

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF KITTITAS

KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING)
COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING)
RE KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER)
PROJECT)

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

February 13, 2006
6:30 p.m.
Commissioners Auditorium
Kittitas County Courthouse
Ellensburg, Washington

SPECIAL MEETING BEFORE THE
KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

REPORTED BY:
LOUISE R. BELL, CCR NO. 2676

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION:

4 COMMISSIONER DAVID BLACK, Chairman

5 COMMISSIONER DOUG HARRIS

6 COMMISSIONER MARK McCLAIN

7 COMMISSIONER GRANT CLARK

8 COMMISSIONER DON WILLIAMSON

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's 6:30 p.m., February
2 13th, 2006. We're calling to order the continued
3 January 30th, 2006, Kittitas Valley Wind Power
4 Project Z-05-22.

5 I will introduce the Planning Commission.
6 On my far right is Grant Clark. Next to him is
7 Mark McClain. Doug Harris is on my left. And
8 I'm David Black, chairman of the Planning
9 Commission. Our clerk this evening is Susan
10 Barret. And we have as staff, we have -- Darrell
11 Piercy is Director of Community Development
12 Services; Joanne Valencia is staff. And we also
13 have Mr. Hurson from prosecuting -- the
14 prosecutor's office.

15 This is unfinished business for the Kittitas
16 Valley wind farm project. It is a closed record
17 hearing to consider findings of fact and
18 conclusions of law only.

19 And with that, I think we should turn it
20 over to you, Joanna to go through those. Do you
21 want to do that or --

22 MS. VALENCIA: Or Darrell can do it.

23 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, Darrell. And
24 Darrell, do you want to -- are you going to
25 individually go through each one of those

1 findings?

2 MR. PIERCY: Well, we can discuss that and
3 see how the Planning Commission would like to
4 approach it.

5 I'm just going to state for the record
6 Darrell Piercy, Director of Community Development
7 Services. We've provided these findings to you
8 for review and consideration based on your
9 direction at your last meeting with regards to
10 your decision that you made at that time pursuant
11 to this application. Before you are findings
12 that consist of 18 items.

13 Again, we've had an opportunity to make
14 these available to you late last week. And we
15 could approach this one of two ways. We could
16 look at each finding individually. Or if you've
17 had an opportunity review these and if there are
18 specific changes you would like to make as a
19 group and propose changes to these draft
20 findings, we're prepared, as you can see, this
21 evening to enter those changes directly into the
22 text and make those modifications as they come
23 forward.

24 Our goal for this evening is to have a final
25 document that you can review and vote on and then

1 have signature by the chairman so we can pass
2 those forward to the Board of County
3 Commissioners. If we're successful in getting to
4 that point, then the Board of County
5 Commissioners will take your recommendation and
6 set their additional hearings on this matter.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's a little difficult to
8 see from here. By the way, Don Williamson just
9 arrived, so --

10 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: The late Don
11 Williamson.

12 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yeah. So we now have five
13 of the members.

14 It's a little difficult to read from my
15 standpoint. It must be age related. But in any
16 event, I think that we ought to kind of go
17 through each one individually. Is that
18 satisfactory to everybody?

19 And do you want to -- if it's an okay thing,
20 we'll just keep right on moving? And then if
21 anybody has any wordsmanship or wants to massage
22 it a little bit, then we can do that at that
23 time. Is that satisfactory?

24 MR. PIERCY: That's satisfactory.

25 Mr. Chairman, if you would like, then I would

1 read each one of these into the record and we'll
2 go through them item by item.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That would be my
4 preference. Is that okay with the rest of you?

5 MR. PIERCY: Whenever you get tired of
6 hearing me speak, we'll let Joanna for a little
7 bit.

8 So the document -- well, to start at the
9 top, the Planning Commission submits the
10 following findings of fact, conclusions at law,
11 and recommendations to the Kittitas County Board
12 of County Commissioners related to the Kittitas
13 Valley Wind Power Project proposal.

14 Finding No. 1. "On September 30th, 2005,
15 Sage Brush Power Partners, LLC submitted a
16 consolidated application seeking approval of an
17 amendment to the county comprehensive plan, a
18 rezone to a Wind Farm Resource Overlay zone
19 including adoption of a development agreement and
20 approval of a development permit related to a
21 proposed wind farm project in Kittitas County to
22 Kittitas County Community Development Services."
23 That would be Finding No. 1.

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right. Any changes, any
25 ideas? That's fine.

1 MR. PIERCY: Okay. Finding No. 2. "A
2 revised application was received on October 17th,
3 2005, and this application was deemed complete by
4 Kittitas County Community Development Services on
5 October 17th, 2005."

