

From: [Karen Brun](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Response to Scout Clean Energy's January 24, 2024 Letter to EFSEC
Date: Tuesday, January 30, 2024 3:04:06 PM
Attachments: [HHRec ... 1-23-24.R229-012224 - Scout comment.pdf](#)

External Email

In response to Scout Clean Energy's 1-24-24 Letter to EFSEC attached), I am submitting the following questions and comments:

First, why was this letter not made public before the public comment period ended? Why did it only come to light through a Records Request?

EFSEC should not allow Scout to bully the Council into giving them what they want as they have done the bare minimum for mitigation measures. EFSEC has a responsibility to the citizens of Washington State and, in particular, the residents of the Tri-Cities, who are being asked to sacrifice property values, wildlife, tribal cultural properties, recreational opportunities, and public health and safety from additional fugitive dust and the inability to fight wildfires aerially.

EFSEC needs to listen to the State's experts and the Yakama Nation who have no vested interest in making this a viable project.

Because Scout did such a poor job on the Application for Site Certification which resulted in a less than adequate FEIS, they are now demanding that EFSEC justify the options that came out of the December 20th meeting. Just who is running the show here? Scout should go back to the drawing board and come up with a project that everyone can live with – not push this monstrosity down our throats laughing all the way to the bank. They don't care about Washington State's carbon goals (which this project will impact very little) – they do care about lining their pockets and those of their investors.

Excerpts from Scout's 1-24-24 letter and my comments/questions (in red):

Paragraph 2 –

"a drastic departure from established council precedent". What is this statement based on? There is no precedent by EFSEC for a project of this scope and scale so it's all new territory where no precedent has been established.

"unsupported by scientific or any other evidence in the record". Again, what is this statement based on? There has been a significant amount of scientific data provided by WDFW, the Audubon Society, and well-known ferruginous hawk experts like James Watson. Just because Scout didn't like the data doesn't mean it is unsupported.

"would render the Project both technically and economically non-viable without substantial amendment to the application". Then that is what Scout should do. Had they brought in stakeholders at the outset, they would not be in this position but they tried to railroad this project through without considering the people and wildlife impacted by it. Ending up with 236 MW of wind and 500 MW of solar is a nice project in keeping with the rest of the wind & solar projects in Washington State.

"The proposals run counter to state energy policy...violate both the SEPA and Washington Administrative Procedures Act." Again, how is this substantiated? Just stating it doesn't make it so.

"many detailed recommendations for mitigation measure improvements that were requested by EFSEC staff from Scout...were not included in the presentation ultimately made to the Council". So what? Perhaps the EFSEC staff thought they weren't substantial enough to be considered

“improvements”.

Page 2

“Eliminating the science-based exception to the 2-mile setback...” So Scout is saying that WDFW’s 2-mile setback is not based on science. That is rather insulting. Since when did they become experts in wildlife nesting and foraging?

“The current Project configuration is the result of years of careful research and planning, including engagement with key stakeholders and agency experts to ensure minimization of impacts...” Scout did not engage anyone in the community to my knowledge. They did a survey of 500 people out of the 300,000 who live here! The research and planning had everything to do with how much money Scout could be expected to earn, and the experts they hired gave them what they wanted to hear. If they are so interested in minimizing impacts, why is there no mention of aerial firefighting in the FEIS?

Page 3

“The unjustifiable elimination of the eastern half of the Project will limit availability of the federal Inflation Reduction Act (a misnomer if there ever was one) incentive...” And there you have it – it’s all about the money!

“Likely forcing procurement of a taller wind turbine model. The elimination of the eastern half of the Project, which would have been constructed first, and new longer permitting timeframe forced by that change, will mean Scout likely can no longer procure sub-500 foot blade-tip height wind turbine models (which are slated to be discontinued due to announced product manufacturing retooling for larger model production). The industry-standard wind turbine model available under the likely new permitting timeline will be a taller hub-height (576 feet, with a larger rotor) and require dual nacelle FAA lighting of every wind turbine and overall greater environmental impact.” So what?

“If feasible at all, these changes will necessitate a major redesign of the remaining project components and include the acquisition of additional land holdings to facilitate the movement of facilities and equipment. These modifications will necessitate a significant amendment to the site certificate, which will set back the Project, and EFSEC’s review process, by many months. This amendment and further delay will add substantial, unanticipated costs and risks, rendering Scout’s substantial investments to date to develop the eliminated infrastructure unrecoverable. These additional delays and costs not only represent undue burden on Scout but also an increase in cost of the power for the eventual ratepayers of the State.” Again, so what? Scout chose to initiate this investment and, therefore, must bear the brunt of any risk associated with it. Also, given the fact that this power is unlikely to stay in Washington State, it will have little impact on the ratepayers.

“The Council’s proposed revocation of a critical exception to the 2-mile buffer around historically documented ferruginous hawk nests contravenes the best available science, ignores and upends the existing mitigation framework, and sets dangerous precedent that will hobble Washington’s renewable energy future.” Scout couldn’t care less about Washington’s renewable energy future. Once this is built, and maybe even before, they will take the money and run off to rape some other community.

Page 5

“Third, no other state or federal wildlife agency in the country imposes a 2-mile buffer on development around ferruginous hawk nests, let alone one for non-viable (or non-existing) nests.” Another so what? This is WFDW has decided – it doesn’t matter if no other state does so. If they don’t like the limitations, they can move their project to one of those other states.

