

Final Environmental Impact Statement

Horse Heaven Wind Farm

Chapter 10 - Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS

October 2023

Table of Contents

10.0	CHAPTER 10 – COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT EIS	10-1
10.1	Introduction	10-1
10.2	Public Participation	10-1
10.3	Comments Received	10-1
10.4	The Comment Response Process	10-1
10.5	Summary Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIS	10-2
10.5.1	Summary Response 1: Project Background and the Need for the Project	10-2
10.5.1.1	Comments	10-2
10.5.1.2	Response	10-3
10.5.2	Summary Response 2: Proposed Action and Alternatives	10-3
10.5.2.1	Comments	10-3
10.5.2.2	Response	10-3
10.5.3	Summary Response 3: Project and Process Opposition	10-4
10.5.3.1	Response	10-4
10.5.4	Summary Response 4: Earth Resources	10-5
10.5.4.1	Comments	10-5
10.5.4.2	Response	10-5
10.5.5	Summary Response 5: Air Quality	10-5
10.5.5.1	Comments	10-5
10.5.5.2	Response	10-5
10.5.6	Summary Response 6: Water Resources	10-6
10.5.6.1	Comments	10-6
10.5.6.2	Response	10-7
10.5.7	Summary Response 7: Vegetation	10-7
10.5.7.1	Comments	10-7
10.5.7.2	Response	10-8
10.5.8	Summary Response 8: Wildlife and Habitat	10-8
10.5.8.1	Comments	10-8

10.5.8.2	Response	10-9
10.5.9	Summary Response 9: Energy and Natural Resources	10-11
10.5.9.1	Comments	10-11
10.5.9.2	Response	10-11
10.5.10	Summary Response 10: Land and Shoreline Use	10-11
10.5.10.1	Comments	10-11
10.5.10.2	Response	10-12
10.5.11	Summary Response 11: Historic and Cultural Resources	10-12
10.5.11.1	Comments	10-12
10.5.11.2	Response	10-13
10.5.12	Summary Response 12: Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	10-13
10.5.12.1	Comments	10-13
10.5.12.2	Response	10-15
10.5.13	Summary Response 13: Noise and Vibration	10-16
10.5.13.1	Comments	10-16
10.5.13.2	Response	10-17
10.5.14	Summary Response 14: Recreation	10-17
10.5.14.1	Comments	10-17
10.5.14.2	Response	10-18
10.5.15	Summary Response 15: Public Health and Safety	10-18
10.5.15.1	Comments	10-18
10.5.15.2	Response	10-18
10.5.16	Summary Response 16: Transportation	10-19
10.5.16.1	Comments	10-19
10.5.16.2	Response	10-20
10.5.17	Summary Response 17: Public Services and Utilities	10-20
10.5.17.1	Comments	10-20
10.5.17.2	Response	10-21
10.5.18	Summary Response 18: Socioeconomics	10-21
10.5.18.1	Comments	10-21

10.5.18.2 Response10-21

10.5.19 Summary Response 19: Cumulative Effects10-22

10.5.19.1 Comments.....10-22

10.5.19.2 Response10-23

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 10-1

Draft EIS Comment and Response Tables

10.0 CHAPTER 10 – COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT EIS

10.1 Introduction

The Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) sought comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) from members of the public, regulatory agencies, and other stakeholders. The Draft EIS was made available for review and comment to all interested parties and was posted to the publicly accessible EFSEC website:

(<https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa>). The official comment period for the Draft EIS was 45 days: from December 19, 2022, through February 1, 2023.

This chapter describes the process by which comments were reviewed, categorized, and evaluated. It includes a set of consolidated responses that address key issues raised during the comment period. Where necessary, the Draft EIS was revised based on the comments received during the official comment period.

10.2 Public Participation

A public hearing on the Draft EIS was held virtually on February 1, 2023. The event was attended by members of the public, representatives of governmental agencies and tribes, nongovernmental organizations, private individuals, and representatives of Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (the Applicant). In total, approximately 74 people provided verbal comments at the public meeting. All verbal comments¹, individual website comments, comment emails, letters, and postcards (referred to as “comment submittals”) are provided for review in the meeting transcripts. The meeting transcripts and comments are available for review on the publicly accessible EFSEC website: (<https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa>).

10.3 Comments Received

EFSEC accepted comments on the Draft EIS during the public commenting period in the following ways:

- Through a dedicated comment website
- Orally or in writing at the public meeting
- By email to EFSEC staff
- By mail or direct delivery to EFSEC staff

More than 2,200 comment submittals were received from individuals, agencies, and organizations. Collectively, the groups are referred to herein as the Commenters. Each comment submittal was logged upon receipt and placed in the Project’s administrative record with a unique identification number.

10.4 The Comment Response Process

EFSEC received comments on the Draft EIS that were often focused on a single issue; however, several commenters submitted comments expressing multiple concerns on a number of issues. Individual substantive comments within each submittal were identified in the comment database. A comment was characterized as substantive if it did one or more of the following:

- Questioned the accuracy of information in the Draft EIS

¹ A court reporter transcribed verbal comments presented at the public hearing on the Draft EIS.

- Questioned the adequacy of, or the methodology and assumptions used for, the environmental analysis
- Questioned Project details and/or the regulatory process
- Suggested new information relevant to the analysis
- Offered reasonable alternatives other than those analyzed in the Draft EIS
- Recommended changes or revisions to one or more of the alternatives
- Suggested use of additional or alternative documents, studies, and methods of analyses
- Suggested additional analyses of topics or issues not covered in the Draft EIS
- Requested EFSEC or the Applicant to undertake something (e.g., collect additional information)

Comments that did not fall into these categories were not considered relevant for the environmental analysis. These non-substantive comments were characterized by one or more of the following:

- General comments in favor of or against the Project
- Comments not pertaining to the Project or the areas that could be affected by the Project (such as expounding the benefits of nuclear power)
- Comments that took the form of vague, open-ended, or unrelated questions or opinions

This process resulted in the identification of approximately 1,217 individual substantive comments. All substantive comments were assigned to a resource category or issue category so similar comments could be grouped together and addressed by the appropriate resource specialist and agency staff. A comment-response table (**Tables 10-1A and 10-1B, Appendix 10-1**) was developed to include each substantive comment, its assigned category or resource topic, and a response. Additionally, **Appendix 10-1** identifies the comments that resulted in changes to the EIS and provides where the updates occur within the document.

10.5 Summary Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIS

After all substantive comments were identified and sorted, common issues were identified for summary responses. Summary responses are provided in the following subsections to address multiple related issues and provide context for the discussion.

10.5.1 Summary Response 1: Project Background and the Need for the Project

10.5.1.1 Comments

Several Commenters questioned or criticized the Project's stated Purpose and Need, expressing the following concerns:

- Commenters questioned the need for the energy that would be generated by the Project, where the energy would be used, and why the Applicant chose the Horse Heaven Hills for the Project's location.
- Comments indicated that Commenters felt that the Purpose and Need are not regionally/locally focused enough to help the public understand the need for the Project.
- Commenters raised concerns that the current Purpose and Need only caters to the Applicant's goal of meeting a nameplate capacity.

10.5.1.2 Response

EFSEC acknowledges the comments regarding the Project's need and has updated Section 1.3 to reflect the Applicant's purpose and need in developing the Project. Section 1.3 has also been updated to reflect EFSEC's purpose and need in developing the EIS.

Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50.010, as follows, guides how EFSEC evaluates the need for additional energy generation in the State of Washington:

"it is the policy of the State of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities and to ensure, through available and reasonable methods, that the location and operation of all energy facilities and certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities produce minimal adverse effects on the welfare of the population and environment, including the ecology of the land and its wildlife, and of state waters and their aquatic life (RCW 80.50.010)"

10.5.2 Summary Response 2: Proposed Action and Alternatives

10.5.2.1 Comments

Multiple Commenters requested that the EIS consider and evaluate additional alternatives to the proposed Project. Specifically, comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters suggested that the Project should reduce the number of turbines and increase the number of solar arrays to achieve the required nameplate capacity.
- Commenters suggested that the Project should be located outside Benton County. Additionally, the Project should consider other locations for the wind turbines whether inside the Lease Boundary or another area entirely.
- Comments expressed concern that the Draft EIS lacked specificity about where exactly the Applicant would place wind turbines within the Lease Boundary.
- Commenters suggested that the Draft EIS needs to include a range of reasonable alternatives rather than just No Project and Proposed Project.
- Commenters suggested the Project could be improved by the following changes:
 - Consider wind turbines that are shorter in height and do not have blinking lights.
 - Consider an alternative with a drastically smaller number of turbines or a shifted site location.

10.5.2.2 Response

The discussion of alternatives has been expanded in the Final EIS to explain the methodology of analyzing the Project as a whole. As the Proposed Action involves "a private project on a specific site," the agency (in this case, EFSEC), per WAC 197-11-440(5)(d), is only required to consider a no-action alternative and reasonable on-site alternatives that achieve the proposal's objective. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows consideration of the most probable worst-case scenario, while also providing the impacts at the component level.

This methodology allows EFSEC to identify components that have higher impact than others. EFSEC has the authority to recommend approval or denial of components of the Project to serve the purposes of RCW 80.50. Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of multiple design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.

10.5.3 Summary Response 3: Project and Process Opposition

Comments expressing opposition to the Draft EIS focused on the issues listed below:

Concerns Regarding EIS Methodology

- Commenters expressed concerns regarding EIS formatting, quality control, and copy/paste text from Applicant-prepared technical studies rather than EFSEC/third-party technical studies.

Concerns Regarding Application of Mitigation Measures

- Commenters expressed concerns about the Applicant being held accountable for implementing the mitigation measures.

Concerns Regarding Public Participation in the EIS Process

- A Commenter stated, “The DRAFT EIS needs to be reprocessed to include proper public process, an analysis of a reasonable alternative and an additional public comment period to allow review and comment on the reasonable alternative to be compliant with state law.”
- Commenters expressed concern about the public’s ability to review the Draft EIS within the allotted timeframe.
- Commenters were concerned that consideration and approval of the Project is going straight to EFSEC and bypassing the land use approval of local counties and cities.
- There were concerns that a public hearing was not held, and there was insufficient notification for locals.
- A Commenter stated, “A key local library was not included on the posting list, and other local libraries were not made aware of the Project.”

Concerns Related to Clean Energy

- Commenters were concerned about turbines’ wind-generating consistency and low energy output.
- Commenters expressed concerns regarding the 20- to 30-year lifespan of turbines, including impacts of decommissioning and lack of deconstruction afterward.
- Comments from Commenters suggested that the fuel used to deliver parts and the oil used to maintain the turbines would make this not a carbon-free project or a green project.
- Commenters were concerned that the generated energy would be transported to western Washington or out of state rather than being used, or needed, locally.

10.5.3.1 Response

EFSEC would list all mitigation measures that the Applicant must adhere to within the Site Certification Agreement (SCA). EFSEC and the Project’s Pre-operational Technical Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Committee would be responsible for reviewing whether the Applicant meets the Project’s commitments and required mitigation measures and providing any additional recommendations to the Council for enforcement.

EFSEC’s responsibilities are listed in RCW 80.50. The legislature cited the necessity of balancing the need for new energy facilities with the broad interests of the public. As part of the balancing process, EFSEC must take into account the protection of environmental quality, safety of energy facilities, and concern for energy availability.

10.5.4 Summary Response 4: Earth Resources

10.5.4.1 Comments

Comments were received regarding the Draft EIS's assessment of proposed earthwork. The comments covered the following topics:

- Comments suggested that the Draft EIS didn't provide due consideration of the rich cultural, geological, and natural histories of the Horse Heaven Hills.
- Commenters' comments expressed concern that construction in exposed areas with highly erodible soils would result in dust storms, reduced agricultural productivity through soil loss, and landslides.

10.5.4.2 Response

The EIS includes a comprehensive list of Applicant commitments and EFSEC-developed mitigation measures that address the geological impacts of the Project.

EFSEC has revised mitigation measure Geo-1, which now reads:

Minimize soil disturbance activities with the potential for soil compaction when soils are saturated, such as following a major precipitation event. Direct construction away from areas with saturated soils and where drainage may concentrate until soils are no longer saturated and limit vehicular traffic to established access roads. Where possible, leave existing vegetation root structure intact to enhance soil stability and infiltration capacity. Where necessary, utilize BMPs such as low-ground pressure and/or long-reach equipment, temporary matting and work pads, and localized engineered drainage improvements. Where soil compaction is observed to have occurred, de-compact subsoils to a minimum depth of 18 inches or as identified in site reclamation plans and lease agreements.

10.5.5 Summary Response 5: Air Quality

10.5.5.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's assessment of air quality impacts. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters raised concerns regarding the Project's potential overall carbon footprint and corresponding impacts on both global climate change and the area's microclimate.
- Commenters raised concerns regarding the potential creation of fugitive dust emissions, corresponding impacts on air quality, and mitigation measures proposed to address these impacts.
- Commenters raised concerns regarding ambient particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}), and regional ozone levels; the lack of dispersion modeling to address these impacts; and the location of the meteorological data used in the analysis.

10.5.5.2 Response

The following responses address the substantive comments on the Draft EIS's analysis on air quality:

- The EIS now includes a specific discussion of carbon footprint and potential global climate change impacts. The new information about the Project and global climate change is presented in Section 4.3.2.5. The

analysis presented in Section 4.3.2.5 concludes that the Project is anticipated to have a negligible to net positive impact on global climate change.

- Regarding the potential for fugitive dust emissions and associated impacts, the EIS includes a comprehensive set of calculations for emissions expected during both construction and operation that were independently checked and verified by EFSEC. These calculations were supplemented with EFSEC-developed fugitive dust emissions from exposed surfaces that were omitted from the Applicant's original analysis. The calculations are summarized in Appendix 4.3-1.
- Tables 4.3-4 and 4.3-7 demonstrate that the Project's overall contribution to regional PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions would be very small relative to the overall quantity of such emissions regionally. As a result, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions impacts are not expected to be significant. A comprehensive set of fugitive dust best management practices has been proposed by the Applicant to address potential fugitive dust. In addition, EFSEC is proposing that vehicle speeds on unpaved construction roads and exposed surfaces be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph) (rather than the Applicant-proposed 25 mph limit) to further reduce the potential for fugitive dust to be generated by offroad construction-related vehicle traffic.
- A supplemental dispersion modeling analysis of stationary sources during the Construction Stage (concrete batch plant and diesel generators) was performed by the Applicant and independently reviewed by EFSEC (see Appendix 4.3-2). The dispersion modeling used meteorological data from the closest station collecting the necessary data to support the modeling, and the selection of that meteorological data set is consistent with the Washington State Department of Ecology's recommendations. The dispersion modeling demonstrates that construction impacts from the Project would not cause an exceedance of any applicable ambient air quality standards. Regional ozone modeling was not performed because the Project's expected emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds) are an extremely small percentage of the regional emission inventory and would be temporary. As a result, the Project's impacts on regional ozone levels are expected to be negligible.

10.5.6 Summary Response 6: Water Resources

10.5.6.1 Comments

Commenters submitted comments expressing concerns regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of water resources. The comments covered the following topics:

Concerns about the Project's Acquisition of Water and Water Use

- Several comments from Commenters questioned where Project water would be sourced from and raised concerns that the Project would impact local water sources.
- One Commenter's comment questioned how the Project would dispose of wastewater.
- Several comments indicated a concern with the volume of water needed for construction and panel washing.

Concerns Regarding the Project's Impacts on Surface Waters

- Commenters expressed concern regarding potential contamination of water resources from oil leaks during operation.
- Commenters expressed concern regarding potential Project impacts on adjacent watercourses such as the Columbia and Yakima Rivers.

- A Commenter's comment suggested that a wetland identified in Project mapping was not addressed in the EIS.

10.5.6.2 Response

Within the Final EIS, the City of Kennewick was removed as the Project's water supplier. As noted in the 2022 ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as a public utility, private irrigator, or well with legal water rights. The water would be transported to the site by truck for use during construction and operation.

In response to concerns from Commenters regarding water management, the following details have been incorporated into the EIS:

- Project construction is estimated to require up to 120 million gallons of water.
- Project operation is estimated to require 5,000 gallons per day for facilities and 2,025,000 gallons annually for solar panel washing.
- The Project would not discharge wastewater to waterbodies. Wastewater would be discharged to an on-site septic system during operation, as described in the ASC.
- The on-site septic system would be permitted and installed according to Washington's Wastewater General Permit Program and Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State.

The following responses were provided to comments regarding potential impacts of the Project on water resources:

- The Applicant committed to developing a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan for construction and operation, which would apply to potential oil leaks and spills from turbines during construction and operation.
- In response to concerns regarding impacts on watercourses, drainages within the Lease Boundary are intermittent and ephemeral; as such, they are not expected to result in changes to downstream systems beyond the Lease Boundary.
- One wetland was identified within the Project Lease Boundary, 240 feet west of the Micrositing Corridor. This distance is greater than the required buffer distance of 40 feet by Benton County.

10.5.7 Summary Response 7: Vegetation

10.5.7.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of vegetation. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters raised the following concerns regarding priority habitat including native shrub-steppe:
 - Concern about how Priority Habitats were identified and loss was calculated within the Lease Boundary and Vegetation Area of Assessment (VAA)
 - Concern about the selection of offset ratios and success of restoration and offsetting of priority habitats
 - Concern regarding the characterization of impacts on Priority Habitats
 - Concern regarding the cumulative impacts on shrub-steppe Priority Habitat in the area

- Commenters submitted comments on the potential for vegetation left under the solar arrays to create a fire hazard.
- Commenters raised concerns regarding the introduction and proliferation of invasive plant species.

10.5.7.2 Response

The following are responses to comments on how Priority Habitats were identified, loss calculation, and mitigation:

- The Project has been designed to avoid impacts on native vegetation where possible; however, some loss of Priority Habitats is expected. Habitat in the VAA was mapped using the National Land Cover Database to provide a regional context for the habitat within the Lease Boundary. This allowed for an analysis of the proportional area of shrubland and grassland habitat in the region that the Project may impact.
- A wetland was identified within the Lease Boundary, but the Project's infrastructure would be more than 240 feet away, greater than Benton County's 40-foot required buffer.
- The loss estimates provided in the EIS represent the maximum allowable impact on these habitats if the Project is provided an SCA. The EIS describes mitigation measures to reduce impacts on Priority Habitat, including recommended habitat-offsetting ratios that were developed based on measures described in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW's) Wind Power Guidelines and consultation with WDFW. Restored and mitigated habitat would be monitored after installation to measure establishment success. As detailed in the responses to comments provided in **Appendix 10-1**, post-construction monitoring of restored and offset habitat would be required to demonstrate that those habitats are functioning as predicted. If success criteria are not met, the Applicant would be required to provide additional mitigation.

The following is a response to public comments concerning fire hazards:

- Mitigation measure VEG-9 was updated in the EIS to address concerns regarding the potential fire hazard associated with buildup of dead vegetation and potential vegetation removal that may be required along fence lines.

The following is a response to public comments concerning the potential introduction and proliferation of invasive plant species:

- The Project's Revegetation and Noxious Weed Control Plan is designed to avoid introduction of new invasive plants and reduce proliferation of invasive plants.
- As noted in Section 3.5, invasive plants are already present within the Lease Boundary as most of the native habitats in the Lease Boundary have been impacted by introduced plants related to prior land use.

10.5.8 Summary Response 8: Wildlife and Habitat

10.5.8.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of wildlife and habitat. The comments covered the following topics:

Concerns Regarding the Quantification of Impacts on Wildlife and Habitat

- Commenters expressed concern that the Draft EIS does not sufficiently address potential impacts on nocturnally migrating birds.

- Commenters submitted comments regarding the language and numeric values presented to quantify the potential bird and bat mortality. Amongst these comments was the suggestion that the EIS should provide an estimate of mortality.
- Commenters submitted comments on the species for which species exposure indices were calculated.

Concerns Regarding the Process for Siting Project Components in Relationship to Wildlife and Habitat

- Commenters expressed concerns on the impact of the East Solar Field in Priority Habitat and modeled wildlife movement corridors.
- Commenters raised concerns regarding the impact of potentially siting turbines within 2 miles of a ferruginous hawk nest and direct/indirect habitat loss for turbines sited within 6 miles of a nest.
- Commenters raised concerns regarding impacts on special status species.
- Related comments expressed concerns on the extent to which the EIS discussed potential impacts on special status species, including ferruginous hawk, burrowing owl, prairie falcon, sagebrush sparrow, Townsend's ground squirrel, and pronghorn antelope.
- Commenters provided comments requesting clarification on data and information presented in tables.

Concerns Regarding the Deployment of Mitigation Measures

- Comments were provided regarding the sufficiency of mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIS to manage bat and bat mortality. Comments included recommendations to use best available technology to evaluate the magnitude of impacts during Project operation, as well as the effectiveness of mitigation.
- Commenters provided comments on the effectiveness of mitigation measures and suggested the inclusion of performance standards to test mitigation effectiveness.
- Commenters' concerns included the level of authority a Technical Advisory Committee, assigned by the Applicant, would have to make decisions on project mitigation and adaptive management strategies.

Concerns Regarding the Characterization of Residual Effects

- Commenters provided comments indicating that the Draft EIS's characterization of residual impacts underrepresented the level of effect.
- Commenters suggested that ratings of impact magnitude, duration, and extent should be increased.

10.5.8.2 Response

The following responses address substantive comments on wildlife and habitat:

- In general, summary comments are addressed in the Final EIS by updating sections with clarifying language to provide additional details and specificity regarding impacts and mitigation.
- Additional qualitative analysis of potential impacts on migrating birds, including nocturnal migrants, was added to Section 4.6.2.2.
- Quantitative details estimating the potential number of bat fatalities per year were added to Section 4.6.2.2.

- Responses were provided to clarify how species-specific indices were calculated and the rationale for calculations of indirect habitat loss.
- Details on siting of Project components provided by the Applicant were added to Section 4.6 of the Final EIS to further describe how the Project may interact with wildlife movement corridors.

The following provides additional information about the application of mitigation measures:

- Responses were further provided to explain how recommended mitigation measures would manage potential impacts wildlife corridors.
- Responses were provided in **Appendix 10-1** explaining how mitigation measures specific to ferruginous hawk (Spec-5) have been developed to manage impacts on ferruginous hawk habitat if the approved final design includes siting features within 2 miles of a ferruginous hawk nest.
- Section 4.6.2.4 was updated with additional analysis and details about potential Project-related impacts.
- Each species section was updated with information on potential interactions with solar arrays and other ancillary infrastructure where not previously included.
- The analysis of impacts on burrowing owls was updated with additional details on the potential interaction with wind turbines, including literature published on the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area.
- Information about the Project's potential interaction with modeled habitat concentration areas was added to the Townsend's ground squirrel section.

The following responses address Commenters' concerns about how mitigation measures would be applied by the Applicant and verified by EFSEC:

- Recommended mitigation measures Wild-1, Wild-5, Hab-1, Hab-4, Hab-5, Spec-2, Spec-5, and Spec-12 were updated in response to Commenters' concerns.
- Wild-1 was updated to clarify the type of data to be collected as part of the post-construction bird and bat fatality program, the duration of the program, recommended bat mortality thresholds, and examples of adaptive management that may be implemented during Project operation.
- Wild-5 and Hab-1 were updated to clarify management of exclusion zones around sensitive habitat and modeled movement corridors, respectively.
- Hab-4 was updated to require the establishment of a Pre-operational Technical Advisory Group and, subsequently, a Technical Advisory Committee during Project operation.
- Additional details were added to Hab-4 to clarify the groups that may be included in the committees.
- Finally, more specificity was added to Spec-5 and Spec-12 to clarify how mitigation may be implemented.

Responses were provided to comments from the public regarding the characteristics of residual impacts to provide additional details on how the characterizations were made.

10.5.9 Summary Response 9: Energy and Natural Resources

10.5.9.1 Comments

Comments were received regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of energy and natural resources. The following comments suggest concerns regarding the replacement of existing power sources:

- Commenters expressed concern the Project would not offset carbon dioxide emissions.
- Commenters suggested that the EIS list all subsidies, tax credits, emissions credits, and similar to allow a cost comparison of the proposed project's power generation against existing generation sources.
- Commenters were concerned that the Draft EIS does not adequately analyze the impact a wind farm may have on slowing down the wind as it moves through the Project area.

The following comments suggested concerns regarding the recyclability of turbine blades and other Project components:

- Commenters are concerned that the wind turbines would not be recyclable and instead be placed in landfills reducing the capacity for municipal solid waste.
- Commenters raised concerns that wind energy is not "green" when considering the full lifecycle of turbines and the material inputs for the foundations.
- Commenters expressed concerns that wind turbines are not economically viable.

10.5.9.2 Response

EFSEC's responsibilities are listed in RCW 80.50. The legislature cited the necessity of balancing the need for new energy facilities with the broad interests of the public. As part of the balancing process, EFSEC must take into account protection of environmental quality, the safety of energy facilities, and concern for energy availability.

The final version of the EIS does not include an evaluation of "wind blockage effect." Under SEPA, the analysis of impacts is related to the natural and built environment and not wind turbine performance.

Section 4.7 includes recommended mitigation measures (e.g., ENR-7) that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's Operation Stage, such as recycling all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.

10.5.10 Summary Response 10: Land and Shoreline Use

10.5.10.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of land and shoreline use. The following describes the Commenters' comments and concerns about the use of agricultural lands for the Project:

- Commenters raised concerns that the Project would impact dryland agricultural lands and that the farms in the Horse Heaven Hills would no longer produce their historical crop yields.
- Commenters expressed concerns the Project would result in the conversion of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance without disclosing the environmental impacts of the conversion. Similarly, Commenters expressed concerns that the conversion of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance would have a high cumulative impact.

- Comments stated that proposed mitigation measures are inadequate to appropriately mitigate the environmental impacts of conversion of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance.

The following describes the Commenters' comments about the Project's conformity with land use plans and zoning:

- The Project would cause increased urban sprawl or prevent future housing developments.
- The Project location does not conform to the Benton County Comprehensive Plan
- The Project location violates the Benton County Land Use Code.

The following describes the Commenters' concerns regarding the Project's decommissioning and land restoration:

- Land restoration after turbine use has not been documented.

10.5.10.2 Response

Section 4.8 discusses the Project's impacts on agricultural lands and agricultural productivity. Section 4.8 also includes a list of mitigation measures (LSU-1 through LSU-5) that would protect agricultural activities through construction, operation, and decommissioning. Mitigation measure LSU-5 requires a Detailed Site Restoration Plan, per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 463-72-050, for restoring the site to its preconstruction character.

Micrositing of the Project would be used to avoid and minimize disruptions to existing cropland. Additionally, the Project would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements with participating landowners.

For aspects of the Project's design that may not be in alignment with Benton County Code 11.17 Growth Management Act Agricultural District or the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC has reviewed discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.

10.5.11 Summary Response 11: Historic and Cultural Resources

10.5.11.1 Comments

Comments were received from Tribal governments, members of the public, agencies, and organizations regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of historic and cultural resources. The following revisions to the EIS were requested regarding the method of analysis for historic and cultural resources:

- Commenters requested justification on why a cultural briefing is not done before permitting.
- Commenters requested the EIS Include the Yakama Tribe in the Tribal Governments Distribution List as well as any historical and cultural discussions and activities.
- Commenters requested an explanation of how commitments to monitoring would be maintained and resources protected.
- Commenters requested that the EIS be revised based on inputs and corrections from the Yakama Nation.

10.5.11.2 Response

The following responses address concerns about the method of analysis for historical and cultural resources:

- The Applicant has committed to conducting cultural briefings. The briefing is part of the Project siting process. Additionally, briefings would occur prior to any impacts from the Proposed Action.
- The Applicant has committed to pursuing an Archaeological Excavation and Removal Permit if any alteration of any precontact archaeological site were to occur, regardless of the level of disturbance. For historic-era archaeological sites, the Applicant would apply for permits related to any removal or excavation of those locations that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places."
- Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation is listed in the middle of the first column of the Tribal Government distribution list.
- Tribal representatives would be invited to monitor the site during construction. Recorded historic and cultural resources would be avoided through modification of Project design and through buffers and protective signage or flagging, as well as monitoring, as appropriate.
- Implementation of commitments would be ensured through cultural resource worker education/training, the Preconstruction Survey and Cultural Resource Avoidance Plan, and an Inadvertent Discovery Plan for Archaeological Resources during Construction.
- The Applicant Commitments could be clarified to state that monitoring would be conducted by qualified professional archaeologists.
- EFSEC has initiated and would continue government-to-government consultation with Tribes. The final version of the EIS clarifies when formal consultation was initiated and distinguishes formal consultation from all other communication and engagement with Tribes. The EIS reports the information shared during formal consultation.
- Factual errors and inconsistencies identified have been corrected in the EIS. The EIS reflects concerns about avoidance, impact ratings, proposed mitigation measures, compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), impacts to Treaty-reserved rights, and impacts to Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) and the traditionally important landscape.
- Because of confidentiality, the EIS cannot disclose the locations of cultural resources, such as archaeological sites and TCPs.

10.5.12 Summary Response 12: Visual Aspects, Light and Glare

10.5.12.1 Comments

Comments were received regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of visual aspects, light and glare. The comments cover the following topics:

Visual Aspects

Commenters expressed concerns regarding the method of analysis used in the Draft EIS for visual aspects:

- Include additional viewpoints (key observation points [KOPs]) and visual simulations in the analysis, such as closer and less obstructed views from Benton City and Interstate 82.

- Update visual simulations to remove atmospheric hazing to more clearly depict the Project during ideal viewing conditions.
- Revise and update viewshed mapping out to 25 miles for the two wind turbine options, based on the Clean Energy States Alliance visual methods, and include additional placenames and locational data on the maps to improve legibility.

Commenters expressed the following concerns and requests regarding the determination of impact magnitude for visual aspects:

- Increase impact magnitude based on the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.
- The analysis does not meet the requirements of the Benton County Comprehensive Plan and/or WAC 463-60-362(3).

Commenters expressed the following concerns and requests about the application of recommended mitigation measures:

- Modify the Project design to reduce visual impacts, including a suggestion from a large number of Commenters that some or all of the proposed wind turbines to be located on the Horse Heaven Hills be removed to reduce impacts on the landscape and views from the communities north of the Project. This would expand on mitigation measure VIS-1 which focused on wind turbines located within ½ mile of residences.
- The language of some mitigation measures was modified in the EIS. Such as mitigation measure VIS-1 to relocate wind turbines within a smaller buffer from residences, and others removed altogether including mitigation measure VIS-4 as being impractical and unnecessary.
- A Commenter specifically questioned the accuracy of the finding of unavoidable, significant adverse impacts on visual aspects.

Light and Glare

Commenters expressed the following concerns and requests regarding the evaluation of light and glare:

Commenters raised concerns about shadow flicker affecting neighboring residents. Additionally, Commenters were concerned about the adequacy and clarity of the proposed complaint resolution system in regard to shadow flicker complaints.

- Commenters questioned the applicability of mitigation measure SF-1 and suggested that it be updated to clarify that it would apply to non-participant receptors.
- Commenters requested that the EIS text be updated to clarify that the complaint resolution system would encompass all complaints—there would not be separate systems and points of contact for different potential impacts (e.g., noise, lighting, shadow flicker, etc.).
- Commenters expressed general concerns about light pollution from the Project.
- Commenters recommended the use of Aircraft Detection Lighting System (ADLS) to limit the flashing Federal Aviation Administration lighting.

10.5.12.2 Response

Visual Aspects

The following responses address concerns about the method of analysis for visual aspects:

- The EIS was updated to include the addition of three new KOPs to further assess views from Benton City, Interstate 82, and the Wallula Gap (as viewed from U.S. Highway 730/12 in Washington State) with accompanying visual simulations depicting the Project.
- Visual simulations developed from KOPs 3, 5, 6, and 7 in the Draft EIS were updated to reduce the effect of atmospheric conditions to best depict visibility of the Project under exceptionally clear atmospheric conditions.
- The wind turbine viewshed maps were updated to look out 25 miles, as was also done in Appendix 3.10-2, as well as to include additional placenames and locational data to more clearly depict these data for the reader.

The following responses address concerns about the determination of impact magnitude for visual aspects:

- No changes were made to impact magnitude as the analysis already indicated high, long-term, unavoidable, regional impacts associated with both wind turbine options and the comprehensive Project as viewed from most viewpoints within 5 miles of the Project.
- The Project and associated analysis meet the requirements of WAC 463-60-362(3); therefore, no changes were made to the EIS. Similarly, the analysis and determination of conformance with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, associated with potential visual impacts on landscapes identified in the plan, were reviewed. No changes to the analysis were found to be required as these lands have not been placed into Open Space Conservation or other types of conservation, and since there are no specific policies to protect the landscapes impacted by the Project, the Project would be in compliance with this aspect of the county plan.

The following responses address concerns about the application of recommended mitigation measures:

- Based on the analysis within the EIS considering full build-out of the Project, no changes to the impact magnitudes can be made until the Project design or turbine locations are revised by the Applicant or as required by EFSEC.
- Commenters suggested narrowing the scope of mitigation measure VIS-1 regarding relocating turbines within the foreground distance zone (0 to 0.5 miles), but based on previous, similar projects using a similar distance threshold, no change was made to the analysis.
- Mitigation measure VIS-5 presented in the Draft EIS was established to reduce impacts on views resulting from visibility of the proposed solar panels. This mitigation measure was renamed in the Final EIS as VIS-4. The mitigation measure was updated in the Final EIS to reflect its intended use which is within 0.5 miles of Project-specific KOPs and residences.
- Mitigation measure VIS-4 from the DEIS was removed as it was found to be technologically limited, and the revised VIS-5 would more directly reduce impacts on adjacent views resulting from the installation of solar panels and associated infrastructure. All visual mitigation numbering was updated to account for the removal of VIS-4.

- No changes were made to the finding of unavoidable, significant impacts on visual aspects.
- Based on the current design of the Project, including turbines along the Horse Heaven Hills ridgeline, the Project would dominate views from highly sensitive viewing areas and modify landscape character within the region, including landscapes identified for protection in the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. While, as discussed earlier in this section, these lands have not yet been placed into Open Space Conservation or other types of conservation, concern for and preservation of the area's landscape character has been identified as an important value.

Shadow Flicker

Impacts from shadow flicker are described in Section 4.10. Based on a conservative modeling analysis performed in support of the EIS, the Project is not expected to be a significant source of shadow flicker. If there are shadow flicker complaints or impacts, measures to resolve and mitigate these impacts have been outlined as part of the recommended mitigation presented in Section 4.10.

In the first sentence of mitigation measure SF-1, the word “nearby” was replaced with “non-participating”. The second sentence of mitigation measure SF-1 was updated to read: “Shadow flicker can usually be addressed by planting trees, shading windows, operational programming, or other mitigation measures.”

Light

Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.

10.5.13 Summary Response 13: Noise and Vibration

10.5.13.1 Comments

Comments were received regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of noise and vibration. The comments covered the following topics:

Noise

- Commenters expressed general concerns about the Project generating noise pollution. As part of their concerns regarding noise pollution, Commenters raised a specific concern about construction occurring after dark/nighttime.
- Commenters suggested that the Project utilize a complaint resolution procedure to address any noise complaints received from residents. A related comment raised concerns about the effectiveness of the complaint resolution process.
- Commenters expressed concerns that the turbines would be located too close to receptors.
- Commenters were concerned that wind turbines would be a source of low-frequency noise (LFN), which is commonly considered to be sound below 200 Hertz (Hz) frequency. Similarly, Commenters raised concerns that wind turbines would be a source of infrasound, which is commonly considered to be sound below 20 Hz frequency.
- A Commenter requested a revision to noise mitigation measure N-3, the monitoring of noise during nighttime construction. Similarly, a Commenter questioned the necessity of Mitigation Measure N-6.

Vibration

- Commenters expressed a general concern about ground vibration generated by wind turbines.
- Commenters expressed concerns that LFN and infrasound would also be a source of vibration traveling through the atmosphere.

10.5.13.2 Response

Based on comments received from Commenters, the EIS has been updated to reflect the following responses to comments on noise and vibration:

Noise

- Noise impacts and assessments are provided in Section 4.11. Noise generated by the Project was estimated using state of the science noise propagation modeling with vendor-provided noise source data and site layouts. The results indicated that neither noise nor vibration is expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health.
- To address the concerns about construction occurring after dark, mitigation measure N-3 was revised to include monitoring noise during nighttime construction operations (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.), when construction activities have the potential to impact neighboring noise-sensitive receptors or reduce activities to ensure that construction noise does not exceed state noise limits. This monitoring requirement will cover the entirety of the construction activities during nighttime hours. Details of the complaint resolution procedure have not yet been formalized.. Daytime hours are set by the state regulation (WAC 173-60-040) as 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.
- Chapter 2 provides the micrositing layouts for Turbine Option 1 and Option 2. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the Micrositing Corridor. Noise figures have been updated in the Final EIS to show more detailed views of the closest approximate locations of wind turbines to identified receptors.
- The EIS has been updated to address LFN and infrasound. Advances in wind turbine and blade design have significantly reduced LFN emissions from wind projects, and LFN from the Project is not expected to be a source of community annoyance.
- The Project is not expected to be a source of infrasound at levels that would impact humans or structures.

Vibration

The EIS has been updated to address ground vibration. While wind turbines would generate ground vibration at the base of the structures, analysis has shown that at such low levels, this impact would be negligible.

10.5.14 Summary Response 14: Recreation

10.5.14.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of recreation use areas. The comments covered the following topics:

- Danger to paragliders and hang gliders who use areas near the Lease Boundary as launch locations.
- Concerns regarding impacts on recreation such as hiking, birdwatching, hunting, and biking.

- Concerns regarding visual impacts on recreation sites.

10.5.14.2 Response

The following responses address Commenters' concerns on the Draft EIS's analysis of recreation:

Paragliding

EFSEC-identified mitigation measures relating to paragliding and hang-gliding are provided in Section 4.12. Paragliding and hang-gliding have not received government authorization or permission to use the launch locations identified closest to the Project.

Hiking and Similar Recreational Activities

Impacts on hiking, birdwatching, hunting, and biking are analyzed in Section 4.12. Visual impacts on recreation sites are analyzed in Section 4.10 and summarized in Section 4.12.

10.5.15 Summary Response 15: Public Health and Safety

10.5.15.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of public health and safety. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters expressed general concerns that the Project would affect human health.
- The Project would have effects on air quality, including dust and suspended herbicides and pesticides, and resulting health effects on people residing downwind.
- Commenters raised concerns that the Project could increase the risk of wildfires and smoke.
- The Project could increase the risks to human respiratory health from dust.
- Commenters were concerned that the proximity of turbines to residences would be a detriment to human health.
- Commenters raised concerns that blinking red lights, low-frequency noise and vibrations, and shadow flicker produced by the Project would adversely impact human health.
- The comments expressed a concern that the turbines would interfere with fire suppression aircraft during wildfires.
- Commenters suggested that the Applicant should coordinate with local fire departments in preparation of the Project's Emergency Response Plan.

10.5.15.2 Response

The following responses address Commenters' concerns on the Draft EIS's analysis of public health and safety:

- General impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2.
- Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2, and the Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk (Section 4.13.2.4), including fire suppression measures and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan. The Applicant has specified that the finalized Emergency Response Plan would be developed and implemented in coordination with the Benton County Fire Marshal

and other agencies before construction began. Public comments related to fire suppression aircraft access are addressed in a new recommended mitigation measure, PHS-1. This new mitigation measure requires the Applicant to temporarily shut down turbines if a fire were to occur in the region

- Section 4.13.2.1 has been updated to include an analysis of fugitive dust effects on public health and safety in response to Commenters' concerns about dust, pesticides, and herbicides being transported downwind of Project activities. In Section 4.3.2.4, Applicant commitments include measures that would assist in suppressing dust and prevent impacts to human health.
- As discussed in Section 4.13.2.1, agricultural practices within the Lease Boundary have likely introduced herbicides and pesticides to the environment. When these lands are exposed to wind and ground disturbance, airborne dust can be transported to nearby lands. Herbicides and pesticides attached to dust particles could, therefore, also be transported away from the Lease Boundary and into neighboring communities. As a result of past and present agricultural practices that involve exposing soil to windy conditions, the suspension of dust with potential pesticides and herbicides attached would continue to occur regardless of whether the Project is approved.
- Project impacts on public health related to LFN are addressed in Section 4.11 and shadow flicker and lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2.

10.5.16 Summary Response 16: Transportation

10.5.16.1 Comments

Comments were received from members of the public and state and local agencies regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of transportation. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters expressed concerns about the lack of detail regarding improvements required for hauling construction equipment and materials.
- Commenters expressed concern regarding the adequacy of the traffic analysis, which did not utilize actual traffic counts at intersections.
- Commenters were concerned about how the Project would affect the region's transportation system.
- Commenters were concerned that the EFSEC process supersedes typical state and local permitting.
- The potential for roads to be ruined or traffic impeded due to use of trucks throughout the construction phase of the Project. Additionally, this concern included the daily use of work vehicles and heavy duty trucks that would be used for the delivery of oversize and overweight materials.
- Commenters were concerned that the Project would not be required to adhere to existing access restrictions and use requirements for each of the highways.
- Commenters had concerns regarding construction-related traffic being considered short term, even though construction would occur for multiple years.

10.5.16.2 Response

The following responses address Commenters' concerns on the Draft EIS's analysis of transportation resources:

- A detailed traffic analysis was requested by EFSEC. The Applicant provided an updated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) in September 2023 that included additional details regarding the improvements required for hauling construction equipment and materials, Appendix X of the ASC. EFSEC will require supplemental analysis, prior to construction, once haul routes for oversize or overweight components, are finalized.
- The updated TIA included the Washington State Department of Transportation's input on scope, methodology, and the improvements known to be required at the time of the publication of this EIS. These details are included in the EIS.
- This SEPA analysis identifies and analyzes environmental impacts associated with a governmental decision to permit this Project. The EIS describes those impacts as they pertain to transportation. EFSEC is the state's regulatory agency that determines compliance with state laws and the terms set in the SCA. EFSEC contracts with other state agencies for on-site inspections. EFSEC has the regulatory authority to enforce compliance with a state law and the conditions in the SCA through fines and other actions.
- Section 4.14 discusses truck counts, oversize and overweight deliveries, and the Project's potential impacts on transportation resources.
- Impacts occurring during construction continue to be identified as short term. Construction would occur over multiple years but would not occur during the full extent of each year. The Project may be phased, and therefore, the impacts would be expected to last for months at a time during the years identified for construction.

10.5.17 Summary Response 17: Public Services and Utilities

10.5.17.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of public services and utilities. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters noted that the Horn Rapids Landfill in the City of Richland is closed and cannot accept solid waste from operation or decommissioning.
- Commenters raised concerns that the new 75-acre landfill at Horn Rapids didn't include waste from the proposed Project in its lifecycle capacity analysis.
- Commenters raised concerns that utility rates would increase due to subsidies and maintenance costs associated with wind turbines.
- Comments expressed a concern that wind energy would do little to mitigate the increasing risk of power grid blackouts in the Northwest.
- Commenters raised concerns that wind energy reduces surplus hydroelectric sales revenue, which increases net hydroelectric power costs, and ultimately increases retail electricity rates.
- A Commenter's comment noted that an analysis by the Western Resource Adequacy Program found that wind power provides the lowest effective capacity in the key winter months when blackouts are most likely.

- A Commenter's comment noted that the generation mix in the local area for public power utilities is already up to 93 percent non-emitting; therefore, this project is not needed to meet the state's clean energy requirements.
- Commenters noted that solar peak production is in summer and early fall, which complements hydroelectric generation. In contrast, wind generation is expected to peak at the same time as hydroelectric generation.
- Commenters noted that the City of Kennewick cannot provide the water needed for construction and operation of the Project.

10.5.17.2 Response

Section 3.15.1 addresses the waste streams that the Horn Rapids Landfill can accept. Chapter 15.04 of the Richland Municipal Code governs the use of the Horn Rapids landfill by residential and commercial Richland and non-Richland entities.

EFSEC's responsibilities are listed in RCW 80.50. The legislature cited the necessity of balancing the need for new energy facilities with the broad interests of the public. As part of the balancing process, EFSEC must take into account protection of environmental quality, the safety of energy facilities, and concern for energy availability.

10.5.18 Summary Response 18: Socioeconomics

10.5.18.1 Comments

The following summary comments describe Commenters concerns related to the evaluation of socioeconomics and environmental justice in the Draft EIS:

- Commenters expressed concerns that the Draft EIS analysis did not adequately address occupation, education, income, and wealth as part of the socioeconomic section.
- Commenters raised concerns that the Draft EIS does not adequately address majority-minority communities like those that occur in Benton City and Finley.
- Commenters were concerned that mitigation measures such as active dust suppression, engine idling, noise mitigation, traffic management, and emergency response plans have little to do with socioeconomics.

The following comments describe Commenters' concerns related to the Project's fiscal and economic impacts:

- Commenters express a general concern that the local community would not receive the benefits from the Project that the Applicant has detailed in the ASC while having to deal with downsides of a large construction project.

10.5.18.2 Response

The following responses address Commenters' concerns about the evaluation of social conditions within the study area:

- Section 3.16 describes the socioeconomic existing conditions, including low-income and people of color communities, and Section 4.16 presents the analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures on socioeconomics, including low-income communities, people of color, and consideration of the environmental justice index.

- Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present a comprehensive analysis of socioeconomics, including, but not limited to, population and growth rate (including low-income residents and people of color), economic conditions, fiscal conditions, taxation, workforce and economics, housing, and schools.
- The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in Section 4.16.

The following responses address Commenters' concerns about the evaluation of economic conditions within the study area:

- Appendix 4.16A of the EIS presents the Economic Impact Analysis of the Project's impact on the study area.
- The Project would supply renewable energy, which is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 5116, enacted into law in 2019). Beyond the growing demand from utilities, industrial power buyers have announced plans to purchase renewable energy, and wind and solar energy are poised to help meet this demand over the long term.
- Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits.
- Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project.
- Benton County would benefit economically throughout the life of the Project as local ordinances would require that the Applicant pay taxes annually.
- Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.

10.5.19 Summary Response 19: Cumulative Effects

10.5.19.1 Comments

Comments were received from Commenters' regarding the Draft EIS's analysis of cumulative effects. The comments covered the following topics:

- Commenters expressed a concern about why the Draft EIS identified certain projects for inclusion in the analysis of cumulative impacts and not others. Similarly, commenters were concerned that the Draft EIS did not consider the cumulative impacts of the Project on wind farms east of the Tri-Cities.
- Commenters expressed a specific concern that the Draft EIS did not consider cumulative impacts of the Project on the sandhill crane.
- A Commenter suggested that the conversion of agricultural lands with long term commercial significance would have a high cumulative effect. Related comments expressed concern that the analysis of cumulative impacts ignores the impact of solar arrays, the battery energy storage system(s), substations, and operations facilities on agricultural productivity.
- Commenters noted that the Draft EIS's analysis of cumulative effects should include evaluating the impacts of alternatives.

- A Commenter expressed a concern about the analysis of cumulative impacts considered mitigation measures.
- A Commenter expressed a concern that the Draft EIS contains no analysis of cumulative effects on habitat, especially the east/west wildlife corridor along the ridgeline of the Horse Heaven Hills.
- A Commenter questioned whether the cumulative impacts of the Project on migratory birds were evaluated in the Draft EIS. A specific interest was related to what cumulative impact the Project would have when combined with other wind farms in the Columbia River Gorge areas of Washington and Oregon.

10.5.19.2 Response

The following responses address Commenter concerns on the evaluation of cumulative effects:

- Table 5-1 in Section 5.0 presents a list of past and present actions, and other reasonably foreseeable developments. Table 5-1 lists the Stateline Wind and Nine Canyon Wind Projects which are east of the Project Lease Boundary.
- The discussion of alternatives has been expanded in the Final EIS to explain the methodology of analyzing the Project as a whole.
- Section 4.8 Land and Shoreline Use examines the Project's impact on agricultural resources and productivity. Table 5.2 includes a discussion of cumulative impacts on agricultural resources.
- Section 5.0 of the Final EIS includes an updated analysis of cumulative effects on wildlife and habitat.
- The EIS's Executive Summary includes a comprehensive summary of the Applicant's commitments and recommended mitigation measures for each resource.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

