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CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It is Thursday, January 12th, 2006, 6:30 p.m., at the Kittitas County Events Center, Home Arts building. We are continuing the open-record hearing for the Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners and the Kittitas County Planning Commission to consider the Kittitas Valley Wind Farm Project submitted by Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC, for siting of a maximum of 80 wind turbines and associated facilities at a site located approximately 12 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg.

I'm going to go ahead and start out with declarations for the County Commissioners and the Planning Commission.

So for myself, I have had no new contacts since our events last night and have nothing else to declare.

With that said, anyone wishing to object to my continued sitting on this project?

Hearing no objections, Commissioner Crankovich?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I have nothing to declare since last night.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing that, does anyone
object to Commissioner Crankovich continuing to
sit in hearing on this project?

Hearing none, Commissioner Huston?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: No contact, no
disclosures.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: With that said, does anyone
object to Commissioner Huston continuing to sit
in hearing on this project?

Hearing none, the commissioners will all
remain seated. Chairman Black?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you, Chairman Bowen.

I'd like to introduce the Planning
Commission. Second from my right is Grant Clark. Next to
me on my right is Mark McClain. Next to Doug
Harris is Don Williamson.

With that, I have -- we'll go into the
legal. I have had no contact or anything to
disclose.

Is there any objection to my sitting on this
board?

Seeing no one, I'll ask Grant Clark for
his...

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have no declarations.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is there anyone in the
audience that wishes to object to Grant Clark sitting on this board?

Seeing no one, I'll ask Mark McClain.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I have no declarations. Nothing to report, no new contact.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN BLACK: With that, is there any objection from the audience for Mark McClain sitting on the commission?

Doug Harris?

COMMISSIONER HARRIS: Nothing to declare.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: With that, is there anyone -- is there anyone in the audience that wishes to object to Doug Mc -- excuse me, Doug Harris sitting on the board?

Seeing no one, Don Williamson.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Nothing to...

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Nothing. Yes, no contacts.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to object to Don Williamson sitting on the commission?

Seeing no one, we will turn it back to David Bowen. I believe he has a couple of housekeeping
chores.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you, Chairman Black. I'm booming now.

There was -- in testimony last night I heard some questions about one of the exhibits given to us by Kittitas Valley -- or by Horizon Wind, I should say, regarding proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions. I spoke with Director Piercy to see how we handled that particular part of our record, and he handled it just like we did with any other comments given to us by any other member of the public opposed or in support of the project.

We did ask last night if there was anybody wanting copies, to try to get an idea how many would want them, and then if we could get an electronic copy. So my biggest question to him was did he handle these two books like we do with everybody else's additional comment on this particular project, and he said we did.

So I'll let him add anything he wants to that.

MR. PIERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development Services.
Just to clarify and expand upon your comments, Commissioner, Department of Community Development did receive those volumes, Book 1 and Book 2, for the proposed Findings of Fact from the Horizon applicant on January 3rd of 2006.

This was considerably after the date in which we received the original application. It was not a requirement of the original application, and we treated this as a submittal document as part of the testimony, just as we treated all of the other public comments that were received prior -- or excuse me, following the announcement of the application and seeking public comment.

These volumes were included both in the Planning Commission books of materials that you see before them this evening, as well as in the Board of County Commissioners' materials.

We have requested from the applicant additional copies of the document and will be receiving no later than Monday electronic versions in disk form of the volumes as well.

I think it should also be noted as you look through those volumes, much of the information is a duplicate of the actual information that was
contained within the application, so the disk
that was provided -- many members of the
community -- I believe there were several hundred
of those disks provided -- contain similar
information in regards to the drawings and to the
basic proposal that was outlined in the
application.

Nevertheless, we do and will have copies
available to the public of all information that
was received as part of the public record for
this project, and all of that information is
available for either review or for copies to
those that request it.

As we indicated last night, a request to our
department would be forthcoming in terms of the
information. And at this point we have received
no additional requests for any portions of the
public record; but again, we would be very happy
to provide that once we receive those requests.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you.

With that said, I don't know if anybody
wanted to add anything more?

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, Perry
Huston, Commissioner District 3.

And I understand we are arguably in front of
the Planning Commission at that point; we're in joint hearing for a variety of regulatory reasons, and we will have our subsequent hearings at some later day.

However, I feel compelled in the interests of fairness to the applicant to understand that I, as one commissioner, if I come into our continued hearing and find a huge volume of substantial information that has not been available and should have been, I will make the motion to continue the hearing so the public does have the opportunity to review that.

It doesn't need to be that way. I suspect that we need to get that information up front so that we can have good quality testimony and can respond to the points in those documents.

Now, I understand there'll be rebuttal documents and I understand things will move, and there's a bit of a line in there that's perhaps difficult to distinguish. However, that said, I think everyone will have sufficient time and to get that information out up front, or frankly, I, as one commissioner -- and I realize I'm just one -- will not proceed.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Thank you, well said. And
I agree with Commissioner Huston's comments.

With that, again with the final things, cell phones; please put them on silent or vibrate, if you would. And on public testimony, address it to the Board. And we will check periodically to see where we are as far as who's left to testify, and we'd really like to try and wrap this up tonight, but we want to get all testimony told -- you know, verbalized before us.

So with that, Chairman Black, it's back to you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much, Chairman Bowen.

I have one item which I received today, which is Cascade Irrigation District letter dated January 10th, and it's relative to this Kittitas Valley wind farm project. It is a copy of a letter that was sent to Kittitas County Community Development Services, so it is in all of the packets.

MR. PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, if I may just clarify on that issue -- again, Darryl Piercy, for the record.

We have provided two packets of information to all Planning Commission members and Board of
County Commissioners this evening.

The first packet is a duplicate copy of all of the items that were submitted in public testimony at last night's hearing. They are identified as 19 items, and they're contained in a packet that clearly identifies them as items submitted at last night's public hearing.

The second packet is a memorandum to both the Board of County Commissioners and the Planning Commission from Staff Planner Joanna Valencia, dated January 12th. That contained all the additional public comments that our department has received to date in regards to this topic.

One of those letters is the one that you referred to.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

Before we go into public testimony, could we just get a quick show of hands. We would like to wrap this up this evening. The chairs are getting hard and some other things. So is there a show of hands of how many people basically would like to testify this evening?

Okay. I think with that, I would caution you that we hate to put a time limit on it;
however, we would like to -- if you come up and -- we want you to testify, but if it's -- if it's relative to something that's already been said, it might be, "Okay, I agree with that."

If you have information that you want to submit, I would ask you that you submit it this evening. We will -- if we can wrap it up this evening, we will go into a continuation for deliberation possibly the week after next, which would be the week of the 23rd of January.

If you can hold it down to five minutes or so, we'd really appreciate it. We want everybody that is here to have an opportunity to testify.

So with that -- and I don't want to cut anybody off, okay?

So with that, we'll go into the first testimony.

MS. BARRET: Michael Genson?

MR. MICHAEL GENSON: Good evening. You guys have held up better than I have. I'm getting a little under the weather.

I'm a supporter of wind power, and I urge you to approve this project.

If we look at the growth in our county alone, we can see that we cannot afford to deny
the growing need for more power. The issue becomes do we want to meet this growing demand with gas or coal power plants? Using up those finite sources? And putting tons of pollutants in our atmosphere? Or do we want to meet this need with energy generated from clean, renewable, and free -- from a clean, renewable, and free source?

We have that clean, renewable, and free source right here in Kittitas County. The whole world knows that the wind blows long and hard in Ellensburg. And it blows longer and harder on the ridges northwest of here within the boundaries of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

We need to join the counties to the south of us and other areas of the world that are making power from this resource. People from all over this state, nation, and the world will applaud us when they hear and see that we are turning wind into electricity.

This is a moral issue. Should we refuse to utilize our resource when it could provide energy enough for 35,000 or more homes simply because a small vocal group doesn't want turbines in their
viewshed?

I've lived and worked in this valley for 44 years. I own property within the proposed project. The income that my family will receive from this project will provide for my children's futures long after I'm gone.

This project will allow me to keep my property intact. It will allow the preservation of some open space. It will allow the preservation of deer, elk, and other wildlife and bird habitat.

It will contribute to our demand for power in a clean way. You will not see pollutants from the turbines rising into the air above our valley. The power is from a renewable source, and the wind will always be here.

My land and most of the land within the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is zoned Forest & Range 20. When I purchased my property I read the zoning code that applied to it. It reads as follows -- you've heard this before, but I feel like I need to say it.

"The purpose and intent of the forest and range zone is to provide for areas of Kittitas County wherein natural resource management is the
highest priority." The highest priority. "And where subdivision and development of lands for uses and activities incompatible with this resource management are discouraged."

I think that wind, by anyone's definition, is natural. I think that when there's an abundant, usable supply by anyone's definition it becomes a resource.

I have a natural resource on my property that can be utilized to benefit my family and the world. And to put turbines on my property to manage this resource obviously meets the intent of the county's Forest & Range 20 zone.

As county planners and commissioners, it's your responsibility to see that I'm allowed to exercise my right as a property owner to manage this natural resource, including the right to determine locations of turbines on my property.

It is your responsibility to look to the needs of the future. Please do not deny this project because the opponents don't want a turbine in their viewshed. The viewshed they claim is my property. I've always believed that my property rights end at my property boundaries. And I've never tried to dictate what neighbors
several miles away could or could not do with their property.

That which is considered part of a viewshed is an aesthetic and subjective thing. It is not a valid basis for judging any project, whether it be residential development, or whether it be a natural resource development.

Just a couple of quick comments. I'm a little bit discouraged. I've been here two evenings and -- and the emphasis that people are placing on energy seems to be way second place to this idea of viewshed. We're not looking to the future.

When I was approached to -- to possibly sign a wind lease on my property, it wasn't what I had planned for my property. And it took a lot of -- it took a lot of investigating, a lot of research, a trip to the State Line wind farm, telephone calls to people who lived within a wind farm. One party who had turbines on her property and one who didn't. And it took a lot of soul searching.

And -- but always in the back of my mind, even though that's not what I wanted to do with my property, I knew that if I could have turbines
on my property that would supply power to people, it would be the right thing to do.

When I signed with -- at that time Zilkha, it was not an economically profitable situation. Wind studies since that time have made it much more profitable for my family. The wind velocities in the actual areas where the wind blew was determined and it was slid down the slopes a bit so my property would have more turbines.

My wife and I care about our property as much as anyone. We care about every single bitterbush on our property. We put as much blood, sweat, and tears into our property as anyone. I, I just don't like the insinuations that somebody with a wind turbine on their property wouldn't want to live there or, you know, didn't have any respect for the property anyway, because that is not the case.

I've heard a lot of view corridor. Highway 97, I live off of Highway 97. The speed limit is 65 miles an hour. Hardly, hardly indicative of a view corridor. You have to top the ridge at the gravel pit up on top of Bettas Pass before you can see Mr. Stuart from that
highway.

I strongly recommend -- you've probably all been out that way a lot of times, but go out there and take a look. 65 miles an hour. Because there are very few residences, there are very few approaches and accesses. I think it's -- it's the only place I know of that a two-lane highway in this state is allowed to be 65 miles an hour.

There's talk about protecting birds and wildlife. I would recommend that we -- we contact the DOT and get the speed limit dropped out there to 50 or 55 miles an hour. There are more deer killed and more birds killed on that stretch of highway by automobiles than any place where I've ever lived.

Size of turbines. Size of turbines are very tall. If you walked under a turbine, which my wife and I did, the State Line project, they're huge, they're immense. But we were able to talk in this tone of voice to each other. The noise is not a mechanical noise, it's not a thump, thump, thump. It's a whooshing noise; it's like a wind noise.

When the wind is blowing 40 miles an hour
over the ridges at my place, you literally have
to shout from me to you to be able to converse.

40-story building. If you walk up next to a
40-story building and you look at it, it's huge.
Just like a turbine. But from 12 miles back,
from 12 miles back it's about like that
(indicating). You can't identify it without a
pair of binoculars.

So once again, this viewshed thing is -- is
blown way out of proportion. Most of the
residences in that area have a beautiful view of
a whole series of power lines and towers. I've
got a view of 34 from my gate, the gate that goes
into my property. And I have a cell tower too,
but luckily it doesn't have a light on it.

To close, I want to read a statement made by
Commissioner of Public Lands Doug Sutherland.
This is taken from the Northern Kittitas County
Tribune, July 17th, 2003. He's referring to this
project. And this is at the conclusion of the
State of Washington signing a lease for -- to be
a participant in this project.

He says, and I quote: "Balancing the needs
of economic growth, the desires of local
communities, and the potential environmental
benefits of this project isn't easy, but it's critical. It's critical if we are going to make responsible decisions that provide benefits today and for generations to come."

Thank you very much for this opportunity. I appreciate it, your efforts.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Questions? Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. BARRET: Douglas MacArthur?

MR. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR: Hello, my name is Doug MacArthur, and I'm scared as heck. I live at 4661 Umptanum Road, which is on the south side of the valley. And I'm speaking for myself.

But I very strongly urge that you do not allow this thing to happen. I am a photographer, and I know beauty when I see it. And believe me, that mountain is one of the most beautiful mountains I've ever seen.

And if I was to stand on the edge of my aunt's property on the south side of this valley, I can count every one of those towers, those power transfer towers, and I can count every one of those 43 -- or 40-foot -- or 40-story buildings that are going to be put there.
I can see everything that's there with the naked eye. I don't have to have a long lens or magnifying glass or whatever you want. I don't have to have it. I can see it. Just right there in front of your eyes at all times.

And as far as those towers going, yeah, we're probably going to get them anyway. But I hope that you guys will recommend no.

I want to know one thing -- well, several things. How much wind does it take to start one of these and how much wind can it handle? Because there are such things as too much wind.

Where are the towers built? Are they built here or assembled here? If they are built in Seattle, because they'll have to be shipped in, if they're built in Seattle, they've got to come across the pass somehow. They come across that pass, it's going to be 30, 35 miles an hour. It's going to hold up traffic for several hours.

And if the -- if the building -- if these things are so big -- and we've seen several towers come in going to the State Line down there in Wallula, I have seen four of them come in through on a -- on a truck. One of them rolled off of the truck down by Wallula and held up
traffic for several hours while they had to wait for a crane to come in and put it back on the truck.

If they come across the pass, how are they going to get them through the bridges, over the -- under the underpasses and so on? That's something I would really like to know.

And if they don't work, if they don't actually make enough power to actually bring it to a reasonable use, do we live with these towers for the rest of our lives? Because you're going to have 64 of them, or as the thing says, up to 80.

How are we going to -- are we going to live with them if they don't work? When the federal money is gone, what do we do? Live with them. We've got flow out here on the edge of the freeway right now. And it's a small thing. Those towers down there at State Line are only 250-foot tall. They're small. These things are twice as big. And they're huge.

If I can see those down there at Wallula from Pasco, 30 miles away, what are we going to do with 410-foot-tall towers sitting on the edge of a hill up here that's going to be like
Mt. Stuart through a picket fence? I can't understand that.

And if they are up there and they don't work, do they stay there or do they come out? It says in here that there is a clause, a decommissioning plan, but it doesn't say anything about taking them out. It says that it's just a decommissioning plan that, okay, they're going to stop them, they're going to break them down, they're going to stop there. We're going to live with them, right? No, I hope not.

And finally, how much does it take to build -- how much money does it take to build one tower and where is that money coming from? Is it coming from us? Is it coming from the federal government, the state government, or the county government? I would like to know.

And as far as that goes, Goldendale didn't work. They took a big -- they had a wind farm down there at Goldendale out in the Goodnoe Hills. It was an experimental wind farm, and I believe that Boeing put it up. It didn't work, okay. They took it out. Now you have that pristine country back where it was supposed to be. Not with a bunch of towers and looking at
the whole countryside through a picket fence.
And that's basically it. But please, do not -- I urge you guys, do not let this happen.
Thank you.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: No. Thank you very much.

(compliments)

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: You know, I think it would be helpful --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me just a second, Mark, if you don't mind.

I think both sides have had their applause. I think we can go on the rest of the time without it, if that's okay with everybody. Both sides have done it; let's go from there. No more applause, please.

Next?

MS. BARRET: Howard Mitchell?

MR. HOWARD MITCHELL: I don't think you'll have to worry about any applause from my presentation. I'm not a public speaker, so I'll read my say and --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excellent.

MR. HOWARD MITCHELL: -- I didn't sleep at the Holiday Inn last night.
I'm Howard Mitchell, 371 Howard Road. I speak for my wife, myself, and my son and his family that live on our farm. We farm at 97 and Howard Road. We raise Timothy hay and cattle.

During my 70 years at this location, I can attest to the wind farm -- wind power in this area. Wind power capabilities. I have it written and I'd better read what I --

In fact, my new neighbors asked if it's ever going to quit. When does this quit, they say.

Actually the wind can be blowing at home, and a mile down the road on Highway 97 toward Ellensburg it is calm. This is nice when it's foggy in Ellensburg or it's hot, a hot summer day in the summer it cools us off a little. So we've learned to live with it.

However, there are times when you can barely stand up in it. And I think you know what I mean there. I commend Horizon Wind Energy people for recognizing wind when they find it.

In my opinion, wind should -- in my opinion we should use this wind power to create electricity for our state and tax assessments for our county. I know this sounds like I am disregarding the complaints of the people in the
close vicinity to these towers. I say this sincerely: If I lived in that area, I would prefer turbines to building as many houses as the developers will eventually build there.

My reason for saying this is that urban encroachment is rapidly spreading in our valley, displacing farming and ranching, the very thing that keeps this valley beautiful to the residents and the tourists that visit.

Realtors say that realty sales have been one of the biggest businesses in Kittitas County. When they tell me this, I say to them when homes cover this valley from one skyline to the other that the majority of the Kittitas Valley’s beauty will be gone. For instance, not being able to see the incredible starlit nights because of suburban glow.

My major concern is the subsurface (well water supply) shortage caused by these many wells in an area that receives less than nine inches of precipitation a year. Such a shortage happened with surface waters more than 30 years ago and has been in adjudication every since -- ever since and still has not been settled.

When the wells start to go dry, the courts
will have to step in and decide who gets water and who does not. That settlement will be decided on a first-in-time/first-in-line basis. That means the wells that were in first will get water; the ones that were in last may not get water.

If wind farms in the Kittitas County help prevent the land from being urbanized, they have made an outstanding contribution. They also make renewable energy and create a good income for some landowners in the county. We have to have more generations supplied. Where will it come from?

The answer, my friends, is written in the answer. The answer is written in the wind. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Robert Young?

Darlene Young?

MS. DARLENE YOUNG: I'm Darlene Young, and I'm speaking for myself and my husband. I live at 771 Sun East Road, Ellensburg, Washington. And both my husband and I are opposed to the location of the wind turbines.

I think everyone has a right to do what they
want to with their property as long as it doesn't bring harm or create havoc to other people. And I'm not going to go on, because I agree with just about everything that everybody said.

