</i>  |
| 54             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident   | FW2        | <i>the Columbia River flyway is a big area of bird migration and bat migration as well, and I know that hawks and other migrating birds use ridges and the wind generated there to travel.</i>   |
| 55             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident   | PM3        | <i>the fact that SDS is collecting the data on the bird and bat issue is in question. I don't think they should be the ones to collect that data. You will analyze it, of course, but I would think that the Fish and Wildlife Service or other appropriate agencies that would be able to do studies in an unbiased way would be more appropriate people to do those kinds of studies.</i>  |
| 56             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident   | EG1        | Concerns about the reliability of wind power.  |
| 57             | Sallie Tucker Jones | Washougal, WA resident   | SE3        | <i>it will cost \$150,000,000 to complete this project, and that seems like an awful lot of money for a 20- to 30-year lifespan of particular projects. So it's just something to think about in that respect</i>  |
| 58             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | FW1        | <i>this large scale wind turbine project located within Washington State designated spotted owl species emphasis areas sandwiched between the National Scenic Area (NSA) and National Forest Land. Given this designation coupled with the NSA and NF being in conduit for wildlife corridors a thorough EIS is warranted which should include the cumulative impacts that was mentioned earlier.</i>  |
| 59             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | NQ1        | <i>there needs to be a low-frequency noise analysis done.</i>  |
| 60             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | NQ3        | <i>a half-mile setback is inadequate when considering the topography of the Columbia River Gorge where the drainage is canyons and mountains that can amplify and transmit sound from wind turbines greater distances than in typically used flatter landscapes.</i>   |
| 61             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | FW2        | <i>This project is the first of its kind in forested habitat Washington State, unquote. The Columbia River Gorge provides habitat for more than 300 bird species, and it's a major stopover for many migratory bird species. Industrial wind turbines can lead to a loss of habitat, fragmentation of habitat, and increased fatalities due to contact with wind turbines. Several Washington State listed bird species could be affected: The spotted owl which is listed as an endangered specie in Washington State, Northern Goshawk and affiliated woodpecker both listed candidate species, and the bald eagle in Washington State sensitive species, as well as numerous migratory birds, bats, the gray squirrel which is a state threatened species and many mammals.</i> |
| 62             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | PM3        | <i>EFSEC does the Environmental Impact Statement. Why was this not required by the applicant as most projects like this? Why is this not required by the applicant of the project like most environmental impact statements? This is a private development that Washington State taxpayers which I'm one of should not have to pay for. SDS's application to EFSEC runs over 900 pages. How much money is that going to cost me?</i>   |
| 63             | Paul Smith          | Skamania County resident | VR1        | <i>the Whistling Ridge southern boundary abuts the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The wind turbines will be over 420 feet high which is nearly the same height as a 42-story building. These would be visible from several key viewing areas throughout the Gorge to include I-84, Hood River, Husum, White Salmon, not to mention many trails throughout the Gorge.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation                    | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 64             | Paul Smith     | Skamania County resident       | SE6        | <i>the SDS application states that the Whistling Ridge site is managed for timber harvest. Wind turbines need to be sited as far away from buildings or trees as possible which can block the wind and cause turbulence. How much timber production will now be taken out of production due to the wind turbines? How much state revenue for schools will be lost on the DNR section in Klickitat County? Will SDS make up for that?</i>   |
| 65             | Paul Smith     | Skamania County resident       | CE1        | <i>SDS originally named the project Saddleback Wind Power and it was for approximately 50 wind turbines. Now there has been an additional 30 plus wind turbines added to that with the change in name to Whistling Ridge....the applicant basically didn't get what he wanted [with Saddleback] going through the county and so he went an end around local land use ordinances and zoning which once in place could be restricted to his agenda</i>   |
| 66             | Paul Smith     | Skamania County resident       | AL1        | <i>This is the right time but definitely the wrong place.</i>  |
| 67             | Don Morby      | Mill A, WA resident            | SE6        | <i>I am in favor of this windmill project because our small county desperately needs something to bring into this county.</i>  |
| 68             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | PM2        | <i>There's no regional or national coordinated planning; no regional or national siting standards even though wind power is the most heavily subsidized (with public funds) form of energy production.</i>   |
| 69             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | PM2        | <i>The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service charged with protecting threatened and endangered species, migratory birds, and eagles, etc., has yet to adopt permanent development guidelines.</i>   |
| 70             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | SE5        | <i>Existing data strongly suggest that industrial wind power and human communities are incompatible.</i>   |
| 71             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | FW2        | <i>The tremendous scale of modern wind power facilities can have profound effects on natural flora and fauna and their physical environment. This proposed project is the first industrial wind power project in the Western U.S. proposed in primary forestland where the impact is known to be much more severe...Habitat fragmentation, habitat avoidance, and bird/bat/blade interactions are well documented. Ridge top wind power facilities such as Whistling Ridge are tantamount to mountain top coal mining.</i> |
| 72             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | FW2        | <i>Ridge tops are leveled and permanently stripped of vegetation sending sedimentation, lubricating fluids, tower cleaning fluids, as well as herbicides and pesticides used to control competing vegetation and unwanted wildlife into the down-slope water systems.</i>  |
| 73             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | NQ2        | <i>A surprising (to some) result of wind energy development is the increase in atmospheric CO2 (carbon dioxide) implicated in global warming and generated from the backup fossil fuel fired facility developments required to offset a destabilization of the energy grid caused by wind power's famous unreliability, inefficiency, and generation intermittency.</i>  |
| 74             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | SE5        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: One, human health, both physically and psychologically on reasonably affected parties.</i>   |
| 75             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | SE5        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Two, potential residential displacement.</i>   |
| 76             | Jill Barker    | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society | SE6        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Three, the potential loss of county tax revenue from property devaluations.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                              | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|-----------------|--|------------|--|
| 77             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | VR1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Four, the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.</i>   |
| 78             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | SW1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: 6 Five, the White Salmon National Scenic River.</i>  |
| 79             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | SW1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Six, Buck Creek, a municipal weather source and recreation area.</i>   |
| 80             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | SW1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Seven, the Little White Salmon River and its role in anadromous fish production.</i>   |
| 81             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | SE1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: 11 Eight, and all other socioeconomic impacts.</i>   |
| 82             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | FW1        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Nine, wildlife, including threatened and endangered species such as the spotted owl and migratory and resident birds and bats and their migration routes.</i>  |
| 83             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | CE2        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: Ten, cumulative impacts on physical, biological, and social elements of the environment from all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable wind energy facilities in the Northwest.</i>  |
| 84             | Jill Barker     | Columbia Gorge Audubon Society           | NQ2        | <i>Specifically, the Audubon Society requests the project EIS analyze potential impacts on the following: And the last one is increased carbon dioxide emissions from the required backup fossil fuel fired facilities</i>   |