APPENDIX 10-1

Draft EIS Comment and Response Tables

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1071233	I would like to express my concerns for this project as the northwest has ample green energy sources already, hydro electric and nuclear to name two. We don't need subsidized wind farms that are unreliable and never pay for themselves over the long haul. Plus the windmills are monumental eyesores. Thank you	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Under Section 1.2.3 of the EIS, you will find the guidance EFSEC is employing in the review and potential recommendation of this project to the Governor, which includes "[t]he] policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities". We hope that section may help in understanding the consideration behind the proposed project.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1071252	To whom it may concern: It's apparent regardless what the vast majority of people who live here WANT, you will be doing as you wish. We DONT WANT THE HORSE HEAVENS DESTROYED BY THESE. It makes no fiscal sense, no environmental sense, and doesn't , in any way, improve our area. LEAVE THE HORSE HEAVENS ALONE. You won't, your decision is made, and checking the boxes to force through what you, and the company doing this want, is apparently what will be.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Under Section 1.2.3 of the EIS, you will find the guidance EFSEC is employing in the review and potential recommendation of this project to the Governor, which includes "[t]he] policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities". We hope that section may help in understanding the consideration behind the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project's economic and social impact is assessed in Chapter 4.16 Socioeconomics and its results would be held under consideration during project review by EFSEC. Chapter 4 in its entirety includes the environmental impacts that would be considered during proposed project review.	n/a	n/a
rwurdeman	1071369	I am 100% against this project. I love the Tricities for its recreation, weather, and small city atmosphere. I do not want to see it ruined by these ugly wind turbines and solar panels. This is a beautiful area and does not need to be scared by such ugliness.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1071490	I don't agree with the efficiency or effectiveness of wind power in our region however you are not looking for my opinion on that. This project is attempting to place a vast number of wind turbines along the crest of the Horse Heaven Hills. My concerns are very personal in that I have lived in my home for 20 years and this project will be littering my view of God's creation with unnecessary and very limited productivity wind turbines. We have extensive solar energy available along with unlimited Nuclear and Hydro power. My voice is small, but one member of the larger majority of southeastern Washington voices. Please don't do this, it will cause irreparable harm. Thank you, Jeff Seitz	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1071550	I am extremely worried about the wind turbine project. We moved to Kannewick because it's so pretty here and we love the community. We found the house of our dreams and we love the landscape view. I don't understand why this project has to be so close to the city and ruin the natural views when there is plenty of land between here and Oregon with hardly any houses or population. Please don't let this business ruin our beautiful landscape forever. We already contribute expanding energy with dams and the nuclear energy which is expanding. If turbines are necessary, please move them away from the Tri Cities. 1,000 jobs are not worth the cost. We have plenty of jobs here especially in the energy and construction industry.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1071552	EIS should be based in science and without political overtones. This is not currently the situation, and given Gov Inslee's proclivity to dictatorship will not change. The proposed wind farm is not an energy source compatible with the location proposed. Does the wind not blow West of the Cascades where the most powers is consumed? Until hydro is deemed a renewable source and nuclear power is supported the push for WA to be "green", these conversations are without merit. The production of windmills, the lack of disposal/reclamation of these sites, the visual impact and numerous downside impacts make this an insult to the environment.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1071561	I will admit that I did not read all 161 pages (!) of the Executive Summary. However, I wanted to voice my strong disagreement with blighting yet more hills with these unsightly behemoths. The visual impact of these War-of-the-Worlds invaders is clearly documented on page ES-137 (screenshot attached), and it reads: "The proposed wind turbines, and comprehensive Project, would dominate views from many KOP locations, and the landscape would appear strongly altered" "Magnitude of Impact: High", "Duration of Impact: Long Term", "Likelihood of Impact: Unavoidable" "Extent of Impact: Regional". And the proposed mitigation strategies boil down to: 1. Locate turbines > 5 miles from "foreground" 2. No signs on turbines 3. Keep towers clean That is not enough!! Please do not destroy our skyline! Do not locate these towers anywhere that would be visible along the I-82 corridor!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1071617	It is a fantasy that "green energy" will ever work - this is about government grift. No other project would be able to get away with the wholesale slaughter of birds and landscape blight these things will cause, but because it's "green" it's sacred and exempt. This will cause large scale negative changes in the ecosystem, but hey, the west side can feel good about their battle against carbon as China brings online a new coal fired power plant every month. Just say no.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1071704	It's really unfortunate that the people/companies who want to destroy our landscape with ugly wind turbines have no idea of the harm they cause. Killing birds, not producing enough energy to make them viable & the being buried underground & polluting the soil & water. They also require copious amounts of oil to run. It really doesn't make any sense to have these ugly creations cluttering our mountain tops.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Water Resources	Impacts to water resources are discussed in Chapter 4.4 along with a determination of significance. Based on the Applicant commitments and the recommended mitigation measures no significant adverse effects were identified for water resources.	4.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1072102	I support the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center because it is a step towards the carbon-free energy future we need to combat climate change while meeting the increasing energy needs of Washingtonians. Our state can and should be a national leader on clean energy development! We passed the Clean Energy Transformation Act with the goal of removing ourselves from fossil-fuel reliance. A big part of meeting that state goal is getting new, renewable energy resources online as in time to avoid energy shortages. Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will add up to 1,100 MW of renewable energy to our grid along with battery storage to help address intermittent conditions. Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center is not the first solar or wind project that the state has greenlit, nor should it be the last. But, today, it is a critical step in the right direction for Washington to responsibly transition our remaining fossil fuel dependent energy sources to renewable energy, curbing emissions and meeting the needs of our communities. I strongly urge EFSEC to support this project and move it forward. Trudi Kubik - 1405 Garfield St. 98368	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1072104	I am writing to urge EFSEC to move the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project forward. Our state needs new renewable energy facilities to cut our emissions and combat climate change on pace with fossil plant retirement. Without added capacity of additional renewable energy, Washington can't meet its Clean Energy Transformation Act goals of becoming coal-free by 2025 and fully renewable by 2045. 2025 is 2 years away! We need to make sure that Washington has the resources it needs to power our communities as we remove coal from our energy mix. Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will produce up to 1,100 MW of renewable energy to support this need. Getting solar and wind energy online quickly, and responsibly, is critical to the health of our communities. Shirley Hogan - 6601 S. 8th St. #B3, 98465	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1072140	This letter is to inform EFSEC of my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. This project would play a key role in helping us meet our state's goal to diminish our reliance on fossil fuels and make a transition to renewable, carbon-free energy. Washington is home to some of the country's leading solar, wind, and hydroelectric facilities. And we should not stop there—I strongly believe this project will act as a pivotal step to achieve our aggressive carbon reduction targets by expanding our clean energy production. Washington has taken an important step forward in the fight against greenhouse gas emissions by passing the Clean Energy Transformation Act. But the challenge ahead is significant. To achieve the objective of phasing out coal-fired power plants, it is our responsibility to respond to the urgency of the climate crisis in the short time we have left. The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project can help Washington secure a greener future. I appreciate the opportunity to share my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. Kelly Hackett - 16015 13th Ave. E. 98445	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1072233	Assuming the project is approved the vendor should be required to provide money to cover the expenses to remove the windmills and any associated equipment. That amount should include funds to dispose of the windmills, concrete and other improvements such as roads so the land is in the condition prior to the initial installation. The sum should be in the future dollars to account for inflation.	General - Recyclability	The Applicant shall provide financial assurance sufficient for Decommissioning costs in the form of a performance bond, guaranty or a letter of credit to ensure the availability of funds for such costs (the "Decommissioning Security") to EFSEC.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1072477	I favor the development of the Horse Heaven wind and solar project described in the Draft EIS. Continued growth in the Pacific Northwest requires development of additional power sources; the renewable power project supports the need for more power generation capacity AND does so using renewable energy. It is a win for everyone.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1072564	Chapter 2.1.3.12 Socioeconomic Environment lists 5 items that have little or nothing to do with socioeconomics. The four socio-economic factors include occupation, education, income, wealth and where someone lives. Dust suppression, engine idling time, noise mitigation, traffic management, and fire emergency response might fall into the "where someone lives" part but none of the other factors are addressed at all. Low income mostly non-Caucasian communities like Benton City and Finley need to be addressed and the DEIS has not done that.	Socioeconomics	Section 2.1.3.12 of the EIS lists relevant mitigation measures relevant to socioeconomics and wellbeing, not the components studied and analyzed for the socioeconomic resource topic. Section 3.16 describes the socioeconomic existing conditions including low-income and people of color communities and section 4.16 presents the analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures on socioeconomics including low-income and people of color and consideration of environmental justice index. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 of the EIS present a comprehensive analysis of socioeconomic including but not limited to population and growth rate (including low-income and people of color population), economic conditions, fiscal conditions, taxation, workforce and economics, housing and schools.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1072666	<p>I am writing to express my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and the role it will play in helping Washington achieve the ambitious decarbonization goals we set for ourselves with the passage of the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) in 2019. I believe strongly in impact mitigation and value EFSEC's process, but know that Washington's ability to realize a carbon-free future will depend on permitting large-scale clean energy projects in a timely manner just like the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. This is a good project with appropriately identified mitigation measures, and backed by an experienced team that will produce up to 1,150 MW of renewable energy through a combination of wind, solar, and battery storage technology.</p> <p>With the passage of CETA, Washington established itself as a leader in the fight to curb global emissions. The state now has a responsibility to ensure the clean energy transition can be achieved in the necessary timeframe to facilitate fossil plant retirement, and in doing we can set an example for the rest of the nation to follow.</p> <p>Nicole Erickson - 15317N, Gleneden, 99208</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1072693	<p>I am pleased to submit this letter to share my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. The climate crisis is the defining challenge of our time, and it is imperative that we take action to mitigate its impacts. The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center would be a crucial step in that direction. If approved, the project will help Washington meet its goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and move closer to becoming a carbon-neutral state by 2045. By investing in these large-scale clean energy projects, we can ensure that we meet the increasing energy demands in Washington with renewable sources. This project will have a combination of wind, solar, and battery storage components that will provide long-term energy viability.</p> <p>In addition to reducing carbon emissions, the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will also create jobs. The project is estimated to create over 900 construction jobs and 56 full-time jobs once operational. These are good-paying jobs that will have a positive economic impact on the communities in the Tri-Cities region. Once the project is completed, it will also generate millions in public revenue that could fund public safety and education.</p> <p>Washington has a responsibility to do its part by setting an aggressive timeline for retiring fossil fuel-powered plants, as well as permitting replacement power resources in a timely manner. The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will deliver substantial job growth and local economic development while reducing our state's reliance on fossil fuels and set us on a path to a cleaner, healthier future for all.</p> <p>I encourage you to consider these comments. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Charlotte Songer - 4532 S. Puget Sound Ave Unit A, 98409</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
rick zimmerman	1072769	<p>Horse Heaven Wind Farm Draft EIS (December 2022)</p> <p>Executive Summary Comments Source: https://www.efsec.wa.gov/sites/default/files/210011/Executive%20Summary.pdf</p> <p>Page ES-38VIS-5: Avoid complete removal of vegetation beneath solar arrays during construction, where possible, to reduce the contrast between the exposed soil and adjacent undisturbed areas during project operation. If site grading requires the removal of vegetation, the area will be revegetated and maintained during project operation (BLM 2013).</p> <p>Comment: Avoid complete vegetation removal beneath solar rays increases operational and economic impact when the area is subjected to a wildfire which is identified as a high risk in Table ES-3a Section 4.13. This also seems in conflict with Table ES-3b Summary of impact during operation section on "Vegetation / Vegetation Maintenance (Section 4.5) which states: "During Project operation, vegetation may require maintenance, such as cutting or removal, for areas under the solar arrays, or along roadways."</p> <p>Table ES-3a Summary of Impacts during construction 1. Comment: The table does not identify the impact of greater fire risk during summer months when vegetation is dry. NOTE: BLM banned off-highway vehicles for many months in 2022 due to high fire risk</p> <p>2. Comment: Table's Public Health & Safety / Fire (Worker Health and Safety) (Section 4.13) states: "Fire resulting from Project construction is unlikely, but wildfire risk in the area is considered high. Section 4.13 Fire (Worker Health and Safety) Only mitigation listed related to topping or removal of trees.</p> <p>3. Comment: Tables Transportation / Vehicular Traffic (Section 4.14) Table does not identify the increased potential of off-highway vehicles on haul roads caused by wildfires during construction being a greater fire risk during summer months when vegetation is dry. NOTE: BLM banned off-highway vehicles for many months in 2022 due to high fire risk</p> <p>Table ES-3b Summary of impact during operation section on 4. Comment: Table "Vegetation / Vegetation Maintenance (Section 4.5) fails to mention the removal of windblown vegetation against fences and structures to ensure ready access to equipment and minimize fire loading of blown-in dry vegetation.</p> <p>5. Comment: Table Public Health and Safety / Fire (Worker Health and Safety) (Section 4.13) fails to include a discussion on the build-up of fire loading on fences and structures during seasonal fire weather conditions. This section also fails to discuss any impact and mitigation if a fire were to occur during turbine operation where the fire spreads to the ground during a structural collapse of a tower. Note: There is minimal discussion of this in Chapter 4 Table 4.13-3b (page 4-468) and Table 4.12-3c (page 4-469).</p> <p>Table ES-4a Summary of Impacts during by component during construction</p> <p>6. Comment: Table's Public Health & Safety / Fire (Worker Health and Safety) (Section 4.13) states: "Fire resulting from Project construction is unlikely, but wildfire risk in the area is considered high. Section 4.13 Fire (Worker Health and Safety) Only mitigation listed related to topping or removal of trees.</p> <p>Chapter 4 – Analysis of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Source: https://www.efsec.wa.gov/sites/default/files/210011/Chapter%204%20-%20Analysis%20of%20Potential%20Impacts.pdf</p> <p>Section 4.13.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation 7. Comment: The section lists the intent to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 2000. This reference is to an Australian rule. The correct citation should be "The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970". The authors may have been confused with Congress passing the OSHA Reform Act of 1999.</p>	Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Vegetation	The recommended mitigation measure for vegetation removal along fence lines during maintenance. Propose an additional Recommended Mitigation Measure to address vegetation removal from fence lines and minimizing the buildup of dead vegetation during all phases of the Project.	4.5.2.5	Revise VIS-5 to "minimize vegetation removal" to be consistent with the veg section. Avoid is not reasonable as some removal is required. Revise the Vegetation Recommended mitigation to include removal of vegetation from the solar array fence line during operations.
			Public Health and Safety	Section 4.13.2.1 of the EIS states that fire risk would be higher in summer. The Applicant's Draft Emergency Response Plan (Appendix P of the ASC) states that vehicles will be used only on roads where the roadway is cleared of vegetation and that vegetation will be controlled and maintained to reduce fire risk in compliance with the Revegetation and Noxious Weed Control Plan. The Applicant's Draft Emergency Response Plan also includes response measures in the event a fire occurs in the Project Area. The Applicant's ASC references the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 2000.	ES, 4.5, 4.13	n/a
Anonymous User	1073325	Section 2.1.1, Proposed Facility Site, states that "portions of the Lease Boundary may currently be enrolled in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program." Is it or isn't it? It makes a difference and needs to be nailed down better than this.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	At the time of the Applicant's Application for Site Certification (ASC), lands were enrolled in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program. Due to the length in time between the Applicant's ASC, DEIS, and FEIS lands may change their enrollment status.	2.0	Added language regarding length of enrollment.
Karen Brun	1073327	Section 2.1.1, Proposed Facility Site, states "This Draft EIS assumes that the road disturbance associated with Turbine Option 1 and Turbine Option 2 would be identical". More details are needed here. The disturbance cannot be identical when the height and length of the towers and blades are significantly more in Option 2, requiring much more gradual curves and significantly larger turning areas. Additionally, the massive weight of the nacelles, towers, and blades, will do significant damage to county roads.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Transportation	The Applicant's Transportation Study did not provide that level of detail. The Applicant was requested to provide a final transportation impact analysis for the Project prior to the Final EIS that would provide details on the required improvements for the construction of the Project.	4.14	n/a
Karen Brun	1073329	Section 2.1.2 states "The combination of components selected would not have a greater disturbance footprint than allowed for in the SCA (if approved) and must satisfy all pre-construction conditions." What are those pre-construction conditions?	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Pre-construction conditions, along with the required mitigation measures, would be included in the SCA and include the appropriate federal permitting and licenses required.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073330	Section 2.1.2 states "Potential impacts related to the Project's component are generalized for the analysis of the Proposed Action when impacts are common within the Micrositing Corridor or Solar Siting Areas." This statement is a rationale for the analysis of only a single action alternative (the Proposed Action). What are the supporting documents?	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073331	Section 2.1.2.1, Project Construction, states" Before construction could commence, a site survey would be performed during the micrositing process to stake out the final locations of the turbines, site roads, electrical cables, transmission line poles, access entryways, substations, BESSs, and other supporting infrastructure." Where exactly is all this stuff going to be? The local community deserves to know this before a single blade of grass is disturbed.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Pre-construction surveys will be used to aid in the final design for the Project facilities within the micrositing corridor. Analyses in this EIS were performed on the entirety of the micrositing corridor.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073337	Section 2.1.2.1 lists construction activities, one of which is "Installing the electrical connection system - underground and some overhead lines." This makes it sound like they are only going to put in a few overhead poles when in reality SCE plans to install a huge kVA transmission line through the project. Please clarify.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Table 2-2 of the DEIS provides information on the amount of disturbance proposed by the Applicant, including the amount of disturbance associated with the collector and transmission lines.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073338	Section 2.1.2 states "Construction material and equipment would be transported to the site primarily via road systems. The primary transportation route would follow Interstate 82 before reaching local and county roads that lead to the Project's Lease Boundary." Please provide documentation proving that the local and county roads are capable of handling the amount of weight each nacelle, tower, and blade assembly multiplied by 244 trucks times 3 as each wind turbine requires at least one truck for each of these components. Provide documentation and approval/permitting from the Benton County Transportation Department.	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to transportation resources from the Project. The Transportation Study provided as Appendix V of the ASC would be verified and updated to include detailed condition assessments of roads to be used, structural assessments, and plans for improvement and maintenance. The Applicant would coordinate with EFSEC and Benton County, to identify a qualified third-party engineer who would document road conditions prior to construction and again within 30 days after construction is complete or as weather permits. All road improvement and construction would be performed in conjunction with Benton County Public Works requirements following Benton County Standards. The Applicant would maintain new access roads to access the turbine structures during operations.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
Karen Brun	1073341	Section 2.1.2.1, Battery Energy Storage Systems, states "The details for the BESSs would depend on the final system selected." Lack of specificity makes it extremely difficult to evaluate this project with any accuracy.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The Applicant did not include component specific information for the BESS. The analysis completed warrants that the amount of disturbance will not be larger than that proposed by the Applicant and that changes in impacts associated with more efficient technology are not expected.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073342	Section 2.1.2.1, Supporting Infrastructure, states "Where necessary, existing public and private roads may be temporarily widened and the turning radii increased." Most of the private roads are gravel. Are those going to be paved and how are you going to assure that they will not collapse under the immense weight of the components? What happens to them after the project is complete?	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to transportation resources from the Project.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073343	Table 2.6: Example of Project Phasing, lists up to 10.2 miles (Phase 2/Alternative A) or up to 19.4 miles (Phase 2/Alternative B) of 230-kV gen-tie overhead electrical lines which seems way beyond the "some overhead lines" stated in Section 2.1.2.1, Page 2-12. Where exactly are these proposed overhead lines going to be located? Provide that information for both Alternatives A and B.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Transmission lines are within the micrositing corridor unless they cross a road.	2.0	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brun	1073344	Section 2.1.3.1, Earth Resources, lists on Pages 2-21 and 2-22 a plethora of things the applicant is going to do. Who are the enforcement authorities for all these things and what recourse is there for failure to comply?	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The required mitigation measures will be included in the SCA and will include the appropriate federal permitting and licenses required. The Council will administer the SCA for the State of Washington.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073345	In Section 2.1.3, Applicant Commitments, another plethora of promises are listed on pages 2-20 through 2-31. Again, who are the enforcement authorities, who will be watching, and what recourses are in place?	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The required mitigation measures will be included in the SCA and will include the appropriate federal permitting and licenses required. The Council will administer the SCA for the State of Washington.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073347	Page 2-24 states "During construction, WDFW-recommended seasonal buffers (per Larsen et al 2004) for ferruginous hawk nests would be observed to avoid disturbing nesting ferruginous hawks. The applicant is citing an almost 20-year-old reference and the ferruginous hawk is not on the Washington endangered species list. A more recent reference is needed and what agreement is in place with WDFW to ensure the nests are not disturbed?"	Wildlife and Habitat	The cited text from Section 2-24 is directly referencing commitments made in the Application. Section 4.6.2.4 of the EIS addresses potential impacts to ferruginous hawks including species specific mitigation measures (section 4.6.2.5).	2.1.3, 4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5	n/a
Karen Brun	1073352	Page 2-24 states "All permanent met towers would be unguyed to minimize collision risk for wildlife." The met towers are to be 411' tall. Does Washington State allow met towers of this height to be unguyed?	Wildlife and Habitat	Structures will be constructed to meet certain standards for both health and safety. In lieu of guy wires, permanent foundations may be engineered to meet applicable structure stability standards.	N/A	N/A
Karen Brun	1073353	Page 2-24 states "The Applicant does not plan to pursue an eagle take permit but would re-evaluate eagle risk and the need for an eagle take permit throughout the life of the Project." So the applicant is going to wait to see how many eagles get killed and then evaluate whether a permit is needed? Where is the WDFW approval for this action, or inaction actually?	Wildlife and Habitat	Federal and state laws prohibit killing, injuring, or disturbing bald and golden eagles without a permit. An Incidental Take Permit authorizes take only where the take is incidental to and cannot practicably be avoided in the course of an otherwise lawful activity. Incidental Take Permits may be recommended by USFWS, but are not required. A violation of the Act can result in a fine, imprisonment, or both for a first offense.	N/A	N/A
Karen Brun	1073354	Page 2-25 states that "The Applicant would conduct two years of standardized post-construction fatality monitoring to assess impacts of turbine operation on birds and bats." Provide the reference for "standardized post-construction fatality monitoring". Also provide what is going to be done if the impacts on birds and bats is unacceptable. Once these turbines are up, it's too late for anything.	Wildlife and Habitat	The text referenced on page 2-25 is an Applicant specific commitment. The commitment references the WDFW Wind Power Guidelines (2009), which require bird and bat mortality surveys during early operation. As per recommended mitigation measure Wild-1, the Applicant would be required to share the results of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring with WDFW and EFSEC so that additional monitoring and mitigation requirements can be assessed. Additional mitigation measures may be required if greater than expected levels of mortality are recorded.	4.6.2.5	Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
Karen Brun	1073358	Section 2.1.3.5, Noise. "Limit use of major excavating and earth-moving equipment to daytime hours (7 a.m.-10 p.m.)." In Eastern Washington, daytime hours end much earlier than 10 p.m. in the summer and don't start until much later than 7 a.m. in the winter. Who is going to monitor this and what recourse does the community have? We have a quarry less than a half-mile away that is not supposed to operate after 10 p.m. but they crush rock all night long and the authorities do nothing about it.	Noise and Vibration	Daytime hours are set by the state regulation (WAC 463-60-352) as 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., not by hours of daylight.	4.11	n/a
Karen Brun	1073359	Page 2-25 promises to "Utilize a complaint resolution procedure to address any noise complaints received from residents." Provide more detail on this (i.e., who assesses the validity of the complaint, how long it will take for a resolution, who we can speak with directly to ensure the complaint is resolved, etc.). I don't have much confidence in this at all.	Noise and Vibration	Details of the complaint resolution procedure have not yet been formalized.	4.11	n/a
Karen Brun	1073362	Page 2-26 states that "A Draft Emergency Response Plan that addresses fire and other emergency procedures has been developed and included as part of the ASC." Provide verification that the local fire chiefs have reviewed and approved this draft plan to ensure that it meets the unique requirements of fighting fires in this area.	Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has specified that the finalized Emergency Response Plan will be developed and implemented in coordination with the Benton County Fire Marshal and other agencies before construction.	2.1.3.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1073552	Section 2.1.3.8, Aesthetics, pg. 2-27, "The turbines and solar arrays would be uniform in design to present a trim, uncluttered, aesthetically attractive appearance." On what planet is a forest of wind turbines considered 'aesthetically attractive'? Provide surveys from communities subjected to more than 150 wind turbines supporting this statement.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Text will be revised to more correctly state the goal is to create visual order and unity among turbine clusters.	2.1.3.8	Change "...present a trim, uncluttered, aesthetically attractive appearance" and more correctly state the goal is to "create visual order and unity among turbine clusters and solar arrays".
Anonymous User	1073553	Section 2.1.3.8, Aesthetics, pg. 2-27 "The only exterior lighting on the turbines would be aviation warning lights..." Given the 2-mile proximity to significant residential neighborhoods, provide justification for not using ADLS.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted and additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	2.1.3.8	n/a
Karen Brun	1073555	Section 2.1.3.8, Aesthetics, pg 2-27 "The turbines and solar arrays would be uniform in design to present a trim, uncluttered, aesthetically attractive appearance". Provide survey results from communities subjected to 150+ wind turbines supporting the statement that they are 'aesthetically attractive'.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Text will be revised to more correctly state the goal is to create visual order and unity among turbine clusters.	2.1.3.8	Change "...present a trim, uncluttered, aesthetically attractive appearance" and more correctly state the goal is to "create visual order and unity among turbine clusters and solar arrays".
Karen Brun	1073556	Section 2.1.3.8, Aesthetics, pg 2-27: "The only exterior lighting on the turbines would be aviation warning lights..." Provide the exact type of aviation warning lights. If they are not ADLS, provide justification for using that technology given the proximity of several heavily population neighborhoods within 2 miles of the east most turbine array.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted, exact type of aviation warning lights have not been identified other than they will meet FAA requirements. Additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	2.1.3.8	n/a
Karen Brun	1073561	Section 2.1.3.9, Recreation, pg 2-28: "Commitments specific to recreation were not proposed. Site-specific BMPs implemented during construction and operation to minimize potential impacts of noise, traffic, and visual surroundings would minimize impacts on recreational users." Why were commitments specific to recreation not proposed? The turbines above Kiona and Benton City are a direct danger to paragliders and hang gliders who use that area as a jump-off point. Installing turbines that close to this significant recreational areas is unconscionable and unnecessary.	Recreation	Applicant commitments were not provided in the Applicant's ASC for recreation. EFSEC provided mitigation measures for the Project in Section 4.12 of the DEIS. As part of Mitigation Measure R-1, the Applicant is required to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan to keep recreation enthusiasts safe. Paragliding is an unofficial recreational activity at the launch locations on public lands closest to the Project.	4.12	n/a
PJKrupin7022	1073564	Please extend the adjudication and the DEIS comment period to 90 days. The weather and road conditions are so bad that it is impossible to conduct safe tours of the Horse Heaven Hills project site in order to see and intelligent comments based on actual natural observation. The ice and snow make driving so hazardous that the entire site is inaccessible. We cannot take road tours with local residents who are interested, or with media, or with local city, county and newly elected state representatives. This severely and significantly impacts the ability for anyone to do any in person field observations with the purpose of verifying the information presented in the DEIS and identify valid or important issues that are to be considered during the adjudication process. The weather in particular makes it impossible to reasonably evaluate the visual impacts of the proposed 499 foot high or 691 foot high turbines due to the inability to see the wind turbine locations and micro-siting corridors, infrastructure facilities on the project. The photo attached, taken from the corner of South Lone and Kennewick Ave in downtown Kennewick, shows the ridgeline to the Horse Heaven Hills south of Kennewick WA with the 260-foot high turbines of the Nine Mile Canyon project to the left and right of Jump Off Joe. The turbines just above the school building are 6 miles away, and the turbines on the ridge are seven miles away or more. The HHH turbines are more than 1.7 and 2.4 times the height of the Nine Mile turbines and will be highly more visible than ones depicted. It will take time to locate and then evaluate the impacts once the reasonable access to the project site is restored. We request that time be granted to allow for proper consideration of the DEIS and the adjudication process, once access to the site has been restored.	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS. Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies of the DEIS were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Please note, under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
Karen Brun	1073565	Section 2.1.3.10, Historical and Cultural Resources, pg. 2-28: "Prior to construction of the Project, a qualified archaeologist would be retained and would provide a cultural briefing that includes..." Provide justification why this isn't being done prior to permitting.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. As stated in the updated ASC, the Applicant will comply with the requirements of WAC 463-72, Site Restoration and Preservation. At least 90 days prior to beginning construction, the Applicant would provide the Council with a Site Restoration Plan describing measures that would be taken at the conclusion of the Project's operating life. This includes Historic and Cultural Resource Mitigation Measures from Section 4.2.5 of the updated ASC. The referenced Applicant Commitments in EIS Section 2.1.3.10, including "Beginning prior to the construction of the Project...", will be implemented as a part of the Project siting process and prior to any impacts from the Proposed Action in compliance with RCW 27.53, Archaeological Sites and Resources. As stated in EIS Section 2.1.3.10, "An Archaeological Excavation and Removal Permit would be pursued if any alteration of any precontact archaeological site were to occur, regardless of the level of disturbance. For historic-era archaeological sites, permits would be pursued for any removal or excavation of those that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places." Therefore, the referenced Applicant Commitment would be implemented prior to permitting.	4.9, 2.1.3.10	n/a
Karen Brun	1073568	Section 2.1.3.10, Historical and Cultural Resources, pg 2-28: "If requested, a local tribal representative(s) would be invited to participate in the environmental training to discuss or provide text from a tribal cultural perspective regarding the cultural resources within the region." Provide justification why the Yakama Nation was omitted on the Section 9.2 Tribal Governments distribution list. The YN is the tribe that has the most interest in this area.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Per EFSEC's website in EIS Section 9.2 Tribal Governments, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation is listed in the middle of the first column of the Tribal Government distribution list.	4.9, 9.2	n/a
Karen Brun	1073570	Section 2.1.3.10, Historic and Cultural Resources, pgs 2-28 and 2-29 "The following are commitments proposed by the Applicant..." Very few, perhaps even none, of these commitments are remotely enforceable unless the experts are on site all the time. Explain how these commitments are going to be assured. Who is going to be monitoring all this stuff during construction?	Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. As stated in EIS Section 2.1.3.10, Tribal representatives would be invited to monitor the site during construction. Recorded cultural and historic resources would be avoided through modification of Project design and through buffers and protective signage or flagging, as well as monitoring, as appropriate. As stated in section 4.2.5.3 of the updated ASC, implementation of commitments will also be ensured through cultural resource worker education/training, the Preconstruction Survey and Cultural Resource Avoidance Plan, and an Inadvertent Discovery Plan for Archaeological Resources during Construction. To address the statements regarding the presence of experts and the identity of the construction monitors: the Applicant Commitments could be clarified to state that monitoring would be conducted by qualified professional archaeologists.	4.9, 2.1.3.10	n/a
Karen Brun	1073576	Section 2.1.3.12, Socioeconomic Environment, pg 2-31: "The following commitments are propose by the Applicant and described in detail in Section 4.4 of the ASC." Active dust suppression, engine idling, noise mitigation, Traffic Management Plan, Emergency Response Plan. These things have little to do with socioeconomics which include income, education, employment, community safety, and social supports.	Socioeconomics	Section 2.1.3.12 of the EIS lists relevant mitigation measures relevant to socioeconomic and wellbeing, not the components studied and analyzed for the socioeconomic resource topic. Section 3.16 describes the socioeconomic existing conditions including low-income and people of color communities and section 4.16 presents the analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures on socioeconomics including low-income and people of color and consideration of environmental justice index. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 of the EIS present a comprehensive analysis of socioeconomic including but not limited to population and growth rate (including low-income and people of color population), economic conditions, fiscal conditions, taxation, workforce and economics, housing and schools.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brun	1073578	Section 2.2, Alternative Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis, pg. 2-31. "The Solar Only and Wind Only alternatives were eliminated from detailed analysis because they would not generate the designed nameplate generating capacity required by the Applicant." The Applicant has plenty of acreage on which to locate solar arrays. These can even be installed on sloped areas that would not be amenable to wind turbines. Significantly reducing the number of turbines and increasing the number of solar arrays to achieve the designed generating capacity would be much more palatable to the surrounding communities. The lower profile would preserve the pristine Horse Heaven Hills ridgeline and the recreation areas, and decrease bird/bat kill. Endangered species habitat could be more easily avoided. Provide justification why a configuration of fewer wind turbines and more solar arrays is not being considered. The local community should have a say in where the remaining turbines are located to minimize the visual impacts. It seems like a win-win.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073587	Executive Summary VIS-1, pg. ES-38: "Relocate turbines located within the foreground distance zone (0-0.5 miles) of non-participating residences to avoid completely dominating view from these highly sensitive viewing locations. Siting the turbines further away would reduce the level of visual contrast and prominence." I would suggest that there be no turbines within at least 4 miles (as the crow flies) of non-participating residences. Due to the elevation of these residences and the prominence of the turbines on the ridgeline, a half mile is going to do no good whatsoever. There is plenty of land in the Lease Boundary Area to move all of the Phase 2 turbines "over the bend" so to speak so they would not be visible from elevated neighborhoods.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
Karen Brun	1073592	Table ES-3a: Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Construction of the Proposed Action, Water Resources (Section 4.4) pg. ES-48 states "Project construction activities would rely on water supplied by the City of Kennewick Public Works." In a conversation with the C of K Public Works Deputy Manager, he stated that the applicant had been notified in May 2022 that Kennewick would NOT be supplying water for this project, yet here it is still in the DEIS. Where is the water going to come from?	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
99337-2794	1073595	My concern with the project is the lack of discussion concerning recycling. For example, in the United States, retired wind turbine blades are primarily sent to one of a small number of landfills (https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/news-insights/wind-turbine-blades-options-at-end-of-life/). This is not sustainable. There are alternatives. Solar energy in the U.S. is expanding rapidly. But according to UCSUSA, only 10% of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are recycled. We can't keep burying this stuff (and our heads) in the sand. We need to work towards circular supply chains.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbine blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1073617	We don't need it nor do we want a wind farm on horse haven. Put in more nuclear facilities that have a proven shot at providing the electricity that we need. It's a clean energy and not an eye sore that the wind mills produce. And the noise produced by the wind farm is more then I want to hear. Not even the solar system at eye pleasing, but at least they don't make noise. And they don't kill birds.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Karen Brun	1073837	Section 2.1.1, pg. 2-5, states "portions of the Lease Boundary may currently be enrolled in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program." Are they or aren't they? Confirm if those portions are in this program and what the ramifications for the project are.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	At the time of the Applicant's Application for Site Certification (ASC), lands were enrolled in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program. Due to the length in time between the Applicant's ASC, DEIS, and FEIS lands may change their enrollment status.	2.0	n/a
Karen Brun	1073849	Fact Sheet, Project Location, states "The Project is located approximately 4 miles south/southwest of the city of Kennewick and the larger Tri-Cities urban area, along the Columbia River." While this may be true of the portion to the south from west of Finley to I-82, it is not true beyond that point. I suspect the Applicant used the city limits as the starting point but there are many well-populated residential areas outside the city limits and they will be within .5-2 miles from the closest turbines. Please correct this error.	Fact Sheet	The closest distance from the lease boundary to the City of Kennewick is approximately 4 miles.	n/a	Update to the scale on figures that depict the proximity of the Project to surrounding jurisdictions.
Karen Brun	1073860	Fact Sheet, Required Permits, Approvals, and Licenses states "EFSEC's Site Certification Agreement (SCA) preempts otherwise applicable state and local regulatory permits pursuant to RCW 80.50.110 and RCW 80.50.120." Does this mean that every permit or approval on the list in Table 1.1-1 is thrown out? I'm particularly interested in the one about Oversize and Overweight Permits because disregarding this could constitute a serious safety hazard and could result in serious injury. Given the extraordinary weight of the nacelles (71+ tons) and towers (54+ tons), multiplied by 150 or 244, unacceptable stress will be put on the Benton County roads which are paid for and maintained through local property taxes. Is EFSEC accepting responsibility for injury and damage claims? If not, who is? Certainly not Benton County since they had no say in the matter.	Fact Sheet	EFSEC was created in 1970 to provide "one stop" siting and permitting for large energy projects. By establishing the Council, the state legislature centralized the evaluation and oversight of large energy facilities within one state agency. The legislature cited the necessity of balancing the need for new energy facilities with the broad interests of the public. As part of the balancing process, the Council must take into account protection of environmental quality, the safety of energy facilities, and concern for energy availability. The Council's responsibilities are listed in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50.	n/a	n/a
			Transportation	This State Environmental Policy Act analysis identifies and analyzes environmental impacts associated with the governmental decision to permit this Project. The DEIS describes those impacts. EFSEC is the state's regulatory agency that determines compliance with state laws and the terms set in the SCA. EFSEC contracts with other state agencies for on-site inspections. The Council has the regulatory authority to enforce compliance with a state laws and the conditions in the SCA through fines and other actions.	4.14	n/a
Karen Brun	1073885	Given the statement on the Fact Sheet and in Chapter 1, pg. 1-7, "For facilities under its jurisdiction, EFSEC's governing statutes and rules preempt all aspects of the certification and regulation of energy facilities approved under RCW 80.50. As a result, state and local regulatory permits, requirements, and standards may not apply to the proposed Project. Table 1-1 lists the generally applicable state and local permits and approvals that would apply if the Project were not under EFSEC's jurisdiction." Does this mean that every WAC, RCW, CWA, and BCC as they relate to this project can be ignored?	Chapter 1 - Project Background	EFSEC was created in 1970 to provide "one stop" siting and permitting for large energy projects. By establishing the Council, the state legislature centralized the evaluation and oversight of large energy facilities within one state agency. The legislature cited the necessity of balancing the need for new energy facilities with the broad interests of the public. As part of the balancing process, the Council must take into account protection of environmental quality, the safety of energy facilities, and concern for energy availability. The Council's responsibilities are listed in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1074200	I support the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center because I support a greener and cleaner future for Washington State. A large-scale clean energy project like the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will help Washington reach a carbon-free future and even position our state as a leader for renewable energy. By greenlighting projects like this, Washington can be a change leader, both regionally and nationally, with home-grown power supply solutions. This project will not just help the state as a whole – it will also benefit the local economy by providing over 900 construction jobs and 56 full-time jobs, while generating tax revenue to support public services for the Tri-Cities community. I write you to express my wholehearted support for this project because the benefits, locally and globally, are what we need to sustain a greener future. The state has a responsibility to foster positive environmental impacts, and the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center can be a key step to making a real difference for the climate. Thank you for considering a greener, cleaner future. Nathan Rockwell - 5720 East McKinley Avenue, 98404	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brun	1075523	Sec. ES-2.1, pg. ES-1, states that "at it's closest point, the Project would be located approximately 4 miles south/southwest of the City of Kennewick and the larger Tri-Cities urban area." This statement is false because: Using the scale provided by Scout, a review of Figure ES-1 clearly shows that the closest point to the Kennewick City limit is 2.5 miles on the east side of I-82/I-395, <2.5 miles on the west side, and 1.25 at the Benton City limit. Significant populations exist between these city limits and the project boundary. The applicant needs to revisit and correct this error.	Executive Summary	The closest distance from the lease boundary to the City of Kennewick is approximately 4 miles. The figures in the EIS have been adjusted to accurately reflect the distance.	ES-1	Update to the scale on Figure ES-1
Karen Brun	1075551	Sec. ES-3.2.1 Special Studies, pg. ES-7, refers to Appendix 4.10-1 which supposedly focuses on "potential visual impacts resulting from modification of the landscape and the response of viewers to those features." It also states "Information and conclusions presented in the special study focused on the introduction of the Proposed Action into the setting and characterization of long-term modifications to the existing landscape's form, line, color, and texture (SWCA 2022)." I object to this because: I did not find a reference in the Executive Summary, Acronyms and Abbreviations, that refers to this. Lots of internet references to Star Wars but that's probably not it. The referenced Table 4.10-1 analyzes glare inputs and assumptions and nothing else. There is much more to visual impact than that (i.e., a forest of turbines destroying the landscape's form, line color, and texture, and flashing red lights all night long).	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 and Appendix 3.10-2 of the EIS. The reference in the Executive Summary will be updated.	ES-3.2.1	Change Appendix 4.10-1 to Appendix 3.10-2
Anonymous User	1075762	QUOTE from Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC, Aesthetics Technical Memorandum, 2.2.1 TURBINE VISIBILITY, page 9 "Project Turbines under Turbine Layout Option 2 would potentially be visible from a slightly portion of the analysis area , approximately 87 percent of the area located within 5 miles of the Project and approximately 83 percent of the area within 10 miles of the Project." To Close, To Tall to 300,000 people.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1077462	To whom it may concern: I oppose the HH Hills project as proposed. The project polluted our landscape with inefficient wind turbines that only benefit a few financially. The power produced will not benefit the Tri-Cities community and provides little in terms of long term employment or benefit to the community and businesses. Of course this is all well known, but seemingly ignored. Long story short our community pays the price while a few prosper. Please deny the request and keep our scenic natural beauty as is. If large community like Seattle and LA want wind power then they can install the windmills in their own towns & cities. Thank you Kevin Cochrane E. 297th Kennewick WA	Socioeconomics	Project location is selected based on several factors including but not limited to viable above-average wind speeds in the area, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panel, proximity to existing transmission lines and willingness of to participate in the Project. Power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant. Such power purchasers could include but is not limited to any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	1.3, 3.16 and 4.16	n/a
Central Washington Construction Trade Unions	1078362	Please see attached comments submitted on behalf of the Central Washington Construction Trade Unions.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1079872	We are already in a climate emergency. It's paramount we transition to clean energy sources immediately.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1080013	It is more important now than ever to make the drastic changes the natural world needs in order for any life including humans to survive and thrive, but the negligence of the worlds governments allowing the earth's resources and environment to be exploited by oil companies and plastic producers and commercial fishing for the past 100 years has left our livelihood in serious crisis. I as a resident of Washington state feel that our state needs to lead the way for the rest of the country. And yes I want greener energy, and love the idea of solar power for our primary source of energy. I do not agree with leaving the snake River damns up though. I want to make that clear. I love wildlife more than anything and the southern resident orcas are literally starving to death due to a lack of salmon. Just in 2018 a mother southern resident orca varied her dead baby through the water for 17 days and over 1000 miles and to me that was a scream for help and we humans have the power to help if leaders would just make the right choices. She was showing the world that they are dying and that it's our fault but we can help. So the damns need to go, but if leaders make strategic decisions we can have both. A better cleaner world for us and for all wildlife. We need the natural environment and all other living beings on this planet. So please make smart decisions for all not just humans. It breaks my heart how much wildlife and the natural world has suffered and sacrificed due to human's greed and negligence. and in the end we depend on all ecosystems and we are on the verge of seeing catastrophic impacts to these very ecosystems we depend on. Thank you Miss Crystal Lynn Fisher	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1080028	It only makes sense to plan for a cleaner future.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1080221	This looks and sounds like a very good idea. We need to do something to stop the rise in temperature. This looks like a good starting place.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1080274	I am concerned about accuracy and integrity with carbon footprint calculations of alternative energy sources. In 2017, the rural community of Newport, WA in Pend Oreille County was threatened with the possibility of a coal-burning silicon smelter being located in our rural area and within a mile from Newport schools and downtown Newport.The PacWest/HiTest silicon smelter claimed that 50% of their product would be for solar panels, and that their smelter would be a "Green" facility. They later back-tracked and stated that only 5% of their product would be for solar panels. The smelter would emit 766,000 tons of GHGs per year (plus tens to hundreds of tons of other coal toxins per year). I began an investigation into silicon smelting impacts on solar panel carbon footprints, and what I have found is very disturbing. I found that the silicon smelting process is NOT included in silicon solar panel carbon footprints, and that the LCI/LCA process for determining carbon footprints is highly subjective, and gives inconsistent and non-comparable results. Please read my guest opinion "Silicon Smelting Process Tarnishes "Green" Solar Panels" in the April 5, 2022 Spokesman Review Newspaper, and my pre-print paper: "The Impact of Silicon Smelting on Crystal Silicon Solar Panel Carbon Footprints" on ResearchGate. I am very concerned about climate change, but what I have found regarding silicon solar panels and carbon footprint calculations tells me that there is corruption in some alternative energy claims; and until this is fixed, we will continue to exacerbate the impacts of climate change. Thank you, John M. Endres jmmendres@tds.net	Air Quality	A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analyses (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21ost/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO2e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO2/kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO2e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#:~:text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,o%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020). As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.	4.3	n/a
KMSelf	1080805	Has the Corp of Engineers been involved or commented on installing culverts and adding fill in the effected draws and tributaries for the new permanent roads for this project.	General - Question for EFSEC	The United States Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District Regulatory Program evaluates applications for permits for proposed activities in "Waters of the United States" (including wetlands) throughout the State of Washington under the authorities of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.		
Anonymous User	1081671	The Horse Heaven Hills Solar and Wind project will provide hundreds of millions of dollars for our local economy and over 900 jobs for the working people who build and maintain our community. Additionally, with the winters getting colder, the summers getting hotter, and fires becoming an entire season we need all the local power generation we can get.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1081707	I believe the horse heaven hills solar wind project will not only provide union jobs but also give back to the community with green energy	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1081711	I am a union electrician living in the Tri Cities and working in the Tri Cities and surrounding areas. I fully support this installation, for the good, high paying skilled labor jobs it will require for construction, as well as the property tax offset it provides for local citizens, and the continuation of our progress to eliminate the need for energy produced from fossil fuels.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mary R. Smith	1081983	Please find attached letter.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1083315	I have grave concern for impacts on soil disruption during the preparation and installation of these massive eye sores. Management of small particle airborne dust is going to be a major issues for all land owners downwind of the 72,000 or so acres of broken ground that the project covers. And the soil erosion that is bound to happen as the ground surrounding the windmills dries out is also going to be a problem for agriculture and wildlife. Likewise, thousands of residents could face adverse health outcomes with compromised air quality due to increased particulates; as well as coping with possible damage to property and exterior machinery/systems for the same reasons. Put these windmills out where nobody lives, about 10 miles south of Badger Canyon. I don't even understand why some people think this is a good idea...	Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1083326	The materials and energy used to make these windmills outweighs the energy they the generate. Most parts of these structures are non-recyclable when they reach the end of their lifespan. Can you please imagine miles of Seattle Space Needles standing in rows on a ridge? The unending noise pollution, and hundreds of feet tall, each lined with blinking red lights, for miles? That alone will destroy the environment for wildlife and landowners alike. These structures are a total waste of materials, resources, land, and tax dollars. A fraud, really. It seems to be purposeful economic destruction.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1083717	To whom it may concern, I'm opposed to any and all wind farm projects. They distract from our beautiful vistas and add visual noise. I'm challenging whether they will truly add as much as claimed to the local economy over the proposed timeframe. The timeframe seems long enough that during that period the technology will likely become obsolete (no longer financially effective as was proposed). Thank you, Concerned resident of Benton County, WA.	Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Beyond the growing demand from utilities, industrial power buyers have announced plans to purchase renewable energy and wind and solar energy are poised to help meet this demand over long term periods. Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1083786	No on the Wind Farm in the horse heaven hills.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1084059	The impacts of climate change in the Pacific Northwest are becoming increasingly apparent to those of us lucky enough to call Washington home. Our marine life is under threat. Our forests are struggling. In September, Seattle had the worst air quality in the world due to wildfire smoke. How is the above relate to car emissions?????	Air Quality	A comparison of the GHG emissions to other available forms of bulk electricity generation would be a more relevant comparison. As noted in response 184, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to be less than or equal to life cycle GHG emissions from other forms of electricity generation and is therefore expected to improve or be neutral with respect to Washington State current GHG impacts on climate change.	4.3	n/a
Anonymous User	1084110	The time for action is now. Let us be an example of responsible climate leadership by making Horse Heaven the most environmental standard of excellence and as a bar to meet and exceed going forward.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1084271	I am DEFINITELY "for" the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center (!!)---I certainly hope it will be as successful as it can possibly be (!!) SINCERELY, David M. Scheer, D.C.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1084470	I'm not in favor of this environmental eye sore. Way too expensive, maintenance intense, low payback yield, environmentally detrimental.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. All of your listed concerns: economic, maintenance, and environmental impacts are covered in this EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1084649	we need to do as much as we can to combat climate crisis NOW!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085410	Why is an out of state company being allowed to come here and place windmills where they aren't wanted or needed. We don't need the power in our area and our land is being used for more populated cities power. If they need power then put them in their cities. The research for the sound pollution isn't being addressed here. The negative environmental impacts to our area and the native birds aren't being addressed either. This isn't wanted in the Tri Cities.	Noise and Vibration	"Sound pollution" is addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds and bird strikes, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1085437	I object to the wind farm project. I live on the boundary of turbines will be and I know FOR A FACT this will harm wildlife. We constantly have birds of prey that fly over our home all year round including the migration path of the snow geese and the sandhill cranes. With the many turbines that are across the miles they will be definitely be impacted. There is plenty of land to be had that is not in migration path or directly next to a huge sprawling city that you could put this wind farm at that does not impact our towns, farms & migrating animals. If you were to perform a non-influenced study of threats to the animals you would see this would effect eagles, hawks, cranes, geese and more. I am including a photo to show how low they fly. With the incredible height of the turbines that you are proposing they wouldn't have a chance. :(Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The risk of bird collisions with the turbines is discussed in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. The EIS considers potential disturbance to wildlife from noise, light and other sensory disturbances in Section 4.6.2.2.	4.6.2.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1085450	Big concerns are the wildlife kill, especially the raptors which soar the ridges. This wind farm proposal will most likely decimate the raptors with no opportunity to recover as the windmills will always be there taking their toll. The studies on the height and number of blades seems inconclusive. The right number of blades is 0 to protect our fragile environment and wildlife. The noise generated by the windmills has not been studied as the location has not been determined. These are incredible noise generators with the impact on human and animal health has not been determined. 20 year life is laughable. My understanding is that is the life a wind turbine with little to no recycling capability. How are these going to be disposed?	Noise and Vibration	Windmill layouts for turbine option 1 and option 2 have been provided in Section 2 of the EIS and impacts on Noise and Vibration have been outlined in Section 4.11 of the EIS. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the micrositing corridor.	4.11	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
City of Kennewick City Council	1085458	From the City of Kennewick City Council	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Anonymous User	1085483	I'm concerned about the impact this projected wind farm will have on wildlife, quality of life for nearby homeowners, i.e., turbine noise, and property values of nearby homeowners.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS	4.11	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Wind farms are not anticipated to negatively impact the property values of agricultural properties that host wind turbines. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1085490	I'm very concerned about the impact to the natural habitat for wildlife in the Horse Heaven Hills area. We all know about the noise caused by the turbine blades, we know the blades kill birds (some protected species), leaking oil/airborne blades, and we all know that so many of these monstrosities AREN'T BEING RECYCLED! In this day and age, why? We don't need more items that need to be buried in our soil. Hydroelectric power is so efficient and they've found ways to protect fish migration. We need more ways to protect our environment instead of sabotaging it with more things that can't be recycled. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2020-02-05/wind-turbine-blades-can-t-be-recycled-so-they-re-piling-up-in-landfills?leadSource=uverify%20wall ... also ... https://projects.oregonlive.com/wind-farms/	Wildlife and Habitat	The risk of bird collisions with the turbines is discussed in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. The EIS considers potential disturbance to wildlife from noise, light and other sensory disturbances in Section 4.6.2.2.	4.6.2.2	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1085524	I am a resident near the proposed area on Country Meadows Lane. I am concerned about drop in property value, danger to wildlife like birds, the noise generated, the cost to subsidize these units, the dust emissions generated, the unsightly lights and structures, and the traffic to construct and maintain the units.	Wildlife and Habitat	The risk of bird collisions with the turbines is discussed in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. The EIS considers potential disturbance to wildlife from noise, light and other sensory disturbances in Section 4.6.2.2.	4.6.2.2	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS	4.11	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
Anonymous User	1085641	I want no part of the sight, sounds, and habitat dangers that come with a wind farm in my back yard, for which I enjoy no benefit.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085659	I strongly feel that any further wind mill development will be a significant blight on our area as they are unsightly and not a viable solution to electrical power generation.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1085685	We have lived in the Tri Cities area for over 40 years. Addition of the proposed wind farm will desecrate the area by killing birds unnecessarily, destroying the habitat of spotted owls and leaving waste from broken windmills that rust and ruin the soil.	Wildlife and Habitat	The risk of bird collisions with the turbines is discussed in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. The EIS considers potential disturbance to wildlife from noise, light and other sensory disturbances in Section 4.6.2.2. Species specific assessment for special status species are provided in Section 4.6.2.4; however, as spotted owls are not found regionally they have not been included in the EIS.	4.6.2.2, 4.6.2.4	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1085692	As a residential owner, I am concerned with the lack of detail studies in turbine noise and vibrations, increased dust in an already known wind/dust zone and detailed water source for construction and operation. The previous studies presented do not have a plan should any of the above concerns prove to be an impact on humans, wildlife or the environment.	Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS	4.11	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Anonymous User	1085695	My name is Shane Schmidt and I live near this proposed project. I am concerned of the negative impacts of the project. There will be definite negative impacts to the wildlife from the construction and operation of the wind turbines. The increased noise, heavy equipment and permanent impact to the land and view even after the turbines life ends, the concrete foundations will be permanent fixtures and make so much of the land unreclaimable. The red lights and vibration will be a detriment to the area, not an asset. Plus the electrical generation will not even be used here. Let the communities that want the power construct electricity generation projects in there area and leave our hills alone	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1085702	This wind farm will be located upwind from my home. The risk of wildfires from the construction and operation of the windmills is too high. We had 7 houses lost due to a wildfire several years ago in Canyon Lakes, and fortunately no injuries. Furthermore, I cannot tolerate dust and pollutants these windmills will create. People with breathing problems will suffer.	Air Quality	The Horse Heaven project is not expected to be a source of wildfire risk.	4.3	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085705	I am extremely concerned about this wind Turbine project as a member of the Kennewick community. I'm concerned about the impact on the environment and animal habitat. I'm concerned about the views of our beautiful Horse Heaven Hills. I'm concerned about how big and tall and close to our city and houses that these wind turbines will be. I'm concerned about the blinking red lights and potential change in environmental factors. Why can't these turbines be farther away from the city? There is plenty of empty land farther south of Tri Cities.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1085706	I generally support the proposed Horse Heaven Hills energy project. However, I would like to encourage EFSEC to require the following as part of mitigation. These are in no particular order as I was too tired to read the lengthy EIS. Fund the equipment to help dryland wheat farms do direct seeding and no-till farming. The dust is horrible and they have not been good stewards or seriously worked on dust control. The money that comes from this project could address that. If they don't have to be on the same sequence, please have the lights on the turbines blink randomly - There are places in the Gorge where they go on and off in a line - light then dark. It's really annoying. Avoid damaging intact shrub-steppe habitat and work around it when possible. Replanting efforts should have a 3-5 year bond to ensure plant success. Use best available technology to limit bird and bat strikes. I recently heard black blades would be better for birds to see. Hopefully the data will be available in time for these. Require Scout to simultaneously fund an energy conservation campaign. We need to conserve the energy we have. Ensure Scout pays a fair price for land leases. The leases could help provide a stable income so farmers can keep farming in the face of climate impacts. Also, whatever role EFSEC has in the matter, it is time to remove the four lower Snake River dams to prevent ecocide and cultural genocide.	Air Quality	The Horse Heaven project is not expected to be a source of agricultural-related dust emissions. Property owners are responsible for controlling dust from their property according to the Washington Administrative Code 173-400-040 paragraph 9. Complaints regarding fugitive dust that does not comply with these provisions can be directed to the Benton County Clean Air Agency. Comment about FAA lighting blink-timing noted.	4.3	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment about FAA lighting blink-timing noted.	4.10	n/a
			Vegetation	The Project has been designed to minimize impacts to shrub-steppe and to avoid where possible shrub-steppe habitat during the phases of the Project. Where shrub-steppe avoidance is not possible, mitigation for the impacts would be provided based on the as-built plan.	4.5.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Painted turbine blades are currently prohibited by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as the installation of high-efficiency electrical fixtures and appliances in the O&M facility, BESSs, substations, security lighting, and others.	4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would financially support ongoing agricultural ownership and operations via its lease agreements with participating landowners. The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). The Applicant has not made publicly available the value of its agreements with participating landowners.	4.8.1	n/a
Anonymous User	1085708	I strongly oppose the construction of this wind / solar project. The environmental impact far outweighs any benefit.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Your environmental concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1085709	Please consider painting one of the blades of each turbine black to reduce bird kill. https://electrek.co/2020/08/21/wind-turbines-bird-friendly-black-blade/	Wildlife and Habitat	Painted turbine blades are currently prohibited by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085716	My utility provider, Benton PUD will be forced to buy this more expensive source of power, and has stated they will pass this on to the consumer as higher rates. I am paying more and getting less. Not only do I have to look at, and hear, these eyesores. I will now have to pay more for the "privilege"	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Your financial concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS (i.e. the proposed project's economic and social impacts is assessed in Chapter 4.16 Socioeconomics) and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085872	Interesting that the faction that bellyaches about interference with property rights wants to interfere with farmland owners' right to use their land to both farm and produce clean energy. Could it be that the wind farm would slow the southward sprawl of oversized homes? The energy produced from wind would enhance our regional focus on energy that doesn't affect climate change. Our capable craft workforce would do a good job of building and supporting operation. Eventual opportunity from the storage capabilities resulting from PNNL's materials scientists will enhance the pairing of wind and Energy Northwest base load power.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085961	I am concerned for our environment, the wildlife, and our community. The turbines will disrupt everything and I am worried about the impact the turbines will have to my friends and families health and wellbeing. I do not feel the turbines are in the best interest of our community. I do not support the turbines project.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1085966	Noise from wind turbines has been documented to have negative impacts on animal as well as human health. Scout Clean Energy should be required to submit a site plan showing the exact location of each turbine so that a noise study for each turbine can be performed. Turbines that produce negative impacts to nearby residents or wildlife should be relocated or removed prior to approval of the project. Particularly I noted that the conclusions in chapter 5 * Vegetation: Conclusion(a): The Proposed Action would meaningfully contribute to cumulative impacts on Priority Habitat and special status plant species. * Wildlife and habitat: Conclusion(a): The Proposed Action would meaningfully contribute to a cumulative impact on habitat loss and degradation, habitat loss for special status wildlife species, barriers to movement, and wildlife mortality.	Noise and Vibration	Windmill layouts for turbine option 1 and option 2 have been provided in Section 2 of the EIS and impacts on Noise and Vibration have been outlined in Section 4.11 of the EIS. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the micrositng corridor.	4.11	Additional figures or figure inserts showing NSR locations with maximum impacts and the closest noise source(s), has been requested.
			Vegetation	Table ES-5 indicates that the impact from the Proposed Action would not significantly directly or indirectly impact Priority Habitat; however it contributes to cumulative impacts.	Table ES-5	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The potential for the Project to disturb wildlife resulting in indirect habitat loss is described in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. Mitigation Measure Hab-5 has been recommended to create a framework for the Applicant to measure indirect habitat loss and develop adaptive management.	4.6.2.2	Mitigation Measure HAB-5 will be recommended to update to measure and manage indirect habitat loss.
Anonymous User	1085993	Strongly oppose due to environmental damage and unsightly views negatively affecting our quality of life and economics.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. Your environmental and economic concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1086079	I am apposed to the wind turbine project in the Horse Heaven Hills as the noise from them have been shown to be harmful to humans and animals. Also the light pollution to the area would effect the quality of life of the people living in the surrounding area. I am also concerned that the preliminary studies that must be done before construction of the turbines can not be completed if there is no clear mapping of where the turbines shall be erected.	Noise and Vibration	Windmill layouts for turbine option 1 and option 2 have been provided in Section 2 of the EIS and impacts on Noise and Vibration have been outlined in Section 4.11 of the EIS. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the micrositng corridor.	4.11	Additional figures or figure inserts showing NSR locations with maximum impacts and the closest noise source(s), has been requested.
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on Project lighting impacts on sky glow and light pollution are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to be a significant source of "light pollution".	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1086095	I am very much against the Horse Heaven Wind Project. Not only will it ruin our natural beautiful hills, but I believe it will be environmentally damaging to our birds and animals that live there.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Your environmental concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1086167	I feel this project would be a great boon for the Tri-Cities and am in favor of it! We need to emphasize renewable energy sources -and this is a worthy project!	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1086189	Eyesore and milieu degeneration is a problem with these huge wind turbine farms, to a point that my opinion is that the Horse Heaven site shouldn't be approved. I'd like to mention that I've noticed that unlike other large structures, such as transmission lines, dams, and large roadways that mar the milieu, the wind turbines are way worse because not only are they huge, environmentally disfiguring structures, THEY MOVE, which catches ones eye, and is fact about impossible to ignore; our eyes, of course, are attracted to things in our visual fields which stand out. Moving white blades of daylight and the flashing red lights of nighttime turbines are not helpful to driving safety- I've encountered some which disturb my driving attention so much that my safety is significantly lessened. Thank you, Steve Fabian, Richland, WA.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1086213	We already have dams were not fully using and the damage has already been done there. I can see how wind energy can be a good thing in the right area but we simply don't need it here.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1086297	I am against putting windmills on the Horse Heaven Ridge or anywhere. Windmills are NOT VIABLE! That means they are NOT COST EFFECTIVE. The spent/used blades are useless, destroying perfectly good land. Hydro (water-powered) is the best renewable, viable, green energy there is. To destroy electricity-making dams is criminal! The windmills look like crosses (for all the wildlife that is killed?). The blinking lights at night are polluting the darkness.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. Your environmental and economic concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1086349	I am concerned about the cost to wildlife in the area of the massive wind turbines. Benton county is a major waterfowl flyway. It's proven that win turbines kill many birds over the days, months and years of operation.	Wildlife and Habitat	Bird collision with the turbines is considered in section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS.	4.6.2.2	n/a
jjsmas1	1086379	My first comment regards the visual impact of this project. I live in N Richland, some distance from the project; however, I have been walking the Columbia River path in Leslie Groves and Howard Amon Parks for over 30 years and have been viewing the Horse Heaven hills from the elevated points of the walking path, where I am approaching the dike and along the dike. That has always been an enjoyable high point of my walking experience, to take in the views of the Horse Heavens from those vantage points. My concern and my opposition to this project is based on the fact that the wind turbines will dominate that view and significantly diminish the natural beauty in that view. My second comment and point of opposition is based on the fact that this project would not be possible without heavy subsidizing from the tax payers. I am opposed to these subsidies.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