I do have an article that I'd like to leave for the Board to read.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Please do. I was remiss in -- please -- I was remiss in reminding everyone that if you haven't -- if you've written something and you're not prepared to read it this evening, we will take any written thing at the planning -- the Community Development Services office by -- 5:00 p.m. tomorrow?

MR. PIERCY: That would be fine.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That way will allow us get it into the record. So if you have it in written form and then you would like to leave it this evening, that's fine. If you want to leave it, take it to the County tomorrow, that's fine also. It will get into the record. Every one of us will read the information that's there, and please do that.

Next?


AUDIENCE MEMBER: She's not here.
MS. BARRET: David Crane?

MR. DAVID CRANE: I am David Crane. I live at 1201 Vista Road, Ellensburg. I own the property there, myself and the finance company. And I have no vested interest in the wind farms. And my dad was a soft-spoken man, taught me to stand up and tell people how I feel about things without abusing them.

My purpose here tonight is to challenge some of the statements that have been made against the wind farms. I wrote something out and I'm going to read part of it. And ad-lib.

Electric power needs are increasing due to population increase and a trend toward more electric power devices. Hydroelectric is about maxed out. It also disrupts habitat, mars the scenery, causes problems with fish, water quality, mud flats, et cetera.

Petroleum-generated power has some noise problems, causes pollution, is considered non-renewable.

Nuclear power generation has a problem with radiation. What to do with the waste. Requires large quantities of water for cooling and needs to be near a significant water source or river
and is dangerous in the event of a possible accident.

Geothermal is still undeveloped.

Solar power has yet a way to go before offering a significant contribution to the equation.

Now, here are some of the complaints that I have heard and read about wind farms:

They make noise.

They kill birds.

They disrupt habitat.

They mar scenic beauty.

They must be government subsidized.

The towers are too tall. They could cause fires.

Power could or may be transmitted elsewhere.

They don't need -- we don't need more power yet.

Will lower property taxes. Excuse me, values; will lower property values.

Too much cement in the ground.

Wind farm people are greedy. Wind farm people don't care about the residents in our valley.

Wind farms shouldn't be near residences.
Wind farms create only a very few jobs.
Wind farms will not produce much power and what if the wind doesn't blow as much as we wish?

Now, I have made some observations about this. I, I don't care if my wind -- or if my electric power comes from Bonneville or if it comes from some nuclear plant or if it comes from geothermal or whatever. I'm just happy that they keep the thing running, because I like to use it.

As to the noise, we have learned how to mitigate noise, so this is a frivolous complaint. Last night a gentleman made the comment that it's impossible to mitigate the noise that comes from a tower that's 300 to 400 feet high. I think that the gentleman misunderstood what the word "mitigate" means. It doesn't mean to eliminate the noise; it means to diminish or modify or reduce the noise.

And in refrigeration and in air conditioning we use the term "sones," which means how much noise the fan makes, and you can buy fans of different sones, which it's mitigated. So it isn't quite as noisy. Sometimes it doesn't matter if it's noisy and sometimes it does. So you put one that has fewer sones.
As to the birds, picture windows kill more birds than wind generators, as do cars, cats, and over-population of birds. Yet the birds survive and thrive.

As far as the habitat is concerned, everything we do mars the habitat. Septic tanks, bridges, roads, blacktop, power lines.

As far as beauty is concerned, "beauty" and "ugly" are subjective; just as a lady said last night, are in the eye of the beholder. The wind towers are quite artistic.

And I don't know if any of you have driven down -- I'm sure you've driven down and paid attention to it, but down Canyon Road, what do you have down along the river down there? Railroad track.

Some of you have driven down through Grand Canyon. If you go down along the Vermillion Cliffs, it's one of the most scenic spots in the world. What do you have down across the Vermillion Cliffs? Power lines. Down up across the top of the thing, power lines. Why do they do that? Because people need electricity. Probably because they don't want to dig up the ground and put them underground. They haven't
figured any way to transmit the thing by radar.

As far as government subsidies is concerned, government subsidies are a fact of life, the same as tax breaks. That's what we do. Including airlines and Chrysler corporation. The reason government subsidies are there is to help private enterprise do what we want to have done for the welfare and the goodwill of the people. Just like New Orleans and some of these other things. Sometimes government steps in, and that's a good thing.

As far as how tall they are, trees, radio transmission towers, and many buildings are also tall, and tall trees cause fires when they're hit by lightening. Had one right in my back yard when I was a kid. Just split the thing in half and it set a fire.

Being tall is no big deal. People build houses right next to trees that are huge, bigger than wind towers, and they do this because they like to do it and they're not afraid of them, and they fall on houses and they kill people.

Who cares as far as where the power goes? Who cares where the power is transmitted, as long as our communities have adequate power which we
pay for at a reasonable rate? What difference does it make if the power we generate here goes to Seattle or Tacoma or stays here? It's all just electricity.

As far as whether we need it now or not, are we going to wait until we're out of gas before we fill our proverbial tank? I think we as responsible people need to make provision for the needs of the future.

As far as property taxes -- and I have to apologize to anybody; I know some real estate people in this town, but does any informed person really believe that wind farms will have a lasting negative impact on property values?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You bet.

MR. DAVID CRANE: I don't think that there's very many. And I'll tell you this, this town is a lot bigger than this meeting, and 400 people who are contrary to the wind farms do not represent this town. If you want to find out what this town believes, you're going to have to have a vote.

And I don't think that just because people complain in the paper or stand up in a meeting complaining -- I've noticed that a lot of the
complaints here are from people who have property and they don't want their view destroyed. I think that there's a conflict of interest here.

As far as cement in the ground, cement in the ground will never be as much of a problem as rocks, and we have already learned how to deal with that. We've learned how to work around rocks, and some rocks you just can't move and they're going to be there, so people -- people work with it.

You know, as far as change is concerned, it's a fact of life that -- human nature that we resist change. Complaints will always dominate the public forum because people are just too busy to get involved with things that they think will be okay or they don't care. So the complainers will always carry the day in a public forum. And read the paper and you can find this out. I know a lot of people say, It doesn't matter to me, and they look at the complaints and they just shrug their shoulders.

As far as whether they're going to produce very much jobs, just because you don't produce very many jobs is a good thing, because it indicates that this is going to be lower
operational costs to operate a facility which produces something of value for our community.

I hear a lot of people giving lip service to clean energy, but when it comes right down to it, they don't want to put their money where their mouth is.

The wind energy is good way to go and it is a better way to go than nuclear or some of these other things. Think about Celilo Falls. I had a neighbor, went to school with a guy in my hometown, which is in Sweet Home, Oregon. Up above they put in a dam, and these people had lived there for generations, and they had to move off of their place because of the thing. And they were bitter people. And I couldn't blame them; they were nice people, but there are sometimes we have to move over.

Mineral rights on my property are reserved. So I don't even own what's under my place. And I knew that when I moved there. I don't care; I'm not going to live here for always, I'm going to pass on.

We have good people chosen by the community to make these decisions. I believe they will weigh the facts, they will consider the effects,
and they will make the best possible decision for all of us. I support them in this even if they choose differently than I would. But I enthusiastically favor the wind farms, and I have nothing personal to gain from it.

And I also favor this location as a very wise choice for this beautiful valley and for our country. We need to diversify our power sources so that even in the event of a terrorist attack or some horrible natural disaster, we would still have some other sources on which to rely.

The proposed sites are ideal because of much wind, because of a rural setting, and because of access to transmission lines. And I hear people say, Well, we're going to take this wind farm way off someplace else and build it someplace where there's no people. And what do they do? Build huge transmission lines right across everything to get there.

Same thing you do with roads. You can't get from Point A to Point B without disrupting somebody's property. And you don't build a serpentine thing around everybody's land because they have a right to. You give them a huge price, sometimes an exorbitant price, and you
move them out of the way, and they all have to move over and they feel bad, but that's the way it is.

I spent 30 months in Clark County trying to get approval for a simple septic tank. And after 30 months I finally got it after the newspaper wrote up an editorial on it. And there was nothing wrong with it in the first place. I think as government we need to streamline the process so that people don't have to wait eight weeks to get a permit, a building permit or some other things.

I think it's a travesty if things -- if people in private enterprise trying to do something to help us all have to go through so many loops that they finally just get discouraged and give up and quit. And I think it's too bad, the reason that I got up here and said what I did. I know it's not a popular thing.

A different siting will only translate into more ugly transmission lines, more expense with no benefit. To deny this application on the basis of these often-expressed complaints would be contrary to reason, because in principle it would condemn every single power-generating
facility in existence.

When you think about it, Bonneville dam, all the dams up and down the river, Hanford, out by St. Helens, the Trojan nuclear outfit. Every one of those would be out. And probably some of us would be glad if Trojan was out of there.

But I have heard very few suggestions from anyone as to where they should be sited. The people that complain about it, they don't know where to put them. They just don't like it there. They don't know why they don't like it except it affects them in some negative way. Of course it does. Any power project does. That's the nature of it.

Those who oppose this siting have not shown the same measure of professionalism and precision as the wind farm companies, and the wind farm people have displayed a remarkable courtesy and patience through the whole difficult process. To deny their application would, in my view, be a great mistake.

I am sure that this valley was very beautiful and serene before we all moved here. But I personally don't favor turning it back over to the snakes, the coyotes, and the sagebrush,
and I will certainly have -- and it will certainly have more beauty as a wind farm than if it were cluttered up with houses and fences, which is the logical result, and I might say cattle feeding lots and other things like that, which is the logical result if we make it -- unless we make it a scenic preserve.

Thank you very much. And I have a letter here to submit which I have previously submitted to the Daily Record.

CHAIRMAN BLACK:  Please.

MR. DAVID CRANE:  Thank you very much. And thank you all for doing this for all of us.

CHAIRMAN BLACK:  Thank you.

Next?

MS. BARRET:  Jim Schwing?

Art DePalma?

MR. ART DEPALMA:  Good evening. My name is Art DePalma, and I live at 6991 Manastash Road in Ellensburg.

And I have a page or two. Although I thought some of the comments from the fellow before were interesting, I wish I had a pencil and had taken some notes, in that he kind of equated wind towers with big trees and whatever
else you might want to look at, silos or, I don't know.

But then he made comment that the people that live there, they don't want their views ruined. Well, if everything looks alike and it's just all in the eye of the beholder, what would ruin their view? Nothing would ruin their view, and you could have a big toxic dump and that would be okay; some people might like that too.

People that are moved from the dam, well, that's just the way it is. And sure, I mean, we need roads. Might have to go through somebody's property. But I don't think we need a wind farm in this site.

You know, I've heard a lot about the benefits of a wind farm here, and Horizon has reduced the number of turbines, oh, down to 60 or 80. Specific actions have been taken to reduce shadow flicker. I guess I should -- and I do commend Horizon for some of these efforts.

Yet, you know, with all these speeches about safety and wildlife and mitigation and so on, nothing was really said the first night about, you know, what would be good for the residents here or what the residents in the area need.
And I'll go on record saying that these environmental impacts can't be mitigated. Sure, you might be able to decrease, you know, some noise. Somebody has a neighbor who has a boom box. You can mitigate it; you can move over a couple of feet. That mitigates it.

So, I mean, you know, even -- either something is mitigated so that your quality of life isn't ruined or then it's not mitigated.

Homes and wind turbines I think are incompatible. I mean, where else in the country has somebody been trying to site a wind farm where there's hundreds of homes, and particularly homes, you know, in this caliber and this price range in this scenic area? Nowhere. Nowhere else in the country has a wind farm been put up in an area like this where there's hundreds homes and where hundreds of people live.

The fellow Tom Priestly, the aesthetics expert, he was honest enough to still classify as moderate and even high impact where you could still see some of these wind turbines. And particularly up on the Table Mountain area.

You know, every year the astronomers, they go up there to look at stars, whatever that is,
star weekend. I guess you wouldn't have that anymore with the 60 or 70 blinking red lights in unison going off all night long.

You know, 400-foot -- what other things can't you mitigate? Not only the 400-foot towers, but there's, you know, there is noise. There's the swish-swish noise that really hasn't been talked about. It's 50-decibel noise near the property line, even around near the house.

And as far as low frequency noise, which we've talked about before, this has just sort of been dismissed as something that doesn't happen. But last year I had mentioned that there's a university in Manchester, England, that was starting to do research on low frequency noise and how to measure it.

And at the present time you can look at their website to see what they have to say, and basically they say that their acoustics research center has just completed doing research and developing guidelines. So they've just completed developing these guidelines for assessing disturbance by a low frequency noise.

They drew upon a unique set of equipment and calibration facilities for low frequency sound
measurement which wasn't available before. It says, "Many local authorities have complaints about low frequency noise which, for various reasons, are notoriously difficult for them to deal with." "Low frequency noise is...particularly difficult to measure reliably. All these difficulties mean that low frequency noise problems may go unresolved for years, which is unsatisfactory for both local authorities and complainants." For this reason they've "decided to try to develop guidelines for use by local authorities."

So this is brand new. This is just off the internet. Off of the website, this university and their noise acoustics research center.

Reducing the number of towers to half, to 60 or so, that's nice but it's like getting a half of a teaspoon, instead of a whole teaspoon, of strychnine in your coffee.

The project director also made a point of a figure over a million dollars in tax benefits to the county. Then, if you heard what I heard, he mentioned the Wild Horse wind farm and really didn't say much about the tax benefits there. It was kind of murky. Well, it was taken over by a
utility and they kind of do their own thing.

Well, would there be any big surprise if this one was taken over by a utility too?

You know, I know that sometimes we have to give way to change whether we like it or not, but I'm here to say that this isn't the right thing to do, to put a wind farm with all these turbines among hundreds of homes. That's the wrong thing to do.

We already have one wind farm in this county. And it's a unique laboratory for us to learn the impact of wind turbines and give us answers that we don't have. What's the rush to build another one prematurely? Especially in a place where it doesn't belong.

I'd like each of you commissioners to imagine that you lived in this area. You're one of our elected officials that's empowered to protect the citizens of this county from harm. And I ask you that you vote "no" on the Horizon Wind Energy project.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

Questions?

MS. BARRET: Sue Bangs?

Eric Prater?
MR. ERIC PRATER: My name is Eric Prater. I'm a fourth-generation resident of the valley. My sons -- I'm speaking for myself and my sons. Hopefully they'll be fifth residents, and I'd like to see them actually somehow involved in agriculture.

I'm for this wind farm. I have struggled in the last several years with the growth issues that have come with our very nice people moving in from other parts of the country. And one of the nice things I like about the wind farm is is that this is going to be a way that in ten or twenty years there'll actually be a black spot on that hillside. It'll have a nice white and red ribbon running right through the middle of it of headlights and taillights in the nighttime, just like the South Hill does now.

In my lifetime I've seen a lot of growth, and it's escalated in the last five years. It used to be that hill was black six night a week, and Friday night, as everyone went down to watch the movies in Yakima, you'd see headlights and taillights.

And this is the same way. I'm having to forecast out a ways, but I live on the west side
of the valley, as some of you do, and we're on
the -- more of the aggressive development edge
than in that part of the valley.

Last summer I walked out and stood on Cove
Road, and I started from the right and I counted
lights across, and I hadn't gotten three quarters
of the way across the hillside and I was well
over 120 blinking lights as the atmosphere was
there near and far. And I thought, my God, what
has happened to us; what happened to our nice
black hillside?

And I'm looking at 6000 acres in this farm
of state and private property and 90 of it is
going to end up developed. There's going to be
one well on that for a house that they can
operate this system with. That doesn't seem like
very much development.

I know you guys might be stunned by that,
because you guys see a lot of lot splits coming
through what you're -- in your job. You guys, if
you saw a hundred acres, you saw twenty houses on
it in the same area, this is the reverse. I
don't know if you guys can handle this. There's
not going to be very many houses on this 6000
acres. I'm not sure if you're prepared to handle
this. It's a reverse of what you're used to. People aren't taking 20 acres and sticking a cluster subdivision on it on 1.4-acre lots. This is a totally different bird.

Another issue that was on this was the noise. Highway 97 goes right up the middle of that. Right now it's fairly quiet, but you guys have seen we have a north-south highway. There's going to be a lot more traffic up there.

If you lived just down the hill, like some of these houses are, it's going to be like living on I-90 with 28,000 cars a day. You're not going to hear anything but trucks going on drunk bumps that rattle. You're going to hear jake brakes as they go down both steep sides, revving up, shifting down. There's a lot of issues there. I don't know if they've been discussed.

Those windmills are the least -- it's almost innocuous. The south hill's getting developed; you can see lights up there. But those are small lots, three-acre lots. This is one turbine, on the average, per 75 acres. That's pretty small. 75 acres and one turbine.

And all around it is going to be lights. In the daytime you're going to see roads slashed
across the hillsides in the normal manner, like I have on my old wheat fields west of me. And south of me and, well, to the north of me, and now I got them on east side of the valley too, so they're on all sides of me.

The impact -- that is why I'm for it, is it's going to be less of anything on this.

I'm not used to speaking at all, and this is kind of terrifying.

It's been brought up about the groundwater issues. If this 6000 acres was developed at the rate that it is going and maybe in the future, we're looking at if it's five-acre lots, that could be 300 houses up there and 300 wells. Maybe it'll be a different water system.

But you're also going to have above-ground power lines; you're going to have huge houses. The people that buy the views, you're not going to see a double-wide like you see down by Selah and that; you're going to see what you see on the south end of Cove Road, 29,000 feet and then an ugly power line going up to it.

And again, the noise issue is -- I have a very nice neighbor that moved in next to me and stuck in a little house and he stuck in a heat
pump. I live six miles out in the country, and I walk out my front door and I can hear my neighbor's heat pump. And I personally would prefer to hear something bigger. In fact, I've actually -- I would like to see a windmill on my place so that my neighbors would stay away if it offended them. So it's the reverse, it's totally the reverse.

And also I think that power generation needs to be in our eyes and in our faces so that we can see it. When we drive across the Columbia we see nice lakes, but we don't see that that is -- behind Wanapum Dam is 38 miles of water backed up. And a lot of river bottom was destroyed for that.

I'm very thankful for it; it allows me to see you right here. I'm very thankful for the electricity I got, and I also want more down the road.

And I think that the power needs to be generated where it's used. At the moment this power will be sold to other places, but it's going to be used here too.

So what I'm asking is, is that can you please keep this little place black at night,
because all around it you guys see what's coming
down the road. There's going to be a lot more
houses and a lot more lights and a lot more roads
and a lot more wells and the problems coming with
that.

So -- and a lot of -- I've seen the Planning
Commisions, you know, what people have used in
the past is to justify a housing development they
look for existing houses to justify this. And
right now I see a lot of proposals for houses,
but I don't see a lot of houses built there. And
I think that if that's the case, then this has to
be considered right now and not down the road.
So you have to use what you have right now on the
ground for what you use to make a decision on
this.