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's fine.

7 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 3. "On October 24,
8 2005, Kittitas County Community Development
9 Services received a copy of a letter that served
10 as formal notice to EFSEC from Sage Brush Power
11 Partners, LLC to request to withdraw the
12 preemption filed on February 10th, 2004."

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Would you mind inserting
14 ahead of "EFSEC" the "Energy" --

15 MR. PIERCY: "Facility Site Evaluation" --

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: -- "Facility Siting
17 Evaluation Council," and then in parentheses
18 "EFSEC"?

19 MR. PIERCY: Will do.

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Please.

21 MR. PIERCY: And right before your eyes
22 Mr. Hurson is making that change in the
23 document --

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I see that.

25 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I think also after

1 "LLC" maybe just say "requesting withdrawal of
2 preemption" or "requesting" -- it just seems a
3 little weak.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Too many "to"s in there.

5 MR. PIERCY: So it would read "Sage Brush
6 Power Partners, LLC requesting the preemption" --

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: "Requesting withdrawal of
8 the preemption."

9 MR. PIERCY: Okay.

10 Jim, do you need a chance to catch up? Oh,
11 you already got it.

12 Any other changes to Finding No. 3?

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's fine.

14 MR. PIERCY: Moving on, then, to Finding
15 No. 4?

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yes.

17 MR. PIERCY: "On October 27, 2005, a notice
18 of application was issued by Community
19 Development Services pursuant to KCC 15A.03 with
20 a December 5th, 2005, comment deadline. Said
21 notice solicited comments from jurisdictional
22 agencies," landowners -- so if we could add an
23 "s" to that -- "landowners within 300 feet of
24 subject properties, interested parties, and
25 subject properties located within the proposed

1 project site."

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Fine. Thank you.

3 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 5. "The Kittitas
4 Valley Wind Power Project proposal consists of
5 development of a utility-scale wind energy
6 facility on a project area of appropriately 6000
7 acres located in unincorporated Kittitas County.
8 A permanent footprint of approximately 90 acres
9 of land area will" be -- "will accommodate the
10 proposed turbines and related support
11 facilities."

12 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Fine.

13 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 6. "The project
14 area includes all or portions of Sections 01, 02,
15 03, 09, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27,"
16 and "34 of Township 19 North, Range 17 East,
17 Willamette Meridian in Kittitas County."

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is that legal enough?

19 MR. PIERCY: We believe so.

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. A portion of or --
21 okay. Thank you.

22 MR. HURSON: I gave that an "and."

23 MR. PIERCY: Oh, okay, thank you. We added
24 one word, "and," between Section 27 and
25 Section 34 just for ease of reading and making

1 sure it was grammatically correct.

2 Finding No. 7: "The Energy Facility Site
3 Evaluation Council (EFSEC) assumed lead agency
4 status for this project pursuant to
5 RCW 80.50.180. As part of Kittitas County's
6 review of the project, all SEPA documents
7 including those from other wind farm proposals in
8 Kittitas County have been reviewed and
9 considered. SEPA materials containing updated
10 information reflecting the current submitted
11 application were requested and have also been
12 provided. A final environmental document has yet
13 to be published by EFSEC, and therefore there was
14 no opportunity for County review. The review and
15 recommendation is based on the environmental
16 information available and contained within the
17 record."

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anything? Okay.

19 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 8. We're now on
20 Page 2. "The applicant has failed to demonstrate
21 that the proposal is essential or desirable to
22 the public convenience. There is insufficient
23 demonstrated need for the electricity that would
24 be produced from this project when balanced
25 against the negative impact to Kittitas County.

1 There is also no assurance or limitation by the
2 proponent that power produced by this project
3 would be for use in Kittitas County, the state of
4 Washington, or even limited to the regional
5 northwest power needs."

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. Next?

7 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 9. "The proposal
8 is detrimental and injurious to the public
9 health, peace, or safety or to the character of
10 the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed wind
11 towers are more than twice as tall as the
12 currently existing tallest structures in the area
13 (BPA power transmission towers). The scale of
14 the wind turbines in both size and number as
15 proposed for this location is inconsistent with
16 the current character of the valley community. A
17 wind farm in this location would be inconsistent
18 with maintaining the geological, vegetative, and
19 environmental continuity of the lower Kittitas
20 County valley. The wind farm proposal area is in
21 close proximity to numerous currently existing
22 residential structures and homesites. The
23 project would result in increased noise levels to
24 the surrounding area. The proposal's visual
25 impacts are significant and cannot be mitigated

1 under the current proposal. Shadow flicker will
2 impact numerous existing residences and home
3 sites."