| 85             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | VR1        | <i>Our interest is in talking about these seven towers. They're on the southern portion of the site, and I'm going to refer to them as the "A Towers" throughout our comments.... Showed photos of what the view of the A towers would be from various vantage points. Concerned about visual effects and impact on agri-tourism...this Council has the authority and responsibility to put the reins on this project by requiring a responsible re-siting of the seven "A Towers", towers that will otherwise dominate the skyline and become Underwood's new calling card.</i> |
| 86             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | SE1        | <i>We respectfully request that the negative impacts of agri-tourism in Underwood be addressed in the forthcoming EIS.</i>   |
| 87             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | VR1        | <i>However, the Association has already taken a vote and the result is unanimous. If the Council or this applicant of its own accord makes a responsible mitigation decision and re-sites the seven "A Towers" to eliminate the negative impacts, the association intends to withdraw as a party to support the project.</i>   |
| 88             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | SE1        | <i>with the A-towers, a disproportionate share of negative environmental and socioeconomic impacts of this project [on agri-tourism in Underwood] in violation of WAC 463-60-085</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                              | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|-----------------|--|------------|---|
| 89             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | SE1        | <i>the fact is that tourists and especially tourists in the gorge don't want to see industrial development. The facts are set forth clearly in studies conducted by the U.S. government and the State of Oregon which are attached to your comments as Appendix 5 and 6. These facts are undisputed and really need no further discussion. Moving the "A Towers" mitigates tourism impacts, and our comments are focused specifically on the seven "A Towers"....Will tourists be inspired to drive the agri-tourism loop at Underwood and walk from vineyard to vineyard and winery to winery on the vineyard trek below a complex of 40-story towers?</i> |
| 90             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | MT1        | <i>We're glad to see that SDS is realizing that the impacts of this project must be mitigated, but the seven "A Towers" should be mitigated whether or not this project is expanded, and that mitigation decision should be based on balancing of the negative impacts of "A Towers" alone.</i>   |
| 91             | John Crumpacker | Skamania County Agri-Tourism Association | MT1        | <i>We are also confident that this Council will use its broad mitigation powers, its depth of experience, and basic common sense to draw a line in the sand, a line that will make it clear to people throughout the country that in the Northwest turbines don't have the right to dominate every ridge line just because the wind blows.</i>  |
| 92             | Gary Collins    | Stevenson, WA resident                   | PM4        | <i>I'm in support of the project, and I think it's very good for the community.</i>   |
| 93             | Gary Collins    | Stevenson, WA resident                   | SE6        | <i>But the economic part of it I think it's great. I think it's good. This county needs it.</i>   |
| 94             | Gary Collins    | Stevenson, WA resident                   | NQ1        | <i>I've been by them. I stopped like going to Walla Walla. There is no noise. I couldn't hear no noise.</i>   |
| 95             | Gary Collins    | Stevenson, WA resident                   | VR1        | <i>And everyone's worried about the color of them or you can see them. To me why don't you paint them an earth tone so, you know, they won't be as visual if that's the problem.</i>  |
| 96             | Walt Loehrke    | Carson, WA resident                      | PM4        | <i>I see this development as a positive thing for Skamania County. It's private land and it's disturbed soil.</i>   |
| 97             | Walt Loehrke    | Carson, WA resident                      | EG2        | <i>It adds a boom to our PUD's ability to have a back feed into the county which is since we are losing Condit Dam puts our power situation here in a very precarious situation, makes it a very precarious situation, and also provides a guaranteed revenue stream for the county.</i>  |
| 98             | Walt Loehrke    | Carson, WA resident                      | SE1        | <i>It's unfortunate for the tourist people. I love to hear them talk and I love to go on their wine tours, but we're still waiting for them to guarantee revenue stream from tourism. That was promised 16 to us 22 years ago with the National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 99             | Walt Loehrke    | Carson, WA resident                      | NQ1        | <i>With that said, I don't personally and my wife and I have tried to make windmills ugly. We have taken trips by ourselves anecdotally to go get those things to be noisy and cause vibration. I personally am very familiar with subsound vibration and what it does to heavy construction workers and have seen it on the job site and I am quite concerned with that. I feel that this commission does have the expertise available to them to make these kinds of decisions and I welcome your guys' involvement in this</i>   |
| 100            | Jim Hutchison   | Washougal, WA resident                   | VR1        | <i>The Gorge Act, though it did not visualize tall towers that would impact views from the Gorge, is very specific about aesthetics. Since the Act's implementation even single nonconforming houses have generated extensive debate.</i>   |
| 101            | Jim Hutchison   | Washougal, WA resident                   | SE6        | <i>Timber production losses...Nearly all timber harvest would thus be permanently eliminated for approximately 18 acres around each turbine. For a 100 turbine field, including the other 50 on DNR land that's been proposed, this would total 1,800 acres or nearly three square miles of lost timber production. Turbine access roads and appurtenant facilities would multiply this loss several fold.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 102            | Jim Hutchison  | Washougal, WA resident | FW2        | <i>Numerous wildlife species, not just those threatened or endangered, rely on forest habitats. Bird mortality from wind turbines is fairly well documented, but most such studies focused on turbines located outside of forest areas. Other wildlife concerns are associated with the SDS proposal. These concerns include seasonal use patterns: travel corridors, habitat alteration or removal, soil loss and associated stream sedimentation, and area abandonment by wildlife due to turbine noise. Many animals with hearing more acute than ours can be detrimentally affected by noise.</i> |
| 103            | Jim Hutchison  | Washougal, WA resident | CE2        | <i>Considering these and related concerns, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's recommendation for a comprehensive cumulative effects analysis should be required for this or any wind turbine application, especially when proposed in a forest setting.</i>   |
| 104            | Jim Hutchison  | Washougal, WA resident | PM3        | <i>for this and other wind power projects in Washington, your agency, the Energy Siting Council, prepares the EIS. That approach appears a most questionable use of public funds -- I stand corrected but I still have questions about this subject -- for this highly contentious proposed Gorge 16 project which the Governor may well not approve in the long run.</i>   |
| 105            | Jim Hutchison  | Washougal, WA resident | AL1        | <i>Wind is a legitimate source of power production, but only if it does not conflict overly with other values. In this case, placing multiple wind turbines which would remove hundreds of acres of sustainable tree harvest on forest land favored by many forms of wildlife immediately adjacent to the Gorge Scenic Area appears substantially unwise.</i>   |
| 106            | Leanne Haight  | Carson, WA resident    | AL1        | <i>The site of the proposed wind farm is the appropriate one, as there are very few if any other places in the county where a wind project of any size and substance can be located, and that's considering wind flow patterns and the boundaries of the National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 107            | Leanne Haight  | Carson, WA resident    | EG1        | <i>This project would also put us one step closer to reaching the state mandate that requires that 15 percent of our energy come from renewable sources by the year 2020, and it will be us walking our talk.</i>   |
| 108            | Leanne Haight  | Carson, WA resident    | SE6        | <i>Additionally and as importantly it will provide a boost to our county economy...This wind project would be one piece of a matrix we need to construct to responsibly grow our economy and sustain a healthy community in the future.</i>   |
| 109            | Steve Andruss  | Bingen, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>But our view of this beautiful place is to preserve it and don't alter it too much because it's a recreational paradise, and I'm really pretty opposed to the wind turbine project as it will affect me every time I go for a walk I'm going to be looking at wind turbines and they're going to be hanging over the valley.</i>   |
| 110            | Steve Andruss  | Bingen, WA resident    | VR2        | <i>And I don't know if you drive down the Gorge at night or not but out east it's like a slurry of lights in the sky at night, and it's aesthetically really not very nice. And so I just think it's kind of a bad idea.</i>  |
| 111            | Steve Curley   | Underwood, WA resident | EG1        | <i>It sounds like we're suppose to be afraid because we're going to run out of energy if we don't get this wind turbine project, which to me seems quite ridiculous because we live on the second largest river in the country with a hydroelectric project every 40 to 60 miles as far as they go. There's a coal-fired plant in Boardman. There's a nuclear project up there in Hanford that's been there since the forties. I think we have energy coming out our wazzus. It all goes somewhere else is what happens.</i>  |