I guess that's it. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MR. ERIC PRATER: Do you have any questions
for me?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: No. Thank you.

We'll take a five-minute break and come back
at approximately ten minutes to 8:00.

(A break was taken.)

MS. BARRET: Chris Cole?
MS. CHRISTINE COLE: I'm Christine Cole, and I'm representing myself and my partner, Roger Bernette. We live at 7430 Robbins Road in Ellensburg.

The U.S. seems to be going crazy with the promises of wind power benefits. One statement of public testimony on Tuesday night said the wind towers would be free to us. If they are free, if they are free, where do the federal subsidies come from but our hard-earned wages and tax dollars?

The struggle over suitable sites is now fought in Europe as well as in the U.S., as the problems with these industrial sites mounts. We have the distinct feeling that this valley is an experiment as to how close these structures can be placed to people so that the expanse of these industrial sites can explode even more.

My statement was going to be rather short until I heard the presentation from the experts, who for the most part don't live here but appear to reside in densely populated areas where I imagine there's little danger of having a tower nearby.

And that is the issue: We do live here.
And it's a good probability that many new landowners are not aware of what they may be facing. In fact, my mortgage banker, who recently bought property near Smithson and Reecer Creek, thought the towers from EnXco would have been or still may be placed a little north of her family until I told her otherwise. So much for general knowledge of what may be a new nightmare.

Saying that we'll save on our property taxes when we've already paid our federal taxes for their subsidies is infuriating.

We do not wish to be part of this industrial experiment and have stated so many times. Those with monetary power, monetary interests, and political persuasion push their agenda and the rest of us be damned.

In my mail when I returned home Tuesday night was a proposal for an initiative drive for Washingtonians for Introduce Security where the turbine is their logo. The landscape picture at the bottom was somewhere in eastern Washington. They definitely sent this to the wrong person, and to say I was angry was an understatement. An additional picture of turbine placements in western Washington might have cooled my mood.
somewhat.

And judging by the numerous weeks of windless, foggy winter weather we've had for the past few years, we will have a mild, I think, and useless stillness as testament to the real lack of wind that does happen. When the inconsistent force of the powerful wind does hit, we will probably see the stillness of the blades due to the braking systems.

I was told by a prior county planner that even though we may not have the fastest winds in the U.S., we have some of the most powerful. Just how will these braking systems -- just how well will those braking systems work when faced with that powerful force?

The loophole in the county's zoning plan was probably made before wind power was most likely even a thought or a least thought out as to what could happen. Heaven forbid there might be a solar panel on each new house built to augment our hydroelectric power bills. Is there or was there not federal subsidies for homeowners or contractors to install power-producing solar panels? That would be cost-effective wrapped into a mortgage rather than what we will face
now.

What about a biomass processing plant providing sustained jobs and certainly having a sustained resource in this valley? Why was the only other alternative power to be mentioned by the presentation to be a dirty, coal-producing plant? It seems to me to be convenient misdirection and plays on people's fears.

I budget for my twice-yearly property tax payments and would certainly rather do that than have to look at these towers for the rest of my life, which I will should they go into place.

I presently have a full view from rye grass to the Cascades. When I invited EnXco onto my property to photograph the line of sight I would have if the turbines were in place, over 90 percent of them would have been in full view.

However, through the magic of photography, only a shamelessly small and disparate portion ever made into it the EIS, and I said so in previous testimony.

And now I'm faced with a full frontal assault on a day-and-night basis with what Horizon intends. My already-angry neighbors and I will see those towers on the ridge tops right
in line with the pristine and certainly scenic view to the west due to our elevation. It will be straight on to our views of the Cascades and certainly a local focal point. To me there will be nothing less graceful than what I will see foremost during the day than those horrid towers, and certainly nothing more annoying at night than the ugly red flashing lights to which there will be no relief.

There is also a unique sound effect in this valley, and we can hear traffic from I-90 over ten miles away and at times my neighbors' voices halfway up the hill a half a mile away. The decibel noise from the towers will be an additional burden to bear, as we will be downwind and only at five miles away.

That is not why I purchased the land, my home, and retired here. And I am not new to this valley; I've lived here for over 40 years and made my living here.

Beyond our sight and sound sensitivities, we do know that wildlife and our domestic animals are far more attuned to their surroundings for their survival than we are. Given that, their welfare is in our hands and must be (inaudible),
for they have no other recourse but instinct.

As the governing body, it is your job to listen and recommend. We certainly hope that you are listening, recommend with your conscience, and place a true value on this valley and not on pocketbooks.

Those who are adamantly opposed to the sights proposed by Horizon and EnXco are not making up the problems associated with these towers. Plenty of documented research has been done. Placing these towers in the tremendous infrastructures here is a cruel and costly joke. Don't let it happen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Chris Fox?

MR. CHRIS FOX: Good evening. My name is Chris Fox. I live at 1000 East Harvest Loop, Unit 304. I'm here representing myself and the generation that seems to be poorly represented in this audience, but it's a generation that's going to be affected by the decisions that you make and the opinions of the people speaking here tonight.

That's the generation that is younger. You know, these people -- many of these people's children and grandchildren are the ones that are
going to have to deal with what comes up in
the -- sorry.

I'm a current employee of the Wild Horse
wind farm. I'm no way tied to what goes on with
this wind farm, the Kittitas Valley wind farm.
I'm no way -- anything that I say is tonight is
not influencing any future employment, so I want
to make sure you guys know that.

Just to deal with a few of the things that
have come up so far in the -- you know, some of
the opinions and some of the concerns that have
come up. I've been employed -- well, my
background, I should state, is I've been -- I
have a degree in environmental engineering; I've
been working in the wind energy field now for
four years. And I think that I can address a few
of these issues that people have brought up.

The first two issues that seem to be quite
troubling are -- well, the first one's shadow
flicker. I can attest to the fact that I've been
present on wind farms in every state of
construction and operation, and never once has it
affected my ability to work, to think, or
anything of that nature. I don't think that it's
fair to say that shadow flicker is going to be a
problem until people have actually encountered it.

In terms of noise levels, I've personally been involved in tests where we've -- taken down in L.A. and Palm Springs where we've taken auto records of noise levels created from a busy highway versus noise levels created by a 103-windmill job, and the noise levels created by the highway were significantly greater than those created by the wind farm. I think that needs to be known by people here.

I've worked on these wind farms, I've stood underneath these windmills and been able to have a very quiet conversation with people and not have to yell. As anyone who knows that they -- when they've stood beside a highway will know that they can't; if there's going to be trucks rolling by, there's going to be cars rolling by at high speed, there's no way that they can have a quiet conversation with anybody.

All right, that's important to know. These things aren't as loud as people think, all right? It's easy to work; there's no -- this low frequency noise business has never once affected me, and I think that it's -- it think it's
preposterous for people to go and claim that that's going to be a long-term affect when they've never actually encountered it before.

Looking at some other things that people have said. Potential fire ignition sources, all right, here we have a 6000-acre-plus lot that's going to be used for this. Which do you consider to be more a fire ignition source, the number of homes that could possibly be put on that property, you know, with all the different homes, all the ignition sources, all the fuel, propane, everything that's located in those homes, versus these windmills, where the only ignition source is actually located way up in the air where it's isolated and never going to go anywhere? Any oil that were ever to spill from any of these wind turbines would be collected and would never reach the ground, all right.

Looking at a few other things, reliance on tax credits. I really -- I really beg people to think about the other ways that we receive energy in this world, okay? Do you think the nuclear power, do you think that fossil fuel power would be possible if it weren't for the incredible tax benefits given to those companies in the
development and exploration phases of developing those fuels?

Do you think it's possible that, you know, when people fuel prices were so low back in the '80s and when they've at their lowest, do you think that those companies could have afforded to produce and make money without those tax credits? I mean, nobody's mentioned that yet, but it's really important to know that all those companies are receiving significantly greater tax benefits than any of these wind farms are receiving.

All right, looking at the impact on the local area, I think that people -- the only thing that's been mentioned about employment on these jobs is the permanent positions that are actually located on those jobs, all right. There may be three, there may be ten. Most jobs that I work on of this size it'll be anywhere between five and fifteen permanent jobs located after the job construction has been completed.

That's not including the two to three hundred people at any one time that are on that job site working during the construction phase that can last up to six months to a year to a year and a half. You know, at the high end it's
going to be 200 people; that's 200 people in this community spending money, you know, supporting the local businesses.

In the first two to three months of the Wild Horse job alone, Wild Horse construction phase, we've spent in excess in between six and eight hundred thousand dollars in the local community, in Ellensburg and Kittitas and Vantage alone.

And I betcha if you considered it, that money has been recycled through almost every pocket in this building. Every person in here is influenced by that money that's been spent.

So there's no -- I mean, tax credits, you know, the taxes going to the county, that's not even a consideration when you you're thinking of the true economic impact this is going to have on this community. This is going to provide jobs and it's going to be a lot of businesses that are supporting these wind farms: machine shops, fuel stations, all the above that are going to be, you know, making money off this, and that money is going to stay in this community.

All right, looking at bird life impact, all right, this is something that has never, ever gone away from back in the days when modest
towers were built on these wind turbines, all right? There was a very small issue with them back in the day in several well-populated -- or in several well -- highly populated bird areas, such as Altamont.

I've been working on the wind farms for four years, through all the phases; I've never once seen a dead bird associated with a windmill. And that is an honest -- that is the honest truth. Never once seen a bird die associated with a windmill. Okay?

And I think it's important -- there's a lot of opinions out there, but it's only opinions. People can say -- the Audubon Society can say they think that birds are going to die, that they believe the birds are going to die, that they've read on the Internet the birds are going to die. But who's saying what those people have written is right?

I've been there, I've seen these, I've worked on them; I've worked in Palm Springs, I've worked in San Francisco, and I've never once seen a bird that has died associated with one of these projects. And I'm not just a general laborer; I'm a construction manager and we've had programs
in place that would report any of those bird
kills where they've happened. And we've been
regulated by various different societies and
we've had to report those if they ever occurred.
Never once have I seen one happen.

I think that the other jobs that people are
tending to forget happen to come as a result of
all the support businesses. I mentioned it just
briefly earlier, but you have to think about the
road maintenance staff that are going to be
required. The cleaning staff that are going to
be required. All the work that's going to have
to occur to keep this project going throughout
its life that's going to come into this
community, all right?

There's a lot of employment to come out of
this project. It's not just during the
construction phase and it's not just the three
people that I've heard; you know, the people that
say that there's going to be three people
employed by this over the long-term.
Significantly more people are going to come into
this community.

And I really ask people to consider the
alternative. I mean, the big thing that keeps
coming up is people that do not want this to occur in their back yards. They'd rather push their energy problems onto other communities and not have to realize themselves, all right.

We're in a consumer society, we're in a society where we consume electricity. Every time you turn on your light switch, that electricity has to come from somewhere, all right? The world isn't building any more big dams; big dams aren't happening, all right? The environmental impacts of those dams are -- have been deemed significant, and the World Bank, the largest lender to any big dam in the world, is no longer funding big dam projects throughout the world, all right?

So big dams, they're gone, you know. The local dams here on the Columbia aren't going to be happening anymore. You cannot dam that river any more than it already is. That has to come from somewhere, all right?

People in this community have never -- a lot of people that are here have probably never seen a nuclear power plant, they've never seen a coal-fired power plant, and they never really realized the impacts of that, but as the
population of this world grows, we have to realize that we're going to feel that crunch more and more. There's going to be more impacts related to that all time, all right?

This, this valley has an incredible resource, all right, this valley has a resource that no -- there's not many other places that can say it. Sure, there's lots of places that are windy, but this valley has an incredible resource, and these people owe it to the world that they need to supply this resource and exploit this resource like they can in order to help the future, all right?

I wish there was more people my age here to speak, but we are the ones that are going to be affected by this, all right.

I appreciate it. Is there any questions?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Yes, I have one.
Alan Crankovich, Commissioner District 2.

MR. CHRIS FOX: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Are you construction manager on the Wild Horse project?

MR. CHRIS FOX: I am.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: So as far as the jobs that are going on right now, can you tell me
the -- approximately how many local people were hired versus bringing in people that are experienced in building these projects?

MR. CHRIS FOX: Okay, well, I have three contractors working for me right now. Of those contractors, they bring in a core group, which is usually -- well, let me take for example one of my core groups. There's six people that came up from California in that core group. At their peak they're going to be employing between 40 and 60 people; all of the rest are going to come from this area.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Thank you.

MR. CHRIS FOX: Any other questions? Please, I -- anything you've got. I'd love to be able to answer anything you've got with respect to construction.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MR. CHRIS FOX: You're welcome.

MS. BARRET: D.J. Frame?

D.J. Evans?

MR. D.J. EVANS: I'm D.J. Evans. I am fire chief with Kittitas County Fire District 1. I'm here tonight to speak as the fire chief for the district and relay the message from the fire
The commissioners have instructed me to inform everybody that the fire district does not endorse this project or is against it. That is not our job. Our job is to figure out a proper fire plan for any kind of endeavor, whether it's residential or commercial.

With that being said, I've heard a lot of comments -- it's scary being up here talking to people. I can tell you a more scarier thing is being an incident commander facing down a wildland fire that's coming at you at 30 miles an hour and you have five minutes to decide what to do with your fire crews before you're overrun.

As a fire district for the past three years, we've had our tail feathers singed quite often. We've had numerous wildfires in our area. Some were very, very bad.

When we heard about the wind power project was finally going to come to our area, we were very hesitant about it and we knew we were going to have some problems that we were going to have to encounter and address.

So we rolled up our sleeves and we started doing a lot of research. We listened to Zilkha
at that time. They presented all their safety plans, all their fire plans, and what they wanted to get accomplished and where they were locating anything and all their roads.

And then we took all of that information and went to other wind farms within the state and out of the state. And we talked to all those individuals, how it all progressed, how it all came together, what problems they had, what fires were encountered, if any, and any other accidents.

I know of one of the other commissioners and myself both have been to Altamont Pass in California where that big wind project from a long time ago is, where there's hundreds and hundreds of these windmills. That in a way is kind of a pretty site but it is also kind of a sad when they weren't properly maintained and taken care of also.

These wind turbines that we have researched that are being put up today, especially the last ten years is a completely different technology. A lot of new safety standards have been built into them. And I've been inside of them myself. I've been under them and talking to people in
normal conversations.

I've looked at all their fire plans for in case a turbine does malfunction. They're all monitored by computers. Any sign of trouble, they shut down automatically. There's a team that goes in and checks it out.

If by rare chance there's a fire, there's fire suppression systems in there to take care of them. Any of the hydraulic oil leaks or whatever, they're all self-contained up there.

When Zilkha came to us and presented their plan and then we came back at them to inform them of our concerns, especially in our area, because of certain communities that we have within the wild and urban areas and the wind problem, if their fire does start how everything will be in danger, and then we have a tough time trying to respond on initial attacks.

And it was a big learning curve for them to understand why we have our problems, because of the poor access into the areas before these communities. And this wind farm is going to be going into those areas, so --

But they finally understood what we were -- where we were coming from and why we had to have
extra measures taken and mitigation done above and beyond normal wind farms. And they stepped up to the plate and -- and took care of those problems well and above and beyond and didn't even gripe about it.

And the Wild Horse project over there, it has its fire plan and it's going to be the same fire plan that we have. The reason I know that, because I was involved in crafting that fire plan for that project also. So if anything goes wrong up there in their process, you can bet it's going to be addressed and corrected and they will come back over here to this wind project if it follows through.

One other thing that I'm looking forward to if this does come to realization for everybody, this project does go in, is the infrastructure, the road infrastructure that will be in place to these turbine lines. These are going to be well-maintained gravel roads that's going to provide excellent access for all the fire crews, the water tenders, and the brush trucks to go after fires, where we never had this before in this area.

And the problems for the fire is not going
to come from the turbines themselves; it's going
to be coming from the people on the ground.
There will be some little bit of liability with
the construction crews, but we've addressed that.
Multiple training sessions and patrols will be
out to take care of that. Extra water will be on
site as these wings are being built.

But the problem that we are anticipating, we
know we're going to have sooner or later up
there, is after these turbines are up, if they do
go up, is the people on the ground. And that's
the recreationalists who have access to the DNR
grounds that some of these turbines are going to
be on. That's your bird hunters, deer hunters,
rock hounds, and people just plain hiking.

Accidents happen; sometimes it's malicious.
But that's the nature of the beast for some of
the things that we have in this county. We've
seen it already with the arson fires that we had
in the past, as one example.

I am very confident of the fire plan that
we're going to have in place, and I'm looking
forward to any asset that they provide to me,
especially for these roads so we can get our
equipment in and go after these fires before they
get too big and I have to call for another state mowed fire from the governor. I really don't cherish doing that again.

Thank you for addressing this. If you have any questions I'll answer them.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Ken Fyall?

MR. KEN FYALL: I'M Ken Fyall. I live at -- or my address is 303 West 3rd Avenue, Ellensburg. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the process here.

After sitting through three nights of testimony now -- I have property on Hayward Road and Highway 10. So I am directly impacted by the Horizon project.

After sitting through the testimony for the last couple of nights, I am not sure which side I come down on, if I'm for massive subdevelopment surrounding me or wind towers. I think both are going to happen.

I think that if the wind farm goes in, Mr. Evans just addressed the access; I think it's going to give access to more property and people are going to subdevelop and we're going to have both going on.
Anyway Debbie Boddy last night mentioned Highway 10 being a scenic corridor and byway. And my concern, then, is String A. There have been a couple of towers eliminated. But I guess the developer holds out that those could go back in.

Anyway, that is directly in that scenic corridor. Those towers are highly visible from Highway 10 and the Yakima River. So if anything, I would like to see the possibility of possibly mitigating that a little bit more, if not eliminating that line.

Anyway, I have a second issue. And it also has to do with that string line. And it has to do with a neighbor. For 30 years I've been partner in this property out there. In that amount of time we've put up one new structure. It's a hay barn. So we've been pretty good stewards of the property.

Now I have got subdevelopment up to the property line. I've got a wind farm proposed. And a large-scale rifle firing range, gun range that is being developed under the County's nose without either the County's knowledge or without the County's desire to do anything about it.
And Cascade Field & Stream Gun Club owns property that I believe A-1 and A-2 are sited on. And in Horizon's information I don't see anything that addresses the firing range development.

Cascade Field & Stream Gun Club bought that property I believe in 2001 and began developing it for a gun range. We met with them and some of the neighbors met with them and they refused to stop developing.

So December 19, 2002, Kittitas County Department of Building and Safety -- Building and Fire Safety issued them a letter from code enforcement to stop development. To this day they have not.

They applied to Kittitas County Planning Department three times for a conditional use permit. First of all, they went to either the Planning Commission or County Commissioners -- I'm not sure of the process -- to get the okay to allow firing ranges in Ag 20.

