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MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you for being here tonight. I would like to get this meeting started. My name is Cullen Stephenson. I am the EFSEC council member representing the Department of Ecology.

The purpose of this meeting is to share information on the proposed TUUSSO Energy Columbia Solar Project and EFSEC process and to hear public comment concerning this project.

This meeting is required by statute to be held within 60 days of receipt of an application for site certification. That application for site certification is called an ASC. The ASC was received on October 16th of this year.

This evening, the applicant, TUUSSO Energy, will provide an overview of the proposed project. EFSEC staff will also present a brief overview of the EFSEC process. Following this, we will have public comment. Speakers will be allowed two minutes to present their comments.

Copies of the agenda for tonight are in the back. We also have a sign-up list at the back of the room for those who wish to comment on the project. Another sign-up sheet is available for those who wish to testify at the land use hearing,

1 which will follow the informational hearing. If you
2 wish to submit written comments, please leave them 3 at the court reporter table just in front of us 4 here.

8 Transportation -- sorry, DNR, jeez -- transported
9 all the way from DNR, Dan Siemann from DNR; Joe 10 Stohr from Fish and Wildlife who can't be here

11 tonight; and Laura Chartoff from UTC. Our council

So the EFSEC council includes five standing members. Joining me as Ecology's members are Jaime Rossman from Commerce; Dan Siemann from chair is appointed by the governor and interim chair Roselyn Marcus was unable to attend this meeting and has asked me to fill in.

For projects around this state that involve other interests, we may add additional council members to help make a good decision. For this project, additional members on the council include Ian Elliot representing Kittitas County and Kelly Cooper from DOH, who I believe is on the phone.

Kelly, are you on the phone?
MS. COOPER: Yes, I am.
MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
I believe that makes a quorum of the council for this meeting.
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We also have staff members here, Stephen Posner from EFSEC, Sonia Bumpus, Ami Kidder, Joan Aitken, John Thompson, our Attorney General, and Christina Potis. Oh, and Tammy Mastro.

Sorry, Tammy.
MS. MASTRO: Hi. Thanks, Colin.
MR. STEPHENSON: Tammy's our coolest person.
We also have counsel for the environment here, Bill Sherman who's here. Thanks, Bill.

He's an AAG appointed by the Attorney General to represent the public and its interest in protecting the quality of the environment.

We will now hear a brief overview of the EFSEC process presented by Steven Posner, our EFSEC manager, and this will be followed by a presentation by the applicant. Thanks, Stephen.

MR. POSNER: Good evening, Council Member Stephenson and council members. Good evening to all of you here. Thank you very for much for showing up this evening. We appreciate the large turnout.

And what we'd like to do is get started with a brief overview of the EFSEC process. We'll go through and just briefly explain the process that we undertake when we receive an application for site certification, and then we will have a presentation

1 by the applicant, TUUSSO Energy.

So I have a PowerPoint presentation, I'll go through that and make some comments as we work through the presentation.

So EFSEC, the acronym EFSEC stands for Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, was formed in 1970, and largely to address a desire or an interest in developing nuclear power in the state of Washington.

And one of the main focuses of EFSEC was to allow for what was referred to as a one-stop permitting process by which EFSEC would be the one agency that would issue all permits associated with the siting and operation of a energy facility.

EFSEC is made up of representatives from different state agencies, as a Council Member Stephenson mentioned, and also includes local government members. And in the case of this project, because it's proposed to be sited in Kittitas County, we have a representative from Kittitas County.

So EFSEC makes a recommendation to the governor, and that decision is essentially the decision that governs the operation of all aspects of the project.
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The law or the statute that EFSEC operates under recognizes and makes certain assumptions, if you will, about the need for energy facilities, the importance of providing abundant energy at reasonable cost, and balancing the increasing demands for energy facilities with the broad interest of the public and doing all this with minimal adverse affects on the environment.

Talked about the representatives on the council, you can see them here, the different agencies that are represented and also the optional state members.

For this project, we do have representatives of the Department of Health, Kelly Cooper is on the phone, she introduced herself earlier. The other agencies chose not to appoint representatives to sit on the council.

We also have counsel for the environment, and Bill Sherman. Bill, were you introduced earlier?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.
MR. POSNER: Okay. Yeah, I was kind of focusing on my presentation and I missed that.

And counsel for the environment represents the public in the interest of protecting the quality of the environment, and if any member of the public

1 has interests that are concerns about this project,
2 I would encourage you to check in with Mr. Sherman
3 later this evening.
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1 facility or an energy plant, it means the facility
2 together with all associated facilities. So if an
3 applicant seeks certification through EFSEC, they
4 have to include all associated facilities connected
5 to the particular facility. For instance, if there
6 was a substation associated with an electrical
7 generating facility, that would have to be included
8 in the application for site certification.
As far as nuclear facilities, any nuclear power facility of any size that produces and sells electricity is required to come to EFSEC for certification.