rwurdeman	1086630	Not at all in favor of this ugly project. Where will the electricity be going too. Will my power bill be going down. Too many workers and where will they find adequate housing in a cumunity that is already being pushed to the brink. Current Infrastructure will not accomodate increased traffic. Ugly sight on rugged hillsides. Will decimate the bird population. Disposal of these components will pollute the environment.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Analysis of housing demonstrated that vacant housing exists throughout the study area and nearby communities, and the nearby communities maintain substantial short term rental options that include hotels, motels, campgrounds, and recreational vehicle parks. Adverse impacts would occur if a reduction in short term and long-term rentals reduces supply enough that it causes an increase in rental prices. Given that most construction workers would be sourced locally and the abundant supply of short term and long-term rentals throughout the study area, the analysis determined that the Project would not result in adverse impacts on housing.	4.16.2	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1086634	The massive area selected for the wind turbines and solar fields is geographical as wider east to west than the Tricities. With over 200 turbines of which many, or most are 500 feet tall. What a blight to our views they will be. Additionally, our electric rates will increase dramatically due to the cost of the wind turbines.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Your environmental, decommissioning, and economic concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1087029	This will create such an eye sore. This is an area that is seeing significant growth and this land should be developed into businesses that can actually help boost the economy and support urban expansion.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Mycomments*2023	1087093	I am opposed to the windfarm due to the threat to wildlife, part of this area is called goose gap for a reason. I am opposed also because of the dirt and dust hazzrds this project will add to people living down wind. I am opposed because we need to protect our Ridgeline views and finally I am opposed because there is no extra water to use for this project and water should not come from kennewick, KID nor aquifer.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Anonymous User	1087287	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>I write to commend this council on the thorough analysis included in the DEIS for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and recommend the project's approval.</p> <p>This review is based in a factual and scientific methodology, a forthright accounting of how the project will impact the environment and surrounding communities, and clear mitigation measures that avoid and minimize the most significant potential impacts.</p> <p>This impartial, science-based approach is needed, particularly considering many of the emotional and inaccurate appeals that have been made about the project. In serving on Benton City Council, I've been privy to some of the discussion surrounding this project, including points raised about visual impacts, and opinions about how private landowners should exercise their private property rights.</p> <p>It is true that individuals may have a difference in opinion about what our region's landscape ought to look like. It's also true that wind turbines are prominent features which will be seen by many and may illicit varied reactions.</p> <p>What has been lost in this discussion, however, is an appreciation of private property rights – a value that is typically held dear by many in this community. The proposed project was deemed to have land use consistency. Now, the DEIS has identified strategies for reducing and alleviating the project's most significant impacts. This includes the restriction of turbines within proximity of non-participating residents and critical viewpoints.</p> <p>Opinions may vary on this project, and on the issue of views, but we ought to be very careful when it comes to telling private property owners what they can and cannot do on their lands, outside of the existing regulatory review process.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jessica Wadsworth</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1087445	I will be directly impacted by the wind farm due to the location of my home, however the entire Tri Cities will be directly impacted way more than they expect. I oppose the wind farm vehemently. The proven physical and mental health hazards are at the center of my objection. The pulsation, blinking red lights, the increased fugitive dust, possibly chemical laden with herbicides, and the steady hum, are all proven to have a negative impact on health, both human and animal. Thousands of birds will be killed. No land owner or wind farm which is an industrial manufacturer of energy should be allowed to infringe on the wellbeing of another. This is 72,000 acres that is all near 308,000 people!! Central Washington is a vast area where no one lives. That is far better suited for this wind farm if it must be built. Good health is our single most valuable possession. To infringe on that for ANY reason is unfathomable, and this is pure greed.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1087489	<p>The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center underscores the significant economic opportunity of building out Washington state's clean energy future. As a life-long resident of Washington State I fully support this project. The project will help advance the state's ambitious climate goals while creating a substantial number of family-wage jobs and economic activity in Benton and Franklin Counties.</p> <p>Developing the project's hybrid combination of wind, solar, and battery storage applications will create as many as 930 jobs for skilled construction workers. Through building local access roads and foundations to support the technology, the project will employ crane operators, electricians and skilled laborers. The project will be a significant source of employment in the local area.</p> <p>The jobs required by this project are high-paying, family-wage opportunities. Economic impact studies examining the project estimated the typical income per worker during the construction phase to be \$113,500. That's nearly 60% higher than the average regional compensation across industries and 37% higher than the compensation in the construction industry for Benton and Franklin Counties. The studies also showed that at full build-out, the project could amount to at least \$73 million in labor income and \$143 million in total economic output. Following construction, the project will also create a combined direct, indirect and induced total of 56 long-term high-paying jobs during its estimated 30-year life span.</p> <p>While the project brings clear and substantial benefits to families and workers in the local area, it will also help advance Washington state's broader clean energy economy. The project will keep workers busy in our Ports and shipping industry as the turbine parts make their way to the Tri-Cities. It will also drive further investments in new and existing workforce development and educational programs to prepare students for careers in the growing renewable energy sector. Such programs already exist at Walla Walla Community College, Bellingham Technical College, and Centralia College, all of which will increasingly important as these projects continue to move forward.</p> <p>I urge EFSEC to advance this project to take advantage of these clear opportunities.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Bob Zappone</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1087573	We don't believe the wind farm will provide enough energy at the times the extra electricity is needed to justify the cost to install the windmills or the disturbance to the growth of the City of Kennewick. Kennewick is growing and can only grow to the south where the windmills if installed will severely restrict the growth. The noise and lights of the towers as well as the view from the area will be very objectionable. There doesn't appear to be a plan in place to demolish and remove the windmills at the end of their lifecycle which is another real problem.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Your environmental, decommissioning, and economic concerns are covered in the analysis of the EIS and would be considered by EFSEC to determine its recommendation of the proposed project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1087856	<p>I am COMPLETELY AGAINST THE HORSE HEAVEN HILLS WIND TURBINE FARM!!</p> <p>Scout Energy has no regard for the objections of the People of Kennewick and surrounding cities and neither does our Governor Inslee!! Scout will be tearing up a designated wine appellation with some of the best agriculture land in Wa. State and completely destroy a newly developed area for our pronghorned antelope that are close to extinction!!</p> <p>DO NOT BUILD THIS MONSTER FARMS!!!!</p>	Land and Shoreline Use	The 72,428-acre Lease Boundary equates to approximately 6.5 percent of Benton County's territory and 11 percent of the land use designation "GMA Agriculture." The ASC indicates that Turbine Option 1 would involve more land disturbance than Turbine Option 2. The Project's total land disturbance of 6,869 acres under Turbine Option 1 is equal to approximately 1 percent of Benton County's lands designated as GMA Agriculture and 0.6 percent of the county's total territory. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	3.8.1.1	
Anonymous User	1087942	I find the High visual impact rates for the Tri-City area and the High impact to the Flyway for Birds to be a major problem for this project. I wish to appose it's construction	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1087990	<p>I don't want to see this happen!</p> <p>1) Those things ruin the beautiful skyline that so many enjoy.</p> <p>2) They do not produce enough power and are not a good replacement for ANY energy source.</p> <p>3) They do have to be maintained by oil! The blades do have to be replaced leaving old ones to be dumped. WHERE?! They are huge!</p> <p>4) They highly affect nature! Many birds have been killed by these monstrosities! https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/how-many-birds-do-wind-turbines-really-kill-180948154/</p> <p>https://www.birdwatchingdaily.com/news/conservation/new-study-estimates-573000-birds-died-at-wind-farms-last-year/</p> <p>5)This can affect farming and grazing along with possible growth in housing there. Idaho is also as concerned as we should be. https://www.kivitv.com/ksaw/locals-raise-opposition-to-wind-energy-project-as-environmental-impact-statement-release-looms</p> <p>6) I am unsure who would actually get what energy comes from them. I do know that Idaho Falls put them up on their mountainside, very ugly, and every bit of that energy is being sent to CA! So CA is gonna start putting these everywhere they can and destroy everyone else's states with these to try to benefit themselves. That is not good!</p> <p>https://dailycaller.com/2023/01/09/real-concern-locals-tear-idaho-wind-project/</p> <p>Also, the abundance of domestic geese is just that, abundant, but several companies need to defend our rights for real.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.6.2.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1088598	We are in FULL support of the proposed project to help bolster renewable infrastructure and provide reliable power to the grid.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1088618	I am against any more wind or solar farms in our Tri City area. Already on a clear day you can see the ugliness of those on the hills around the valley. At night all one sees are blinking red lights. Birds are killed by them including protected birds like our Bald Eagles. Windmills are not environmentally safe - they use gallons of oil during their lifetime, as we saw a couple summers ago they can start wildfires, there is no recycle program for the blades. Plus, most are made in China not the USA.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Bird collision with the turbines is considered in section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS.	4.6.2.2	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
Dean Nester	1088673	My comments/concerns are written up in the attached PDF file. Respectfully, Dean Nester West Richland, WA 99353	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. The visual impacts to recreation sites have been determined to be "High" with a finding of "Significant Impact".	4.12	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	None of the turbines ID-ed for removal in this comment were removed in the DR from the Applicant.
Mike Minelli	1088697	pls see attached	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Please note, under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1088704	With Family members who share the direct view & have grave concerns about the environmental impact, so much so they packed up their entire house and planned on moving, i make a plea for ONLY SOLAR power generating structures be put on these lands vs the negatively impactful wind turbines. Please do not put these in the proposed location.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1088901	I am ABSOLUTELY against wind turbins! Not just in my area but ANYWHERE! They are an eye sore, bad for animals and birds especially, and not environmentally friendly. I HATE THEM! Those people who promote them has \$\$ to gain from them and that is all they care about.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1088940	I don't see a direct benefit to these monstrous structures (windmills). The energy they develop will not benefit the local population but instead bring many adverse impacts ie; sound, concerns impacts to animal and bird populations to say nothing about the ugliness cast upon God's landscape beauty.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1088945	Please address the following issues regarding the proposed Horse Heaven wind project (HHWP). 1. I live approximately 1 mile North of the proposed turbines and witness first hand almost year round thousands of birds flying directly into the path of the proposed turbines. See link to pictures. https://photos.app.goo.gl/Nw1mcseTU3zFSaTB8 All but one picture I posted is from the same time and spot looking different directions. The groups of birds stretched as far as I could see in every direction. Is EFSEC aware of this? Who will be responsible when many birds are injured or killed by the turbine blades? 2. Quite often there are a pair of owls hooting on roof tops at night. I have seen them or another pair nesting in the canyon in the proposed turbine area. 3. I also see many hawks in this area. Is EFSEC OK with killing or driving them off as well? 2. There are several houses nearby and more being built at this time. This is a housing growth area to the south of town. Please explain why the EFSEC committee would subject our Horse Heaven (proposed turbine hell) community to: a.) Low frequency sound, B.) light flicker during the day, C.) stirring up dust from the nearby dry wheat fields. D.) Light noise. My hot tub and general view is of the Horse Heaven area and the marker lights would ruin our serene natural landscape. 3. According to Western Power Pool Western Resource Adequacy Program the massive HHWP 850 megawatt project would only have 8% effective power, equaling only 68 megawatts of effective power that is generated at a time when it is not needed. Please see the attached slides and explain the benefit of this project. Link to Western Power Pool Western Resource Adequacy Program: https://www.westernpowerpool.org/about/programs/western-resource-adequacy-program Thank you. D. Brent & Karen Strecker	Wildlife and Habitat	Information on bird movements over the Lease Boundary was provided in the Application and is summarized in Section 3.6 of the EIS. This information was used to calculate the species specific exposure index to assess the potential bird collision impacts of the Project. These are described in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. The Applicant would be responsible for conducting two years of post-construction bird and bat fatality monitoring. The results of the monitoring program would be used to inform whether additional mitigation measures and monitoring are required as part of an adaptive management program (See recommended mitigation Wild-1). Impacts to raptors (owls and hawks) are discussed in Section 4.6 of the EIS. Proposed mitigation measures include an evaluation of indirect wildlife habitat loss (e.g. through sensory disturbance) that could reduce habitat function adjacent to Project components is discussed in mitigation measure Hab-5.	4.6.2.2	Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from shadow flicker and lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to be a significant source of shadow flicker, increase sky glow, nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	The project is not expected to be a source of "Low frequency sound" at levels that would impact humans or structures.	4.11 (LFN)	Low frequency noise to be directly addressed in the FEIS.
			General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns and observations have been noted. Economic impact analysis (Appendix 4.16-1) has been completed to determine potential socioeconomic impact on the local communities.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089167	These many monstrously large windmill towers (higher than the space needle) will destroy the beauty of the surrounding area. They will also decimate the raptor population such as the recovering eagle population. And who knows how loud or visually disturbing the spinning blades will be? There are plenty of other less controversial or intrusive ways to get green energy such nuclear power.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1089470	You haven't given a designated area for EACH turbine; therefore no noise study can be performed. We know the noise factor is a problem to health for human and animals. Lack of sleep due to the noise can cause major health problems for citizens. The AM is horrible to citizens. The rotation is a death threat for birds. Some animals are injured to the loss of sight regarding vibration of these turbines. And we know chickens quit laying eggs due to them. Any lights attached to them are a problem for all residents that can view these turbines. Infra-sound is detrimental to our health. Vibrations can cause pressure pulsations to liquid tanks. These turbines are to do away with alternative energy products, but they MUST have gas and oil to run. Then sometimes they have come apart and slung the blade where someone could get hurt. There is no way to recycle blades. The blades are not USA made - China benefits which is against most USA citizens. William Acker, Energy Engineer states the dangers of the turbines. I realize the land owners will benefit greatly money-wise, but neglecting the citizens surrounding these turbines MUST be a factor to consider. The electricity they will produce will be probably be sent to Seattle or California. No good reason to put them here. AND - truck traffic, the dust factor, the fire danger, what water will you use for construction and to put out fires, are they too tall, blades too flashing, too close together, too many, flashing lights, animal injury and death, etc. are all problems. Therefore: Submit a site plan for exact location for each. Do a 360 degree 6 month noise study for each turbine. Any turbine that produce detrimental noise to citizens or animals must be removed for your plan. Thank you. Louetta Shipleit 2704 W Old Inland Empire Hwy Benton City, WA 99320	Noise and Vibration	Windmill layouts for turbine option 1 and option 2 have been provided in Section 2 of the EIS and impacts on Noise and Vibration have been outlined in Section 4.11 of the EIS. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the micrositng corridor. The project is not expected to be a source of "infra- sound" at levels that would impact humans or structures.	4.11 (LFN)	Additional figures or figure inserts showing NSR locations with maximum impacts and the closest noise source(s), has been requested. Low frequency noise to be directly addressed in the FEIS.
			Wildlife and Habitat	Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS provides an analysis of the potential indirect habitat loss (e.g. sensory disturbance) to wildlife from the Project. These areas were calculated based on the general micrositng corridor that will encompass the turbine locations.	4.6.2.2	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
Anonymous User	1089521	Information seems to be totally lacking as to why these sites have been selected over all others. Why only here?	General - opposition	A majority of the site is privately owned by the Applicant, Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC. Scout Clean Energy LLC (Scout) is the indirect owner of 100 percent of the Project. Scout intends to build, own, and operate the Project and therefore, the Proposed Project has been proposed for this site. Project location is selected based on several factors including but not limited to viable above-average wind speeds in the area, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panel, proximity to existing transmission lines and willness of to participate in the Project.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089592	This project will ruin and overwhelm the beautiful landscape that make the Tri-Cities a special place to live. It needs to be moved closer to the Washington population that requires it. Other clean energy alternatives are available, for example, small modular reactors. They could easily be placed near metropolitan areas where the demand is higher. The organization involved in placing so many wind turbines main goal is financial gain. Please consider an alternate area or smaller number of turbines for this project that does not overwhelm the Tri-City landscape.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The Proposed Project would consider a reduction in turbines as noted under Option 2 (per Chapter 2, Proposed Action and Alternatives) as a result of the evaluation of impacts. The EIS does note that fewer turbines and solar arrays may be constructed for the Project and still allow for the achievement of the nameplate generating capacity. In addition, EFSEC would review the aesthetic analyses completed for the Project and consider the impacts on local communities.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089601	We are one of many families that are building homes within 1-2 miles of many of the proposed windmills just south of Kennewick. In the report, there is not much mention of noise from the windmills or the vibrations these will cause. Especially due to the size of the proposed windmills. There are many health effects that must be considered. It seems irresponsible to place windmills that are the size of the Space Needle within a couple miles of homes and businesses. You are potentially ruining our beautiful horse heaven skyline and impacting the physical health of thousands of Benton County residents. Why? There is so much room, in so many places that are more rural. Please do not do this Please review this case study https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3653647/	Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS and are not expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health from noise or vibration.	4.11	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1089602	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3653647/	Public Health and Safety	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089638	This is in opposition of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. In Benton County, we already have the ability to harness energy through nuclear and hydroelectric power. In this area, harnessing a mere 27% of wind power is not a significant amount of energy considering all of the documented negative impacts the turbines may have to our local environment. It is proven that wind turbines have a negative effect on animals and human health, along with creating an undesirable visual landscape. The cost to develop a local windfarm does not appear to be cost efficient when we have two other sources of energy currently in our backyard.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089663	If the wind turbines must go ahead, they need to be at least 2 miles from residential structures, specifically non-participating community members. There are multiple studies that show large turbines cause auditory and psychological health risks to nearby residence.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089668	The size and density of the proposed wind turbines is far too great. I'm not sure if this will positivity impact my rual neighbors in badger canyon. We kivr in a rural area for a reason. Wind turbines is not one of them.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089697	EFSEC DISCOURAGES PUBLIC INPUT FOR HORSE HEAVEN PROJECT BUT NOT GOLDENDALE ENERGY STORAGE? Goldendale 64 days of public comment. Horse Heaven 30 days during 6 major holidays (Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, New Years Eve, New Year's Day, Hanukkah, Holiday State Days, MLK. Later after public pressure, 15 days were added. DOES THIS ENCOURAGE OR DISCOURAGE PUBLIC INPUT? THREE public input occasions for the Goldendale project plus media, email and social media communication HHH Project...ONE phone meeting - in March 2021. Audio and access was very difficult for some and impossible for others. EFSEC Senior Management has openly recognized it. PUBLIC INPUT ENCOURAGED? Car Tour of HH Project EFSEC led by "Scout". The public was invited but asked by senior management Not To Speak. PUBLIC INPUT DISCOURAGED? Wautoma Solar Project Town Hall was A Face to Face meeting which included EFSEC members in the Tri Cities and meeting at Columbia Basin College. No public meetings are scheduled for Horse Heaven Project? Is this fair? IT LOOKS LIKE PUBLIC INPUT WAS NOT ENCOURAGED....AND IT'S NOT A GOOD LOOK. The Spirit of SEPA as written is a fair process. It encourages public input with a fact based approach. However In practice SEPA becomes a whole lot of words about nothing. It's too bad. The actions mentioned above clearly shows EFSEC is a Siting Approval Process. MPMinelli	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Please note, under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089781	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project for a number of reasons: adverse impacts to wildlife visual impact to nearby residents adverse impacts to property values adverse impacts of oil spills when turbines fail adverse impacts of disposal of blades that have a limited life	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Wind farms are not anticipated to negatively impact the property values of agricultural properties that host wind turbines. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project resulting from hazardous materials use and storage are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The applicant has committed to developing and implementing a SPCC Plan to address potential spills during Project Operations, as noted in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089797	Consideration should be given to moving the wind farm further away from the city limits and closer to the Columbia River. There is a significant amount of open land between the Tri-Cities and Umatilla. Having the wind farm in an area less visible to Tri-City residents would mitigate the problem of unsightly turbines impacting residents while still allowing the project to go forward.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1089949	Is Scout Energy and the State of Washington prepared to be sued by people who have their hearing impaired by wind turbines? If these turbines and their vibrations are damaging the eardrums of whales in the Atlantic Ocean what do you think will happen in the Tri Cities? These turbines are too close to the city. These turbines will destroy flight patterns of birds and will drive native fauna out of the area. Just say NO!	Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS and are not expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health from noise or vibration.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including an assessment of potential wildlife mortality and indirect habitat loss, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
cbartram45	1089980	EFSEC should disapprove this project due to its proximity to a metropolitan area or downscale the project to reduce the visual and environmental impact to the Tri Cities area. Having such a large project located so closely to a metropolitan area is a terrible precedent. This project has no benefit to residents living within the area. None of the local utilities or residents will receive the energy from this project. At a minimum, the turbines should be downsized in number and in height, and require the project to utilize systems approved by the the Federal Aviation Administration that detect aircraft radar and turn on only when planes are flying low in the vicinity.	Chapter 1 - Project Background Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Comment noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	n/a 4.10	n/a Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
Anonymous User	1090013	Can't believe what you're letting these Liberal West siders get away with , going to be an eyesore just like Souther California , if you want this in your back yard . Why don't you just move down there	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1090026	Why only here?	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1090049	I oppose the proposed wind farm in Benton County.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1090085	Hello, My family and I are residents of the Badger Canyon area in Benton City, Washington. We moved to this area for its natural beauty and the breath taking views of the Horse Heaven Hills. There are also many wonderful bird species in this area. Wind Turbines are not a natural part of any environment. If the proposed wind turbines are built across the Horse Heaven Hills, what was once a beautiful natural landscape, will turn into an industrial eyesore. Not to mention the animal impact. It has been proven that in its lifetime, a single wind turbine can kill hundreds of birds and bats. Not just local birds, but also migrating birds. If rural communities are to preserve the natural aesthetics of an area, and preserve bird and bat populations to keep the environment in balance, wind turbines must not be built. If wind turbines must be built, they should be built away from human populations, to preserve the natural ecology of those areas as much as possible. Imagine if 500' tall oil drilling rigs were to be built in this location. It would be obscene. Why then would any energy corporation push 500' tall wind turbines on a local community? We love our environment as much as anyone, and desire more green energy. But green energy must not come at such a cost to any community. We hope you can take these comments into consideration. Please reach out to me if you would like a longer statement, or a public reading of the statement. Respectfully, Grant Nelson grant250@live.com 425-890-1144	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare Wildlife and Habitat	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.10 4.6	n/a n/a
Anonymous User	1090190	I support the development of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy project. We need to develop non-carbon sources of energy whenever feasible to address climate change	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1090217	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Turbine Project. I believe it will have a negative impact on birds, ground wildlife, and human residents in the area. I also have concerns about the impact that getting the raw materials necessary for the batteries and the construction of the turbines themselves will have in other parts of the world. Also, there is no good plan in place for how to deal with turbines and batteries years later after they are useless.	Wildlife and Habitat General - Recyclability	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.6 4.7.2.4	n/a n/a
Anonymous User	1090236	We need a hearing A other complaint is they have not done adverse testing on each proposed wind turbine, they have not even given exact location of each turbine. We need testing as to the affects on people health, noise and dust studies or killing wild birds, animals and environment! Lights, noise, dust, and killing protected animals! Birds antelope breeding grounds. Latest is the deaths of Whales off the east coast! No noise studies were done to protect the whales, birds or people. Here it is not only fleshing lights increased, land temperature, pollution of the land as each unit requires 80 gallons of oil to be changed out every 3 months that is known to leak into the soil, massive water needs in a dessert. The fact that the fiberglass blades are not recyclable and massive blades have to be buried in landfills. Each unit only lasts 20 yrs and costs almost 1 million dollars to replace. New infrastructure has to be laid to transport this massively expensive power to where it is needed. This is all charged to the taxpayer either federal or local! --	Noise and Vibration Wildlife and Habitat Air Quality Visual Aspects, Light and Glare Public Health and Safety General - Recyclability	Windmill layouts for turbine option 1 and option 2 have been provided in Section 2 of the EIS and impacts on Noise and Vibration have been outlined in Section 4.11 of the EIS. The layouts are approximations as the Applicant is requesting the flexibility to site turbines anywhere within the microstiting corridor. Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary. Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations. The ASC states that 5 gallons of lubricating oil will be needed for each turbine per year. Oil would be brought in, and waste oil would be removed using by a maintenance contractor using a specialized vehicle. Impacts of the Project resulting from hazardous materials use and storage are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The applicant has committed to developing and implementing a SPCC Plan to address potential spills during Project Operations, as noted in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts associated with fugitive dust are discussed in Section 4.3.2.1 of the EIS. The applicant has committed to several fugitive dust minimization measures that are outline in section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.11 4.6 4.3 4.10 n/a 4.7.2.4	Additional figures or figure inserts showing NSR locations with maximum impacts and the closest noise source(s), has been requested. n/a 4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM n/a n/a
Anonymous User	1090245	Please support clean energy projects in Washington. Thank you!	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1090506	I support the completion of this project and find, with maybe two or three exceptions, the arguments against this project to be irrelevant. Most of the proponents of these arguments see this project as a threat to their current and future significant financial profits. So they have formed organizations with names that hide their greed in order to lobby against this project.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1090663	I am submitting my comments in regard to the Visual Aspects, Light and Glare mitigation measures in the DEIS. VIS-1 states to relocate turbines located within the foreground distance zone (0 to 0.5 miles) of non-participating residences to avoid completely dominating views from these highly sensitive viewing locations. Comment: I would like an analysis performed of the possibility of locating the project further south in unincorporated Benton County beyond the current southern border of the project to eliminate all potential for the turbines to be viewable by all non-participating residences.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare Noise and Vibration	Comment regarding VIS-1 noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources. Comment regarding SF-1 and SF-2 noted. The complaint "hot line" was recommended to operate up to one year after completion of all turbines. LIG-1 comment noted and additional mitigation measure recommendation will be considered. Details of the complaint resolution procedure have not yet been formalized. The hotline is to remain active until 1 year after the completion of the project. Daytime hours are set by the state regulation (WAC 463-60-352) as 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	4.10.2.4 Lighting 4.11	Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS n/a
Anonymous User	1090729	The proposed Wind Turbine project will have a major impact on our communities. It appears to be larger than Kennewick, Pasco, Richland, West Richland and Benton City. This will have a major negative impact on our cities. The development will over ride the scenic beauty of our area, and will threaten various species that live in the area.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1090741	I am concerned with the long lasting impact on our views which will be impacted by the massive wind turbines to be placed adjacent to our cities. The attached demonstrates what the view from Southridge in Kennewick.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1090789	The proposed horse heaven wind farm project will devastate the view shed of the entire TriCities area as well as have major impacts to wildlife. The EIS is a masterful tome that no one will, or can read without being paid to so. The only real benefit of this EIS was to employ dozens of people for a couple of years to cut and past a bunch of boilerplate B.S. I know. I used to be one of them. They do a fine job of admitting there will be lasting impacts to wildlife and plant communities. I've worked in the field of habitat restoration and can tell you it is impossible to restore native plant communities in our desert environment. You can try to plant a half dozen or so species but you can never restore a complete native community. There are no seeds available for 90% of the grasses and forbs that live on those ridge tops. As for impacts to wildlife, they try to say impacts will be minimal and no more impacting than another wind farm east of the TriCities. They don't mention the cumulative effects of all these wind farms. This wind farm is in the main fly way for sand hill cranes and all waterfowl flying between the Umatilla wildlife refuge and the Columbia river in the TriCities, and the Columbia basin. It will have major impacts to the migratory silver hair and hoary bats, whose populations are already in decline. There are some mitigation measures that can be employed to reduce impacts to bats, such as curtailing operations when the wind is less than 6 mph. I did not find any mention of this in the Tome. If allowed to go forth, this should be a required minimum mitigation measure. Most greedy wind farm projects don't employ any bat mitigation measures because it might cost them a nickel or two. There will also be impacts to all the local raptors. This is one of the last places in the state that has ferruginous hawks. These people claim there will be minimal impact. If you take out the last one, that is not minimal impact. What are you going to say when some of these species become extinct? Sorry about that? That doesn't cut it! Finally, the impact to the viewshed of the TriCities will be monumental, as admitted in the tome. If this project was proposed for the west side of the state within the viewshed of 200,000 people it would never get off the ground. Please do not allow this project to go forward.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Vegetation	The Project is sites in an area that has been historically altered due to agriculture. Some native habitats remain and Project components have been sited to avoid these areas where possible. Where avoidance is not possible, mitigation is proposed. The revegetation plan proposes the use of planting with native plant species following temporary disturbance. Cumulative impacts to vegetation are addressed in Table ES-5.	Section 3.5, 4.5, Table ES-5	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Cumulative impacts are the combined result of incremental direct and indirect impacts on resources from a project or plan, past and present actions, and other reasonably foreseeable developments (RFDs). Table 5-1 provides a summary of existing projects and RFDs geographically and temporally relevant to the Proposed Action, their characteristics, and potential resources susceptible for being cumulatively impacted. Table 5-2 provides an analysis of impacts from the Project and cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action and past and present actions and RFDs.	Section 5.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Mitigation measures recommended by EFSEC to reduce impacts to wildlife are discussed in section 4.6.2.5 of the EIS. Specifically, Measure Wild-1 has been developed to require the Applicant review the results of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program with EFSEC and WDFW to determine if additional mitigation measures are required. This mitigation measure will be updated in the final EIS to provide additional clerlicity to the intended scope and steps to achieve this mitigation. Wild-1 will read: Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities. The EIS provides a rating of the potential operational project impacts on ferruginous hawks and other special status species in Table 4.6-11b. This table assesses the magnitude of the potential impacts from the turbines and project as a whole on ferruginous hawk as high given the potential impacts to the local population from collisions. Mitigation measure Spec-5 has been developed to address impacts to ferruginous hawk by requiring the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of ferruginous hawk core habitat and provide a management plan identifying specific mitigation measures, such as curtailment, in the event avoidance cannot be achieved. Rationale for placing infrastructure in core ferruginous hawk habitat as well as mitigation measures would be reviewed by the TAC and approved by EFSEC.	4.6.2.5, Table 4.6-11b	Mitigation measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
Anonymous User	1090842	I have lived around windmill power generating farms and Solar stations for fifty years in California and Washington. I have an Engineering background and have noticed that the windmills are both detrimental to the environment and to the animals and people who live in the project areas. The migratory patterns have been changed due to the wind farm near Finley, WA. After talking with people at WFWL they have produced documents outlining the damage done to endangered animals. My house looks right down HW395 and all that I will see is the large ugly turbines and the flashing red lights. These turbines are the most uneconomical pieces of equipment as they are igh maintenance and are a contaminater of the soil and only operate about 30 percent of the time. In our area we don't need additional power as we have excess nuclear and hydro power. The ugly wind farm will ruin the scrub step which has been protected at the Hanford Site. There will be soil. Contamination and dust storms and occasional dust storms that will cause health problems for those who live in the shadow of the project area. And on a foggy dusty or snowy day, an airliner will eventually hit one of these high windmills	Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Vegetation	The impacts to shrub-steppe ecosystems are discussed in the EIS. The Project has been sited to the extent practical on previously disturbed land from agriculture. Applicant commitments include avoiding disturbance to shrub-steppe where possible and in avoidance is not possible to provide mitigation. Recommended Mitigation Measures include the requirement for an As-Built Plan that would provide final calculations on shrub-steppe for mitigation.	Section 4.5	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
ggraves13	1090863	The project is driven by political agendas without scientific data to support this project. It is detrimental to the shrub steppe, federally and state protected birds, it will raise local temperatures by 4 degrees annually (per Harvard and other studies world wide) effecting our food supply nationally and locally, Tricity agriculture and economically and it will effect the local wine economy. Our federal tax dollars will be sent to overseas investors where in their own countries are dismantling existing turbine farms or banning them all together because of the environmental devastation and no-energy benefit. The buyers of the tax credits will benefit corporately at the tax payers cost. The setting is in the middle of the Pacific Flyway with studies supporting the devastation of our own and global bird population. The Lewis and Clark Trail, federally protected, will be negatively impacted. The dry wheat land during construction will create another "down winder" effect on the local population by stirring up the herbicides and pesticides used in dry farming. On the scientific and transparent communication side the information provided has been not forthcoming on the data, the time lines, the public communication. Example Scout Energy has not provided an "accurate map" of the turbines implementation. Just a map with with turbines planted here and there. Over 100,000 of our Tricity population from Kiona Benton City, Badger Canyon, Kennewick and Finley live within 6 miles of the wind farm. The largest and closest to people effecting their health during construction and after implementation. Regarding employment this is a beginning and end project with out of state employees that are transient going from one job to another. Leaving a few maintenance people rotating in and out of territories assigned them. This has been misleading information regarding employment in our Tricity area. In conclusion this is a tax subsidy inspired project that will devastate the wild life in our area, raise temperatures that will demolish our contribution to our nations food supply and ruin our local economy. It will raise pricies on food and energy. Not create energy or jobs. And commit an unmentionable blow to the environment and wild life locally and globally. I have submitted an on-line petition of 1, 126 (as of this date 1/18) from local and international people that support local control of their environment and are against the devastation of turbine wind farms and against this specific project. I will be mailing the document as well.	Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. An evaluation of down winder effects resulting from the Project will be added to the FEIS.	4.13.2	Provide evaluation of "down winder" effects resulting from Project construction, operations, and decommissioning.
Anonymous User	1090920	The dramatic negative effect on the existing sweeping desert views needs to be taken into account.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Kathy Dechter	1090923	I am writing to protest Scout Energies' building a plethora of wind turbines along the Horse Heaven Hills. Of course they will be unsightly (read ugly—ala HG Wells' science fiction novels). Far worse, they will pose a potential deathtrap to our wildlife, especially birds. The only entity who will benefit is Scout Energy. Do NOT let this happen! Kathy Dechter	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1091052	I am against the project. The skyline vista will be destroyed by the installation of the wind machines. Birds will also be killed.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The EIS does assess the visual impacts of the Proposed Project as well as the impacts on wildlife. EFSEC would consider these impacts in their recommendation of the Project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
BethG	1091131	I support the project though I think it should be built further south. I am not concerned about the view. I am concerned that if they are too close to town it will retard the growth of our city (Kennewick). No one will want to build beneath them or in any close vicinity. We're hemmed in by the Columbia River to the north and these windmills would block off all other directions. Rethink the location.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Section 5.2.2 provides additional analysis for the resource topics evaluated in the EIS that would be subject to meaningful cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action within the defined spatial and temporal setting. Section 5.2.2 also includes an analysis of the No Action Alternative.	Section 5.2.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1091358	Please don't allow this wind farm to be created so close to our beautiful Tri Cities. Among other reasons, they are unsightly and ruin our beautiful view from our homes and places we recreate. They will harm our unique tourism industry based on the unspoiled beauty and serenity of our local lands. They represent a fire danger to our homes and in light of current global climate change and worsening wild fires, it would be unwise to increase our local fire danger in any way. They are noisy. They are a shameful insult to the historic Native American cultural and sacred lands. They mar our ability to enjoy our view of the ice age flood landscape which is a geological wonder bringing people from all over the world to see. This treasure is so rare in the world, and as stewards of our land it is morally reprehensible to not protect it. We already have hydroelectric dams that produce enough energy to supply our needs as well as others on the northwest who buy our electricity. Our local community will see very little profit from jobs, but will be paying the ultimate costs losing so much. Please don't build them onr our beautiful Horse Heaven Hills. Elinor Woehler	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
International Union of Operating Engineers	1091376	Please see document.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1091461	Our Climate plan needs to be aggressive. The timeline of 2045 that has been set, must be a Stretch Goal if we are to be successful with ensuring that the climate crisis has been put into remission. The 2045 goal is greater than a decade, and more than what has been recommended (2030) by science. Based on business best practices statistics, the 2045 goal is likely to be missed. If you want to meet the science based recommended deadline of 2030, a stretch goal should replace the goal of 2045. The fact that we have already lost 3 years getting started, and the fact that our goal of 2045 is likely to be missed, we should set a stretch goal of 2035. Further, to achieve the goal of 2035, this project must be properly funded and staffed. Do we have adequate and qualified staff?	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1091536	We don't need 244 turbines that will screw up our beautiful scenic views. That's why we live here, the little bit of power that is produced doesn't off set all the negatives. It will effect all of us in the tri-cities, every where we go we will have to look at this gross display of ugliness. I traveled the gorge last week and 2/3 of windmills weren't even working. When these things are broken we can't even dispose of them. They are an environmental hazard to us, the birds and the animals. All this project will do is make a few rich ,while the rest of us suffer for years the aftermath of what this will do to our area. How this can even be considered is beyond me. I was born here, stayed here because of our rivers and clean air and our panoramic views. Don't be fooled by unwarranted promises such as jobs. This is baloney. I've watched over the years projects like this that do nothing to benefit the majority only a few. How disgusting when we travel our state and all we can see is ugly windmills every where we go. We can produce power thru single power plants and even under ground that are far superior than these dinosaur projects. Please stop this. I'm getting to old to relocate but I will to get away from such devastation to our Tri-cities and all the ares for miles it will effect.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1091664	there should not let this happy to our area. they do not know how to dispose of them.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1091898	IT CERTAINLY SOUNDS LIKE SOMETHING WASHINGTON STATE CAN GO FORWARD WITH TO PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT BY Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center being the biggest carbon-free, renewable energy project in our state's history. As dirty, polluting fossil fuel plants across the Pacific Northwest are retired in coming decades, it will be up to projects like Horse Heaven to bridge the gap in our energy needs. Through a combination of solar, wind, and battery storage, HHCEC can ensure Washington residents continue to enjoy clean and water without having to sacrifice their health or the environment for reliable energy."	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1092122	I think Horse Heaven is great. Wish they sold stock I could invest in.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1092502	Data Request 2 Response 2 Attachment Wildlife states: "The issue of climate change has been cited as an additional threat to ferruginous hawk survival (Hayes and Watson 2020, Ng 2020). While predicting how climate change will affect ferruginous hawk is uncertain, the reduction in fossil fuel use and purpose of the HHCEC is one measure that can be taken to assist in the effects of climate change." Data Request 2 Response 2 also reports five ferruginous hawk fatalities attributed to wind turbine collisions in the Pacific Region over a 10-year period ending in 2012. Hayes and Watson, 2020 present this clear evidence of the lethality of wind turbines to the ferruginous hawk, and yet Data Request Response 2 has only uncertain and unstated predictions implying that the survival of ferruginous hawks may be impacted by climate change, and that wind turbines will save the ferruginous hawk by preventing the climate from changing. This is absurd. It is clear (see Hayes and Watson, 2020) that wind turbines increase mortality of ferruginous hawks. If the intention of the HHCEC is to decrease the mortality of the recently up-listed ferruginous hawk, the HHCEC project should eliminate wind turbines. Has Scout Clean Energy considered divesting wind turbines which have been shown to be fatal to ferruginous hawks? It is my opinion that Scout Clean Energy should divest wind turbines and invest in ferruginous hawk nesting habitats. Ferruginous hawks are most vulnerable during nesting.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to ferruginous hawk, and other raptors, from habitat loss, disturbance, and mortality associated with the Project in Section 4.6.2.4 including acknowledgement that the population may not be resilient to loss of individuals and habitat. This analysis drives the rating of high magnitude impact on ferruginous hawk during project operation (see Table 4.6-11b). Mitigation measure Spec-5 has been developed to require the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of core ferruginous hawk habitat and develop additional mitigation measures, such as turbine curtailment, in the event that avoidance is not feasible. Rationale for siting infrastructure and additional mitigation measures will be reviewed by the TAC and approved by EFSEC.	4.6.2.4, Table 4.6-11b	n/a
Anonymous User	1092638	Without being able to read a hard copy of the EIS at my local Pasco library, I am strongly opposed to the project to install windmills, solar panels, and battery stations on the Horse Heaven Hills.I believe the project is not cost effective. Windmills are the ultimate in embedded costs and environmental destruction. Each on will weigh 1688 tons, and will contain 1300 tons of concrete, 295 tons of steel, 48 tons on iron rebar, 24 tons of fiberglass and many, many pounds of hard to get rare earths. And windmills kill protected birds. Solar panels require an extensive list of toxic chemicals to make them, and then these toxic chemicals must be safely disposed of. I believe that once the embedded and environmental costs of making windmills and solar projects and then replacing and burying them become apparent, these projects will be abandoned.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Pgiack01	1092709	Not interested in the project in my back yard no clear or long term benefits to the Tri Cities. This project will destroy our views of the surrounding areas that make the Columbia basin a beautiful picturesque landscape. The loss of wildlife is also a big impact that will be destroyed. Not in my backyard!!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The EIS does assess the visual impacts of the Proposed Project as well as the impacts on wildlife. EFSEC would consider these impacts in their recommendation of the Project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1092856	We are totally against the establishment of this project. This will not only destroy the view but more importantly the environment and well being of the people nearby with constant blinking of lights and peace of the area	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The EIS does assess the visual impacts of the Proposed Project as well as the impacts on wildlife. EFSEC would consider these impacts in their recommendation of the Project to the Governor.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1092864	We moved from Austin TX to Tri Cities not knowing about the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project. If we had known, we would have gone elsewhere (other city or state). The beautiful views and untouched nature is what drew us here. We discovered the Tri Cities area a few years ago when we visited the wineries. If we had nothing but memories of wind turbines on the horizon, we most certainly would not have returned. This area shows so much potential to grow in tourism -- but that would most certainly come to an end with nothing but wind turbines in front of them. As far as residents, we would not benefit from this project (unless you are renting your land out). This is not to mention the wildlife that call the Tri Cities their home.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1092865	This is a project which will line up money to farmers lending the land and big corporation which will export the energy out of state. We, the citizens of tri-cities, will suffer for years to come. Not only we do not need this energy as we are well served by nuclear, hydro and existing renewables, we should focus on improving the livelihood of the communities, well-being of its citizens and not big corporations driven by greed	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Editianne	1092895	My husband and I have lived here since 1978 and love our local views of the Horse Heaven Hills. We moved here from a very industrial area in Pittsburgh, PA. The proposed windmills would change our beautiful sage step desert views to views of an industrial wasteland. We do not support a venture in our backyard designed to solve a problem in Seattle and that we do not accept the notion that "sending energy value to our west-side neighbors is worth forfeiting the economic and environmental health of our own community."	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1092897	I have lived in the Tri Cities all my life and part of the beauty here is the wide open sweeping spaces and views. These wind turbines would ruin that. No more sunsets! There'd be a huge turbine blocking the view! Tri Cities should not have to be responsible for providing energy for the west side. This is not our problem and the residents here don't want it. It should not be forced on us. Our opinions should matter much more than they seem to.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1092904	I live less than a mile from House Heaven Hills in Badger Canyon. EVERY DAY I gaze at that horizon. It would BREAK MY HEART to have to look at those uglyodly wind turbines, and for what??? A few cents saving in power for somebody, somewhere?	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1092930	I am a resident of Pasco who loves this area and loves the outdoors. The Columbia Basin is a very unique ecosystem with disappearing native habitat. The sagebrush steppe habitat is home to many different native flora and fauna that are declining in numbers due to human development and disturbance. Mule deer throughout the entire western United States has been in a downward spiral. The main cause for their decline is development and destruction of their habitat. We have several species of native hawks and owls here in the Columbia Basin as well. They are also suffering from human development. There have been efforts to help them where their habitat has been threatened, such as the Army Depot just outside of Irrigon, OR. Burrowing owls are a native species that depend on an intact sagebrush steppe ecosystem to live and reproduce. The one thing that all of these different species have in common is they share the same habitat and they decline in population with human disturbance. The windmill project that is proposed through the Horse Heaven Hills will destroy native strips of wildlife habit forever. Not to mention, we do not need the beautiful views of the Horse Heaven Hills to be permanently destroyed with loud, gigantic, noisy, flashing lights. This is just just displeasing to me and most other residents. It is the reason that wildlife and plants will not have any benefit from this proposed windmill project.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to special status species, such as burrowing owl, in Section 4.6.2.4 and provides mitigation measures in section 4.6.2.5.	4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5	n/a
Anonymous User	1092974	I advocate that the issue be put to a ballot measure vote by the people affected. The vote should include all of the residents of Benton County, as well as the residents of Pasco in Franklin County and the residents of Burbank in Walla Walla County. Only by approval of the majority of the people affected would this impact to their life-style be allowed.	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1093116	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven Hills Scout energy windfarm project.This will create asthetic pollution and will slaughter migratory birds and has a very damaging environmental footprint. There are much better more acceptable energy generation production options for our community to be considered that will be much more reliable and take up a fraction of the land mass ie nuclear. At the very least move this bad idea elsewhere. Sincerely, Vince Shawver, west Richland	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including migratory birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1093161	Kathleen Drew, Chair Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Madam Chair Drew and Council Members: Thank you for the opportunity to lend my support for and endorsement of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Project which seeks to develop, operate and construct Horse Heaven Windfarm as a renewable energy generation facility located in unincorporated Benton County. It is my understanding the Project is consistent and in compliance with Benton County's Comprehensive Plan and applicable zoning ordinance in effect as of the date of Application. An old axiom says a successful pilot has as many landings as take-offs. Well, this project will be a successful pilot should the Council decide to take-off with it and undoubtable, it will land as a success. At this point in the process, you most certainly have received testimony on both sides of the issue, so I won't take more of your time citing statistics you presently have at hand. Rather allow me to say, if there ever was a project which checks all of the boxes needed for approval this is the project. The boxes of which I speak include community involvement, high-paying construction jobs with benefits of retirement and health care, educational opportunities, programs for careers in the renewable energy sector, advancing Washington state's broader clean energy economy and forming partnerships with the surrounding cities, counties and state entities assuring the quality of life. In the construction industry, we like to say when a project is on the books, it should not cost jobs but should not be jobs at any cost. Said in another way, honoring the environment while creating high-paying, high-skilled construction jobs are compatible. At the risk of acting as one who has been vaccinated with a phonograph needle, I respectfully ask, with leadership from you and input from the Council, to move this Project forward for all of the above reasons. Thank you in advance for your consideration, Allan B. Darr Retired Business Manager, IUOE Local 302 and International Vice President. allanbdarr@comcast.net (425) 446-0958 (Text)	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093178	If you have ever driven west on highway 14 towards John day dam at night and had to look at all of the flashing RED lights along the skyline it is a sickening site. It is hard to imagine those annoying RED LIGHTS constantly Flashing across our beautiful Tri-Cities skyline. I'm sure a more isolated place could be found that would serve the same purpose.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1093258	Adding all the wind turbines to the horse heaven hills would be giant eye sore for the tri-cities. Why should the tri-cities be burdened with them for other areas that need the power. Put them with the other turbines along the gorge in rural areas and not in someone's back yard	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1093294	I do not support the installation of wind turbines in the house heaven holds. I believe they will have a negative impact on our local environment and economy.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093300	I fully agree with the Yakama Nation's comments about this renewable energy facility. They have submitted some really valuable points and definitely they should be considered. Renewable energy is great, but the tribal rights should be considered, it is on their ancestral land after all! Thank you, Joe Wiederhold Bellingham, WA	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Kitty Neill	1093302	I am very familiar with the wind farms located in Sherman County, Oregon. While this is a very rural area, towers have been placed less than 1/2 mile from farmers' residences. These turbines are extremely noisy, sounding similar to a commercial aircraft waiting for take off, and thats just one turbine - imagine hearing that noise times 20 or more within the same area. They are very unattractive and have visible oil leaks. The red, blinking lights at night are disturbing, especially if located close to a residence. Many of these turbines in Sherman County, Oregon have exceeded their 20 year lifespan, and were upgraded a couple of years ago to larger blades. Where did the old blades go? I suspect there are no recyclable materials in either the tower or the blades.	Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the DEIS and are not expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health from noise or vibration.	4.11	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1093336	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven wind farm project. The negative impact on the people of the Tri-Cities and its surrounding communities will be negative. It will be a blight to views and future development in the area. It is simply unfair to ask one portion of the state to shoulder this massive burden to satisfy the whims of those in Olympia. There are alternatives to generating power that do not require such monstrosities. It is simply a short sighted and selfish project. Shame on those who have let it progress this far. Sincerely Sharon Schwenk	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093402	This comment mainly concerns the continuously blinking red lights at night or Aircraft Detection Lighting System. HB 1173. This is a worthy bill, it begins to address, in a small practical way, the tremendous impact the new energy generating systems are having and will be having in Eastern WA. The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council and the multiple Investment, Hedge Fund companies rarely care about the impact on our local communities. It is about money and a movement away from our low-cost current power to new sources such as wind and solar. I challenge any resident of this state to come over and view the red lights blinking all night and tell me they like the look or would live near these things. The lights are similar to a crime scene, and it is a crime to view of thousands of wind turbines across our landscape. This bill proposes a simple system to lessen some of the impacts from these monstrosities. Of all the money spent and all money these absentee companies that will make, this seems like a small ask for something the local communities will have to live with for a lifetime.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations. Additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	4.10	n/a
RAS256	1093541	This process essentially bypassed local planning authority by going directly to the State. There are multiple reasons NOT to do this project in this location. They include: - Negative impact on a thriving local tourism industry associated with wine country - The electrical power is not needed locally due to our hydro and nuclear power generation capabilities - If the West side of the State needs additional generation capability then put it there, the wind we get all comes from the West anyway - When the Federal/State subsidies dry out, this project will fail just like what happened in California where the coastal hills West of I-5 are littered with abandoned wind generators. - Negative impact on bird life, this area is part of a major bird migration path	Land and Shoreline Use	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)). A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	1.2.3	
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including migratory birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093603	The proposed siting in the Benton County in the Tricities is unacceptable. I consider to be urban and not rural. There are other areas which are better suited. I don't want to see any windmills!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093640	I am concerned our community well water may be contaminated by oil leakage from the wind turbines. Our home is supplied water from the Southgate Water System which is located near the lease boundary. My apologies if I missed the following in the draft EIS but I did not see a response or mitigation plan to address oil leakage from the wind turbines and its impact on ground/surface waters.	Water Resources	Hazardous materials would be required during construction and operation and include synthetic lubricating oil and hydraulic oil for turbines. Applicant commitments include a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan for construction and operations. Recommended mitigation includes employee training on how to report and address spills according to the SPCC Plan and a requirement for spill response equipment to be stored in vehicles and equipment on site. The Applicant commitments along with the proposed mitigation resulted in no significant adverse impacts determination to changes in water quality.	Section 4.4.3	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1093789	SEPA WAC 197-11-440 (5) (b) requires that the EIS identify and analyze reasonable alternatives, including the proposed action, that can reasonably attain the project's objectives at a lower cost and a decreased level of environmental degradation. As it stands now the DEIS lacks identification and analysis of reasonable alternatives. Analysis: The placement of the wind turbines on the Hanford Reservation would provide an ideal alternative site for the HH Wind Project. The turbines can be built as tall as necessary to make up for any topography shortcomings because of existing flight restrictions on the site. Also there is an abundance of land, out of public view, that will never be suitable for occupation. Lastly, the transmission infrastructure is already in place! Conclusion: The Hanford Reservation would be a more suitable site for the HH Wind Project. This option needs to be considered in the DEIS.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093852	I have been a resident of Richland, Washington for nearly 25 years. My primary form of recreation is bicycling in the Horse Heaven Hills (HHH) between Finley and Prosser, more than covering the range of this proposed project. I love the scenery and solitude of the HHH. I have found that the existing windmills in the HHH do not detract from my enjoyment of this environment whatsoever. In fact, I believe windmills are a positive addition to the HHH because they allow landowners to generate additional revenue from their land. This will likely delay or eliminate the desire for large landowners to sell their land for future development. Keeping this area agricultural is paramount, and this wind project will only help preserve its agricultural, rural nature. The fact that windmills are visible along the hills has at best a minimal impact on the viewshed. Keeping the area rural is far more important than keeping the hills free from windmills.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1093933	I am writing to you today in support of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. I am a fish biologist, a retired Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife manager, and the former co-chair of the Independent Hatchery Science Review Group. As a fish biologist, I urge you to strongly consider the positive impacts of this project in addressing climate change and salmon. The warming of our climate is well documented and the impacts of increasing water temperatures in the Columbia River system are also well established. We have seen increasing water temperatures throughout the system. These increases have had devastating impacts on salmon. The development of wind and solar energy projects, like Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center, could give our power and fish managers in the Columbia River System greater flexibility to provide spill for the salmon passage. Additional non-hydropower sources can help reduce our hydropower dependence, allowing for additional spill during the critical salmon mitigation season. There is no reason we should not pursue the opportunity for our hydro, wind, and solar power managements to work more closely together to protect salmon populations. Without such projects as the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center providing additional non-hydro megawatts of power, these opportunities will simply not exist. I want to recognize the good work of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) in its issuance of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I urge you to continue to follow the data and science when assessing impacts and appropriate mitigation. Do not let our system of environmental review be taken hostage by politicians who do not respect science and data or by citizens who simply look at these issues through their lens and not at the overall benefits of the project. The simple truth is that hydropower may not be able to produce at the same level in the future. Therefore, I believe it is critically important for us to support renewable projects like this that produce needed power and give us the best chance to manage our hydro system to continue to provide much needed renewable energy while maximizing our ability to protect salmon. Lee Blankenship	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1094011	Wind farms are insufficient for meeting our state's energy needs. For this and many other reasons, I oppose the proposed wind farm.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Vicky Keller	1094013	I DO NOT support the Horse Heaven Wind Project	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1094030	The Horse Heaven Hills wind farm proposal is not going to assist in true energy production economically or in reality- it costs MORE energy to make these windmills than they will ever produce number one. The maintenance costs are added on top of that and make wind farms a total bust for the tax payer. Furthermore they do not run constantly and shut down if the wind is too high and simply don't run if we don't have enough wind. This is compounded by the fact that solar is also not consistent in cold weather at peak energy needs so what power or energy would supply the grid- the dams do but the unwise Inslee has once again attacked them vowing to take them out. Finally wind farms do hurt the environment- migrating birds primarily but they also raise the average temperature throughout the year 3-4 degrees - during the warmer months that means greater evaporation and on low snow pack high temperatures that means drought which damages an entire ecosystem animal, plant and human. Do you want to be 119 degrees instead of 115 degrees the highest temperature recorded in Kennewick - Las Vegas has temperatures at 120 degrees but they are a desert. Then the spin-wizards will tell you it's global warming- the same people that nationally advertised the fall of the polar bear who are doing better than ever. These wind farms are not good for the East coast whales and many true environmentalists have been raising the issue for some time only to be quashed by the ideological powers that now govern our media and this Biden administration we are in which Inslee is a part of. Wait doesn't he care about whales? Apparently only when it's convenient to create a narrative which was NOT remotely true and if Republicans were smart - they would immediately impeach the 9th Circuit Judge (9th Circuit being the most overturned circuit in the country historically) down in Portland for not holding parties accountable to his own 2014 Biological Opinion. He may yet have a hand in this too because all Inslee or Murray have to do now is wink his direction- he knows what to do. No. This is not about saving earth-it is a political battleground for control and they will use energy and green energy ideas that don't have longevity yet to do it. Why else at the same time would the rotten EPA WOTUS (waters of the United States) rule kicked out under Trump controlling every mud puddle ever to form be reinstated- to hamper farmers - all this while Biden appointees over the Corps of Engineers, USDA, US Wildlife, US Forrest Service, US Reclamation (think about the largest Water Right in the Country by Grand Coulee) Department of Energy, EPA, Chamber of commerce tribal governments right to clean air and clean water, Department of Transportation (barges or in this case air traffic patterns) with all their governmental grants and weight all be brought to bear on Eastern, WA - because we are an easy target and once the precedents are established here - they form the basis for unelected bureaucrats and bureaucracies to rule over the very people and lands they were designed to serve. I am against these wind farms from beginning to end - it is pretty package containing a bucket of sewage as old as the Clinton's administration which the snarl alone is lethal. We have reached critical mass. I do not want to see Kamala Harris's husband back here celebrating over our resources and literally delivering a death sentence to this state nor do I want to see Inslee - the jerk we kicked out of our 4th Congressional district get his revenge. He has tried through Covid - a now proven bust and HE was at the center of - the same guy who with Bob Ferguson experimented with vaccines on inmates in Sheldon and Walla Walla - and were caught trying suppress it with regard to vaccines as well as other drugs- the same two jerks who magically privatized Pedophiles and are releasing the worst of the worst from McNeil Island as we speak. Benton and Franklin County Commissioners have a due diligence to use their NEPA authority review in the oversight of these wind farms - the EIS wasn't done properly over the dams and they weren't in all likelihood done right here. Am wondering if they even know what those checks and balances are much less how to use them. But the citizens in both counties need to apply pressure at the County level- it is the proper level along with public comment.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)). The Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar" (RCW 80.50.020(1)(a)-(b)). EFSEC is a council comprising the directors of five state agencies (or their designees) and a chairperson appointed by the governor. Counties, cities, and port districts where a potential project is located also appoint members to EFSEC. For this proposed Project, Benton County Board of Commissioners has appointed a member.	n/a	n/a
Franklin County Democratic Central Committee	1094031	Franklin County Democratic Central Committee WHEREAS clean, renewable energy is essential to combating climate change here and across the globe; WHEREAS the Washington Democratic Party has adopted as part of its platform, "Increasing support for development of renewable and sustainable energy programs to supply electricity to the power grid to meet or exceed statutory climate goals for Washington State and the Paris Climate Accord globally"; WHEREAS the Tri-Cities continues to pursue a policy of transitioning our economy based on the regionally-supported strategy of "cleanup to clean energy"; WHEREAS wind and solar energy are necessary parts of achieving renewable energy goals and can improve energy resiliency in the Tri-Cities during extreme weather events; WHEREAS family-supporting-wage jobs are a necessity for families to thrive in our region and have the opportunity to enter into and stay in the middle class; WHEREAS union jobs fulfill the need for family-supporting-wage jobs; WHEREAS local unions, and therefore our friends and neighbors, are slated to fill the jobs necessary for construction and maintenance of the energy sector; WHEREAS it is estimated that the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project is estimated to create almost 1,000 family-supporting-wage jobs and generate more than \$75 million in labor income for our local workforce; WHEREAS the Washington Democratic Party has adopted as part of its platform, " Organizing millions of workers into unions is the most effective way to reduce poverty and restore balance to an economic and political system dominated by giant corporations and billionaires;" WHEREAS private property ownership is a bedrock aspect of American life, up to and including being able to sell and lease private land as the owner desires; WHEREAS the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project will be built on privately-owned land with the owners' consent; WHEREAS Washington has developed a system to allow landowners to go through the state to ensure energy projects on leased land go through a rigorous but fair environmental impact process; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Franklin County Democratic Central Committee, do hereby submit this resolution, as part of the public comment process, in support of the approval, construction and upkeep of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. Initial motion passed by the Franklin County Democrats during its regular meeting on January 19, 2023.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1094046	One big disadvantage of wind energy is that no matter how great the technology becomes, a wind turbine will never be able to be more than 59.3% efficient according Betz's Law. Betz's law states that the wind which passes through the blades of a wind turbine can never be captured to more than a 59.3% efficiency because of the physical laws of moving parcels of air. Negative Impacts on the Environment: Wind turbine blades can be extremely hazardous to birds, especially turbines that are built near migratory flight pattern areas. Wind turbines are very susceptible to damage from lightning because of their tall and metallic form, which, in very few cases can be dangerous for nearby animals or people. Wind turbines also generate noise, and when they are built close to homes, may be a disturbance to people. Wind turbines create a shadow flicker, which can be disturbing to nearby residents.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Potential project impacts and mitigations on wildlife, noise and visual, light and glare are discussed in respective chapters of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including migratory birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1094103	Local citizens are being asked to sacrifice too much at the hands of a company trying to make money off an energy source that is not needed here or welcome here. This monstrosity will taint our landscape and I have no effect on carbon emissions. Plus, the city of Kennewick has no ability to provide water for construction. Our community is against this project.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted.	n/a	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Anonymous User	1094142	I am writing to you today in strong support of Scout Clean Energy's Horse Heaven project located in Benton County. As a former Washington Department Fish and Wildlife fish biologist and the current CEO of Northwest Marine Technology, I have always encouraged leaders throughout Washington to follow the science to determine best environmental practices in the protection of salmon. For five decades, my company has been a leader in protecting endangered fish species throughout Washington State. As a State and a Nation, we need to drastically reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and simultaneously diversify our energy sources. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, diversifying our energy sources, are essential to saving our diminishing salmon populations. Washington State is already facing significant impacts on vulnerable fish populations due to climate change. The declining salmon populations and subsequent decline in Southern Resident Orcas require us to pivot to more advanced renewable sources of energy. Horse Heaven is exactly the type of project to lead this transition. Scout Clean Energy's hybrid facility will combine two clean energy resources, wind and solar. Diversifying our renewable resources could possibly allow our hydro system to operate differently to enhance river flows that can help our salmon populations. Scout's Horse Heaven project will help reduce impacts on salmon by reducing our dependency on fossil fuels, stabilizing grids, and increase energy efficiencies. While it is the true every energy project has impacts, it is clear from the DEIS that these impacts have been independently analyzed. For instance, the visual impacts according to the DEIS will vary widely at different distances. I do not mind looking at wind turbines, but I do find it ironic that some of the opposition foes do not complain about irresponsible growth, sprawling mansions, and ongoing practices that damage our fish and wildlife. Even though the project has impacts, I am encouraged that the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council's draft EIS identified potential mitigation measures to address the impacts. I would encourage EFSEC to avoid pandering to dysfunctional local politics that are not based on a factual review of the impacts and benefits of the project. Thank you for considering my comments on this unique and exciting renewable energy project. As a society, we can't look the other way anymore and pretend that the impacts of climate change are not real. We also cannot pretend that we do not need wind and solar power projects to fuel our economy. Thank you, Dave Knutzen	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1094245	The Horse Heaven Wind Farm is a non-starter, and absolutely should not be built. The negative impacts are abundant, and the proposed actions to mitigate these impacts are extremely lacking. The degradation to the shrub-steppe environment and the large impact to birds and bats, especially raptors like the horned lark, white pelican, sandhill crane, and ferruginous hawk are unacceptable. On top of the nuisance and disruption to the environment and ecosystem in our backyard, the local people in Benton County do not want to look at these windmills, as they are an eye sore. Furthermore, these windmills do not last very long relative to other power-generating operations, and recycling all these materials is not feasible right now. It is incredibly wasteful to produce wind turbines and then scrap them in the landfill 20 years later, and Benton County wants no part in that. To make matters worse, nameplate capacity of windmills (in this case, up to 1,150 MW) is nearly impossible to achieve. The intermittent power of windmills is so inconsistent, it becomes difficult to properly power the electric grid. Typically, wind farms operate at ~5-15% of their nameplate capacity, and for the little amount of power that this wind farm would produce for how many turbines there are, it is absolutely not worth building. Nuclear and hydroelectric are the only sustainable power supplies that are not wildly intermittent. The people in Benton County support those kinds of plants, including new small modular reactors that may be constructed here. We want nothing to do with new wind (or solar) farms that are wasteful and a huge impact to the wildlife.	Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1094366	I oppose the placement of wind machines along the Horse Heaven Hills. This will cause harm to the beauty of our area. These machines are not environmentally friendly as they do not last forever, but the materials they are made of can not be safely disposed of. We are blessed with nuclear power that should be used as we move forward. I do not want to have these erected here, and then send the power to Seattle or out of state. Please keep the Tri City area the way it is. You are only satisfying a few to ruin it for the rest of us. The jobs they say they will create are again few in comparison to the whole.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1094460	Please support the Horse Heaven draft EIS for its project to make the area the center of clean energy in he State of Washington.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1094505	I want to record my opposition to the currently proposed wind farm development for Horse Heaven Hills. The turbines will not only ruin the local views, but it is also more complicated than simply aesthetics for Tri-Cities residents. The presence of turbines will ultimately impact our weather including changing wind patterns and raising our local average temperatures. This will affect all the farms, orchards, vineyards and agriculture in the area, thereby the region's economy, as well as the city residents. The sound will descend on the Tri-cities and the multiple blinking lights will project for miles into windows and homes. Native birds and animals along with our native lands and plants, many of which are protected species, will be negatively impacted. The fragile habitat will be destroyed by construction and operational activities. New roads will disturb soils and will increase dust additionally causing health problems for residents and increase issues for those with respiratory problems. Washingtons Department of Fish & Wildlife Statewide Technical Lead on Wind and Solar has stated in regard to this project "...The immense size of the HWSB along the Horse Heaven Hills ridgeline and the subsequent landscape-scale impact to an important habitat and ecological connectivity will be difficult if not impossible to mitigate. It is important to note that the lineal Horse Heaven Hills represent some of the last remaining functional and uninterrupted shrub-steppe and natural grasslands in Benton County... Development within this ridge will result in further fragmentation and isolation of shrub-steppe and grassland habitat as well as loss of function and value to wildlife."	Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to Priority Habitats and special status plant species in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts such as dust. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat and special status plant species were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of priority habitats throughout Washington and sensitivity of special status plant species, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1094583	We oppose the Horse Heaven windfarm project by Scout Clean Energy for a number of reasons, none of which were adequately addressed in the EIS. First, and most importantly, earlier generation windfarms are now beginning to show performance issues well before their design lifetime (<60%) has been reached. An example is the Biglow Canyon windfarm in Oregon operated by PGE although there are numerous other examples. Scout has proposed an even larger design with limited operating experience. Because of performance issues of the smaller designs this seems terribly risky. As a minimum, until final reports are in and reviewed of the existing windmill design issues, the Horse Heaven windfarm should be delayed. The EIS should specifically address these flaws and show how they are resolved. Second, we concur with other comments that the visibility of the windmills throughout the Tri Cities is detrimental to the viewscape, property values and further growth in the area. As a minimum the approval process should include an outreach effort with viewscape simulations. These should be posted for a lengthy period, in affected areas in order to gain input from a broader slice of the population. Next, the economic justification is not well treated particularly when compared to replacement power from hydro. If the majority of the energy will be exported to the westside of the state, then transmission losses need to be included. This raises the possibility of alternate sites closer to the end use; that is, on the west side of the state. Doug & Cathy Adkisson 1240 Plateau Dr, Richland WA	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. Alternative scenarios are discussed in the EIS, chapter 2.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2 including views from residences, recreation areas, and travel routes .	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1094931	I am writing to you today to tell you that the wind project on Horse Heaven Hills is terrible! The Horse Heaven Hills are a beautiful view seen from all over the Tri-Cities and the wind turbines will ruin that view. I live in West Richland and will be affected by this view, as well as the noise, wind issues and sunlight glaring off the turbines. The "power" that will be made by these turbines will go to Western Washington! Why would we do that? Western Washington needs to figure out their own energy issues, not use our land and views for their benefit. For so long we on the eastern side of the Cascades, have been the step children of the west side of Washington. It's time for western Washington to take care of itself. I respectfully ask that you don't let the wind turbine project go forward. Thank you, Geneva Carroll West Richland, WA	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