That was their first step. They did that after they bought the property. They found out they couldn't do what they wanted to do; they went to the Planning Commission and they got approval to have gun firing ranges added as a
conditional use. Which I was told at the time
would be -- would give property owners around
there an active say during the process of whether
this should be developed or not.

So that was the beginning. Then they
applied for conditional use permits -- well, then
they started to develop and then this letter went
out. So then they made three attempts at a
conditional use permit. All three times it was
sent back to them for more information, because
it was incomplete.

This is all on file with the Planning
Department, this whole file. It's probably this
thick (indicating).

There was a response from Department of
Ecology, Public Works, Yakama Indian Nation,
Wildlife, and they all wanted some conditions
met. There's a seasonal stream that runs across
that property that in none of their permits they
ever admitted to. Currently they are firing into
the seasonal stream.

After not being able to get their
conditional use permits okayed, during that time
they applied to the Interagency Committee for
Outdoor Recreation, State of Washington. Here's
their application. Here is their funding letter. They received a $40,000 matching grant from the IAC to begin development of their gun range.

Without permits.

Now, the reason I'm bringing this up is because I believe it has to do with the Horizon project, because I believe that we have two large-scale developments, conditional use developments, happening simultaneously on the same property. That's why I'm bringing this up. I think it needs to be addressed.

Last night Mr. Black, I believe, or somebody said that we needed to ask questions to the Planning Commission that need to be asked to Horizon. I want information on this.

They show on their milestone status tracking sheet dated March 28, 2003, that they began their project on 1-17-2003-- no, excuse me April 1st, 2003. Under any known circumstances that could affect the sponsor's ability to maintain the time line above, they state at this time, Our conditional use permit is still in the process and some unsupported requirements are being imposed upon us by the County, obviously an attempt to thwart our plans from a political
position.

Whatever that means.

They've buried a fifteen- to twenty-thousand-gallon tank underground up there without permits. They're improving roads. They've cleared brush in the shrub-steppe without permits. And to this day they continue to shoot.

In their application -- in their application they state that among stated uses for the firing range is a gun range, rifle range up to a thousand yards, pistol ranges, archery range, clubhouse, and caretaker residences, for about 5000 feet of structures. RV parking, campground, hiking trails, fire pits, parking for 100 vehicles, and a training site for law enforcement, including the Bellevue SWAT team.

So I propose that if we're going to be siting turbines on that property that this needs to be looked into. So that's what I would ask Horizon and the Planning Commission -- and the Planning Department to do. They do have a memorandum of wind option agreement. So --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You're not suggesting in any way that Horizon is involved in this?

MR. KEN FYALL: Not in any way whatsoever.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. Is this on the property that is within that -- that configuration?

MR. KEN FYALL: It has -- it has turbines marked on it.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: It does? Okay.

MR. KEN FYALL: A-1 and A-2. And they had more turbines at one time. There's a couple of them that have been eliminated. And I don't know if those'll come back or not.

But you know, I would also ask the question why this stopped development from code enforcement, is -- I would ask the Planning Department themselves why that has not been enforced. This is a paid club; you pay to belong to the club. And they have structures going up out there, so.

Anyway, I would like to -- with the size of this development and the size of Horizon's development, I would like to see that addressed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Would you submit that -- it's already available? Thank you, thank you.

MS. BARRET: Robert Peterson?
MR. ROBERT PETERSON: I'm Bob Peterson. I live at 70 Chukar Ridge Road in Ellensburg.

I had some stuff on wildfires involving those turbines, because we were involved in a wildfire up in Sun East where DNR came up and did a darn good job of putting it out and saved our homes up there. And it jumped Robbins Road and headed for the power plant.

But I was just talking to your chief here at Kittitas County Fire Department, and he said these turbines are different; they have fire suppressants on them, they're new turbines and stuff like that. He says there's no problem with fires. I'm not sure about that, but that's what he said.

Let's see, what else. The only thing else that I was concerned, did anybody ever look into solar panels at all? I talked to -- I think it was Dave, a long time ago and went into his office and got a tape of the last meeting with the wind turbine outfit. And we started talking about solar panels, and he said he's going to look into it, and I says okay.

So I think was -- I can't remember the time, two weeks or a month later, I was reading an
article in the True Light, and it said in there
Arnold Schwartzenegger, governor of California,
is going to request that every home in California
have a solar panel on it.

As soon as I saw that, I went down and
copied that sucker off, went up to the office and
threw it on his table and I says, Here, read
this. He said, I already read it. He said, I
thought of you.

So has anybody ever looked at solar -- solar
power at all and looked into it? I've got one on
my camper and it works pretty good. And it
doesn't take away, it is not dangerous, you don't
have to worry about things with it. And it
doesn't ruin the landscape or anything else.

But anyway, that's about all I've got to
say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

MS. BARRET: E.L. Fry?

MS. E.L. FRY: My name is Edna Fry. I live
at 70 Chukar Ridge Road in Ellensburg.

Anyhow, three years ago I was in a car
accident and spent quite a bit of time laying in
a hospital bed in front of a window. And as I
looked out and watched the weather go by all
winter long -- my accident was in October -- there was very little wind. When I looked out across the valley, Ellensburg set under a huge blanket of dirty fog.

Are we going to add more pollution to this dirty fog that sits over Ellensburg? We're up where we get fresh air, and I mean, we get it a lot.

Views, I mean, everybody's talked about views. Well, it's without saying we've got a wonderful view. But I don't understand why we have to have wind power as our source. We have biochemicals like cow manure. Why can't we process it and get the methane out of it? That makes energy.

We have solar, which people have spoke about. That's clean; that isn't going to cause whirling problems for people or lights flashing at them or any of that kind of difficulty. Or fires; hopefully not.

And they talk about all these new buildings going in that my gosh, we're going to have power lines everywhere. What happened to putting them underground?

I read an article which was one that I cut
out while I was bedridden, and I did a lot of looking into a computer for information, and I've got articles everywhere.

One of the articles talks about 93 miles of cable to a solar -- to a substation down at Dayton, Washington, that is owned by PSE. This power's heading for Seattle. Why should we be doing these to heat up a Starbucks in Seattle or swimming pools or whatever? We've got a nice place here; why ruin it?

I've lived here, grew up here in Roslyn. I remember Roslyn with the coal mines; and yeah, coal is dirty. We don't have a coal plant here putting out energy. I don't know why people keep talking about it. They stopped doing coal a long time ago; they did it before I left the area.

I guess what it comes down to is there are so many things being wrote about what's happening; why can't we go slower? Why do we have to have one power farm or one wind turbine farm on top of another? We haven't even found out what the first one's going to be like.

Dr. Holly Pinkart asked me to read this one little piece for her because she wasn't able to stay. She says the case that Horizon makes for
its "clean" energy and lack of greenhouse gas emissions is false. Construction of the wind industry proposed would generate 21,600 tons of CO2 in concrete production alone.

She shudders to think of the amount of fuel -- fossil fuel needed to produce the towers, transport them here from their point of origin, then erect them on site. The dust produced from months of blasting to produce sixty-four 6000-cubic-feet holes in the ground will be unbearable for those in close proximity to the turbines.

Each turbine takes approximately 200 gallons of lubricant and will need changing twice a year, generating 25,600 gallons of waste hydrocarbon that will not be recycled. These wastes are usually incinerated, which will generate at least 250 more tons of CO2. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Robert Keller?

MR. ROBERT KELLER: I'm Robert Keller. I live at 14205 Wilt County Road 396, Milliken, Colorado.

I'm affiliated with Horizon, and I'm working
on the Wild Horse project. Just a couple of things I wanted to say; I really wasn't planning on talking.

One of them is the tax credits. We're talking about production tax credits, not tax credits to build the wind farm. The money for the wind farm all has to be put up in advance, and we get zero money for tax credits until we produce energy. If we do not produce any energy, we collect no tax credits.

It gives us an incentive to make sure the farms are put in right, gives us an incentive to make the turbines work right, and it gives us incentive to keep them running. If we produce no energy, we get no tax credits. It's a very high investment up front, and if we don't make energy, we get no money from the government.

Second thing is you've been talking about 400-foot towers. I've been in the wind business 27 years and I've never seen a 400-foot tower. Towers are usually 220-foot tall. You might have a blade that sticks up above that 120 foot. So we're talking somewhere in the range of about 320 foot from the ground to the tip of the blade as it sticks straight up in the air.
The other thing is money into the community. Like Chris Fox said that -- since we've been here we've put in over $600,000 into the community so far. That's been within two months. We've donated $168,000 to the fire department, the local fire department, for a new fire truck so they could provide fire service to us out at the Wild Horse project. So we are bringing a lot of money into the community.

We want to see this -- all wind turbine projects work. You can argue the aesthetics one way or the other. It's all in the eye of the beholder on the aesthetics.

Most of my background is working with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado, on research and development of wind turbines. If you're interested, you can find documentation on noise, bird kills, anything you need to know about wind turbines and the study of wind turbines from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. You're welcome to contact them; if you need their address, I'd be glad to give it to you.

But we're here not to come in and destroy the environment; we're here to help the
environment. And I think we do that by putting in nice, clean, renewable energy sites that works and be working for many years. If we do -- if they do not work, there's a bond in place to remove them, remove all the concrete to four foot below the surface of the ground. So at any time that the project does go defunct, if it goes defunct, there's a bond in place to take it out and get rid of the debris.

That's pretty much all I have to say. Is there any questions?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Milt Johnston?

MR. MILT JOHNSTON: Good evening. I'm Milt Johnson, Assistant Region Manager for Department of Natural Resources. My address is 1211 Vuecrest. I live here in Ellensburg, Washington. I work out of the region office located at the airport. Again, I'm speaking for the Department of Natural Resources.

The DNR manages more than five million acres of state-owned land throughout the state. These lands are forest, aquatic, agricultural and range and urban lands that produce economic and ecological returns for the state. In addition to
generating income for the beneficiaries, trust
land are self-supporting.

Wind power development on state lands
provides a long-term source of income that allows
to us retain existing habitat instead of
developing the land for other uses. It's also
compatible with the many current uses of state
land such as agricultural, farming, and grazing.

With regard to this project, DNR has leased
out 2075 acres of state land that's included in
the Kittitas Valley Project. These land were
previously leased for grazing, which generated
less a dollar an acre each year. We anticipate
more than 1.8 million in revenue from this
project during the first 25 years of operations.
75 percent of that revenue will go directly to
support K-12 school construction.

In addition, leasehold tax is assessed at a
rate of 12.84 percent of the state's share of
wind power project income. The leasehold tax
revenues over the next 25 years should be nearly
$250,000. 48 percent of that comes directly back
to the county.

The project also provides a local tax base
leading to property tax reductions, which we've
already talked about earlier.

Horizon Wind Energy has made significant alterations in their wind project proposal. For example, on state lands the number of turbines being proposed has been reduced from 33 -- 33 turbines to 15 now. This is a major reduction in the number of turbines on state land.

From a personal point of view and speaking as a citizen of Ellensburg myself, we as a nation are in a deep energy hole. Alternative energy such as wind power is now making sense. Kittitas County is blessed with wind that has economic value. We have a responsibility to do our part to improve the wind energy -- or to improve our energy imbalance.

Again, thank you very much for your time. I just have one further comment in summary. The state funds that have come to Kittitas County from July 1992 through July of 2005 have been nearly $18 million. 7.7 for support of Ellensburg schools, 4.8 million in support of Kittitas schools, and 5.3 million in support of Cle Elum schools. So these tax -- these state revenues do come back to the local community.

Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The revenue figures that you quoted here, are those based on the number of turbines?

MR. MILT JOHNSTON: Yes, they are.

MS. BARRET: Tom Maskal?

MR. TOM MASKAL: Good evening. My name is Tom Maskal. I live at 420 Kern Road, Badger Pocket, in Ellensburg. I'm here to represent myself, my wife, my children, and my children's children. The decisions we make at this hearing will have a lasting implication for all of us.

I am most vehemently opposed to this wind farm project as it is proposed and, most importantly, where it is proposed.

The Kittitas Valley is an incredibly beautiful place, bounded on all sides by the Wenatchee Mountains, the Boylston Mountains, Manastash Ridge, and the foothills of the Cascades. From almost anywhere in the valley one can see across the valley to the other side. These views are completely unspoiled by large-scale development. The views are of pastoral farms and ranches, shrub-steppe land, and forested ridges.
Even the town of Ellensburg is a delight with its historical downtown and the Central Washington University campus. This is no place for a large scale industrial development like the proposed wind farm.

I find the arrogance of the wind farm applicants to be truly amazing. During the applicant's presentation the other night, reference was made to the area of the proposed project being, quote/unquote, hardly pristine, unless you like, quote/unquote, blue and white tarps on haystacks and irrigation pipes scattered around in fields.

This is what we do in Kittitas Valley. We grow irrigated crops like hay and we store it until it's bought and shipped. Just because we only farm the land does not mean the applicant should be allowed to destroy the pastoral farm and, yes, the pristine views, whether they think they are or not.

The applicant in their presentation acted as if only the residents of the immediate area would be affected and only their concerns need to be addressed. We must all understand that this project will not only be seen by the
participating and compensated landowners and their unlucky neighbors, but it will also be seen by travelers, of course, on Highway 97 and 970, but also by travelers on I-90 as well.

For many it will be the defining view as they enter the Kittitas Valley from the west and look back towards the Stuart range. It will also be seen by the residents of the valley floor in Ellensburg itself.

I live at about 1850 feet elevation in Badger Pocket all the way across the valley. On clear nights even now I can see the headlights of cars eastbound on I-90 in the vicinity of the Elk Heights Road exit, Exit 93. I can even see the strobe lights of the nearby cell phone towers that are close by that exit.

I can see this with the naked eye; I don't have to use binoculars. That's over 27 miles from my house by either the freeway or as the crow flies.

Consequently I most likely will be able to see this wind farm that's proposed. Certainly its lights and probably the turbine towers themselves. I do have a clear view of the Stuart range.
It should be apparent to all, even the applicant, that the views of this project are not compatible with the beauty of the Kittitas Valley.

If I look northeast from my house right now I can also see Whiskey Dick Mountain. Consequently I should be able to see that wind farm when it's constructed. The principal difference is that that wind farm is not in the view corridor and certainly not in a populated area. One wind farm, properly sited, is enough for the Kittitas Valley.

I'm not against wind farms. I consider myself to be an environmentalist. I'm a member of the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, and the World Wildlife Fund. In addition to growing hay here in the Kittitas Valley, I also grow blueberries in the Puyallup Valley organically.

I am not opposed to wind farms or solar power. I think we need more renewable resource generators of electricity. But this is a populated valley of unparalleled beauty and it is also growing rapidly in population. We deserve to not have it destroyed to generate what will amount to only a very small amount of
electricity.

This project could have been the right project in a different place; read that a different county. But it is the wrong project in the wrong place here in Kittitas County. Bend and Sisters, Oregon, would not put up with this. The applicant is not proposing a wind farm at Mt. Bachelor, Oregon. Why do we have to defend our way of life in order to prevent the destruction of our valley?

The applicant says that they came to the Kittitas Valley to construct a wind farm because we've got the wind and our county code seemed to allow it because we did not specifically not allow it, as some areas do. That's kind of like saying if we dress provocatively and the wind happens to blow up our skirt, when we are raped it must be our own fault. The wind farm industry is in the process of raping the Kittitas Valley.

If we allow this wind project, we'll not need to change -- we will need to change the logo for our county. I'm being facetious here, of course. Seattle is characterized by the Space Needle, and in fact it is on their logo. Kittitas County will no longer be able to say,
"We stretch from the Cascades to the Columbia."
It will instead have to say, "We stretch from one wind farm to the next."

Now, I'm going to digress from my prepared statement a little bit right now. Maybe we owe Horizon a debt of gratitude because they're going to prevent development, as this one gentleman said tonight. They're going to make housing and property more affordable because the property values in that particular area are going plunge. So maybe we really do owe them a debt of gratitude.

The other concern I've got that was just voiced was that shadow flicker and low-intensity -- low-spectrum noise is not going to harm any of us. Well, we thought the same thing with asbestos, and then we found out that asbestos causes tremendous lung damage.

I don't think we know all about the damages that can be done with wind farms, turbines, noise pollution, and everything else. If Horizon was a different kind of company and they were a major polluter and backed up huge tank trucks and dumped all kinds of pollution into the Yakima River -- the premiere, pristine fly fishing river...
in the whole country -- I think we'd be outraged. Here what Horizon is going to do is visually pollute our valley.

I urge the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to reject this proposed development. Further, I urge that we place a moratorium on all further applications and development of wind farms until we can assess over time the views and performance of the Whiskey Dick project.

Barring the rejection of this proposal by the county, I urge all of Kittitas County to write to the governor, Christine Gregoire, to urge her not to approve it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

MS. BARRET: John Sparrow?

Tom Burke?

Ray Ridenour?

Joe Freeman?

Connie Freeman?

James Brown?

MR. JAMES BROWN: I'm James Brown. I have property up Reecer Creek Road going from Sun East to Reecer Creek.

And I'm not representing these folks at all,
but I've been an operating engineer, operated cranes for over 40 years. And I helped put up about 500 of these units, not only in California but in Colorado and several other places. My income is derived from operating cranes, not getting shot at for putting these things up.

And that's really kind of what it boils down to. People that are against putting these things up, and a crane operator is sitting in a seat being targeted for doing stuff because somebody from the Audubon or whatever claimed that these machines kill birds, make noises.

And I can attest that it makes me very angry as a crane operator to be shot at because somebody doesn't want a machine put in their back yard. And so trust me, I'm one of the guys that -- I don't like getting shot at because somebody doesn't want something put up in their back yard.

And I've been under these machines, around the machines, I've set the cages. That's a big massive amount of steel that goes in the ground to hold the concrete in place. And I have yet to be hurt or hear a lot of noise from these machines. I've yet to see one bird killed on any
of these project sites.

And I got to thinking as I set in the seat, many times I set there for eight, ten hours a day working on these projects. I've never been on these folks' projects, the Wild Horse or any of the others.

You know, when we go to do our resources for one of these machines to produce this electricity for one month, I'd like every one of these Audubon people and the people that are against these things to come up here and put their keys on the desk here, because for one month of one of these machines running it's going to be about two years of their gas money. And if they don't like their SUVs running, they should bring up their keys and donate their car, you know, because we're running out of gas.

Our coal that somebody said that we're not using, over in Olympia they got a big coal turbine running over there. What are they going to do when they run out of coal? They're coming over here to the -- to this area and get the coal and transport it over to Olympia. Boy, that's really going to be smart. Transporting coal. What's that going to do for the electric bill
then? Our electric bills are going up.

Wind power and all these other entities that are putting in their resources, we ought to be thanking these people. And guys like me, I lived here -- I've lived here for a lot of my years. And the money I make working in California and Colorado and all over on all these projects, I bring that money back to Ellensburg. I don't bring it back to Seattle, I don't bring it to Spokane.