Page 6

“Fifth, with no scientific or data-based backstop, this requirement is ripe for inaccurate or mistaken reporting or abuse.” Well, Scout should know a lot about that since the SCA was full of inaccuracies and omissions.

Page 7

“Imposing this measure generally (i.e., prohibiting project features on all land designated as medium to very high linkage according to the map) would be precedent to prohibit any project siting on over 13,000 sq km or over 5,200 sq mi of the State.” **Given that this is the largest project ever proposed in Washington State, EFSEC needs to take a hard look at what kind of precedent they are setting and not be steamrolled by a developer who is only looking out for themselves.**

“Nor was there any consideration of the commercial or generation-related implications of eliminating half the Project.” **Judge Torem effectively excluded any discussion of commercial or generated-related implications in the adjudication. Therefore, it cannot be a consideration here either.**

Page 10

“In sum, approving the Council’s recent proposals would not only represent a drastic departure from the Council’s own established precedent...” **Since EFSEC has never before been tasked with siting a project of this size and scale, there is no precedent for it making this statement moot.**

“This is the exact opposite of the goal of EFSEC – to provide a one-stop, streamlined, process to approve projects objectively and uniformly.” **To my knowledge, there is no other wind and solar hybrid project anywhere else in Washington State so there is no way for this one to be processed uniformly. There has to be more than one, and they have to be the same size, in order to do this.**

Karen Brun
Treasurer, TRI-CITIES C.A.R.E.S.
Phone: 509-392-1156
Email: karen@tricitescares.org

TRI-CITIES C.A.R.E.S.
Community Action for Responsible Environmental Stewardship
Visit: www.TriCitiesCARES.org

HHH Project

David Sharp
Tri-City Cares
January 31, 2024

Reference Scout Letter, January 19, 2024

This comment is based upon the contents of the Scout letter to the council. The Council is urged not to vote to approve the project as proposed by the Applicant. There are still many questions, and the FEIS has not, to my knowledge, considered important safety issues such as aerial firefighting.

It appears the Applicant believes the Council actions are limited to either the No Build option, or the Build Option in the FEIS, with the Applicant in control of what mitigation needs to take place. There are still important issues not resolved or even addressed. If there must be a vote today and there are only those two options, the Council must choose the No Build scenario.

This project is too large and without specifics, too malleable, too complicated, and lacking in transparency and "full disclosure" required as part of the EFSEC process. Short notice was given by the Applicant when they abruptly decided to change horses in mid-stream and make Application to EFSEC rather than continue with Benton County. It was actions taken by the Applicant that complicated and delayed the SEPA process.

The issues described by the Applicant in their letter are self-made. The Applicant either did not do their homework, or did their homework late in the process and found out just how inappropriate the Horse Heaven site is for the size and magnitude of the project they are proposing. Rather than resizing the project to an appropriate level they, chose to challenge the Council.

The project is bounded on the South and West by Department of Defense Military Training routes, on North by 4 cities and urban growth areas that make up the third largest and fastest growing metropolitan area in the State. The area proposed is a peninsula created by the Yakima and Columbia Rivers. The area contains a rich and broad diversity of wildlife, in particular avian species. The projects butts up against and along a ridgeline designated multiple use BLM Resource Area. The project interferes with wildlife corridors and migration patterns. The Northwest part of the project has recurring wildfires that have been fought with aerial techniques because of terrain not suitable for ground firefighting access. In short, the Applicant chose a site that is outside what is considered best practices in the wind industry.

Ferruginous Hawk and Wildlife Corridor Issues-The Applicant cites a number of firsts and precedents regarding the Ferruginous Hawk. This is the first project that will be built after the State Endangered Species designation in Washington so all of the Applicant's examples are based on a different standard. One of the very first formal public comments was from the WDFW that outlined their concerns about the proximity to Ferruginous Hawk habitat and nesting, and the wildlife corridors. That was not the first time Scout had heard of that issue. Rather than examining the project and making changes to satisfy the

WDFW concerns the Applicant left the project as is. Changes eventually made were not sufficient. The Applicant offered no changes until the Moon memo dated August 9, 2023 as Data Request 9 response.

The Applicant referenced the deliberation *“option to remove the project East of Straub Canyon, and removal of the East Solar field as unprecedented, and would make the East project unviable”*. It is true that without solar and battery the hybrid nature of the project would not be possible. However, assuming that there is a wildlife issue based upon the location of the East solar field, this is just another indication that the Applicant intends to build this project no matter the cost. This was that presumably was known early in the project. Reference Technical Report-*“Multi-scale Resource Selection of Ferruginous Hawk (Buteo regalis) Nesting in Eastern Washington and at the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center, Benton County, Washington. Prepared for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Sept 22, 2022”*

This project will provide minimal renewable electricity for Washington, if any. Several times the applicant mentioned the dire nature of the State electricity system and whether the project would be viable. However, they have been very closed about the performance of this project. Washington and the Northwest will have some significant problems after 2025 after coal power is banned. However, it is impossible for wind to replace that dispatchable energy with low-capacity factor renewable projects with minimal battery storage as the HHH project specifies. Local IOU's and the State Energy Strategy recognize the Northwest wind problem, changing to huge imports of wind from Montana, Wyoming, and Arizona. Experts were brought on for the adjudication to describe the situation, but surprisingly, testimony was not allowed in the adjudication process. To give a recent example of how unhelpful wind and solar energy will be, during a recent cold snap from January 14-17, the wind performance was less than 1% across Washington and Oregon based upon the BPA Balancing Authority real time data. Solar was 5%. The entire last half of January wind average was less than 5%. No amount of battery storage can overcome that lack of energy. RCW 80.50. requires a balancing criterion of *“To provide abundant clean energy.....”*. A more appropriate quote for this project, and for any Washington wind would be, *“a scarce and unreliable supply clean of energy”*

*“The Applicant States that “the Council’s proposed changes would **potentially** render the Project infeasible:”* The above quote precedes several bullet points that deserve comments.