4 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I'm a little
5 concerned with the word "character of the valley
6 community." I don't think that that necessarily
7 explains what we're talking about, at least as I
8 was suggesting, because certainly I think the
9 valley encompasses the entire area, and I don't
10 think we want to say that we think it's
11 inconsistent with every place in the valley. I
12 think we want to say it's inconsistent with this
13 particular area or location.

14 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: "Neighborhood"?

15 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Yeah. Because I do
16 think it's appropriate for these in the valley,
17 just not in this location, so how do we get a --
18 "character of the neighborhood"?

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: How about "the
20 character" --

21 MR. PIERCY: How about "the valley within
22 the vicinity of this proposal?"

23 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: How about "character
24 of the neighborhood"?

25 MR. PIERCY: "Neighborhood"? Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: "Neighborhood"?

2 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Or "area"?

3 MR. PIERCY: So we're changing "community"
4 to "neighborhood"?

5 CHAIRMAN BLACK: "Character of the valley
6 neighborhood"?

7 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: "Valley"?

8 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Just strike "the valley."

9 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: How about strike "the
10 valley" and say "neighborhood" or "slash area."

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: "Character of the
12 neighborhood"?

13 MR. HURSON: How's that look?

14 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: "Valley
15 community."

16 MR. PIERCY: Changing "valley community" to
17 "neighborhood area."

18 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I was thinking of
19 slash, "neighborhood slash."

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: How about if you just
21 changed it to "this valley community"? You don't
22 like that at all? You want to get into
23 neighborhood --

24 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I think we're
25 talking -- it was location-specific, so I want to

1 make sure that we're conveying that.

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. "Neighborhood"?

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sounds fine to me.

4 COMMISSIONER HARRIS: I would have thought
5 the legal description would have covered the
6 area.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yeah, neighborhood.

8 MR. HURSON: Do you want "neighborhood" or
9 "neighborhood/area"?

10 CHAIRMAN BLACK: "Slash area"?

11 "Neighborhood/area"? Yes, please.

12 MR. HURSON: Okay, that's what you got.

13 MR. PIERCY: Any other changes to Finding 9?

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Nope.

15 MR. PIERCY: Moving on, then, to
16 Finding No. 10. "The proposed use at the
17 proposed location would be unreasonably
18 detrimental to the economic welfare of the
19 county. The applicant has failed to adequately
20 demonstrate that the property values in the area
21 would not be adversely affected. The Planning
22 Commission finds that opinions and testimony
23 presented indicate that there would be an adverse
24 impact on property values and property rights of
25 adjacent landowners."

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: What if we changed "the
2 proposed use at 'this' proposed location"? Does
3 that isolate it a little bit more?

4 MR. PIERCY: I think it does.

5 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. Is that all right?
6 We don't have any problems with that --

7 MR. PIERCY: The first sentence, "The
8 proposed use at 'this'" instead of "the."

9 MR. PIERCY: Anything else on No. 10?

10 CHAIRMAN BLACK:

11 MR. PIERCY: Moving on, then, to No. 11.
12 "The proposed project area has left islands of
13 non-participating landowners and is adjacent to
14 numerous non-participating property owners' homes
15 and lots. In order to mitigate identified visual
16 impacts, the currently proposed 1000-foot
17 setbacks are inadequate in order to address
18 impacts on homes and land parcels adjacent to the
19 project."

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, fine.

21 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 12. "Pursuant to
22 KCC 17.98.020(E), a petition requesting a change
23 on the zoning map must also demonstrate that the
24 following criteria are met. The proposed rezone
25 does not meet all seven of the zoning code

1 criteria as described below:"

2 And Mr. Chairman, would you like to go
3 through each one of these separately?

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think so. Please.

5 MR. PIERCY: "Requirement - the proposed
6 amendment is not compatible with the
7 comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission
8 finds that this proposal is not compatible with
9 the comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission
10 voted to deny the request to amend the
11 comprehensive plan to designate the Kittitas
12 Valley Wind Power Project Area as a Wind Farm
13 Resource Overlay district."

14 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Do we need that in
15 there twice, first and second --

16 MR. PIERCY: I think the intent was to
17 identify the requirement, the seven requirements.
18 And then the response. I didn't read it very
19 well.

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Okay, that's fine.

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: What we're not doing is
22 being consistent on any of the rest of them.

23 MR. PIERCY: No.

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: So could we strike that?

25 MR. PIERCY: I think so.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: So take out the first
2 sentence entirely, "Requirement," and then "the
3 proposed amendment is not compatible...?"