I'm doing a project in Spokane right now. And where does my money come? It comes back to this county. It don't go to Spokane. When I go to Spokane, my gas bill is pretty high, running back and forth in a truck. Where's my -- most of my gas, I fuel up plus I take extra gas from here because the gas in Spokane is about 40 cents higher than it is here in Ellensburg.

And so when we talk about where our energy and our resources are going, it's going out the window, folks. And what we need is start being responsible characters for what we're doing here tonight. We got to look for the future. You know, it's all right that I go, and I'll be gone, dead and gone, but what about our children, what
about our future children?

You know, when we run out of resources, what are we going to do? We going to say, oh, well, now let's put in a wind farm?

They may be ugly, but guess what, up here, like the lady said that they up there at Chukar Ridge, Gary, my neighbor across the way, had a generator; I never heard it. He's right across the way from me.

You know what makes more noise? The wind blowing across those power lines. In fact, I got those ugly power lines setting in my back yard, you might say. What's more uglier, the power lines or the wind generators?

To me I think those power lines is just about as ugly as them, but when I start looking at how long I've lived up there in that area, guess what? Before all of these people moved up here to Chukar Ridge and all these other places, I can name them; there were five people that lived up there, and when I drove into town from up there down here to town, I'd only see maybe one, sometimes no cars at all. Now I see the minimum of ten to twenty cars going up and down that road.
So what's more ugly, the houses that are being built -- and they're not even houses; they're throwed together from Japan, houses that are manufactured homes. The material don't even come from here.

So what are we to do? We going to be irresponsible in our future generation? What are we going to do when we run out of lights? We going to say, Well, it's time to put in solar panels now or put in wind generators? And people are going to still do the same crying and moaning and groaning.

Is this what we're after, a bunch of people that are not responsible? I think we need to start thinking where our energy is going to start coming from, because when the gas runs out and the oil runs out and we keep paying higher gas bills -- what is our gas now? $2.50 a gallon? What was it before we had all this problem?

So I'm just leaving it with you that we need to start being responsible people and putting in things that are going to go for the future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

We're going to take a five-minute break
right now.

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Our hope was that we would
get completed this evening, so can I get a hand
or showing of hands of how many more speakers
we'll have?

Will you keep your hands up; and anybody
that's going to speak less than two minutes or
five minutes or something?

Okay. So we're getting through. Let's,
let's try it at least, okay? We want you to have
an opportunity to say what's on your mind, but we
also want to ask you to be brief if you can. If
you -- if we've heard a lot of it, please just
ditto and go on, okay?

The other thing is is that we're going to go
through the list that was signed up -- correct
me, Susan -- the night before?

MS. BARRET: Yesterday, yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: And I think we have one
name left on that. Then we're going to go into
the list of names that were signed up last night.
But I would ask you if you've already testified
and put your name on this new list that you not
do that, not testify. Please.
So with that, let's start. We'll try to -- if we are looking like around 10:30 or so that we can get it wrapped up, we will do it. If not, then we would have to continue it into next week; and next week is just a tremendously busy schedule for the Board of County Commissioners, so we'll go with that, okay?

MS. BARRET: David Fowts?
Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That was the first night?
MS. BARRET: That was the 10th, yes.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.
MS. BARRET: Ken Hartman?
MR. KEN HARTMAN: Ken Hartman. I live at 500 North Alder in Ellensburg, and I also have my farm business address and a ranch at 1000 Hartman Road in Cle Elum.

And I'm representing the property -- we still have the ranch at Swauk Prairie, Pleasant View farm. It was -- my brother and I farm it; we're about fourth generation there. My great-grandmother named the place Pleasant View Farm when they come here from the old country.

And we haven't done much farming the last ten years, so I had a chance to look up and see
why they named it that. And it's quite obvious that it is a pleasant view.

And my objection to this is that from our ranch I can look about three or four miles and see that ridge where these gizmos will be something up there. And then my mother's side of the family, they -- she came from Horse Canyon; they owned a lot of that range and stuff in there, and some of that stuff is going to be on the property they owned. That was back in -- well, they didn't own it after the '30s.

But anyway, I just -- that's my roots up there. And when I walk -- I walk every -- twice a day up on below the fairground on Reed Park, below the fairground -- anyway, I look up toward where the ranch is, like I say 12 miles up there or some damn thing.

Anyway, I know darned well if they ever put those things up there, I can see them from this side, and I go up to the ranch -- I like to go up every day, but I got to go up and take care of it anyway as long as I can. When I'm up there, I look back this way about three or four miles at most and see it.

And I consider putting those things on that
ridge, from my objection, and I hate to see everybody have to see it. I call it trashing the ridge. You know, just a bunch of --

Well, years ago in 1950 or '60 we went -- we traveled down on the Columbia and come up through Goldendale. And the wife's got family, relatives down that way. Anyway, they have that -- the windmills on Goodnoe Hills or something like that about Goldendale.

And as I understood it, there was a disaster then so they weren't even operating -- there were plenty more problems. Never been down there to see if they're there or not.

And I don't think there's a whole lot of future -- those windjammers here, maybe 50 years or something; and then it's just, like I say, it'll be trashing the whole ridge.

And anyway, within the next ten years there's no more -- I got a couple daughters and a granddaughter but nobody to take that -- we still own the home place (inaudible) to it and sold that. But we still have the home place. And it'll have to be sold, and I don't want to have to tell -- explain to somebody it's Pleasant View Farm except for that stuff on that ridge over
there. It's no selling point.

And you know, the whole -- this whole deal, these people that are talking about wanting to do it, they're doing it for the almighty dollar, and I don't want that to detract from the value of that property, because it's got to be sold and I feel it's my obligation to get every damn dollar I can out of it for ourselves and my family and whoever. And I have to admire the people that -- all my kinfolk that stayed with it that many generations.

And finally, they used to come from Cle Elum and Seattle and relatives and friends: Boy, this is a beautiful place. And it is, but they look -- they have to see -- if they do put those things up.

Whatever one of them says, the whole deal -- that company wanting to do whatever is for the almighty dollar, and I'm for my almighty dollar, all I can get out of it.

And so I, I think that you spend too much time talking about nothing here. All you got to do is to -- those people wanting to do it, pack their bags and get the heck out of here and look at what's -- give it about five years to see
what's going to develop out there.

And then you'll have answers to 90 percent of all this opinionated what is going to be and what isn't going to be, how many birds die and all that stuff. And give you a chance to see how it fits the county, how it works out, and that's -- there's no big rush for it.

You know, you had enough power to run how many aluminum plants out on the river, around the state and all over, and they couldn't make it without cheap power. And now the things, what are they doing up there? Well, they're going to make some expensive power that you can't afford to use. Just all forget it for a while and see what happens.

And if you got any questions where you think my thinking is, why go ahead and ask me. But otherwise I'm like -- TV first started up there, we looked at Sergeant Friday, Joe Friday on -- he was, oh, with the law, you know, and he'd go investigating -- he and his partner would investigate some problem around. He'd always say, Just give me the facts. You know, he started babbling on what happened. So I'm just trying to just give you the facts the way I see
it.

Thanks, and if you got any questions, let me know. Otherwise I'm going to --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Will do. Thank you.

MR. KEN HARTMAN: It's quitting time to go home.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: James Landreth?

MR. JAMES LANDRETH: My name is James Landreth. I live at 271 Voston Road in the Valley.

I happen to be probably one of the only individuals here tonight that has past experience in many aspects of power generation and utility operations. I am an electrical engineer registered in the state of Washington for better than 35 years.

I appreciate those individuals that brought up the Goodnoe Hills project, because I can sit in my chair and chuckle over that one. And if my experience on that project were to be reflected on this one, we would have a tar-and-feather party and send these people out of town.

That particular project was sponsored by NASA, who should stay with rockets and going to
the moon and not delve themselves into wind farms. It was a dismal failure. There were three turbines built; don't recall now the size of them.

And of course we all know that in that area of the Goodnoe hills, the wind blows all the time. The project was completed and ready for testing, and we waited three weeks for the wind to blow hard enough to turn the turbines; and when it did, it was blowing so hard we blew one of them up.

And as the end result of the whole project, it never put a kilowatt of power into the Bonneville grid and was finally dismantled and done away with.

That was built in 1982. Hopefully technology has improved somewhat since then.

Last evening I left with the clerks a copy of a letter that I wrote, so I won't go through it except a couple of areas that I would like to read into the record.

But first off I would like to support Mr. Carmody's request that the public be given time to digest the voluminous amounts of information that has been brought forth by the
applicant, in order to judge its validity.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on how you look at it, since I wasn't able to speak last night, it gave me all day today to investigate some of the validity of the data that's been presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement addendum and also in the original Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and I have found a couple of areas that appear to be faulty, which are two areas which of course are in great question in this project, one of which is noise, and the other which is shadow flicker.

And I derived my information from the Danish Wind Power Association, which I feel is more credible than many of the sources we have in this country. They've been in this business a great deal longer than we have in the United States.

And one of the conclusions that I drew is that the wind farm developers, the wind farm -- or wind equipment manufacturers and the industry associations in Europe are far more prone to think of the surrounding neighbors of one of these installations than we are in this country.

Tuesday night Mr. Andrew Young made the
statement that they had adjusted the setback from non-participating property owner -- property lines to 541 feet. And that number was derived from the numbers which were used for the Wild Horse project.

I'm sure that all of us can remember the meetings that we had early on -- by the way, I I'm neutral; I'm going to maintain my neutrality because I, like Mr. Black, are 50/50 on wind farm development voting.

But Commissioner Huston made it very, very clear -- very, very clear -- that any of the requirements which were used for one farm and one application were not to be reflected onto any other one.

The 541 feet is a far cry from what it needs to be.

Also in their own paperwork, in two different areas, one of which calls out 541 feet, the other calls 541 feet plus the blade length from non-participating property lines. The inconsistency is inexcusable.

But even if we were to use the figure of 541 feet, again in their own data there are setbacks which do not meet that requirement. If
we use the 541 feet plus the blade length for a 3 megawatt turbine, it comes up 688 1/2 feet. There are 11 turbine locations on their own charts which do not meet that requirement.

In studying the information from the Danish organization -- and if I can quote. This happens to be from the area entitled Sound From Wind Turbines.

"It does appear that noise is not a major problem for a given distance to the closest neighbors" -- misspelled, of course. "Usually a distance of about seven rotor diameters is needed." That's 2000 feet for a 3-megawatt turbine.

Most all of the information in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and all the calculations are based on a 1.5 megawatt turbine. This is where the data is grossly faulted.

There is also, as has been spelled out by others who have testified earlier, there is no rush to judgment on this. The only reason for rushing to a decision on this project is such that the applicant can take advantage of the tax incentives to get them built and on line and generating.
There is no need for the power. We in the Northwest -- and this is true pretty much throughout the country -- currently have about a 22 percent margin of generating capacity to demand. That is not what most utilities would like to see. It is higher than it's been in the last seven to eight years. The margin has increased every year since 1997.

A project of this magnitude and of this importance to the county, whether it's built or whether it's turned down, the importance to the county is all too great to a rush to judgment. We have faulty data we're making decisions on, or what appears to be faulty data. And in order to make legitimate decisions, either yea or nay, we need to take more time, investigate the data, and make sure we're making the decision correctly.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you -- excuse me.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: What is your source for this 22 percent margin?

MR. JAMES LANDRETH: The 22 percent margin came from data which is published by the Energy Information Administration of the Department of
Energy.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Ed Garrett?

MR. ED GARRETT: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Good evening.

MR. ED GARRETT: My name is Ed Garrett, and I represent myself and my wife, Rosemary Monahan. Our current residence is 19025 67th Avenue Southeast in Snohomish. For the purposes of informing the new commissioners -- Williamson, McClain, and Clark -- I'll give a little brief summary of what my situation is.

My wife and I purchased 50 acres near Dry Creek off of Tricklewood Lane near the Highway 97. This was in April of 2001. We found out about the proposed wind farm project by then, around that time when Zilkha in June did a press release into the Daily Record.

Merle Steinman, who testified before you on Tuesday and the combined commission, and his 50 percent partner, Gordon Gallagher, sold us the property under the pretense that this is a great, secluded, and private area for me to built a remotely-operated observatory. We talked about a
small cabin to go along with that.

He said he knew of no other developments that would affect us and our use or disturb our 360-degree view for my telescopes. They never informed us about the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project proposal.

Around fall we found out that both of them had signed up with Zilkha to get some wind turbines on their property. Before Zilkha had filed anything with the County, we already filed a building plan, we got our perc test done and approved, we received our official address, which is now 2880 Tricklewood Lane.

Since then all of our plans have stopped. And then when Zilkha filed with EFSEC and bypassing the county process, it was too undecided what we were going to do to invest any more into the property. So that's the background we're dealing with.

Now, for tonight, I'm a little confused over this newly proposed project. I can't even figure out how many turbines will be built, where they're going to be located, how big they're going to be. Chris Taylor's fire (inaudible) are all over the map, so to speak.
Originally we would be looking at J string, which is to be composed of 15 turbines, 480-something feet tall. In the packet I received to review December 2nd, 2005, J string was then shown as six turbines 410-feet tall and some about 500 feet west of my east property line. Now looking at the latest map, which I was hoping we would have tonight, now they're showing that there's going to be eight turbines there.

I wanted to give you an idea where the property's located and the situation that we're in. The area that we are -- Zilkha or one another gentleman spoke about is going to have full view of this project. My property, 50 acres, is located right here (indicating). I'm looking at what used to be J-1 or J-3; now I think it's J-2, which is about 500 feet right of my west property line.

I can see -- or my east property line looking west.

But I can see virtually every one of these turbines from up there. And I'll be looking through, like someone suggested earlier, a picket fence at every sunset.

The other people that bought property here
are six other people. And I'll speak a little bit for them because they were here on Tuesday but didn't get the opportunity to speak. And that would be Jill Kuhns, Skip Littlefield, myself, Cal Wilkins, and Diane Schwab; Bud and Diane Schwab. So all of us who purchased property from Gallagher and Steinman for development, three of them were planning a small residence. Now nobody's doing anything up there.

So the situation, because we're so close to the action with this J string, and yet it points out with the land uses there, when you look around the periphery of this project, all the little plots where people are putting in houses, people are even putting them here but not as much; the turbines are further away.

So that's the situation we are in this one particular sector. And this whole area that goes over to where Mike Genson was talking, it was all purchased by Gallagher and Steinman several years ago, probably 15 years ago, and every couple of years he sells off a 50-acre lot and tells people it's recreational use or you can put a house up there or do whatever.

Now, to one of the comments that was made
regarding that location, and this is in regards to Horse Canyon area, which is having the same problem, about the development, I believe it was Commissioner McClain wanted to know what was going on in that area as far as developers.

There's two developments now being proposed in Horse Canyon. Tom Roth is a developer doing that, and that area was divided up into 29 lots. It used to be the property of Archie Bow when he'd sold it, and I believe it was 2001 -- or 2002, 2003. That area used to be commercial ag. Mr. Taylor would still like you to believe it's commercial ag.

If you go out there now, you're going to see about five new houses, a substructure put in, roads, paved, and a place called Horse Canyon Estates plus another new access road called Lowe Road. And I believe all the properties are sold but seven. And they're going for some pretty good high prices, and they range anywhere from -- I believe the smallest was around four acres and the highest is around nineteen or so acres.

So I made some copies of the current listings that we have for that area from one of the real estate people in town, and I'll pass
this to the clerk to be placed into the record so that you can review those.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Please.

MR. ED GARRETT: Another thing that was bothering me was that there's supposed to be guidelines on siting wind farms. I'm not necessarily against wind power; I'm just -- about where they should be sited. It should be an appropriate area.

The AWEA, which is the American Wind Energy Association, puts out guidelines on how to site a wind farm and what we need to do. And just some of the five issues come up on top on the list.

To successfully site a wind farm, it says, number one, you need a large land mass owned by a few willing landowners. Or one willing landowner, in the case of the Wild Horse project.

The area should already be disturbed by agriculture. Commercial agriculture, which means -- it should be like corn fields or wheat fields, things of that nature. Should not be any prime habitat area.

Should be located far away from residences. And lastly, support from the local public. Or local citizens, however you want to word that.
It seems to me that this particular project, they're failing to go by their own guidelines from the American Wind Association, because the project doesn't meet really any of this criteria.

So another issue that I have is -- and it was brought up before, was that when I got my notice from the County and my little CD with information in it, I not only go through the information and read it, and it was said that submitted application was going to be the development agreement, the development plan, and then we'll have a joint hearing here on the 10th so that interested parties could testify to the information that was going to be on that CD ROM.

So I went through that CD ROM. I made comments, I cited paragraph numbers, page numbers. Did some research on what was in there. And I noticed some discrepancies and a lot of lacking information. But that's what I was supposed to review.

I also am an intervenor with EFSEC, and I knew some information was available that was not in this application or on the CD. It was just their proposed project but no real detail to it, so you really couldn't really comment on it.
As an intervenor with EFSEC, I got the copy of the addendum to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which I'm supposed to be reviewing, which I have to send comments to them in two weeks from the information in here.

This is more than meat and potatoes of what should have been on that CD, which I found out on Tuesday was now recommended as being Book 1 of the facts -- Findings of Fact for this particular project.

So the information was available to us through EFSEC and it should have been available to us with this CD. It's just a matter of copying and pasting; that's all that was done between the book that you have, Book 1, I believe it's Section 14, and this information.

Another thing that was disturbing was I was unable to attend the meeting on Tuesday, but I sure got a lot of phone calls and e-mails wanting to know what was going on. And I said we sat through two and a half hours of listening to the applicant bring up expert witnesses and throw out a lot of numbers and information that was not part of the CD but basically new information.

And they were just dumbfounded that, Well,
this is interesting, I didn't know all this, how can I respond to it? Well, technically you can't. You could if you had resources like some people did to go home, read these things, and come back.

But it kind of struck me that if you're going to review something, you should have all the information and not have it thrown at you in a land use hearing when you really don't have any chance to rebut that information. And it was a lot of significant information, so that kind of bothered me on the process. But I understand that happens in land use consistency hearings.

The other part of that process I heard was after we finish our testimony, the applicant will have an opportunity to rebut everything we said, but then again we don't have an opportunity to rebut the new information they threw at us. So that's just a concern I had about that.

Lastly, something was placed into the record by one person, and it had to do with the wind farm neighbor easement agreement. And it's kind of interesting, because you hear all this information about the project has no effects, doesn't make any noise, it doesn't do this, it
doesn't do that; and then you get into here and you read through.

When you sign one of their contracts, basically you're signing away all of your rights to complain about anything. You sign away all of your rights to basically the use of your property or what they call payment for an easement, easement agreement, that things can be assigned, they have a right to encumber through financing on your deed. Basically they say easement -- or affects easement, what you sign away, owner grants to the grantee an easement right and an entitlement on, over, across, and under the owner's property for any audio/visual, view, light, shadow flicker, air turbulence, wake ice or weather-created hazards, or other effects of any kind whatsoever resulting directly or indirectly from any, A, operations or activities of any wind farm.