Bullet point #3 “Reducing a key federal funding source associated with the retirement of the Boardman coal Plant”. This seems to imply that the power is going to Oregon customers or to support a green hydrogen project. It also implies that as we all knew, the Applicant is simply chasing tax credits, and only tax credits and taxpayer money make this project viable. Is there another tax credit or incentive over and above the PTC? To restate the Applicant’s language: Because we cannot build as much of the project as we want, we will receive less “Inflation Reduction Act” incentives.

Bullet point #4-Likely forcing procurement of a taller wind turbine model. The key wording here is likely. For GE, the sub-500’ model turbine has, is, and will be a mainstay and workhorse for onshore wind. GE continues to make modifications to improve their product, but the 500’ limit that came about because of the FAA regulations will still be there. Customers will still want

sub-500' wind turbines. Think of this statement another way. Is GE going to abandon the onshore wind turbine market around the world? It is more unlikely than likely.

Visual Impacts-The public did not see the actual viewsheds of concern that were raised in public comment periods from 2021 until the FEIS was published. For a reason still not explained, the Applicant did not provide a visual representation to a Key Observation point based on public comments. During the EFSEC tour, the Scout representative clearly said that turbines would not be visible from Kiona Ridge. When challenged, the response was, "all I saw was blade tips". It was not until the Shawn Green presentation (Link below), in the December 2023 Council meeting that the 4 turbines on Kiona Ridge were shown to the public.

The letter states:

"The current Project configuration is the result of years of careful research and planning, including engagement with key stakeholders and agency experts, to ensure minimization of impacts"

There was no evidence of local stakeholders input for visual impact.

The council is asked to recall the PowerPoint presentation made by Shawn Greene, showing Avennia Winery looking South to Kiona Ridge. Shawn highlighted by blue dots the turbines to be removed by the Applicant. [PowerPoint Presentation \(wa.gov\)](#) However, look at the picture to the right of the removed turbines. There are 4 very prominent turbines Kiona ridge turbines showing. These have multiple major impacts: Visual, Aerial Firefighting, Ferruginous Hawk, wildlife corridor, Cultural, Habitat, and Public Safety.

The Avennia Winery is 5 miles from the ridgeline, but Freschette, Fidelitas, Kiona, Hamilton, Elkhorn, or Anelare wineries could just as easily been used. Those wineries vary from 1 mile to 3 miles and the ridgeline turbines will be prominently seen from almost all wineries in the Yakima Valley.

Under the Applicants current proposal, those turbines would be installed as shown in the presentation.

From: [Jim Bennett](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Comment
Date: Sunday, January 28, 2024 3:47:22 PM

External Email

TWIMC,

The best option for this project is not listed. It's an ill-conceived, non-environmentally friendly, feel good "green" project that benefits no one except the energy companies involved. It belongs on the trash heap, before it turns into the latest chapter of taxpayer-funded failed government projects milked by vendors who eventually abandon them, leaving the mess to be cleaned up using more taxpayer dollars.

Jim Bennett

Kennewick,WA

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Moon, Amy \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#); [Hafkemeyer, Ami \(EFSEC\)](#)
Subject: FW: EFSEC HHH Proposal - Observations and Question related to the Maps of Options
Date: Friday, January 26, 2024 11:04:19 AM

See comment below. Essentially, the commentor is asking about the turbine models to be used for Turbine Option 1 and Turbine Option 2 which is presented in the Final EIS.

From: pixelate@mathsavers.com <pixelate@mathsavers.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 10:40 AM
To: Moon, Amy (EFSEC) <amy.moon@efsec.wa.gov>
Cc: pixelate@mathsavers.com
Subject: EFSEC HHH Proposal - Observations and Question related to the Maps of Options

External Email

Hello Amy Moon of EFSEC –

Regarding the HHH Wind / Solar project, I was looking at the Maps of the Options (8 in total):

<https://www.efsec.wa.gov/sites/default/files/210011/feis/20240109%20Horse%20Heaven%20FEIS%20Council%20Exclusion%20Considerations%201%20through%204.pdf>

Looking at these maps along with the site depictions, notes and restrictions, there appear to be 3 binary permutations which result in $2^3 = 8$ different Options (maps).

- East of Straub Canyon Demarcation: Maps 1-4 include Straub Canyon / Maps 5-8 do Not include Straub Canyon.
- Notes per Restrictions: Maps 1, 2, 5, 6 include two Notes / Maps 3, 4, 7, 8 include many Notes.
- Proposed Turbine Options: Maps 1, 3, 5, 7 per Option 1 / Maps 2, 4, 6, 8 per Option 2.

I counted the Turbines (depicted by the green dots) on each of the Maps. It appears that Option 1 consistently has more turbines than Option 2.