Siting process begins with the submittal of an application for site certification. We have received an application from TUUSSO Energy. We received it in October. We're beginning our environmental review. We are having -- planning on having a land use consistency hearing later this evening.

And if there's a full environmental review for a project, we also have adjudicated proceedings. EFSEC also issues all the air and water discharge permits associated with the project.

SEPA, State Environmental Policy Act, is we -- EFSEC is the SEPA lead agency for projects that

1 fall under our jurisdiction. The process requires
2 that a Threshold Determination be made where the
3 responsible official for the agency determines
4 whether or not there's going to be a Determination
5 of Significance which would trigger an Environmental
6 Impact Statement being issued. And there are a
7 number of steps in that process, there's a couple of
8 them outlined right here.
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1 findings, and conclusions, which result in a
2 recommendation to the governor.

EFSEC also has an expedited process, and this project, the proposed Columbia Solar Project has filed their application and requested that EFSEC process it under expedited process. So this slide describes the basic steps in that process. The applicant has requested expedited processing.

There are two requirements that have to be met before the project can qualify for expedited processing. The first one, that is when the SEPA review is conducted, it has to be determined that a DNS, a Determination of Non-Significance, or an MDNS, a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance, may be issued. And then it also has to be shown that the project at the time of the filing of the application is consistent with land use plans and zoning ordinances.

The ultimate determination of whether or not the project or the application will be processed under expedited processing is made by the EFSEC council. If it's determined that the project qualifies and the council makes that decision, there's no Environmental Impact Statement that's required under SEPA, and there's no adjudication

1 required. The council would still put together a
2 recommendation for the governor's approval.

Recommendation to the governor, the council makes a recommendation to approve or reject an application. The governor, upon receipt of the application or the recommendation, has 60 days to make a decision.

The governor can approve the application and execute the draft Site Certification Agreement if the recommendation is to approve the project, the governor can reject the application, or may remand it back to EFSEC for reconsideration of certain features. Any application rejected by the governor is final as to that application.

EFSEC oversees all construction activities and operating standards for a facility. So not only do we go through the siting review, we oversee all activities associated with construction, operation, and decommissioning. And here are the primary areas that EFSEC looks at when reviewing an application for site certification and also during construction and operation.

We also have a compliance monitoring and enforcement program. All projects that are approved are monitored during construction for compliance
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1 with the terms and conditions of the appropriate
2 permits including Site Certification Agreement,
3
4

1 compliance monitoring and enforcement program and we work with local and state agencies under interagency contracts to assist us with the oversight program.

Again, there's the generalized siting project, here is a project location map. You can see the various projects that EFSEC currently either is conducting an application review, or the sites are listed here, some of them are permitted and some of them have been permitted but are not constructed yet.

This is also on our website. This is the -if you go to our website, this is the homepage, and as you can see, you can scroll through each project, whether it's permitted or under review, has a homepage.

This particular slide is outdated because under review we -- along with the Tesoro/Savage Project, we do have the Columbia Solar project listed, so there is information about the proposed project, if you're interested you can read more about it on the website.

And I think that is it. Now the applicant, I believe, is going to come forward and give their presentation. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Mr. Posner.
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And as the applicant comes up, please introduce yourself.

MR. EVANS: Let me just get set up here.
All right. Good evening, everyone, members of the public, members of the council. Thank you for coming out tonight.

My name is Jason Evans. I'm here on behalf of my company, TUUSSO Energy, and I'd like to take some time to talk about our company, myself, introduce the project, talk about the development process that we went through to get here today.

So my company, TUUSSO Energy, is based in Washington. We were founded in 2008. We've been exclusively focused since then on solar development, and specifically, photovoltaic solar projects. And we have a track record of working closely with communities, agencies across this country to develop these solar projects. And right now we have 130 megawatts that are currently operational under construction.

Personally, I was one of the co-founders of the company. I led the development of two 20-megawatt projects in California, a 30-megawatt project in Georgia, and 45-megawatt project in Arizona.

These are just a few of the projects that we've built or are under construction right now. If you look from left to right they're kind of on a timeline from when we first started we worked in California on two 20 megawatt projects. The Antelope Project was actually one of the first projects that was permitted in Southern California, first solar projects.

We then turned to the east coast, we worked in Georgia and Maryland developing some projects there in rural communities. And most recently, we have a 45- megawatt project that recently broke ground in Arizona.

So the projects we're going to be talking about are the Columbia Solar Projects, these are five megawatt projects located in Kittitas County. And these projects are going to use photovoltaic solar modules, there's one of them back there, and they're getting mounted on single-axis trackers following the sun during the day from east to west.