ccraigmills	1095163	I am writing to oppose the current plan for the HHH wind farms for the following reasons: 1) Potential impact on wildlife migration corridors; 2) Lack of recycling plans for turbines; 3) Potential impact on tourism and property values; 4) Better siting options away from HHH and surrounding views for Tri-City residents	General - opposition	Project location is selected based on several factors including but not limited to viable above-average wind speeds in the area, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panel, proximity to existing transmission lines and willingness of to participate in the Project.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Anonymous User	1095267	Hello, I am writing as a concerned citizen of Tri Cities. I am extremely opposed to the Horse Heaven Project. Windmills have been shown to have a negative effect on people and wildlife (See paper titled "Environmental Impact of Wind Energy" by R.Saidur N.A.Rahim M.R.Islam K.H.Solangi) especially given the close proximity of this project to a large population that is expanding exponentially. Please do not approve this project. It will leave a negative impact on the Tri Cities area that will be felt for decades to come. Brittany Cartwright	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1095290	I initially commented a couple of years ago when SCOUT Energy first proposed the Horse Heaven wind farm and the Richland City Council had a comment period before the EIS was sent to Gov. Inslee. I am VERY OPPOSED to the proposed wind farm. I am not against alternative energy sources but have never been a proponent of the wind turbines. I believe they are truly an eye sore covering beautiful open landscapes which are rare enough in this day and age plus the fact that half the time they don't seem to be working cuz the wind direction is not going the right way, and there is no real means of storing the energy when there is wind either. Plus when you realize all the materials needed to first produce them and then they only last approx. 20 years and then have to be disposed of. Not to mention the havoc it creates for wild life in the area. On top of that--we in this area already meet state carbon reductions since we have abundant hydro and nuclear power, and so the wind farm does not really benefit except for a handful of jobs--it benefits the West side of the state and maybe other states as well. So if you insist you need wind turbines to meet the rest of the state's carbon mandates--then find some place on the West side to build them!!!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1095334	It's time--lets do this!!!!	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Drstrange	1095389	There needs to be a lot more work and study of this project before you even think of building it. We are now finding out that wind turbines are having a devastating effect on the bird population and the noise these turbines make needs to be evaluated. Overall I do not think this should be built at all	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Anonymous User	1095397	If you wouldn't want these in your backyard, please do not put them in ours.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1095563	We need to take better care of what is left of our environment, for wildlife, marine life, plant life, and people.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1095764	We are devastated to think of the ridge lines in our area lined with windmills, the impact to birds and animals, the flashing red lights at night. Concentrate on the dams which are already in place, and provide power in all types of weather. Picture from the top of Badger Mountain of the untouched Horse Heven Ridgeline.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Photo received.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1095937	I fully support clean energy.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1095941	Please commit Washington state government to support clean energy at the state level by permitting Horse Haven.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tom Pierson, Founder Earth Friendly Properties	1095969	I am writing today as the former President and CEO of the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber and the founder of Earth Friendly Properties. I am corresponding to express my full support of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. As someone who has worked in Olympia for State Senator Pete von Reichbauer and across the State of Washington on economic development projects including in the Tri-Cities, the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center exemplifies the kind of project we should support. First, we simply need power. Due to the near-term closure of coal-fired plants, the 2021 Northwest Power Plan calls for the development of 3,500 megawatts of renewable power by 2027. The state needs the power to avoid the risk of rolling blackouts that would be devastating to our regional economy. Second, the 930 jobs for skilled construction workers in the Tri-Cities would average an annual salary of \$113,500. Studies show the full build-out, the project will produce at least \$73 million in labor income and \$143 million in total economic output. Following construction, 56 high-paying long-term jobs will be created. This is significant improvement for the Tri-Cities region. The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center will also be a state-wide energy and economic asset. As we are aware, we are all dependent on each other. The western part of the state depends on the agricultural community of the eastern part of the state. The eastern part of the state depends on the westside ports, consumer markets, and overall economic infrastructure. West side ports are critical to the agricultural community. This project will create west-side port and shipping jobs while also producing workforce development opportunities for both sides of the State. I would also argue there is a great opportunity for the eastern Washington agricultural community, including the wine industry, to brand themselves as the most "green renewable" products produced in the country. With Hydropower, wind, and solar energy, we all win, including mother earth. Best wishes, Tom Pierson, Founder Earth Friendly Properties PO Box 502 Milton, WA 98354	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1095995	As a concerned citizen and lifelong resident of the Tri-Cities I am against this wind turbine project. I recently retired from Franklin PUD and know that we get the majority of our power from hydroelectric and nuclear and that we also meet state carbon reduction mandates. The energy produced from this project will be used to solve other utilities needs to bolster their clean energy portfolios which are located in western Washington. Certainly there are other more rural locations in eastern Washington that this project can go to that does not affect thousands of people and could use the boost to their economy. Keep our scenic vistas clean and take this project somewhere else. Carrie Locke Franklin County Resident	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1096105	I support wind and solar energy development; however, I do not support placing the proposed wind farm so close to the Tri-Cities community. I do not believe the submitted study accurately reflects the impact to our community. A local team has completed an analysis of the project that evaluates economic impact associated with property value, tourism and environmental impact. Please take this into consideration and find a location that is not so close to our community.	Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged. Project impacts on property values will be assessed in the final EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
cbartram45	1096490	I am strongly against the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind turbine project. The size of the project is far too large and will affect the entire community. It will ruin our scenic vistas which in turn will jeopardize tourism and economic growth. I understand that these very tall wind turbines are very noisy and contribute to noise pollution in the community. The Tri Cities is very fortunate to have hydro and nuclear energy sources that are very cost effective and clean. Wind turbines are not cost effective without the energy credits given to the industry and are not reliable when the energy is most needed. The enormous increase in trucks to bring in the wind turbine parts and to erect the turbines will add to the air pollution in our beautiful area. And lastly, the disposal of the blades in land fills during routine maintenance adds to the environmental problems in our area. Scout Energy should find a location for their project in California where the energy will be used. The fact that Scout Energy is going around the wishes of the Tri Cities Community and submitting an application to the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council for permission to build this project is infuriating.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1096562	The windmills are worthless, they operate using oil, they are an eyesore, do not produce enough energy to offset the costs, and kill our birds of pray!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1096685	Scout's Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center is an Essential Energy Source and A Winner for the Tri-Cities To date myself, I first started working on Tri-Cities issues in 1968 when I first went to work for U.S. Senator Warren Magnuson. Later I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1976 and served for 36 years as a Member of the House Appropriations Committee. During that span of time, I developed lifelong relationships with the Tri-Cities community and people like my longtime friend Sam Volpentest to Congressmen Morrison, Doc Hastings, and Dan Newhouse. I successfully fought for funding and supported almost every major Tri-Cities initiative from Nuclear Power and the cleanup of Hanford, to countless Pacific Northwest National Laboratory initiatives. I also have spent time fishing and hunting in the area. I believe the Tri-Cities is a unique and special place made up of great and innovative people. I have always felt a special connection to the area. I've had the opportunity to learn about the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project in the Tri-Cities and I am convinced it is a great project that will provide 1,150 Megawatts of needed power while also generating \$262 million in new revenue that will help keep local taxes from rising at higher rates. These investments will result in new funding for important public services, such as the hiring of teachers, police officers, firefighters, and nurses. It is estimated that the project will create over 900 construction jobs and up to 16 permanent jobs. And importantly, the project developer has made good on its commitments to the community, recently signing an agreement with local labor unions that will ensure the project is built by the Tri-Cities workforce who will have access to good-paying jobs that are close to home. Put simply, The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project will put the Tri-Cities on the map as a cutting-edge renewable community with a thriving green economy powered by integrated hydro, wind, and solar power. This project will also substantially advance the local communities' efforts to make the area a regional Clean Energy Hub and work in concert with nuclear and hydropower. How can the Tri-Cities claim to be a clean energy hub if it is opposed to wind and solar? The development of this project is timely as all of us have recently felt the increase in extreme weather events - excessive heatwaves and other storm events are becoming far more common. With a growing population and increased local demand for power, we need our existing hydropower and additional wind, solar, and energy storage projects like Horse Heaven to meet that demand and avoid brown and blackouts in the Tri-Cities and around the Pacific Northwest region. Power experts and the new Northwest Energy Plan called for 3,500 additional megawatts of generation to meet this demand, with renewable energy playing a key role. Our economy and our families cannot be put in jeopardy by failing to adequately prepare for a robust energy future. As an old friend and supporter of the Tri-Cities, I am convinced the Tri-Cities and the Northwest need the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. The Tri-Cities has always embraced needed changes and it has prospered for it. Former US Congressman, Norm Dicks	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1096835	To the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council: Scout Clean Energy's SCE proposal to install an estimated 244 wind turbines and solar arrays over a 110 square mile area between Benton City and Finley in Eastern Washington, with some turbines as tall as the Seattle Space Needle will negatively impact the lifestyle many of us here in Eastern Washington have chosen for ourselves. I value the wide open space, rolling hills and agricultural vistas; vineyards, orchards, wheat and farm fields that I see as I travel from my home in Prosser to the TriCities. In fact one of my most treasured views is when I leave my son's home in South Kennewick heading south on Highway 395, looking directly at the Horse Heaven Hills and as I continue westbound on I82, I can view the four peaks of our area, Rattlesnake, Red, Candy and Badger Mountains all lined up and the expansive Horse Heaven Hills to the south with the evening sunset as backdrop. The community of the TriCities has worked very hard for a very long time to develop an outstanding hiking trail system from Badger Mountain across Little Badger Mountain to Candy Mountain, because the people here value our unique and striking views. We appreciate the natural beauty and diverse wildlife of living in a rural area. We live here because we love living here, we don't want our land, views and night sky negatively impacted by SCE HHH project. Think how the people of the Puget Sound would feel having 250 wind turbines on the slopes of Mt. Rainier. Or on the banks of Puget Sound. Our views and vistas are just as treasured to us and should be considered when placing large scale projects like the one proposed. The communities of the TriCities, from Prosser to Burbank, including Commissioners from Benton County have come out in the majority against Scout Clean Energy's (SCE) proposal. However, SCE circumvented our local authorities permitting process and applied directly to the State for approval, cementing a distrust of SCE to work with local jurisdictions on the environmental and personal impacts of the project. The first step in siting any project should be the input of the surrounding communities. It makes me so angry that now the approval of this project, given its size and consequence, has been given to a committee who will not have to live with the direct daily consequences. This Energy project does not directly benefit the citizens of the surrounding Tricity area in the way of supplying energy needs or even replace the use of fossil fuels for energy production in Washington State. See link below. The energy produced from this project will be sold to companies outside of Eastern Washington and possibly Washington all together. If this is the case, Scout Clean Energy needs to site this project in the area where the energy is needed and in truly rural areas where the impact to the people living there is minimized. Alison Burgett 159401 W Richards Rd Prosser WA https://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2021/03/08/wind-turbines-on-washingtons-horse-heaven-hills-how-not-to-pursue-a-green-new-deal/?sh=68fbb1dd508d	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1097189	4 comments in uploaded pdf named 202301025 Morton Comments	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment #2: The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Generation and disposal of solid waste during the decommissioning stage for turbines would include the blades to be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks and turbines to be refurbished and resold or recycled. So not all waste from turbines decommissioning will be considered for waste disposal in landfills. Lastly, the landfills considered for end of cycle waste disposal are Columbia Ridge Landfill which has a permitted remaining capacity of approximately 329 million tons and Finley Buttes Landfill which has an estimated available fill capacity of approximately 130 million tons of municipal solid waste.	4.15	n/a
Anonymous User	1097358	As a Benton County resident it appears to me that this is a great spot for wind energy to be produced. My life has been centered around agriculture and I have a good understanding of highest and best use of agricultural and range ground. This ground has relatively low value and production potential for agricultural uses and a wind energy development would provide the land owners a much better return on their investment, increase our county's tax roll and provide clean energy to the grid.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1097396	So Many Tri Citians - So Little Voice - WIND FARM APPROVED	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1097436	No to this plan for huge windmills cutting off our beautiful open view. Eastern Washington should focus on hydro, nuclear, the newer small nuclear plants, rather than unsightly wind turbines that kill wildlife and are unreliable and unusable unless the wind blows. At the very least, place them far away from any city or put them where they do not block the view. Also note, the blades and components of these massive windmills go into landfills....they do not break down into soil...EVER. Keep our reliable dams, utilize our nuclear plants, and shelve windmills until better technology is developed.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. Potential Project impacts and proposed mitigations for wildlife, visual quality and other resource areas have been comprehensively discussed in the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1097518	Blighting our beautiful Horse Heaven Hills with hundreds of bird killing wind turbines is unconscionable. Shame on the Audubon Society for stating that the impact to birds is minimized if these unsightly wind turbine farms are located properly. I strongly oppose this project on environmental grounds.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1098075	Our group of concerned citizens have been working on this issue for over two years. I've seen environments destroyed, animals killed, and the turbines themselves FALL APART. To me it seems that these wind turbines are a WASTE of money, they have an expiration date, and no means of clean-up when expired! I've asked Solar Co.'s where they recycle the batteries. They have no idea! Please reconsider building these wind farms until we are conclusive that they are best for our HHH agricultural area and will NOT DESTROY OUR BEAUTIFUL COUNTRYSIDE AND WILD ANIMAL LIFE!	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
J dorch	1098381	I believe the environmental impact will affect animals and public access to the are. I oppose the wind and solar project. With the impact potential to the environmental stability and access for the public. I vote no wind project.	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1098606	My husband and I both agree that the wind turbines are not necessary for our area. We think they are a waste of materials and a problem for the birds that fly in our area. Not much has been said about the fact of how much water and cement they require and the fact that the blades have to be buried and do not decay.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Water Resources	The EIS includes estimates for water usage for construction and operation phases in Section 3.4.1.5. An estimated 120 million gallons of water is required for Project construction. Project operation is estimated to require 5,000 gallons per day for facilities and 2,025,000 gallons annually for solar panel washing. Impacts to water are assessed in Section 4.4 and no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 3.4	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1098719	I am against the wind farm proposed for Tri-Cities Washington. It is a bad fit for our community! Our beautiful sunset views, Our scenic countryside vistas will be a Marg! And all for what? And for the benefit of the west side of the state, and for the pocketbook of the contractor proposing this plan! Surely there is another location in a more rural place. This is a good looking town, a town growing much too quickly, and many decisions Concerning the livability of our area are being made. This decision is a biggie! Mark it is huge! We must turn down the Wind farm plan!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1098867	These windmills will of course be a major eyesore for the Tri Cities and the numbers of birds killed will be devastating. It seems that solar farming is likely to follow along the same footprint. Since both of these supposed green energy resources are intermittent, the need for huge amounts of battery storage to collect this energy for timely use is obvious. The recognized limited life span of these devices along with advanced technology resources will in 20 plus or minus years push them into obsolescence. There is little to no proposed future support to remove these components. What is likely to remain will be an entanglement of forever debris and trash scattered across the area. Why isn't nuclear power being considered in an area that has supported this technology for 70 years or so? The Hanford reservation could easily support renewed nuclear power and cause no additional burden to the local area.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Mike Minelli	1098906	Please See Attached	Wildlife and Habitat	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. The EIS considers the potential impact to loss of wildlife habitat, including indirect loss through sensory disturbance, as well as habitat fragmentation and creation of barriers to movement in Section 4.6.2.2. Mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce these impacts to wildlife (see Section 4.6.2.5), specifically Hab-1 and Hab-2, which were developed to mitigate potential impacts to wildlife movement corridors and draws, and Hab-5 which was developed to address indirect habitat loss that may occur due to wildlife displacement.	4.6.2.2, 4.6.2.5	n/a
Anonymous User	1098992	I am opposed to locating wind farms near the Tri-Cities for the following reasons: 1) they are an eyesore 2) they harm the environment by killing raptors 3) they should be located near the populations that want the power. 4) they are intently wasteful of resources as a source of power. Nuclear is great more efficient. Small nuclear plants should be investigated. 5) the cost and planning for their eventual decommissioning should be included in estimates and the money for the same set aside.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. .	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including raptors, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1099021	Unreliable power. Cost is out of control too expensive to build and maintain.. Cogeneration with gas will have a smaller carbon footprint in the long run if all things are considered.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.		
Anonymous User	1099048	We are excited to be part of this project to provide clean, renewable energy that our country so badly needs. Our land is in a windy place. We are glad that this energy can be harnessed to provide reliable energy. This energy will be collected while still allowing farming to continue growing wheat on this land. Our land is in the right place at the right time to participate in this important growth of wind energy for our nation which is seeking alternatives to using fossil fuels.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1099049	Wind mills should only be installed on land that would not have any future use such as residential, commercial or agricultural development. The placement of the proposed wind mills south of Kennewick are not beneficial to our area and will only hamper any future development and are not environmentally friendly to wildlife. A better placement would be between Yakima and Ellensburg where no development could ever occur or on Federal land below Rattlesnake mountain on the 240 corridor.	Land and Shoreline Use	The Benton County Comprehensive Plan's purpose and intent is to provide for local needs relating to the use of land and infrastructure, including the protection of property and water rights and, in so doing, meet the state's minimum planning law requirements. In accordance with RCW 36.70A.070, the comprehensive land use plan includes the following required elements: land use, rural, housing, transportation, capital facilities, and utilities. The land use element presents the framework within which future growth and development will occur consistent with community objectives and the requirements of law. Consistent with GMA requirements, the land use element designates the proposed general distribution, location, and extent of land uses for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other functions, as applicable, and describes development densities and projections for future population growth.	3.8.1.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1099127	Due to the overwhelming data supporting the inefficiencies of large scale wind farms relative to size and scope, their damage to native birds of prey that are quite prevalent in Eastern WA, and the daytime and nighttime visual pollution wind farms create, I am adamantly opposed to the proposed wind farm in the Horse Heaven Hills.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1099221	Wind turbines use massive amounts of oil; when they break, they leak that oil directly into the ground, contaminating fields and water sources. Turbine blades are not recycled, they are buried in mass pits to further contaminate the ground. Fires from broken turbines, leaking oil and lightning strikes would be a highly dangerous prospect in the horse heaven hills being in the desert already and so close to our homes.	Public Health and Safety	The ASC states that 5 gallons of lubricating oil will be needed for each turbine per year. Oil would be brought in, and waste oil would be removed using by a maintenance contractor using a specialized vehicle. Impacts of the Project resulting from hazardous materials use and storage are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The applicant has committed to developing and implementing a SPCC Plan to address potential spills during Project Operations, as noted in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1099240	I hope this wind farm is not a done deal. I am a Long time environmentalist, but the more I learn about the siting of this particular wind farm, the more I oppose it. I am a resident of Richland. It appears that this wind farm will loom over the entire Tri Cities, visible from each of the three cities. Visible from downtown. Richland. It will impact each resident intimately. I am learning that the placement will destroy a good deal of the scenic beauty that residents and tourists value. Wind farms do not belong along the edge of cities! We are now an urban area of more than a quarter of a million people, not a remote rural region. The project does not belong here.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1099331	The DEIS for the Scout Clean Energy Horse Heaven Project shows an estimated death rate to birds and bats. Benton and Franklin counties and the areas surrounding the SCE HHH project are predominately agricultural farm lands that rely on bees, birds and bats to pollinate fruit orchards, vineyards and other income producing crops. A significant danger to birds and bats exists and the true effect cannot be established without specific locations for the turbines. SCE must be required to submit a site plan showing the location of each turbine to determine the impact to adjacent crops. https://www.usgs.gov/faqs/why-are-bats-important https://learnbirdwatching.com/do-birds-pollinate/ https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2014/10/29/working-night-shift-bats-play-important-role-pollinating-crops https://letstalkscience.ca/educational-resources/stem-in-context/how-do-wind-farms-affect-birds-and-bats	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds and bats, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Mitigation measure Hab-6 requires the Applicant to work with an advisory group and EFSEC to develop the final project layout and design, including how the Applicant will implement Applicant commitments and recommended mitigation measures.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1099349	<p>To the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council</p> <p>I am concerned about the installation of over 244 wind turbines by Scout Clean Energy's project in the Horse Heaven Area in Eastern Washington. This article from the Harvard School of Engineering shows the effects of large wind turbines can increase day and night time temperatures by .24 degrees Celsius.</p> <p>https://seas.harvard.edu/news/2018/10/large-scale-wind-power-would-require-more-land-and-cause-more-environmental-impact</p> <p>A rise in local temperatures could have unknown effects on so many things. The cooling of homes in the summer, crop production and harvesting, the temperature of rivers and stream. I am against installing wind turbines in our direct area for this reason and so many more (noise, animal and bird population disruption and the disturbance to our landscape and views). I believe more study needs to be done before this large scale wind farm is installed in our area.</p>	Air Quality	The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celsius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.	4.3	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Anonymous User	1099540	I feel the wind turbines would significantly damage our beautiful landscape.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1099575	<p>I am very much opposed to the wind farm project because of the severe negative effect on our environment. Few people in our area support it other than the very few greedy people who will gain financially from it's construction. The Horse Heaven Hills is a unique geological formation that adds to the scenic beauty of Eastern Washington and our wine country. Let's not destroy this asset with a hideous and expansive wind farm. The Horse Heaven Hills AVA is an important part of our wine region which brings tourist activity to the Tri-Cities and surrounding areas. This is a financial benefit to the entire community.</p> <p>I cannot understand why this wind farm is needed when we have abundant hydroelectric power. Wind energy is not very efficient. It produces a minimum amount of power for the cost and no power when there is no wind. It is my understanding that most of the parts are manufactured in China. How many birds would be killed by these wind mills? What happens when the blades need to be replaced? Where would they be buried?</p> <p>The cleanest, most environmentally friendly, efficient and cheapest energy is hydroelectric. Keep the dams on the Snake River. Spend the money to improve fish ladders rather than something as environmentally destructive as the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind farm.</p> <p>We have a beautiful and clean natural scenic environment. Let's Keep it that way!</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1099635	<p>Today is January 28th. We received ballots this week for school Levy's. I was sad when I opened the envelope, because I was hoping we would be allowed to vote yes or no for the installation of huge turbines on our hills, but our governor did not give us that opportunity.</p> <p>The Tri-Cities are made up of three close cities - Richland, Kennewick and Pasco. There are 325,000 residents in the Tri-Cities. Between Richland and Benton City there is a growing city named West Richland. They have 15,000 residents. It has already been determined that in the center of Richland we will be able to see about 100 turbines. That is just not right. One of the worst things about having huge turbines and red blinking lights at night is that they will be here forever. The only thing our community receives from this is ugly hills. We have beautiful colorful sunrises and sunsets that may not be so pretty anymore. Since 325,000 residents have no say, I am hoping that the company from another state at least does not cover all of the hills with these huge turbines.</p> <p>Sandy Fishback Richland</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	<p>Same as comment 1100580.</p> <p>Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals have been proposed by the Applicant with additional turbine removals to be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources. See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. As part of Mitigation Measure R-1, the Applicant is required to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan to keep recreation enthusiasts safe. Paragliding is an unofficial recreational activity at the launch locations on public lands closest to the Project.</p> <p>A Data Request has been provided to the Applicant requesting information on the downwind effects of the turbines.</p>		Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
Anonymous User	1099667	<p>Popular Mechanics: Turbines failures are on the uptick across the world, sometimes blades falling or spinning out of control and flying off, or even full turbines collapsing. When these conditions happen, it causes major damage to surrounding properties.</p> <p>July 2019 Juniper Fire in Klickitat County Washington caused by a faulty turbine, the blade falling off and catching the field on fire.</p> <p>These windmill turbines will be sitting on the ridge with homes at Tripple Vista, Canyon Lakes and Seal Springs. Homes and businesses are expending south on the hillsides every day. Remember in 2018 the Bofor fire it didn't take long for the fire to get out of control putting homes and lives in danger the community was lucky it only destroyed 5 homes and over 5,000 acres.</p>	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1099699	<p>I am a resident of Finley Washington. I am totally against this proposed windfarm going in above my home and the homes of thousands of my fellow Tri Citians.</p> <p>I would like to comment from a scientific point of view.</p> <p>I spent a significant part of my working career as an employee of Energy Northwest's Maintenance Department, (Columbia Generating Station). Most of my time there was spent working with very large rotating equipment; (i.e., huge: motors, turbines, pumps, and generators) A significant portion of my employment involved specialized training in the "Vibration Analysis Department" so I feel I can comment with some degree of authority.</p> <p>Simply stated, all rotating equipment produces some degree of vibration, and as such the vibrations are felt in the rotating structure and its mounting point. In the case of these hundreds of Space Needle sized windmills it will be "felt" in the ground they are mounted on, and then transmitted perhaps as far as 5 to 10 miles away. One recent scientific Italian study measured a small windfarm's vibrations 6.8 miles away.</p> <p>I'm absolutely positive Scout Clean Energy will promise all of us that their windmills will not produce any "significant" vibration or discomfort to any of us stuck basically forever with this boondoggle. Like the tobacco Industry the windmill industry will always need more studies to prove anything negative about their product.</p> <p>Vibration from these windmills - the closer you are, the more you will feel in the seat of your pants, and then at the same time be able to see the ripples in your coffee cup.</p> <p>Anybody want a good buy on a million-dollar new home with a two-dollar view and a small vibration problem?</p>	Noise and Vibration	The wind turbines will generate ground vibrations at at such low levels (less than 10 ⁻⁶ meters/second at 1 kilometer [0.6 miles]) that their impacts will be insignificant. (Liavero Hurtado et al., 2017)	4.11 (Ground Vibration)	
Anonymous User	1099712	<p>I do – with some qualms – support the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm project. Our growing state population and worsening climate are increasing our need for electricity. We need more low-carbon including renewable sources for that electricity. This project also includes benefits for local farmers, construction jobs, and some long-term jobs. Scout Clean Energy seems to have established a good working relationship with the Yakama Nation, which should minimize damage to culturally important areas.</p> <p>I strongly support the 150-turbine option over the 244-turbine option. The Horse Heaven Hills is not an ideal site for a massive wind farm, but the 150-turbine option should cause less harm to wildlife, wildlife habitat, and habitat connectivity. Fewer turbines should also reduce the impact of this project on our views.</p> <p>I'm concerned that the project could cause catastrophic losses to the ferruginous hawk population. Increased bird kills by wind turbines and transmission lines; disruptive activity near nesting sites, flyways and foraging areas; and the project's negative effect on one of their main prey species, the Townsend's ground squirrel, can be expected to increase losses to this species. This an important breeding ground for ferruginous hawks. I'm also concerned about impacts to other species. For example, sage sparrows and burrowing owls are already struggling, and pronghorn antelope need access to water.</p> <p>I realize this is a draft, but I hope the final EIS is more specific. I support the proposed mitigations to reduce the impact on wildlife, habitat and habitat connectivity. But how will they actually be implemented? As just one example, wind turbines will be moved farther away from canyons "where feasible." Minimizing the number of wind turbines too close to the draws and canyons, and transmission lines and roads crossing those draws and canyons, is important. The draws and canyons are where we still have native habitat. The rest of the Horse Heaven Hills is also wildlife habitat, but it's been degraded by farming and grazing. I'm glad this draft includes modifications to the fencing around the northern solar array. But it's not clear to me whether these modifications match the recommendations of WDFW to allow wildlife access to water. Mitigations during operations and during decommissioning could also be more specific.</p> <p>I'd like to see specific commitments to minimize the environmental damage this project will cause. I'm not asking Scout to do the impossible. But let's make this project as good for the environment as it's really "feasible" to do.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of impacts to special status species including Townsend's ground squirrel, ferruginous hawk, sage sparrow, burrowing owl and pronghorn antelope in Section 4.6.2.4. Impacts to general wildlife and habitat, including movement corridors and nesting are addressed in Sections 4.6.2.1 and 4.6.2.2. The dEIS acknowledges the potential for the Project to result in impacts to wildlife and special status species and has provided recommended mitigation measures specific to wildlife corridors, nesting birds, and special status species in Section 4.6.2.5. These measures include requirements for additional studies, creation of species specific management plans, and adaptive management through Project operation.	4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.2, 4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5	
Anonymous User	1099831	I want to send a comment to adjudication which is no longer accepting comment?	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Public had the opportunity to submit their comments on the Draft EIS and adjudication process during the public comment period for each of the processes.	n/a	n/a
Ioeraj	1099869	<p>We strongly believe this wind farm project is of NO benefit to our beautiful local community and insist on a hard pass. This will negatively impact our area's visual and aesthetic resources. With the project covering almost 50% of the Horse Heaven Hill ridgeline it will be seen by the majority, over 80%, of our residents. The red blinking lights at night will also be visible. Simply stated this will be too many huge wind turbines too close to too many people! This project is too large to be located so close to a metropolitan area. This is not the norm for wind farms of this size. Our community will only continue to grow and thus the project will effect more and more people in the near future. It should not be built or at the very least be moved to a more rural area and scaled down. We must protect the rural natural habitat of the Tri Cities!</p> <p>Joe and Patricia Loera</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	
Jkochenauer	1099977	<p>My greatest concern with the proposed wind farm is its close proximity to established residential areas. Not because of the sound (which is a worthy concern) or the visual pollution, but because these farms pose a wildland fire threat both in causing fires and preventing access for fighting natural cover fires. As a volunteer with Benton County Fire District #1, I work to educate residents and property owners about this urban-wildland interface so they can mitigate the hazards from wildfires. And now we have a private, for-profit company trying to force a new threat on these property owners, which has the potential to increase their property insurance rates and put added strain on our emergency resources without providing additional funding to support the specialized training and equipment needed to manage these threats.</p> <p>Wind turbines are a fire hazard. Mitigation includes constructing the wind farms far away from populated areas. That is being ignored with this proposal. When a turbine catches on fire, it can still spin as the blades burn, throwing burning debris far from the turbine and igniting additional fires. We do not have the equipment to put out a wind turbine fire. A study by the SP Technical Research Institute of Sweden shows that 10-30% of all incidents in wind turbines that lead to a halt in energy production are due to fire. An average wind turbine fire costs about \$8 million dollars in losses. Is Sprout's insurance going to guarantee reimbursement of property loss and fire fighting expense in the event of a fire caused by their turbines?</p> <p>Please deny any and all permits for this project.</p>	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1100110	Please do not build a wind farm in our backyard. This area has grown into a beautiful neighborhood. We don't want/need all the negatives that go along with wind fields. Please leave our neighborhood and homes alone.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	
Anonymous User	1100225	<p>I am deeply opposed to this project as it will mar the landscape of our beautiful Horse Heaven Hills!!!! No no no!</p> <p>Suzanne Caron Richland</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1100290	NO WIND FARM - DO NOT DESTROY OUR REGION FOR THE PROFIT OF AN OUT OF STATE COMPANY OR ANY OTHER ENTITY. IT'S ALL ABOUT THE MONEY, NOTHING ELSE.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	
Anonymous User	1100337	<p>I say no. This huge project heavily impacts or area. We hike and enjoy the out of doors in these areas. The west side of the state is benefiting from our suffering. This is unfair. There is a huge negative reaction to this plan in our area. So many have lost faith that they have any power so are not even saying no. This is so sad and is not want the United States of America is about. It seems that we as an entire community have absolutely no say in what happens. The project will go through and all they have to do is go through the outlined steps of offering us a chance to say no.</p> <p>The project is too large. If all parts of the state must pay the price of using renewable energy make the project smaller with less impact and make similar projects on the west side too</p> <p>What is wrong with hydropower and more of the new small nuclear plants</p> <p>We retired in Washington and remodeled our home so we could enjoy our old age here. We hike to stay fit and enjoy the wildlife. Between this plan and Washington state heavy taxes we are now questioning staying in the area</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	
Anonymous User	1100346	I added a comment under the other section on your home page. I am in great support of this project as it is needed not only as a power generating facility but it can benefit the green energy side of our fair community as it grows bigger by the day. Sacrifices must be made however small to ensure the ability to sustain electrical power production without huge impact to the environment. These are the future of our ability to do that. I am a union millwright in the tri cities area. I currently have a view of the south hills wind farm we already have there. It's not far from my home. I have worked on wind farm projects before. The contractors go to great lengths to ensure the ground and area disturbed is returned to its natural state when the job is completed as well as throughout the whole process during the build. Please see my other comment on the other subtitle on your homepage as it may have a bit of information that could be helpful.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	
Anonymous User	1100355	The community has spoken. We don't want the wind farm here.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	
Anonymous User	1100377	<p>I have owned a home and have lived in Pasco, Washington for some 30-plus years. I am totally opposed to the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Project.</p> <p>Why should we in the Tri-Cities endorse or approve of a wind turbine project which would greatly benefit the western part of the state but which would provide very little benefit to the eastern part. On January 22, 2023, The Tri-City Herald's Editorial Board said it best in a headline entitled "Tri-Cities' sacrifice too great for wind turbine project." I agree entirely with what was stated in the Opinion piece. In addition, the cost to our avian wildlife would be tremendous. Slow-moving big-bodied birds like pelicans and herons, the majestic bald eagles, other eagles, osprey, and other water fowl would be killed along with smaller birds and migratory birds. All this to benefit only one section of Washington: the west. If the western part of the state wants wind turbines, they should build them where they live, not where we live. And our desert area is just as beautiful, in its own way, as the western part; better -- since we don't have the constant rain, wind, and humidity of the west.</p> <p>If the wind turbine project becomes a fait accompli, tearing down the hydroelectric dams will be next, and I am totally opposed to that as well. Please do not allow this wind turbine project to go ahead as planned.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathleen Megow 3713 Road 109 Pasco, Washington 99301</p>	Wildlife and Habitat General - opposition	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.6 n/a	
Anonymous User	1100523	I can deal with the visual impact of the turbines during the day, but the nighttime illumination is an enormous and unnecessary blight on the area. It is my understanding that it is possible to install lights that would only switch on if there is an aircraft in the area. This should be a requirement for any installations in this area.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations. Additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	4.10	n/a
Pdcurc	1100540	This is a blight on our landscape and endangers our wildlife. The governor needs to start considering the needs and wishes of the east side of the state. Place the project elsewhere.	Wildlife and Habitat General - opposition	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.6 n/a	
Anonymous User	1100580	The Horse Heaven Hills area south of Benton City is a prime location for paragliding in Eastern Washington. The proposed wind farm will not only tarnish the beautiful area, but also pose several potential safety hazards to paragliding. There is the obvious risk of getting too close to a wind turbine and getting hit by a propeller blade, but this risk seems small and manageable. The larger concern is the huge area of turbulent air downwind of a turbine, which can significantly affect the capability of a paraglider to stay inflated and capable of flying. The Draft EIS does not address any of those risks or how they will be managed. It would be important to include some sort of assessment of unsafe area downwind of a turbine. I'd imagine the size of this area depends not only on the size of the turbine but also the wind speed and other external factors (e.g. proximity to other wind turbines, etc.). This would not only be of interest for paraglider pilots but also for other light aircraft (small planes, ultralights, powered paragliders, trikes, etc.). Please see attached some pictures of paragliding at the Kiona ridge (the ridge south of Benton City, between Weber Canyon Rd and McBee Rd).	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. As part of Mitigation Measure R-1, the Applicant is required to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan to keep recreation enthusiasts safe. Paragliding is an unofficial recreational activity at the launch locations on public lands closest to the Project. Section 4.12 has been updated to include downwind effects of the turbines.	4.12	Downwind impacts have been included in the Final EIS.
Anonymous User	1100581	The Horse Heaven Hills area south of Benton City is a prime location for paragliding in Eastern Washington. The proposed wind farm will not only tarnish the beautiful area, but also pose several potential safety hazards to paragliding. There is the obvious risk of getting too close to a wind turbine and getting hit by a propeller blade, but this risk seems small and manageable. The larger concern is the huge area of turbulent air downwind of a turbine, which can significantly affect the capability of a paraglider to stay inflated and capable of flying. The Draft EIS does not address any of those risks or how they will be managed. It would be important to include some sort of assessment of unsafe area downwind of a turbine. I'd imagine the size of this area depends not only on the size of the turbine but also the wind speed and other external factors (e.g. proximity to other wind turbines, etc.). This would not only be of interest for paraglider pilots but also for other light aircraft (small planes, ultralights, powered paragliders, trikes, etc.). Please see attached some pictures of paragliding at the Kiona ridge (the ridge south of Benton City, between Weber Canyon Rd and McBee Rd).	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. As part of Mitigation Measure R-1, the Applicant is required to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan to keep recreation enthusiasts safe. Paragliding is an unofficial recreational activity at the launch locations on public lands closest to the Project. Section 4.12 has been updated to include downwind effects of the turbines.	4.12	Downwind impacts have been included in the Final EIS.
Anonymous User	1100678	This proposed wind farm would create obnoxious visual blight on the Tri-cities and do harm to the environment. Clean energy should be built adjacent to the majority of the users. These windmills, if built, should be installed in Seattle and Tacoma. Their growth is creating the energy demand, so let them look at them.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare General - opposition	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.10 n/a	n/a Revise FEIS to include ground vibration attenuation and the following source: (Llaverro Hurtado et al., 2017) Field monitoring and analysis of an onshore wind turbine shallow foundation system Jesús González-Hurtado, Pengpeng He, Tim Newson & Hanping Hong Geotechnical Research Centre, Department of Civil Engineering, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada. Melanie Postman & Sheri Molnar Department of Earth Sciences, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
William G. Jasen	1100689	See attached letter dated January 29, 2023.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives Socioeconomics Visual Aspects, Light and Glare General - Question for EFSEC	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. The No Action Alternative was analyzed. Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0 Appendix 4.16-1 4.10 n/a	n/a n/a n/a
William G. Jasen	1100694	Please ensure the residents of Benton County and the surrounding Central Washington area have the opportunity to vote in the next general election if the Horse Heaven Wind Farm should be constructed. The people of Central Washington have the right to decide on matters affecting our local environment and ecology, not the bureaucrats in Western Washington and a profit hungry Limited Liability Corporation (LLC).	n/a	Please refer to Submission: 1100689	Please refer to Submission 1100689	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Visit Tri-Cities Board of Directors	1100695	Please see the attached letter of opposition from the Visit Tri-Cities Board of Directors.	Land and Shoreline Use	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)). The Project would be micrositied to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	1.2.3, 4.8.1, 4.8.2	
Anonymous User	1100760	I am opposed to this project. The horse heavens hills wind park should not be built. It is to close to the existing community, it will endanger migrating birds, it will not provide many long term jobs, and the facility is not needed locally.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1100805	Wind turbines have numerous drawbacks and negative impacts on the environment and communities with noise pollution, threat to wildlife, especially birds, visual pollution and impacts on scenic views, potential health hazards. These factors become permanent scars on the land as the turbines have limited life-spans and cannot be recycled thus the land eventually becomes energy graveyards. This certainly has a gross negative impact on property values FOREVER. As an energy source, they fail as their production is intermittent and without any energy storage, a very difficult to use source and as mechanical devices, prone to high maintenance. Many of these projects across the country are created to take advantage of the federal subsidies that only last ten years then they become unprofitable so maintenance declines and defective turbines abandon. We should not let our area to become a playground for those who wish to exploit federal subsidies for profit at the cost of our environment. These issues raise questions about the sustainability, cost-effectiveness, and environmental concerns of wind energy as a solution for meeting our energy demands. Any turbine project MUST include a full life-cycle commitment by the developer which includes full restoration and off-site disposal of defective systems, damaged materials. See attached file.	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.		n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1100866	I support the proposed Horse Heavens wind farm project. I am a new resident to the Tri Cities area. The goal of clean air and utilizing all of our resources to get us closer to the goal post includes the wind turbines. The wind farm is future oriented vs continuing to live in the past.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1100877	No No. we are totally against the continued pollution of these wind turbines due to the effect on the wildlife, environment, appearance, and lack of justified 'benefit'. Please do not approve this effort!	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.	4.9	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The Project would serve as a source renewable energy. This benefit is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Project would pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
Anonymous User	1100936	I am generally in favor of wind farms...we need to use every form of energy available to us in a prudent manner. But this proposed, huge farm is not a good fit for this location. It will create a "wall" for future expansion of Kennewick and blight our horizon. At the risk of being a "NIMBY" - find a better location away from a major population center!	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1100940	The Horse Heaven Wind Project would continue to the effect of other Wind Projects in damaging the scenery around the Tri-cities. Looking at the rolling hills with Wind Machines on top of them totally destroys the areas natural beauty. Wind Generators are also not the cheapest source of power. Let's invest in nuclear and solar. Strongly against wind generators.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1101015	I fully support bringing more renewable engergy resources to the area. The Horse Heaven Hills are a perfect place for this development.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101051	I am absolutely against this massive, intrusive turbine wind project. This will negatively affect our neighborhood and our property values will severely decline. Nothing positive will result for us.	Socioeconomics	The Project would serve as a source renewable energy. This benefit is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Project would pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	3.16 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Anonymous User	1101220	I am against locating the HHH windfarm on the ridges above the Tri Cities because of the visual impact and the environmental impact. There is plenty of power produced in this area already. They should be located in an area where the power is needed.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1101287	I feel that these wind turbines are a hazard to our wildlife migration and daily life. Noise levels, pollution (disposal of used blades that cannot be recycled). They are ruining the skyline that is so beautiful, flashing red lights and continual turbine noise. That you would consider wind turbines as "green" is the height of misdirection and misinformation. They are not even manufactured in our country but China! If they weren't subsidized they would not even be an option.They are not helping the citizens of Washington with our power needs but the power is sent out of State. In short, I am 100% against this technology for many reasons....	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.		n/a
Anonymous User	1101321	Christensen comments on HH Wind Farm in attached letter.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential project related impacts to wildlife including state and federal species at risk (discussed under Section 4.6.2.4 Special Status Species). This section discusses the potential for the Project to result in loss of habitat required for special status species, including ferruginous hawk and burrowing owl, through direct removal and reduction of function from displacement of wildlife (e.g. sensory disturbance). The EIS evaluates the potential magnitude of impacts to special status species in Table 4.6-11b, which rates the magnitude of potential impacts from project operation on special status species as generally medium to high depending on the resilience of the population to anthropogenic changes. Mitigation measures have been provided in Section 4.6.2.5 to address species specific and habitat impacts.	4.6.2.4, Table 4.6-11, 4.6.2.5	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified, however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
WildRootJulie	1101353	Why are we allowing companies from other states to build wind farms in eastern Washington when Washington has the lowest energy rates in the nation (source: www.choosewashingtonstate.com) due to hydroelectricity?? Wind farms 1) are known to disrupt wildlife habitat and kill birds and bats, we have several species known to be impacted by this farm 3) inhibit wildlife movement with miles of fencing 3) are short-lived and resource intensive 4) are not recyclable (currently blades are cut up and disposed of in landfills) 54) require a tremendous amount of battery storage. Our state already has too many wind farms that are a huge eyesore. This feels like a money grab. If the dams are remaining in place, there is absolutely NO NEED FOR ANOTHER WIND FARM IN WASHINGTON STATE. If a renewable energy station must be built, I propose just the solar arrays, no turbines, without fencing (some other means of security that does not disturb wildlife such as video surveillance) and that hydrogen energy storage be investigated as an alternative to the battery housing facility.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the magnitude of impacts to wildlife from mortality and barriers to movement (e.g. fences) in section 4.6.2.5, specifically Wild-1, Wild-3, Hab-1, Hab-2, Hab-5, and Hab-6.	4.6, 4.6.2.5	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101442	If Washington was really concerned with renewable energy they would look at adding another nuclear plant. Wind farms are notoriously unreliable. They produce 1/1000 the energy of a nuclear power plant and can only produce electricity in specific weather. Several studies have shown, for wind, the average power density — meaning the rate of energy generation divided by the encompassing area of the wind plant — was up to 100 times lower than estimates previously given by leading energy experts. When taking into account the additional issues of turbine-atmosphere interaction and a small increase in temperature because of wind changes, there is no positive environmental impact; in fact, it is a negative environmental impact. Not only are wind turbines a poor use of taxpayer money, but research has shown Horse Heaven Hills is not a good candidate. Environmental impacts are minimized only when wind farms are located on the ocean and oceans have more reliable wind patterns. If Washington is looking to maximize their output, then another location needs to be used (the coast). If they are looking to actually curb fossil fuel usage and improve emissions, we need to add another nuclear power plant. The reality is that wind power is not a viable alternative, we need to be using more nuclear power. It is clean, renewable energy.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101444	I am not in favor of a massive, intrusive turbine wind project. This is terrible for the vegetation, and the beauty of the Horse Heaven Hills. Not to mention a huge waste of the taxpayer's dollar! Thank you, Jan Lenkersdorfer	Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to Priority Habitats and special status plant species in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts such as dust. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat and special status plant species were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of priority habitats throughout Washington and sensitivity of special status plant species, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
Jayson1210	1101469	We are against the Horse heaven SPA because of negative environmental impact it will create on this area.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101481	Please do not pollute the entirety of our area with more windmills. They have proven to be an ecological detriment, and there is no plan for disposing of the aging equipment. Keep the dams, and stop the windmills.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1101488	I'm AGAINST this project. The facts keep getting ignored. Wind turbines are one of the least energy efficient and least green energy technology's available. They occupy massive amounts of land and kill many many birds. Furthermore they are flat out ugly. Additionally, the power is not going to benefit the local counties. They people have responded multiple times that they are against this project and they are continually ignored. Perhaps it's time to vote out the commissioners that are pushing this project.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101497	I hope that any migratory birds will not be disproportionately impacted and that this has been researched to prevent their marginalization.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Recommended mitigation measures Wild-1 would require the Applicant to conduct a minimum of two years of post-construction monitoring and propose additional mitigation measures to reduce bird and bat mortality based on those data.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1101526	I have sold and am selling view lots on top of Horse Heaven Hills and do not want these wind mills to be in our view. . I own from Badger Canyon Rd to Clodfelter Rd. Loren Miller	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1101562	We are not in favor of this massive, intrusive turbine wind project !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101568	What is the typical life span of the turbine blades, where will they go to be recycled, and who pays for that cost?	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1101578	Listen to your constituents who have elected you. Overwhelmingly we do not want this HH wind farm project in our community that already has sufficient electrical power. Short term employment for construction workers and need of minimal maintenance workers will not make up for the long term environmental degradation of our communities, deflated economy and loss of our relaxed lifestyle. You would not enjoy this project in your community if this affected your home.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101596	They are ugly and will ruin the skyline.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1101616	I strongly oppose the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind farm	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101654	As a Kennewick resident I do not want our landscape changed for these windmills. They are not environmentally friendly and will harm the environment. We need to concentrate on what this area needs...hydro power and nuclear power. We do NOT want these windmills in this area.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101673	I am vehemently against the windmills! Why on earth would we want these here? Environmentalists have already spoken to their damage and none of the electricity stays local!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101818	NOT in favor of this project.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101830	NOT in favor. Strongly against this proposed project.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101835	I have serious reservations regarding the Wind project for some of the following reasons: Obstruction of migratory bird paths, negative impacts to wildlife livelihood, and permanent damage to wildlife habitat.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101842	Not in favor.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101857	After reading this report on the health effects on these wind farms, I am very concerned that we will suffer symptoms from the vibrations and low frequency sounds as well as flickering. My husband has severe bouts of vertigo and we are closer than 3 miles to the windmills. we are in open country which makes these sounds and vibrations travel further. We recommend these windmills be moved back 3 miles from the closest human dwelling.	Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the DEIS and are not expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health from noise or vibration.	4.11 (Vibration and LFN)	Revise FEIS to directly address Vibration and LFN.
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1101890	I am very concerned about this report , this windmill farm , as close as it is to our city will cause horrible health problems. I am against this wind farm	Noise and Vibration	Advances in wind turbine and blade design have significantly reduced LFN emissions from wind projects and LFN is not expected to be a source of community annoyance from this Project.	4.11 (LFN)	Revise FEIS to directly address LFN.
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101917	From what I understand, the batteries can only store 30% of the energy generated from these windmills , how can we justify the cost of this project compared to the small approved reactors that are safe and only take 6 acres of land and don't kill wildlife..... How are you protecting our environment, energy bills and tax dollars? Have we worked out all the kinks with this wind power? We finally have with nuclear, why aren't we using it?	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101926	I am vehemently opposed to this project. I've seen the terrible light pollution through red, flashing aviation warning beacons that this has caused in neighboring communities and I firmly believe it is not worth the risk. Our state is one of the largest providers of energy in the country via other sources besides windmills therefore I don't feel the "benefits" that these eyesores could possibly offer are worth the natural beauty and wildlife livelihood that they will be spoiling. NO WINDMILLS!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1101931	Take away the government subsidies then tell the public how these are self supporting. NO MORE WINDFARMS! How many windfarms are being built west of the cascades? NO MORE WINDFARMS!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101942	The attached article is very disturbing, please address and consider the health of our community, there is too much evidence that these windmill farms have not been completely vetted . This farm is being placed too close to our community, the greater good for all argument is fading. I ask each committee member, would you want to put your kids and family close to this project with all the health risks? I recommend using only Solar and the small nuclear plants.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill response measures.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1101944	This is a very bad idea. There is not enough energy produced from these wind mills to warrant the ugliness that comes having to see them daily. There is not enough energy produced from them to pay for the electricity it takes to start them. There will be wind mill blade grave yards to hold the broken pieces throughout the years that will be filled with non biodegradable metal, plastic and whatever else they are made of. They will freeze in winter, look at Texas ! I vote no in putting these ugly useless monstrosities in our area. Lori Morrison Benton City	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1101951	I object to the proposed Horse Heaven wind project and provide the following comments. I request that EFSEC disapprove the project based on the impacts it will have to our Tri-Cities area. 1. I hike Badger mountain preserve in Richland 5 to 6 times a week for exercise. It's beauty is awesome both on the mountain and for the unique vistas available in all 360 degrees of direction. The wind farm would wreck the skyline vista in about 120 degrees of arc. This impact would be both day and night. The size of the towers and blades, along with the number of towers themselves would totally destroy the beauty of the southeast to southwest vista. The project amounts to the industrialization of our rural views, whether we live with sight of turbines or if we're hiking Badger Mountain, Candy Mountain of the Rattlesnake Mountain preserve. In addition, the turbines will be visible, including their blinking red lights at night, from many areas of Kennewick, Richland and Pasco. Thus impacting a large percentage of Tri-City residents. The negative impact on the community can easily be anticipated simply by looking at the visual impact of the wind farms located between Wallula Gap and Walla Walla. The project will in fact be partially visible from my home in West Richland and will impact my views to the south and the west. The blight on the landscape this project will cause far outweighs any possible benefit it might bring. I have included a picture looking south from atop Badger mountain. This view would become one filled with hundreds of tall turbines. 2. Eastern Washington has a significant number winter days of atmospheric pressure inversions resulting in cold and windless days. This occurs frequently during very cold weather, precisely when more generation is needed, not less! During the inversions, the wind drops to zero. Wind turbines in Washington are more productive in the summer, but that coincides with times that hydropower is at maximum levels and not as much help is needed from other generating technologies. Also, during very hot weather in the Tri-cities, the wind frequently drops almost to zero, precisely when more, not less generation is needed to meet load. 3. The generation from the project will not be used to meet load in the local area of Benton county, let alone in the State of Washington. We should not be forced to endure a disruptive project that will have no benefit for us. 4. The draft study fails to analyze the proposed wind project's impact on the people who would live near it. The results of a Tri-Cities Chamber of Commerce survey determined that 78% of respondents said the Horse Heaven wind farm was not worth the personal, environmental and economic impacts it would have on the Tri-Cities. 5. Ferruginous hawks are an endangered species in Washington state. It is apparent that this Wind project will have a detrimental impact on these hawks. The Washington state Fish and Wildlife said in its comments about the Horse Heaven project that the Horse Heaven ridgeline is among the last remaining functional and uninterrupted shrub-steppe and natural grasslands in Benton County and is an important foraging area for raptors. It said, "Maintaining sufficient foraging area to support successful territories and nesting for ferruginous hawks and other raptors that use thermals and air currents associated with the Horse Heaven Hills seems particularly challenging with current proposed structure orientation". 6. As a Washington State resident. I enjoy hunting in our beautiful state. My experience has been that once wind farm projects are constructed, both land owners and the wind farm companies severely limit access to private and public lands that were formerly open to hunting. This has occurred in the wind farm area between Wallula Gap and Walla Walla and in the areas northeast of Dayton WA an in the surrounding hills around Pomeroy, WA. I have observed this result directly as I have seen my hunting areas become more restrictive or eliminated. The effect has been to take land out of use for recreation and hunting, which is working against the efforts being mad by WDFW to acquire more land for hunting in Washington whether it be by direct land purchase to add public land, or arranging with landowners to place their land into "feel-free-to-hunt" designated areas. 7. If the State of Washington is truly interested in reducing CO-2 emissions as far as energy production and environment impact is concerned, the State should be focusing it's efforts on support for Nuclear power plant construction. The cost-benefit for a nuclear investment far exceeds that for a wind far given the magnitude of the environment impact and the far superior consistent power production capability. Respectfully Submitted, Andy Rapacz 3513 Eastlake Drive West Richland, WA 99353	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The Project impacts on people were discussed in multiple sections of the EIS including but not limit to: 3.10 and 4.10 (visual aspects, light and glare), 3.11 and 4.11 (noise and vibration), 3.12 and 4.12 (recreation), 3.13 and 4.13 (public health and safety), 3.14 and 4.14 (transportation), 3.16 and 4.16 (socioeconomics). Benefit of the Project include supplying renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential Project-related impacts on ferruginous hawks in Section 4.6.2.4. The assessment provides a description of the anticipated impacts to ferruginous hawks due to loss of habitat, displacement due to disturbance (indirect habitat loss), mortality, and change in predator/ prey dynamics. The EIS acknowledges the potential impact to this species in by rating the magnitude of the potential impact at High, defined as an "incremental change is sufficiently large that it approaches or falls within the range of impacts that could exceed the resilience and adaptability of the species or population, potentially impacting the viability of the species or population" (See Table 4.6-2). The EIS provides recommended mitigation specific to ferruginous hawk (Spec-5) requiring the Applicant to avoid siting infrastructure in core ferruginous hawk habitat and developing a species specific management plan including additional mitigation measures, should avoidance not be feasible.	4.6.2.4, Table 4.6-2	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. Information on hunting allowed on both private land and DNR-administered land within the Project Lease Boundary was not readily available after contacting WDFW.	4.12	n/a
Anonymous User	1101962	This windmill project will require trucks and trucks of cement , I am asking that if this project is approved, the truck traffic for this be limited to Locust grove which is a truck route and banned from Clodfelter rd., which is a residential area with school bus children and rural neighborhoods, which would present a danger to our community and ruin our road.	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
Anonymous User	1102003	Paraquat was sprayed in the Horse Heaven hills years ago, it seeps in the ground and stays there, when Scout comes in and digs these holes , how is EFSEC going to assure us that that dirt won't blow into the entire Benton County area from the south? Agent Orange is still causing cancer and illnesses after more than 50 years, will scout have a bond to cover health problems from this? I recommend taking samples from every hole dug, and having outside health officials from Benton County ok the dig, and in addition, strict dust control should be required as the wind blows from the southwest towards our community .	Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. The ASC states that 5 gallons of lubricating oil will be needed for each turbine per year. Oil would be brought in, and waste oil would be removed using by a maintenance contractor using a specialized vehicle. The applicant has committed to developing and implementing a SPCC Plan to address potential spills during Project Operations, as noted in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. An evaluation of down winder effects resulting from the Project will be added to the FEIS.	4.13.2	Provide evaluation of "down winder" effects resulting from Project construction, operations, and decommissioning.
Anonymous User	1102050	As a lifetime resident of Benton County, I am adamantly opposed to seeing these grotesque, inefficient machines being built anywhere within sight of our community and especially don't want them polluting our view of the Horse Heaven landscape we all love and enjoy. They may not be Mt. Rainier or snowcapped peaks, but they are a part of the area we call home. If Mr. Inslaw is so dead set on covering the state with these ugly behemoths, then I'd suggest he begin by building them at the foothills of the Cascades near Mt. Rainier on the West side where they get plenty of wind or better yet, all along the Washington Coast. Maybe the folks on the West side will be more receptive to the destruction of their landscape than we are here on the East side.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1102100	I've been a resident of Benton County for over 74 years & want to say that I strongly oppose the building of these proposed windmills anywhere within sight of our community. The Horse Heaven Hills are not scab lands. To the residents of this community, they are just as important and beautiful as the Cascades or Blue Mountains are to those folks that live within viewing distance of those. I've heard these proposed windmills are as little as 40% efficient and the list of damage they will do is extensive. Building them across the crest of the Horse Heaven Hills will effectively shut down the only true corridor the City of Kennewick has to expand. No one will want to build within sight of these grotesque machines and the residences that already occupy the areas proposed for this project will suffer the brunt of watching their property values plummet and having to endure the sounds, flashing lights, additional roads, traffic, dust and all the other detriments that come with them. Much of this area is prime view property occupied by multi-million-dollar homes. The folks that built those homes paid dearly for the property they sit on and definitely didn't build up there so they could look out their windows and see these wasteful, destructive and buttugy machines. We, the people that reside in this community do NOT want them here!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Transportation	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.14	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1102138	The opposition letter attached was dropped off at Kennewick City Hall by a Kennewick citizen. Submitting it on their behalf as a courtesy.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
The Applicant	1102200	Please see attachments.	n/a	Please Refer to the "Submission 1102200" Spreadsheet Tab	Please Refer to the "Submission 1102200" Spreadsheet Tab	Please Refer to the "Submission 1102200" Spreadsheet Tab
M59Steward	1102363	I wish to add my STRONG OPPOSITION to the HHH Turbine Wind Project. I feel this is a HORRENDOUS project to put in our back yard. The environmental impact statement does little to address the known FACT that there are ENDANGERED WILDLIFE in this proposed area, that will be unnecessarily affected by this senseless project. Please add my name as to voting NO on this project.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1102366	1-30-23 I have long had a belief that this whole effort to build a giant wind farm in Washington State is really some kind of a scam; and I use that language because the company that has pushed this idea, Scout Energy, has done everything it can to circumvent the will of the people on both sides of the state. They managed to find a way to keep local control out of this process, and have done this in such a manner that they hope that we haven't noticed that we are about to be fleeced. What if the reality is that none of us who live in this state actually wants this kind of windfarm built anywhere within the boundaries of the State of Washington? What if what is actually happening is that the company that wants to do this is manipulating all of us; and doing that by pitting east vs. west/Democrat vs. Republican in a strategy designed to keep us from realizing that our whole state loses if this wind farm is built. And I suspect that once one of this type of windfarm is constructed, that they will demand to build many more of them everywhere that they can. So, what is the reason that we are doing this? When I think of this idea of filling our landscape with 650-foot tall windmills I keep asking that same question: what is the reason that we are doing this to ourselves? What is the reason we are allowing a company from outside of our state to build a windfarm so large that it's negative impact to the landscape and the environment is beyond comprehension? And what is the reason we are allowing this to happen when the huge amount of money made from the small amount of electricity these windmills will produce, will leave this state and never come back? And another thing for us to ponder is if these windmills are not acceptable on the west side of the state what makes them to be acceptable in the eastside as well? If the people on the west side don't want them affecting their views of nature, and neither do those of us who live in the eastside, then maybe we should all agree that none of us actually wants them built anywhere in the state in the first place; so why are we forcing ourselves to do this? I have already stated that this will be just the first of these monstrosities to be built unless enough of us are willing to recognize how unfair and unjust the selection process has become, so that we can join forces and say no and stop this whole mess before it is too late. I am a member of the Tri-City Photography club and I have seen extraordinary photos of Eastern Washington that will take your breath away; photos of the beauty of the desert, of shrub steppe spring flowers; of channeled scab lands created by ice age floods; and of the rolling hills of the Palouse; all of which will be lost if this is done here. Isn't that the reason that the west side of the state doesn't want these windmills either, so that they don't lose the natural beauty of the surf crashing on ocean beaches; or mountain views with spring flowers blooming amidst the snow, or waterfalls that capture the rainbow of the sun; all of which they would lose if these things were built in their backyard. And that is what will be lost, be destroyed, if this project is allowed to be constructed in Eastern Washington. So, if nobody wants these windmills, then maybe the best path is to say no to this whole idea and instead we can work together, so we can find a better way to provide the energy that we do need and at the same time protect the natural beauty that exists throughout all parts of Washington State. Sam Geyer 2616 W. 37th Ave, Kennewick WA 99337 509-528-6222 scgeyer12@charter.net	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1102385	I am concerned about the environmental impact from the non-recyclable blades on the windmills. I believe the lifespan is about 20 yrs then they have to be disposed of in landfills. I also do not want windmills visible on the ridges, it greatly detracts from the natural beauty of the area. Also greatly concerned about the impact on wildlife from birds hitting the blades and from the noise the windmills make.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Bird collision with the turbines is considered in section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS.	4.6.2.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1102437	Oh, the one problem I'm not seeing mentioned is how the vast blades of turbines are currently choking landfills.(google it) The blades are built so well, they basically do not rot, nor can they be recycled. Somebody in Benton County needs to ask what they plan to dispose with the blades when our grit is done with them. What does runoff do? And out wind is gritty, leading to early retirement. I'd hate to be stuck with a same problem the early landfills got.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1102483	The western writer, Zane Grey, wrote about these hills in the classic Horse Heaven Hill western story. The location of this project has great cultural and historical meaning to the generations past and present. The Horse Heaven Wind Farm project's footprint is vast extending 26-miles long and covering 72,000 acres. The project will significantly impact the people and wildlife of multiple counties in Washington and Oregon. Multiple and significant adverse impacts cannot be fully mitigated. These adverse and cumulative impacts make this project unviable and inappropriate for the Horse Heaven Hills. 1.Loss and impact due to incompatible use of agricultural lands. 2.Loss and impact of natural resources due to destruction and degradation of wildlife habitat, habitat connectivity, and increased mortality of multiple species. 3.Loss and impacts to our local fowl and migratory birds on the Pacific flyway due to increased mortality from bird kills. 4.Loss and impact to historical and cultural resources for the Horse Heaven Hills are part of the ceded lands of the Yakama Tribes and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation. The tribes have stories and have walked these hills for centuries, which will be a loss that the tribal people will suffer for generations. 5.Loss and impact to visual and aesthetic resources for the views of the beautiful hills, especially at sunset, will be forever disfigured. The location for this project does not conform to the comprehensive plan land use. Benton County has better locations for energy development on Hanford land that will not create this magnitude of adverse impacts. Alternatives for energy development, such as nuclear, should be considered that do not create this level of adverse impact. The Advanced Nuclear Reactor project is located on Hanford land already purposed for a nuclear reactor, and can produce 320-megawatts of energy. Increasing the scale of advanced nuclear on Hanford land can match the level of energy output proposed from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm.	Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositest to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential impacts to wildlife and habitat in Section 4.6 including habitat loss, displacement of wildlife (indirect habitat loss), impacts to wildlife movement, and wildlife mortality. These impacts have been further characterized in Section 4.6.2.6. Additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce potential impacts to wildlife in Section 4.6.2.5.	4.6, 4.6.2.6, 4.6.2.5	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Applicant Commitments as stated in Section 2.1.3.10 of the EIS include collaboration with tribes. Per EIS Section 9.2, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation along with several others are on the Tribal Governments distribution list.	4.9, 2.1.3.10, 9.2	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	EFSEC will initiate government-to-government consultation with Tribes and the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. The FEIS will report the results of consultation. Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Lou Boliou	1102491	<p>This letter is in response to the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Project—the plan to erect a 24-mile line of wind turbine generator “Eiffel Towers” atop the hills adjacent to the Tri-Cities, Washington.</p> <p>I am a retired nuclear technician and engineer, and have worked in both the DOE and commercial nuclear field. I also spent ~5 years maintaining the Arizona State Air Quality Lab in Phoenix, Arizona, as an instrumentation specialist.</p> <p>I find this proposed plan to be egregious for multiple reasons. The first is that Tri-City residents have valid concerns about these environmentally destructive and subsidized part-time energy generators. It seems that, since this region is not politically in lock-step with the political monopoly on our western shores, we have little influence on the ideas promulgated by activists and special economic interests.</p> <p>One valid objection is the placement of these spinning monoliths so close to a growing city environment. The vast majority of large wind generation is established away from relatively large urban populations. Why is this project to be sited so close to our citizens' homes and businesses in one of the fastest growing cities in Washington? Many truly enlightened nations place their wind turbines off shore, as the winds are far more predictable and consistent. California is presently considering just that. Perhaps, the political and geographical divide of Western and Eastern Washington helped with this siting decision.</p> <p>Another factor is the maintenance cost of these wind turbines. Studies indicate the rapidly increasing use of massive turbine blade generators is becoming a mounting problem. These huge blades, made of composites, are largely non-recyclable or so expensive to maintain it makes the already expensive maintenance of turbine generators even less attractive. Yet, the political inertia pushes on with the old kick-the-can-down-the-road principle.</p>	Land and Shoreline Use	Private and public entities own the land parcels within the Lease Boundary. As a result, the Applicant have to establish terms of agreement with the Lease Boundary landowners to develop and operate the Project.	3.8.11	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including bird mortality during operation are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Specifically Section 4.6.2.2, subsection <i>Turbine Option 1 and Turbine Option 2, Wildlife Mortality from Operation of Turbines</i> provides an assessment of the anticipated mortality of birds and bats from turbine operation. This section predicts that horned lark is the species most likely to be frequently impacted by the Project. Further details on wildlife collision risk is presented in Appendix 4.6-1.	4.6, 4.6.2.2, Appendix 4.6-1	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to “recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities.” For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1102504	<p>My wife and I firmly believe that this project would negatively impact the Tri-Cities region and there would be little or no long term benefit for the area. The Tri-Cities has the Snake and Columbia River Hydroelectric Dams and Nuclear Power being produced by Energy Northwest. The proposed wind project would have a long term negative impact on the Deer, Antelope, Hawks, Pheasants, Owls and a host of other wildlife. The migration habits of Geese, Ducks and other migratory birds not only could but will be negatively impacted and altered if not destroyed completely.</p> <p>There will also be a loss of revenue that will be felt by Wineries, and other Tourism Industries like Hiking, Birdwatching, and Biking, to name a few. The impact to these and other groups would be significant, and all for the production of unreliable and costly wind power that would not benefit this area but be sold to areas that are hundreds of miles away just for the sake of being able to say its “Green”. This is a project for investors and companies only and not for this community. They will never have to look at these eyesores or deal with the waste that they create.</p> <p>Michael Fitzsimmons Kennewick WA.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