Map	Turbines Option	Turbines
1	1	$66 + 40 = 106$
2	2	$45 + 18 = 63$
3	1	$62 + 31 = 93$
4	2	$39 + 16 = 55$
5	1	66
6	2	45
7	1	62
8	2	39

If we look at the Tri-City CARES Video per the Tri-City Herald Op Ed / June 9, 2023:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Mr6MUdtf_U

- We see that the project consists of 70,000+ acres including wind turbines and solar panels.
- There will either be:
 - o 244 turbines with a height of 499 feet

- o 150 turbines with a height of 671 feet
- I am not able to determine the type (height) of turbines that are proposed on each of the Maps.

I believe that the applicant (Scout Energy) or the EFSEC needs to clarify the type of turbines that are to be installed per the map / turbine locations.

I am looking forward to the next EFSEC Open online meeting.

Cheers,

Patrick Grengs / Owner of 40 acres of mixed-use land in West Richland, WA

From: [Christy Pruitt](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: EFSEC Upcoming Action Item available: Horse Heaven Hills Energy Public Comment
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2024 1:22:03 PM

External Email

Greetings,

In regard to our state's wind farm project, there should be NO EXCLUSIONS to the rule regarding migratory animals and their safety - always erring on the side of what nature needs to succeed. It does NOT matter how high they migrate, ALL animals should be able to migrate their natural patterns freely, not down corridors man decides they should. There is tremendous generational loss for each bird & animal that is displaced, injured, or killed by these windmill & solar farms. Additionally, it has been found that by painting one of the windmill's blades black, it gives birds enough visual movement to navigate more successfully around moving windmills. Painting all blades creates a blurry movement where they cannot truly see what is moving down, around, and what is coming towards them. However, with the one blade painted, there is way less blur created, giving them enough visual clearance from the other blades that it makes it much more likely they will clear the windmills. There ARE ways to do this properly, and it may take us knocking out several windmill site plans in order to be the proper stewards of our environment - a true "environmentalist" approach to this specific problem. Far too long Washington State leaders & businesses have talked about being "environmentalists." THIS project is where you put your money where your mouth is, walk the walk, do more than talk. Do what is right, swallow the profit loss of extra windmill sites that have been squeezed into the plans. Do NOT allow ANY loss to the 2-mile wide corridor; this is a pitifully small corridor.

Thank you for your careful consideration.

Sincerely,
Christy Pruitt
Washington State Native

From: Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council <WAEFSEC@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 12:48 PM
To: cp-pruitt@outlook.com <cp-pruitt@outlook.com>
Subject: EFSEC Upcoming Action Item available

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it as a Web page.](#)

EFSEC banner graphic



- January 25, 2024 -

Contact: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

January 31, 2024 EFSEC Upcoming Action Item available

Dear interested persons,

The Proposed Action item for the Horse Heaven project for the upcoming Council Meeting is available on our website here: <https://www.efsec.wa.gov/council-information/council-meetings>

Public comments on EFSEC Final Actions must be submitted in-writing to EFSEC at least 3 business days prior to the scheduled public meeting for which the proposed

FINAL ACTION Agenda item is planned. Written public comments must be submitted to EFSEC through <https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/>.

You received this message because you are subscribed to updates from State of Washington, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council.

Get this as a forward? [Sign up](#) to receive updates.

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:

[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Unsubscribe All](#) | [Help](#)

This email was sent to cp-pruitt@outlook.com using govDelivery Communications Cloud on behalf of: State of Washington, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council · 621 Woodland Square Loop SE · Lacey, WA 98503



From: [Tenika Morrison](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Monday, January 22, 2024 3:27:41 PM

External Email

I have read up on this and see that EFSEC says that they cannot have a basis for a total permit denial which is disappointing. If there is an option though I definitely believe option 4 is the best but it needs to address the need for the aerial firefighting.

I sent in my statement about that in which in the 6 years that I have lived off Clodfelter by Horse Heaven Hills I have personally witnessed from my back yard no less than 6 fires. This is a highly combustible area and having these turbines here where now possibly firefighting would not be available as that fire is rushing towards our homes seems very reckless.

We need to identify those needs and take out additional turbines where homes/property/wildlife is an issue. Please address this....

Thank you.

Tenika Morrison
Kennewick, WA

From: [Kevin Lewis](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Monday, January 22, 2024 7:39:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

External Email

We are aware that EFSCE is considering four Council Mitigation options for the Horse Heaven Wind and Solar Project based recognition of the significant negative impacts the project has on wildlife, cultural resources, and visual impacts.

Having reviewed the options with the information available to us, we feel Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative. In addition, we feel EFSEC must adequately address aerial firefighting in the area should the project go through. This would require that additional turbines be removed from what is currently proposed in option 4.

Please consider these recommendations as you discuss further action.

Sincerely,

Kevin Lewis



[Visit Tri-Cities.com](https://www.visittricity.com)

KEVIN LEWIS

President & CEO | Visit Tri-Cities

☐ (509) 873-5936

☐ 7130 W. Grandridge Blvd., Ste. B
Kennewick, WA 99336



--

From: [Denise Wilson](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 10:39:02 PM

External Email

Dear Sirs,

In regards to the proposed mitigation options- option 4 is the only option reasonable. Please also allow for air fire suppression needed in the proposed area. Please do not force harm on our beloved community, wildlife and growth by allowing the wind turbine project as previously proposed. I am begging you as a community member to please choose option 4 of the mitigation if a permit is allowed at all.

Thank you for your time reading this. I was told it would never be read or listened to. Please prove that notion wrong.