Each of these projects will avoid approximately 5,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide, and that's by displacing traditional generation sources. This is the equivalent to taking about 1,100 cars off the road. They don't create steam,
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1 exhaust, or emissions. These are not concentrated 2 solar projects, these are just the modules just like 3 you see on people's roofs.

6 There are a few inverters on each site, five to six,
7 there are limited access roads to access those
8 inverters, there's perimeter fencing, and then there
9 are grasses throughout the site. This is a picture 10 of our Maryland project and you can see the grasses 11 that were planted there.

Now, over the past nine years we've honed our development process, and we look at it from -- we kind of approach each market from looking at the utility demand, looking at the region that will meet that utilities demand, identifying potential sites, screening those sites for viability and availability, and then we solicit stakeholder input.

So stepping through how we evaluated the Washington State market when we first looked here, we looked at Puget Sound Energy. And we saw that they have a real need for renewable power. Right now, they're at 9 percent of their renewable portfolio standard targets, and we're going to help them reach 15 percent by 2020, which is the

1 requirement here.

In addition to diversifying their generation mix, we're going to help offset the loss of some of their coal generation sources that are going to be coming offline in the coming years as well as to meet the growing electricity demands they forecast.

In Puget Sound Energy's most recent RP, they saw the need for 266 megawatts of solar by 2023. So this is going to help them meet approximately 10 percent of that need.

Each of these projects has a Power Purchase Agreement with Puget Sound Energy for 15 years. We executed it earlier this year. And they're going to supply power during the day to the residents that are taking power from Puget Sound and Kittitas County.

Each of these projects generates approximately 11,500-megawatt hours per year, and just to put that in terms we can all understand, this is the electricity needs of approximately 1,000 households here.

So when we looked at Washington State, we saw Puget Sound Energy's service territory, we knew we wanted to sell to Puget Sound Energy, and we saw that looking at their service territory, as you can
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1 see here that is highlighted in purple, the red 2 overlay is sunshine, and you can see that the area around Ellensburg and Kittitas County stands out as a uniquely sunny place in Puget Sound's territory. And, in fact, when we looked at the numbers, this is really one of the only places you can put a solar power plant and sell effectively to Puget Sound.

So we looked at Kittitas County and we saw -we first looked for land that was zoned for utility-scale solar development. We're happy to see that in 2015 a project was sited here, the Osprey Solar Project, and went through the permitting process on land that's zoned exactly like our land is.

We also looked for agriculture or otherwise previously disturbed land. We're renewable developers but also like to think of ourselves as low-impact developers. We want to make sure that we're not impacting kind of native habitat, places with protected flora or fauna, we're looking for those places that already been touched by humans.

In addition, we need proximity to Puget Sound Energy's network. And in particular, for this size project, we need to be near distribution lines or near substations. And if you look at the map right

1 now, you can see the $I-90$ corridor going from east 2 to west, and along that corridor is where the Puget 3 Sound Energy substations that are called out there 4 are located and that coincides with the population 5 core of the county. And it's no coincidence that 6 our projects are located there because we need to be 7 constructed near those lines.

We also needed available land of sufficient size for the solar facilities, proximity to roads, needs to be flat, all of those kind of general characteristics of solar projects.

So we identified the pieces of land that were going to be ideal for solar facilities and started reaching out to the landowners here. We sent about 100-plus letters to landowners asking them if they'd be interested in leasing us their land, and we started whittling through those sites.

Some landowners weren't interested, sometimes the price wasn't viable, sometimes another solar project was already proposed for that line so that
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1 line was oversubscribed, essentially, there can be
2 only one project per distribution line in Kittitas 3 County.

1 Commerce. We've engaged in a really comprehensive
2 outreach to our neighbors. We want to inform them about the projects and what our plans are but also solicit feedback on how we can best shape those plans to meet their needs.

So earlier this year, in May, we had an open
house. We represented to the public along with other solar vendors and Puget Sound, other utilities. We advertised that in the paper, we had sent postcards to over 100 landowners, and we've just opened ourselves up to talk -- to start that conversation with the public.

Then we had project-specific open houses, and these were to solicit feedback from the very specific landowners that are nearest to our sites to figure out what their concerns were in that particular area of the county.

We sent follow-up letters to those landowners, and then we went door to door after that just to make sure that those landowners that we weren't able to reach by mail, that weren't able to make it to our open houses, that we did have that touch point, that we did have that opportunity to hear their feedback.

MR. STEPHENSON: Mr. Evans --
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MR. EVANS: Yeah, I'm sorry.
MR. STEPHENSON: No, you're doing great. I'm just seeing our reporter and you're doing a wonderful job, stay in the microphone and just a little slower, thank you.