Anonymous User	1102641	<p>I am against the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm project. I am a licensed pilot and have enjoyed many hours of up draft flight along the proposed area of this project, as do many of the large birds of pray that soar along the ridge line. This project would prohibit my enjoyment and the birds of pray from their natural desire to soar and hunt for food. I fear that many birds will be killed and or injured because of this project. Next, as I live in Benton City, the visual aesthetics will depress my attitude and lower my property value. The movement of the blades during the day and the flashing lights at night will be very distracting and unnatural. Much of this project does not benefit our U.S. manufactures and sends our tax money overseas. Then the power is slated to go to the west side of our state. If the west wants this, then build it there, and keep it out of my backyard.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant. Such power purchasers could include any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users with potential off-takers having distribution outside of Washington state. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	1.2.1 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Anonymous User	1102738	<p>I am a lifelong Tri-Cities resident, and have always enjoyed looking up to our ridge lines. I don't want to see huge wind machines with flashing red lights, also I'm concerned how the wind machines will affect birds. Please locate these machines away from the Tri-Cities.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1102748	<p>My comments are in the attached document. Here is a link to the video of the swarming sandhill cranes mentioned on page 3. https://photos.app.goo.gl/bhhQCKMx47H5BFmB6</p>	Socioeconomics	The Project would serve as a source renewable energy. This benefit is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Project would pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project. Additionally, an on-site concrete batch plant will be used by the Applicant.	4.14	n/a
			Air Quality	A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analyses (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/ft/21osti/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO ₂ e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO ₂ /kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO ₂ e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#:~:text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,o%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020). As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.	4.3	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to birds, including special status species such as sandhill crane, red-tailed hawk, and American white pelican in Section 4.6. The EIS provides recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to wildlife including special status species, bird mortality, and bat mortality.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1102754	<p>I am totally against these wind machines going up in the tricities! Take them over to the West side! They are ugly, expensive, bird killers!!!</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1102757	<p>I am not in favor of this project. It will be of no benefit to our area; build it next to the people that will benefit. It's a blight on the land, it destroys the appeal of this beautiful part of the County. It will have a detrimental economic impact on our property values. It kills birds. It's noisy. It causes fires when these fans overheat.</p>	Socioeconomics	The Project would serve as a source renewable energy. This benefit is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Project would pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Anonymous User	1102778	<p>I am opposed to the Horse Heaven windmill project. Wind is not a reliable source of energy but I know you know that. What I don't understand is why you are willing to devastate the earth burying the used structures when their "life span" is complete. Is there really that much profit in it?</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1102812	<p>Jobs: The wind turbines will not provide additional jobs or benefit the economy. Any jobs preparing the sites and constructing the wind turbines will only be temporary. The craft workers are transitory and will move on to the next project once work in this area is done.</p> <p>Esthetics: I chose to live at the base of the Horse Heaven Hills for the wide-open views of farmland, natural sage grasslands and wildlife living within. The wind turbines will change the landscape from its current natural beauty to an industrial wasteland. The red lights at night will create major light pollution which will lower my property value.</p> <p>Wildlife: The Antelope population that has steadily increased since introduction to the Horse Heaven Hills. They habitat has been a safe environment for the herd to raise young and thrive. I am concerned about the protected antelope population will be negatively impacted by the industrialization of their habitat. The avian and wildlife habitat will never recover.</p>	Socioeconomics	The Project would serve as a source renewable energy. This benefit is aligned with the State of Washington's goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Also, construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Project would pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to pronghorn antelope under the topic of Special status species. While, this species is not a state listed species or a priority species, it was included as a special status species due to the understood importance to Yakama Nation. The EIS includes mitigation measures specific to pronghorn antelope to manage potential impacts to this species as their range may expand into the the Lease Boundary in the future. The EIS also describes assessed impacts and mitigation to wildlife under Section 4.6.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1102814	<p>Les&amp;Andrea Abercrombie 4817 Corvina St., Richland, WA 99352 South Badger homeowners opposing the wind farm.</p> <p>While we refrain from interpreting the science and facts beyond our area of expertise, there remain significant unanswered questions and poorly addressed conclusions. In a 2021 survey, 2,220 respondents and our partners indicated that they had unanswered questions regarding:</p> <p>The true efficiency of the benefit of this project when compared to the 93% non-emitting energy resources already provided by the Greater Mid-Columbia Region.</p> <p>The long-term economic benefits of selecting this technology over proven alternatives for a region that supplies 40% of Washington's non-emitting energy.</p> <p>The impacts to the \$500 Million+ annually expended by consumers visiting Washington Wine Country's vast unencumbered viewshed.</p> <p>Compared to the relatively unseen energy infrastructure of our community, the proximity of the project to our population center creates a disproportionate burden to the region's nearly 300,000 residents.</p> <p>The infrastructure and resource needs of this project may result in reduced capacity for business development in more appropriate locations throughout the region.</p> <p>Light pollution through red, flashing aviation warning beacons - and the resultant safety factor of the mitigation strategy suggested for 'timed periods of inactivity.'</p> <p>Obstruction of migratory bird paths, negative impacts to wildlife livelihood, and permanent damage to wildlife habitat.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage.	4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	Include AVA in LSU
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.		Include AVA in Recreation
Anonymous User	1102816	<p>I am commenting in opposition to the proposed wind farm project. The Mid Columbia already provides a significant amount of power to other regions via our dams and Columbia Generating Station. The windmills will ruin the beautiful views provided by the Horse Heaven Hills and affect the wine tourism this area is aggressively trying to market. Please reject this wind farm proposal.</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	A forecast of regional electricity demand is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS, which suggests that by 2041, the region could see a 22.5 percent increase in demand.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	Include AVA in Land Use
cbarnard	1103467	<p>I do NOT support this project. Windmills are an eyesore and we already have too many of them in eastern Washington. I'd like to see the ones we already have removed! The loss of agriculture land and the impact on wildlife is not worth it. STOP THIS PROJECT!</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1103552	<p>I oppose the wind farm project. I have been around wind farms for years. I hunt on a large wind farm in E. Washington on a regular basis. I have seen the birds that are killed by these wind turbines...Eagles, Hawks, Geese, Ducks, all types of Birds of Prey even small birds. I am not talking 1 or 2 birds, but many on the ground.. especially after a foggy stretch of days. I have also seen first hand the damage when these turbines have problems and the amount of oil that runs down to the base of turbine...looks like hundreds of gallons.</p> <p>I honestly believe that there is a reason that the concrete pads, as well as the amount of dark gravel spread out around the base of these wind turbines is so large...is to hide the oil spills (dark oil...dark rock). after a spill, the turbine is repaired and more dark rock is spread on top of existing oil covered rock...Not only are wind turbines an eye sore, they just do not perform like Nuclear, or Hydro. Has anyone seen where these turbines go to die? The amount of natural habitat destroyed by the roads leading to and from these, as well as the size destroyed by each "pad" is astonishing. Has anyone discussed the size/location of the sub stations where this "power" is held? Another major piece of land, as well as another eye sore. ...Where is GreenPeace, PETA, and the tree huggers when they are really needed?</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1103610	<p>Comments attached</p>	Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	An analysis of setback requirements listed in Benton County Code 11.17.070 are presented in Table 3.8-2A: Benton County Zoning Ordinance Consistency Analysis. For any aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with Benton County Code (BCC) 11.17.070 Growth Management Act Agricultural District (as in effect at the time of application), EFSEC may consider in the adjudication whether inconsistent provisions should be preempted, and if so, whether any conditions should be included to serve the purpose of such provisions. Prior to decommissioning, the Applicant would submit a Detailed Site Restoration Plan, per WAC 463-72-050, for restoring the site to its preconstruction character. This would assist in preventing conversion of a land use that is not in alignment with the Lease Boundary's current designation. The Applicant would be responsible for working with the landowner to return all agricultural land to its preconstruction status. If future site conditions or land ownership no longer allows for the land to be returned to agricultural production, the Applicant would submit a request to EFSEC for an alternative land use that would be in alignment with the Lease Boundary's preconstruction rural character and resource value. If the Detailed Site Restoration Plan requests an alternative land use, EFSEC may require that the Applicant provide additional mitigation to offset impacts from a permanent conversion of the land. The Project would financially support ongoing agricultural ownership and operations via its lease agreements with participating landowners. The Project would be micrositest to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements.	Appendix 3.8-1, 4.8.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1103681	<p>I am writing in support of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center (HHCEC). As a nearly lifelong resident of the Tri-Cities, I support the project because I believe that an "all of the above" approach will be required to mitigate, and perhaps even reverse, the effects that human activity are causing to our climate. I strongly support nuclear energy in all its forms, solar, hydropower, wind, and fusion when it becomes available. All of the forms of energy production have their adverse side effects, but I believe we should, and eventually will, do a better job of minimizing these.</p> <p>In particular, for the HHCEC, the towers and blades should be painted a beige or tan color to blend in better with the surrounding vegetation most of the year. I also think that the navigation hazard lights should only be turned on when aircraft are nearby. I don't mind looking at wind turbines during the day, but the lights are unnecessarily annoying at night (and they waste energy, anyway, if there are no aircraft to see them). Note that I expect to be able to see the turbines from my residence in Pasco. In fact, I can already see the Nine Canyon wind farm, and I've never heard any of my neighbors or visitors complain about it.</p> <p>Permit me to address some of the criticisms that have been leveled at the HHCEC. First, the notion that the turbines will affect tourism strikes me as totally lacking merit. I believe that nobody visits the Tri-Cities to look at the Horse Heaven Hills. They mostly come here for wineries, sporting events, water recreation, golf, and to visit friends and relatives. None of these attractants will be affected by wind turbines on the hills in the distance. I have no trouble visiting Ellensburg and Vantage even though both have wind turbines nearby, and I doubt that anybody else avoids those locations due to the wind turbines. When travelling in Europe, wind turbines are visible often, and they hardly draw a second glance. It wouldn't surprise me if someday the Tri-Cities becomes a prime ecotourism destination to see all of our carbon-neutral energy generation and storage facilities, including wind turbines. The dams and nuclear power plant already draw tourists.</p> <p>Second, the idea that it is somehow unfair to generate electricity in the Mid-Columbia that is then transmitted to the west side is a disingenuous. The bulk of the electricity generated nearby is already mostly used elsewhere largely without local complaint, and we're already suffering the side effects of that with salmon lifecycle impacts and nuclear waste generation. As I said above, these side effects need to be better minimized for all energy sources, and real progress is being made towards that. Residents of the Mid-Columbia region don't seem to have any trouble eating the halibut, crab, oysters, and cranberries that come from the west side, so how is sending energy west any different? Further, the local area will benefit economically from land leases and local taxes paid by the project. And finally on this point, once offshore wind turbine technology becomes economically feasible, I expect we'll have thousands of turbines installed in the coastal waters of Washington, Oregon, and California, thereby better sharing the impacts of energy generation throughout the region.</p> <p>Third, the criticism that agricultural land will be taken out of production is overblown. While the HHCEC is a huge project, only a small percentage of it will actually displace any agricultural activities. In fact, each turbine typically requires only 0.25 acre of land (http://www.energybc.ca/cseche/wind2/www.nrel.gov/analysis/power_databook/calc_wind.html), or about 61 acres total for the entire HHCEC (plus any new roads that will be constructed). The rest of the 112 square miles of land can continue to be used for crops and cattle grazing or as natural scabland.</p> <p>Fourth, some argue that the project is not economically feasible. To that I say that if the project is able to attract private funding, it is evidently economically feasible enough. That's exactly how capitalism works.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Gary E. Spanner, Ph.D., PE, CEcD</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1103712	<p>Comments Attached</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1103793	I am in complete disagreement with the horse heaven windfarm, all of the decision making should not be taken away from the people of Benton county, the proposed windfarm would be 3 to 5 miles away from 10's of thousands of residents, nearly 5 times the TOTAL affected residents in Washington state today, with the downwind effects of a windfarm not being taken seriously into consideration, the climate change they create, the effects on local agriculture due to the climate change created. Herbicide drift that will blanket the Tri Cities from all the turbine created inversions of air movement either from residue in the dust from 120 miles of service roads or from applications to all the wheat farms that exist under the proposed wind farm. This will create health and welfare problems similar to what we had in the 80's and 90's when aerial applications of herbicides were detrimental to downwind agriculture, viticulture, and health of all people within 300 miles from wind inversions that exist TODAY, BEFORE the proposed windfarm inversions. This is one of the many problems the windfarm will create. our aquifers are getting low enough that 10% of my neighbors have had to drill deeper wells, the 250,000 gallons of water that scout energy will need for road construction would undoubtedly create more wells needing to be replaced. Who'll be responsible for all of these future problems created by a foreign company with highly subsidized, poorly planned, unreliable, overrated, unneeded, NOT green created power? The draft EIS is 1600 pages of regurgitation. The content of this report is not specific to our area and lacks relativity. falsely reports the effected residents in reference to distance and urban growth areas.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1103798	How will this project not negatively impact the migration of the sandhill cranes along the inland Pacific flyway? In February of each year, the sandhill cranes start appearing in our area here in the Tricities/Othello as they rest/leed and make preparations to continue on to their summer feeding grounds in Canada and Alaska. They fly right over the Horse Heaven Hills during the course of this journey. In the Fall, they reverse direction on their ultimate destination back to California, again passing directly over the Horse Heaven Hills.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to Sandhill crane under section 4.6.2.4. Species specific impacts have been included under Section 4.6.2.5. Based on bird mortality reports from other wind power project, sandhill cranes may be less susceptible to collisions with wind turbines due to their flight height. While sandhill cranes may be able to avoid interaction with turbines, the magnitude of the potential impact of the Horse Heaven Project on sandhill crane is rated as Medium, suggesting the Project could have measurable impacts on the local population although within the expected population adaptability and resilience.	4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5	n/a
Benton County Public Works Department and Board of county Commissioners	1103829	Please accept the following DEIS comments from the Board of County Commissioners	Land and Shoreline Use	The submitter's comment letter is acknowledged. In response, a discussion on the impact of agriculture on Benton County's economy is presented in 3.8.1.4. The Applicant would be responsible for working with the landowner to return all agricultural land to its preconstruction status. The Project would financially support ongoing agricultural ownership and operations via its lease agreements with participating landowners. If future site conditions or land ownership no longer allows for the land to be returned to agricultural production, the Applicant would submit a request to EFSEC for an alternative land use that would be in alignment with the Lease Boundary's preconstruction rural character and resource value. If the Detailed Site Restoration Plan requests an alternative land use, EFSEC may require that the Applicant provide additional mitigation to offset impacts from a permanent conversion of the land. The Benton County Comprehensive Plan and Benton County zoning ordinance would continue to guide land use development within the county.	3.8.1.4, 4.8.2.4	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Opposition	EIS does reference "West Richland" and "unincorporated Benton county". For example, section 3.7.1: "The county is predominantly rural and agricultural in nature, with unincorporated areas making up most of the jurisdiction. The Lease Boundary is south of the Tri-Cities: Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland, Washington." or, section 3.8.1* "The incorporated cities within Benton County include Benton City, Kennewick, Prosser, Richland, and West Richland (Benton County 2021a)."	n/a	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project. The Applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix X of the ASC. EFSEC will require supplemental analysis, prior to construction, once haul routes for oversize or overweight components, are finalized. Additionally, as noted by the Applicant in their ASC, the Transportation Study provided as Appendix V of the ASC would be verified and updated to include detailed condition assessments of roads to be used, structural assessments, and plans for improvement and maintenance. The Applicant would coordinate with EFSEC and Benton County, to identify a qualified third-party engineer who would document road conditions prior to construction and again within 30 days after construction is complete or as weather permits. All road improvement and construction would be performed in conjunction with Benton County Public Works requirements following Benton County Standards. The Applicant would maintain new access roads to access the turbine structures during operations.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary. With respect to impacts on regional ozone levels, construction impacts would be temporary and the expected emissions of the main ozone precursors (NOx and VOC) are very small when compared with the overall inventory of countywide ozone precursor emissions. Mobile source emissions of ozone precursors are considered exceptional small relative to regional emissions and expected to have a negligible impact on regional ozone levels. The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celsius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
Anonymous User	1103861	My husband and I live in the Horse Heaven Hills and would be one of the closest residences to the proposed turbines. There are so many reasons why this project should not move forward, but I will address only a couple here. 1) Lack of transparency with the community. It is not surprising, but rather alarming, that there are still so many in the Tri-cities area who don't know about the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. I personally don't know anyone locally, who does know about the project, who is in favor of it. A project this large that has an effect on the citizens of this community in so many different ways, should be put before the local residents as a vote. Where is democracy if something like this can be imposed on a community without the said entire community having a say? 2) We have been amazed at the number and variety of birds as well as deer up here in the hills that we have witnessed. We have an owl who visits frequently and hoots right outside our home at night. The hawks are beautiful to watch as they ride the currents through the ravines looking for their next meal (natural rodent control). Just a couple of weeks ago, I witnessed a large flock of Canada geese flying up the ravine that is near our home, likely on a stopover on their migration journey. I watched as they flew towards the south, slowly gaining altitude as they jostled for their place in their "V" formation. This all took place at a low elevation right over the area of proposed turbines! Another recent day, hundreds of white snow geese were camped out in the field behind our home, again in the proposed area. Geese have long been a favorite of mine, as I grew up on a farm and witnessed so many migrating flocks during harvest season each year. These hills are abundant with geese finding a place to rest for the night and I often see these low flying flocks as they are coming in or leaving on their journey. We are most definitely in a migration path where the birds can enjoy the nearby waters of the rivers as well as the Horse Heaven farmlands for a safe place to stop over. A wind turbine farm (especially one so many miles in length) would be a huge detriment to all the wildlife patterns and alter the natural ecosystem of our area. Again, there are so many more reasons why a wind turbine farm is not a fit for this urban and suburban location. It would be a forever disruption to the beautiful skyline that this area is known for, and a complete visual distraction with the hundreds of blinking red lights at night. Health concerns regarding the visual, audio, and mental effects of the turbines have not been thoroughly studied, but should be taken into account when considering the large number of population in close vicinity to this project. I respectfully ask that ALL of these points are taken into consideration and that you will truly listen to the community's concerns in this matter.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
raygor	1103903	The proposed wind farm will inhibit the future growth of the city of Kennewick. Kennewick is bound on the north by the Columbia River; on the east by Finley; on the west by Richland and the south by the wind farm. South is the only direction for future growth for Kennewick and we don't want a miles-wide wind farm inside the future city limits. The wind farm will create a dead zone for future expansion of Kennewick. The proposed wind farm will further disrupt the view of the foothills south of Kennewick, which I currently view and value. Cluttering the hillside with more windmills will ruin the view for me. There is documented evidence that the swishing noise from the windmills affect humans and wildlife. Large numbers of birds are killed by the rotating blades and will drive out other animals by the background noise of the windmills. The proposed wind farm will represent a negative "welcome to Kennewick" visual for traffic entering Kennewick, which is likely to discourage visitors to Kennewick and other nearby towns. This negative impression will likely affect tourism to the area. During the summer months there is an increase in ozone levels in south Kennewick. The EIS for the proposed wind farm does not address this problem. Will the proposed wind farm prevent the "scouring out of ozone and other air pollutants" by reducing air movement in the area? If the wind farm is allowed to proceed, Scout Energy needs to address eventual dismantling and removing the eyesore they are creating. A removal plan and escrow account for funding the removal needs to be established prior to operation is allowed. Many times windmill farms are simply abandoned. The current leadership and government of Washington state are opposed to using petroleum products, which are used in large quantities in the windmill generators. Oil spills and windmill fires are common damage the surrounding area. How can this wind farm be allowed by Washington state?	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed. The project is not expected to result in a discernable change in the overall broad scale ventilation effect of air movement in the region.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions. For aspects of the Project's design that may not be in alignment with Benton County Code 11.17.070 Growth Management Act Agricultural District or the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (Applicant).	3.8.1.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1104047	Please do not allow Scout Clean Energy to ruin our most beautiful Horse Heavens by constructing wind turbines. I own a 200-acre farm that borders the base of the hills where turbines are proposed to be erected. I worry this could lower the value of my property in years to come. I'm concerned about the flashing lights that will be nothing but a nuisance at night, they are monster eyesores, I truly believe they will affect habitat, and so goes the list of complaints. I was strongly approached by Scout Clean Energy when they first came to our community hunting for pathways to transport their power to the power grid. At first it seemed like it was a good idea, since this country is working on cleaning up the environment. Once I really started to look into this and after legal advice and advise from community developers, I felt it best I run and run fast. I do not feel Scout Clean Energy has this community in heart, what they have at heart is an opportunity to line their pockets and the pockets of their investors. They came to our area scouting for a sweet place to install turbines that we really don't need at this time. We have abundance of power (sources nuclear, hydro, solar) already in our area. When the time arrives in this community where we must have more power to supply to the consumer, I'm sure you would have the backing and support from all in this community. But why? Why do we need to agree to this when it won't really do much for the area. Oh sure, a few hundred jobs for a few months, but will they bring in their more experienced installers from other states? Then when it's all said and done, we will have just a hand full of local people to oversee their turbines. Please listen to the heart of the people who care about the beauty of this land. Please put this on hold until we NEED more power here. Scout can put their Turbines up where the need is. The picture below is a morning sun rise this past September. If Scouts gets their way, I will be looking at windmills on my morning walks. For shame! Thank you.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1104076	The planned Horse Heaven wind-farm will destroy the iconic views of Mt Adams and Mt Hood from the Badger Mountain Park	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations including recreation areas as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1104154	Dear Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council: Re: Scout Clean Energy Horse Heaven Wind Farm Scout's proposed wind farm will have negative consequences for the endangered Washington state ferruginous hawk and environmentally sensitive areas the hawk needs to be able to hunt and nest in. And as I have stated before in my previous comments submitted to you, Scout has NO MEANINGFULLY COMPENSATION proposals nor any real mitigation efforts for any negative effects suffered from their proposed wind farm for the hawk. The U.S. and Wildlife Service estimates that between 140,000 and 500,000 bird deaths occur at wind farms each year and the most significant threat is posed to species of large, threatened and high-conservation-value birds such as the Washington state Ferruginous hawk. Please do not approve this industrial sized wind farm. The endangered Washington state Ferruginous hawk should not be sacrificed to meet the green energy goals set forth by the governor. Respectfully, Kathryn Knutson Furnace Canyon Ranch 1333 Hains Avenue Richland, WA 99354 kknutsonwa@gmail.com	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to ferruginous hawk are addresses in section 4.6.2.4 of the EIS and species specific mitigation measures are included under section 4.6.2.5.	4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5	n/a
Anonymous User	1104185	Regarding Tri-City Herald article titled: "Here's your chance to say what you thinks of this huge Tri-Cities wind farm": January 31, 2023 I am a concerned resident of Kennewick, WA, in Benton County. I feel we are not being heard by EFSEC and fear we may be forced into a wind farm that doesn't benefit anyone. Further, I do hope our elected Governor Inslee is listening. We think the final decision whether to move forward with the wind farm project should be up to the people who are most impacted. We are telling you all "NO!", we don't want the project located here and for some really compelling reasons. It would be smart to listen to the people who know the area best. While I do agree with the valid environmental impacts sited in the Tri-City Herald article of: the loss of agricultural land, the negative impact of our wildlife, and the scaring of our beautiful skyline of the "iconic Horse Haven Hills", which should be enough, I would like to reiterate some other compelling reasons why this project should not move forward in this location. The fact that the project would be non-productive for long periods of time, according to Benton PUD, should be a very compelling reason. It also says, even when the turbines are more productive in the summer, it coincides with times that our hydropower is at maximum levels and is not as much help, needing other generating technologies and resources, as well. This is concerning. I can attest to the fact that the turbines are not and have not been producing since last summer, in general, firsthand, as I live on the south ridge of the city and can see the turbines that presently reside there everyday. It's true, they are barely turning or do not turn at all rendering them non-productive due to the lack of wind. Why add more turbines compounding waste and abuse? I also agree there are several better locations in Northwest Washington that need to be explored for this wind farm. I think it would be way more productive if it were closer to the ocean or in the ocean, like our US eastern coast, where the wind blows regularly. Isn't that the point? In addition, I think EFSEC's proposed location, "within a half mile of our homeowners" is appalling, that proposal should be miles from homes, wherever it ends up being located. Finally, if the lack of conducive weather rendering an unproductive project isn't enough reason to relocate the project, here are a few more: -Concerns of a complete, well thought out project plan and follow through from beginning to end: I'm concerned that there is no plan or money to maintain and remove these giant turbines in a few years when they become obsolete. Is there a viable plan in place? If so, I sure haven't heard anything about it. But I do have some food for thought: I read a news article about a Southern California wind farm that is obsolete with no plan or even any idea what to do about it now! And then I can't help but compare this wind farm project with our Hanford headache. The long overdue "promised" cleanup of nuclear waste is being put off for up to 75 more years. It won't even happen in most of our lifetimes...and maybe not at all. It's just another example of incomplete, poorly planned projects! You see why we don't trust in "promises". Why continue to place more burden on the Tri-Citians? Let's share these projects throughout the state. -Benefits to Tri-Citians: We will get little, if any benefits. While we are all for going "green" and doing our share for the climate, which can be seen in the many projects already in place here, we don't see an advantage to anyone with this project in this area. Please relocate the wind farm to a better, more weather conducive area, where people will actually benefit from it. Plus, we aren't hurting for jobs here and the "local" tax revenue is in question. Define local... Thanks for your attention. Leann	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16	n/a
Anonymous User	1104261	i support the transition off of fossil fuels. We need wind, solar and other non carbon emitting forms of energy to power our world. It is so late already. The planet is in peril and it is past time to act. Thank you	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1104270	pls. see attached	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
Par Pacific	1104278	Par Pacific / US Oil is in the process of developing our own hydrogen and sustainable aviation fuel projects. Supportive of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
WSDOT	1104290	WSDOT has reviewed the proposed project's DEIS. Our comments are attached (PDF).	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project. The Applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix X of the ASC. EFSEC will require supplemental analysis, prior to construction, once haul routes for oversize or overweight components, are finalized.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1104298	pls see attached	Wildlife and Habitat	As the final turbine layout was not available at the time of writing the EIS, the EIS applied conservative assumptions to estimate impacts to wildlife. For example, to calculate the potential indirect habitat loss through sensory disturbance, the 0.5 mile disturbance buffer was measured from the edge of turbine micrositing corridor so that impacts are measured regardless of turbine location.	4.6	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1104310	I was born and raised in Kennewick. I am a tax payer, an Army and Navy veteran. Do not put those windmill in my backyard. I live on Fair VIEW Loop which is off of Summit VIEW, but not on the nearby streets called Grand VIEW or Clear VIEW. See a theme here? We spent our hard earn dollars to get this VIEW and you want to ruin it so you can sell excess power to California. No! Eastern Washington is flush with truly green energy from Hanford and the dams. We don't want it, we don't need it, do your job and stand up for your constituents	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1104329	We are concerned about how tall the wind turbines will be and the visual impact that they will have from the Tri-Cities. Also concerned about the increased fire danger and the millions of gallons of water needed for the project.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
			Water Resources	The EIS includes estimates for water usage for construction and operation phases in Section 3.4.1.5. An estimated 120 million gallons of water is required for Project construction. Project operation is estimated to require 5,000 gallons per day for facilities and 2,025,000 gallons annually for solar panel washing. Impacts to water are assessed in Section 4.4 and no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1104341	Not only are these things an eyesore they will kill large amounts of birds, which always seems to be overlooked. I'm against this project.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
pmstauffer	1104223	All options need to be considered: the DEIS only looks at a full build-out of the wind farm with 244 turbines and some solar, or "no action". The huge environmental costs are not fully considered; a better alternative is to emphasize more solar. The "face-plate capacity" cannot be the most important factor, the environmental impact has to be the focus in the Environmental Impact Statement.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
Anonymous User	1104413	Benton Clean Air Agency would like to comment because these activities may cause possible fugitive dust emissions, we would like to take this opportunity to provide information to ensure that the applicant takes reasonable steps to control the dust from his/her project. The Benton Clean Air Agency (BCAA) requires the applicant submit a Proof of Contact: Soil Destabilization Notification for this project prior to any excavation/construction taking place. This will ensure that the proponent has the ability and resources to control fugitive dust emissions that may be created as a result of construction activities. This will also inform them of the regulations and requirements of the BCAA. Additionally, a written dust control plan must be developed and maintained for all soil destabilization projects and must be readily available upon request by the BCAA. Part of this plan is submitting the name of at least one person for the project so that the BCAA has a point of contact should we receive any dust complaints from the project. The Soil Destabilization Notification form can be found and submitted on our website, www.bentoncleanair.org. Benton Clean Air Agency is also aware that this project may include sources of air pollution such as a concrete batch plant, aggregate processing, and rock storage on site. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-400-110 New source review for sources and portable sources, including the operations described above, may require: (2) Approval requirements. (a) A notice of construction application must be filed and an order of approval must be issued by the permitting authority prior to the establishment of any new source ... Benton Clean Air Agency Regulation 1 requires that sources complete a Notice of Construction (NOC), submit the appropriate filing and engineering fees, and receive an approval to operate prior to operation of the source.	Air Quality	Comment noted - EFSEC will include a requirement that a Proof of Contact: Soil Destabilization Notification be submitted to both EFSEC and BCAA	4.3	Add the following mitigation measure: Applicant shall submit a Proof of Contact: Soil Destabilization Notification to both EFSEC and BCAA at least 90 days prior to commencement of construction.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1104418	Dear EFSEC Council Members, I am writing once again, respectfully, in opposition of the Horse Heaven Hills Wind, Solar, and Battery Project. Let me be clear, I never saw myself opposing a climate action project in my lifetime. When I relocated back to Eastern Washington from San Diego in 2020, we purchased a home with a view of the 9 Canyon Wind Project to the South East built by a local corporation, Energy Northwest. We purchased a geothermal home paying \$50,000 more for geothermal to reduce our footprint. My husband and I recycle, like our neighbors in our geothermal community, and have been donors to the Nature Conservancy for many years. We care about conservation and climate change. We believe there is simply a site conflict given the on-going conservation efforts and priority species at stake in the Horse Heaven Hills, which we believe the recently released Draft Environmental Statement (DEIS) acknowledges, but not adequately enough. We also believe that the sheer size and proximity to existing housing and a significant population ought to raise eyebrows. Not just because the site chosen abuts economically underserved communities, such as Finley and Benton City, but because these are treaty lands of those often politically disenfranchised and dismissed by large corporate interests. I believe we ought to be an actual ally not a performative one to our indigenous Nations. Finally, the Out of State Developer has yet to show significant benefit in lowering our community's or WA State's footprint that is specific to this location, and so it is our conclusion they can find another more suitable location. A few short-term union jobs is not a sufficient benefit when the project obliterates the higher value of conserving native species and habitat. Such statements by Scout Clean Energy is using labor to silence conservation concerns, and is a clear political ploy. It only adds insult to potential injury. Analysis and work needs to be done prior to siting of future projects to preserve habitat connectivity and to analyze the cumulative impacts of the 38 or more such projects that are in the pipeline. We understand that funding for WA Fish & Wildlife has been made available for this purpose, but not in time for considerations regarding this project. We believe these concerns are truly at the heart of opposition to this project, and it gets lost in the politics of the day. But at the end of the day, no matter how one feels about the solutions for climate change, when a climate action project conflicts with conservation, communities must stand up because the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) only makes a statement in favor of conservation, it does not have teeth without community action, which is unfortunate. And as a result, people, like myself, must spend so much time and energy fighting for what in word is given priority, but is so easily ignored by corporate developers unless local voices speak loud enough. And are considered and heard. We believe that Scout Clean Energy is an out of State Corporation that is tone deaf to local conservation efforts, and that showed when they initially attempted to fast-track their application without an Environmental Impact Statement skirting local concerns and permitting. In fact, a proper analysis of impact cannot be performed given that they have failed to give locations of the 150 larger or 244 smaller turbines they have proposed. In this regard, their application was incomplete, and makes sound scientific analysis impossible. Our community, with a diversity of views on this, is largely in agreement that Scout did not do their due diligence. As the Draft Environmental Impact Statement notes there are 20 priority species in the stretch of land proposed and two of those are endangered: The Sandhill Crane and the Ferruginous Hawk. We are in agreement, that no matter how community members may differ on climate action, we agree that due to conservation conflicts, this is quite simply a poor site for this project. Many in our community are in agreement with the letters written to you by Mr. Ritter, the Biologist who is also the site lead in the State. We would like to see the project scaled back to solar only and moved further to the South West away from the ridgelines. Our community is unique with three rivers and associated wetlands along the Pacific Flyway. We regularly see Golden Eagles and Bald Eagles and other migratory birds as well as Sandhill Cranes flying overhead. People here pay attention, care about conservation, and value the efforts made to preserve our birds and wildlife. A love for the natural world is not exclusive, but very human. We have a history of cooperation and a clear history of producing and valuing clean energy. This project is just sincerely tone deaf to this. When I first heard of this project, I almost dismissed those opposed because I didn't fully know what was at stake. The only thing that gave me pause was how close it would be to current housing communities. I began researching the conservation claims being made, and what I found blew me away. I volunteered my time to create a nonprofit organization with a mission to preserve balance with conservation in the Tri-Cities, and I helped build and provide content for the website: TriCitiesCARES.org. CARES stands for Community Action for Responsible Environmental Stewardship. You see we know that this won't be the last time we'll have to fight an industrial project. We know we have to be proactive as a community to protect on-going conservation and further its efforts and education and outreach will be necessary into the foreseeable future. The content for our website was not hard to find because of the work already done by WA Fish & Wildlife from maps to information on all the priority species in the area, and information available via organizations, such as Conservation Northwest, and the Northwest Native Plants Society as well as all those partnered as part of the three State Arid Lands Initiative. I was quite frankly astonished that a climate action company would have done so little homework regarding conservation efforts given that the whole purpose of their work is to reduce coal fire dependence and help save the planet. But what are we doing if we're disregarding significant conservation efforts in the process? It's like saying, "Screw the shrinking shrub-steppe habitat and all those species that are a part of such an ecologically diverse ecosystem, we're trying to save the planet!" I think it is an assumption. One that I will admit to having at one time myself, that sagelands are empty flyover spaces. The truth is they're not empty. Not any more empty than the evergreen forests we all love, and not any less worthy of conservation and protection. Please, heed the words of the biologists that know. Look at the Arid Lands Initiative. Look at the information we've shared and the links via TriCitiesCARES.org. This really isn't a conflict over solutions to climate change. That is a distraction from what really is at stake. It is a conflict between two worthy values—climate action and conservation. And I urge you to heed SEPAs words and give them teeth in this instance. If this project weren't threatening habitat connectivity, migratory birds, and many priority species, I would be focusing my volunteer time and that of TriCities CARES on getting wildlife crossings for the newly returned Pronghorn in the Horse Heaven Hills. I would have energy to focus attention on more public education regarding the diversity of our native shrub-steppe, as well as working to create more permanent green space protections including working with Farmers and local politicians to create incentives to return farmlands to shrub-steppe. This would include education on farming practices that allow for the return of prey species, such as the at risk Townsend's Ground Squirrel, that burrow homes for the Burrowing Owls and provides the preferred diet of the Ferruginous Hawk during breeding. We'd be looking for win-wins in the interest of conservation instead of just fighting for what should just on-its-face receive protection. Conservation is preserving the natural beauty of our communities, and if I'm guilty of that then I'm happy to have that on my rap sheet. Guilty as charged.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential impacts to wildlife, including special status species and species, in Section 4.6. The assessment of impacts to wildlife considered precautionary principles when characterizing impacts, meaning that conservative assumptions were applied when estimating and characterizing impacts given the uncertainty in Project layout, baseline conditions, and existing science on the impacts of wind power on wildlife. Recommended mitigation measures were developed to require the Applicant to collect additional information on wildlife use of the Lease boundary when completing final design and develop adaptive management approaches, in consultation with regulators, to manage impacts.	4.6	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income. Power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant. Such power purchasers could include any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users with potential off-takers having distribution outside of Washington state.	4.16	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	Revise FEIS to provide distances actual distances from wind turbines to closest residences, not just set-back distances.
		Besides my concern about conservation being paved over, I'm concerned about the proximity of this project especially after reviewing the DEIS. I've never seen a project this size placed so close to populated areas, especially a community of 300,000 people. This is still a concern as the Draft EIS seems to allow for turbines to be within .5 miles of houses on non-leased lands. The accepted standard is 2 miles from what I can find to avoid being so close that sound, flicker, and night lights do not disrupt people's health and quiet enjoyment of their homes. And many in our community were led to believe, who will not read a 1200 page Draft EIS report, that the turbines will be 4 miles away. The proximity to existing homes is my secondary concern, although those who are in .5 miles of leased lands probably count it as more of a priority. Nobody wants to live that close to these things no matter where you live or how dedicated you are to climate action, so distance to populated areas does matter. Projects of this size ought to be further away in my opinion. I think it is a reasonable consideration. Finally, I'm opposed because there is no long term benefit to the State of WA, or to our local community. As a community, Eastern WA is 96% dependent on green sources of energy with surplus being exported at the moment. As an initial skeptic to smaller, cleaner, more safe nuclear power, it is a way forward if we can focus efforts on clean-up from mistakes made in the past generations ago. The energy from this project is not intended or promised to us, but could go out of State. I do understand why this would anger our local community because it sets the precedent that outside corporations like Scout Clean Energy, who are tone deaf to the value of these lands, the beauty of our landscapes, maintained largely by historical cooperation with WA Fish & Wildlife concerning conservation and development, can land grab for their personal profit to the detriment of both conservation and the look and feel of our local communities. There must be balance with all kinds of development no matter their good intentions because they tend to be ruled by profit NOT: 1. Impacts to the environment since nobody on the Board, or invested in the corporation lives locally; 2. Impacts to the lives of people they don't call neighbors. Due process is still an important value in this State and Country, and attempts to skirt it, must be checked. I humbly ask that you check Scout Clean Energy, by limiting this project's scope in the interest of conservation. There are clear precedents for this, and it is quite simply the right thing to do for our community and for all Washingtonians. I leave you with a quote from the father of Conservation and from William Shakespeare (respectively): "Like winds and Sunsets, wild things were taken for granted until progress began to do away with them." –Aldo Leopold "Nature makes the whole world kin." –William Shakespeare After your decision, I will continue to do volunteer work in the interest of conservation, but I hope that your decision is in conservation's interest, so we can have a strong foundation from which to continue our work here locally. Kind Regards, Jessica Percifield Henry Volunteer at Tri-Cities CARES Former Board Member Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. – Community Action for Responsible Environmental Stewardship 501(c)(3) Nonprofit powered by volunteers. Mission: We support local conservation of wildlife, their ecosystems, and local decision-making to preserve the picturesque natural landscapes that make our communities unique, healthy, and beautiful.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
pknana	1104523	Save the Ferruginous Hawk	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>The EIS was developed based on a review of available literature and in consultation with WDFW regional biologists and experts (See Sections 3.6 and 4.6). Ferruginous hawk occupy a variety of habitats seasonally and undertake migrations to and from winter habitat. As such, there are multiple sources of data that provide information on the distance traveled by birds. For example, Watson and Pierce (2000) provides information on distances traveled during the post-fledging dispersal and migration periods. Based on recent literature and information provided by State experts, core habitat for ferruginous hawk during the breeding season, when the species would be present in the Lease Boundary, includes habitat within an approximate 2 mile radius from the nest. This buffer is larger than recommended buffer sizes in published WDFW guidelines (e.g. Larsen et al 2004; USFWS 2021) based on data provided by WDFW experts.</p> <p>The EIS assigns a magnitude rating of high to characterize the potential impacts of the Project on ferruginous hawk (see 4.6) given the uncertainty in how ferruginous will respond to the Project and potential regional population level impacts from losing breeding adults. Mitigation measures are recommended to reduce potential impacts on ferruginous hawks.</p> <p>The mitigations measures recommended would require the Applicant to conduct additional surveys to update and expand on the current data available for the Lease Boundary regarding wildlife occurrence and habitat use (see Spec-1 through 13). The Applicant would be required to incorporate the results of pre-construction survey results into the final design (Hab-6) and develop management plans for approval by EFSEC.</p> <p>Specific to ferruginous hawk, Spec-5 requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of the 2 mile core area. If circumstances arise where the Applicant has designed infrastructure within this core area, Spec-5 requires that the Applicant provide the TAC and EFSEC with rationale for siting. EFSEC would provide final approval. In addition, if infrastructure is required within core ferruginous hawk habitat the Application would be required to develop a mitigation and management plan that outlines the potential impacts and new measure they will implement to reduce those impacts. Examples may be curtailing turbines when hawks are present. The mitigation plan would be developed by the Applicant in consultation with the TAC but approved by EFSEC. The mitigation measures in Spec-5 allow for adaptive management of impacts to ferruginous hawk as new nests could become active in the region.</p> <p>EFSEC is the state's regulatory agency that determines compliance with state laws and the terms set in the SCA. (EFSEC contracts with other state agencies for on-site inspections.) The Council has the regulatory authority to enforce compliance with state laws and the conditions in the SCA through fines and other actions. EFSEC continues this oversight responsibility through restoration of the site after the project is terminated.</p>	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1104568	I just feel that the Tri-Cities is becoming energy manufacturing plant for the more populous west side of the state. We produce it, they get to use it. We have wide open spaces here in eastern WA that would do well for windmills and solar panels: why must this be placed in view of those who live here? Seattle wouldn't want it, Tacoma wouldn't want it, Everett wouldn't want it - well, guess what, some of here don't want to look at those impossibly tall windmills either. Our skyline may seem ugly to some (who are used to sunny palmy beaches or dark green trees in the mountains) but the desert/arid lands has its own beauty: why should we sacrifice it when there's lots of land available to build these elsewhere? I am opposed to Horse Heaven Hills windmill project.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Mark T	1104588	I have serious concerns about the proposed wind farm on our Horse Heaven Hills. The damage to our beautiful view of our hills will have many unintended consequences. Damage to our wine industry and tourism, noise pollution, damage to our native birds, dust and noise pollution, heavy trucks using our roads and plowing new roads into our pristine hills. I look around where other wind farms are in our area and find it unacceptable to plant more of the ugly machines. This is too close to our homes.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.		
Anonymous User	1104609	<p>The proposed wind turbines will soon be old technology. There are new ones that are bladeless, more efficient, and less intrusive to the environment. Scout Energy is doing this project because of government subsidies which enable them to make money. If Scout Energy goes out of business, who is going to remove and dispose of them when they are outdated and no longer sustainable? Wind farms should not be close to urban areas. The Tri-City area is one of the fastest growing areas in the state. The proposed wind farm will take land that may be needed for future urban growth areas. The huge structures will be distractions to drivers on our freeways and roads. Nature is good for our health. The wind farm will destroy some of our local nature. The Horse Heaven and Rattlesnake hills are scenic views of the beauty of our region.Putting a large number of these huge wind4 turbines on top of our hills would be like putting large wind turbines onto Mt. Rainier--ruining the beautiful view of the mountain for the people of the Seattle area. The huge wind turbines will be an eyesore to those living nearby! They will destroy our beautiful views, destroy local natural habitat, and have a negative impact on wildlife, some of which are endangered.</p> <p>I believe that the decision of whether or not to approve this proposed wind farm should be a local county decision, not a decision by the state of Washington. If you did a survey or vote of local residents, you would be better informed on whether or not we are in favor of the proposed wind farm. I think you would discover that like me, most of us locals don't want the wind farm here!</p> <p>We have dams and nuclear power here in eastern Washington. We don't need the wind farm. Build it where you need the power.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions. The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)).	3.8.1.2, 1.2.3	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	SEPA guidelines and Washington Administrative Code do not specify that Draft EIS should be published in any other languages than English. However, EFSEC has completed their due diligence in notifying the public by publishing English and Spanish notices, and English and Spanish factsheets. See the HH SEPA public website for copies of those documents in the Draft EIS Documents pulldown menu at https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice of issuance of Draft EIS. EFSEC did not receive any requests for Spanish translation of Draft EIS during the public comment period.	n/a	n/a
Port of Benton	1104664	Please see uploaded document.	Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Recreation	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1104721	Horse Heaven Draft EIS NEPA/SEPA Comments Provided in uploaded 3 page .pdf file. Thank you.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to bird and bat fatality in Section 4.6.2.2 and notes that the Project is expected to result in mortality to birds and bats. To mitigate impacts from mortality, the EIS proposes mitigation measures Wild-1, which would require the applicant to conduct two years of operational mortality monitoring and apply the results to developing additional mitigation measures. Wild-1 has been updated to provide additional clarity.	4.6	Wild-1 Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts from decommissioning the Project are difficult to depict accurately, as this work would occur up to 35 years after operations begin. The EIS indicates that impacts involving hazardous wastes would be similar to those impacts resulting from Project construction because the activities would be similar. Potential health exposure to hazardous materials are discussed under construction impacts in the EIS and incorporated into the decommissioning impacts. Risks associated with hazardous materials would be mitigated by the Applicant's commitments provided in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS, and include the implementation of an SPCC. The SPCC would specify the methods and destinations of offsite transport of hazardous materials.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2 including views from residences, recreation areas, and travel routes .	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. There is no federal nexus for the Proposed Project, and therefore, NEPA is not applicable. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The Proposed Project is subject to Washington State Environmental Policy (SEPA), which has a similar rule under WAC 197-11-440(5). Scoping is the first step in the SEPA environmental review process, to identify issues and concerns related to a proposed project, and thus to assist with identifying potential impacts and alternatives to analyze in the EIS. As noted in Chapter 1 of the EIS, in accordance with WAC 463-26-025, on March 30, 2021, EFSEC held a virtual public information meeting to explain the process that would be followed for review of the proposal. Members of the public were given an opportunity to provide oral and written comments. The scoping comment period for this EIS was May 11, 2021 to June 6, 2021. Members of the public, government agencies, tribes, and other interested stakeholders were invited to attend two scoping meetings/hearings and to submit comments verbally or written on comment forms during scoping meetings or by email or surface mail. EFSEC received approximately 370 comments from private citizens, environmental organizations, public agencies, and tribal representatives during the scoping period. EFSEC reviewed and considered these comments when determining the scope of the EIS. The Scoping Report Memo can be found on EFSEC's website. The expedited processing under WAC 463-43" as noted in the EIS is in reference to the request for expedited initiation of permit applications, including the NPDES, air permits, and other permits. The Applicant withdrew its request for expedited processing, prior to the first public information meeting held of March 30, 2021.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
stomren	1104740	The visual analysis does not adequately consider the impact of turbine lighting during the operational period, specifically at night. Based on the elevation of the ridgelines and the height of the turbines, the aviation lighting on the towers will be unobstructed for a significant distance. Due to the sparse development to the south of the project area, these lights will have a high degree of contrast with the dark background, which will magnify the visual impact. A significant portion of the residences throughout Tri-Cities and the surrounding regions will have direct view of hundreds of blinking red lights. Based on review of the regional topography, this field of lights may also be readily visible for long stretches of US-395 north of Tri-Cities, I-82 south of Tri-Cities, US-12 and SR-124 to the east, and possibly I-84 in Oregon. Lights from the Lower Snake River wind farm near Pomeroy are visible along portions of SR-26 west of Colfax, in spite of separation of more than 25 miles. The rolling hills of the Palouse reduce the area in which those lights are visible, but the topography of the lower Columbia Basin does not provide the same advantage. The areas lying generally north and south of the project area in particular are low-lying ancient floodplains, with no features of sufficient elevation to limit the viewshed. These are also the areas with the highest population concentrations. In these areas without physical obstruction, the visibility of turbine lighting will only be diminished by atmospheric effects. Imagine creating a field of blinking lights that are visible from virtually every point from downtown Everett to downtown Tacoma. That's what this proposes.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations. Additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1104746	I am in line of sight of the proposed turbines. I don't want to continuously look at these turbines from my house. Very disturbing!!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1104781	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven Wind Project.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
		With up to 244 wind turbines being 499 to 671 feet tall it creates visual pollution for the entire Tri Cities area. The site is located too close to homes. To protect human health from noise and shadow flicker, turbines must be a minimum of two miles from homes. The red flashing lights are annoying. We will no longer be able to watch the night sky while in the Horse Heavens because of the red flashing lights impact.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
		20 special species and the Pronghorn antelope are listed in the DEIS as being impacted by the wind project, including the state Endangered Ferruginous Hawk. I believe the solar only plan alternative submitted by the WA Department of Fish and Wildlife to protect the Ferruginous Hawk and all special species be considered. All turbines placed in the wildlife movement corridors and in shrub-steppe habitat must be moved or removed.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. The description of conditions within the Lease Boundary and evaluation of impacts was based on a variety of information sources including data presented by the Applicant, publicly available data managed by state agencies and science based organizations, and consultation with state agencies.	4.6	n/a
		I was a licensed raptor rehabilitator for over 30 years. I have first hand knowledge of the raptor deaths caused by wind turbines. We are already dealing with special species, species of concern and endangered species in the area encompassed by this project. There is no question the project will harm resident and migrating raptors and other wildlife.	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
		The low frequency noise, vibrations and shadow flicker will affect wildlife and create a reduction in the foraging, breeding and nesting areas along with disrupting wildlife corridors.	Socioeconomics	Wind farms are not anticipated to negatively impact the property values of agricultural properties that host wind turbines. Project impacts on property values will be assessed in the final EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
		The wind turbines increase the fire danger. They will limit the use of aircraft for fighting wildfires.	Energy and Natural Resources	Recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications is recommended as a mitigation measure as part of the Project's EIS. Additionally, the State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
		Currently the only way to dispose of wind turbines is by burial. They are not recycled. Creating massive amounts of non-recyclable waste by trying to "go green" is unacceptable.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
		Having the monitoring data recorded, compiled, and analyzed by the applicant rather than unbiased 3rd parties is placing the fox in the henhouse. This is unacceptable.		Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.		
Anonymous User	1104784	See attached word file	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. The analysis area for the wind turbines extended out 25 miles in the EIS. The viewshed mapping in Chapter 4 of the EIS has been updated to show the correct maps which were included in Appendix 3.10-2 within the Draft EIS. Viewshed mapping was also updated to show additional contextual features as suggested. Additional viewpoints and visual simulations have been included in the Final EIS, no change was made to the format of the simulations.	4.10	Update turbine viewshed maps from Visual Technical Report with additional context information. New simulations included in updated analysis
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides a calculation of predicted direct and indirect habitat loss associated with the Project in Section 4.6. Direct habitat loss includes areas that will be removed due to infrastructure such as turbine footprint. Indirect habitat loss describes the loss in habitat function for wildlife due to wildlife displacement and sensory disturbance. Section 4.6 of the EIS provides an estimated area calculation based on a 0.5 mile zone of influence. The EIS provides offset ratios for direct habitat loss (See Section 4.5) and mitigation measure Hab-5 would require the Applicant to conduct studies to understand the project-specific indirect habitat loss and provide an approach to compensating for loss.	4.6, 4.5, Appendix 4.6-1	Hab-5
			General - Recyclability	The EIS includes a comparison of the potential impacts on avifauna from the two turbine heights. It is provided in Appendix 4.6-1.		
				In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
				Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.		
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. Edits to 3.12 and 4.12 have been made to include additional analysis.	4.12	Include golf courses as part of recreation.
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's construction, operations and decommissioning stage.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS, including impacts to the 742 closest residences.	4.11	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Morris371*	1104817	<p>1. The overwhelming visual impact from this proposed Horse Heavens Hills wind farm is enormous, and I doubt if Tri-Citians can truly comprehend what the impact of the completed project will have on their quality of life. We have no visual mockups to show exactly where these behemoths are proposed to be, and the quantity of turbines themselves is not stated exactly, so the entire description and visual impact is cloudy at best.</p> <p>2. The timing of this public comment period is so very contrived in favor of Scout Energy, they are trying to keep the very existence of public comments hidden from the public. Imagine beginning the public comment period days before the Christmas and New Year's holiday seasons are occurring ! Scout Energy knew this massive proposal would be a very hard sell to the people of Benton County, and the only previous in-person public comment event that happened clearly showed that over 80% of attendees were against this wind farm proposal from Scout Energy.</p> <p>3. This very short comment period combined with the lack of public awareness surrounding this Virtual Public Comment process speaks volumes about how contrived this whole public information gathering activity is. This is by far the largest wind farm project ever proposed, and because of the scope and potential for permanent damage to the environment ; the micro climate of the TriCities ; the local and migratory birds, the animals, and the flora ; much more care, study, time, and expertise is clearly a necessity. Endangered species inhabit the Horse Heaven Hills and surrounding areas, and I would think that fact alone would summon the input from affected Federal Agencies. The State Legislature, Benton County Commissioners, and also a Referendum vote by the people of Benton County is in order. A recommendation from EFSEC to the Governor, for his decision is, too much power for one individual to have.</p> <p>4. I fear that one bad decision will lead to another bad decision. The Governor and Senator Patty Murray did their own study on the Removal of the Snake River Dams, they also stated that alternative power generating sources had to be in place before the dams could be removed. As an aside, removing the Snake River Dams (a green source of valuable electricity) would seem to go counter to the need to provide enough electricity to convert from gas to battery powered cars and trucks.</p> <p>The power production from the 4 Snake River Dams is 933 to 1,000 megawatts, and the power production from the proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind farm is 1,150 megawatts, and the HHH wind farm proposal includes a large array of solar panels for electricity generation and massive structures for electricity storage.</p> <p>5. In summary the HHH wind farm as proposed is a terrible plan, would do irreparable damage to the immediate and surrounding areas of Benton County, and permanent damage to the flora, wildlife, and quality of life for the Tri-Cities.</p> <p>Thank You, Lloyd Fred Lieske Jr. RPh, retired</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The visual resource analysis includes a viewshed analysis which identifies how many turbines would be visible within the area of analysis. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2 including views from residences, recreation areas, and travel routes.	4.10	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds and endangered species, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			General - opposition	Thank you for your comments; your concerns have been noted. The public comment period was held from December 19, 2022 - February 1, 2023, a 45 day period, as required per SEPA requirements for an EIS. Public scoping and the public review period was publicized on the EFSEC website and an announcement was mailed to those on the interested parties distribution list, tribes, and EFSEC's general distribution list. Public Notice was published in Tri-City Herald for the SEPA Scoping on May 12, 2021 and the Scoping Notice was posted to the SEPA Register on May 14, 2021. In addition, a virtual public information meeting was held on March 30, 2021.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1104861	<p>I ask that the wind towers and solar arrays be constructed in places in the Horse Heaven Hills that ensure the least amount of damage to habitat and migratory routes, including roads and other infrastructure, and to be sited to minimize visual impact. This project should be required to perform an analysis to show that it has done its best to reduce visual impacts while still being able to meet energy production goals.</p> <p>The draft EIS calls to redesign the project "where feasible" which allows Scout Clean Energy too much leeway. Please address specific concerns as identified by the WA Dept. of Fish &amp; Wildlife and consider their recommendations as well as those of C.A.R.E. (Community Action for Responsible Environmental Stewardship).</p> <p>You may also want to consider scaling the wind project down and using the resources in places where wind will generate more power, such as Colorado. The Mid-Columbia can get the power it needs with new nuclear.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to wildlife in Section 4.6, including recommended mitigation measures. The measures were developed to require the Applicant to provide EFSEC with rationale and additional mitigation measures when project components are sited in sensitive areas (e.g. within core ferruginous hawk, migration routes). EFSEC would have the ability to approve the Applicant's plans or require the Applicant to make additional adjustments if their design/ mitigations are not considered sufficient.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous User	1104874	These are a horrible idea. The people who live in this are hate this idea. I don't know why you would force this down our throats. Please do not build them.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
psflatau	1105130	<p>I oppose the construction of the Horse Heaven wind farm. The huge, imposing wind turbines are noisy while destroying the natural beauty of the landscape. Birds are killed indiscriminately including endangered species. Earth worms will no longer populate the soil in the vicinity of the turbines leading to depleted soils. This is an important agricultural production area that will become unproductive. All of this destruction to supply energy to out of state interests.</p>	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021).	4.8.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1105149	Please see my attached document.	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of impacts to bird from the proposal solar arrays including potential mortality. The citation provided in the comment references data collected from three solar projects in California: Desert Sunlight, Genesis Solar, and Ivanpah Solar. Of these projects the Desert Sunlight power project is a photovoltaic power station, similar to the solar facilities proposed at Horse Heaven. Ivanpah Solar and Genesis Solar energy projects are concentrated solar thermal plants. These facilities use reflective mirrors to concentrate energy on a central tower. Mortalities of avifauna at concentrated solar thermal plants are estimated to be higher than PV projects (11.61 bird fatalities/MW/year at PV projects and 64.61 bird fatalities/MW/year at concentrated energy projects [Smallwood 2022]). Bird deaths at PV facilities are typically from collisions with the PV panels, whereas mortalities at concentrated energy projects may occur from collisions but also include exposure to the zone of solar flux resulting in burning.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1105229	<p>Please Don't Please leave this area Please give us peace, leave our beautiful mountains and prairies and lands untouched. We have the right to a beautiful view. No to Turbines In 20 yrs they will be obsolete littering our lands an expense to our kids, grandkids. Will you be maintaining? No Will you be paying for upkeep? No Will you come remove? No Get lost !! Turbines everywhere already. You will have to give count to the Lord someday.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1105239	We moved here for the natural beauty, and turbines - especially in this size and quantity - greatly distract from that, not to mention the sight and sound pollution they bring. Easy money for the land owner and incentivized energy corporations, but not thousands of citizens who call this area home.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Anonymous User	1105241	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Jacob Roy. I am both a farmer and a resident of Central Washington. I am writing to you in support of the Horse Heaven Wind Project. I have chosen to support this project because of two major concerns. One concern is climate change. Being a farmer, my life and my career are heavily impacted by the environment I live in and I can say with the utmost certainty, any opportunity we have to slow down the rate of climate change or stop it completely is an opportunity we should not pass by. The other reason why I support the Horse Heaven Wind Project is because of the resiliency this project will provide. Resiliency to our cities, resiliency to our state, and resiliency to our nation. The more we can diversify, as a nation, to produce electricity, the better. Energy resilience through diversified energy sources, such as this Project, will prevent grid disruptions and help to keep the lights on. I support the Horse Heaven Wind Project because it will reduce our usage of climate disrupting fuels while making our country, and grid, more resilient as we move into the future.</p> <p>Thank you, Jacob</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1105243	<p>not in favor of an army or wind machines on Horse Heaven Hills:</p> <p>My first experience with a windmill was when I worked a job at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station in Ontario Canada in the mid 90's. Each day, we drove past a huge wind machine. It was so huge and so cool looking. It was only one. Some days we would drive by and even with the windows of the car rolled up we could hear the blades dip toward the ground and it sounded like a jet was approaching. Back then, I thought it was neat.</p> <p>I owned 20 acres east of Brooks memorial in Washington state. I saw more and more of the windmill lights pop up in what I am assuming was the Biglow canyon wind farm, or Klondike III, or maybe something else. I did not think much of it.</p> <p>One night I was sleeping in my camper and noticed a faint red light reflecting off the walls. I could not believe it. If you consider the light source coming from the Biglow Canyon near Arlington Oregon, I was getting flashed from over 20 miles away as the crow flies!</p> <p>I thought wind power was neat at one time but an army of them blinking at the same time and all the other things I am learning about them. Not for me.</p> <p>I also read that a windmill near the plant I worked at all those years ago had lost a blade. Kincardine, Ontario I believe.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1105329	<p>Greetings –</p> <p>My name is Patrick Grengs. I am writing in regards to EFSEC NOTICE: HHH Wind Farm Notice of Public Hearing and Request for Comment on DEIS / Horse Heaven Wind Project EFSEC - The State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council</p> <p>As a 30-year resident of the Tri-Cities, owner of 40 acres of farmland under cultivation (West Richland) I am writing to make clear my statement against any construction related to the "Clean Green" Wind turbine farm. My reasons are outlined below.</p> <p>First and foremost, wind turbines are not economically viable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Wind power is intermittent – when the wind stops, the power must be provided by hot-standby sources. These include hydropower, nuclear, coal-oil-gas.•Every watt of power produced by base-plate wind must be supplemented by backup sources. At a minimum, this doubles the cost of wind power.•Additionally, the backup power (hydro, nuclear) will need to be on stand-by mode while the wind power is feeding the electric grid.•Wind turbines have a cut-in and cut-out wind speed. That is, the turbine will not generate power until the wind reaches the cut-in speed. The cut-out speed is the wind-speed where the turbine is brake-locked. As such, during very high winds, the wind turbines will not even be rotating; all the while, the blades are wearing out due to stress fractures.•The recent wind turbine debacle in Texas was just one example of where the failure of wind power results in catastrophic failure of the electric grid. <p>Wind power is not "green" – although the wind is renewable the wind turbines must be replaced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The standard windmill with a 2Mw baseplate generation capacity (those commonly seen throughout the U.S. with the 200' tower and 100' blades) requires a foundation consisting of 2,500 tons of concrete. Concrete is made from a mixture of cement, water, sand and gravel. The cement, 600k pounds in total, is created in a process that requires heat curing and the expenditure of fuel that generates 0.93 pounds of CO2 for each pound of cement. The windmill, before it generates 1kw of power, has already generated ~560,000 pounds of CO2.oThe National Ready Mixed Concrete Association says that, during production, each pound of concrete releases 0.93 pounds of CO2.ohttps://www.ecori.org/climate-change/2019/10/4/global-warming-has-a-co2ncrete-problemoIn addition to the concrete, you have the several tons of rebar reinforcement, plus the metal tower along with the gearbox and other components that must be mined, refined and fabricated.•All the components for a turbine must be transported by vehicles (trucks, trains) that require fuel which generates more CO2.•Wind turbine blades must be replaced every 15 years; they wear out like aircraft wings. Stress fractures break down the effectiveness of the blade which requires replacement prior to catastrophic decay. Germany is already experiencing the result of this as wind farms have been decommissioned due to known material degradation of the blades. Most of the turbines in the Columbia Gorge were installed during the period 2008-2010. These will need to be replaced no later than 2025. Watch for the online films of an ever-increasing number of turbine failures.•Offshore wind turbines need to be replaced more frequently due to the adverse effects of salt water. Every wind turbine currently in operation, along with the future construction of offshore turbines, five years out, will need to be replaced in 15 years.•See here: https://srsroccoreport.com/major-flaw-in-the-wind-power-industry-terrible-hidden-secret-the-wind-industry-doesnt-want-you-to-see-3/•Wind turbine blades can only be "recycled" at exorbitant costs. Instead, government municipalities have taken in spent turbine blades; for this, they receive tax-credits and other State-incentive subsidies. Instead of burying them in landfills, the are piled up out in the desert or open spaces of sparsely populated areas – out of sight, out of mind.•Hydropower is 100% renewable. In Washington State, hydro is not classified as "renewable" – this is to mandate the construction of wasteful, economically bankrupt wind turbines and solar to meet politically-mandated "Green Targets." <p>Consider the destruction of property values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•These huge wind farms destroy the scenic vistas and natural open spaces. They require orders of magnitude more land per kWh when compared to nuclear.•They reduce property values to homeowners and landowners because of their adverse effects on the environment and natural surroundings.•Knowing what I know about the false economics of wind turbines, I see them as a vast pollution across the landscape. <p>Looking at the fundamental rational for wind turbines – to address so-called "Climate Change."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Whether the sea levels are rising or falling, glaciers are advancing or retreating, mean atmospheric temperature is increasing or decreasing; know this: the climate is always changing. If we lived in a static climate, this would be cause for concern.•"Climate Change" as advertised by the MSM and state scientists, is bunk – to wit, the 97% consensus is a fraud:oThe Cook study of climate paper abstracts and its resultant 97% consensus has been roundly discredited.oThe online climate survey by Doran, et. al, with its 97% results, when looked at mathematically, has similarly been revealed to be without merit.o10 minutes of research on the internet illustrates the 97% figure to be an arbitrary fabrication.•The sea levels have been rising at the rate of approximately 2mm per year over the past 150 years. That's one foot over 150 years. This is not an emergency. This is not a crisis. This is normal.•When 25+ years of IPCC reports slowly remove any notion of the existence of the Medieval Warm Period – the premise of which would invalidate the necessity for AGW (Anthropogenic Global Warming) you must know that something aside from Science is taking place.•When 95% of all the greenhouse gasses consist of water vapor, and you cannot put a tax on water vapor ... and life-giving CO2 is labelled a pollutant, then you need to be assured that something is rotten at the very core of the Great Climate Change Fraud.•When children are used as tools to further the notion that Climate Change, as the result of man-made use of fossil fuels, is changing or otherwise damaging the Climate, then know that you are dealing with Climate Charlatans.•Consider the direct effect that wind turbines have on the climate:oWind turbines change the wind velocity to such an extent, that in the larger wind farms (report by US Wind Power 2016), the rows of turbines at the trailing end of the wind vector move more slowly because of the momentum of the wind being significantly dampened by the turbines on the front of the wind wave. In short, the actual amount of power produced is significantly less than the calculations from the models.oWind turbines directly change the climate by parasitizing the surface convective air currents which place a drag on the vertical atmospheric mixing. This effect is mostly evidenced in offshore turbines that dampen the smooth laminar flow of air that oscillates between the land and the sea.oWhen you have over 250,000 wind turbines, around the world, that directly change the climate via parasitization of surface convective air currents which dampen atmospheric mixing and nobody from the Union of Concerned Communists or the Friends of Global Progress, is even bothering to wave a flag, then you can be assured that Climate Change Catastrophism is less a matter of science and more a matter of politics and taxpayer financed corporatism.•"Climate Change" and the push for so-called "green energy" as advanced by The State is easily the largest scam in recent history. <p>Electricity produced by the hydroelectric dams provides the most cost-effective and reliable form of energy. The dams do not shut down at night. They do not shut down when the wind stops. The fluctuations of so-called "green power" (solar and wind) are highly dependent on power from 24/7 sources including hydroelectric dams and nuclear plants. Solar and Wind farms require far more land area per kilowatt hour produced when compared to Hydro and Nuclear. Additionally, solar panels have a tremendous cost in terms of the waste products from both their manufacture and disposal. Every wind turbine now in operation will need to be replaced in 15 (or fewer) years. Instead of desecrating our beautiful landscape in Eastern Washington, we should focus our efforts on preserving the hydropower currently in operation and advance the build-out of nuclear reactors.</p> <p>In summary, I am fully opposed to HHH wind turbine project. I encourage you to work to ensure that the Horse Heaven Hills remain unblemished by the appearance of the proposed</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This sections is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Air Quality	A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analyses (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/ty21osti/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO2e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO2/kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO2e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#:~:text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,o%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020). As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.	4.3	n/a
				The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celsius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.		