| 112            | Steve Curley   | Underwood, WA resident | AL1        | <i>It's the wrong place for a wind farm within a few miles of the Columbia National Scenic Area. You can put this farm in Eastern Washington, Bickleton, Maryhill. There's tons of wind farms out there, and it's not bothering anybody out there.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name   | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
| 113            | Steve Curley     | Underwood, WA resident    | SE2        | <i>I have no idea what's going to happen with my property value, you know. They're going to collect extra taxes from these windmills, yeah, but what happens to my property value if it goes down? I have no idea what's going to happen. I mean that's obviously one of the variables here.</i>  |
| 114            | Steve Curley     | Underwood, WA resident    | AL1        | <i>If this project wasn't so close to the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area and it's like a mile or two away, it's right there, I wouldn't have such a problem with it. But you know what? I can't put the wind turbine at my house one or two miles away so why should they be able to? I think they should put it in Eastern Washington.</i>  |
| 115            | Sally Newell     | Underwood, WA resident    | PM3        | <i>I don't want studies that are being financed by the proponent. I want truly neutral studies of the wildlife and human impacts...Also I know your chair formally served on the Columbia River Gorge Commission. That's a real small club and I actually belong to that club too.</i>  |
| 116            | Sally Newell     | Underwood, WA resident    | TT3        | <i>But that transportation piece has me very worried.</i>   |
| 117            | Sally Newell     | Underwood, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>The National Scenic Area is a major concern to me because I think there's a potential for a precedent here. This whole Gorge is windy, and it's windy on both sides of the river, and it wouldn't take a whole lot of the blinking red lights to really trash it.</i>  |
| 118            | Scott Hulbert    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR1        | <i>General opposition based on scenic values</i>  |
| 119            | Scott Hulbert    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR1        | <i>I think from Hood River and from coming from the Dalles and coming from driving up from Portland at night this is going to be a major distraction, and I drive this road everyday to Portland and back and I know exactly where they're going to be and it's a huge concern for me.</i>  |
| 120            | Scott Hulbert    | White Salmon, WA resident | VR1        | <i>that key provision of the National Scenic Act is the idea of manmade objects being visually subordinate to the natural resources, especially in these key viewing areas. I don't feel this project would fit that definition.</i>  |
| 121            | Scott Hulbert    | White Salmon, WA resident | PM3        | <i>And referring to Section 4 of the application, I really was seeking more information and I didn't feel that the photos were an accurate representation of what impact this will have visually from key viewing areas. The problems I have with the application were that they seemed less than accurate in regards to ratios of height. You know, some of the trees looked like they were not much shorter than these towers. I know they're 400 plus feet tall. The problem I have with the photos again is that it really doesn't show the visual contrast that these windmills will have.</i> |
| 122            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident    | SE6        | <i>I have not seen any presentation in all of these things about this that has demonstrated conclusively that the county will make one thin dime net off of this project. In fact, I propose that this project will actually be a money losing proposition for the county when all of the expenses and the diminishing of revenue generated by this thing are calculated completely and looked at thoroughly which haven't been done yet.</i>   |
| 123            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident    | SE6        | <i>The other thing I wanted to mention we have no guarantees about how long these things will be in place, how long they will generate property tax revenues for the county.</i>  |
| 124            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident    | SE6        | <i>Like other people mentioned we might have loss of other potential development, commercial event sites. We have a big ordinance, you know, a zoning thing that allows for these commercial event centers, and who's going to build one if they get a bad write-up in a magazine about the area, the scenic impacts? So there are commercial influences like that that could affect the income stream also. ... If it's a money losing operation, we don't need the project.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name   | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 125            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident | FW2        | <i>I'm concerned where we're going to get the birds. They cover in here it said 1.9 birds killed per tower. So I'm just saying if that's true where do we get the birds? We've only got so many of them in Underwood and I'm concerned.</i>   |
| 126            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident | TT3        | <i>The other thing that I wanted to talk about was the road access. The map over here shows widening necessary at the intersection of Scoggins and Kollack-Knapp Road. That applicant assured us -- I asked about it three separate times, three separate questions -- that this project could be accomplished within the existing rights of way of the existing public roads and thoroughfares that connect the major thoroughfares with this project, and the County Commissioner Jamie Tolfree told us that no transportation plan would be approved that did not meet that standard. Now I'm concerned that the applicant is requesting that this project would require the condemnation of private land to widen this intersection. And if that's the case, that would be contrary to what's been promised and presented to the community, and actually that would be important.</i> |
| 127            | Steven Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident | VR2        | Nighttime visual impact of the warning lights is a big concern.   |
| 128            | Charles Barker   | Mosier, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>renewable energy is only capable in this region up to 6,000 megawatts. In other words, we have enough hydro and hydropower in place right now to effectively carry 6,000 megawatts of power renewable. After that point we will be saturated and we have to start building more gas-fired turbines. That's by the renewable impacts statement by Bonneville, and I'd like to know what you're going to do now that we are at almost 6,000 just here in the Columbia Basin. The region is Northern California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. That is the region, 6,000 megawatts for that region. We are approaching 6,000 megawatts in the Columbia Basin.</i>   |
| 129            | Charles Barker   | Mosier, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>Every 1,200, every megawatt of renewable energy is required to have a megawatt of backup power provided by gas-fired turbines in this region. So for 6,000 megawatts we will be building -- well, let's see. 6,000, 1,200, that's five new gas-fired plants right there, and you'll be asked to okay or not okay sometime here very shortly in the future. Then when we go to 30 megawatts renewable, 30,000 megawatts of renewable energy that's going to another 25 more gas-fired power plants to back up the renewables. Have you thought about this? We've asked this question to the EFSEC in Oregon before and they said, "Well, when we get to that threshold, we'll worry about it then." We are at that threshold. You're the same region, you have the same responsibility as the EFSEC in Oregon, Idaho, Montana. It's all one big region.</i>                             |
| 130            | Charles Barker   | Mosier, OR resident    | EG1        | <i>There is a document that was put out in the beginning and it says that -- actually it says in the very first paragraph [of BPA's documentation] that wind energy is totally unsustainable.</i>   |



---

May 7, 2009 Transcripts



| Comment Number | Commenter Name    | Affiliation                         | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---|
| 1              | W.D. Truitt       | Skamania County Planning Commission | SE4        | <i>Speaking from the Port's point of view, we are pro wind power. It's for the tax base for the county, for the job providing. What we do is we try to provide an infrastructure so businesses do move into the county and so they can provide jobs for the workforce in the county.... SDS is just trying to stay in the economic market the same way people are who switch from orchards to vineyards.</i>  |
| 2              | Stephen Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident              | SE4        | <i>In the application it's in Section 4422, and on this diagram over here the applicant states that the \$731,500 and would represent a permanent annual increase of 7.6 percent to the current 2007 year. I don't see anything in the application that supports the claim that it will be a permanent revenue stream so I would like to point that out. If there is, I'd like to know what it was.</i>   |
| 3              | Stephen Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident              | TT3        | <i>Also in the application you drove up there today and you went by the intersection of Kollack-Knapp and Scoggins roads. There's a bunch of photographs in this application, and none of them show the Rawley's house that's on that corner that you drove right around. That road makes a 150-degree turnaround....I'm curious as to why that house was not depicted in all of those photos when that house could be severely impacted by the haul route and road use procedure that takes place in Skamania County here.</i>   |