MR. EVANS: Okay. Sorry about that.
So then we commissioned a public opinion survey of 250 voters in Kittitas County. We wanted to understand whether or not the people of Kittitas County did want to see solar, and overwhelming, the response was yes, they were happy to have solar in this county.

MR. STEPHENSON: That's just a little slower. Please.

MR. EVANS: Even slower? Okay. Sorry, I have 20 minutes, I'm trying to get it all done but I'll do my best. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: You're doing great.
MR. EVANS: Looking at this timeline, I'm not going to go through this in detail, but I did want to point out that all these projects are on the same timeline, we'd like to get them in the ground by the end of 2018. And in order to do that, we need to break ground by April or May of this year, and that's why we're here requesting expedited treatment

1 by EFSEC.

Now, I wanted to talk to some of the concerns that we've heard from the community up until now, and I want to directly address them. Now, one of the concerns that we've heard is that we're taking some agriculture land out of production, and they want to understand what are the benefits to the community from these solar projects. And I think they're quite substantial so I'd like to kind of point out some of those benefits.

In terms of job creation, about 80 local construction jobs will be created during the construction window, so this is going to be in 2018. On an ongoing basis, we're going to be creating about three to five operations and maintenance jobs that will be for the life of the projects.

In terms of our benefits to the local economy, we're going to have 40 to $\$ 50$ million construction investment, much of that is capital, but then there's going to be at least $\$ 5$ million that will go to local contractors and workers.

Over the lifetime of the project, there's going to be significant property tax revenue to the county, there's going to be significant lease payments to local landowners, and there are going to
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1 be operations and maintenance wages paid to workers
2 here. And if you look at the total impact of these
3 projects over the next 30 years, it's about $\$ 25$
4 million that are going to be paid to the county or
5 to families living in the county over the next
630 years.

1 that means is that that 15-year term remains whether
2 or not we get online in 2018, 2019, or later. And so every day that we're not online we're losing contractual revenue, and that's vital for these smaller projects.

Now, we met with Kittitas County's Community Development Services in May -- June of 2016 to discuss our projects, we talked about the project that they had recently permitted, again, this Osprey Project that they permitted in 2015, and we talked about the Iron Horse Project that was currently winding its way through the permitting process with the county.

Now, we watched the progress of Iron Horse through the county with interest until the permit was eventually denied in January of 2015, and the county ended in enacting a moratorium, that I'm sure you're aware of, that prevented the county from receiving new solar applications.

Now, during this moratorium, a citizens committee was formed to recommend new regulations for solar, and as I mentioned, we've been an active participant in that, trying to craft regulations that work for the solar industry as well as for the community.
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Unfortunately, our timeline is such that we can't wait for the county to come up with these new regulations and then apply for permits after that and go through that extended process. So for that reason, in early 2017 we got to seriously explore this option of working with EFSEC.

And when no regulations were produced by the county in the in six months of the moratorium, we were forced to file our project with EFSEC. And indeed, it's now coming on 12 months of the moratorium, and there still have not been regulations submitted to the Board of County Commissioners.

So turning to our projects in particular, the Camas is our first project I'll look at, and you can see here that across the project site there will be rows of panels mounted on trackers, those are those lines that you see crossing the site. In addition, there are six inverter pads on Camas that take the electricity from the panels and convert them to AC electricity.

And there are access roads -- limited access roads just to access those inverters. Beyond those access roads, the rest of the site will be planted with grasses or other ground cover. Originally,

1 we've been looking at native grasses in
2 communications with WDFW, but we've heard from our
3 neighboring landowners and we've continued this
4 conversation with WDFW, and a lot of people are more
5
6
7
8
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1 are actually quite improved by our projects because 2 we're actually going to be incorporating buffers as

3 opposed to the current farming operations that go 4 right up to these natural features. particular features of the Camas project. One of them is the landscaping along Tjossem Road. We incorporated that landscaping, these trees and bushes outside of our fence line that will help obscure our facility from your neighbors based on feedback we were getting.

We also incorporated a 40-foot offset from Little Naneum Creek as well as a 20-foot offset from an irrigation ditch that has created kind of a man-made wetland on the west side of this project.

Turning to our Penstemon project, a couple of the features we've incorporated here, we have landscaping along two sides of the project, along the north and west sides. Again, we got the landowner input, they wanted to have us incorporate a visual buffer and we did that.

In addition, Coleman Creek along the eastern side of the project was of concern to WDFW, they wanted to make sure we were incorporating a buffer there, so we have a greater than 100-foot offset

1 there. We actually moved our entire project over to
2 the west to provide the maximum buffer possible
3 there.
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1 that looked like it could look out onto this land.
2 And as a result, we again changed our site
3 footprint, we took a row of panels out, we
4 incorporated some landscaping as you can see
5 highlighted there, and we're going to incorporate
6 the same sorts of trees that are currently setting 7 up the border of the golf course.