Kind Regards,

Denise Wilson

West Richland, WA resident

Option 1 - removes micro-siting corridors turbines, solar arrays, & BESS 2 miles from known ferruginous hawk nests plus migration corridors medium or higher impact based on the FEIS.

Option 2: Option 1 plus removal of infrastructure and turbines, solar arrays & BESS from noise, visual, and recreation impacts.

Option 3: Infrastructure removed within high or above migration corridors and east of Straub Canyon plus turbines removed within medium migration corridors and within 2 miles of ferruginous hawk nests.

Option 4: a combination of Options 1 plus 2 plus 3.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Aussie Mom](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 10:44:39 AM

External Email

My husband and I are strongly opposed to the idea of a wind farm so close to Tri-Cities. It would impact all aspects of our lives. The detriment to birds and wildlife, the noise, and the impact on the environment far outweighs the energy produced. The windmills being proposed are huge eyesores that are unnecessary if we harness more power from our dams and nuclear plants.

If Governor Inslee wants windmills, let him put them in his backyard, not ours.

Respectfully,
Debora Rossi

From: [linda thompson](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Monday, January 22, 2024 8:34:12 PM

External Email

I am in support of mitigation that addresses the needs of migrating and resident birds. I do not support what I suspect is NIMBY, in terms of wind turbines disturbing "views". We must replace fossil fuel based power generation with solar and wind power. Given more and more vehicles will be using electricity homeowners may be faced with choices, my car or lights at my house, if the grid is unable to support both!

From: [Norbert Rossi](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2024 4:17:03 PM

External Email

To whom it concerns,

I am strongly opposed to the wind farm that is proposed for the TriCities, WA, area. I am concerned about its impact on the environment (birds and other). I also object to exploiting our community for power which will not even be used here.

I also object to the impact it has on lasting environmental issues. I recently visited Walla Walla, WA, and took a picture of an area east of the city that contained a graveyard for the turbine blades - a massive junkyard directly next the Highway 12. This is pathetic.

Please build this monstrosity somewhere else.

Norbert Rossi
Kennewick, WA

From: [Anne Maughan](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:29:28 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only option we can live with, and **aerial fire fighting** must also be addressed.
We prefer NO WIND TURBINES, but **OPTION 4 is the best alternative** to no turbines.
Thank you.
Anne Maughan

From: [David Maughan](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:31:41 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only option we can live with, and **aerial fire fighting** must also be addressed.
We prefer NO WIND TURBINES, but **OPTION 4 is the best alternative** to no turbines.
Thank you.
David Maughan

From: [Kc Mail](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:33:43 PM

External Email

After reviewing the latest maps and options I believe option 4 is the best option. But, you also need to address firefighting issues by removing additional turbines.

Karen Hughes
Sent from my iPad

From: [Debbi Pratt](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:35:58 PM

External Email

Option four is the only solution and no more aerial firefighting

Sent from my iPhone

From: lincalm@aol.com
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:37:17 PM

External Email

Dear Council—

As a homeowner on Clodfelter road in Kennewick, I often see bald eagles fly between Finley and the upper Columbia river right over my house. Sandhills cranes and other wildlife such as antelope, deer and coyotes cross over my property or can be seen crossing nearby land.

As one who is in favor of alternative energy in many respects, building the turbine project will be detrimental to the Tricity area wildlife, views, and values.

I absolutely oppose the turbine project, but if it will be going through regardless of what the public wants, then Option 4 is the least destructive. Firefighting from the air will need to be addressed, however.

Thank you,
Linda C. McCalmant
97208 E 382 PRSE
Kennewick WA 99338
(509)528-0835

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [Debbie Larson](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:44:41 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative and EFSEC must adequately address aerial firefighting.

Sincerely,
Arvid & Debbie Larson

From: [Carolyn Riddle](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:46:39 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only acceptable option to mitigate danger to bird migration corridors particularly for ferruginous hawks. The necessity of access for aerial firefighting must also be addressed.

This could also be an opportune time to continue a study in Norway in 2020 when one propeller of a turbine was painted black to increase motion blur and contrast to the surrounding environment. It resulted in 70% fewer bird collisions. <https://www.audubon.org/news/can-painting-wind-turbine-blades-black-really-save-birds>

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Carolyn Riddle

JMJ/F

From: [KAREN FORTIER](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 1:57:43 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative but aerial firefighting must be adequately addressed.

Karen Fortier
28129 Florence Acres Rd
Monroe, WA 98272

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Geneva Carroll](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:01:43 PM

External Email

As a homeowner in Benton County, Washington I can see that Option four is the only viable option for our community. However, we still need to hear what will be done to mitigate the fire prevention and fire safety issues we are facing. This fire mitigation issue is in addition to Option four.

Thank you,

Geneva Carroll

From: outsets_shogun0w@icloud.com
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:11:33 PM

External Email

Comments :

Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative and that they must adequately address aerial firefighting.

From: [Andrea Aldrich](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:11:35 PM

External Email

Regarding the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind turbines, I feel that Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative for this project and that aerial firefighting capabilities must be considered. Thank you.

Andrea J. Aldrich

5708 Mulberry Dr.

West Richland, WA 99353

From: [KELLY WETHERELL](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:46:01 PM

External Email

Please choose option 4 and you must consider aerial firefighting requirements. To not factor that in would be foolish considering how many brush fires the area has every year. They are not possible to fight without planes.