I don't think any sane person would want to sign that contract with a clause in it. This is one of the actual contracts that was submitted to a landowner up in there. That's been entered in as part of the record.

I think that's about it. Any questions?
CHAIRMAN BLACK: No. Thank you.

MR. ED GARRETT: Thank you very much.

MS. BARRET: Nelson Booth?

Don Wooldridge?

Andrew Johnson?

MR. ANDREW JOHNSON: Andrew Johnson, 260 Lenas Road. I've lived in Ellensburg now 22 years, and I've been interested in the affairs of this county for most of that time.

Specifically, to deal with the issue tonight, I was speaking to one of the gentlemen that were present yesterday, or last night, and he said that he had worked on these projects down in California and elsewhere, and he'd never seen a dead bird.

And I was reminded of years ago when I was a crop duster -- and this, by the way, is pertinent. I was a crop duster and one particular year it got very cold in Canada very early, the ducks came down, got into the rice fields, and they were calling us up every day to go run the ducks out of the rice, which they were destroying, and push them over into the game refuge.

In the process of doing that, I killed two
ducks with the airplane that I was using to do the work with. And the third one just about did me in. I laughed so hard I had to go home. I was pushing a bunch ducks into the game refuge when a lone duck come out of nowhere, came through the propeller, came through the landing and flying wires of the biplane and went by the stabilizer and never touched a thing. I still don't know how in the world he got away with it.

But I did look back; he was in a ball, rolling over and over, and finally one wing came out, then the other, then he shook his head like "What in the world was that?" I was laughing so hard I had to quit; I couldn't fly the airplane properly.

Now, the pertinence here is why in the world with an airplane making noise did I hit two ducks with the leading edge of the wing and kill them and have the third one come through the propeller and the gyrations I just described?

The only answer I can give you for that is a duck doesn't know what he's running into. And I suspect the reports I've seen of bird kills by these machines that we're talking about, the duck or whatever other bird it is, including bats,
don't really know what those blades can do.

Now, I've been told they turn at about 25 rpm, revolutions per minute, and with the blade length and doing -- adding a little mathematics, you'll find that the tips of those blades are traveling over a hundred miles an hour. And for a bird flying across the country, he probably won't see it. And that'll be the last thing he remembers on this earth.

Now, I was told by this gentleman that actually the problem is that there are environmentalists out there throwing dead birds out and then counting them, claiming that the machines have killed them. But some of the studies that I've seen have been legitimate studies, and the bird kills are more than likely quite legitimate.

So let's get on to something else. You gentlemen are here to determine if this project is good or not good for Kittitas County. And I have done a little study on this. I was a flight engineer for Transworld Airlines for a number of years. I was qualified on 707s and so forth, and there was a remarkable bit of machinery in every jet airplane that resembles this. It's called a
constant speed drive.

What it does, it takes a variable speed input and converts it to a constant speed, because for the electrical equipment that we used in the airplanes -- and you gentlemen use similar equipment every day; they're called computers -- these lights, the electrical equipment we're using here has to be -- has to be 60 cycles per second, give or take one or two. If it varies from that very far, your computers don't work, your clocks don't work, and other equipment that requires and relies on a constant cycles per second won't work.

Now, what this machine does, the rotors turn at variable speeds. They start producing power at 11 miles per hour wind speed. And at 55 miles per hour for safety reasons they shut down.

That means that at slow speeds there is only a very small amount of horsepower put into the generator; and as the speed increases, the amount of horsepower that can go into the generator increases up to its maximum.

And what we're talking about here is there's a horsepower input that the propeller or turbine, if you want to call it that, puts out. And the
output from the generator itself is not horsepower; it's kilowatts.

Now, remember that it has to put that out at 60 cycles per second. That means that it turns at a constant speed. And because of electrical adjustments done by a computing system, it will determine the amount of kilowatts that are put out.

I'm kind of going around the barrel here a little bit. I don't do this every day. But the point I'm getting at is the wind speed is the key to the whole thing. At 11 miles an hour, you only get a little bit of output. At 54 1/2 or some prior -- very, very close to 55 it puts out its maximum rated kilowatts.

There's only one problem. The wind around here very, very seldom blows at 54.9 miles per hour. It varies up and down; and the average, I'm told from the reports I've seen and other sources that I've run across, is only about 30 percent. Which means that you pay for the maximum amount the machine will put out but you only get about 30 percent of that. And we're really talking about what we get for our money. We're not getting our money out of this.
Now, we have another factor. The highest demand period in the year is in the wintertime and in the summer for opposite reasons. In the wintertime, because it's cold, we use electric power for heating, don't we. In the summertime it's just the opposite: We screw down the air conditioning system so we can keep the house cool. Spring and fall, the wind blows but we don't need the power. So we're in opposition here. We're not getting our money's worth.

And my recommendation to you gentlemen -- and I've been sitting back there flattening my sittus, and that's nothing compared to what you guys have been doing sitting here, and I sympathize.

I recommend to you that we turn this thing down. You've already turned down one, and the objections on that one very closely fit what -- the objections I'm hearing on this one. I recommend to you you turn it down.

Thank you very much. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. No.

MS. BARRET: Louise Garrison (sic)?

MS. LOUISE GENSON: Louise Genson, 101 Elk Springs Road.
And I had a packet for each of the commissioners and everyone on the Planning Commission. If someone could pass those out or do you want me to pass them out?

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak in favor of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. When approved, this project will benefit the state, Kittitas County, private landowners who have signed leases with Horizon, and will use the natural resource, the wind, to its fullest potential. The benefits of this project are immense and far-reaching.

Much has been said about the effect the project would have on nearby property values. I have studied the sales of property in the Elk Springs area since the public notice of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project in April 2002. Sixteen properties have sold in the area shown on your map, which is on the third page, which is about a mile north of the project. Three of which are almost adjacent to the wind farm boundary. None of these properties sold at a loss.

And I have four examples of -- if you look on the -- at the map there, all those properties
in blue have sold since the announcement of the wind farm. The one in purple, 7/2, actually sold twice in that period of time.

Properties shown as map ID 8, it sold for $55,000 on 5-12-2000. And in your packet 8B documents the prior sale, and it's found in your packet after map ID 8. That property sold for $85,000 on 4-2-03. That's after the announcement of the wind farm. And that shows a 55 percent gain in value.

My second example is property ID 14, which sold -- I'm sorry, which sold for $195,000 in 4-04-01. That same property sold for $260,000 on 10-15-04. And that shows a forty -- or 33.3 percent gain in value.

I selected these two examples because to the best of my knowledge, few if any improvements were made to the properties in between those two sales.

Some of the other properties, which had improvements made to them, had a much more spectacular gain in value. For example, map ID No. 8 -- I'm sorry, No. 9, sold as vacant land on 4-8-99 for $17,000. Improvements included a small log cabin, a septic system, a
thousand-gallon storage tank, and a driveway to access the cabin. This property sold for 110,000 on 6-17-03. That shows over -- that shows an increase in value of over 500 percent.

Map ID No. 11 also sold as vacant land on 3-27-01 for $76,950. And improvements to it were a small cabin and a horse corral. And then the property sold for 145,000 on 12-2-03. And this property gained 88 percent in value.

And if you look on the map on the third page, it shows the current placement of the turbine string just kind of south of property ID No. 10. At the time that this property sold, there hadn't been the reduction in the number of turbines and the string continued to go past property ID No. 10 and within probably 500 feet of Property 11.

This information which was obtained from the office of the county treasurer indicates that the real estate market has remained strong and property values have continued to improve in this area since the announcement to the public of the pending Kittitas Valley Wind Power application. Public awareness of a strong possibility of a wind farm has not been detrimental to the use
of properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project, nor will the project be detrimental to neighboring properties. The final project, I'm sorry.

The benefits of this project are immense and far-reaching. Please help us use the natural resource we have been given -- the wind -- in an area of Kittitas County where resource management is the highest priority. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Questions?

Questions?

MS. BARRET: Ray Ridenour?

MR. RAY RIDENOUR: Evening. I'm Ray Ridenour, 5319 Smithson Road, Ellensburg. I represent the Ross family and the Jones family.

I'd like to commend the county Planning Commission and the County Commissioners for handling the Desert Claim project. This Horizon project is a mirror image, nearly, of that project, and the way you handled that was quite good.

Although I understand the Desert Claim people are going to try to come through the back door and go through the State. And that I'm
sorry to hear about.
Otherwise you folks have got a project being built and in the process of development. I'd like to call for a moratorium on further development of wind power in this county until that project is completed and to see what we get; what it produces and what the effects are.

I understand Lathrop proposed an overlay project that would restrict wind development to certain parts of this county. The Planning Commission approved that plan and the County Commissioners decided that that was not something that was needed. I feel very strongly that it is something that should be looked at again because this system, I'm afraid, is not working.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very much.

MS. BARRET: Gary McGiesick?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think that's Terry (inaudible).

MS. BARRET: Sorry.

MS. TERESA PETREY: Good afternoon. Or evening. Maybe it's good morning. My name is
Teresa Petrey. I reside at 300 East Helena in Apartment No. 113.

I supported the Wild Horse project, I supported the EnXco project, and I support this project.

I would like to perhaps maybe step out of my place and say that I represent some of the younger generation and I'm an apartment dweller, and we're kind of an unheard minority. Well, we're actually an unheard majority in this town. I believe it's over 60 percent of the people that live here actually live in rentals.

And along with good housing that's affordable that we can live on in our single-family wage opportunities basically that we have here -- it's well-stated that one person may come with a good job but that second spouse has a hard time finding employment; that's definitely been our circumstance. We do need economic development here. There is a desperate need for good jobs here.

I'm not talking about construction jobs. We need those long-term jobs that a project such as these wind farms would provide for the community. And even if it's four or five projects at a time,
that's a significant dent in that kind of mid-management capacity that Ellensburg has so many people in the employment pool to take out of that and actually pull that back into the community.

We're looking at in the next -- and I'm sure you guys have a much better grasp on this, but it's my understanding we have hundreds of homes that will be built in this valley in the next few years. We really ought to be having hundreds of jobs come in with those homes, because where are those people going to be working?

I want to thank very much the Zilkha family for coming in very early, investing their private dollars in this project. I'd also like to thank Goldman Sachs. For those of you who don't know who Goldman Sachs are, they're a major force in the investment community and Wall Street. For a community of this size to have an investment player of that magnitude and -- I struggle for the right word -- profile is quite a coup.

And I also want to point out that a player such as Goldman Sachs does not come in and buy a company such as Zilkha that's invested in a community like this without doing substantial due
diligence, which includes looking at not only the books and the economic outlook, but whether the technology is actually going to fly. Because their investors, private and public, expect it of them.

I do have some experience selling a company in the past to a publicly traded company, and it is quite an experience to go through the due diligence process. It's not something that's done lightly. My company was small; it was an acquisition by a much larger, publicly traded company.

We are not talking about anything on that level. Multiply that by many, many, many times. And the homework has been done here, I can assure you. The mere fact that we have a player like Goldman Sachs and looking at investing in our valley is something that we should put a high price on and consider that a great benefit.

Beyond that, you had Mr. Fox and Mr. Keller talk about the money that's been spent in this valley. I want to urge everyone to remember that that money multiplies.

I've had some experience trying to help develop the economy here, and some of the things
I've been involved in have had an eight-times multiplier affect, according to the Chamber of Commerce. I don't know how they came up with that.

But if you multiply the expenditure of what Horizon -- or excuse me -- well, I guess it was Horizon; it's now PSE -- has put into the community, that's a significant turn on -- return on investment, basically, to this community. It's that money that goes down to Vinmans Bakery that then goes down to the University Auto Center, and it turns and it grows at each place it goes through. It seems to me that we're forgetting that.

We also live in a state we're very, very privileged to have the leadership of Christine Gregoir, her new initiative on biofuel. We're living in a very exciting town and a very exciting time, and we have a chance to make a difference for the future.

I've driven this area, I was out there probably four to six weeks ago with a location scout -- I do a lot of volunteer work for the Washington State Film Office -- on Mr. Fowler's beautiful property, trying to get us placed in
the Washington State Tourism ad campaign.

And I can tell you that most of the spots that we were on out there -- and I've driven over that -- I'm not really familiar with the strings, but I've driven through where this project will be. I think it's one of the best places that we could site wind energy in this Kittitas County, and I don't think that the impact's going to be that high on the view.

And frankly, I would love to be able to add a wind farm to my photos that go over to the Washington State Film Office to attract people. I believe it's going to be a big tourism magnet.

Also as a renter I will be approaching three years, but I am fortunate enough to actually be in the housing market right now, and I can tell you that the property values have not decreased significantly. They have softened a little bit in the area.

Many of the homes in this area that are for sale involve manufactured homes, which is almost impossible to get financing for the average person these days. So if there any softening, that could be it. But there just isn't a whole lot of inventory out there anyway. And then
we've also had rising interest rates.

So I do have some concerns that -- that the whole issue with property values has been slightly misstated. There might be other factors in play there.

I'd just like to close by saying that today I sat in a doctor's waiting room and flipped open a magazine of a scenic motorcycle trip that somebody took through the southwest. I think it was in California. Beautiful, recognizable scenery; and one picture in front of a whole stand of windmills, and obviously it was something that they found attractive enough to showcase in their magazine. And I think that it will have a positive impact on our scenery. Beauty is truly in the eye of the beholder.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. I would not have been able to come back, and it was a great sacrifice on my part to make it out, and I really appreciate your holding open the discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: H.J. Havens?

Mark Holloway?
MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I'm Mark Holloway. 1581 Thomas Road. 31-year resident of the valley.

I'd like to ask that this aesthetic qualities of wind generators be removed from consideration on the grounds that aesthetics are totally subjective by nature. Just be real quick about that. And I don't believe that any kind of aesthetic decision should be made by a committee, especially on other people's property.

Number two, there's been a comparison in previous meetings of the wind towers to the large power poles that were a major issue a couple years ago back along the John Wayne Trail and which are also along Main Street right now in Ellensburg.

This was -- this was -- let's see, we own property in view of these large poles. We've only seen our property values go up. And I don't think anybody even knows that they're around anymore. They become part of the local environment and you just have to get used to it. And I know change is hard, but you know, that's -- it's part of life.

I've seen no conclusive evidence that wind towers will have an adverse effect on our
property values. Certainly no more effect than
the same land turned into hundreds of
single-family ranchettes or vacation homes.

On the subject of noise, let's see, I am
submitting a list of recognized noise levels for
comparison to the 40 to 50 dBA at the edge of the
property lines. Some of these, this list --
actually shaving is in the 40-to-50 range.
Raining, like it's doing outside right now, is
50.

So you know, as long as these noises aren't
bothering people that don't own the property, I
mean, everybody has the right to do what they
want to with their own property.

I live in a view area. I can see the power
poles that are behind -- or the big transmission
lines that are up on the hillsides on Naneum and
that run up over into that area. I also see when
I drive home at night the lights of the -- of the
dish -- or the dishes that they did for the
airport and the transfer -- or substation that
they have up on Wilson Creek.

Initially they're -- it's something that
you're like surprised about, but we live in an
area where we use energy. We like to keep the
lights on at night, you know. And you got to pay for it. It's got to come from somewhere. If we can get from it a renewable source, then I think that that's what we should do.

The, you know, as far as shadow flicker goes, well, I don't know about that. Shadow flicker, I guess when I walk down by the river or, you know, see the trees that are on my property, there is shadow flicker. Are we talking about -- is that the same thing we're talking about?

If it's something different, you know, I mean, when there's shadows, yeah, that's part of life, you know. Are we suggesting to avoid shadow flicker that we should cut down all the trees so there's no shadows?

Bird kills, I think that that's something that needs to be addressed. That the impact on the environment, it's something that needs to be addressed. But I don't know if when you -- it's something that needs to be balanced.

Think about the amount of kills that are caused by the dams that dam up the rivers. Well, if we're getting wind energy and maybe there's going to be some death in the -- in the process.
But you have to balance it out. If we lose all our salmon runs because we've dammed everything up and we have no wild salmon anymore, you know, you kind of have to take those things into account.

Or glass windows. Do we want to have houses with no windows because birds are going to hit them? Or no cars because we're going to run over an animal? We -- you have to make sacrifices. We can mitigate these things. We need to address these things. Address the bird kill question. Address -- and then mitigate it; come up with an answer.

And that's great that this is going before a committee that has to weigh these things. But there's some portions of it that, you know, like aesthetics that I don't think should be part of it.

The sound, if it's only going to be 40 to 50 decibels, then -- at the property lines, that's something that we all live with. We're -- I mean, yeah. It's 50 -- 50 decibels in rain. So -- and if that sound's produced when it's windy, well, come on, it's windy; it's kind of hard to hear when it's windy. And we're not
trying to legislate or to call Kitcom because the wind's blowing too hard and causing a noise violation. So yeah.

As far as the income goes -- or the effect on my property value, my property value on my properties in town as well as our home in the county have only gone up. And you know, there's -- we just have to realize that we need the energy, we need it for my kids, my grandkids, and all the future generations and all of us here; we're going to need it.

So I just want you to take those things into consideration and make a -- make the right choice, which I think is a well-considered move towards wind generation. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Did you submit the --

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yeah, I --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's submitted?

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: It's not submitted; I have it sitting over here --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Would you, please?

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's 10:15. And how many more do we have? Three? Four?

And then we'll give you ten minutes at the
end?

Can we do this by eleven o'clock?

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I sure would like to, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to get it done tonight, but --

(A discussion was held off the record.)

(A break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BLACK: We saw, I think, four hands that were going to speak. Susan?

MS. BARRET: Noel Andrew?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Noel's up.

MS. BARRET: Who'd I miss?

MR. NOEL ANDREW: Noel Andrew, 2701 Elk Springs Road.

I own 150 acres in the middle of the project area. And where I live there is no electricity or water, garbage collection or a public road, fire protection, or any other services that most people think of when they think of a neighborhood, as these opponents of wind farms like to call the area.

The land I own is on forest/range. It is not good for farming and not much good for pasture either. It is not very productive resource land right now.
With wind turbines on my land it would be productive resource land, and both I and the County would benefit. I want to keep my property open range land, and I don't like the county getting crowded in more and more houses. With so many urbanites moving over here, they are causing property taxes to skyrocket, and this is pushing farmers and ranchers to have to sell their land. It is not the future I think most people want to see for this valley.

I think most people who actually live in this county are for wind farms. But since they have to work so hard to pay for their property taxes, they don't have time to come to all these hearings. If they could come, I think you would see a majority approval of the wind farms. But it seems the retirees from the west side have lots of time to sit in on these long meetings.