| 4              | Stephen Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident              | TT3        | <i>in the application the applicant states that all of the road use access and haul route issues would be handled under Title 21 of Skamania County, and therefore go through a county approval process for determining if there is in fact a legal route for delivering these items to the proposed site, and I suggest that process be completed before we proceed with this application because it's fundamental. ...So I would request that that issue go before Skamania County ...right of way and ownership, right of way ownership and easement determination would be required at those three intersections: Kollack-Knapp Road, Scoggins Road, and the intersection with the private roads as listed in their thing. ...settle those right-of-way and ownership easement determinations before we proceed with this siting.</i> |
| 5              | Stephen Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident              | TT2        | <i>page 4339 of the application states that the traffic southbound on Cook-Underwood Road would increase from 20 vehicles an hour during peak time during construction up to 285 vehicles per hour at 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. on Cook-Underwood Road. And I can tell you that would represent an unacceptable increase in traffic and therefore danger to the community. That impact is not being addressed in this application.</i>  |
| 6              | Stephen Bronsveld | Underwood, WA resident              | ER1        | <i>Underwood would respond to incidents at this site and the cost incurred by Underwood Fire Department has not been addressed. In fact, none of the costs associated that's for the county have been identified and those are significant impacts on us. The county's in trouble for money. We don't get a project that make us lose any money.</i>  |
| 7              | Steve Curley      | Underwood, WA resident              | SE1        | <i>The impact on degrading the beauty of the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area is reduction of visitors, the reduction in room tax, the reduction of receipts to potential tourism is something that should be addressed and probably looked at.</i>  |
| 8              | Steve Curley      | Underwood, WA resident              | SE2        | <i>The reduction of property values. People unwilling to invest here which impacts tax values, of course, which I think most people are looking at the tax impacts when you put this thing up coming into the county. But what if my property values go down?</i>   |
| 9              | Steve Curley      | Underwood, WA resident              | SE3        | <i>I recommend there needs to be an economic impact study to understand what these costs are, not just an environmental but an economic.</i>  |
| 10             | Steve Curley      | Underwood, WA resident              | AL1        | <i>You know this is the wrong place. This project should be out east not here in the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name  | Affiliation                           | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--|
| 11             | Wally Stevenson | SDS Lumber; White Salmon, WA resident | SE6        | Discussion of SDS lumber... <i>we think that this is a very good way to get into the business that will help keep White Salmon and Underwood and everything alive around here. So I just want to say that we appreciate you people coming here and we're very serious about this and we intend to do our best to do it right.</i>  |
| 12             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | SE1        | <i>Yes, I'm saying not in my backyard, but really I'm saying not in this part of the Gorge, a place where there is a new economic engine that is thriving, and that is tourism, recreation, and the draw of a better lifestyle.</i>  |
| 13             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | SE3        | <i>plenty of people are hurting from the current economic slowdown, but this is no reason to trade our long-term economic future and the future that could be for one that has a short influx in capital and minimal jobs, the most lucrative of which do not come from the local community. The long-term tax revenue from property taxes on depreciating windmill equipment is dubious at best as a significant revenue source for our future. (\$150 million to construct) but (87.5 tax base). Basically even if you are for the windmills, our county government is getting hung out to dry on the long-term revenue stream being collected while the huge profits and taxpayer funded subsidies are going directly into the developer's pockets.</i>                           |
| 14             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | TT2        | <i>the movement of heavy wide-load equipment up Cook-Underwood will impact people's ability to get to their jobs and go about their daily business, as well as block escape routes in a wildfire</i>   |
| 15             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | AL1        | <i>As far as the environmental impacts, I truly hope that this project is not a series of rubber stamps for wind energy expansion without looking at which places are unsuitable for such expansion based on factors such as proximity to local communities and residences and the fact that these windmills are being placed in forestland. This should give everyone pause for thought. This is not a farmer's field or an arid desert. This is a forest that has supposedly been sustainably logged to help protect the ecosystem it supports. It directly borders a community and residences as well as the protected National Scenic Area itself.</i>   |
| 16             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | EI1        | <i>It was interesting to find in the application that some of the protective species preferred forest habitats characterized by multilayered canopy and a high incidence of large trees. It also goes on to say that no late-serial forests are present within the project site. Well, they were present a few short years ago until SDS decided to remove the last of them. There are still many species of large predator and prey that call it home or migrate past it and birds such as Eagles, Owls, Osprey.</i>  |
| 17             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | MT1        | <i>The application also says the project has been planned and designed to eliminate or fully mitigate all environmental impacts. If the committee does end up recommending approval of this installation, I hope they will make every attempt to truly mitigate the effects of such a development on the surrounding communities and environment.</i>  |
| 18             | Chris Lloyd     | Underwood, WA resident                | LU1        | <i>Any regard to zoning should take into account appropriate areas large of scale industrial installations and expansion. Remember that 450-foot windmills are half the height of the bluff at its highest point. They pierce the skyline and have bright red flashing lights at night. If you have not done so yet, try driving out east at night and see the sea of blinding red. The windmills made a mockery of the restrictions most landowners in this community face who are not excluded from the scenic area and its rules. The impact to the scenic area and its zoning is horrendous. Everyone in this community pays a high price for the protection of the scenic area. To not include this as a significant factor in the approval process is to turn a blind eye.</i> |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 19             | Chris Lloyd    | Underwood, WA resident | SE1        | <i>It weakens the foundation for protection of the entire area, including its burgeoning economy, and this effect should be considered regardless of whether the windmills themselves are placed within it. Remember that SDS land was excluded from scenic area rules in order to protect timber jobs and timber resources.</i>  |
| 20             | Chris Lloyd    | Underwood, WA resident | PM3        | <i>I would plead the committee to fairly assess all sides of the argument and validate any and all claims, Then provide a fair and unbalanced assessment to the Governor.</i>   |
| 21             | James Buckland | Mill A, WA resident    | VR1        | Concern about daytime visual impact   |
| 22             | James Buckland | Mill A, WA resident    | VR2        | Concern about nighttime visual impact   |
| 23             | James Buckland | Mill A, WA resident    | RR1        | <i>So if we're going to have to live with these things here, I hope they can see to opening the woods at least [to recreational uses] so we can enjoy what we used to enjoy. I mean we are going to be impacted by these things. I don't want to see them there.</i>  |
| 24             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | VR1        | <i>As it's currently defined the project will be visible from all nationally designated key viewing sites in the mid Columbia region. This would be a horrible inexcusable degradation of our National Scenic Treasure.</i>   |
| 25             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | SE1        | <i>I also believe that the turbines sited in the scenic area will have a negative financial impact to our tourism business. Site the turbines so they cannot be seen from key viewing areas.</i>  |
| 26             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | SE5        | <i>there is a potential for elk and other large animal movement to be modified due to this wall of turbines that is going to span the current corridor for animal movement. Along with the large animals will come predators. We have Cougars in this area. They will be redirected. The question is where will they go? Most likely to the south of the wall of turbines. That means they're going to be now going through residential and agricultural areas. Let me tell you elk and deer cause major damage to agricultural products, not to mention the predators in the residential areas will not be safe for our community.</i> |
| 27             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | SE5        | <i>I would suggest that you delete the "A Towers" to allow the corridor for the animals to continue to cross without pushing them into the residential areas.</i>   |
| 28             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | LU1        | <i>Regarding land use, as you know Skamania County tried to update the zoning to support industrial facilities in the county. It's called Title 21, and as you know that has been stopped temporarily. ...all the oral comments made about the zoning said they wanted setbacks for industrial facilities, all kinds of industrial facilities to be greater than one mile; yet, the county did not listen to this.</i>  |