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1105453	I oppose the wind mill project. The vast majority of residents within site line of this project object to being bypassed on who makes the decision on this project. Stop this project now.	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged. Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility. Several opportunities were given to the stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the Project and Draft EIS. EFSEC considers all submitted comments and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1105645	The potential number of fatalities and significant injuries in the manufacture, erection, maintenance, and eventual end of life removal, should be evaluated and compared with other energy sources (e.g. nuclear). We are opposed to the windmill project due to a number of reasons, including the following: -- The much higher potential fatality/injury rate during the life cycle of the windmills compared with other energy sources such as nuclear or solar. -- The unreliability compared with other energy sources such as nuclear. For example, the wind is typically small or nonexistent on the coldest and hottest day of the year. -- The negative affect on wildlife (e.g. birds killed by the blades). _ The negative visual impact.	Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to measures that would protect worker safety, as provided in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
bluemtngirl	1105752	I am not in favor of this massive, intrusive turbine wind project	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1105774	This is a Seattle Space Needle view at Wind Turbine Height from The Horse Heaven Hills into the Tri Cities(500 ft.). We need your help.	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1105921	It appears that these wind turbines are simply a way for the State of Washington to say it's doing something "green", when, in fact, it is the exact opposite. These windmills produce less power than they consume for their lifespan, they kill birds, and they damage our visible environment. There is NO NEED for these in Washington State when we have an abundance of renewable hydroelectric power options and actually EXPORT our power to those areas that don't have enough power. We are wasting taxpayer money, increasing our energy costs for no good reason and continuing to damage our environment and wildlife. Come to your senses and STOP this abomination.	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, a forecast of regional electricity demand is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS, which suggests that by 2041, the region could see a 22.5 percent increase in demand.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous User	1106112	I don't feel that this proposed Wind Farm is necessary in the Tri Cities, WA. We have enough power here. It will only line the pockets of the wind farm company and the few farmers who own the land. It will desecrate the view of the residents who live in this area and by those who drive by. I would listen to the local environmentalists rather than those who stand to gain money! From what I have read, the energy would not be used in our area and maybe not even in this state! The project will create road traffic problems by bringing in these monstrous poles and arms. It also creates a problem of where to dispose of them when they are no longer able to function. Get greed for a few out of the picture and allow our local citizens a more serene and soothing view of our beautiful landscape!	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Hayleyhoyt	1106136	No on the windmills! We have more than enough nuclear power here in the Tri-Cities area and we do not need to clutter our vans and backyards with hideous windmills. If the Eastern side of the state wants these windmills so bad they can put them over near Seattle! Please stay out of our Tri-Cities area! Use nuclear power. IT IS THE GREENEST POWER AVAILABLE!!!! DO YOU PEOPLE NOT UNDERSTAND THIS???? .	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106187	Yesterday I went for a walk in the Horse Heaven Hills just south of my home. I enjoy the exercise, open areas, seeing the occasional deer, raptor or other surprises nature provides. Driving home on Owens road I noticed 3 wind turbines operating near Jump Off Joe and probably another 20 just sitting idle. I consider all of them "eye" sores. I hear Scout Clean Energy talk about "clean" energy and local jobs. If the goal is "clean" energy we would be building new generation nuclear plants. And jobs? ... If the acreage Scout Clean Energy wants allocated to them were used to put in feed lots or even pot farms, I'm sure more local jobs would be created. I don't have much use for any pot farms, but I do like a hamburger now and again. The Horse Heavens Wind project benefits energy consumers and business interests many hundreds of miles away not the locals. I heard our governor recently remark with pride that the people of Washington are an audacious bunch. Maybe so, if the people of this state allow this wind project to be rammed down the throat of those who live here, well that sounds audacious to me. I've always associated an audacious person as one who's arrogant and self serving. I looked audacious up in the dictionary – "showing an impudent lack of respect".	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106258	My name is Clark Stolle. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to the proposed project. I am a long-time resident of Kennewick, WA. My professional background is in land use planning and management, where I have worked at city, county, regional and federal (contractor) levels. I am also a past Planning Commissioner for the City of Kennewick. Below are my comments regarding the proposal and the draft EIS. What is our legacy to be in the Tri-Cities? My family has lived in the Kennewick area for over 70 years and we have shared a feeling of pride in the Horse Heaven Hills, believing that they should to be preserved as much as possible, as part of the heritage of our area. They are a unique and beautiful part of our region. Allowing this project to be built at the proposed locations when other options exist has long term consequences. This complex will cause significant and irreparable harm to the environment, wildlife, birds, local economy, visual aesthetics, recreation and the overall quality of life for an urban area of over 300,000 people. Has serious consideration been given to the location, quantity, and size of these monolithic towers next to an urban area? There are two scenarios proposed for this 25 mile long project, running along the Horse Heaven Hills ridgeline from Finley to Benton City: 244 turbines up to 500 feet tall and 150 turbines up to 670 feet tall. Both create significant adverse visual impacts that cannot be mitigated. These towers will be among the tallest and most massive in the world. The blades on each tower are hundreds of feet in diameter and span acres of air space. Make no mistake this is not a visually aesthetic "wind farm" churning away in the middle of nowhere. It is an industrial complex of enormous proportions with many components. By comparison, these towers will be taller than the Space Needle (605 ft); the Statue of Liberty (305 ft); Gateway Arch in St. Louis (630 ft.); and the Washington Monument (555 ft.). They are far taller than any Redwood, Douglas Fir, or Sequoia tree. If this project is approved, our community will be forced to live within eyesight of the towers and no one who lives here, or visits can escape seeing them.	Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility. Several opportunities were given to the stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the Project and Draft EIS. EFSEC considers all submitted comments and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation. Regarding the expedited processing, on March 29, 2021, prior to public information meeting, the Applicant withdrew its request for expedited processing.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
Anonymous User	1106262	Do not bring this into our community ! We do not want the environmental impact that comes with wind farms, let alone the eyesore ! What happens when one catches fire which they do, and starts a grass fire. The risks and long term effects are not welcome.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106263	In James Conca's online article in Forbes titled "Wind Turbines On Washington's Horse Heaven Hills – How Not To Pursue A Green New Deal," he states that wind in this region doesn't produce much energy, only functioning at 30% of capacity. In contrast, our local nuclear reactor, the Columbia Generating Station, is at 98% of capacity. The map included in the article shows that Tornado Alley is a much more efficient location for wind power, functioning at 50% of capacity. Also stated in the article - "Whenever energy from wind comes onto the grid, hydro generation is dropped or curtailed, by spilling water over the dams instead of through the turbines. " "This wind farm will have no effect on climate change or carbon emissions, will not replace fossil fuel at all, will mar the beautiful vistas of this area, provide a trivial number of temporary construction jobs, and preferentially kill raptors and migratory birds in the great Pacific Northwest Flyway zone. "	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1106300	I think it is very easy for out of state companies and even those on the west side of the state to underestimate the fire danger in the Horse Heaven Hills, which for a few months out of the year is Extreme. The HH wind farm is not a good idea for several reasons, one of which is the significant fire danger in the HH, which would only increase with the construction and operation of the wind farm. I have seen multiple fires on the dry hills. They are fast moving, cover large areas, and are difficult to contain. We should not put our farm land and land in close proximity to Tri-Cities in greater fire danger. See last paragraph of 4-62 of DEIA "The City of Kennewick has a goal of reducing water demand per capita..." See first paragraph under "Fire" page 4-104 of DEIA "Project construction could increase the risk of fire, particularly during hot, dry conditions. Wildfires have become more commonly human-caused than natural...Benton County has a high potential for wildfire." Thank you for your time and consideration.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106319	Please see attached document	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. EFSEC considers all submitted comments and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Additional mitigation measures (such as using ADLS) recommendation will be considered.	4.10	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present socioeconomic conditions and impacts on socioeconomic including impacts on people of color and low income communities. In accordance with WAC 463-26-025, on March 30, 2021, EFSEC held a virtual public information meeting to explain the process that would be followed for review of the proposal. Members of the public were given an opportunity to provide oral and written comments. DEIS also published publicly for public for comment. Public had 45 days to provide comments in writing to EFSEC. Also, a public hearing meeting was held on February 1st 2023 for oral and written comments on DEIS.	1.4, 3.16 and 4.16	n/a
Resident	1106331	I am in favor of this project for the local jobs it will create and the economic boost for our local economy.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106360	I am vehemiately AGAINST this wind farm project. Wind turbines will ultimately NOT end up being GREEN! Nuclear power coupled with reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel will ultimately become our energy source for the future. Perfect that energy source and the nuclear fuel cycle NOW...	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106388	Please see my attachments. Thank you	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This sections is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
Anonymous User	1106394	We are against this project! Too many animals die using these massive monstrosities! Do not ruin our natural landscapes with these expensive giants! These are not environmentally friendly. Do not put these up!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Kit	1106470	Hello, I am not in favor of this wind turbine project. There is not supporting evidence that this region requires the energy generated from the proposed wind farm in the Horse Heaven Hills. Sites should be considered in other areas of the NW to determine if there is need for the energy generation for that region, and if the average winds would support the investment when electricity is needed most. Eastern Washington has many winter days of high-pressure inversions resulting in cold and windless days. Wind farms in Washington are more productive in the summer, but that coincides with times that preferred hydropower is at maximum levels which supports no need for the wind power. Recent public surveys from Tri-Cities Chamber of Commerce and Benton County Parks show a majority of Tri-Citians highly value our regions scenic vistas - ridgelines, hillsides, canyons and desert views. This proposed wind farm will destroy the designated areas open space vistas which I think of as Landscape Pollution. As degradation of our open spaces continues, protecting our beautiful open space areas should be given serious consideration. Protecting Area Wildlife - I read that the Washington state Department of Fish and Wildlife raised concerns about ferruginous hawks and other wildlife in comments that the agency submitted earlier to EFSEC. Many of the turbines, transmission lines and solar arrays are close to or stretch across draws and canyons with shrub steppe and grassland habitats. (20 special species and the Pronghorn antelope are listed in the DEIS as being impacted by the wind project; this includes the state Endangered Ferruginous Hawk). Since there is no evidence to support the need for the energy in this region which is generated from the proposed wind farm, this project should not be approved in order to protect the Area Wildlife. Thank you. Kit	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including special status species are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1106563	Please do not approve the Horse Heaven Wind Farms Project. I do not believe it will provide a meaningful and long term solution to clean energy. I personally enjoy the views without the windmills.	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Anonymous User	1106634	I think this is a great idea and we should embrace wind farms today and for the future even at Horse Haven.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1106639	I am strongly opposed to the HH W&S Project. The net benefit is less than zero—ruined skyline, negative effect on wildlife and environment, limited life span, non-recyclable material composition sourced through methods harmful to people and the environment, inconsistent generation capability, no storage, and not financially viable without publicly funded subsidies. Jim Bennett, Kennewick	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS. This sections is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
Anonymous User	1106684	I would like to record my opposition to the proposed Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center just south of the Tri-Cities as currently presented by Scout Clean Energy. I acknowledge there are some pros - it will produce up to 1,150 megawatts of power (depending on the weather), it will provide good-paying construction jobs for a while, and farmers leasing their land to the project will benefit financially. However for the community, it will permanently blemish the rustic and unspoiled beauty of the hills and ridges south of the Tri-Cities. The scope of the project is massive encompassing over 70,000 acres stretching from Finley to Benton City with wind turbines visible from Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland as well as Finley and Benton City. I also question how "clean" the project really is when you consider the carbon footprint created by the manufacture, transportation, installation, maintenance, and eventual removal/replacement of the wind turbines, solar panels, and batteries. The Tri-Cities Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey with 78% of respondents stating the Horse Heaven Hills wind farm was not worth the personal, environmental, and potential negative economic impacts it would have on the Tri-Cities. If you want a source of clean energy that the Tri-Cities could get behind, we should be promoting the development and deployment of the Advanced Small Nuclear Reactors. Richard W. Richter 146 Henley Drive Pasco, WA 99301	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Socioeconomics analysis for the project did not identify any negative economic impacts. Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
Anonymous User	1106733	Kennewick Urban Growth Area SAVE OUR RIDGES PLEASE1	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106745	I support Washington State taking the necessary steps to meet it's energy goals. We must become green energy efficient to save our state and planet.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce	1106756	Please see attached comment letter.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals have been proposed by the Applicant with additional turbine removals to be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10 / 4.10.2.2 Shadow Flicker	Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Potential impacts on wellbeing upon decommissioning would occur as a result of Project termination and the fact that the Applicant would no longer be required to pay taxes. Since in the methodology of determination of magnitude of impacts "Medium impacts" is assigned for when potential impacts may occur on sensitive receptors (in this case schools, school districts, and fire stations) this potential impact is medium for all populations, including people of color and low-income populations. However, as the status of well-being will be resumed to pre-construction/current conditions because of the project termination, no mitigation measures are deemed necessary. Additionally, the analysis of potential project impacts on people of color and low-income populations in the last row of Table 4.16-4c presents disproportionate impacts on these communities through indirect pathways, as discussed in section 4.3, Air Quality; section 4.10 Visual Aspects, Light and Glare; section 4.11, Noise and Vibration; section 4.12, Recreation; and section 4.14, Transportation. Section 4.16.2.3 and table 4.16-4c in the final EIS will be revised for more clarity.	4.16, Table 4.14-4c	4.16.2.3 and table 4.16-4c
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1106768	Please see uploaded document, HHH_DEIS_comments_-_Berkowitz_2023_02_01	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>The description of habitats and potential species use of the Lease Boundary provided in the EIS was developed using habitat models (including corridor models) supplemented with empirical data collected by the Applicant. At the time of drafting the EIS, studies had not been conducted for all species with potential to occur in the Lease Boundary, as such, the EIS applied precautionary principals and assumed their potential presence and impact based on available habitat. The mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 4.6 require the Applicant to conduct additional studies to further characterize wildlife use of the Lease Boundary and adjust the Project layout to manage those impacts in final design. The results of these studies and final design would be reviewed and approved by EFSEC along with rationale for where sensitive habitat was not avoided. Terms like "where feasible" were used to allow for these discussions with EFSEC and the application of adaptive management as the Project design progresses.</p> <p>A technical advisor committee is a useful tool developed to bring technical experts together in management of environmental impacts. The purpose of the TAC would be to provide unbiased input to mitigation measures that can be implemented and adapted based on the results of pre-construction surveys, and operational surveys. While the TAC would provide input into project mitigation, the ultimate approval of mitigation measures would be with EFSEC. The Applicant will propose TAC members but EFSEC will approve the TAC members.</p> <p>Spec-5 is not specific to currently active nests but includes nests documented in PHS data. Spec-5 will be revised to provide additional clarity and include nests that have had recorded activity in the preceding 10 years. The same approach cannot be applied to smaller birds that do not reuse their nests. Mitigation measures applied to these species includes a requirement to avoid and compensate for habitat loss.</p> <p>Variability in annual mortality rates is expected due to a variety in factors, including changes in annual variation in local populations. However, two years of mortality data is expected to be sufficient to verify the assumptions applied in the EIS. If data collected during the initial two years of operation is not considered sufficient or is not consistent with assumptions presented in the EIS then Wild-1 allows EFSEC to require the Applicant to continue annual monitoring.</p> <p>Wild-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide additional clarity.</p> <p>Information on turbine height and potential impact on birds and bats is provided in Appendix 4.6-1</p> <p>The EIS addresses the potential impact to birds and bats, including mortality, in Section 4.6. As noted in Section 4.6.2.2, bird mortalities are typically evenly distributed between nocturnal migrants and resident birds, while bat mortality is anticipated to be greatest during migration. Mitigation measure Wild-1 was developed to require monitoring bird and bat mortality and development of additional mitigation measures if bat mortality rates exceed anticipated threshold. Wild-1 will be updated to provide clarity to the process the Applicant would be expected to follow to establish mortality threshold rates and establish adaptive management strategies. If the results of operational monitoring suggest elevated impacts occur during nighttime migration, additional mitigation measures may be applied such as monitoring night time movements or periodic curtailment of turbines. These mitigation measures may be targeted to a specific time of year, time of day, or group of turbines depending on monitoring results.</p> <p>Data collected on bat presence was collected using acoustic monitoring devices. These detectors operate 24 hours a day when set to detect nocturnal activity.</p> <p>The ratings provided in this table are based on the extent of the impacts directly connected to the Project. It is acknowledged that, for many impacts, there can be cascading effects that occur beyond a particular spatial bound. indirect effects of altering migration routes could extend beyond the Lease Boundary. Mitigation measures provided include measure requiring the Applicant to avoid impacts to modelled movement corridors. Where avoidance is not possible, the mitigation measures would require the Applicant to develop additional mitigation measures to maintain wildlife movement. The rationale for why avoidance is not feasible and proposed new mitigation measures would be reviewed and approved by EFSEC.</p> <p>Current FAA regulations do not allow for turbine blades to be painted colors other than white.</p>	4.6	Mitigation measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. Spec-5 will be revised to provide additional clarity and include nests that have had recorded activity in the preceding 10 years.
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106774	<p>Alternative energy is essential to reduce global climate change, which causes more violent weather, bigger floods, more drought, more forest fires, higher sea level, more acidic oceans, and the direct and indirect deaths of millions of people. The draft environmental impact statement seems to correctly address the Horse Heaven wind and solar project thoroughly. Three common complaints about windfarms are noise, birds, and view. I do not understand the noise issue because I have led many field trips to the Stateline wind farm on windy days; my guests seemed to enjoy the gentle sound as the propeller blades make electricity. Some birds and bats get hit by the propeller blades, but fossil fuel use, ecosystem modification, and cats have by orders of magnitude killed more birds. Wind turbines on the Horse Heaven Hills do not block views of the Cascades, the Blue Mountains, or any rivers or canyons; indeed, their presence indicates the engineering and architecture necessary to reduce global climate change. The economic advantages of windfarms to rural landowners in eastern Washington are huge. Wheat is grown right under wind turbines; cattle graze in the shade of wind turbines; farmers and ranchers benefit from payments by wind power companies. The proposed Horse Heaven Hills wind farm would provide hundreds of millions of dollars in economic output and taxes, plus hundreds of jobs. The project is particularly attractive because it includes solar facilities and batteries. Dust from construction is minimal compared with farming. No fish-bearing streams are directly affected. Native Americans did not live atop the Horse Heaven Hills. I believe that habitat alteration will be minimal, especially compared with fossil fuel pipeline construction. Hopefully the project would reduce the use of motorized off-road vehicles which are noisier than wind turbines, cause erosion and dust, and consume fossil fuels. The proposed Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center should be approved. Resources like the wind and sun need to be economically and environmentally developed everywhere possible; the windy, sunny Horse Heaven Hills are ideal.</p> <p>Robert J. Carson, 705 Boyer, Walla Walla, Washington 99362 Whitman College Professor of Geology and Environmental Studies Emeritus</p>	Vegetation	<p>The EIS provides an assessment of each project component individually (each solar field and the microsliting corridor) and for the comprehensive project considering all project component together. For vegetation including priority habitats and special status plant species, the assessment is provided in Section 4.5. Table 4.5-12a, 4.5-12b, and 4.5-12c show how the ratings for individual project components and the comprehensive project. Permanent disturbance of the east solar field and the comprehensive project were rated as high magnitude due to permanent impacts to priority habitat. While no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified, priority habitat was identified as a cumulative impact in Section 5.2.2. Details of specific Applicant commitments and identified mitigation proposed by EFSEC are provided in Section 4.5.2.4.</p> <p>One wetland was identified within the Project Lease Boundary, which is located 240 ft west of the microsliting corridor. This is greater than the required buffer distance of 40 ft by Benton County. The infrastructure sited near the wetland is a 240 volt transmission line. Other Project infrastructure is sited approximately 0.4 miles west of the wetland at the nearest point. Proposed mitigation include a wetland specific Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan for work near the wetland (W-6).</p> <p>Noxious weeds and other invasive plants, including cheatgrass are already present within the Project lease boundary including within Priority Habitat areas. A description of some of the existing stressors on Priority Habitat is provided in Table 3.4-5. The Eastside interior grassland varies in quality based on the presence of invasive plants, including cheatgrass, and evidence of cattle use in the existing conditions. The Revegetation and Noxious Weed Control Plan is designed to avoid the introduction of new invasive plants and minimize the spread of existing invasive plants through the life of the Project. As many invasive plants are present at existing condition, complete removal is not likely. However, treatment of invasive plant infestations would occur through all phases of the Project, and revegetation of areas of disturbance will focus on planting with native plants, as described in Section 4.5.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation.</p> <p>The EIS attributed temporary and short term to habitat loss associated with temporary disturbance during construction that would be restored and revegetated following construction. Restoration of shrub-steppe and grasslands in arid environments is challenging. Section 4.5.2.4 Applicant Commitment and Identified Mitigation includes an As-Built Report and Offset Calculation whereby areas of temporary disturbance that do not meet the success criteria for revegetation after the established monitoring period would then be included as a permanent disturbance and offsets would be required at a permanent disturbance ratio.</p> <p>Vegetation selected for growth under solar panels must be conducive to the operation of panels. Short grasses are preferred to avoid interferences with the panels and to minimize fuel load to minimize risk of wildfire (Beatty et al. 2017, Native Vegetation Performance under a Solar PV Array at the National Wind Technology Centre). Based on the Application the maximum height of the top of the solar module would be 15 ft above ground with a rotational access 6.2 to 8.2 ft off the ground.</p> <p>Section 4.5.2.4 include the mitigation measure Tree Avoidance (Veg-1), which requires the Applicant to avoid trees during construction. If avoidance is not achieved, the number and location of trees removed would be provided to EFSEC and a mitigation plan would be developed.</p> <p>Disturbance to rabbitbrush is mitigated at the same offset ratios as a Class II habitat (e.g., shrub-steppe) for temporary and permanent disturbance. Rabbitbrush is offset as Class III habitat (e.g., eastside interior grassland) under the solar arrays. Habitat offset ratios are provided in Table 4.5-11.</p>	Section 3.4, 4.4, 3.5, and 4.5	n/a
			Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
gedgemon	1106824	I'm opposed to this project as it will be an aesthetic blight on a beautiful landscape. I'm also concerned that turbine bearing failures could set of range fires in the area.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
mhue	1106828	<p>Decide Locally is Against the Proposed Wind Turbine Farm A PETITION TO GOVERNOR INSLEE AND THE STATE ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL. WE, CITIZENS OF WASHINGTON, HEREBY GIVE OUR SIGNATURE TO PETITION AGAINST THE HORSE HEAVEN HILLS WIND FARM PROJECT STRETCHING 24 MILES OF THE TRI-CITIES RIDGE LINE FROM SOUTH OF TRI-CITIES IN FINLEY, ABOVE SOUTH KENNEWICK, ABOVE BADGER CANYON EXTENDING TO KIONA/BENTON CITY. THE WIND PROJECT DEVELOPER PLANS TO BUILD AND ERECT 244 WIND MACHINES TALLER THAN THE SPACE NEEDLE ALONG THE ENTIRE SKYLINE OF TRI-CITIES AND BADGER CANYON. THERE HAS BEEN NO PUBLIC HEARING LOCALLY SO OUR VOICE HAS NOT BEEN HEARD. THIS POWER IS NOT NEEDED LOCALLY AND WOULD LIKELY BE SOLD OUT OF STATE. THIS PROJECT SITE CONSTRAINS THE BENTON COUNTY GROWTH PLAN. THE WASHINGTON STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT INCREASED MORTALITY OF ENDANGERED AVIAN SPECIES, SUCH AS, FERRUGINOUS HAWKS AND MIGRATORY BIRDS SUCH AS SANDHILL CRANES. THE FRAGILE SHRUB STEPPE ECOSYSTEM WILL BE FURTHER DEGRADED AS WILL NATIVE PLANTS, SOME OF WHICH ARE PROTECTED. THE TRI-CITIES SKYLINE WILL BE FOREVER CHANGED. THE CONSTANT LOW FREQUENCY NOISE, BLADE FLICKER REFLECTIONS, AND 244 FLASHING RED LIGHTS ON THE MACHINES AT NIGHT POSE HEALTH RISK TO HUMANS INCLUDING HEADACHES, LOSS OF SLEEP, AND VERTIGO FROM THE CONSTANT NOISE THAT CAN CARRY OVER LONG DISTANCES. THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT TURBULENCE FROM LARGE WIND PROJECTS ACCELERATE MOISTURE LOSS FROM THE SOIL AND WILL INCREASE LOCAL TEMPERATURES. WE HAVE GRAVE CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO OUR LOCAL WINE INDUSTRY, FRUIT ORCHARDS, AND DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURE. PROPERTY VALUES WILL BE DECREASED. I AM AGAINST CONSTRUCTION OF THE WIND FARM ON HORSE HEAVEN HILLS RIDGE OF TRI-CITIES AND BADGER CANYON.</p> <p>The attached pdf are signature pages of residents and people visiting as tourists, sports events, shopping, dinner and wine tasting events. Many commented they come to Tri-cities because they don't want to drive down the gorge or to Walla Walla to have a weekend away.</p> <p>We collected 2668 signatures, a copy is for EFSEC and the original will be given to the governor. Because scanning lost some quality in the signature, I will mail your copy today Febr. 1, 2023</p> <p>Sincerely, Margaret Hue, Spokesperson</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies. EFSEC hosted a public comment meeting for the Horse Heaven EIS on February 1, 2023.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to wildlife, including birds, ferruginous hawk, migratory birds, and sandhill cane in Section 4.6. Impacts considered included habitat loss (direct and indirect), mortality (e.g. from collisions with turbines), barriers to movement, and habitat fragmentation. Section 4.6 also provides recommended mitigation measures intended to reduce potential impacts to wildlife.	4.6	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to Priority Habitats and special status plant species in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts such as dust. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat and special status plant species were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of priority habitats throughout Washington and sensitivity of special status plant species, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	Include AVA as part of LSU .
			Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous User	1106857	<p>This project is totally unnecessary. There are sufficient alternative, existing power-providing resources (nearby dams, nuclear generating station) surrounding the Tri-Cities that provide adequate power support for the population in that area and in the surrounding areas. Destroying the landscape and the natural aesthetics of the Horse Heaven Hills and creating a dangerous environment for wildlife and the public are absolutely unacceptable.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present socioeconomic conditions and impacts on socioeconomic including impacts on people of color and low income communities. Power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant. Such power purchasers could include any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users with potential off-takers having distribution outside of Washington state.	3.16, 4.16 and 1.2.1	n/a
Anonymous User	1106884	See attached file.	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar". EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brun	1106901	Attached is a document containing my comments to the Horse Heaven Wind Project. I am totally opposed to this project.	General - Question for EFSEC	SEPA guidelines and Washington Administrative Code do not specify that Draft EIS should be published in any other languages than English. However, EFSEC has completed their due diligence in notifying the public by publishing English and Spanish notices, and English and Spanish factsheets. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice of issuance of Draft EIS. EFSEC did not receive any requests for Spanish translation of Draft EIS during the public comment period. In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Aspects of the human-environment and Project impacts on populations of Benton and Franklin counties were analyzed in various sections of the EIS. These sections include but are not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	The analysis area for the wind turbines extended out 25 miles in the EIS with high impacts identified out to 5 miles from most KOPs. The viewshed mapping in Chapter 4 of the EIS has been updated to show the correct maps which were included in Appendix 3.10-2 within the Draft EIS with additional context information added. Additional viewpoints and visual simulations have been included in the Final EIS including an additional KOP in Benton City. Many simulations were updated to reduce the effect of atmospheric conditions to best depict Project visibility under exceptionally clear atmospheric conditions including KOP 5. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals have been proposed by the Applicant with additional turbine removals to be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10 / 4.10.2.2 Shadow Flicker	Updated turbine viewshed maps from Visual Technical Report with additional context information. New simulations included in updated analysis with atmospheric hazing removed in simulations included in the Draft EIS. Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the FEIS
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. -- The Applicant has proposed constructing in the micrositing corridor. The Appliance provided the most probable worst-case scenario for disturbance acreage in that micrositing corridor for the greater number of turbines. Because information regarding disturbance for the smaller quantity of turbines was not provided, the larger amount of disturbance was assumed for the smaller quantity of turbines to be conservative. -- A detailed traffic analysis was requested by EFSEC.	2.0	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
			Air Quality	Air emission calculations included in Appendix 4.3-1 were independently reviewed and either independently confirmed. In addition supplemental fugitive emissions calculations were performed by EFSEC since these were omitted in the Applicant's analysis.	4.3	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	Additional figures or figure inserts showing NSR locations with maximum impacts and the closest noise source(s), has been requested.
			Energy and Natural Resources	Nameplate generating capacity is the amount of electricity a generator can produce when running at its maximum designed output. The proposed Project would have a nameplate generating capacity of up to 1,150 megawatts (MW) and would utilize both wind turbines and solar photovoltaic panels to convert energy from the wind and sun into electric power. Other alternatives were considered for detailed analysis, however, these were eliminated because they would not generate the designed nameplate generating capacity required by the Applicant.	2.1Description of the Proposed Action 2.2Alternatives to the Proposed Action	n/a
			Executive Summary	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Fact Sheet	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2. An analysis of the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts on agricultural productivity is provided in Table 5.2.	4.8.2, 5.2	n/a
			Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. EFSEC will initiate government-to-government consultation with Tribes and other state agencies. The FEIS will clarify when formal consultation was initiated and will distinguish formal consultation from all other communication and engagement with Tribes. The FEIS will report the results of the formal consultation.	4.9	The FEIS will clarify when formal consultation was initiated and will distinguish formal consultation from all other communication and engagement with Tribes. The FEIS will report the results of the formal consultation.
			Wildlife and Habitat	Issue ES-24: The EIS notes that gaps in available information on wildlife distribution and occurrences in the lease Boundary and uses conservative assumption (e.g. assumes presence) to characterize impacts. Mitigation measures in Chapter 4.6 requires the Applicant to conduct additional studies and use the results in their final design process. Where impacts still occur (e.g. where avoidance of sensitive areas are not feasible) the Applicant is required to develop a mitigation plan and provide additional measure to reduce impacts. The role of the TAC will be to provide independent advice on data collection, results interpretation, and suitability of mitigation measures. Plans and final design would be approved by EFSEC. Issue TAC: The purpose of the TAC is to provide independent advice to the Applicant and EFSEC regarding data collection, results interpretation, and mitigation planning. HAB-4 reads that the TAC will be formed in consultation with EFSEC. For clarity the following will be added to Hab-4 in the FEIS: "The Applicant, in consultation with EFSEC, would establish a TAC. The TAC would include local experts such as governmental experts (e.g. WDFW), scientific non-governmental organizations, and public organizations. EFSEC would approve the final TAC members." Issue Chapter 4 Reference Connell et al (1984) and Weaver et al (1996) provide definitions of adaptability and resilience. While these references are dated, the definitions are applicable. Sources of data used in Chapter 4.6 included site data collected by the Applicant. The Applicant designed field studies in consultation with WDFW. Other sources of data included publicly available databases managed by government and non-government groups and consultation with WDFW and WDFW species experts. References to discussions held with WDFW are documented in the reference section of the EIS.	4.6.2.5	Update to Hab-4: The Applicant, in consultation with EFSEC, would establish a TAC. The TAC would include local experts such as governmental experts (e.g. WDFW), scientific non-governmental organizations, and public organizations. EFSEC would approve the final TAC members."
			Water Resources	The Columbia River is located outside the Project Lease Boundary. The intermittent and ephemeral streams within the Project Lease Boundary flow to the Yakima and Columbia Rivers; however, impacts to surface water are not anticipated to cause impacts to these major rivers. The intermittent and ephemeral streams are dry most of the year.	Section 3.4 and 4.4	n/a
Karen Brun	1106936	Issue: The DEIS disregards a major percentage of the Benton and Franklin counties demographics. A total of 40% of the population in Benton and Franklin counties are Hispanic. While the letter notifying residents of the DEIS release and where to find a copy, none of the actual DEIS documents are in Spanish. This is a significant disservice to a large portion of the population whose primary language is Spanish. Many do not understand or speak English at all. All DEIS documents should be translated into Spanish and reissued electronically, and hard copy provided to ALL libraries in impacted cities including Benton City.	General - Question for EFSEC	SEPA guidelines and Washington Administrative Code do not specify that Draft EIS should be published in any other languages than English. However, EFSEC has completed their due diligence in notifying the public by publishing English and Spanish notices, and English and Spanish factsheets. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice of issuance of Draft EIS. EFSEC did not receive any requests for Spanish translation of Draft EIS during the public comment period. In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1106953	I do not live near the proposed siting of the Horse Heaven project, but I strongly support our transition to renewable energy. I also note that the project comes from a Colorado based company, raising an issue of local control. Still we need to expand the already numerous solar and wind installations in ways that can support this crucial transition to renewables.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
pmstauffer	1104224	The air quality in Badger Canyon will be greatly affected by the HH wind farm. No reliable monitoring data exist for PM10 and PM2.5 in these areas downwind from this giant industrial project. An air monitoring system for these fine particulates needs to be established along the 25 miles from Finley to Benton City before construction starts, to have a baseline and evaluate if the area meets air quality standards. Dispersion modeling needs to be done and included in the DEIS, not the FEIS, for proper review. Special attention needs to be paid in the dispersion model to the effects of the arrays of turbines in rows 6 deep, such as increased turbulence, soil drying, and soil mobility, and the unique topography of the HHH located 1500 feet above the Badger Canyon. The people in Badger Canyon are downwind from the Project, and their health and safety could be affected greatly by the HH wind farm project for the next 35 years.	Air Quality	As stated in the EIS, a dispersion modeling analysis of project emissions will be performed and included in the FEIS.	4.3	see column H
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Applicant Commitments as stated in Section 2.1.3.10 of the EIS including multiple commitments to collaboration with tribes throughout the proposed Project. Please also see the EIS Section 9.2 Tribal Government Distribution List for specific tribal distribution information.	4.9, 2.1.3.10, 9.2	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Earth Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1107020	This area doesn't need anymore power. Windmills are not efficient and an eye sore, destroying the views, landscaping and environment. Doesn't make sense to rap the environment and nature to save it ? The cons outweigh the benefits. Our kids need a hero. Someone needs to step up and do the right thing. No more Windmills in Kennewick views.	Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Background air quality levels are discussed in Section 3.3.1.2 of the EIS. The final EIS will include the results of a forthcoming dispersion modeling analysis.	n/a	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107055	PROJECT ELECTRICAL GENERATING CAPACITY - Statements in 1.2, 1.3 and 2.1 about the electrical generating capability of this project are highly misleading, and need to be clarified. This is particularly the case in 1.3 which states the project's purpose "is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy." In reality, the project's average electric energy production through a year could never come close to its nameplate capacity of 1,150 MW. Rather, it would be closer to an average of 250 to 300 MW because the capacity factors of both wind and solar energy generation are very low, close to 25% based on experience elsewhere. (Capacity factors take into account generation being off line or reduced due to routine maintenance outages, lack of wind, no solar production at night, cloudy skies, etc. As a point of comparison, the nearby nuclear Columbia Generating station, with a similar nameplate capacity, has a 90% capacity factor.) Statements in the referenced sections need to clearly state what the actual energy production from the project will be, so that reviewers who are weighing the adverse impacts of the project against its benefits aren't misled into thinking the electrical generation benefits are far higher than they will actually be. BIRD AND BAT MORTALITY -- The analysis provided in 4.6.2.2 never provides an estimate of the total number of bird and bat fatalities for a year of wind turbine operations. Rather, it states only numbers expected per MW per year based on other projects' experience. And, it's not clear if those numbers are per nameplate MW or per actual MW produced. Regardless, an estimate of total fatalities per year needs to be provided (and I'm sure it's in the thousands).	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The FEIS will be updated to provide an estimate of bird and bat mortalities based on the estimated number of mortalities per MW/year. This estimate is predictive based on mortality rates at other facilities.	4.6	HAB-4
Anonymous User	1107069	The "significant unavoidable adverse impacts" noted in the draft EIS are of significant concern. Also as noted in the draft EIS, the wind turbines would dominate views from many locations throughout our community. This project would be a blight on our landscape. studies have shown adverse impacts to tourism, which is a significant economic engine in our area. I feel it robs Tri-Cities of a quality of life aspect of our region (beautiful vistas) and as a homeowner located int the Horse Heaven Hills I am concerned about diminished resale values as well as shadow flicker and impacts to area wildlife (as noted in the study).	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Pasco Chamber of Commerce	1107083	Please see attached letter	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including special status species such as ferruginous hawk, burrowing owl, and pronghorn antelope are addressed in section 4.6 of EIS. This section also discusses the potential impacts to sandhill crane and wildlife movement.	4.6	n/a
			Earth Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS	4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. In summary, the Proposed Action would generate local jobs and tax revenue. As a result of these benefits, the Project is not anticipated to have adverse impacts on the study area's economic conditions.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	SEPA guidelines and Washington Administrative Code do not specify that Draft EIS should be published in any other languages than English. However, EFSEC has completed their due diligence in notifying the public by publishing English and Spanish notices, and English and Spanish factsheets. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice of issuance of Draft EIS. EFSEC did not receive any requests for Spanish translation of Draft EIS during the public comment period. In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.		
Anonymous User	1107104	Another very important point! Today even the environmentalist are calling for a moratorium on east cost wind farms because the noise is interfering with the wales and killing wildlife well being! No substantial studies were done on humans and whales before these were forced on the people and built costs are enormous, 20 million per unit! This folly is our tax payer money! All indications suggests harm is being done to everyone and every creature living in the areas of these turbines! We are not Guinea pigs or lab animals. Maybe they should be called death wind turbines 9 wales dead now and countless wildlife. Do not put these in residential areas of badger canyoni! --badger canyon resident Becky Hughes	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107106	<p>In the DEIS for the Horse Heaven Wind and Solar Project, Scout Clean Energy fails to identify the true effects on migratory birds and relegates the effect as similar to the adjacent wind projects with no basis as to why that should be the case.</p> <p>The scale and breadth of this project presents a major hazard to migratory birds as they follow the Columbia River corridor, especially for populations that fly at night, and insufficient analysis is provided as to why expanding the breadth of effected flight path in the east west direction (across the basin) will not result in a significant increase in bird mortality. It also fails to mention the effects on raptor populations which are more effected than songbirds since they reproduce at a low rate. They also fail to mention the effects of taller structures and longer blades in to reaching the migratory pathways.</p> <p>Audubon Society, effect of wind power on birds:https://www.audubon.org/news/wind-power-and-birds</p> <p>Resources documenting effects on raptor populations: https://tethys.pnnl.gov/receptor/raptors#:~:text=Raptors%20are%20at%20high%20risk,elevation%20as%20wind%20turbine%20blades.</p> <p>Scout Clean Energy must be required to study migratory bird populations in more detail and ensure that expanding the wind farms territory further across the Columbia Basin and to lower lying areas than are currently occupied will not result in a marked increase in migratory bird and raptor mortality.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS addresses potential bird mortality. This section suggests that rate of mortality per MW per year may be similar to the adjacent Nine Canyon Project based on the proximity of this project to the Lease Boundary. The rate of bird mortality at the Nine Canyon Project is above the average rate for Washington State. The proximity of the Nine Canyon Project makes it a reasonable surroget to predict bird and bat mortality at the Horse Heaven Project; however, it is noted that the Horse Heaven Project is larger than the Nine Canyon Project; as such, would be expected to result in more bird and bat mortalities. This section will be updated in the FEIS to provide an estimate of the number of birds mortality that may occur per year at Horse Heaven based on the rates at Nine Canyon. In addition to the text provided in Section 4.6.2.2, Appendix 4.6-1 provides a comparison impacts to avifauna from the two proposed turbine heights. Raptors are discussed in Appendix 4.6-1.</p> <p>Mitigation measure Wild-1 provides a method for EFSEC to review mortality data from the Project and require additional mitigaiton measures in the event that the Project results in a higher mortality rate than predicted.</p>	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1107110	<p>HHH Public Hearing Testimony Feb 1, 2023</p> <p>Hello Everyone. My name is Paul Krupin. I am a retired environmental protection specialist with a BA, MS, a well-used law degree, and over 40 years of work experience in the Pacific Northwest. I live in Karnewick Washington.</p> <p>On Tuesday January 31, 2023, President Biden said that climate change is a bigger threat to humanity than nuclear war.</p> <p>Governor Inslee is on record that he is committed to achieving bold, "science-based limits" on the greenhouse gas emissions that are causing our climate to change".</p> <p>Reference: https://www.governor.wa.gov/sites/default/files/ClimateBrief-Dec2020.pdf</p> <p>The key question is whether the Horse Heaven Hills Project, and other projects like it, will be able to do anything at all to protect us from climate change.</p> <p>What does the best science really tell us? How are we going to identify good projects which can truly satisfy the needs identified from bad ones which cannot?</p> <p>I respectfully offer the following Recommended Action:</p> <p>EFSEC, with concurrence of the Governor and in cooperation with the tribes and local counties and cities, should convene a blue-ribbon commission (or a panel or committee) of exceptional people who are appointed to independently investigate, study and analyze the difficult and complex problems being caused by climate change, global warming and energy generation in Washington and the underlying purposes and premises for projects like the Horse Heaven Hills Project.</p> <p>The members of this blue-ribbon commission should be selected using a best and brightest approach to assure independence from political influence or authority.</p> <p>The commission should be charged with utilizing their expertise and experience to consider and evaluate the "science-based limits" and then issue scientific, programmatic and project-specific findings and recommendations which can then be used by decision-makers to take action on energy facility projects and proposals such as the Horse Heaven Hills Wind and Solar Project.</p> <p>The blue-ribbon commission should be charged with identifying, describing and evaluating the validity of the Purpose, Need, and Underlying Premises in energy projects to assure they can help achieve climate change goals and objectives.</p> <p>Their review should also evaluate the project proposals and the alternatives proposed by the Horse Heaven Hills Project, to assure they that can meet the goals and objectives of the policies and requirements of the State of Washington.</p> <p>The blue-ribbon commission should make specific recommendations regarding the need for the projects, the validity of the underlying purpose and need, the project components and their associated geographic locations, and an evaluation of whether key component can potentially be eliminated or relocated to reduce the significant impacts to people and the environment.</p> <p>No formal action should be taken on the Horse Heaven Hills Project until the findings and recommendations regarding the validity of the underlying purpose and need for the project, are provided by the blue-ribbon commission.</p> <p>This commission should prepare a draft report, give public presentations, take public comments, and then finalize its findings and conclusions and present recommendations for consideration by the Administration, the Legislature, as well as interested federal and state, tribal, and local government agencies, Tribal governments, other stakeholders, and the public.</p>	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107137	I support Horse Haven Clean Energy Center permitting.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
mhue	1107175	<p>Decide Locally is Against the Wind Farm installation proposed on HHH. The DEIS comments are attached and convinces us more that this is the wrong location for a Wind Farm and the project needs to be withdrawn and the energy facility needs to find a new county. The DEIS was flawed, difficult to read and poorly marked. Pages printed off on charts deleted portions off after getting it printed.</p> <p>The applicant does not want to commit themselves with over 5000 "would" and 175 "will" seems like a lot of information is missing and inadequate. The DEIS left no buffers for wildlife corridor, shrub-steppe, distance for adverse health issue and no regard to the vast expensive diversified agriculture that will be severely impacted .</p> <p>We are against this project in Benton County</p> <p>Margaret Hue Decide Locally</p>	General - Question for EFSEC	<p>In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were also available for public review at 8 local libraries (including 6 different branches of Mid-Columbia Libraries) on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.</p> <p>Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances.-On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public.-On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.-On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.-The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. <p>The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies.</p> <p>Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility. Several opportunities were given to the stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the Project and Draft EIS.</p>	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	<p>The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p>	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Information, including data provided in Figure 3.5-1, describes existing conditions and did not include buffers recommended as part of mitigation measures described in Section 4.6 of the EIS. Further, some data reviewed, such as the location of ferruginous hawk nests, is confidential and therefore could not be visually rendered onto figures. Wildlife corridors are shown on Figure 3.6-2. Biologists and experts from WDFW were consulted during the development of the dEIS including identification of sensitive areas.</p> <p>Figures and data provided in Chapter 3 are specific to existing conditions. Mitigation measures and buffers are described in Chapter 4, including those recommended for wildlife. Wildlife corridors are shown on Figure 3.6-2. The Pacific flyway is a broad area that supports bird migration from South America to the Artic. It covers a large portion of Washington State, as such, displaying on a map specific to the Project would not provide useful information.</p> <p>Mitigation measures proposed for wildlife have been included in Section 4.6 of the EIS.</p>	4.6	n/a
			Water Resources	<p>The EIS provides a discussion of the existing conditions for water resources and identifies their occurrence in section 3.4, including for runoff/absorption, ground water, and other water sources. The evaluation of project impacts, Applicant commitments, and proposed mitigation measures are provided in Section 4.4 for water resources. The EIS includes Watersheds and Water Resources in the Project Lease Boundary in Figure 3.4-1, including surface water in Badger Canyon and Coyote Canyon. Water for the Project would be obtained from an off-site supplier and no groundwater wells would be used for the site. Impacts to groundwater wells from the Project are not anticipated.</p> <p>The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. The proposed Project results in limited increases in impermeable surfaces in the Lease Boundary and impacts to increase in surface water run off, including to Amon Creek are rated as low magnitude, short-term duration for temporary disturbance and long-term duration for permanent disturbance, unavoidable, and confined spatial scale. Impacts to soil erosion are provided in Section 4.2 and do not include natural erosion processes, only those directly related to impacts from the Project.</p>	Section 3.4 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Vegetation	<p>Habitat types and subtypes in the Lease Boundary are identified and described in Section 3.5.2 of the EIS. Impacts of the Project to habitat types are identified and evaluated in Section 4.5 with a summary in Tables 4.5.12a to 4.5.12c. Applicant commitments and identified mitigation measures are provided in 4.5.2.4. There are no requirements under the Act that requires buffers around the identified habitat types and subtypes that are impacted by the proposed Project. Where impacts were identified, mitigation offset ratios for habitat types and subtypes followed the WDFW Wind Powe Guidelines (2009), including increased offset for rabbitbrush shrubland recognizing this is an early seral shrub-steppe community. The offset ratios for habitat impacts were agreed upon with WDFW and are provided in Table 4.5.11. Plants that occur within the Lease Boundary at existing conditions are identified and described in Section 3.5, including invasive plants and noxious weeds and special status plant species. An evaluation of Project impacts on plants is provided in Section 4.5 with a summary in Tables 4.5.12a to 4.5.12c. Applicant commitments and identified mitigation measures are provided in 4.5.2.4.</p> <p>Section 1 (d) of WAC 197-11-444 refers to plants and animals as elements of the natural environment, which does not include agricultural crops, cultivated plants, or landscape plants. Rather agricultural crops falls under WAC 197-11-444 (2) Built Environment (b) Land and Shoreline Use (vi) Agricultural Crops. However, agricultural land within the Lease Boundary is provided in Section 3.5.2 as a habitat type. Within the Vegetation Area of Analysis (2 mile buffer around the Lease Boundary) National Land Cover Data was used to identify habitat types, which includes areas identified as cultivated crops and pasture/hay. For wildlife habitat these areas are not required for habitat offsetting based on the offset ratios in WDFW Wind Power Guidelines (2009) and as agreed by WDFW.</p>	Section 3.5.2, 4.5, 4.5.2.4, Tables 4.5.12a to 4.5.12c, Table 4.5.11	n/a
			Recreation	<p>1) and 2) The micrositing corridor is primarily sited on Private land that is not typically used for hunting.</p>	4.12	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	<p>An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS. Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions. For aspects of the Project's design that may not be in alignment with Benton County Code 11.17.070 Growth Management Act Agricultural District or the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (Applicant).</p>	4.8.2	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	<p>Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS.</p>	n/a	n/a
			Earth Resources	<p>See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.</p>	4.2	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	<p>Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.</p>	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	<p>The location of KOP 10 has been corrected on the maps and on the associated visual simulation. Additional viewpoints and visual simulations have been included in the Final EIS including an additional KOP in Benton City. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals have been proposed by the Applicant with additional turbine removals to be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.</p>	4.10	Corrected the location of KOP 10 on mapping and on visual simulation. New simulations included in updated analysis. Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the Final EIS
