Responses to Comments Presented at the Draft Supplemental EIS Public Hearing on August 25, 2004

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the comment letter.

1. **Lee Bates**

1(1) Thank you for your comment. Your opposition to the KVWPP is noted.

1(2) Please refer to Individual Letter 30, Response 15 regarding project impacts on cultural resources. Please refer to Local Agency Letter 2, Response 18 regarding consultation with the Yakama Nation.

2. **Jeff Howard**

2(1) Thank you for your comment. Your preference for siting the project in the Whiskey Dick Mountain area is noted.

Please refer to Key Issue B in Section 2 of this volume regarding property values. Please refer to Individual Letter 1, Response 9 regarding treatment of quality of life issues in a SEPA EIS. Please refer to Individual Letter 9, Response 3 regarding the project's benefits to local businesses.

3. **Ed Garrett**

3(1) Please refer to Draft Supplemental EIS Letter 1, Response 25.

3(2) Thank you for your comment. Your preference for siting the project in the Whiskey Dick Mountain area is noted.

3(3) Your comment is noted.

4. **Geoff Saunders**

4(1) Please refer to Organization Letter 4, Response 5 regarding reasons why EFSEC has limited its analysis of alternative sites to those within Kittitas County, and to Individual Letter 1, Response 8 regarding the project's permitting process.

4(2) As described in Section 2.5.1 of the Draft Supplemental EIS, EFSEC identified potential offsite alternative locations to the proposed KVWPP by considering five criteria that are generally necessary for a site to be amenable to wind farm development. These criteria include: (1) a minimum average wind speed of 16 miles per hour; (2) existing transmission line with unused capacity within 10 miles of a site; (3) large undivided land parcels totaling a minimum of approximately 6,000 acres; (4) Kittitas County zoning

classification of Agriculture-20, Commercial Agriculture, or Forest and Range; and (5) absence of significant environmental constraints or conflicting land uses.

4(3) Please refer to Response 4(2) of these public hearing comments regarding siting criteria for alternative project locations. Project profitability is inherently linked to project feasibility. Profitability in and of itself is not a siting criterion. However, proximity to adequate transmission facilities is an appropriate criterion for which to evaluate potential wind power development sites because it affects a proponent's ability to feasibly attain or approximate their objective to construct and operate a viable wind facility.

4(4) Please refer to Response 4(3) of these public hearing comments.

4(5) Your comment is noted.

4(6) The Draft Supplemental EIS relies on several sources of information, all of which were prepared by and/or reviewed by independent consultants (see Section 1.1 of the Draft Supplemental EIS, last paragraph for a list of these sources). As such, the Draft Supplemental EIS presents objective and accurate evaluation of viable alternative offsite locations.

4(7) Please refer to Key Issue B in Section 2 of this volume regarding property values.

4(8) Your comment is noted. Please refer to State Agency Letter 3, Response 24 regarding fire risk in modern turbines. Your preference for siting the project in the Whiskey Dick Mountain area is noted.

5. **James Carmody**

5(1) Please refer to Draft Supplemental EIS Letter 11, Response 3 regarding timing of the Draft Supplemental EIS public hearing.

5(2) WAC 463-47-060(3) requires that EFSEC initiate and conclude an adjudicative proceeding hearing required by RCW 80.50.100 before the Final EIS is issued. The KVWPP Final EIS will contain the comments and responses on both the Draft EIS and Draft Supplemental EIS.

5(3) EFSEC staff prepared the Draft Supplemental EIS. Please refer to Response 4(6) of these public hearing comments regarding independent review of project information. Please refer to Responses 5(4) through 5(6) of these public hearing comments regarding the alternative's analysis.

5(4) Please refer to Organization Letter 4, Response 5 regarding reasons why EFSEC has limited its analysis of alternative sites to those within Kittitas County, and to Local Agency Letter 2, Response 10 regarding updates to the offsite alternatives analysis.

5(5) Please refer to State Agency Letter 3, Response 5 regarding a redefined No Action Alternative.

5(6) Please refer to Local Agency Letter 2, Response 10 regarding updates to the offsite alternatives analysis. Please refer to State Agency Letter 3, Response 5 regarding a redefined No Action Alternative. Please refer to Organization Letter 4, Response 5 regarding reasons why EFSEC has limited its analysis of alternative sites to those within Kittitas County, and please refer to Response 5(2) of these public hearing comments regarding timing of the adjudicative proceeding hearing.