| 29             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | TT1        | <i>The application mentions no load limits for the transportation route; that there are no load limits on the transportation route. .... This is a slide area so I just would suggest that you have someone take a look at actual load testing of the route.</i>  |
| 30             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | TT2        | <i>The planned route goes through Underwood and its on residential streets and, in fact, the Cook-Underwood is the main arterial residential street. Figuring seven extra wide trucks per turbine that means that we're going to have approximately 700 trips up and down of these huge trucks through the residential site.... You should limit it to times there is no commuting to and from work and you should also limit it to just weekdays. That way the tourism and the scenic area will be less impacted because we do have most of our visitors on the weekends.</i>  |
| 31             | Mike Eastwick  | Underwood, WA resident | ER1        | <i>Emergency vehicle considerations during turbine truck traffic hours... We need to have emergency vehicles be able to access all Underwood during these traffic windows.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| 32             | Mike Eastwick       | Underwood, WA resident | ER1        | <i>we would need to have enhanced or supplemental police enforcement of the traffic windows and suppress breaking laws. These huge trucks down the hill are going to have trouble, and the other roads' safety laws should be further enforced.</i>   |
| 33             | Richard Aramburu    | SOSA                   | PM3        | <i>the Council has apparently authorized the applicant to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement for this proposal. It is done so without any record of why that was done in that manner when other choices exist such as it being done by a contractor for the Council. It's absolutely illegal for BPA to allow an applicant generate an EIS. This is a big mistake. You should reverse that and do your own EIS, point one.</i>  |
| 34             | Richard Aramburu    | SOSA                   | CE1        | <i>the project that is being announced today is not in fact the entire project that's being proposed by the applicant. We learned from the applicant's website and from information provided on that website that in fact the applicant is intending and has filed an application with DNR to extend this proposal to the north of the project area on approximately 2,500 acres of DNR property to add an additional 30 turbines to this proposal. That's a proposal that's been made formally to DNR. We're going to address this in our comments with you, but we think it's important that the scope of the EIS be extended to the additional turbines that are being developed in this area mainly because the applicant has said that's what they're going to do and also because the turbines that would be generated in this location would rely upon the substation which you all saw this morning for the connection to the BPA transmission grid. So if this is being developed in this area, it must attach to the grid at the substation on the 230. 115 kV lines. That makes this project very much dependent on this location and would generate additional momentum for this project. So the EIS needs to include the environmental aspects of the proposal already made by the applicant to proceed and develop on the DNR property,</i> |
| 35             | Richard Aramburu    | SOSA                   | PM2        | <i>the involvement of DNR in this project and the fact that this project will facilitate development on DNR property raises questions as to whether or not this Council passes on the Whistling Ridge proposal should include the representative of DNR when DNR has a vested interest in this development because the development will provide a connection to the grid for possible uses on DNR property.</i>   |
| 36             | Richard Aramburu    | SOSA                   | EG1        | <i>for the period of time from January 13th to January 22nd of this year when it was so bloody cold all over the Northwest how many megawatts of power came from wind energy? Does anybody know? None. For nine days notwithstanding all this business about installed capacity there wasn't a single megawatt of power that came from wind energy to the Northwest grid when the Northwest grid was running from 9,500 to 11,000 megawatts. That's because all of this depends on the wind blowing. If it doesn't blow, there is no energy. So when you look at this capacity, it's not like capacity from other sources of energy.</i>  |
| 37             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>I oppose this wind project for several reasons; first, the visual impact to this area. The towers proposed are 400 plus feet. That's like over a 42-story building, which I can't even imagine 42-story buildings along those ridges. These towers would become visually dominant in this area.</i>  |
| 38             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | AL1        | <i>I'm for wind projects in flatter, more agricultural areas. This is not one of those areas obviously. The wind towers would be huge additions to the industrialization of our quiet and beautiful landscape.</i>  |
| 39             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | FW2        | <i>The other thing is impact on wildlife. I believe that wind generators kill birds and bats, and bats are very important to our permaculture farm. They help with pest control, insect pest control.</i>   |
| 40             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | SE3        | <i>another reason that I'm opposed to this project is the energy generated would leave this community. We would be faced with living with these towers, but yet we wouldn't benefit from the towers because that electricity is going to go to the general grid and we're not going to see any benefit from that.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name      | Affiliation            | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| 41             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | SW1        | <i>The destruction of the earth that will occur building these wind farms with the roads being built could wreak havoc of the Little White Salmon and the White Salmon River.</i>  |
| 42             | Rebecca Stonestreet | Mill A, WA resident    | AL1        | <i>The proposed wind farm is just too close to the National Columbia Gorge Scenic Area. It needs to be put in another place.</i>   |
| 43             | Lynn Bergeron       | Mill A, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>I don't want to look at the towers. I'll tell you that right now. But I think whether or not I want to look at the towers doesn't matter.</i>   |
| 44             | Lynn Bergeron       | Mill A, WA resident    | EG1        | <i>Obviously there's a demand for more power or none of these power projects would even come to be. But my question is, is it a short-term demand or a long-term demand? And is the demand that we're trying to meet in power something that's going to put a lot of money and a lot of benefits in a few pockets and, you know, 25 years from now the picture is entirely changed and we're left with the towers, the roads, the environmental degradation?</i>                             |
| 45             | Lynn Bergeron       | Mill A, WA resident    | EG1        | <i>So as part of your scope of what you're looking at I would like you to tap into people who have a long-range vision of power generation in the state because a lot of things that we do just end up to be short-term impacts.</i>   |
| 46             | Lynn Bergeron       | Mill A, WA resident    | AL1        | <i>Organizations that have looked at the impacts of wind projects have said that, you know, sticking them on mountain tops has a lot more challenges and therefore to the environment and therefore they're not a prime choice.</i>  |
| 47             | Lynn Bergeron       | Mill A, WA resident    | SE3        | Recognition of need for economic benefits for county but this is too risky and benefit is for too few.   |
| 48             | Wirt Maxey          | Underwood, WA resident | SW1        | <i>my understanding is there's a month's stage of band up there, particularly on the south where the slope slopes steep. I don't believe that that's been documented as part of DNR making connections with some of SDS logging permits and so forth. I intend to make written comments to supply you with that, but I'm mentioning it now.</i>  |
| 49             | Wirt Maxey          | Underwood, WA resident | SW1        | <i>As well you're perfectly aware that there's some springs again at the south end very, very close by where they're talking about doing all those turbine strings. Those springs serve a lot of the agriculture there down below. Again, I believe at least one or two households so I think in terms of your scoping you need to take a close look at those two things.</i>  |
| 50             | Wirt Maxey          | Underwood, WA resident | VR1        | <i>[mt. Rushmore and others]... They're national treasures, and that's why it's not appropriate to site these here and the same reasoning applies to the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Contrary to what was suggested by Commissioner Pearce [regarding the perimeter of the scenic area] this has no bearing whatsoever on the duty and obligation of this Council under SEPA and of the BPA for NEPA to consider the scenic impacts as part of your environmental review.</i> |
| 51             | Wirt Maxey          | Underwood, WA resident | SE6        | <i>I would like to say there's been a lot of talk about how this project will take care of the economic woes of Skamania County. I submit to this Board plundering the National Scenic Area is not an appropriate way to cure the economic woes of Skamania County, whatever they may be.</i>  |
| 52             | Wirt Maxey          | Underwood, WA resident | AL1        | <i>There are lots and lots of alternative sites for wind farms. In Washington to the east there's hundreds of thousands of acres, and they're a much more appropriate site. So there's lots of alternative sites. There is only one National Scenic Area. You can't pick it up and move it someplace</i>   |