			Socioeconomics	<p>The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.</p>	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107183	We are very concerned about this proposed wind farm! We cannot see any value to our community in this proposal and in fact see only negative benefits for our entire community and specifically the many homeowners nearby! This would have a very negative impact on the value of homes nearby and create absolutely nothing positive for our community. Wind farms that serve to provide what little electricity can be produced for areas outside our community should not be placed here! We have plenty of hydro power and want this project to be stopped immediately.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107213	I am opposed to the wind turbine project at Horse Heaven Hills.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107214	1. The Wind Turbine - Solar Panel - Storage Battery system is an excellent approach for adding to electricity supply especially surge capacity 2. Wind Turbine blades can & amp; are being recycled in US and other countries 3. Agrivoltaics projects should be offered and supporting funding for demonstrations and/or project sought from USDOE National Renewable Energy Laboratory 4. Revenue shared with participating farmers will be very beneficial in managing revenue instability from impacts of market pricing and weather related crop damage. 5. Discuss with FAA their rule for not painting half a wind turbine blade black to minimize bird loss. Kathryn M Tominey, retired research scientist and former farm girl.	Wildlife and Habitat	Painted turbine blades are currently prohibited by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107223	(Text of comments in uploaded pdf) Comments on Draft EIS for the Horse Heaven Wind, Solar and Battery Storage Project Laure Ness Patrick Paulson The Draft EIS fails to meet the requirements of WAC 197-11-440, which requires the DEIS to •include "[r]easonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." (WAC 197-11-440.5.b) •"Describe the principal features of the environment that would be affected, or created, by the alternatives including the proposal under consideration." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.i) •"Describe and discuss significant impacts that will narrow the range or degree of beneficial uses of the environment..." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.ii), and •"Clearly indicate those mitigation measures ... that could be implemented or might be required..." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.iii) In our comments below we discuss environmental features, impacts, and mitigations the DEIS fails to address. Please note that we agree and support all comments submitted on 1/31/2023 by Trina Bayard, Director of Conservation, Washington Audubon for the Horse Heaven Hills DEIS. We also agree with the comments submitted by Debbie Berkowitz. 1. Failure to provide reasonable alternatives as required by the EIS framework WAC 197-11-440.5.b requires that alternatives presented in the DEIS "shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation" [our emphasis]. The DEIS states (p. 4-155): ... It is predicted that Turbine Option 1 would result in a higher risk of collisions for small birds and raptors than Option 2 (GAL 2022: Appendix 4.6-1). Waterfowl may be more susceptible to collisions with the taller turbines in Option 2; however, raptors are reported to have higher exposure indices for shorter turbines than taller turbines and therefore are considered to be more susceptible to collisions with turbines under Option 1.... And (p. 4-173): The exposure index for ferruginous hawks is approximately 1.3 times greater for Turbine Option 1 (GE 3.03-MW) than for the other three turbine technologies ... In addition, Option 1 also requires a larger number of turbines, and therefore, it is expected that this option would result in a greater collision risk for ferruginous hawks ... Options 1 and 2 are also stated to have different potential impacts on Golden Eagles (p. 4-174), Great Blue Heron (p. 4-175), and other special status bird species. Since Options 1 and 2 have different environmental costs, they should be presented as Alternatives as required by WAC 197-11-440.5.b. 2. Failure to "describe the principal features of the environment that would be affected ..." by the alternatives including the proposal under consideration." In this section we discuss environmental features not identified by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.i. WAC 197-11-444.1.d identifies "Plants and animals" as a feature of the environment to be considered by an EIS. This feature includes: (i) Habitat for and numbers or diversity of species of plants, fish, or other wildlife; (ii) Unique species; and (iii) Fish or wildlife migration routes. 2.1 Vegetation and failure to consider PHS Priority Features The VAA includes the Lease Boundary and a 2-mile buffer surrounding the boundary. The Lease Boundary includes the Wind Energy Micrositing Corridor (except portions of the corridor crossing an interstate highway) and the Solar Siting Areas. The DEIS fails to identify some PHS areas within the VAA such as the cliffs on Chandler Butte and many cliffs throughout the east west ridgeline of the project. Figure 1. Cliffs in VAA. In the discussion of priority habitats (Section 3.5.2.4) the DEIS notes that PHS may be a "particular habitat feature (e.g., cliffs, talus slopes)". The DEIS statement that "Shrub-steppe and Eastside Steppe Priority Habitats are presently limited in the ... surrounding VAA" is without basis since no field surveys were completed in the VAA outside of the Lease Boundary (Sect. 3.5.2.2). Due to lack of field studies, PHS features such as cliff/sand talus slopes within the VAA were not identified. For example, the topographical map on p. 3-55 of the DEIS (see Figure 1) clearly shows cliffs (defined as a cliff "Greater than 7.6 meters (25 feet) high and occurring below 1524 meters (5000 feet)". PHS List p. 287) within the VAA. The topo lines show 10 foot changes in elevation. 3 topo lines would indicate a cliff. Error! Reference source not found. Indicates cliffs just west of the radio facilities on Chandler Butte, within the VAA. Our personal observations show the presence of the Priority feature of Talus Slopes (PHS List p. 289) at the base of basal cliffs within the VAA. Talus PHS features may contain PHS species and provide roosting habitat for bats. Examples of the talus slopes with their acreage are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3. These are two examples of the many talus slope within the VAA. Figure 2. Talus slope in VAA adjacent to Lease Boundary. Figure 3. 2nd example of talus slope adjacent to Lease Boundary. Other examples of PHS within the VAA not identified by the DEIS include: •Freshwater Emergent Wetland and Riverine habitats along Yakima River near Benton City. •Freshwater Emergent Wetland, Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland, and Riverine habitats along Columbia River on eastern edge of the VAA. 2.2 Wildlife and Habitat The DEIS (p. 3-39) states "Field surveys in the Wind Energy Micrositing Corridor and Solar Siting Areas mapped two intermittent streams and 31 ephemeral stream channels, all of which are considered waters of the state." The DEIS fails, however, to include these waters of the state as wildlife habitat. The Benton County Code states that "Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas ... include ... Waters of the state, including lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, inland waters, underground waters, salt waters, and all other surface waters and watercourses within the jurisdiction of the State of Washington" (BCC 15.08.070(a.22.v)). 3. Failure to "Describe and discuss significant impacts that will narrow the range or degree of beneficial uses of the environment or pose long term risks to ... the environment, such as storage, handling, or disposal of toxic or hazardous material" In this section we discuss impacts environmental features not analyzed by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.ii. 3.1 Vegetation The DEIS states that Agricultural land, Shrub/scrub, and grassland within the VAA may be affected by the proposal. Shrub/scrub habitat includes Dwarf shrub-steppe, Rabbitbrush shrubland, Sagebrush shrub-steppe, and Unclassified shrubland. The grasslands include Eastside grassland, non-native grassland, planted grassland, and unclassified grassland. In addition, the VAA may contain areas of Deciduous Forest, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands, Evergreen Forest, Open Water, and Woody Wetland (pp. 3-68 to 3-69). In addition, the DEIS notes the potential of Woven Spore Lichen occurrences within the VAA. No analysis is given in the DEIS for impacts to the following environmental features identified in Section 3 of the DEIS: Deciduous Forest, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands, Evergreen Forest, Open Water, and Woody Wetland. The analysis does not include PHS and other features that exist in the VAA outside of the Lease Boundary (such as the cliffs and talus slopes on Chandler Butte). 3.2 Wildlife and Habitat 3.2.1 Wildlife Habitat The impacts to the wildlife habitat consisting of the ephemeral streams and intermittent identified on p. 3-39 of the DEIS are not analyzed. Table 3.4-1 of the DEIS identifies 40 different 'interactions' between this habitat and the Wind Power Micrositing Corridors and Solar Siting Areas. Levick, et. al (2008) is a one source of the habitat function and values of this habitat that the proposed action may impact. The DEIS should include analyses of these impacts. In addition to the habitat described as vegetation (DEIS Section 3.5), the DEIS identifies additional wildlife habitat in section 3.6.2.1. The additional habitat includes a wetland. As discussed above, wildlife habitat outside the Lease Boundary was not physically surveyed and so habitat features within the VAA have not been identified or analyzed for impacts as required SEPA. These habitats include Freshwater Emergent Wetland, Riverine, and Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland. 3.2.2 Birds 3.2.2.1Impacts from Wind Turbine Operation The DEIS states (p. 4-156) that "In a synthesis of literature, Arnett et al. (2007) reported that bird mortalities are typically evenly distributed between nocturnally migrating passerines and resident birds." However, the cited literature instead states (p. 18) Based on data from the 14 studies, it appears that approximately half the reported fatalities at new generation wind power facilities are nocturnally migrating birds, primarily passerines, and the other half are resident birds in the area. This is different from being "evenly distributed", since nocturnally migrating birds are only present during migration. This implies that the impact of turbines is significantly higher for migrating birds than it is for resident species.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to ephemeral and intermittent streams are discussed in Section 4.4 of the EIS. The wetland located within the Lease Boundary is not within the temporary or permanent disturbance areas. The magnitude of impacts to watercourses was rated as negligible to low magnitude. Water obligate species, such as amphibians, were not recorded in the lease boundary. As such, the potential changes to watercourses were not carried through the wildlife assessment. The wetland identified in Section 3.6.2.1 is outside of the temporary and permanent loss and is not expected to be impacted. Impacts to watercourses are discussed in Section 4.4, which concludes negligible to low magnitude impacts to this resource. Aquatic obligate species have not been recorded in the Lease Boundary. As such, the analysis of impacts to these features was contained in Section 4.4 The EIS assesses the Project's potential impacts to bird and bat fatality in Section 4.6.2.2 and notes that the Project is expected to result in mortality to birds and bats. To mitigate impacts from mortality, the EIS proposes mitigation measures Wild-1, which would require the applicant to conduct two years of operational mortality monitoring and apply the results to developing additional mitigation measures. Wild-1 will be updated to provide additional clarity. There is limited data available regarding the impact of solar facilities on wildlife, including birds. As such, the potential impacts from the Project were extrapolated from published data from other locations. The Applicant would be required to conduct post-construction mortality surveys, which are not limited to the wind component of the Project. The results would be used for adaptive management by applying additional mitigation where the results of monitoring suggest an unexpected impact to avifauna. The impacts to special status species is included in Section 4.6.2.4 and the impact of solar facilities on special status species are analyzed in 4.6.2.6. These sections will be reviewed in the Final EIS and reference to mortality with solar arrays will be included where appropriate. Due to the lack of data regarding burrowing owl habitat use, the EIS includes mitigation measure Spec-4 requires that the Applicant conduct burrowing owl surveys prior to construction and use the results of these surveys to inform the final project layout. This mitigation measure requires the Applicant to avoid and mitigate impacts to burrowing owl burrows, if recorded. The DEIS describes mapped prairie falcon habitat in Section 3.6 and the potential impact on nesting in Section 4.6. Spec-8 requires the Applicant to conduct surveys for prairie falcon nests and apply buffers recommended by WDFW (Larsen et al 2004). The definition of magnitude is provided in Table 4.6-2. The Operation of the project is predicted to have a Medium magnitude impact on sagebrush sparrow (See Table 4.6-11b) as operation is predicted to result changes to the population over shorter or longer periods of time; however, are not expected to exceed the resiliency or adaptability of the population. This analysis was based on current information on sagebrush sparrow population declines, threats, and impacts of the Project. Painting turbine blades was considered; however, current FAA regulations do not allow this practice. Wild-1 and several species specific mitigation measures require the Applicant to monitor wildlife mortality and apply additional mitigation measures where mortality thresholds are exceeded. Wild-1 will be updated to provide additional clarity.	4.4, 4.6.2.2, 4.6.2.4, 4.6.2.5, Table 4.6-2	These sections will be reviewed in the Final EIS and reference to mortality with solar arrays will be included where appropriate; Wild-1 update to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
			Vegetation	The purpose of the of the VAA is to understand over a broader area what the occurrence and distribution of habitat is to better understand the extent of these ecosystems on the landscape. The VAA uses habitat data from the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) to map habitats within the VAA. One category within the VAA is "barren land" and this includes talus, scarp, etc. The data from NLCD does not specifically identify Priority Habitats but is meant to help understand the proportional area of shrubland and grassland habitats at a broader scale, as these are impacted by the Project. The NLCD is not meant to replace the habitat mapping provided by the Applicant. For specific impacts within the Lease Boundary the habitat mapping produced by the Applicant which includes a combination of imagery interpretation and ground field surveys provides a more accurate and detailed representation of the extent and occurrence of habitats, including priority habitats. No cliffs were identified within the Project Lease Boundary. The Priority Habitat database maintained by WDFW was also queried and no cliffs were identified in the Project Lease Boundary (Section 3.5.2.4). As no impacts are anticipated to occur to cliff ecosystems from the Project, no further assessment was made. Freshwater emergent wetland and riverine habitats along the Yakima River near Benton City occur within the VAA but are not anticipated to be impacted by the Project. Therefore, no further assessment was conducted. Freshwater emergent wetland, freshwater forested/shrub wetland, and riverine habitats along the Columbia River on the easter edge of the VAA is not anticipated to be impacted by the Project and no further assessment was conducted.	Section 3.5 and 4.5	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>The DEIS references the same source to state "Mortalities occur year-round, peaking from April to October," but neglects to note the source states on the same page that For example, peak passerine ... during fall migration at Stataline in Washington and Oregon [citing (Erickson et al. 2004)].</p> <p>Given the proximity of Stataline Wind Farm to the project site, this indicates potential high impacts to birds during fall migration. Also on the same page this source states "There is some concern that nocturnal migrating passerines may be compressed near the surface when cloud ceilings are low or when flying over high mountain ridges, increasing the risk of collisions with turbines." This indicates the need for additional monitoring of nocturnal migration and possibly curtailment during periods of high migration.</p> <p>3.2.2.2Impacts of Solar Array Operation</p> <p>The DEIS states (p. 4-158) [our emphasis]:</p> <p>Kosciuch et al. (2020) reported taxonomic variability in the bird fatalities observed at different solar sites; however, mourning doves (Zenaida macroura), horned larks, and western meadowlarks (Sturnella neglecta) were reported at all sites. Mortalities of water-associated birds and water obligates occurred at most solar sites in the Sonoran and Mojave Deserts Bird Conservation Region but were less common in the Great Basin and Coastal California Bird Conservation Regions. Further, most of these fatalities involved ground-dwelling species (three out of four most common species detected) and were detected during the fall...</p> <p>The DEIS fails to mention that the cited source includes data from only one facility located in the Great Basin and 2 facilities in Coastal California while the southwestern region contains data from ten facilities. It is misleading to conclude from this study that mortality of water-associated birds and water obligates are unlikely at the project site. (We're also annoyed that the DEIS downplays the importance of "fatalities involved ground-dwelling species" and fatalities "detected during the fall").</p> <p>3.3 Failure to discuss significant impacts on "Unique species"</p> <p>3.3.1 Impact of Solar Arrays on Special Status Bird Species not analyzed</p> <p>None of the analyses of impacts to special status bird species (except for a casual mention for Tundra Swan) analyze the effect of mortality from Solar Arrays that was indicated by the DEIS on p. 4-158 citing Kosciuch et al. (2020). This study found Solar Arrays were associated with an "average annual fatality estimate of known and unknown cause per MW at [solar] facilities in desert [Bird Conservation Regions] to be 1.82 birds/MW/year".</p> <p>3.3.2 Burrowing Owl</p> <p>The DEIS (p. 4-171) states "Surveys for burrowing owls were not conducted as part of the [Application for Site Certification]; therefore, it is possible that other burrows may exist within the Lease Boundary." Due to lack of field surveys, Burrowing owls were not considered during the siting of project components so the impact of the project on Burrowing Owls cannot be determined. The DEIS fails to meet the requirement to discuss significant impacts to Burrowing Owls as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.i.</p> <p>3.3.3 Prairie Falcon</p> <p>The DEIS (p. 4-177) states "PHS data report 12 occurrences of prairie falcon within 2 miles of the Lease Boundary, though none within the Lease Boundary (WDFW 2022a). Nine of the occurrences are nest sites." The DEIS does not report, however, that the Micrositing Corridors are adjacent to documented Prairie Falcon Breeding areas in cliffs at the Lease Boundary. Nor does the DEIS note these same corridors will directly impact likely Prairie Falcon foraging areas at this same location (See Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6). The impact to Prairie Falcon should be rated as Unavoidable, High, and Local for these Micrositing corridors. Construction within the corridors adjacent to Prairie Falcon breeding areas should only occur outside of breeding season.</p> <p>Figure 4: Sightings of Prairie Falcon near Cliffs adjacent to Lease Boundary.</p> <p>Figure 5: Portion of DEIS Figure 3.5-1 showing Micrositing corridors encroaching on foraging habitat near Prairie Falcon nesting habitat.</p> <p>Figure 6: "PHS on the Web" indicates multiple breeding areas and nests for Prairie Falcon in the same area.</p> <p>3.3.4 Sagebrush Sparrow</p> <p>The DEIS predicts that Micrositing Corridor Construction will "have a low-magnitude impact on sagebrush sparrows that is constant and unavoidable for habitat loss". Figure 7 shows the Micrositing corridors will fragment a portion of the largest expanse of shrubsteppe on or adjacent to the Lease Boundary. This will result in a high-magnitude impact on Sagebrush Sparrow that is constant and unavoidable for the proposed action.</p> <p>Figure 7: Micrositing Corridor Fragments Largest Expanse of Shrubsteppe in the Vicinity. Extracted from DEIS Figure 3.5-1, with added rectangle showing where corridor is located on shrubsteppe.</p> <p>4. Failure to "Clearly indicate those mitigation measures (not described in the previous section as part of the proposal or alternatives), if any, that could be implemented or might be required, as well as those, if any, that agencies or applicants are committed to implement," along with the environmental benefits of the mitigation measures for birds and bats</p> <p>In this section we discuss mitigation measures not considered by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.iii.</p> <p>Arnett et. al (2007) (cited by DEIS in section 4.6) indicates current research on the effects of wind turbine curtailment to prevent collisions. The source also discusses current research on painting or coating blades to alert birds/bats of the turbine and ultrasonic devices to alert bats. The mitigations for the project should include monitoring of these research and implementation of any practices or techniques that is indicated to reduce impacts to birds and bats.</p>	Water Resources	Intermittent and ephemeral streams within the Project Lease Boundary identified during field surveys are discussed in Section 3.4 and 4.4 Water Resources. The streams in the Project Lease Boundary are not known to support fish and are dry for most of the year. Mitigation measures applied for Water would reduce impacts to downstream fish habitat (e.g., erosion and sediment control BMPs).	Section 3.4 and 4.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
patrick-paulson-richland	1107239	We've already submitted these comments, but I wasn't logged in and so am unsure if they were received. Here's the text of the uploaded pdf. Comments on Draft EIS for the Horse Heaven Wind, Solar and Battery Storage Project Laurie Ness Patrick Paulson The Draft EIS fails to meet the requirements of WAC 197-11-440, which requires the DEIS to •Include "[r]easonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." (WAC 197-11-440.5.b) •"Describe the principal features of the environment that would be affected, or created, by the alternatives including the proposal under consideration." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.i) •"Describe and discuss significant impacts that will narrow the range or degree of beneficial uses of the environment..." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.ii), and •"Clearly indicate those mitigation measures ... that could be implemented or might be required..." (WAC 197-11-440.6.c.iii) In our comments below we discuss environmental features, impacts, and mitigations the DEIS fails to address. Please note that we agree and support all comments submitted on 1/31/2023 by Trina Bayard, Director of Conservation, Washington Audubon for the Horse Heaven Hills DEIS. We also agree with the comments submitted by Debbie Berkowitz. 1. Failure to provide reasonable alternatives as required by the EIS framework WAC 197-11-440.5.b requires that alternatives presented in the DEIS "shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation" [our emphasis]. The DEIS states (p. 4-95): ...It is predicted that Turbine Option 1 would result in a higher risk of collisions for small birds and raptors than Option 2 (GAL 2022; Appendix 4.6-1). Waterfowl may be more susceptible to collisions with the taller turbines in Option 2; however, raptors are reported to have higher exposure indices for shorter turbines than taller turbines and therefore are considered to be more susceptible to collisions with turbines under Option 1.... And (p. 4-173): The exposure index for ferruginous hawks is approximately 1.3 times greater for Turbine Option 1 (GE 3.03-MW) than for the other three turbine technologies ... In addition, Option 1 also requires a larger number of turbines, and therefore, it is expected that this option would result in a greater collision risk for ferruginous hawks ... Options 1 and 2 are also stated to have different potential impacts on Golden Eagles (p. 4-174), Great Blue Heron (p. 4-175), and other special status bird species. Since Options 1 and 2 have different environmental costs, they should be presented as Alternatives as required by WAC 197-11-440.5.b. 2. Failure to "describe the principal features of the environment that would be affected ... by the alternatives including the proposal under consideration." In this section we discuss environmental features not identified by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.i. WAC 197-11-444.1.d identifies "Plants and animals" as a feature of the environment to be considered by an EIS. This feature includes: (i) Habitat for and numbers or diversity of species of plants, fish, or other wildlife; (ii) Unique species; and (iii) Fish or wildlife migration routes. 2.1 Vegetation and failure to consider PHS Priority Features The VAA includes the Lease Boundary and a 2-mile buffer surrounding the boundary. The Lease Boundary includes the Wind Energy Micrositing Corridor (except portions of the corridor crossing an interstate highway) and the Solar Siting Areas. The DEIS fails to identify some PHS areas within the VAA such as the cliffs on Chandler Butte and many cliffs throughout the east west ridgeline of the project. Figure 1. Cliffs in VAA. In the discussion of priority habitats (Section 3.5.2.4) the DEIS notes that PHS may be a "particular habitat feature (e.g., cliffs, talus slopes)". The DEIS statement that "Shrub-steppe and Eastside Steppe Priority Habitats are presently limited in the ... surrounding VAA" is without basis since no field surveys were completed in the VAA outside of the Lease Boundary (Sect. 3.5.2.2). Due to lack of field studies, PHS features such as cliffssand talus slopes within the VAA were not identified. For example, the topographical map on p. 3-55 of the DEIS (see Figure 1) clearly shows cliffs (defined as a cliff "Greater than 7.6 meters (25 feet) high and occurring below 1524 meters (5000 feet)", PHS List p. 287) within the VAA. The topo lines show 10 foot changes in elevation, 3 topo lines would indicate a cliff. Error! Reference source not found. indicates cliffs just west of the radio facilities on Chandler Butte, within the VAA. Our personal observations show the presence of the Priority feature of Talus Slopes (PHS List p. 289) at the base of basalt cliffs within the VAA. Talus PHS features may contain PHS species and provide roosting habitat for bats. Examples of the talus slopes with their acreage are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3. These are two examples of the many talus slope within the VAA. Figure 2. Talus slope in VAA adjacent to Lease Boundary. Figure 3. 2nd example of talus slope adjacent to Lease Boundary. Other examples of PHS within the VAA not identified by the DEIS include: •Freshwater Emergent Wetland and Riverine habitats along Yakima River near Benton City. •Freshwater Emergent Wetland, Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland, and Riverine habitats along Columbia River on eastern edge of the VAA. 2.2 Wildlife and Habitat The DEIS (p. 3-39) states "Field surveys in the Wind Energy Micrositing Corridor and Solar Siting Areas mapped two intermittent streams and 31 ephemeral stream channels, all of which are considered waters of the state." The DEIS fails, however, to include these waters of the state as wildlife habitat. The Benton County Code states that "Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas ... include ... Waters of the state, including lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, inland waters, underground waters, salt waters, and all other surface waters and watercourses within the jurisdiction of the State of Washington" (BCC 15.08.070.a.22 vii). 3. Failure to "Describe and discuss significant impacts that will narrow the range or degree of beneficial uses of the environment or pose long term risks to ... the environment, such as storage, handling, or disposal of toxic or hazardous material" In this section we discuss impacts environmental features not analyzed by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.ii. 3.1 Vegetation The DEIS states that Agricultural land, Shrub/scrub, and grassland within the VAA may be affected by the proposal. Shrub/scrub habitat includes Dwarf shrub-steppe, Rabbitbrush shrubland, Sagebrush shrub-steppe, and Unclassified shrubland. The grasslands include Eastside grassland, non-native grassland, planted grassland, and unclassified grassland. In addition, the VAA may contain areas of Deciduous Forest, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands, Evergreen Forest, Open Water, and Woody Wetland (pp. 3-68 to 3-69). In addition, the DEIS notes the potential of Woven Spore Lichen occurrences within the VAA. No analysis is given in the DEIS for impacts to the following environmental features identified in Section 3 of the DEIS: Deciduous Forest, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands, Evergreen Forest, Open Water, and Woody Wetland. The analysis does not include PHS and other features that exist in the VAA outside of the Lease Boundary (such as the cliffs and talus slopes on Chandler Butte). 3.2 Wildlife and Habitat 3.2.1 Wildlife Habitat The impacts to the wildlife habitat consisting of the ephemeral streams and intermittent identified on p. 3-39 of the DEIS are not analyzed. Table 3.4-1 of the DEIS identifies 40 different 'interactions' between this habitat and the Wind Power Micrositing Corridors and Solar Siting Areas. Levick, et. al (2008) is a one source of the habitat function and values of this habitat that the proposed action may impact. The DEIS should include analyses of these impacts. In addition to the habitat described as vegetation (DEIS Section 3.5), the DEIS identifies additional wildlife habitat in section 3.6.2.1. The additional habitat includes a wetland. As discussed above, wildlife habitat outside the Lease Boundary was not physically surveyed and so habitat features within the VAA have not been identified or analyzed for impacts as required SEPA. These habitats include Freshwater Emergent Wetland, Riverine, and Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland. 3.2.2 Birds 3.2.2.1Impacts from Wind Turbine Operation The DEIS states (p. 4-156) that "In a synthesis of literature, Arnett et al. (2007) reported that bird mortalities are typically evenly distributed between nocturnally migrating passerines and resident birds." However, the cited literature instead states (p. 18) Based on data from the 14 studies, it appears that approximately half the reported fatalities at new generation wind power facilities are nocturnally migrating birds, primarily passerines, and the other half are resident birds in the area. This is different from being "evenly distributed", since nocturnally migrating birds are only present during migration. This implies that the impact of turbines is significantly higher for migrating birds than it is for resident species. The DEIS references the same source to state "Mortalities occur year-round, peaking from April to October," but neglects to note the source states on the same page that For example, peak passerine ... during fall migration at Stateline in Washington and Oregon [citing (Erickson et al. 2004)]. Given the proximity of Stateline Wind Farm to the project site, this indicates potential high impacts to birds during fall migration. Also on the same page this source states "There is some concern that nocturnal migrating passerines may be compressed near the surface when cloud ceilings are low or when flying over high mountain ridges, increasing the risk of collisions with turbines." This indicates the need for additional monitoring of nocturnal migration and possibly curtailment during periods of high migration. 3.2.2.2Impacts of Solar Array Operation The DEIS states (p. 4-158) [our emphasis]: Kosciuch et al. (2020) reported taxonomic variability in the bird fatalities observed at different solar sites; however, mourning doves (Zenaida macroura), horned larks, and western meadowlarks (Sturnella neglecta) were reported at all sites. Mortalities of water-associated birds and water obligates occurred at most solar sites in the Sonoran and Mojave Deserts Bird Conservation Region but were less common in the Great Basin and Coastal California Bird Conservation Regions. Further, most of these fatalities involved ground-dwelling species (three out of four most common species detected) and were detected during the fall... The DEIS fails to mention that the cited source includes data from only one facility located in the Great Basin and 2 facilities in Coastal California while the southwestern region contains data from ten facilities. It is misleading to conclude from this study that mortality of water-associated birds and water obligates are unlikely at the project site.	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	See response to 1107223	n/a	n/a
			Vegetation	The purpose of the of the VAA is to understand over a broader area what the occurrence and distribution of habitat is to better understand the extent of these ecosystems on the landscape. The VAA uses habitat data from the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) to map habitats within the VAA. One category within the VAA is "barren land" and this includes talus, scarps, etc. The data from NLCD does not specifically identify Priority Habitats but is meant to help understand the proportional area of shrubland and grassland habitats at a broader scale, as these are impacted by the Project. The NLCD is not meant to replace the habitat mapping provided by the Applicant. For specific impacts within the Lease Boundary the habitat mapping produced by the Applicant which includes a combination of imagery interpretation and ground field surveys provides a more accurate and detailed representation of the extent and occurrence of habitats, including priority habitats. No cliffs were identified within the Project Lease Boundary. The Priority Habitat database maintained by WDFW was also queried and no cliffs were identified in the Project Lease Boundary (Section 3.5.2.4). As no impacts are anticipated to occur to cliff ecosystems from the Project, no further assessment was made. Freshwater emergent wetland and riverine habitats along the Yakima River near Benton City occur within the VAA but are not anticipated to be impacted by the Project. Therefore, no further assessment was conducted. Freshwater emergent wetland, freshwater forested/shrub wetland, and riverine habitats along the Columbia River on the easter edge of the VAA is not anticipated to be impacted by the Project and no further assessment was conducted.	Section 3.5 and 4.5	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>(We're also annoyed that the DEIS downplays the importance of "fatalities involved ground-dwelling species" and fatalities "detected during the fall").</p> <p>3.3 Failure to discuss significant impacts on "Unique species"</p> <p>3.3.1 Impact of Solar Arrays on Special Status Bird Species not analyzed</p> <p>None of the analyses of impacts to special status bird species (except for a casual mention for Tundra Swan) analyze the effect of mortality from Solar Arrays that was indicated by the DEIS on p. 4-158 citing Kosciuch et al. (2020). This study found Solar Arrays were associated with an "average annual fatality estimate of known and unknown cause per MW at [solar] facilities in desert [Bird Conservation Regions] to be 1.82 birds/MW/year".</p> <p>3.3.2 Burrowing Owl</p> <p>The DEIS (p. 4-171) states "Surveys for burrowing owls were not conducted as part of the [Application for Site Certification]; therefore, it is possible that other burrows may exist within the Lease Boundary." Due to lack of field surveys, Burrowing owls were not considered during the siting of project components so the impact of the project on Burrowing Owls cannot be determined. The DEIS fails to meet the requirement to discuss significant impacts to Burrowing Owls as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.ii.</p> <p>3.3.3 Prairie Falcon</p> <p>The DEIS (p. 4-177) states "PHS data report 12 occurrences of prairie falcon within 2 miles of the Lease Boundary, though none within the Lease Boundary (WDFW 2022a). Nine of the occurrences are nest sites." The DEIS does not report, however, that the Micrositing Corridors are adjacent to documented Prairie Falcon Breeding areas in cliffs at the Lease Boundary. Nor does the DEIS note these same corridors will directly impact likely Prairie Falcon foraging areas at this same location (See Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6). The impact to Prairie Falcon should be rated as Unavoidable, High, and Local for these Micrositing corridors. Construction within the corridors adjacent to Prairie Falcon breeding areas should only occur outside of breeding season.</p> <p>Figure 4. Sightings of Prairie Falcon near Cliffs adjacent to Lease Boundary.</p> <p>Figure 5. Portion of DEIS Figure 3.5-1 showing Micrositing corridors encroaching on foraging habitat near Prairie Falcon nesting habitat.</p> <p>Figure 6. "PHS on the Web" indicates multiple breeding areas and nests for Prairie Falcon in the same area.</p> <p>3.3.4 Sagebrush Sparrow</p> <p>The DEIS predicts that Micrositing Corridor Construction will "have a low-magnitude impact on sagebrush sparrows that is constant and unavoidable for habitat loss". Figure 7 shows the Micrositing corridors will fragment a portion of the largest expanse of shrubsteppe on or adjacent to the Lease Boundary. This will result in a high-magnitude impact on Sagebrush Sparrow that is constant and unavoidable for the proposed action.</p> <p>Figure 7. Micrositing Corridor Fragments Largest Expanse of Shrubsteppe in the Vicinity. Extracted from DEIS Figure 3.5-1, with added rectangle showing where corridor is located on shrubsteppe.</p> <p>4. Failure to "Clearly indicate those mitigation measures (not described in the previous section as part of the proposal or alternatives), if any, that could be implemented or might be required, as well as those, if any, that agencies or applicants are committed to implement," along with the environmental benefits of the mitigation measures for birds and bats</p> <p>In this section we discuss mitigation measures not considered by the DEIS as required by WAC 197-11-440.6.c.iii.</p> <p>Arnett et. al (2007) (cited by DEIS in section 4.6) indicates current research on the effects of wind turbine curtailment to prevent collisions. The source also discusses current research on painting or coating blades to alert birds/bats of the turbine and ultrasonic devices to alert bats. The mitigations for the project should include monitoring of these research and implementation of any practices or techniques that is indicated to reduce impacts to birds and bats.</p>	Water Resources	Intermittent and ephemeral streams within the Project Lease Boundary identified during field surveys are discussed in Section 3.4 and 4.4 Water Resources.	Section 3.4 and 4.4	n/a
Anonymous User	1107245	Not in favor of the wind turbines. I live in badger canyon off goose gap rd.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107259	If we don't do this, we will set our extinction.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107310	Invest in clean energy. It's time for change. Let's clean up our mess and make drastic improvements. I'm In support of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107326	Please do not place these windmills at the Horse Heaven Hills. The footprint is too broad, the number of windmills is too many, and they will be too tall. We already have plenty of windmills in the Tri-Cities region. I suggest placing them closer to where the power will be used.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107329	<p>Comments on the Draft EIS for the Horse Haven Wind Farm</p> <p>COMMENT 1</p> <p>Richland residents that lived in this area during the initial stages of the Manhattan Project often mentioned the very high winds that were referred to as the termination winds. I moved to the Tri Cities in 1970. During the fall and spring seasons of 1970 to about 1985 there were often very high winds that would last for several days. However, because of climate change, the winds in this area have become much less in intensity and frequency. The trend is that the winds in the Tri Cities area are continuing to diminish with time. For this reason, the subject EIS should address the issue of climate change and recognize that at some point in time there may not be sufficient wind in the Tri Cities area to power the wind turbines. Because of climate change, the proposed project may not be viable.</p> <p>COMMENT 2</p> <p>It has been said that the cost of one wind turbine is \$20 million. This cost is not a life-cycle cost. It does not include such items as project site preparation, maintenance, repair, end of life disposal, recycling of the used hardware and equipment, etc. Therefore, the life-cycle cost of the proposed Horse Haven Wind Farm Project should be compared to the cost associated with other alternative green energy sources such a nuclear energy. The results of such a cost analysis may reveal that an alternative energy source is more desirable.</p> <p>COMMENT 3</p> <p>It has been stated that wind turbines are built in China. The energy source for production of wind turbines in China is obtained from coal powered generation plants. Therefore, if the wind turbines for the proposed Horse Haven Wind Farm Project are built and fabricated in China, the contamination to the atmosphere resulting from coal powered generation must be assessed and evaluated to determine the impact to the environment.</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
DBerkowitz	1107350	I previously submitted a comment (uploaded a document), but wasn't registered so didn't get a confirmation email. I have now registered and am resubmitting the same document.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	See response to 1106768	n/a	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS provides an assessment of each project component individually (each solar field and the micrositing corridor) and for the comprehensive project considering all project component together. For vegetation including priority habitats and special status plant species, the assessment is provided in Section 4.5. Table 4.5-12a, 4.5-12b, and 4.5-12c show how the ratings for individual project components and the comprehensive project. Permanent disturbance of the east solar field and the comprehensive project were rated as high magnitude due to permanent impacts to priority habitat. While no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified, priority habitat was identified as a cumulative impact in Section 5.2.2. Details of specific Applicant commitments and identified mitigation proposed by EFSEC are provided in Section 4.5.2.4. One wetland was identified within the Project Lease Boundary, which is located 240 ft west of the micrositing corridor. This is greater than the required buffer distance of 40 ft by Benton County. The infrastructure sited near the wetland is a 240 volt transmission line. Other Project infrastructure is sited approximately 0.4 miles west of the wetland at the nearest point. Proposed mitigation include a wetland specific Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan for work near the wetland (W-6). Noxious weeds and other invasive plants, including cheatgrass are already present within the Project lease boundary including within Priority Habitat areas. A description of some of the existing stressors on Priority Habitat is provided in Table 3.4-5. The Eastside interior grassland varies in quality based on the presence of invasive plants, including cheatgrass, and evidence of cattle use in the existing conditions. The Revegetation and Noxious Weed Control Plan is designed to avoid the introduction of new invasive plants and minimize the spread of existing invasive plants through the life of the Project. As many invasive plants are present at existing condition, complete removal is not likely. However, treatment of invasive plant infestations would occur through all phases of the Project, and revegetation of areas of disturbance will focus on planting with native plants, as described in Section 4.5.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation. The EIS attributed temporary and short term to habitat loss associated with temporary disturbance during construction that would be restored and revegetated following construction. Restoration of shrub-steppe and grasslands in arid environments is challenging. Section 4.5.2.4 Applicant Commitment and Identified Mitigation includes an As-Built Report and Offset Calculation whereby areas of temporary disturbance that do not meet the success criteria for revegetation after the established monitoring period would then be included as a permanent disturbance and offsets would be required at a permanent disturbance ratio. Vegetation selected for growth under solar panels must be conducive to the operation of panels. Short grasses are preferred to avoid interferences with the panels and to minimize fuel load to minimize risk of wildfire (Beatty et al. 2017, Native Vegetation Performance under a Solar PV Array at the National Wind Technology Centre). Based on the Application the maximum height of the top of the solar module would be 15 ft above ground with a rotational access 6.2 to 8.2 ft off the ground. Section 4.5.2.4 include the mitigation measure Tree Avoidance (Veg-1), which requires the Applicant to avoid trees during construction. If avoidance is not achieved, the number and location of trees removed would be provided to EFSEC and a mitigation plan would be developed. Disturbance to rabbitbrush is mitigated at the same offset ratios as a Class II habitat (e.g., shrub-steppe) for temporary and permanent disturbance. Rabbitbrush is offset as Class III habitat (e.g., eastside interior grassland) under the solar arrays. Habitat offset ratios are provided in Table 4.5-11.	Section 4.5 Table 4.5-12 a,b,c; 4.5.2.4; 5.2.2; 3.4.1.1; 4.4.2.1; 4.4.3	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Water Resources	One wetland was identified within the Project Lease Boundary, which is located 240 ft west of the micrositing corridor. This is greater than the required buffer distance of 40 ft by Benton County. The infrastructure sited near the wetland is a 240 volt transmission line. Other Project infrastructure is sited approximately 0.4 miles west of the wetland at the nearest point. Proposed mitigation include a wetland specific Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan for work near the wetland (W-6).	Section 3.4.1.1, 4.4.2.1, 4.4.3	n/a
Anonymous User	1107365	I'd like to register my opposition to this project and note the DEIS does not adequately address: -Wildlife and avian mortality monitoring -Wildlife and avian forage area reduction -Wildlife and avian breeding pattern disruption -Wildlife nesting area reduction -Wildlife corridor disruption -The setback of machines from known nesting areas of the ferruginous hawk is significantly smaller than the known range of the hawks -The loss of recreation areas available to the public -Visual aesthetics -Size and location of each specific machine is not enumerated -Future growth area of the region is eliminated -Reduction of hunting opportunities -The project does not displace fossil fuel use, but replaces hydro electric -The project has the largest footprint, with the largest wind machines and is closest to large population centers than any other project -Devaluation of property values -Degradation of the livability of the region and its impact on employers' ability to attract a workforce	Wildlife and Habitat	Wildlife and avian mortality are discussed in section 4.6.2 of the EIS. Mitigation measures Wild-1 and Wild-6 as well as several special status species mitigation measures were developed to monitor and manage wildlife mortality. Loss of wildlife habitat is described in Section 4.6.2.2. Loss is described as direct loss, which describes habitat permanently removed through operation due to citing of infrastructure (e.g. under a road), and indirect loss, which describes habitat that is not removed but may be reduced in function due to disturbance (e.g. noise). The EIS addresses the potential for the Project to deter wildlife from using habitat proximal to the project, including the potential for this habitat to be less functional for breeding. Potential behavioural disturbance is calculated as indirect habitat loss within a zone of influence. Mitigation Measure Hab-5 has been proposed to require the Applicant to measure and mitigate for Project specific indirect habitat impact. Wildlife corridors are discussed in the dEIS in Section 4.6.2.2. Mitigation measure Hab-1 has been recommended to require the Applicant to avoid corridors and, where avoidance is not possible, provide additional mitigation measures to reduce impacts to wildlife. The final siting and mitigation would be approved by EFSEC Mitigation measure Spec-5 requires the applicant to place turbines outside of core ferruginous hawk habitat. The definition of ferruginous hawk core habitat as 2 miles from a nest site was developed in consultation with experts from WDFW. In the event the Applicant requires placement of infrastructure within the 2 mile core habitat, the Applicant would be required to design additional mitigation and provide compensation.	4.6.2, 4.6.2.2	Hab-5, Hab-1
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. Based on IMPLAN analysis, the project is not expected to have a negative impact on the availability of general workforce within the region.	Appendix 4.16-1 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	3.8.1.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1107375	We absolutely don't want to see turbines above our house. They're loud & we don't want them so close. Whatever power they generate won't even be benefitting our area (or state) & they don't generate enough power to make up for how much they cost & the damage they can do to wildlife. They're dangerous for birds & we have a lot of different types of hawks & owls in Badger Canyon that we don't want killed or injured. The picture I've attached is of a hawks nest that has been in this tree at Badger Canyon Rd & Badger Rd for many years. Every year this same pair of hawks have 2-3 chicks. We want to preserve our beautiful Horse Heaven Hills & we're NOT ok with the wind turbines being installed.	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1107398	I oppose the horse Heaven wind project	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous User	1107403	Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Dr. James Conca, a retired research scientist and professor in the field of energy generation and transmission. I live in Richland, WA. The way the grid works in WA State is that it has to be balanced minute to minute, and hydropower is what is used to do this. Whenever wind energy comes onto the grid, it always displaces hydro. This is seen daily at BPA's website in their load-following graphs (see example figures below). The hydro must be dumped, it cannot be stored. Our dams are run-of-the-river, only Grand Coulee can store significant water. Dumping hydro when wind comes onto the grid is a significant loss of energy in a time when we are losing about 12 GW of generation by the closure of coal plants in WA and surrounding states. So there is no advantage of wind to our emissions goals. Before emplacing more wind, we must make useful the 7,100 MW of wind we do have by emplacing pumped hydro storage, the only grid-scale storage available at this time. Of course, we need to engage the tribes when we do this, something that keeps not happening. There needs to be 50MW/500MWh storage for each 2,000 MW of wind. Only then can wind replace coal, and only then should we start building more wind. This is detailed in the latest E3 Northwest Resource Adequacy Study. As it stands now, we are looking at a 26% risk of rolling blackouts beginning in 2026, after Centralia Coal Plant closes. Thank you, Dr. James Conca, Trustee Herbert M. Parker Foundation 2801 Appaloosa Way Richland, WA 99352 509-205-7541 jim@ufaventures.com	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107441	<p>I live in the Badger Canyon area very near the proposed location of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. I have lived at this location since 2000. I am very familiar with the wind conditions around this area. During what would be the highest energy usage times, mid winter and mid summer, the winds are typically light and variable. The high pressure weather zones that camp in our area are what produce our highest and lowest temperatures and they do not produce wind. In fact, the Farm is predicted to only provide 8% to 18% of it's name plate power rating (850MW) in January and August which are peak power usage times. When winds are strong and steady, typically spring and early summer, there is large volumes of runoff water available for the hydroelectric dams located on the Columbia and Snake rivers. This project has no local power benefit for us.</p> <p>There are huge quality of life and environmental cost in the placement of this wind farm. It far exceeds any benefits we receive locally. Just the ascetics alone will impact property values and peoples well being as their visual landscape is permanently changed. The view from my house will be greatly affected. When I look south, I will see the turbines instead of rolling wheat fields. When I look east in the evening I will see the shadow of turbines instead of the steadily rising shade line of the hills behind me.</p> <p>But there are also environmental costs. The project is in line with the path of migratory waterfowl. I observe many flocks of geese flying over our area in the direction to and from the planned wind farm location. I have attached a photo of a flock of geese that is within 0.5 miles of proposed turbines sites heading the direction of those sites. There is also a predatory bird (eagles, hawks, etc) population that has slowly recovered in our area that will be impacted by the turbines.</p> <p>Also, I understand the turbines will require water, I presume for cooling, during operation. Where is the water coming from? Which aquifer? How will water permits and rights be obtained? I am part of a Class A water system (BAR 80 Ranchettes) operating in Badger Canyon that services several households. Will the availability and quality of our water be affected? There are very recent studies being released about the adverse effects of the noise produced on animals, birds and marine mammals. We don't have whales nearby, but the studies are an indicator that there are real consequences for mammals. Are we going to be part of the study for adverse affects on people?</p> <p>Wind parks in general are not economically viable solutions to energy production. In the mid 1980's I worked for Flow Research of Kent WA. It's sister company, FLOW Wind, built vertical axis wind turbines and developed energy farms in California. At the time, federal subsidies paid for the production of power were available to encourage wind farm development. The subsidies were set to expire in 5 to 10 years when it was expected wind powered electricity would become economically viable. Well, almost 40 years later they still are not economically viable. It requires federal subsidies, state tax incentives and legislative/executive action for companies to develop wind energy. The energy company's business model is to profit on subsidies. And because legislative and/or executive action is required, this wind farm is being developed because of a political agenda, not a market need. When the market really needs wind power, no subsidies will be required.</p> <p>This wind park should not be built at the proposed location, the costs to our environment and community are too high.</p> <p>Thank you, Chris Lentz</p>	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. A cooling system will be required for the Battery Energy Storage Systems. This will use an air cooling /air conditioning system or separate chiller plant for the BESS. Water cooling is not part of the operations for the wind and solar facilities as described in the ASC. Water will be sourced from an off-site supplier and trucked to the Site.	Section 3.4 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous User	1107447	<p>My name is Joetta Rupert.</p> <p>My husband and I are proponents of clean energy but are strongly against this project. Besides being an adverse visual impact to our community, there is no plan for the end of life for this project. Since these materials are not recyclable, what will happen to these monstrosities when they are no longer functional? Who will remove them if anyone? TriCities depends on the natural beauty of the ridge lines of the HHH for tourism dollars from hiking and biking, vineyards and wineries. The windmills will destroy the natural beauty of the Tri City area. This would create an undue hardship or economic impact on many companies and entities in the Benton and Franklin County area. This project will have negative impacts on agriculture, light pollution, and the natural habitat that inhabits these hills. And quite frankly we don't know the real dangers the windmills would place on the physical and mental health of the humans in the surrounding area. The TriCities area is already active in providing stable clean energy for Washington State.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Socioeconomics	An analysis of socioeconomic for the project did not identify any negative economic impacts. Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy.	4.16 and Apendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107462	<p>As resident of Kennewick for over 20 years, I am completely against constructing a wind farm so close to our growing community. There is no reason that this wind farm needs to be sited at the southern border of the Tri Cities. Eastern WA has plenty of unpopulated, open space available for these kinds of low density, inefficient energy producers. Appendix Q Visual Simulations Figure 8-1 a and b is what I would see every day as I drive to work, get groceries, walk the dog, mow my yard or look out of my living room windows. Instead of the greens of the wheat fields in spring slowly fading to different hues of yellow and brown over the summer, my view would be dominated by over 20 spinning, blinking monstrosities. Part of the Tri-Cities allure is the open, panoramic views of our vast shrub steppe ecosystem. 244 wind turbines would make a mockery of that.</p> <p>If I bought a house within view of a wind farm, then that would be a choice I made knowing full well going into the purchase. Placing the Horse Heaven Hills wind farm at its proposed location is an insult to many south Richland/Kennewick homeowners who chose this area specifically for the views of Badger Canyon and the feeling of openness as you look out of your house.</p> <p>I would much rather have a single Small Modular Reactor (SMR) nuclear plant built in the same general location than hundreds of inefficient wind turbines and solar panels. An SMR may not have as large a "nameplate" generation value, but we all now wind and solar never generate their nameplate values. And an SMR will give you consistent electrical output versus the variable nature of wind and solar. In the winter we can sometimes go weeks with the low cloud base and no wind. There would be zero output from Horse Heaven Hills wind and solar generators during those weeks.</p> <p>In closing, if the State of Washington feels the need to install renewable energy devices to meet carbon emission reduction goals, they need to do it far away from the major population centers of Eastern Washington.</p> <p>Jeff Banning</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Karen Brun	1107538	<p>I am opposed to this project. The quantity and height of the proposed turbines, and the proximity to a large metropolitan area plus smaller communities is unprecedented in Washington State, if not the entire country. At 2 miles, 52.6% more Benton County residents will be impacted 24/7 by this than the other 9 Washington counties combined where wind projects exist. At 4 miles, 110% more will be impacted. This is extremely disproportionate to the rest of the state.</p> <p>Tri-Cities residents, including 40% who are people of color, are being asked to sacrifice our landscape, wildlife and habitat, and our way of life for the benefit of those on the west side and beyond. This is social and environmental injustice in the extreme.</p> <p>Governor Inslee publicly stated at the recent Climate Change Conference in Egypt that he thinks NIMBYism has no place in Washington State. If that is his philosophy, then why are 11 of the 13 EFSEC projects completed, or in the pipeline, located east of the Cascades? And how many applications did EFSEC reject because they were to be located on the west side?</p> <p>If Governor Inslee insists that citizens in eastern Washington accept the ecological disruption and sacrifice of our lifestyles to forests of industrial wind turbines and seas of solar panels, he needs to have more justification than 100% clean energy bragging rights. He needs to follow the science. The Western Resource Adequacy Program has proven that wind power in Washington has an effective capacity of 8-11% when it's needed most. What off-taker is going to sign a contract for so little?</p> <p>This project is going to cost much more environmentally, socially, and economically than it will ever return. One just has to follow the money to see who truly benefits.</p>	Socioeconomics	Sections 3.16 and 4.16 presents the affected environment and Project impacts for the Socioeconomic study area. The analysis of Socioeconomics includes an evaluation of Project impacts on people of color and low income communities.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