Thank you,
Kelly Wetherell

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Paul Engert](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:58:57 PM

External Email

I am writing to ask the committee to eliminate all proposed windmills. The visual and environmental impacts are greater than potential benefits. I suggest that nuclear is a better option for future power needs.
Thank you for your consideration.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [Mark and Lois Killinger](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 2:59:30 PM

External Email

Regarding the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind farm, I believe the only acceptable option is #4, the most restrictive. And please also consider aerial firefighting capabilities.

Thanks for your consideration.

Mark Killinger
West Richland

From: [Fred Lieske](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:04:15 PM

External Email

After I reviewed the 4 Mitigation Options that EFSEC is considering, I strongly encourage EFSEC to adopt Option 4 as their response to the Proposed HHH Wind Farm from Scout Energy.

EFSEC still needs to address the very important topic of the access for Firefighters to use Aerial Firefighting Techniques to combat wildfires, fires that occurred as recently as this past summer 2023 !

From: [Patrice Tullai](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:26:40 PM

External Email

Please do NOT approve the wind farms...they are proving to be a poor choice across the planet...many have below projected energy levels, kill wildlife, destroy the natural beauty, and above all, they are not sustainable or renewable. These wind turbines are fossil fuel dependent. The only one who benefits from them are the companies that receive the subsidies, you tax hard earned dollars. Please don't pollute our future with these machines,

Patrice Tullai

PatriceTullai@gmail.com

From: [Bob Ruby](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:38:27 PM

External Email

To Whom it May Concern:

I don't like any of the options, I prefer none of this to happen, but, Option 4 as I see it is the only viable way for this project to get a hold. You can argue for what ever reason that progress needs to happen, and it will happen, but please there has to be a compromise.

There is not much more I can say as I would be talking to death ears, I feel.

The final decision with our governor whom doesn't live in the area anyway, will be for the additional income.

Robert Ruby
87728 Summit View Dr.
Kennewick, WA 99338

From: [Curtis Earl](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Wind Farm Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:45:29 PM

External Email

Hello,

I'm writing to support a modified Option 4 of the Horse Heaven Hills wind farm mitigation options (unless another option arises that were to recommend not moving forward with any part of this project). It appears Option 4 would have the least visual, recreational, and environmental impact of the options that may be presented.

However, we believe that additional turbines that may impact aerial firefighting should be removed from Option 4. We live south of I-82 in SW Kennewick and have seen how wildfires can have a scary impact to all of us in or near the Horse Heaven Hills.

Please take the local residents' concerns into account when discussing recommendations for this project. For what it's worth, the vast majority of us do not want this project to move forward at all.

Curtis Earl

From: [gayle graves](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:46:19 PM
Attachments: [2-20-24 signatures on petition against.numbers](#)
[2-20-2024 88 comments .numbers](#)

External Email

Attached is a petition that has 1,228 signatures against the wind turbine Scout project.

In addition is "comment data" of 38 comments that is associated with the petition attached.

Considering data from scientists , environmentalists and communities impacted by this culturally and environmentally negative impacting project this needs to be rejected.

The fire fighters and pilots latest testimony of the danger, not only he wildfires that are created by the turbines, but of lives and property. The firefighters and pilots won't be able to contain fires due to the location and height of turbines but will be unable to fight these fires.

I hope EFSEC and the Governor will make a risk-informed and data-supported decision regarding this project.

Respectfully,
Gayle Graves

From: [jean vanni](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:51:36 PM

External Email

Good day to all of you. I hope this finds you well and safe. This is my official comment regarding mitigation options

I am in support of Option #4 with an additional caveat that there be included the consideration of aerial and ground wildfire controls and removal of wind turbines in the farm project to accommodate these requirements. I have lived in Richland Wa since 1985 and have seen the result of wildfires.

I also believe all electrical power generated needs to remain in Washington state to serve its citizens. Preferably those in the Tri Cities area as we are the ones most disadvantaged by this action.

Sincerely, Jean Vanni.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [E Robb](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 4:03:24 PM

External Email

As residents of Kennewick, with the Horse Heaven Hills visible from our home, we are strongly opposed to the wind farm being proposed for the HHHs.

From what we understand from the four available options, we would choose Option 4.

Our first choice would still be to reject the project based on the significant issues previously identified by Tri-Cities CARES and others.

Respectfully,
Elver & Jeanne Robbins
16006 S Fairview Loop
Kennewick, WA 99338

From: [Kevin Self](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 4:39:57 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the only reasonable choice.

From: [RONALD G GEIGER](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 4:54:49 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the best option and firefighting needs to be address! Please do what is best. Please do what is best and looks like
Option 4 in my opinion is best.

Thank you
Eileen

From: [B.E. Beldin](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 5:05:32 PM

External Email

I totally support implementation of Option 4 for mitigation of this proposed project.

B. E. Beldin
469 Winesap Court
Richland, WA 99352

From: [Karen Brutzman](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 5:19:37 PM

External Email

Dear Committee,

As you approach your final recommendation, we want to thank you for taking into consideration the needs of the residents, wildlife, and cultural resources situated in the unique ecosystem of the Horse Heaven Hills. We have studied the 4 options that you released for public review and comment and believe that Option 4 will adequately address many of our concerns regarding wildlife, cultural resources, and fugitive dust. However, we are concerned that even Option 4 does not permit aerial firefighting to protect the homes, livestock, and businesses in our area.