I support the wind farm because it is going to allow me to keep my land like it is. I was first approached by Northwest Energy in 1991, but was not enough interest for them to go forth with it. And with this project I have been trying since 2001 to get these turbines built on my land. Five years is a long time to wait, and I'm
losing my patience for all these hearings and processes.

Wind turbines in the county may be offensive to some people's opinion of their view, but if you would look at the DEIS addendum, Figure 3.9-1, Viewpoint 1, Highway 97 at Ellensburg Ranches Road, which is the view looking north on Highway 97 towards my property, there are already a huge bunch of power transmission lines running through the area with their towers. Anyone who thinks this is a pristine view must be blind.

If you look at the existing view and simulated view, you'll see there's not much of a difference. I don't think there would be much difference between the way things look now and how it would look with turbines. They will blend in.

Most of the people who are objecting to this project bought property with transmission lines and towers already there. And how could they think there would never be any more electrical development in the area?

When you make your decision, I ask you to consider what would truly benefit the county as a whole and not what would affect a few people's
opinion of their view. As a landowner, taxpayer, voter, and a citizen of Kittitas County, I urge your immediate approval of this project.

And also I understand there may be some concern with my house being too close to one of the turbines on my property. Is that true?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's a question we can ask.

MR. NOEL ANDREW: Okay. If that is so, then it is my feeling that it would be my business. Within that range the decibels would be 50, and since I am half deaf, it would be only 25 to me.

And as to shadow flicker, I don't believe it would bother anyone unless you was to stare directly at it for maybe an hour straight. But maybe not even then.

I am 64 years old and perfectly capable to look after my own well-being, and if it does bother me I will move further away from them.

Also I think each one of you making such an important decision should go to a wind farm when the wind is blowing and camp out for the weekend instead of trying to make a decision on people's opposing using every bogus excuse they can think of.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MR. NOEL ANDREW: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Did you write in the margin?

MR. NOEL ANDREW: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Did you write in the margin? I'm laughing with you, okay?

MR. NOEL ANDREW: I guess I better get my paper and get out of here.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Joe Sheeran?

Linda Rubio?

Brian Thomas?

John Ufkes?

MR. JOHN UFKES: I didn't say I was going to speak. I just said --

MS. BARRET: Okay. I'm just reading everybody on the list.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: John Cunningham?

Pam Helleman?

Pat Deneen?

MR. PAT DENEEN: Pat Deneen, 1890 Nelson Siding Road. I'm going to try to talk about just things I know about, and one thing I know about
is property and property values. I'm a majority owner in John L. Scott in the county. I'm going to try to talk about property values with my realtor hat on.

My family also owns about a thousand acres next to -- next to the windmill sites. I've had a chance to work with Chris a bit, and he's been -- they've been pretty good to work with about relieving some of my issues. I still have some small issues with them that I think can be resolved.

What I'd like to suggest, first of all, I probably know as much about property values in this county as anybody in the county. I deal with it daily. I do major transactions all the time. And these will impact adjacent property values. There's just no way, and they're going to impact them negatively. I guarantee you that.

Another other thing is that as property's changing hands right now, I think of myself as a relatively sophisticated property buyer. Mary Burke sold me her ranch, and as she was walking out the door, she said, You know what, you ought to check on those windmills.

I'm, What? Windmills? There aren't --
right now there's no notice out there on windmills on power reports, which I read hard every day. The notice of people coming in, just because people buy some pieces of property doesn't necessarily mean they know what's going onto it. I can attest to that, having spent a bunch of money and looking a little bit foolish on the other end of it.

But Chris is working pretty well on that, and I would suggest that if this thing is denied, the fight would be at the governor's office. I would suggest I'd like to try to keep this locally and not fight this at EFSEC, which we will probably lose if it's denied and will go to the governor's office.

It seems to me like there might be a middle road. I think if it was approved with conditions on it -- and it looks to me like -- I think -- I think Chris and Horizon have kind of realized that the problem areas seem to be around the fringes of the ownership of what they have.

It seems to me that the biggest issue we have is 500 feet away from somebody else's property line and putting a 410-foot, 40-story building. That to me probably doesn't work real
well.

It seems to me if you're a couple thousand feet off, it starts to diminish; and you know, it looks to me like this could probably be approved with conditions.

Now, I'm probably going to get yelled at by those guys and by these guys, but nobody likes me anyway, so it doesn't bother me most of the time. It seems to me that by approving it with conditions, we can keep it in a local -- locally here. If not, a number of us will be at the governor's office trying to fight it there.

Which is a lot harder fight. Because we don't get to talk to her like this; we have to sneak around in the back rooms. It costs a lot more money to get it done. And it will be a big fight at that point in time.

So on property values, definitely negative impact. On people that are buying land, they're just a lot of them unaware these things are coming on. I'd like to keep the decision local.

I know you guys love conditions. I got to know that. I think you can put conditions on it to make it work and also provide the people who have legitimate -- especially in the core area
right there that want -- that want to keep their places in bigger lots, and this will help them by getting money back to maintain their ranches.

And ranching right now, unless you have a really well-irrigated Timothy farm, probably isn't that valuable -- or value in the county. I don't think much of those in the center there have water rights. I also am chairman of the water conservancy board and kind of look at a lot of water rights.

So that's what my suggestion would be, is you take all this testimony, you come up with an idea to split the baby in half, approve it with conditions on it, and then see where it goes. A straight denial means we'll be fighting at the governor's office.

Any questions for me?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: No, thank you.

MS. BARRET: Tony Helland?

MR. TONY HELLAND: My name's Tony Helland. I live at 414 Alpine Drive in Kittitas. I'm speaking for myself only.

I am also a council member for the City of Kittitas, and anything I say here tonight has nothing to do with the City of Kittitas.
I am currently employed by Hurling Construction, and they are a subcontractor for the Wild Horse project.

I didn't make it Tuesday night. I was at a council meeting, so I missed a lot. I missed the meat and potatoes of the presentation.

I'd just like to say, who knew that we'd all be sitting here tonight with such a hard decision coming about land that has traditionally just been rock, sagebrush, jack rabbits, brown snakes. And I just can't believe some of the prices of this land that people are paying.

And I keep hearing that it's all about the dollar, you know. This side says Horizon just want to make money. But then they want to sell their land. There's got to be a middle road we can come up to.

I, I've lived in this valley my whole life. My family's been here six generations. There were -- I don't know, I'm just -- what I'm trying to do, I guess, is trying to rebut some of the things that I've heard last night and tonight.

There are local jobs out there from Wild Horse. All of them went home; they have to get up early tomorrow morning. I should have went
home a long time ago. I have to be pretty much first one there in the morning. I'm the gate guard; I got to greet everybody coming in.

There's just a couple things I -- I'd like to bring up about that I heard tonight that just kind of struck me. One lady said something about dust from blasting. I got a pretty good view of a few shots that they did up there. There was no dust.

People are talking about their views and the views in the Highway 97 corridor. I don't know how many people have drove up Highway 97 and saw some of the visual blight that's alongside that road. I don't want to call any particular house, homestead, or dog farm to anyone's attention, but there's some stuff out there that just doesn't look very good. And to sit there and say, Oh, I got a good view out there, I got to beg to differ.

There was -- somebody last night said that -- they were talking to the County Commissioners about having to make a decision that would affect people down the road. Well, anybody that holds an elected office or any -- any commission chair, any decision you make is
going to have a long-term effect. There's
nothing short-term.

So what we need to do is, like I say, find
some middle ground. Because people, they always
say, Oh, yeah, wind power's good but I don't want
it in my back yard. Well, it's got to go in
somebody's back yard.

And these companies have been studying wind
patterns for years. They just haven't come in
here on a whim and decided that "We're going to
go up over here and mess up Joe Smith's view
because we just want to." They've studied this,
they've spent a lot of money to do this, and they
aren't going to come in here and ask you to grant
them an application to put in a wind farm to lose
money.

I mean, people will sit here and say, Oh,
the wind doesn't blow that much here. I beg to
differ with them. I've been here 53 years; the
wind does blow. I also know -- I learn stuff
every day on the job, and -- because I stop
people and I talk to them, you know. And there
might not be any wind at the surface. 150 foot
up there's wind.

I think that's about it.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MS. BARRET: Holly Pinkart?

Andrew Schock?

That's all I got.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's it?

MS. BARRET: Did everybody speak?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Did you sign up?

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: The clerk said she would add my name to the list (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BLACK: We certainly wouldn't want to not allow you to speak, would we. I mean, that would -- that would be the coup de grace. So let's -- I would assume you're all ready?

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: I'm all ready.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: We recognize that the applicant wants to take about 10 to 15 minutes. I don't want to shut you down, because you have been here for all of the sessions, so.

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: That's very courteous and I believe a fair situation. Since some did go on long, I will try to keep mine short.


My fellow assistant here, Matt Youngblood,
also an Ellensburg resident. And he's going to hold some props up for me. And I believe he put some other props down here which we'll come to shortly.

I want to rebut some issues that have come up later that unfortunately have something to do with this board that I've set on this stuff for quite a while. Mr. Black, as you remember, I called into question you sitting on the board. I have no problems with you sitting on the board.

Something that you did leave off on your disclosure was that in November 20th of 2002, you moved to ban all wind farms within Kittitas County. And the motion was seconded by Doug Harris and was defeated by a 2-3 poll from the Commission. That's all said about it, that's all I care about it. Thank you.

Mr. Garrett also brings up some interesting issues. I can do nothing but feel sorry that the way he feels about buying land and Forest & Range and Ag 20-plus and wondering why the residents aren't all around him yet. The way I read the rules, that's supposed to be Ag 20 and Forest Ag -- Forest & Range, excuse me.

That is where we would like to maintain that
land as is, and if you want to homestead on it, feel free. But if your neighbor wants to farm, ranch, put up wind towers if this whole commission decides, then let's accept it.

Okay, the handout that Mr. Piercy put out to you guys is some facts on the tax base. This was just recently done by Ms. Debbie Strand of the Kittitas County Economical Development Group. I also believe she submitted it in a different format, is what I found. I got this offline.

But the most important thing, even if you read all the way down the smaller print, the who gets the money, the main thing is 1.6 million come in a year, and that's at the 2005 rate.

But most importantly and least to not forget is that commercial and industrial and businesses put in a dollar into the government coffers and only take out 25 cents. Residential, which is happening all around here, put in a dollar and demand a $1.25 back. That is a net loss of 25 cents.

Or for that 112-lots division that's being spoke about here by some members, well, that's 84,000 a year you're going to be in the hole. So let's start thinking about ways to generate
income that will balance this out. These taxes are not out of one pocket into the other, as one of the local attorneys would say to you. That's a fact of life. How congress doles out our tax money, you know, I might not agree with and believe in the way it is always done; but you know, unless I get a better lobbyist, I'm kind of sitting on the side with the rest of us.

The tax break they give is 2 to 4 percent of the total tax break given to the National Energy Policy tax break taken mainly by the oil, gas, and coal companies. So I believe their share of the pie is whatever crumb is left over.

Why are we still subsidizing the oil industry and the coal industry that is taking what kind of profits a quarter? I believe they were in the Bs.

We keep bringing up what the project will do negative to the area. What about what does it do positive for the area in the farming, ranching, Ag 20, Forest & Range lands that Loel owns that are being subdivided that keeps these acres together and it keeps and puts money into the government coffers along with the private
citizens.

And as you heard the DNR representative speak of, the schools. They get it twice. From our levies and from the school levy -- from the state. We must not forget that the 112-lot subdivision and other subdivisions will affect all of us in this valley. They've affected me.

Remember, this preserves 6000 acres of undeveloped land kept for agricultural, Forest & Range, and open space, which this land is zoned for and in the Comp Plan designations. This project ties up 6000 acres, which of that, 90 acres will be used for actual footprint of project.

There is an energy transmission corridor and we have power lines and poles in it. This is where my little display here will come. As you can see, there is an approximate scale of a tower, a nacelle, and the blades. You can see where the little red houses are. Those are approximately to scale. And that is also approximately how far the nearest property owner's house is.

In the middle of it you'll see the property lines and the safety setback zone. That's quite
a ways to tie up some property which I don't think me or you would be willing to do on our property unless we'd signed with a reputable firm that will take care of my property and let me range my animals on it.

The energy that is produced here will be used here. It goes to the closest switch. Whether you turn it on, I turn it on, or it goes to the west side. The west siders want to have move over here to retire to get out of the traffic jam. They only want to move over here to live because it's a rural life. And I may add, bringing their masses with them to do away with the rural life.

When we are dividing hundreds of acres of farmland into lot size, one acre or less, that brings up a question. Pretty soon we're going to be out of water, power, sewer, because we have no plan for the sewer or the water yet. We maybe better put a moratorium on building until we have a water source designated for all the homes. And a sewer source for all the homes.

That is what is -- that is what Patty Murray says she put money in to help us --

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Point of order,
Mr. Chairman. This is way off subject. We've got nine minutes left, and I'd ask the applicant -- or Chair to direct the speaker to resolve this issue and move on or --

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: Thank you, I'm done.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I don't think he was off subject.

MS. TERESA PETREY: Neither do I, sir.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: How much longer do you have?

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I don't want you shut down.

MR. DESMOND KNUDSON: I'm not going to -- I'm done.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, we go into the --

Go ahead.

MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Mark Holloway, 1581 Thomas Road. I think that shutting down anybody's speaking in the middle of their presentation is totally -- I mean, we had people rambling on here. We're all here late, we're willing to stay up here, I'm staying up late --

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Mr. Chair --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me. Mr. Holloway, we'll give him an opportunity to finish his
1 presentation if he wants to do that.

   MR. MARK HOLLOWAY:  Okay.

   CHAIRMAN BLACK:  And that's his choice. If
2 he doesn't want to do it, then it's the fact that
3 Mr. McClain brought it up and we've now given him
4 an opportunity to do it. If he decides not to do
5 it, I don't think that Mr. McClain should be held
6 responsible for it. So I think it's his choice
7 now. And he has the --
8
     MR. MARK HOLLOWAY:  Yeah. I would just like
9 to see --

   CHAIRMAN BLACK:  If he doesn't want to do
10 it --

     MR. MARK HOLLOWAY:  (inaudible) -- in a
11 civil way.

   CHAIRMAN BLACK:  I probably -- and as far as
12 it goes, anybody else. And so I'm willing to sit
13 here.

     MR. DESMOND KNUDSON:  Mr. McClain, are you
14 going to withdraw that, or am I --

   CHAIRMAN BLACK:  I'm the chairman; you have
15 to opportunity to finish your presentation.

     MR. DESMOND KNUDSON:  Thank you.

   CHAIRMAN BLACK:  You're welcome.

     MR. DESMOND KNUDSON:  The transmission
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1. corridor that this would be built in has been there for 60 years. Only to enlarge as more power is used on the busy west side. So there will be more transmission lines built. I don't have a magic ball; I'm just using common sense.

Let us put the people who are willing to use their land as it is and not alter it with development of homes, roads, and, most importantly, more services, leave it the way and make income and taxes from them.

The opponents have not explained how they will pay for more services they demand without raising my taxes, my neighbor's taxes, and your own taxes.

Yes, these machines are big, but not as big as or out of proportion that the opponents would like you to believe and make you believe with their advertisements in the local paper. The visual sights will still be there, either with a lot of houses and/or with less homes and 64 to 80 turbines. The sky is not falling; we can harvest the wind and our tax coffers will fill up.

Back to the props in front of you and the guy that was holding up the two-by-four earlier,
that was half the height of Mt. Stuart. And you
guys are all kind of sitting there about the
proper location that the southern view of that
way would look. You're not going to see too much
of a tower.

My quality of life has changed by all of the
new people moving into the area, the college
getting bigger, and the infrastructure not
keeping up. However, you know what? I and
others, we cope and look at it as a new way of
life. Not that I like it that way, but I also
understand we're getting to be bigger.

Most importantly, I close with the line I
hear from most people when I say I'm from
Ellensburg: Oh, the windy city; how's the wind
blowing? Not. Oh, the Stuart range guy, the
viewshed town.

Thank you very much and thank you for
listening.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

I believe that's the last of the public
testimony? We will hopefully be able to do about
ten or -- ten minutes or so as the rebuttal? Our
clerk needs to go shortly after 11:00 or so. If
we could do it, why it would be great, okay?
Are we ready? Flip a coin, let's do it. I believe she's on your payroll anyway, the stenographer.

MR. DANA PECK: Indeed.

For both commissions, thank you very much for your time. And for the audience both here and not here, thank you for a really orderly hearing. When you're the proponent in these kinds of situations, you don't come in expecting as good of couple of nights as we've had. And I'd just like to thank you for the way you ran the meetings.

And again, for the folks that are here and even for the folks that aren't, for the kindness and courtesy that we were shown as the proponent, that's really unusual. And staff's just been superb.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

MR. DANA PECK: A very small point, a couple questions were raised about availability of reports. I think both we and the staff have done everything we could to make those available at the time they were submitted either to the County or to EFSEC, and we're trying to go the extra mile with the proposed Findings of Fact by
helping facilitate get that out electronically.

It's unfortunate that there's always someone who wanted to see something that they didn't know where to look. We sure tried to resolve that, and we're still working on it.

That said, while all the issues brought up were addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and various related analyses that are part of the record, I'll be briefly providing a summary of information on three topics that came up on Tuesday and Wednesday, and those are avian noise and scenic byway issues. I'm going to be submitting written reports, which I cleverly walked away without grabbing.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Can I get your name again, too, when I -

MR. DANA PECK: Yeah, sorry about that. Sorry about that. It has been a couple of nights. I'm Dana Peck, project manager for Horizon.

This is the -- I have a noise report from Mark Bastasch, who was here on Monday night; and I also have a brief wildlife response from Wally Erickson, who was here last night but it didn't quite suit himself to testify.
And then again, as we did on Monday, the closing remarks for Horizon Wind Energy will be handled by Erin Anderson.

On the WEST materials that I just submitted, which would be Tab 16 in the documents that we were all looking at on Monday night, Wally produced information to address some of the comments made by the Kittitas Audubon Society representative.

And for the record, Wally Erickson is widely recognized as one of the nation's leading experts on wind and wildlife interactions. He's the author of literally dozens of reports and peer review articles on the subject.

And to summarize his report, Wally states, "The studies conducted at the KV site were approved by the WDFW and were consistent with others in the region. These studies at the KV site do not indicate the area is a major migratory flyway, and estimates of raptor use of the site do not suggest raptor mortality will be significant. The references to the GAO" -- or General Accountability Office -- "report made by the" Audubon Society "representative were selective and out of context and do not"
accurately reflect the conclusions of that report."

And the printed submission goes into that in considerably more detail, which I won't trouble you with on the abbreviated schedule.

On noise, I'm going to spend a little bit more time on that, because it was addressed several times in the course of the evening. I'm going to read from this very closely because this is not my area of expertise; I'm reporting what Mark said.