| 53             | John Tyler          | Underwood, WA resident | VR1        | <i>We were drawn to this place because of the national beauty. I'm afraid this is going to be severely affected by all the wind towers and the wind farm that it contains.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| 54             | John Tyler     | Underwood, WA resident  | MT1        | <i>I am concerned about the irreversibility of this project. Three million dollar or thereabouts massive concrete towers are not going to be willingly moved when they become obsolete. They aren't going to rot and deteriorate. They're going to be here for the duration. What happens if our needs change?</i>   |
| 55             | John Tyler     | Underwood, WA resident  | EI1        | <i>concern is the precedency of the thing for this. Jason mentioned earlier that this hasn't been tried before in reforested areas. I think that's a bad thing because if it is done here, I think we can expect other people who have an interest in wind energy to also seek outward a place to move and relocate and start an industry up here, plenty of wind. More people will follow, and the people who follow this may not have the roots in the community that SDS does and may not have the confidence of many community members that would look out for the interest of this.</i> |
| 56             | Tom Quinn      | The Dalles, WA resident | VR1        | <i>...I think my neighbors and I decided after seeing this is that our area of the Gorge was just not acceptable and I don't think this is area acceptable either....Any time Mr. Spadaro gave his speech the one thing he didn't say he didn't mention anything about the impact on the scenic area. That's crucial.</i>  |
| 57             | Tom Quinn      | The Dalles, WA resident | NQ1        | <i>a lot of towers were proposed for a half mile from people's houses, and if you did the research the wind industry will say that there's no peer reviewed study of wind towers that close to people will have any adverse effect. And I still think there's enough anecdotal evidence to say this is not</i>   |
| 58             | Tom Quinn      | The Dalles, WA resident | AL1        | <i>Wind farms are ok in eastern OR and WA, but the gorge is not the correct location.</i>  |
| 59             | Tom Quinn      | The Dalles, WA resident | NW3        | <i>I would just encourage you to draw the line somewhere and say anything five miles from the scenic area is just a no-go zone for a wind turbine and two miles from a house. I mean those are just common sense setbacks</i>  |
| 60             | Cam Thomas     | Underwood, WA resident  | SE6        | <i>This project will be in my backyard as a local Underwood resident as much as anybody else's, but I'm here to say that I'm in favor of the 75 megawatts of renewable power, and \$731,000 of tax base and income that it will bring to Skamania County.</i>  |
| 61             | Cam Thomas     | Underwood, WA resident  | VR1        | <i>And it's my understanding that all of the wind turbines that were proposed in this project are outside of the scenic area, and there are areas even closer to the scenic area that are farmland on which these type of turbines would be permitted outright. So I think the forestry and wind generation is compatible in this area.</i>  |
| 62             | Cam Thomas     | Underwood, WA resident  | EG1        | <i>Skamania County PUD will get a huge benefit as will all of Skamania County PUD's customers because the interchange and interconnect to the Bonneville line will provide Skamania County with a circular loop that is not available right now.</i>   |
| 63             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident  | PM3        | <i>I for one am not willing to accept any studies that have been already commissioned by SDS Lumber. I'd like to see a neutral third party conducting studies.</i>   |
| 64             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident  | FW2        | <i>Natural resource concerns, wildlife particularly, the affect of turbines on human health, noise from the turbines.</i>  |
| 65             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident  | NQ1        | <i>And speaking of noise echoing through the mountains, we get jets from Whidbey Island Naval Air Station flying low through here from time to time. The affect the turbines will have on their exercises should be assessed in your scoping.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| 66             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>I am troubled the proposed project will be visible from so many places in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area as well as other beauty spots nearby like the Hood River Valley, White Salmon River Wild, and Scenic River Corridor. The aesthetic impact for me is much less about how these turbines look during the day turning in their lazy circles, but if I had to look at those dudes at night with their strobing red lights, I'd buy drapes.</i>  |
| 67             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | SE2        | <i>You should study the effect of the project on local real estate values both during construction and after completion.</i>   |
| 68             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>One of the reasons those homes can command such prices is the National Scenic Area. You can't just buy a couple acres here and drive your trailer onto it. Right or wrong it does restrict the supply, and demand drives up the price. We have only just begun to eat the scenery here. Please don't yank it out of our mouths.</i>   |
| 69             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>People here have sacrificed, often unwillingly and sometimes at great unanticipated personal expense to preserve the beauty of this place for the larger public interest. The State of Washington signed a compact with the State of Oregon because this place is special.</i>  |
| 70             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | NQ2        | <i>I want to know how many tons of exhaust will be going into our air shed here because the Columbia River Gorge Air Shed is already in trouble as you know.</i>   |
| 71             | Sally Newell   | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>I understand that the State of Oregon has a law requiring their Energy Siting Board to consider lands bearing special state or federal designations very carefully when siting facilities like wind turbines. I know you have no state law compelling you to give special consideration to a national treasure, but I hope your good sense and moral compass will lead you in that direction.</i>   |
| 72             | Glenda Ryan    | Underwood, WA resident        | SW1        | <i>main concern ...is the amount of water that's going to be necessary to the footings for these towers, spraying the roads to eliminate the dust.</i>   |
| 73             | Glenda Ryan    | Underwood, WA resident        | SW1        | <i>water quality is something I would like to see addressed and how it's going to impact our water supplies and future water supplies as far as the aquifer and that sort of thing. I'm not sure if it has been affected.</i>  |
| 74             | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>key viewing areas... Several of these were missing from the discussion; therefore, it is unclear whether they are national scenic areas and resources were adequately captured.</i>   |
| 75             | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>National Scenic Area is a nationally known and protected landscape of high quality and high sensitivity. All key viewing areas and analysis should reflect this. The results of the applicant's analysis are heavily weighed on the assignment of existing scenic quality and viewer sensitivity. These methods were not traveled and do not represent the reality of the scenic area.</i>  |
| 76             | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | PM3        | <i>the conclusions made on the summary chart were more accurately conveyed using degree of contrast with the natural landscape both during the day and at night and distance of the viewer from the project area. This assumes that the most visually impacted viewpoints have been found and that the simulations accurately depict the degree of contrast. The impact summaries discuss these contrasts, but the rates do not reflect the discussion...the visualizations are important for finding the number and location of the visible turbines but have limited utility for assessing scenic impacts.</i> |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation                   | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| 77             | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>the recommendations of the Forest Service. Recommendations: In order to assure that the scenic resource impact is adequately analyzed I recommend the following improvements to the scenic resource and BACT assessment: A fluid discussion or summary of the most visible turbines; include photographs of existing energy projects visible in the National Scenic Area; do not use visual simulations of a small scale with clouds in the picture to depict the visual impacts of visible turbines; make certain that the most visible viewpoints have been covered, especially with respect to linear viewpoints, and make certain to include the nighttime effects in your analysis.</i> |
| 78             | Nathan Baker   | Friends of the Columbia Gorge | VR1        | <i>In order to prevent the scenic impact of the turbines visible from the scenic area key viewing areas, I also recommend that the applicant eliminate turbine locations found to be visible from the scenic area key viewing areas.</i>  |
| 79             | Matt Ryan      | Underwood, WA resident        | VR1        | <i>I fairly strongly oppose this project for many reasons. I think most of them have been well stated by others today already. I just wanted to reemphasize my concerns both primarily with the scenic impacts...So, again, I think the scenic impacts are going to far outweigh the benefits that others have already stated</i>   |
| 80             | Matt Ryan      | Underwood, WA resident        | SW1        | <i>I'm concerned where all the water is going to come from to create all the cement that's going to be needed for this project, again for dust control, all the water needs</i>   |
| 81             | Matt Ryan      | Underwood, WA resident        | ER1        | <i>If they were to have other wildfires while this project is going on, I'm concerned how much water we would have to fight wildfires.</i>  |