We built our home in 2004 and we have witnessed many wildfires. The most terrifying for us occurred on Saturday, July 21, 2018. You can view photos of the fire and read comments about it here: <https://thenwfireblog.com/2018/07/21/final-update-benton-county-wa-locust-grove-fire/>

Here is a summary of the comments:

The fire was believed to have been started by farm equipment.

It was estimated to be about 10 acres at 1227 PDT and putting off a lot of smoke. Fire crews were working to gain access to the north but it was challenging due to terrain and fire conditions.

Level 1 evacuation orders were issued by Benton County Sheriff Office for homes south of Badger Road which are located on the south side of the fire.

Additional engines were en route to the fire as of 1324 hours PDT.

A dozer line was implemented around a good section of the fire as of 1441 hours PDT.

WA State Fire Mobile resources was approved around 1800 hours and two helicopters were inbound from Yakima and Ellensburg.

Around 2036 hours, the fire was under control and put out and in mop-up operations. A few engines stay overnight to monitor (fire watch) the area.

Locust Grove Road is surrounded on all sides by wheat fields. Had this wildfire reached the top of the canyon, it would have moved quickly through the wheat fields consuming homes, farm equipment, and livestock. I believe the use of helicopters to fight this fire saved our home!

I urge you to protect residents of Benton County by restricting the location of wind turbine placement. Those of us who have lived in the Horse Heaven Hills for decades should not have to rely on antiquated fire fighting methods when helicopters and other fire fighting aircraft can quickly extinguish the flames! If you cannot restrict the location of the wind turbines, please limit the height of the wind turbines (and associated structures) so that it does not interfere or endanger aerial firefighting and wildfire suppression efforts.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on this matter.
Keith and Karen Brutzman

--

Karen Brutzman
509-947-4143

From: [Chris Wright](#)
To: [Council on Community](#)
Subject: Comments on the Windfarm Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 5:45:10 PM

External Email

Good evening. As a long time West Richland resident I'm deeply concerned about impacts from the proposed HH Windfarm. While I believe the farm should not be approved, I recently was able to view maps of some of the proposed mitigation options being developed. I strongly urge the council to adopt Option 4, which I believe would help to mitigate the visual and environmental impacts of this deeply flawed project. I also urge the council to take additional action to mitigate the impacts to aerial firefighting in the area. Photo is from last summer's fires just west of the proposed project. I'd also note a 24 mile long energy project that only runs 25% of the time and generates 10 jobs is a really terrible idea. Thanks for your consideration.

Chris Wright
5502 Astoria Rd
West Richland WA



From: [Vicky Keller](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 5:55:25 PM

External Email

Because there is no way around having this wind project foisted upon my community, I respectfully request that EFSEC approve Option 4 of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. I also concur with all identified restrictions and specifications as outlined by the Tri-Cities CARES organization.

I pray that this committee will unanimously vote for Option 4.

Vicky Keller
Kennewick, WA

From: [manifestjkd](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 6:24:32 PM

External Email

Option 4 is the best and only acceptable option. Aerial firefighting accomidation is imperative and must also be part of this decision.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

From: [Kathy](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 6:28:15 PM

External Email

Dear EFSEC Council:

I just finished reading the summary of the EFSEC's "four Council Mitigation options" based on recognition of the significant negative impacts the project has on wildlife, cultural resources, and visual impacts, and I think Option 4 is the best and only choice for the Benton County endangered Ferruginous Hawk and my farm.

My farm is located within a couple miles of the proposed Horse Heaven Hills Wind and Solar Project. My farm makes up a series of parcels totaling 540 acres that includes watersheds and shrub steppe habitat for the endangered Ferruginous Hawk and other native species in Benton county. Five hundred acres of my land is now four years into a 15 year state and federal conservation contract to restore habitat for the endangered Ferruginous Hawk. The program, State Acres for Wildlife Enhancement (SAFE), restores vital habitat in order to meet high-priority state wildlife conservation goals. Option 4 is the best choice for my farm.

In addition to Option 4 the EFSEC needs to address the wildfire danger in Benton County and the ability of our Fire Districts to continue providing aerial firefighting services for my land and other Benton County property owners; otherwise all my efforts at hawk restoration could go up in smoke within minutes without this service.

Please consider option 4 and **additional turbines removed** to permit aerial firefighting and to address additional visual, wildlife and dust issues.

Respectfully,

Kathryn and Gordon Knutson
1333 Hains Avenue
Richland, WA 99354
509-713-6627

From: [Richard Carpenter](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 6:29:24 PM

External Email

I would like to express my opinion of the HHH wind turbines. I am totally against wind turbines in the Horse Heaven Hills but if it has to be then option 4 would be the the best option if necessary.

Thanks,
Richard Carpenter

From: [Jocelyn Peterman](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 6:34:43 PM

External Email

No windmills, period. The 4 options are not acceptable.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Chris wright](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on HH Windfarm Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 7:01:25 PM
Attachments: [image0.png](#)

External Email



What don't we see in this picture from last summer on Red Mountain. Wind Turbines?

Chris Wright
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 20, 2024, at 5:44 PM, Chris wright <cswakw@frontier.com> wrote:

Good evening. As a long time West Richland resident I'm deeply concerned about impacts from the proposed HH Windfarm. While I believe the farm should not be approved, I recently was able to view maps of some of the proposed mitigation options being developed. I strongly urge the council to adopt Option 4, which I believe would help to mitigate the visual and environmental impacts of this deeply flawed project. I also urge the council to take additional action to mitigate the impacts to aerial firefighting in the area. Photo is from last summer's fires just west of the proposed project.