We asked Mark Bastasch of CH2, which is Tab 12, to clarify the noise analysis information presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the addendum, and the proposed Findings of Fact.

The basic point of Mark's report is -- this is taken right out of the printed report -- "The noise modeling and analysis conducted by the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project" -- which was conducted using accepted and proved methodologies -- "demonstrates that the proposed project will, and indeed must, meet all applicable county and state regulatory requirements for noise."
Continuing from Mark's report -- a question was raised last night about how the sound modeling was performed, and there were repeated references to the 105 dBA figure in Mark's report. After explaining the distinction between sound pressure level, the measure used for noise which is always accompanied by distance from the sound source, and sound power level, which is used in the calculation of noise and the computation, Mark goes on to say, "...the sound power level 105.3 dBA was used in the model."

That was sound power level.

"There is often confusion about sound power level and sound pressure level as discussed above. Sound pressure level is what is measured with a meter...and is what you hear. The sound power level will always be a higher number than the sound pressure level that is measured. This is because sound power takes into account the size of the source. The sound power level of a turbine is not the sound level you would measure or hear immediately at the turbine. The noise level of the turbine will not be 105 dBA, it will be much less" -- and you heard those reports tonight -- "you are able to hold a conversation
at the base of turbines and OSHA does not require hearing protection for workers working outside of the turbine," which I think is pretty instructive in itself.

On the scenic byways issue, Horizon Wind's predecessor, Zilkha, always recognized the presence of established scenic byways in the vicinity of the project; and in fact, several years back, proactively reached out to the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust, Kittitas County cause, before the original project permit was even applied. After several meetings, the original project was modified to address their concerns, leading to the removal of the wind turbine generators from Lookout Mountain.

And as you can see from your record, that organization's not chosen to comment on the project in its current configuration.

With respect to Highway 10, while a plan is prepared by the advisory group, it's my understanding that it was never adopted by the County. In any case, the Scenic Byways legislation at RCW 47.39.069 labeled "Designation and Removal Criteria" clearly states under Section 2 that -- and I quote from the RCW --
"the criteria developed in Subsection 1 of this section must not impose nor require regulation of privately owned land or property rights."

On a personal note I was, among other things, tourism director of Klickitat County. We not only thought the wind farms, wind power projects would be a tourism draw; when the turbines that were there on an experimental basis -- and they were considered a highly successful experiment; they taught us not to build turbines like that. But the new ones don't work anything like the ones in Goldendale 20 years ago.

There were a lot of people who came to the area. It's still a topic of conversation. The relatives came to see those turbines, but they never come over to Goldendale for any other reason. My wife, who's education curator at Maryhill museum, says that her predecessor validates that those same people came by the museum on their way home.

So the idea that these things are reflexively not good for tourism certainly wasn't proven out by the Klickitat County experience.

With those points made, I'd like to ask Erin
if she could prepare our closing remarks for us.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Would you mind if we ask you a couple questions?

MR. DANA PECK: Oh, sure, sure.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: There was some discussion and confusion about whether or not this is a 1.5- or 3-megawatt turbine. Did you want to address that at all?

MR. DANA PECK: I think the confusion turns really more on a question of number of turbines. It's an evolving technology. As one of the previous people who mentioned, said 25 years ago they weren't as good, yep. Ten years ago they weren't as good. 18 months from now they'll be better than they are today.

The idea being that the basic technology has stabilized around a standard design, but they're finding out how to get more power out of that design on almost a quarter-to-quarter basis within the industry, and that's why we talk numbers of turbines and set strings at this stage of the game, because we don't really have an answer to what technology -- what unit for sure we're going to deploy.
But it'll certainly be within anything that we've reported in any of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or related materials.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: There was some questions about the braking system and the noise that's created from the braking. Can you explain that?

MR. DANA PECK: Well, the braking system itself is used during maintenance cycles. The turbines in a high-wind regime, when wind becomes a survival issue for the machine, the blades of the turbine are really more analogous to airplane propeller blades. They literally yaw within their -- you know, I'm going to get jargon in here.

The turbine shuts itself down by feathering out the blade, not by putting on the brakes. The braking mechanism on the current generation of turbines and actually for about the last four generations existed to lock the thing down when somebody was going up to work on it. So there's not -- there's not some sort of a disk brake, jake break noise coming out of them in operation.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: And with respect to the federal subsidies or subsidies regarding
this, is that -- there was a lot of discussion about that being the thing that makes this project actually viable or makes it such a way that you can actually build this project. Did you want to address that?

MR. DANA PECK: Well, it certainly adds to the profitability of the process -- of the project. On the, on the subsidy as a percent of total energy subsidies, the previous person was right on the money; we get less than 3 percent of the national take of federally provided energy subsidies. It's not a, typically, make-it-or-break-it situation for wind power.

There was a time when it was. That time was when natural gas was a lot cheaper than it is today. We compete very successfully with natural gas.

There isn't a utility -- I used to be strategic manager for Pacific Power & Light. There isn't a utility company in the world that's going to go to a utility commission and say, Let us buy something that costs more than it's worth.

And in fact, the reason that utilities are going out into the market for more green power is because they've got customers that on one hand
will pay more for it, but for the rate-based customer who doesn't want to, it's still more cost-competitive than natural gas right now. And during your Wild Horse deliberations, I think the PSE representative went to great lengths to demonstrate why they're buying wind power. And it was price.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You will have people available during our deliberation?

MR. DANA PECK: Certainly will.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: To answer these questions?

MR. DANA PECK: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think maybe, if that's okay with you, Mark, I'd just as --

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: That's fine --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: -- Mr. McClain, I'd just as soon do that during the deliberation --

MR. DANA PECK: Okay, I'll -- and I'd like --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: -- and Ms. Anderson to finish up, and then we can continue this into the deliberation portion. We have a bunch of questions that we want to ask you at that time.

MR. DANA PECK: Happy to.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.
MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board of County Commissioners; Mr. Chair, Kittitas County Planning Commission. It is late; I'm tired, I'm cold, I'm sure you are as well, so I'll try to make it brief.

Very quickly, I want to point out two points of correction quite quickly. Mr. Landreth's comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the DEIS, which has been kicked around for nearly four years, addressed all ranges and sizes in terms of height and number of turbine generators. So if you take the time to go back and read it, you'll find it. It's a lot of reading, and we do understand that it's a lot of reading.

I don't perceive us to be in haste. This has been a long process. We've been at this for years. I would encourage you to take the time to go through those materials. We're familiar with them because we've worked with them so long.

Insofar as setbacks, I would like to reiterate that 541-foot setback from the property line is what we will comply with under any scenario. That's what shows up in the development agreement and that's simply
mandatory. And you know that; you've been through this process before.

Insofar as technical reports on the new layout, they were provided to the County at the same time as they were delivered to EFSEC, and we'll get those out.

One follow-up to Mr. Peck's comments about scenic views, the actual statute that he was referring to is the Highway Advertising Control Act. It is not the Scenic View Protection Act; it is the Highway Advertising Control Act designed to deter billboards. So please don't get confused. I have that entire statute here for anybody that would like the citation I'm referencing.

EIS -- I'm trying to make this quick. And Louise, I will try to speak slowly and clearly but still make it fast.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement received plenty of review from scoping on forward. This has been the most widely publicized project in Kittitas County since it hit the press years ago. Every year it makes the Daily Record's top ten list of the biggest issues in the valley. This year it was No. 1. So we've
all been kicking it around for a long time.

Draft Environmental Impact Statements, as you know, cover a range, always cover a range of events. You know that because we went through this in Suncadia years and years ago. They had a proposed range, they had a proposed impact level. There are preferred and less-preferred alternatives. You know this stuff.

I understand that people get confused when they say is it this or is it this or is it this. But what we also know is we're requesting a maximum megahertz -- or I'm sorry, megawatts, a maximum number. And within those confines you work, much as you did in Suncadia, much as we did at Wild Horse. That's nothing new.

Insofar as what these three nights have turned into appears to be a referendum on what is the future policy of land use in Kittitas County. Is it residential, is it going to be wind power. Folks, you can't make that decision in this process. You cannot say, We now prefer residential over an already existing Comp Plan designation and a zoning use.

But you all know what I do for a living. I'm a land use and municipal lawyer. My
responsibility is to watch the land use laws and how to deliver services to the public.

I keep hearing that we want to preserve this property for residences. Let me tell you what we're seeing trend-wise, is rezones to five acres. As a land use lawyer, I know how to get all of those approved without going through environmental review in this county. And when I get to the end of my summation, I'm going to start pointing out where it's already happening in this county.

But I want to talk about the consequences of that, because apparently there is some sense that we must choose that over an alternate energy source. Rezoning to five acres on 6000 acres, five-acre parcels, for 6000 acres of this project, by my math -- and I double-checked it, because I'm not a mathematician -- yields 1200 new homes. Just in this one spot. 1200 new homes.

That is 1200 new lights in the night sky that I see from my house every night. Not 16 on turbines but 1200 porch lights, sodium vapor lights, whatever they are. It yields generators, it yields barbecues -- and barbecues actually
start fires. People and cigarettes and children start fires. This is a woody area. The biggest cause of fires isn't turbines; it's us.

More concern to me, that's 1200 new straws in the aquifer. Because each of them is going to be served by a well because there is no potable drinking water delivery system there.

Likewise you get 1200 new septic tanks on this hilly property. When you clear hilly property, you do it so that you can build a house and an apron for parking and garage. You then remove some of the material that holds the soil in place on this woody property.

So what you're going to have is 1200 new homes with a lot of impervious surface, septic systems on 1200 homes, and there's no storm water management system out there.

You get traffic, you get police, emergency medical services. These kids show up at the schools. It is unrefuted in the record -- and I think it is true; we've been through this before as well -- residential does not pay for itself. For every dollar of taxes they generate, they take 1.25 in services.

This is just 6000 acres. That whole
hillside is going to become a huge burden. And I heard people saying, Put it up on the hills so we don't ruin the valley floor. That's not the right answer. We don't put sprawl up on the hills so we don't have to look at it in the valley.

And that's not what our code says and that's not what your Comprehensive Plan says. What your Comprehensive Plan says is preserve these natural uses, natural resources' already predominant use.

Unfortunately this has seemed to turn into some kind of referendum. Do we want to promote rampant sprawl or do we want to put a small portion of that land -- because 6000 acres certainly is a lot to any of us, I'm sure, but on that hillside it's not a huge amount. I don't think you have to look at this as a either/or kind of thing.

Briefly, to address concerns that people expressed regarding who's going to run this in the future, we don't know who's going to run this in the future. You know how to -- actually Kittitas Country does a very sophisticated job of negotiating assignability so that there are criteria to review before an approved operation
gets handed over to somebody else.

And we've most recently seen that with Suncadia, who has been through the transition -- the first I ran into them, they were Trend West, then they were Mountain Star, and now they are Suncadia, which is actually a joint venture between between Jeld-Wen and Lowe Enterprises under the mantra of Easton Ridge, LLC. So we know how to do that. That's what you use a development agreement for, to fix these things down, to screw them down so that there isn't that question from the public.

How do we know that you're going to get somebody good to run this? You do a very good job of that. You've used general counsel in the past, you've dealt with PSE on this.

Same with financial protection. There are indemnity provisions. I've -- Kittitas County's pretty tough on developers on these kinds of things.

Decommissioning, likewise. There are all sorts of requirements, bonding, letters of credit, guaranty. You've used those in Suncadia, you've used them at Wild Horse. You guys know how to do this.
Specifically, I would direct your attention to decomm at Section 6 of the Draft Development Agreement, financial protection at Section 13, and assignment in Section 10. I know you've dealt with all of this before.

I would encourage you not to make this decision as banking on the future use, which is residential sprawl that is not compatible with your current Comprehensive Plan and your current zone. If that is this county's desire, there's a process for that. This is not it.

This applicant and the participating property owners have every legal right to ask that this application be processed in accordance with the law as it reads. And I ask you to do that.

For 30 seconds, I'm also Erin Anderson, not at 105 East First Street in Cle Elum and 200 East Third Street here in Ellensburg, but I'm also at 360 Willowbook Lane here in the county, a private citizen. I'm the last house in the flight path. It is incredibly noisy. I built my house there on purpose. To me that's the sound of freedom. I choose to live there. I love being near the airport. My children are learning to fly there.
already. Those are lifestyle choices. I also situated my house to face the Stuart range and to face this project, knowing it was coming. This project came before I went there. Those are personal, subjective choices.

One of the messages I would hope that you all come away with here is it is a beautiful valley. We all think our home is beautiful. The stars still fall in Alabama; they love Alabama, whether I want to be there or not and would rather have them handle my energy problems.

The Sunshine State in Florida; they -- we all wrap ourselves in the mantra of home. But we are members of a bigger community. That is the United States of America, and we're all Americans. It's not fair to say, We're more important so put it over there.

And folks, there is a price to everything. We just watched this play out on CNN. Coal mining takes lives; it takes lots of lives. It takes people in the prime of their life. Appalachia is beautiful. We watch the scenes of the coal mines and the conveyer belts, and those people love that. And it costs them their lives to pursue that living so that they could fuel
this nation.

Nuclear. I get nuked for saying the "N" word. We don't even talk about nuclear.

Oil. Our kids are dying in Iraq for oil. We're all going to pay the price on delivering energy to the biggest consumptive beast this planet has ever known, and that is this culture of America. Whether it is dying through mining. The nuclear word. Frankly, I don't want to have to take my kids down to Selective Service and register them and see them go over to Iraq and die for this.

This society will pay this price, and it's a burden we should all share. None of us are better than the rest. We should all be treated fairly and equally under the law.

It's tough. It's a tough call. I do trust you to do the right thing, and I thank you for the many, many hours and the courtesy that you've shown. And also the courtesy of the participants; because it's been testy and hard on all of us. And the staff, who's been with us every inch of the way. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. With that --

MS. ERIN ANDERSON: Can I sit down? Thanks.
CHAIRMAN BLACK: With that, I believe that we have completed the, the public testimony portion. And we will go into a continuation for the deliberation. And we are looking at -- correct me if I'm wrong -- maybe the 25th of January? That's a Wednesday. 25th of --

MR. DANA PECK: We all have a conflict.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You have a conflict?

MR. DANA PECK: We have a conflict.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: When don't you have a conflict? Because we really -- I would encourage the Planning Commission all to sit down and go through the questions and write their own questions and come up with some questions for you.

So we really -- I believe in order to do a fair job on this, we really need you to be available.

MR. DANA PECK: The 25th or the 27th is the one time that we couldn't commit to right now.

COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Could we do it the day of our regular Planning Commission meeting?

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Our regular Planning Commission looks like the agenda is a two-day agenda to start with, so it's the 23rd and 24th,
probably. I was looking for the 25th to be the best time, but we can go into the following week?

MR. PIERCY: What I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that we could conduct your normal agenda business on the 24th and carry into deliberations on that night. We probably have several hours available prior to the ten o’clock hour, if that would be something that you would have an interest in. And then that could be continued to a further date from that point if you would like.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. I think that's probably --

The regular agenda will take us into the 24th; is that correct?

MR. PIERCY: We believe, based on what we see as the action items for you to consider, the agenda will take you into the 24th, but we also believe that you will have additional time available on the 24th prior to 10:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, that would be fine. And then if we needed to continue that, we could continue it to the 25th, because we probably wouldn't need -- most of our questions would be answered, I believe, for the --
MR. PIERCY: Or at that point you could continue it to the next week, with the opportunity for additional preparation and deliberation of the information heard.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Mr. Peck?

MR. DANA PECK: The afternoon of the 24th is our travel day.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Oh, okay.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

MR. PIERCY: So it sounds like the week of the 30th would be the first available date.

MR. DANA PECK: That would sure be ideal, because -- or next week.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Next week's out. We need to -- we have reams and reams and reams of paper. If we don't go through them -- we need to go through that material and read it, develop some questions, and get back to you.

I think my recommendation, if it's okay with the Planning Commission, would be that we do it the Monday the week of the 30th and...

MR. DANA PECK: I'm sorry to express that kind of inflexibility, but it's the guys who sign our paychecks that --

CHAIRMAN BLACK: You're pretty inflexible.
MR. PIERCY: Then that would be Monday, January 30th?

MR. DANA PECK: That would be, yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Does that work for everyone?

MR. DANA PECK: Again, my apologies for our -- for our not being able to be flexible in the dates.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: That gives us an extra day and a half to read this stuff, so that's fine. And will it be here?

MR. PIERCY: We will obtain a location at the fairgrounds, so you can make it site-specific and time-specific in terms of your continuation.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Because we've got quite a few questions from the audience that we would like to get some answers, and we'd like to get back to the audience, if at all possible, so.

MR. PIERCY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would entertain a motion that we continue this public hearing to this location on November -- excuse me, January 30th, 2006.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I so move.

CHAIRMAN BLACK: Let's do it at 6:30.
MR. PIERCY:  6:30 would be fine.
CHAIRMAN BLACK:  All in favor --
COMMISSIONER McCLAIN:  I'll second that.
CHAIRMAN BLACK:  Moved and seconded that we
hold this -- continue this public hearing to
January 30th, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. in this
building.

All in favor?
COMMISSIONER HARRIS:  Aye.
COMMISSIONER McCLAIN:  Aye.
COMMISSIONER CLARK:  Aye.
COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON:  Aye.
CHAIRMAN BLACK:  I vote aye also.

With that, we'll turn it back to
Commissioner -- or excuse me, Chairman Bowen.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN:  Thank you, Chairman Black.
Just for clarification, for those -- I think
in the -- earlier in the record we had indicated
we'd continue to receive testimony through
tomorrow at 5:00.  Is that understood by staff?

MR. PIERCY:  That is understood,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN:  Thank you.  Gentlemen, what
I was thinking for us is to continue this
probably to our February 7 agenda, to get an
update from staff on where the Planning Commission is. And I'm not exactly sure where the record would be. Would it be open or at this point closed to public testimony? So I'm going to ask for some guidance.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: What I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that we go ahead and continue this to February 7th but make sure it's understood it's for the sole and express purpose to determine where the Planning Commission is in terms of their deliberation and our discussion is restricted only to the determination -- in fact, we can reach out and pick a date by which we will begin our own accumulation of the open record. Because we will make an open record here.

And so -- and the reason I make that very specific observation is that I don't want the public, or anyone else, for that matter, to believe there'll be anything else happen on February 7th. It will strictly be for us to talk about if in fact we have enough information in front of us to do so when we begin our series of hearings.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Great, that was my intention. Is that a motion?
COMMISSIONER HUSTON: I move to continue this public hearing to February 7, 2:00 p.m. in the commissioners auditorium.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's been moved and seconded to continue this public hearing to February 7, 2:00 p.m., in the commissioners auditorium.

Any discussion to the motion?

Hearing none, all those in favor indicate by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I too will vote aye, and the motion carries.

Thank you all.

(The proceeding was adjourned at 11:23 p.m.)
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