1 landscaping that forms the rest of that southern
2 boundary, and we have a 60-foot setback to the
3 wetlands on the west side of that project.

I appreciate your time. Thank you for coming again. I look forward to hearing what the council has to say. I really look forward to hearing what the community has to say. I'm very open to feedback on these projects. Thank you very much.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Mr. Evans.
I'm going to propose a two-minute break to let our court reporter's fingers cool off for a moment. And, Mr. Evans, you did a great job, but I'm asking -- we're about to go into public testimony and we will have two minutes per person, this will be timed by staff, and we will go forward with that.

But please try to remember if you're going to be recorded, you have to be written down, and we listen to all of these things and it's great, I think this worked, but I'm looking at my court reporter here and she seems okay, but I want to make sure this is going well. So two minutes and then we'll start up with public testimony.
(A short recess was had.)
MR. STEPHENSON: All right. We are now ready
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1 to start the public comment for this phase. And
2 remember, we are about to have another hearing just
3 later this evening on the land use hearing, so these
4 comments are not on the land use hearing but we will
5 hear those.

Staff will help us by calling up the numbers and the names of the folks that have signed up to testify. Please keep this to two minutes each. Written comments can be given to us at the table here, and we're happy to look at those, we look at those all the time, and we will look at each of them and we do review those.

So with that, Steven, can you tell us -- or
Ami, are you going to tell us --
MS. POTIS: Christina.
MR. STEPHENSON: Christina, sorry, I can't get the names right tonight.

MS. POTIS: That's all right.
MR. STEPHENSON: But who's the first
testifying?
MS. POTIS: Our first speaker is Tony
Helland,
No. 1. Do you want to come up to the front?
MR. STEPHENSON: And can you maybe read out the next four or five names so that other folks are

1 ready to go?

MS. POTIS: Oh, sure.
And the next four or five speakers can come and sit in the front and then they'll be ready to go right after.

So that would be Keith Crimp, Dwight Bates, Judy Hallisey, Barry Brunson can come and sit in the front, it will just help expedite the process.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thanks, Christina.
MR. HELLAND: Good evening. My name is Tony Helland. My address is 414 Alpine Drive, Ellensburg, Washington. I'd like to say this is the second EFSEC hearing process I've been involved in, first one was back maybe 15,16 years ago when we were involved with the Wild Horse Wind Project. I'm happy to say that was given the go-ahead.

Another thing I'm happy about is all the dire things that were predicted that might happen with the turbines going in up on the hill, none of those have come to fruition.

I'm just happy to see our county moving forward. I've lived here 65 years, I'm a sixth generation valley resident. I want to see -- I want to see growth. I want to see forward movement, and there's just nothing better to do for forward
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1 movement than projects like this.

2

3

I'm trying -- when $I$ first was going to speak, I -- everything I was going to talk about kind of tied everything together with land use issues and stuff, but that land use is going to be later. So I'm trying to pull stuff out that -- for the general portion of this.

These facilities, these plants that TUUSSOs is proposing to build, are needed. They're community-based, they're going to provide not so many ongoing jobs but they'll provide construction jobs and there are many people in this room that are in the construction business, myself included.

I just want everybody that's here tonight to keep an open mind and think about what this is going to mean for the valley. We need to lead, we need to bring this together. There's a lot of talk about solar in Washington State but it's just not there.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: You need to wrap up now.
MR. HELLAND: That's it.
MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you. And good job keeping to your two minutes. That's what we're going to work on.

MS. POTIS: Keith Crimp.

MR. CRIMP: My name is Keith Crimp. I am a co-owner of the Ellensburg Golf Club. What Jason said was right, he came out and gave a nice little demonstration on what the solar power project is all about. My brother and I thought about it a long time and the more we think about it, we're adamantly opposed to the Typha project.

Now, the Typha project is located right on the Yakima River, we talked about a buffer and all that sort of stuff, but gosh, if you know golfers, golfers have a tendency to slice the ball, and regardless or not where you put those solar panels, they're going to slice that ball.

And unfortunately, we've got about one-third of our play is college kids, so you can imagine seeing 20,000 solar panels sitting out there, some of them are going to be a little bit inebriated and going to show off and I'm afraid we're going to have broken solar panels.

So the first thing is, I don't want to go ahead and be liable, $I$ want a waiver for our golf club on any liability on broken solar panels or any of their equipment.

My other concern, and I'll talk to the individual in front of me as far as the
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1 environmental impact, we're right by the Yakima
2 River and we've got teams of wildlife right there,
3 in fact, we're in the migratory pattern of several
4 geese and other pelicans and believe it or not swans
5 and so on.