| 82             | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA resident        | PM4        | <i>I am in favor of this project. I believe that there's a campaign of misinformation by opponents that obscure the objective evaluation of the project. We've had statements of the towers are concrete, but they're not. They're steel. We've had statements about water. We've had statements about visual impacts. And this project is outside the scenic area of the National Columbia River Gorge.</i>  |
| 83             | Don Bradford   | Underwood, WA resident        | PM4        | <i>SDS owns this property. It's outside the Gorge area. They have a right to the beneficial use of their property.</i>  |
| 84             | Frank Backus   | White Salmon, WA resident     | SE6        | <i>Skamania County has very, very little land that they can look to for economic development.</i>   |
| 85             | Frank Backus   | White Salmon, WA resident     | SE4        | <i>You need to analyze the importance of the small privately owned companies like SDS Lumber Company, and their need to be able to diversify to stay in business. The economic ties of the wind today are no secret to anybody on how difficult it is for a company like SDS to stay open.</i>  |
| 86             | Frank Backus   | White Salmon, WA resident     | EG2        | <i>It's been mentioned today you all understand that the State of Washington did pass a referendum requiring utilities to have renewable energy. Fifty-four percent of the people of Skamania County voted for that.</i>  |
| 87             | Frank Backus   | White Salmon, WA resident     | VR1        | <i>The final thing you need to take away from here are wind turbines are wind turbines and they affect the scenery but the boundary of the National Scenic Area is the boundary of the National Scenic Area.</i>  |
| 88             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident     | PM4        | <i>I think that this is an opportunity to show that as a community that we can do it right by putting this wind farm up there, showing that they can be compatible.</i>   |
| 89             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident     | SE3        | <i>And in doing that we need to see if there's going to be a short-term sacrifice that we can make in getting this wind farm up to benefit everyone for the long term or because there are going to be heavy trucks coming up from a year or maybe year and a half do we just kill the project altogether despite the fact that this provides for energy needs?</i>   |
| 90             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident     | EG2        | <i>We are going to need energy, and wind energy is a viable, viable way of getting energy to the homes.</i>   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|
| 91             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | FW1        | Environmental impact is minimal - according to the application there are no spotted owls in the area, only grey squirrels   |
| 92             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | EG2        | <i>And I think that this is a marriage made in heaven because of the fact that we have BPA's transmission lines.</i>  |
| 93             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | SE1        | <i>I don't think that this small area is going to impact this, you know, agri-tourism is what it's called I guess. I don't think that it's going to collapse the economy of the Columbia River Gorge just because of this wind farm, but it does supply power for 20,000 homes is the estimate.</i>   |
| 94             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | SW1        | <i>I know that water sometimes is hard to come by, but SDS has the equipment and the means to get water to these places.</i>  |
| 95             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | TT1        | <i>They have the roads already in place. Okay? Two and a half miles of extra, you know, widening of roads or excavating roads those things are not a big deal in my book, you know.</i>   |
| 96             | Kevin Herman   | White Salmon, WA resident | SE4        | <i>It allows me because I'm a student at Columbia Gorge Community College in the renewable energy resources program to not have to move out of the area, and that I would very much appreciate.</i>   |
| 97             | James Browne   | The Dalles, OR resident   | EG1        | <i>We need to make sacrifices to make renewable energy work, because in 20,30,40 years we might be in the same situations as communities in Alaska that are economically challenged because of the cost of electricity generation.</i>  |
| 98             | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | PM3        | <i>I want to introduce we reside at the property nearest the project, about 1,500 feet from the project, and we're surrounded on all three sides by forest that's controlled by SDS Broughton. I'm very concerned about the potential conclusions from the EIS with the fundamental data that's derived and prepared by the applicant</i>   |
| 99             | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | FW2        | <i>That bats are active as early as March in our area. We see them frequently flying along the riparian slope up in perennial stream that goes through our property. Bat surveys right now are only between July and September and so I think they're missing a significant portion of their active season.</i>   |
| 100            | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | PM3        | <i>Allegation that owl surveys that the applicant completed in 2008 not reported correctly in the application from SDS (owls that were observed by both the speaker and the surveyor were not noted in the application). Additionally we have a photo of a gray horn owl coming into our perennial stream. We frequently hear barn owls and the owls are prevalent and often move back and forth at each other. We have recorded owls from our property in 2008, the nearest neighbor to the project. And we continue to document the presence of owls within audible range, within audible range of our property using specialized distance recording equipment. The design of the applicant's owl survey appears to be void of any calling points within the perennial stream but does not show up on their maps that are adjacent to this project that they want to develop.</i> |
| 101            | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | PM3        | <i>Our suggestion is that all further EIS work needs to include extensive independently conducted owl surveys in the area beginning immediately. Coordination of the project applicant will be needed to ensure these studies are carried out prior to removal of the entire habitat area under the terms of the DNR program.</i>   |
| 102            | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | SG2        | <i>there's an issue of geologically unstable slopes there. From the DNR permit they weren't allowed to log that for that reason we presume.</i>   |
| 103            | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident    | SW1        | <i>And water resources of that perennial stream again interestingly is the case there are streams, other streams there that is perennial. It's all year round and that slope in that area goes right down into that drainage. We'd like to see it appear on the maps and be represented.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation             | Issue Code | Comment   |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|---|
| 104            | Loreley Brach  | Underwood, WA resident  | SE3        | <i>this is the National Scenic Area. We need to as a society we need to step back and take a look. What are we getting from this project: some intermittent power? In the long term what does that mean or the scenic area means to our society of increasing population that needs to be able to escape city and industrialized areas, get out and enjoy our resources? This area is spectacular. We need to preserve it. I want my kids to enjoy it wherever they live. I would also like to see other important areas in this nation and this state preserved for future generations. This place is special. Let's keep it that way, please.</i>   |
| 105            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | TT3        | <i>I've seen circles where they are having to severely change the roads and how the trucks will get up basically cuts through our property and possibly through our home. My concern is if it has such a severe impact on our personal property why we have not been notified by SDS, by the county, by anybody that this could have an impact. We've seen documentation that says it could take out part of our landscaping or it could take out part of our home or complete home. We have found out this week from Skamania County that we are not able to build another home on our 5 property because it is zoned agriculture which means that our current home was grandfathered in because it's 25 years old. So I have some research to do this week which I wasn't able to do prior to coming today to see what that truly means if we lose our home or part of our property. What is that future for us with what we had hoped to be on retirement?</i> |
| 106            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | PM3        | <i>As far as the owl study I haven't read the complete study, but I would verify we hear owls every single night and sometimes every morning. They are there. They're on the property. They are on the property around</i>  |
| 107            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | NQ1        | <i>US<br/>I'm concerned for us about the noise and there are studies out there but nothing -- there aren't enough studies to do with how it affects people's homes, and I do have a concern about that long-range piece.</i>  |
| 108            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | TT1        | <i>I have a really strong concern about the impact of the traffic and the trucks coming around that corner in Underwood at Kollack-Knapp. I don't think it will end with the project when we talk 18 months of huge amounts of truck and traffic coming up. That will not end with the project because there will always be maintenance.</i>  |
| 109            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | SE2        | <i>Loss of property value (personally) because of the loss of the rural scenic enjoyment.</i>   |
| 110            | Jeannie Rawley | Underwood, WA resident  | TT3        | <i>I would like some support from you about communication and letting those that are truly physically impacted that we are kept in the loop and communicated to about the impact that it will have on our personal property.</i>  |