4 MR. PIERCY: I think that reads better.

5 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Take out the first
6 sentence altogether.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's we said. That's
8 what I meant, I'm sorry. All the way through
9 "comprehensive plan"? Okay.

10 MR. PIERCY: Second item. "The amendment
11 does not bear a substantial relation to the
12 public health, safety, or welfare. The Planning
13 Commission finds that the proposed setback of
14 1000 feet is inadequate in order to mitigate the
15 visual impacts and shadow flicker to surrounding
16 properties not within the project area. In
17 addition, the turbines are in close proximity to
18 existing homes in the area."

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay?

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Would it make more
22 sense to say "would be," "the turbines would be
23 in close proximity to...?"

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yes, it would be.

25 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Because they don't

1 exist yet.

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right, "would be." Okay.

3 MR. PIERCY: Moving on, then, to the third
4 criteria. "The proposed amendment does not have
5 merit and value for Kittitas County or sub-area
6 of the county. Although the reduction of overall
7 taxes may have merit and value for Kittitas
8 County, this is not sufficient when balanced
9 against the negatives and the Planning Commission
10 denied" -- "and the Planning Commission denied
11 the comprehensive plan and sub-area plan for the
12 proposed project area due to those negative
13 concerns. There are significant visual impacts
14 and likely reduction in property values near the
15 project area. There is concern for impact of
16 shadow flicker and noise affecting participating
17 and non-participating landowners. The proposed
18 project area also creates an island of
19 non-participating landowners."

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: On the second
21 sentence the second line needs to be capitalized.

22 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Sub-area of the "county"
23 should be. Everything else okay? All right,
24 next.

25 MR. PIERCY: Fourth criteria. "The proposed

1 amendment is not appropriate because of changed
2 circumstances or because of a need for additional
3 property in the proposed zone, or because the
4 proposed zone is appropriate for reasonable
5 development of the subject property. The
6 Planning Commission finds that there has been no
7 demonstrated change in circumstance that warrants
8 this change in land use and that the benefit
9 seems to be only for participating landowners but
10 to the detriment of adjacent landowners."

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

12 MR. PIERCY: Fifth criteria. "The subject
13 property is not suitable for development in
14 general conformance with zoning standards for the
15 proposed zone. The Planning Commission finds
16 that" the "project area and surrounding
17 neighborhood is an established rural recreational
18 and rural residential area and the proposed
19 project is not appropriate in rural populated
20 areas such as this neighborhood."

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. All right.

22 MR. PIERCY: Sixth criteria. "The proposed
23 amendment will be materially detrimental to the
24 use of the properties in the immediate vicinity
25 of the subject property. The Planning Commission

1 find that the proposed amendment will be
2 detrimental. The Planning Commission finds that
3 the land adjacent to the project area including
4 the pockets and islands of property are going to
5 be significantly affected with impacts that"
6 cannot "be mitigated and that of which will
7 affect property rights."

8 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Going to change that
9 "can't" to "cannot"?

10 MR. PIERCY: I said "cannot," didn't I.

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would prefer it, frankly,
12 to read "cannot."

13 MR. PIERCY: And in reading that, what I
14 might suggest is "mitigated which will affect
15 property rights and values." Because I think
16 we've had at least a consistent theme through
17 this. When you mention property rights, you also
18 speak of property values. Just a thought.

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, that's fine.

20 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: You can eliminate
21 two words, couldn't you, "that of," couldn't you?
22 "Can't be mitigated which will affect property
23 rights and values."

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right. "Cannot be
25 mitigated and which will affect property rights

1 and values."

2 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Do we want to get rid
3 of "and," "that cannot be mitigated"?

4 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Just a comma after
5 "mitigated."

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: And then strike "and that
7 of." All right?

8 MR. PIERCY: Yep.

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Go ahead.

10 MR. PIERCY: Seventh criteria. "The
11 proposed changes in use of the subject property
12 shall not adversely impact irrigation water
13 deliveries to other properties. The Planning
14 Commission finds that there will be no impact to
15 irrigation deliveries."

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: It should be "will
18 not."

19 MR. PIERCY: We okay with that?

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Or just "will not
21 impact."

22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: "Irrigation
23 deliveries."

24 MR. PIERCY: "...finds that the proposal
25 will not impact irrigation deliveries"?

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right.

2 MR. PIERCY: Take out "to."

3 MR. HURSON: So much pressure.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Next. 13.

5 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 13. "Pursuant to
6 KCC 17.98.0202(E), the Planning Commission
7 recommends denial of the zone change of the
8 project site from the existing Forest and Range
9 and Agricultural-20 zone to Wind Farm Resource
10 Overlay zoning with a 5-0 decision."