6

7
8
9
10
11
12

You know, when you're a golfer, you like to go out there and seeing the surroundings, you're not there to go ahead and be inundated by 20,000 solar panels, now, that's just for our site alone. So when you go ahead and put the little notice in there this is going to be discreet, it's not discreet one bit. It's going to be kind of, as I said, a bombshell.

I gave this to you on public record and I believe you've got that and I'm good. I'm going to give one copy to the environmental agent right here. But there's several other things I'd like to discuss that in my two minutes I'm not going to get the chance.

But we are against it. There's a right place and a wrong place. The Typha project is not the right place. I am pro clean energy. The wind power was fine. It was put in the wrong place, the one that was in front of the Cascade range. Out by Whiskey Dick it was great.

Here, next to a golf course, when you've got 3 or 400 golfers golfing every day, that's taboo. I'm afraid it's going to hurt our financial bottom line is the final thing.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, sir. That was some really fast golfing, and so I want everybody to think about slowing down just a little bit in your testimony so that our court reporter can record all of this.

MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 3, Dwight Bates.
MR. BATES: I'm Dwight Bates. I represent myself. 1509 Brick Road. These solar panels are inefficient. I'm an engineer. I think they're an eyesore. Just like the wind turbines are inefficient, they're an eyesore. I'm against them.

And I came to this valley to see the hay fields and the cattle. I retired here 18 years ago, I didn't retire here to see solar panels. I didn't retire here to see those ugly wind turbines.

I can't see them coming to this valley at all. It's a beautiful valley and you're just ruining the whole valley putting them in. If you have to put them in, put them in a overlay zones east of the city in the sagebrush, do not put it in farmland. I don't want the Timothy hay land ruined
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1 by big solar panels.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: Speaker 4, Judy Hallisey.
MS. HALLISEY: Good evening. My name is Judy
Hallisey. I'm a resident of Kittitas County, I'm also a natural resource manager and a lifelong birder.

My concerns are with bird habitat. And National Audubon declared three years ago that the No. 1 threat to birds is climate change. Because of that, I am a strong proponent of solar farms and solar energy. If I had my wish, every rooftop in this valley would have panels on it.

My first check on the location of these proposed farms was to see if they overlaid the important bird areas. They do not. That's a plus for their location.

Secondly, I'm pleased that they're not being proposed within the shrubsteppe. The shrubsteppe habitat is our most rapidly disappearing habitat in North America. It supports a plethora of wildlife

1 and birds.

Over half the bird species of North America are threatened by climate change, 50 of those birds occur right here in Kittitas County and are dependent on shrubsteppe. Shrubsteppe is disappearing because of development and conversion.

So if these solar farms go in as proposed to converted land, I would like to see the areas mitigated by covering the ground for erosion and invasive species by use of native plants and grasses. And I have at my disposal a list of native plants that are fire resistant, draught-tolerant, and tailored specific to Kittitas County that will benefit those 50 species of birds, and I will make them available. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you. Christina, do we have the next five?

MS. POTIS: Yes, so Speaker No. 5 is Barry Brunson. And then if Karen Poulsen, Jim Armstrong, Debbie Strand, Klaus Holzer would like to come forward and sit in the front.

MR. BRUNSON: Hi. I'm Barry Brunson. I'm a resident of Cle Elum. There are many reasons to support solar power but two of the most precious to me are named Avery and Sydney. They're eight years
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1 old and three years old. They're our grandchildren
2 and they and their parents -- our kids -- and their
3 kids and their grandchildren are the ones who are
4 going to be most impacted by the climate change as a
5 result of global warming.

Global warming comes from principally an increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and that causes lots of climate disruptions. Lots of you are familiar with this. There's no specific dispute about those facts. They come largely from burning fossil fuels and that's not in scientific dispute.

The evidence is all around us from more extreme weather events and more of those extreme weather events, from hurricanes, droughts, floods. Millions of climate refugees are expected. And wildfires, as we saw most closely by this summer up here, as well as spread previously only tropical diseases.

Now, solar is a big part of a healthy future, and that's why I'm fully in support of increased industrial sized as well as individual level solar panels -- solar power.

It may seem -- it may seem troubling to some that the TUUSSO project is going around -- going

1 directly to the state, but on the other hand, there 2 was a permit denied by the county. They imposed a 3 six-month moratorium and then extended it another

4 six months and that sort of leads one to be
5 impatient, and I can sort of understand that. Thank
6 you.
7 MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.

MS. POTIS: Karen Poulsen.
MS. POULSEN: Hello. I'm Karen Poulsen. 5591 Tjossem Road. I'm a full-time farmer with land across from two of the proposed solar sites. I'm also fifth generation -- or my family -- I'm fifth generation of family.