I'd also note a 24 mile long energy project that only runs 25% of the time and generates 10 jobs is a really terrible idea.

Thanks for your consideration.

Chris Wright
5502 Astoria Rd
West Richland WA

<IMG_9916.jpeg>

From: [Chris wright](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on HH Windfarm Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 7:08:41 PM
Attachments: [IMG_1086.png](#)

External Email

Chris Wright
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 20, 2024, at 7:00 PM, Chris wright <cswakw@frontier.com> wrote:



What don't we see in this picture from last summer on Red Mountain. Wind Turbines?

Chris Wright
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 20, 2024, at 5:44 PM, Chris wright <cswakw@frontier.com> wrote:

Good evening. As a long time West Richland resident I'm deeply concerned about impacts from the proposed HH Windfarm. While I believe the farm should not be approved, I recently was able to view maps of some of the proposed mitigation options being developed. I strongly urge the council to adopt Option 4, which I believe would help to mitigate the visual and environmental impacts of this deeply flawed project. I also urge the council to take additional action to mitigate the impacts to aerial firefighting in the area. Photo is from last summer's fires just west of the proposed project. I'd also note a 24 mile long energy project that only runs 25% of the time and generates 10 jobs is a really terrible idea. Thanks for your consideration.

Chris Wright
5502 Astoria Rd
West Richland WA

6:59



Sean P. Sullivan | June 14th, 2023





res briefly bring smoke to other eastern

🔒 northwestwinereport.com

<IMG_9916.jpeg>

From: [Ira Johnson](#)
To: [EESEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 7:50:56 PM

External Email

To the council: if I had my way I would deny the installation of all wind turbines, solar panels. After reviewing all the choices plan 4 is only one vaguely acceptable. Sincerely Ira Johnson

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Greg Hanson](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 8:11:48 PM

External Email

To: EFSEC

Having lived in the Kennewick area for over 60 years, we are very concerned with the HHH Project. As such, Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative and that your organization must adequately address aerial firefighting.

Concerned citizens,

Greg Hanson and Nancy Hanson

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Lisa Wooley](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#); [Lisa Wooley](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 8:54:47 PM

External Email

To Whom It May Concern,

I live in West Richland, near the border of Benton City. My home faces the Horse Heaven Hills. My family and I enjoy our view as well as a wide variety of animals and birds that live in this area.

I have had an opportunity to review the four options you are considering. My first choice would be leave the area as it is, but as that is not an option you are considering, I instead support Option 4 - but only with additional turbines removed to permit aerial firefighting and to address additional visual, wildlife and fugitive dust issues.

Please put the welfare of our wildlife and our local area first and recommend Option 4 but with a reduction in turbines.

Thank you very much,

Lisa

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Lorraine Pedersen](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Saturday, January 20, 2024 10:31:21 PM

External Email

I am writing on behalf of the Mitigation Options.

I believe that Option 4 is the best option offered and wholly support it. But the subject of aerial firefighting still needs to be addressed - this is a very valid concern and must be provided for.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Lorraine Pedersen
Lake Stevens, WA

From: [Enrique Rosas](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Sunday, January 21, 2024 12:22:27 AM

External Email

To who it may concern

My name is Enrique Rosas. I Live in Kennewick, Washington. And I've been a resident of the state of Washington from the time I was 14 years old, I am now 28.

I'm a local business owner. As well as A Member of the benton Franklin historical society, The Coyote Canyon mammoth dig site. &. The Lakeside Gem & mineral club. I also volunteer for the church of Jesus Christ of latter-day Saints.

In April 2023 I spoke at the first City Hall meeting of that month in hopes to bring attention to the needs of the community. Specifically, the protection of cultural and historical artifacts, both natural and historically significant. Tri-Cities was one of the last segregated cities to be made in the US and used with it, the development of Hanford, which was pivotal for the end of the World War II. I do not want to dimension or discriminate against crimes of predecessors.

I am not one to judge.

However, I do believe that the volunteers and the work that the mammoth dig site as well as the protection any significant information and historical artifacts that come out of the area should be protected. And part of that is advocating for the immediate removal of the windmills. I understand that there is a lot of land that wants to be developed into an energy farm.

But why should people in our area have to support the destruction of our history our culture?

Ancient native burial sites, and endangered species.

I have spoken to tribal leaders in both the Wanapum Yakima and Umatilla tribes. I believe that option number four is the best way to move forward. If that's what you wish to do.

However.

I will spend every waking moment. Relaying information to tribal leaders as I will be representing. The lake side, gem and mineral club. 5013c

Coyote Canyon mammoth dig site. 5013c.

And I will advocate for all the tribal leaders in a place where you don't want to acknowledge them.

I am not afraid to stand up to people in power I have months of public speaking experience for advocating for what I believe in because what I believe in is the best for the community, regardless of their interest and knowledge about the subject

Should for whatever reason you overlook this email I will make sure I am present at the

hearing in Olympia with kind regards.

Enrique Rosas

01/21/2024

From: [Karen Elliott](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on HHH Council Mitigation Options
Date: Sunday, January 21, 2024 8:04:49 AM

External Email

Option 4 is the only acceptable alternative and that they must adequately address aerial firefighting. Please think about what you are doing and how it affects our communities.

Karen Elliott

Sent from my iPhone