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

12 MR. HURSON: Darrell, it's not changing it
13 from Forest and Range and 20; it's overlaying.
14 So it should be a zone overlay.

15 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Wind Farm Resource Overlay?

16 MR. HURSON: It would be a zone overlay.

17 MR. PIERCY: Okay. Let's do that.

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Correct it, then.

19 MR. HURSON: So overlay of the project --
20 yeah.

21 MR. PIERCY: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

23 MR. PIERCY: Finding 14. "A development
24 agreement is required to be processed
25 concurrently with the rezone and comprehensive

1 plan change request. Because the Planning
2 Commission recommendation is for denial of the
3 project, the Planning Commission did not
4 specifically address the proposed draft
5 development agreement. The Planning Commission
6 voted to forward the proposed development
7 agreement to the Board of County Commissioners
8 with no recommendation."

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Did you want to put "a 5-0
10 vote" on that? I believe that's what it was.

11 MR. PIERCY: "A 5-0 vote." Would it be "by"
12 or "with"?

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: What did you say up there
14 before? "With a 5-0 vote."

15 MR. PIERCY: Just to be consistent. Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

17 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 15. "There was
18 public testimony both in favor and in opposition
19 to the project."

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Correct.

21 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 16. "The project
22 proposal is not compatible with surrounding land
23 use in this area of the county."

24 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Should "county" be
25 capitalized again?

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

2 MR. PIERCY: Finding No. 17. "The project
3 as presented was not compatible with the
4 comprehensive plan, zoning code, and utility
5 ordinance."

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

7 MR. PIERCY: And Finding No. 18. "The
8 Planning Commission unanimously recommends that
9 the Board of County Commissioners deny the
10 Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project proposal in
11 its entirety." And again "with a vote of 5-0."

12 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right.

13 MR. PIERCY: And if we could spell out
14 "Board of County Commissioners" I think that
15 would be appropriate.

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Or at least the "Board of
17 County Commissioners, BOCC" would be fine.

18 Okay. Gentlemen, with that we need a motion
19 to approve the --

20 Or are there any additional findings of fact
21 that you want to add? Okay.

22 We need a motion to --

23 MR. HURSON: Do you want to go over it
24 again?

25 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Pardon me?

1 We need a motion to approve the findings of
2 fact.

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I so move.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is there a second?

5 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Seconded.

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's been moved and
7 seconded that we pass forward to the Board of
8 County Commissioners the Kittitas Valley Wind
9 Power Project -- I think it's Z-05-22 -- and the
10 findings of fact be passed forward.

11 Pardon me?

12 MR. HURSON: And authorizing the chair to
13 sign on behalf of the Board.

14 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I so move.

15 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Seconded.

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay. Fire it off.

17 MS. BARRET: Doug Harris?

18 COMMISSIONER HARRIS? Yes.

19 MS. BARRET: Mark McClain?

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Yes.

21 MS. BARRET: Grant Clark?

22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

23 MS. BARRET: Don Williamson?

24 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Yes.

25 MS. BARRET: David Black?

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yes.

2 And with that, that concludes the Planning
3 Commission section of the Kittitas Valley Wind
4 Power Project, and the findings of fact will go
5 forward to the County Commissioners.

6 MR. PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would
7 just like to express my thanks and appreciation
8 to the members of the Planning Commission. This
9 was a very complex, difficult project that
10 involved many, many nights of testimony and
11 literally hundreds of people providing that
12 testimony, and I would like to congratulate you
13 on the manner in which you conducted yourselves
14 in the hearing and the process which you
15 undertook, and it was a pleasure to be part of
16 this process. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think that from our
18 standpoint, or at least my standpoint, I think
19 that the matrix that was provided to us by your
20 staff was helpful and brought us -- kept us on
21 point, I think, on most cases. So it was really
22 very helpful, and I hope that we see more of
23 those types of things.

24 MR. PIERCY: Good, thank you for that
25 feedback; we appreciate that.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: With that we're adjourned.

2 (The proceeding was adjourned at

3 6:55 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) SS.
COUNTY OF YAKIMA)

This is to certify that I, Louise Raelene Bell, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at Yakima, reported the within and foregoing hearing; said hearing being taken before me as a Notary Public on the date herein set forth; that said hearing was taken by me in shorthand and thereafter under my supervision transcribed, and that same is a full, true and correct record of the hearing.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in the outcome of the cause.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this _____ day of _____, 2006.

LOUISE RAELENE BELL, CCR
CCR No. 2676
Notary Public in and for the
State of Washington, residing at
Yakima. My commission expires
July 19, 2007.