The land and water resources of the Kittitas Valley have long been important to both Native Americans and those who have come since. This valley is well known around the world for its Timothy hay and is now also being known for its high-quality apples and seed crops.

Due to a unique climate and an ability to irrigate our prime farmlands, Kittitas County has developed a viable agriculture community. However, for modern agriculture to thrive in a world marketplace, it takes a certain economy of scale and land base to maintain both our markets and our local
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1 agricultural infrastructure of buyers and farm 2 suppliers.

1 zoning regulations are favorable, and willing
2 landowners seek to diversify their income by leasing 3 their land for solar.
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1 residential development which is forever, at the end
2 of their lifespans these can be removed and the land
3 returned to agriculture if that's what the landowner

Given these factors and that TUUSSO's plans conform to county land use regulations, the Chamber Board asks you to give expedited approval for the applications before you. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 8, Debbie Strand. MS. STRAND: Good evening. My name is Debbie Strand. I'm 1932 East Village Drive, Ellensburg. I've been a resident here for $20-\mathrm{plus}$ years now.

I'm the former director of the Economic Development Group of Kittitas County and the owner of a consulting firm, Strand Consulting. But I'm not here representing either of those entities, I'm here representing myself. I worked closely with the wind projects in our valley, and I'm very familiar with the EFSEC process having gone through it two, maybe three times. TUUSSO's application to EFSEC is understandable. The county's existing zoning allows for alternative energy. Hearing examiner found as much with Iron Horse. The superior court decision

1 is flawed and I imagine that One Energy will likely
2 appeal that decision.

Board of County Commissioners, when they
rejected Iron Horse, it signaled to developers that they were reversing their pro solar position that they had with the Teanaway Solar Project.

Certainly, the county has its right to reverse its policy and developers also have the right to not wait until the county figures out what its policy is, because as we know and any business knows, time is money.

So there are three projects permitted, wind projects here now: Two are built, one is yet to be built. And there really aren't that many people that are angry with them, it's hard to find somebody that really is. The employment, the property taxes, the landowner benefits, they're all wonderful assets.

The county will be heard here, Mr. Ian Elliot, he will certainly represent our county very well. He's done so on other projects before the EFSEC board. Mitigation will be taken care of through the EFSEC process.

Let's see, Kittitas County is the center of wind energy, and we'd really like to be the center
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1 of renewable energy by adding solar to this. So I
2 think that the proposed facilities should be built,
3 and I think it's good and something that we all
4 should be proud of. Thank you.

Two minutes goes really fast, especially when I try to be slow so that the reporter can get it. MR. STEPHENSON: Yes, it does. Thank you. MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 9. MR. HOLZER: Hello. My name is Klaus Holzer. I live at 9982 Manastash Road. And I'd like to also voice approval of the solar project, but, you know, I really love my home here.

I love this valley and I love my neighbors. I'd hate the idea of them being harmed in terms of placement of new solar and wind projects. And this makes for some real difficulties in deciding where and when we're going to site -- well, where we would site these projects.

And so the purpose of my contribution here this evening is to kind of admonish our own commissioners and county process. Your presenter on the project said that it had been 12 months and they still haven't gotten any kind of a ruling from our county. And this seems to be a tendency for us to just kind of kick the can down the road and let

1 someone else make our decisions.

And that's what I have to say. Thank you.
MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: Speaker No. 10, Merrill Klocke.
And if the last two informational speakers, Kathi Pritchard and Schrade Rouse would come up to the front to expedite the process, thank you.

Speaker No. 10, Merrill Klocke? Are you Speaker No. 10?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I got a number.
MS. POTIS: No, no. That's for land use.
Speaker No. 10 for informational meeting, Merrill Klocke?

MR. KLOCKE: Yes. Yeah. My name is Merrill Klocke, No. 6 Tjossem Road. And my main concern is keeping the valley in agriculture which, to me, is the biggest income of the county. And mine is on the Camas project and they want to put them within
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1200 feet of my back window of my yard.

Originally, they weren't going to come north of the Bull Ditch but they said they had to have a certain size. So if they kept them south of the creek I wouldn't be quite concerned. But I would have to look at these things, I've got to -- to me, it's going to depreciate my value of my property.

If I had to look at a few acres with 360-degree view, and I had to look at a property that had a bunch of solar panels, which one would I buy? That's my main concern, they're going to block my view around my property. So it's my property value and my view and preserving agricultural land. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: Speaker 11, Kathi Pritchard.
MS. PRITCHARD: Good evening. I'm Kathi
Pritchard, a local resident. The state is at a crossroad. The agricultural investment throughout the state would be diminished and a serious precedence made if this council approves this application to convert prime irrigated farmland to use as utility-scale energy production.