| 111            | Rob Bell       | Hood River, OR resident | SE1        | <i>I invested over three million dollars and six years of my life on the promise that the Columbia Gorge Scenic Management Area view shed would remain intact. I don't think any reasonable person can dispute that 50 wind turbines sitting 300 feet above that ridge is going to be an absolute visual abomination. It's irretrievable....weddings and events was the second largest cash prop in the Gorge...The aggregate investment in wineries and vineyards is somewhere in excess of 50 million dollars. Talk to any restaurant, any hotel, they'll tell you what's kept them alive.</i>  |
| 112            | Rob Bell       | Hood River, OR resident | SE1        | <i>This is economically grotesquely flawed. There is no mention made of the 45 to 50 percent government, state, and federal subsidies. That is the only reason that makes this project of any interest to anyone interested in making a profit.</i>   |
| 113            | Rob Bell       | Hood River, OR resident | EG2        | <i>Sufficient but not too much wind at Whistling Ridge is intermittent... Whistling Ridge it whistles like crazy about 40 percent of the time. The rest of the time it's going too fast for them and the other time there is not enough wind to move them.</i>  |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation                | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------|--|
| 114            | Rob Bell       | Hood River, OR resident    | SE1        | <i>I would urge you to look at the economic underpinnings of this make to sure that the real deal is equal to the obvious unbelievable irretrievable step which is I counted 150 blinking red lights sparkling away and it's not something that I want to spend the rest of my days looking at.</i>  |
| 115            | Mary Trombly   | Mill A, WA resident        | SE2        | Almost did not buy her house in Mill A because she heard about the Whistling Ridge project.  |
| 116            | Mary Trombly   | Mill A, WA resident        | PM5        | <i>I agree with all the other people that have talked about their reasons for not wanting this project here, the scenery, the economic impacts, wildlife, and birds, water. I really, you know, if you look around you just don't see any 42-story buildings around here or even in the big city to the west.</i>  |
| 117            | Mary Trombly   | Mill A, WA resident        | PM5        | <i>I think if we're going to make sacrifices everyone in the nation should make sacrifices and start conserving energy.</i>  |
| 118            | Mary Trombly   | Mill A, WA resident        | SE3        | <i>I like money too, but I'd much prefer preserving the national treasure that we have here which is the Gorge and that's why I brought my family here in the first place.</i>   |
| 119            | Mary Trombly   | Mill A, WA resident        | NQ1        | <i>wind turbine syndrome. It's a very real medical illness that they're really just learning more and more about everyday which affects the inner ear and it's due to the low frequency vibration that the turbines put out and have so far not been able to mitigate. So I really don't think it's fair to place these within a half mile of someone's home and then expect them to just live with the possible consequences which make them unable to even live in their own home.</i> |
| 120            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | LU1        | <i>We are primarily concerned with the consequence of this wind farm on the [adjacent] national forest, a publicly owned forest.</i>   |
| 121            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | PM3        | <i>We feel that further NEPA documents need to be done by independent biologists looking at EIS studies here for both the northern spotted owl, the western gray squirrel, and the goshawk.</i>  |
| 122            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | FW1        | <i>I do recognize that a lot of this land here has already been cut over, but there is habitat located in these SDS timber lands that can be used by a northern spotted owl.</i>   |
| 123            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | CE1        | <i>I hope that a preliminary NEPA document will include both the cumulative effects of future projects that are going to be occurring in this area and the cumulative effects that occur on other parts of the area, including some of your timber projects. Some of the timber sales on DNR land are located here. Some of the wind farm projects are going to be going in on DNR land located near this project and some of the other timber cuts will occur on the BPA itself.</i>    |
| 124            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | FW2        | <i>Putting in roads, putting in turbines, and adding to the overall industrialization of our forest is the primary cause of decline in our forest health. We're extremely concerned about that.</i>  |
| 125            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | CE1        | <i>We are concerned about that so we'd like to see more information on how the edge effect of this project will move into our public forestlands, also to make sure that the scope of the EIS that is going to be done in the future includes all cumulative impacts.</i>  |
| 126            | Jessica Walz   | Gifford Pinchot Task Force | VR1        | <i>Please remember that our public forest is located near this farm and it's not just about the Gorge. It's also about our Gifford Pinchot National Forest that is in total view.</i>  |
| 127            | Jane Nichols   | Hood River, OR resident    | VR1        | does not want to see the A towers from Hood River. This is in disregard of the Scenic Act.   |

| Comment Number | Commenter Name | Affiliation               | Issue Code | Comment  |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| 128            | Rex Johnston   | White Salmon, WA resident | PM4        | <i>I'd just like to say that in Klickitat County we not only support wind energy development, but we went to the trouble of creating an energy overlay zone to facilitate its development, not only because of the obvious tax advantages to the county and to the sub taxing districts in the county but also because of the jobs created in the county which Skamania County obviously needs both the tax and the jobs.</i>                          |
| 129            | Brian Shortt   | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | <i>And the thing that concerns me the most, and I understand the biological or the wildlife issues, is the western landscape aspect that we are sacrificing. It's as simple as that.</i>   |
| 130            | Brian Shortt   | Hood River, OR resident   | SE1        | <i>The western landscape that's what we enjoy the most. That is what brought us here. That is what's allowed our economies to continue to survive the way they have. It's what brings hundreds of millions of dollars of tourism trade and helps sustain not only the Gorge but the Northwest economy.</i>   |
| 131            | Scott Cook     | Hood River, OR resident   | VR1        | Scenic degradation of the windmills is made worse because they are spinning, therefore they will catch people's eyes.  |
| 132            | Scott Cook     | Hood River, OR resident   | EI1        | <i>And in this new green rush of wind power I think we're going to have problems just like we had when we were building dams back in the thirties, forties, and fifties.</i>   |
| 133            | Laszlo Regos   | Underwood, WA resident    | VR1        | <i>We are sitting in the National Scenic Area, and scenic is a key word. Those of us who live here have certain obligations and certain rules that you have to live by...And we gladly live with these rules because we enjoy the scenery and we love the beauty that living here affords. So to subvert the scenic area in such a way and to disregard the prime reason it is a scenic area I think is perhaps short sighted.</i>                     |
| 134            | Laszlo Regos   | Underwood, WA resident    | MT1        | <i>I think this project could be mitigated to avoid the largest number of objections by moving probably only seven of these windmills, the A towers, and that would probably eliminate about 95 percent of the scenic impact that we're dealing with, that we're talking about here. So my views are that if this project was mitigated and taken into consideration the scenic impact then it would be much more beneficial to everyone involved.</i> |
| 135            | David Neikirk  | Mosier, OR resident       | EG1        | <i>One is that the grid is full. It seems to me 6,000 megawatts is the number these days. The proposed projects on both sides of the state on the river have far exceeded the number of megawatts which fill the grid. Until the infrastructure is redone getting the power to people is a real problem.</i>   |
| 136            | David Neikirk  | Mosier, OR resident       | EG1        | <i>This gentleman with this project said this is a project that's timely for its time. It's just not true. First, you need an infrastructure to deliver the electricity.</i>   |
| 137            | David Neikirk  | Mosier, OR resident       | EG1        | <i>At times the wind does not blow puts an extra load on the dam system. The dams have to call around and computerize around in order to dig up power from other places to replace that commitment because simply the wind did not blow. I think a lot of this has not been well thought out.</i>  |
| 138            | David Neikirk  | Mosier, OR resident       | VR1        | <i>We're talking about putting this next to the scenic area. It seems ridiculous.</i>  |
| 139            | David Neikirk  | Mosier, OR resident       | EG2        | <i>I think a lot of the newer projects need to be held down until you get a system of delivery in place where you can actually use the power we're making. Because at this point they just sit out there and spin on their electricity</i>   |
| 140            | Gary West      | Underwood, WA resident    | PM1        | Support of SDS's integrity because the speaker liked the way they handled their timber lands adjacent to his private land.   |
| 141            | Gary West      | Underwood, WA resident    | VR1        | The scenic boundary lines have been drawn, and outside of that SDS should be allowed to do whatever it wants.  |