Agriculture is woven into the fabric of Washington State's heritage according to the State

1 Department of Commerce website. Governor Inslee
2 supports this fact through goals to, quote, grow the agricultural sector. Among his five goals listed on the state commerce website are protecting scarce resources, land, water, and labor; harnessing emerging opportunities in organic, sustainable, and local farming.

Kittitas County is the home to a thriving farm community. Ranging from small family farms to national-ranked export operations and new crops are being developed every year.

MR. STEPHENSON: Just a bit slower, please. Thank you.

MS. PRITCHARD: I'll take a breath.
MR. STEPHENSON: I'll give you some more time.

MS. PRITCHARD: Okay. Thank you.
According to 2012 USDA Kittitas County farm figures, Kittitas County farm economy exceeded \$68 million. The state export assistance program cites Anderson Hay \& Grain a success story through its venture to export hay and grain to the middle east.

Kittitas Valley is also home to innovative growers in apples and organics. Just this year, Yakima-based Zirkle Fruit planted 600,000 trees on
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1600 acres in lower Kittitas Valley, and they have
2 plans to plant up to 1.5 million trees.

3
4

Another business, a family-owned organic seed company, also calls this county home, farming about 150 certified organic acres. These are just three farming success stories for our county. These and many more could be adversely affected if this application is approved.

If approved, the proposed projects would likely begin a drain on the number of irrigated acres available to our -- I'm sorry, in our county and states, since 18 other projects are seeking similar acreage and are waiting in the wings.

As proposed, these projects are not in harmony with the governor's stated goals to protect scarce resources of land, water, and labor and encourage emerging innovation in sustainable farming.

Now, the choice does not have to be between farms and renewable energy. Over 18,000 acres of non-irrigated land and DNR trust land meet developers' criteria for siting. The site on trust land would fund $K$ to 12 schools throughout the state.

The laws of prime irrigated farmland means

1 that agriculture and innovation and economic growth
2 for longer than the 30 years of the proposed projects' timeline --

MS. POTIS: And your time is up.
MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you. And thank you for slowing down.

MS. POTIS: Speaker 12.
MR. ROUSE: My name is Schrade Rouse. I live on Park Creek Road near where the Iron Horse solar facility would have been located. I came to this meeting tonight to thank my locally elected county commissioners for enacting the solar moratorium.

I believe that this decision was a direct response to public sentiment. I would also like to thank the judge who upheld that decision, again, for representing the people.

Lastly, I came to this meeting so that I could try to understand how and why a nonelected board has the ability to override local government, and I do not feel that those questions have been answered.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
MS. POTIS: Speaker 13.
MR. BLAZYNSKI: Good evening. Stan
Blazynski, resident of Kittitas County. To start
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1 off, I would like to reveal that I'm really for
2 clean energy, but I'm against these solar farms
3 because they trade precious farmland for very, very
4 expensive electricity.

If we're going to have expensive electricity
like they proposing, we're going to lose any
leverage
with -- as a county we're not going to be competitive.

I submitted this to the county previously. Germany seems to be ahead of anybody on solar farms, but where they put these farms, that's very
interesting. Typically, they find locations that are useless: Mines, vacated military bases, so on, be too long, not enough time.

Another case here is I don't know if people are aware, it's called a feed-in electricity tariff. It's a tariff designed for quick return on investment. Our neighbors to the north in Canada do that. It is the tariff per kilowatt of electricity is over 40 cents, over 40 cents. Please add 40 cents to the current rates of about 10,12 cents, we're not going to compete with the world at 50 cents an hour, kilowatt hour. I'd like to submit that because it's too lengthy.

And I appreciate the opportunity.
MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
Is this the last one?
MS. POTIS: Yes, it is. Actually, no, one more.

MR. STEPHENSON: One more?
MS. POTIS: Yeah. Dan Morgan.
MR. MORGAN: Hi, my name is Dan Morgan. I'm a Kittitas County resident and a local business owner. I'm here to speak in favor of this project. I believe that renewables are a good fit for this county and consistent with land use regulations.

My company has been involved with renewable projects in the past and still -- we still are, and it's been very good for us. It's employed my people, and they have spent their dollars locally and trickles down through the economy here.

So you've -- we've already had projects like this approved before so need to be consistent and I'm all for it. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.
Is that it now?
MS. POTIS: Uh-huh.
MS. STEPHENSON: All right. So let's take a 15-minute break. There's a couple reasons for this.
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1 One is to let our court reporter have a chance to
2 rest her fingers, and the other is to let myself and
3 the council members, we listen hard to these things
4 and we need to keep listening hard, so we're going
5 to take a 15-minute break and then we're going to
6 start the land use hearing portion of this meeting.
7 Thank you very much for being here.

8
(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 6:48 P.M.)
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