TC Cares and Save Our Ridges	1107593	February 1, 2023 Via Email to EFSEC and the EFSEC SEPA Comment Page Web Form RE: Comments on the DEIS for the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement On behalf of TC Cares and Save Our Ridges, and numerous individual reviewers, we are submitting the attached comments on the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We do not believe this project should move forward in its current condition. The SEPA process is flawed and the DEIS is filled with errors, omissions, and misrepresentations regarding the Project's purpose and need, premise, financial feasibility and viability, proposed action, lack of feasible reasonable alternatives, lack of mitigation measures, and the significance of environmental and community impacts that cannot be avoided. Even in spite of these flaws and issues, the DEIS clearly demonstrates that the Project will bring about more harm than good. It is imperative that EFSEC search, develop, analyze and present alternative solutions that actually meet the need for power generation and do not impose such damage on the environment and the communities of Benton City, Richland, Kennewick, and Finley, as well as the rest of Benton County and the Tri-Cities and beyond. The following summarizes the list of contestable issues describing the many flaws of the project, the DEIS, and EFSEC's review of the project: The EIS is Poorly Done •The DEIS is lengthy, complex, piecemeal, filled with obfuscation, and contains a plethora of would's and may's vs wills. •The DEIS fails to describe the project, impacts, and mitigations with any certainty which makes a mockery of the SEPA process and abuses the SEPA process and the public. •The developer appears to be using the SEPA process to push a foregone conclusion without proper rationale and justification. •There are repeated and re-iterated errors, omissions, and misrepresentations. The DEIS contains cascading errors and omissions that render the document unusable for rational decision-making. •The DEIS is poorly done and uses out-of-date publishing technology. It contains poor maps that are too small and fuzzy with misleading coloration and not enough detail. It is very difficult to see the project component locations which means the public is unable to identify exact turbine locations in order to complete an accurate analysis of the impacts. We needed to create our own turbine location maps. •The DEIS fails to make use of digital GIS mapping tools to help the agencies explore and fully understand the environment and the impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. •The DEIS does not contain maps of the project that identify micrositng corridors and turbine locations suitable for a reasonably accurate analysis of the impacts. Integrity of the SEPA Process Is Questionable •The ASC was updated on December 1 without proper public notice. The scope and magnitude of the changes in the ASC Update on December 1, 2022, makes the entire SEPA Process questionable. The ASC should be revoked and reissued and the DEIS should be reissued with a new comment period. •EFSEC did not perform independent validation of the data contained in the many SEPA Elements of the Environment. Any proof of quality validation by EFSEC is lacking and there are a myriad of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations throughout the DEIS that should not be there if a validation had been properly performed. •The EFSEC consultant repeatedly just incorporated the developer's consultant's work verbatim using copy and paste. This raises serious conflict of interest issues since work done for the Applicant carries a risk of inherent bias in favor of the Applicant's project. •The DEIS lacks "impartial discussion" and is plagued from beginning to end by a noteworthy lack of detail and a verifiable lack of commitment to WAC requirements and mitigation. Purpose and Need for the Project •The DEIS fails to adequately establish a feasible purpose and need for this project. The project's funding and high price tag, as much as \$1.7 billion, is not described and renders the project impracticable. •The DEIS does not contain a reasonably detailed description of how this project is being funded. Who is going to pay for this project and how? Who paid for the consultants and how much did they get paid? •No off-taker for the power has been identified at all. •The DEIS fails to explain the purpose and need for a 19-mile transmission line. •The DEIS fails to identify and analyze the impact the project will have on climate change. •The DEIS fails to identify, document, and demonstrate that the project does anything at all to mitigate the cited near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. •The DEIS fails to establish a pressing need for the energy that will be produced by this project. Proposed Action and Alternatives •The history of the power generation requests (BPA LGIP) are not consistent with the Project's nameplate power generation claims. They claim to have the necessary authorizations to provide 1150 MW, but the documentation only indicates 850 MW. •The project nameplate capacity of 1,150 MW is not supported by the record. The DEIS and the Updated Redfined ASC repeatedly describe the nameplate capacity in error. •Fails to justify the need for the proposed action at 1150 with interconnection capability, is only supported at 850 (LGIP requests), and fails to clarify the Boffer Canyon Substation limit of 350 MW. •The DEIS fails to identify and analyze the impacts the project will have on the Nine Canyon project. •There has been no identification or analysis of the effects and impacts of a phenomenon known as blocking, which decreases turbine performance when an upwind wind project is too close to a downwind project. •The DEIS dismisses consideration of alternatives other than the proposed action without a rational basis and justification. •The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate the costs and benefits of any reasonable alternatives that can be demonstrated to feasibly attain or approximate the project's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental damage. Impacts on People in the Affected Environment Visual •The DEIS fails to adequately identify and evaluate the visual impacts of the project on people in the Tri-Cities. •The DEIS Visual Assessment Report contains numerous errors, omissions and misrepresentations which render the document ineffective as a basis for decision-making under SEPA. •The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the project based on the CESA Guidance 2021 regarding "Unreasonable or Undue Visual Impacts". •The DEIS visual simulations contain numerous errors and omissions and misrepresentations. •The DEIS fails to accurately describe the visual impacts of Option 1 and Option 2 on people. •The Applicant's commitments to mitigation of visual impacts in the DEIS are minimal, ineffective, and unacceptable. •The DEIS fails to recognize that visual impacts on Benton County are significant and disproportionate when compared to every other wind project in the State of Washington. •The DEIS visual assessment fails to apply the BLM and CESA Guidance adequately to describe and evaluate the impacts on people in proximity to the project. An area of analysis of 25 miles will be more appropriate in midwestern and western landscapes, open terrain, drier air, and larger wind projects (hundreds vs. dozens of turbines) creating a larger mass visible over greater distances. •The Applicant's, and therefore the DEIS's, visual assessment did not select Key Observation Points and Representative Viewpoints adequately. •The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the value of the dark skies at night on the Horse Heaven Hills project. •The DEIS fails to describe and commit to commonly used, FAA-approved light mitigation technology utilizing aircraft detection lighting systems to mitigate light pollution.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies.	n/a	n/a
			Executive Summary	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comments noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including assessing views within 25 miles of the proposed wind turbines. The viewshed map from Appendix 3.10-2, correctly showing the analysis out to 25 miles, has replaced the maps in Chapter 4 of the EIS with additional locational information included. The current analysis includes the assessment of the three criteria identified in the CESA visual impact assessment process (see Section 4.10.1.1), as well as applying methods from the BLM VRM system, to identify Unreasonable or Undue Visual Impacts. Conformance with the Benton County Comprehensive Management Plan was also included in the EIS. The visual simulations, including from KOP-5, have been updated to remove atmospheric haze. Based on this analysis, the Project would still result in significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Lighting comment noted and additional mitigation measure recommendation will be considered.	4.10 / 4.10.2.4 Lighting	Will use correct turbine viewshed maps from Visual Technical Report with additional context information
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics.	n/a	n/a
			Air Quality	The FEIS will include an assessment of the net effect of the proposed project and no project alternatives on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals. The EIS did include a detail estimate of fugitive dust and construction emissions that were documented in Appendix 4.3-1. The FEIS will include a dispersion modeling analysis of project emissions including PM2.5 and PM10. The FEIS will include the requirement for an onsite Air Quality Mitigation Manager to monitor fugitive dust and quality assure the adequacy of construction mitigation and direct the application of additional mitigation or cessation of site specific activity if necessary to address excessive fugitive dust.	4.3	see column H
			Wildlife and Habitat	Special status wildlife species are described in Chapters 3.6 and 4.6. Chapter 3.6 describes how special status species were defined and Chapter 3.6 describes the potential special status wildlife species that could occur in the Horse Heaven Lease Boundary, habitat requirements, threats, and population status. Chapter 4.6 evaluates potential Project specific impacts on special status species with potential to occur in the Lease Boundary. The final locations of wind turbines were not available at the time of writing the EIS. As such, conservative assumptions were applied when evaluating potential impacts to wildlife and special status species. For example, the EIS acknowledges that the Project could result in indirect habitat loss due to disturbance to wildlife. The extent of indirect habitat loss (estimated at 0.5 miles) was measured from the micrositng corridor instead of a turbine location thereby accounting for various permeation of turbine placement. This approach overestimates the potential Project indirect impact as it does not account for micrositng of turbines away from sensitive habitat. A similar approach was applied when estimating the direct and indirect loss of special status species habitat such as Ferruginous hawk. Comment: "WDFW data may not include private property" This sentence was included to describe the limitations of available background data. WDFW maintains databases on known occurrences of special status species; however, data may be limited by where surveys have been conducted and data reported. Access is not necessarily available on private lands, as such, information pertaining to special status species on these properties may not be available. Lack of documented occurrence should not be taken as species absence. In lieu of confirmed species presence, the EIS assumes species presence based on the availability of suitable habitat. Comment: the EIS avoids mitigation commitments and defers to a selection of mitigation with TAC A technical advisor committee is a useful tool developed to bring technical experts together in management of environmental impacts. The purpose of the TAC would be to provide input to mitigation measures that can be implemented and adapted based on the results of pre-construction surveys, and operational surveys. While the TAC would provide input into project mitigation, the ultimate approval of mitigation measures would be with EFSEC. The Applicant will propose TAC members but EFSEC will approve the TAC members. Comment: Exposure indices were developed for 8 of 14 special status species Exposure indices were developed for species for which flight height data was collected during field surveys. Exposure indices could not be calculated for species that were not recorded during flight (e.g. singing, perched). These species are typically species that remain closer to the ground, moving between bushes (e.g. sagebrush sparrow) and are unlikely to interact with blades. Comment: extent of Acoustic bat surveys The design of baseline programs, such as acoustic surveys, were developed by the Applicant in consultation with WDFW. Comment: the EIS does not adequately assess burrowing owl The EIS describes suitable burrowing owl habitat and potential impacts to the species in Chapters 3.6 and 4.6. As no species specific surveys were conducted, the EIS assumes species are present and will be impacted by the Project. Mitigation measure Spec-4 requires the Applicant to survey for burrowing owl prior to construction and apply set back buffers from active burrows. Comment: the EIS does not adequately assess townsend's ground squirrel The EIS describes suitable Townsend's ground squirrel habitat and potential impacts to the species in Chapters 3.6 and 4.6. As no species specific surveys were conducted, the EIS assumes species are present and will be impacted by the Project. Mitigation measure Spec-12 requires the Applicant to survey for Townsend's ground squirrel prior to construction and apply set back buffers from active colonies. Comment: Table3.6-3 This table describes the current threats to special status species and is not specific to impacts from the Horse Heaven Project. The table is intended to provide background information on species population changes and pressures (threats) impacting populations. Comment on CPE cumulative report Red-lined changes to the Application and supplemental documents will be considered in the FEIS. Comment: the EIS fails to adequately identify mitigation The application of several of the recommended mitigation measures are dependent on the results of preconstruction surveys and final turbine siting. The mitigation measures will require the applicant to provide EFSEC with additional information on species distribution facilitating a better understanding location specific impacts and application location specific additional measures if required. For example, Spec-5 requires that project infrastructure be kept 2 miles away from Ferruginous hawk nests unless the Applicant is able to substantiate why infrastructure needs to encroach on this buffer area and EFSEC is satisfied that additional mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant (such as additional habitat compensation) is sufficient. Comment: EIS makes no mention of the elimination or relocation of turbines in wildlife corridors: The text cited in the comment are Applicant Commitments. The EIS recommends additional mitigation measures be required to supplement the Applicant Commitments. These include Hab-1 which requires the Applicant to site all Project features outside of modelled movement corridors. The measure requires that EFSEC is provided with rationale for any components within modelled corridors along with a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. The final Project design and mitigation plans would be resultant of additional studies, reviewed and approved by EFSEC. Comment: WDFW letter regarding impacts of the Project The EIS provides an assessment of impacts to wildlife and proposes mitigation measures to reduce the magnitude of those impacts; however, residual impacts to wildlife will remain. This is notable in the characterization of impacts in Tables 4.6-11a,b,c. These tables note that the magnitude of impacts to wildlife movement are predicted to be medium, meaning the impact is predicted to result in a defined change that could alter populations The TAC would be established to provide input and expert guidance on turbine siting and mitigation measures. EFSEC would be responsible for approval of the final layout, adaptive management, and mitigation plans.	4.6, Table 3.6-3, Tables 4.6-11a,b,c.	n/a
			Introduction	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS..	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>Population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The DEIS fails to characterize, analyze, or provide enough information to allow reviewers to quantify the level of impact to population.•The DEIS fails to accurately identify and quantify that a large number of mid-range viewers, in particular, are impacted. There is no substantive mitigation offered.•The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate the Benton County policy goals meaningfully and then fails to recognize the importance that the features hold for the County and its residents.•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the visual impacts on wineries.•The DEIS fails to accurately describe and evaluate the scenic resource attributes and sensitivity levels.•The DEIS does not accurately describe and evaluate the location, proximity, and impact on people who live in close proximity to the project. The distances described in the DEIS are in error and misrepresent the real conditions found at the present time.•The ASC and the DEIS fail to identify and evaluate the impact of the project and feasible alternatives using a suitable analysis of population within the affected environment. <p>Fugitive Dust Emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The DEIS fails adequately identify, describe, and evaluate the significant and unhealthy adverse impacts fugitive dust emissions that will be caused by the project.•The DEIS fails to identify, describe, and evaluate feasible alternatives that can reasonably control and mitigate the health hazards from the fugitive dust emissions caused by the project.•The DEIS fails to adequately identify, describe, and evaluate that unacceptable conditions will occur from the road construction disturbance and cause significant environmental impacts that will affect over 100,000 people in the Tri-Cities. Project monitoring of PM2.5 and PM 10 is inadequate.•The DEIS does not provide for adequate project air monitoring and mitigation plans do not identify and commit to any increased monitoring of PM 10 and PM 2.5. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate special status wildlife and their habitats.•The DEIS contains numerous errors, omissions, and misrepresentations regarding the project wildlife resources and the impacts on wildlife and their habitats.•The DEIS assessment of wildlife is shallow and fails to adequately describe and evaluate the significant near-term and cumulative impacts the project will have on 20 special status wildlife species (two are endangered) and on their habitat and prey.•The DEIS ignores and disregards the mitigation recommendations in the several Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife letters.•The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate specific turbine locations that are known to cause significant impacts.•The DEIS fails to propose or even contemplate any remedy if that remedy entails turbine elimination or relocation.•The DEIS makes no mention of the elimination or relocation of turbines located in essential wildlife corridors that preserve connectivity of wildlife habitat and foraging areas.•The DEIS does not identify, describe, and evaluate wildlife resources, in particular special species, outside the boundary area even though they are clearly in the affected environment under the WAC.•The DEIS fails to evaluate impacts the project will have on wildlife outside the project boundary.•The DEIS contains no analysis of cumulative effects to habitat, especially the east/west wildlife corridor along the ridgeline of the Horse Heaven Hills. <p>Inadequate Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The DEIS avoids mitigation commitments and defers the development and selection of mitigation measures to the FEIS and a Technical Advisory Committee selected by the Applicant.•The DEIS does not include an adequate planning horizon that considers mitigation.•The DEIS fails to provide adequate information about the indirect and cumulative impacts from the proposed action, and any reasonable feasible alternatives.•The DEIS fails to identify and describe reasonable measures that can be taken to mitigate and minimize the visual impacts on the environment.•The DEIS fails to adequately identify and describe effective mitigations for wildlife habitat and special species. <p>The Horse Heaven Hills Project isn't green at all. The project need for the project is unproven and will force dependence on giant, mechanical monsters which have very little impact on climate change at all. This project has nothing to do with protecting the earth from the impacts of climate change and power. Instead, it is dedicated to corporate profits at the expense of the public and the impact on the local environment. Spending \$1.7 billion dollars on this project, much of it is taxpayer money, is irresponsible, unnecessary, unacceptably damaging and wasteful.</p> <p>The complete version of the comments are provided in the attached pdf file. This file is also being transmitted to EFSEC via email with attachment. The file can also be downloaded here:</p> <p>https://presari.com/s/792230000463680</p> <p>If you have any problems receiving and opening the file successfully please let me know.</p> <p>Paul J. Krupin</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar". EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Because of confidentiality, the EIS cannot disclose the locations of cultural resources, such as archaeological sites and Traditional Cultural Properties.	4.9	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. According to Appendix J the Wallula-Dodd Road Water System would be willing to enter into a contract with the Horse Heaven Project to supply the required water for construction.	Section 3.4 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Public Health and Safety	The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Earth Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS	4.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1107639	We do not want, support or desire windmills and solar panels in Benton County WA	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Schae1	1107667	These wind turbines will devalue the property throughout this area. We have hawks and other wildlife that will be impacted in a very negative way by killing these birds with one hawk species that is endangered at this time. The noise and reflection from blades will also be a problem. I have lived here for 30 years and it is not windy win the months that energy is needed most. Need to go elsewhere. Sharon Schaefer	Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Potential Project impacts on wildlife and ambient noise are comprehensively discussed in the EIS. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107703	We are opposed to such intrusion to the beauty that is the Horse Heavens, and home to several species of wildlife.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife species are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1107732	I emailed to speak, and I was never called upon. The hearing was closed around 7:40p. EFSEC should have an in person DEIS Hearing in the Tri-Cities, accomodate non-English speaking residents, and have the DEIS available in Spanish. Also, the West Pasco Library didn't have the DEIS available like the downtown location did.	General - Question for EFSEC	SEPA guidelines and Washington Administrative Code do not specify that Draft EIS should be published in any other languages than English. However, EFSEC has completed their due diligence in notifying the public by publishing English and Spanish notices, and English and Spanish factsheets. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice of issuance of Draft EIS. EFSEC did not receive any requests for Spanish translation of Draft EIS during the public comment period.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107739	I am opposed to the wind project- The damage done by this project outweighs any short term job opportunities mentioned during the public forum. Harm done to wild life, the environmental impact once a windmill is put out of commission, aesthetics are appalling & definitely not least is the unknowing potential of health issues for people with this project being so close to homes & the community. Kellie Hamilton	Wildlife and Habitat	In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.	4.6	n/a
			General - Recyclability	Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Schaef2	1107741	The proposed wind farm that is being shoved at us in try cities wa will be unsightly. cause unforeseen health issues that have not been addressed not to mention noise pollution, flashing strobing lights that are unhealthy for people that have epilepsy which they will have seizures from the strobing light. When power is needed most is in the winter and heat of summer which is when there is no wind moving to produce power. The needless deaths of hawks and owls and any migratory birds that are coming through this area which is migratory flyway. No one has addressed the loss of land values that will created by the unsightly monstrous tall towers which noise can travel miles.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Anonymous User	1107745	LISTEN TO THE HEART OF THE TRI CITIES. NO WIND TURBINS. DO WHAT IS RIGHT, SAY NO TO THIS AT THIS TIME. THANKS	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107748	I am against the wind farms going in. They are an eye sore, they harm the wild life and will devalue our properties. They are loud and the little bit of electricity they make doesn't go to serve our area.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Anonymous User	1107749	I am opposed to the Horse Heaven wind project. Please see enclosed document.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to Golden eagle were addressed in section 4.6.2.4 of the EIS, including potential for golden eagle to collide with the Project.	4.6.2.4	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	3.8.1.2	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS. Neither noise nor vibration are expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health. The effect of local topography on noise and vibration was included in the noise impact analysis.	4.11 (Vibration and LFN)	Revise FEIS to directly address Vibration and LFN.
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Project location is selected based on several factors including but not limited to viable above-average wind speeds in the area, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panel, proximity to existing transmission lines and willingness to participate in the Project. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present socioeconomic conditions and impacts on socioeconomic conditions including effects on people of color and low-income communities.	1.3, 3.16 and 4.16	n/a
Anonymous User	1107754	<p>Horse Heaven Draft EIS Comment:</p> <p>The Draft EIS is incomplete. Further study is essential and expected to be produced to protect the Horse Heaven Hills environment.</p> <p>In reference to just one highly significant impact regarding bird kill analysis, the firm of Golder Associates says at the end of their data summary regarding wildlife mortality: "It is important to acknowledge that there is uncertainty associated with these conclusions related to conflicting results in available published scientific studies, lack of studies at turbines within the range of heights considered for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm, and potential for substantial variability in wildlife mortality based on local factors (e.g., bird abundance, species composition, topography, habitat, spatial arrangement of turbines). These sources of uncertainty limit the confidence of predicted wildlife mortality risk associated with the two turbine options." Therefore, it is beyond dispute that at a minimum a pause must be placed on the approval process and additional studies commence that can produce confidence in the predicted wildlife mortality risk.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that mortality is assumed to be an acceptable reality and intolerable that this project moves forward without clearly understanding the scope of the expected mortality to the precious wildlife and habitats of the Horse Heaven Hills, some of which are being pushed to extinction.</p> <p>Yesterday we watched a large flock of birds heading from the Columbia River over Badger Mountain. Their path of travel was taking them smack into the middle of where you are considering placing the turbines. We commented that these birds and their ancestors have been making this flight for many thousands of years, driven by their instinct. Now in a matter of a year or two they could be flying right into these proposed whirling blades that will slice them up and scatter their remains over our landscape, for no good reason.</p> <p>I'd like to ask EFSEC members the following question: If you were driving down one of our roads you might encounter a flock of geese and other birds walking across the roadway. What would you do. I'm sure you'd take your foot off the accelerator and place it on the brake pedal. I've seen this happen countless times around here and people always stop and patiently wait for the birds to make their crossing.</p> <p>You need to take your foot off the accelerator and move it to the brake on this project. Stop this project before the slaughter of innocent wildlife begins.</p> <p>There is nothing "clean" about the proposed project, in fact, the use of that term is a mockery of reality. The Horse Heaven Hills is a treasure in the State of Washington and needs to be preserved not desecrated and discarded in the rush to create wealth for the developer and send the costly and inefficient energy out of the area to users that should face the reality of improving conservation and local production of their own energy sources.</p> <p>The gigantic turbines considered for this project were originally designed for offshore use. That is where these turbines belong, off the coast of where the energy will be consumed.</p> <p>In closing, we must see an irrevocable, damage compensation bond in place before any approval.</p> <p>Undoubtedly, some property owners within the viewshed and noise and flashing light areas of the turbines will experience a decline in property values and health damage. Therefore, an irrevocable bond of at least 2 billion dollars needs to be in place before construction begins to provide compensation to property owners and injured parties for these losses and damages when they occur.</p> <p>As for the individuals claiming the electrical and general construction jobs justify the wind farm project but consider how many jobs will be lost if the turbine project goes forward. A large hotel has already cancelled plans to build in the Southridge area, citing the viewshed of the wind farms as a reason for not building. This will also be the case for the single-family homes that will not be built within the view area of the wind farm over the years to come. Far more jobs will be lost than gained through this ill-conceived wind farm project.</p> <p>We are firmly opposed to this project in any form.</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential mortality impacts on avifauna; however, the estimated impacts were extrapolated from data on mortality from other wind project. As such, there remains uncertainty in the actual magnitude of mortality associated with the Project. Mitigation measures have been proposed to monitor mortality rates and adjust mitigation measures in response to higher than predicted mortality rates.	4.6.2.4	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. This analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	Appendix 4.16-1 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107761	Please do not approve the HHH massive turbine wind project.	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period.	n/a	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and Section 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Birds Pacific Flyway and Wildlife: The EIS assesses the potential for the Project to impact birds and other wildlife in Section 4.6. This section discusses impacts from habitat loss, disturbance, barriers to movement, habitat fragmentation, and mortality. The Project is expected to result in mortality to avifauna including birds and bats. The rate of mortality is presented in Section 4.6 as an estimate of number of mortalities per MW per year. These rates are estimates based on adjacent wind power project mortality rate calculations. The Applicant will be required to conduct post construction mortality monitoring (Wild-1) and provide adaptive management (e.g. curtailment) in the event that mortality rates exceed predictions. Additional mitigation measures could be specific to times of year (e.g. migration), weather conditions (e.g. fog), or specific turbines. TAC: The purpose of the TAC would be to provide expert input and guidance to Project refinements such as turbine placement and mitigation. While the TAC would provide input and advice, EFSEC would be responsible for final approval of the project layout and mitigation plans. The TAC mitigation measure will be refined to describe the role of a committee prior to operation and during operation.	4.6.2.5	Hab-4
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar". EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 35 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)). For aspects of the Project's design that may not be in alignment with Benton County Code 11.17.070 Growth Management Act Agricultural District or the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (Applicant).	1.2.3, 4.8.1	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
Anonymous User	1107771	After listening to the public comments just now, I am glad to see people voicing their opinions on this proposed project, especially the con's. I only wonder where they were when Nine Mile Wind Project went in. As for the visual and light pollution people say these turbine will bring to our view shed, where were they when our view shed of our rolling hills are now being adorned with houses that have decimated our view as well as all the light pollution they create. They claim to be concerned with how this wind farm will hurt tourism in our area but have no concern for tourism with number one most contaminated and hazardous site in North America, Hanford, in our backyard. I noticed no one spoke about the farmers who own this land and have agreed to these wind mills on their property, should they have this right? I am in favor of nuclear energy and since our local nuc plant and the power it produces was brought up, my understanding is none of that power produced stays locally. I believe this project will create family wage jobs in our communities for years to come and will be an economic boon for our area and thats why I speak in favor.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107772	see attached	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. EFSEC considers all submitted comments on the Draft EIS and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Attorney General of Washington Environmental Protection Division	1107773	Please see attached.	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>The EIS indicates that the project could result in a similar rate of bird mortality as the Nine Canyon project. This Project example was given as a surrogate to estimate mortality based on the proximity of the projects and similarity in habitat types. However, it is noted that even projects that are similar can have variability in mortality rates. The EIS reports the estimated mortality rate (2.6 birds per megawatt) at the Nine Canyon Project as well as the number of reported mortalities from the same project (n=22). Bird mortality rates are estimated based empirical data, such as carcass surveys, corrected for factors such as scavenger removal and searcher efficiency so the number of carcasses found during surveys is not the same as the number of birds that have been killed by the project. The bird collision rate is expected to vary between projects based on bird abundance and diversity in the project area, proximity of a project to bird migration areas and unique habitat, topographical features of the project area, and project features, such as turbine height and rotor sweep. The Applicant has proposed two different possible turbine heights (e.g. 244 smaller turbines or 150 larger turbines) which will likely affect the number of bird mortalities as there is some literature suggesting that shorter turbines may increase bird mortality per MW (see Golder 2022).</p> <p>This variation is apparent in wind power bird mortality literature. For example, bird collision estimates from various wind power sites across the U.S. and Europe range from 0 to 30 collisions per turbine per year (reported in Zimmerling et al [2013]). In their study of bird mortality rates at wind project in Canada, Zimmerling et al (2013) found a similar range of 0 to 29 birds per turbine per year.</p> <p>Based on the averages reported by Zimmerling et al (2013), the Project could result in 0 to 7,320 mortalities per year (based on 244 turbines). Using the number of bird fatalities at the Nine Canyon Project, which is understood to be a smaller project, the Horse Heaven Project could result in an upper estimation of 2300 bird mortalities per year.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that these numbers require context. In general while wind turbines are a source of mortality, Erickson et al (2014) reported that the total turbine-related mortalities from currently developed wind farms (circa 2014) constituted a small percentage of the total population size of small birds (<0.045%), which is not predicted to lead to population level impacts .</p> <p>The FEIS will be updated to remove the reference to the 22 carcasses found at the Nine Canyon Project as it is understood how the number may be confounded with mortality rates. Using estimated bird mortality rates are a useful tool to compare impacts between projects as it provides a mortality rate per MW. An estimated range of bird mortality using the 2.6 birds per megawatt rate provided for Nine Canyon Project as will also be provided</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to an adaptive management process to address uncertainty in the impacts of the Project on bird and bat mortality. Under their proposed Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy, the Applicant commits to incorporating the adaptive management approach in coordination with the TAC prior to Project operation. To provide some specificity to this approach Mitigation measure Wild-1 will be updated to provide additional steps to be taken in the event the Project results in high bat mortality.</p> <p>The potential population effects of wind developments on tree roosting bats, predominately hoary and silver-haired bats are discussed under section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. This section notes that population level impacts to these species is possible as the number of wind farms increase.</p> <p>The purpose of the Project specific cumulative effects assessment is to consider how the Project may interact with regionally occurring existing and reasonably foreseeable projects in order to consider whether further adaptation or mitigation measures can be applied to reduce these regional effects. Population level cumulative effects assessment or an industry wide cumulative effects assessments are outside of the scope of the EIS.</p> <p>Pronghorn</p> <p>Pronghorn antelope have been recently re-introduced to the region and the current population is generally concentrated in Yakima County with some occurrences in Klickitat and Benton Counties. Data obtained by aerial surveys reported in Fidora et al (2019, 2021) report observations of pronghorn antelope on the eastern boundary of the Project with some observations in 2021 occurring in the Lease Boundary. While available data on the movement patterns of the Washington State pronghorn antelope population are limited, results reported in Fidora et al (2019, 2021) could suggest the herd is expanding its range eastward. However, as the species has been recently re-introduced there is currently no published established or modeled pronghorn antelope movement corridors in the Lease Boundary. The modeled movement corridors developed by the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group are based on species specific models, which did not include pronghorn antelope. As such, based on the information available, it is not understood that the Project would interact with established antelope migration routes. In the ASC, the Applicant indicated that fencing is required for security purposes consistent with WAC 463-60-275: The application shall describe the means employed for protection of the facility from sabotage, terrorism, vandalism and other security threats. As such, the purpose of the fencing around solar arrays is to limit the access to these areas by people. While the fence can be risen by 4 inches to allow access for small animals, it understood that the fencing should remain close enough to the ground to serve its function. To accommodate movement by pronghorn antelope the fence would need to be raised to approximately 18 inches (46 cm), which could negate its function for safety and security. Finally, as the solar arrays are not expected to prevent pronghorn antelope movement and are not expected to result in substantial alteration of existing occupied pronghorn antelope habitat it is not clear that the population would benefit from being able to access habitat around the arrays. Allowing pronghorn antelope access to the arrays could increase interactions with Project structures and result in damage or injury. In the ASC, the Applicant included a commitment to minimize enclosed areas. Mitigation measures Hab-6 allows EFSEC to approve final design, including fencing. The proposed turbine and solar array locations predominately avoid Townsend's ground squirrel high suitability habitat (modelled as high to highest habitat concentration areas) and overlaps a medium habitat concentration area. These HCAs were developed based on concentrations of modeled suitable habitat and does not indicate documented species presence. Mitigation measure Spec-12 will require the Applicant to conduct pre-construction surveys for Townsend's ground squirrel to facilitate management of habitat and colony impacts. Spec-12 will be updated to provide additional clarification regarding Townsend's ground squirrel mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures Hab-1 was designed to require the Applicant to provide additional impact management and mitigation for Project components in modeled movement corridors. The option of including open bottom culverts will be added as an example of a feature that may be considered to facilitate movement.</p>	4.6	Update discussion on bird migration to describe potential avoidance distances. Wild-1 will be updated Spec-12 will be updated
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	In accordance with RCW 80.50.010, it is the policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities, and to ensure, through available and reasonable methods, that the location and operation of all energy facilities and certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities produce minimal adverse effects on the welfare of the population and environment; including ecology of the land and its wildlife and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life.	Section 1.3	Update the Purpose and Need
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Air Quality	The FEIS will include an assessment of the net effect of the proposed project and no project alternatives on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.	4.3	Inclusion of assessment of the net effect of the proposed project on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.
Anonymous User	1107788	Please see enclosed document.	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1107790	I hope EFSEC pays attention to what happened at tonight's public hearing. 85% of the commenters are opposed to the HHH Wind Project - some outright opposed and some as it's currently configured. That 85% is in direct opposition to the propaganda on Scout has published stating 85-90% are in favor. Just one of many misrepresentations they've told. Of the 12 in favor, 4 of those were union members with an inherent bias. A number of the those speaking had obviously never read the DEIS - one of those being Dave Kobus. Had he done so, he would not have said the things he did. Anyway, I thank you for having this public hearing even though you were forced into doing it.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107907	The environmental, practical, safety and aesthetic impacts of this proposal in my area is a HOSTILE THREAT to everyone who lives here. It is yet another example of local communities being predated and exploited. No one wants this here unless they have direct pecuniary gain. STOP RUINING OUR COMMUNITIES!	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107919	I have read the executive summary of the draft EIS and think that it has thoroughly covered the impacts this project may have on the plants and animals of the project area. I think the mitigation steps that are outlined are reasonable and will ensure the protection of the land, native plants, and wildlife.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107924	Please add this Additional page with the Petition to Gov Insee and EFSEC Against the Horse Heaven Hill Wind Farm Project. I uploaded 2668 signatures earlier and I am adding 9 more signatures to make 2677 signatures total.	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to wildlife, including birds, ferruginous hawk, migratory birds, and sandhill cane in Section 4.6. Impacts considered included habitat loss (direct and indirect), mortality (e.g. from collisions with turbines), barriers to movement, and habitat fragmentation. Section 4.6 also provides recommended mitigation measures intended to reduce potential impacts to wildlife.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
Anonymous User	1107944	Dust Storm April 27, 2018 in Badger Canyon looking to the SW from spirit lane T8N R 28E S 21 This would be looking at the placement of turbines 1.5 miles back. The Badger Canyon drainage canyon from HHH would be behind the group of trees.	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107947	Windmills produce low energy efficiency while representing 1. high visual pollution 2. high noise pollution 3. high light pollution 4. high kill rate of birds 5. high pollution when turbines are discarded and stacked up in less populated but scenic areas where they sit and rust away for years causing further environmental damage. We, the people, have our roots in this community and decry attempts at the exploitation of land by those outside of our community whose sole interest is financial gain. DEIS ISSUES Impacts to Wildlife, Birds, and Humans • Fugitive dust • Dust particle monitoring standards – PM size reduction to align with proposed new EPA standards • Insufficient number and inaccurately placed monitors • Monitoring data to be recorded, compiled, and analyzed by the applicant rather than unbiased 3rd parties • Wildlife and avian mortality monitoring • Wildlife and avian forage area reduction • Wildlife and avian breeding pattern disruption • Wildlife nesting areas (ferruginous hawk, burrowing owls, rattlesnakes, etc.) reduction • Wildlife corridor disruption • Blasting with accompanying noise, vibrations and dust • Low frequency noise • Low frequency vibrations • Shadow flicker • Nighttime flashing red lights • Recreation area loss (paragliding, hiking, birdwatching, ATV trails) • Future growth • Property devaluation • Visual aesthetics • Traffic disruption – long wait times during road straightening, widening, and paving • Traffic disruption - long wait times during component transport • Windshield damage • School bus safety • Hunting Impacts to Local Businesses • Tourism/wineries • Recreation area loss (paragliding, hiking, birdwatching, ATV trails) • Diversified agriculture • Traffic disruption – long wait times during road straightening, widening, and paving • Traffic disruption - long wait times during component transport Potential Impacts to Taxpayers • Property devaluation • Federal, state and county road damage from overweight vehicles • Increased fire potential & accompanying fire-fighting costs • Degraded component disposal • Decommissioning component disposal	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Air Quality	The EIS includes assessment of fugitive dust emission and mitigation measures to address them. Additional modeling of air quality impacts will be performed in the FEIS. An onsite AQMM is proposed to assure compliance with fugitive dust mitigation measures.	4.3	Sec 4.3 - additional modeling and discussion of results; additional mitigation measure to address AQMM
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Wildlife and avian mortality are discussed in section 4.6.2 of the EIS. Mitigation measures Wild-1 and Wild-6 as well as several special status species mitigation measures were developed to monitor and manage wildlife mortality. Loss of wildlife habitat is described in Section 4.6.2.2 of the EIS. Loss is described as direct loss, which describes habitat permanently removed through operation due to citing of infrastructure (e.g. under a road), and indirect loss, which describes habitat that is not removed but may be reduced in function due to disturbance (e.g. noise). The EIS addresses the potential for the Project to deter wildlife from using habitat proximal to the project, including the potential for this habitat to be less functional for breeding. Potential behavioural disturbance is calculated as indirect habitat loss within a zone of influence. Mitigation Measure Hab-5 has been proposed to require the Applicant to measure and mitigate for Project specific indirect habitat impact. Wildlife corridors are discussed in the dEIS in Section 4.6.2.2. Mitigation measure Hab-1 has been recommended to require the Applicant to avoid corridors and, where avoidance is not possible, provide additional mitigation measures to reduce impacts to wildlife. The final siting and mitigation would be approved by EFSEC Mitigation measure Spec-5 requires the applicant to place turbines outside of core ferruginous hawk habitat. The definition of ferruginous hawk core habitat as 2 miles from a nest site was developed in consultation with experts from WDFW. In the event the Applicant requires placement of infrastructure within the 2 mile core habitat, the Applicant would be required to design additional mitigation and provide compensation.	4.6.2.2	Hab-5, Hab-1
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous User	1107959	I am writing to say that for quite a few reasons, I am not in favor of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project proposed by Scout Clean Energy for Benton County, WA.	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
		So many of our ridgelines in Benton County are being developed for housing at a very rapid rate. The ones that remain provide unspoiled vistas and unparalleled beauty to our region. The public lands and existing roads draw local residents and tourists alike, to hike, photograph, draw and paint, and observe wildlife, and the hills provide a visual reminder and learning opportunity of the rich cultural, geological, and natural histories of the Horse Heaven Hills.	Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
		The large tracts of land currently used for growing dryland wheat will likely be carved up by roads, resulting in precipitation- and wind-driven soil erosion.	Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	3.8.1.2	n/a
		Large construction sites and extensive road-building in exposed areas with highly erodible soils can result in dust storms, reduced agricultural productivity through soil loss, and even landslides.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
		Downslope temperature and wind could affect diverse agricultural areas near the project area, including orchards and vineyards where microclimates are critical to growing the high-quality fruit that this area is well-known for. Small growers and family farms could lose much-needed income.	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
		The project area is in close proximity to many rural homes and small family farms, where families have space to raise crops and animals and have sought solitude in a quiet living environment. Construction and operation of wind turbines would disrupt daily life for these residents, with whirling blades, vibrations, shadows, and flashing lights, and would likely reduce their quality of life and property values.	Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
		We also can't overlook the scenic beauty, the wildflower displays, and the birds, animals, and plants that make up a beautiful, unique, and rapidly shrinking ecosystem.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
		Additionally, the areas of high quality, largely undisturbed shrub steppe habitat and grasslands provide feeding, nesting, breeding, and hunting areas for many resident and migratory wildlife populations. There would be risks to the endangered ferruginous hawks, owls, eagles and other raptors, along with sandhill cranes and white pelicans, and songbirds who seek thermal currents and ridgetops to make their long-distance flights.	Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
		Wind turbines do not appear to be very efficient and I have read that they are often shut down for frequent repairs. It would be better to place them near the areas where the power is needed. Our human environment in Benton County and surrounding areas have already been impacted by hydroelectric dams and a nuclear power plant, and there are solar facilities in the works. Surely there are better already-disturbed sites in the Pacific Northwest for wind turbines with more reliable wind and lower human and wildlife populations.	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the EIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
		Why not think bigger and address, plan, and implement energy conservation measures state-wide, in both small and large-scale ways? Energy-efficient lighting and machinery, upgrading insulation, requiring buildings to turn off excess lights out they are not occupied. Surely conservation and retro-fitting of existing structures is a lot greener than another giant wind farm in WA State. Plus, implementing widespread energy conservation measures would also provide longer-term jobs for the trades and manufacturing companies.				
Anonymous User	1107961	I oppose the Horse Heaven Energy project. I do not feel the wind turbines, solar panels and battery energy storage systems is in Kennewick and the Horse Heaven community best interest. Even the governor knows what an eye sore these are otherwise he'd be putting them all over the West side of the Cascade mountains and in the Columbia River Gorge from Hood River to the Mouth of the Columbia. Every concern I listened to at the public meeting was already discounted by the "independent" report. I have read Governor Inslee's letters of approval to go ahead on several projects on the East side of the Cascade Mountains and they all sound the same. The "independent" report siting the exact same thing with each concern people had for their communities. As he has promised at the "green climate" meetings he will not tolerate opposition to these projects.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1107984	oppose	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1108001	Dust Pollution is a large concern not only as PM10 but especially PM2.5 and less with EPA putting out new requirements. This is a study "Airborne Dust and It's Impact on Hi-Vol Sampling Results at Richland, WA January, 1978. This was from Phil Cook, Director of Air Pollution at Benton County he shared in 1988 with TRI-ACT as 1987-1992 were difficult times for HHH farmers keeping their topsoil from blowing.	Air Quality	Fugitive dust emissions are an acknowledged concern that has been evaluated in the EIS and will be further evaluated in the FEIS. It is noteworthy that the study provided is more than 40 years old. At that time, the particulate matter ambient air quality standard was measured as total suspended particulate (TSP). Developing health effects literature has increasingly pointed to very fine particulate matter that can be respired into the deeper portions of the respiratory tract as the primary contributor to public health concerns. As a result, in 1987 the TSP standard was dropped, and replaced with 24-hr and annual average ambient PM10 standards. In 1997, 24-hr and annual average PM2.5 standards were promulgated. In 2006, the annual average PM10 standard was also dropped and 24-hr and annual average PM2.5 standards were lowered. In 2012, the primary annual average PM2.5 standard was further reduced. Although the 1978 study is an important historical document, the TSP emissions characterized in the 1978 study are no longer reflective of current measurement techniques or current ambient air quality standards.	4.3	n/a
David Watson	1108005	Have cumulative environmental impacts (e.g. to migratory birds) associated with this project in combination with those of other wind farm projects in the Columbia River gorge in Washington and Oregon been evaluated?	Cumulative Effects	Cumulative impacts are the combined result of incremental direct and indirect impacts on resources from a project or plan, past and present actions, and other reasonably foreseeable developments (RFDs). Table 5-1 provides a summary of existing projects and RFDs geographically and temporally relevant to the Proposed Action, their characteristics, and potential resources susceptible for being cumulatively impacted. Table 5-2 provides an analysis of impacts from the Project and cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action and past and present actions and RFDs.	Section 5.1, 5.2	n/a
David Watson	1108031	See updated map of wind farms in Washington and Oregon regarding my earlier comment on cumulative environmental impacts to migratory birds. Source is US Wind Turbine Database. See: https://eerscmmap.usgs.gov/uswtdb/viewer/#7.33/45.741/-119.885/-10.2 Has there been any assessment of cumulative impacts to migratory birds from operation of wind farms? What do they conclude?	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1108040	Attached are copies of the FACT SHEET from Tor-Citians Against Chemical Trespass giving background investigation numbers and other study reports on drift off HHH into Badger Canyon, Kiona, Red Mountain, Badger Mountain, Kennewick and Finley 1947-1993. After final WAC regulation went into effect the downwinders had 5 more years of residues from sulfonylurea herbicides that drifted off HHH to Badger Canyon, Finley, Kennewick, Kiona and Red Mountain. The last areas to get buffer zones was Finley and Badger Canyon two major hotspots.	Public Health and Safety	The CEA, published after the DEIS, will be reviewed and incorporated into the FEIS.	4.6	n/a
Anonymous User	1108065	NO MAP WAS AVAILABLE FOR SHOWIG TOWNSHIP RANGE AND SECTION NUMBERS. THIS IS A MAP PUT TOGETHER AFTER GOING THROUGH THE TURBINE SITES. THIS WAS NEEDED TO GET PERSPECTIVE ON LOCATION AND PROXIMITY TO RESIDENTIAL HOMES.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. An evaluation of down winder effects resulting from the Project will be added to the FEIS.	4.13.2	Provide evaluation of "down winder" effects resulting from Project construction, operations, and decommissioning.
Anonymous User	1108082	The Burrowing owl is under federal threatened species. This is native ground nesting bird living in wide open agricultural grounds and agricultural fields like shrub-steppe ground are located are an important food for conservation and habitat for these owls. It is a specie of concern in WA and vulnerable or imperiled due to habitat lost. Protected under migratory treaty act and considered a bird need in conservation that it needs it thrives on. The conservation of the habitat is imperative to its survival.The DEIS failed to identify the burrowing owl as a species; collisions of wind turbines is a source of mortality for the species of these birds. This is an endangered specie and needs to be identified and the DEIS needs to mitigate the safety and protection of the burrowing owl as well as the habitat for its survival.	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous User	1108082	The Burrowing owl is under federal threatened species. This is native ground nesting bird living in wide open agricultural grounds and agricultural fields like shrub-steppe ground are located are an important food for conservation and habitat for these owls. It is a specie of concern in WA and vulnerable or imperiled due to habitat lost. Protected under migratory treaty act and considered a bird need in conservation that it needs it thrives on. The conservation of the habitat is imperative to its survival.The DEIS failed to identify the burrowing owl as a species; collisions of wind turbines is a source of mortality for the species of these birds. This is an endangered specie and needs to be identified and the DEIS needs to mitigate the safety and protection of the burrowing owl as well as the habitat for its survival.	Wildlife and Habitat	Burrowing owl are discussed under Section 4.6.2.4 of the EIS. Burrowing owl are state listed as a Candidate species and are not listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act although are considered a species of conservation concern. Burrowing owls generally stay close to the ground, foraging by swooping from low perches or walking. As such, they are less likely to collide with turbines than other bird species. However, they could be killed during project construction due to destruction of burrows and during operations from collision with project machinery, such as vehicles. These impacts are discussed in Section 4.6.2.4. of the EIS.	4.6.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1109614	<p>I am writing to express my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center.</p> <p>However, I am really writing to express the support of my grandchildren and great grandchildren and their children.</p> <p>What would I tell my heirs if they said "How come your generation allowed the earth to warm to nearly unlivable temperature?"</p> <p>I am sorry that some people's views might change but I feel that is better than most of our vegetation dying off and our water resources drying up.</p> <p>Please complete this project as quickly as possible. Time is running out.</p> <p>Arlo Petersen 209 NE 136th St Vancouver, WA 98685</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109627	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear EFSEC,</p> <p>The DEIS is almost 1340 pages to have printed off. When home reviewing it the charts, visual simulations, Glare maps and many others were missing 35% from the DEIS report.</p> <p>Since the pages are not chronological without renumbering them for what page to print it means going to the library to use the computer and print specific pages at 65% which requires staff to help do that as it changes the printing. But the cost of redoing something that what not submitted correctly should be on Scout Energy and EFSEC for not checking it.</p> <p>When I first asked to view this at the library as my computer is broke; they had no knowledge of the DEIS report release and what it is. How sad to list these locations without giving them an email notice as there was no communication with them that the public will want to view this. They forwarded on the information to the other mid-Columbia libraries.</p> <p>The size and time for printing this off is enormous and expensive. Very few people may have time to sit in the library for weeks to read the report and comprehend such a massive report in 30 days or even 45 days. The majority of the public do not know because on article was in the paper just before Christmas when many residents have been out with holidays and family.</p> <p>I request at least 90 days to view and interpret this humongous document and time to find technical people to help interpret what the average citizen can not understand.</p> <p>The communities need to have more time to educate the public as 90% of 308,000 residents in Tri-Cities have No awareness to this project that will impact everyone. Due to no local public hearings with Benton County Planning and Benton County Commissioners we have missed that open hearing for people to learn about the size and impact of this wind farm on HHH.</p> <p>As a resident in Badger Canyon and knowing the canyon drainage fall of 700' off the ridge to us and Tri-Cities the sound and vibration noise will echo into our community which after time is documented on health problems from sleep disorders, lack of sleep, irritability, loss of patience, anger and frustration when family and children's health is impacted, as well as animals and pets that are even more sensitive to noise.</p> <p>Nothing is mentioned on the rising temperatures leaving the wind farm perimeter and the timing of those rising temperatures, changes in weather patterns and increased turbulent winds impacting the most expensive diversified agricultural crops in the state including many types of orchards and the wine industry directly below the 27 mile ridge line. These increased turbulence and increased changes in rising temperature can impact not only the noise downwind but temperature increases will impact the local power grid.</p> <p>Also the site of the visual in Badger Canyon is in the wrong location. It is about 4 miles off. Can they correct it, please?</p>	General - Question for EFSEC	<p>Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period.</p> <p>In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS. Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).</p> <p>In accordance with WAC 197-11-455, "the draft EIS shall be issued by the responsible official and sent to any person requesting a copy of the EIS from the lead agency (fee may be charged for DEIS, see WAC 197-11-504)". On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and physical copies were sent to local public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft EIS along with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project Application for Site Certification, (EFSEC Application/Docket No. EF-210011) were available for public review at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, as stated above, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.</p>	n/a	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositd to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 4.11 of the EIS. Neither noise nor vibration are expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health.	4.11	n/a
joan.owens	1109630	<p>External Email</p> <p>Being green and mandating unproven ways to be supposedly "green" are two different things. I am green and was taught caring for our earth through WSU environmental science and engineering as well as my Native American grandmother. The proposed windmills do not pay for themselves ever over their lifetime. The companies are given money by the government to subsidize the efforts. So of course the companies want to create and operate them. The massive machines take a lot of petroleum oil to operate, the massive blades are mixed materials; therefore, they cannot be recycled, and they require and abundant amount of land, which in this case disturbs the precious minimally remaining shrub steppe. The winds are high in the spring and fall. The wind produced energy takes priority with the energy companies per requirements so the energy production by the dams gets wasted in the spring. In order to not have conflicting energy use, windmills should not be located near dams. This proposed area has an abundance of dams and nuclear power and is self sufficient on power needs. The creation of solar panels has a huge toxic effluent (creates a lot of toxic materials such as toxic metals that pollute the earth). Many states classify solar panels as hazardous waste; therefore, they are not recycled. Both proposed "green" energy producers are not fully developed and should not take up the massive amounts of land in their beta form. It just isn't good stewardship forcing this down the throats of the locals who do not want this. To exclude the local authorities from the decision making process is undemocratic. For the proposed land of this ungreen project, it is in a peninsula area in Benton County that has three major rivers that merge. There are massive amounts of wildlife in this area. The mighty Columbia River is in the center of it all. The birds move between Oregon and Washington over this peninsula going between the wetlands up the Yakima River to the bird refuges along the Snake and Columbia Rivers. They fly daily over the Horse Heaven Hills peninsula area to obtain their grains and head back and forth to water. Thousands and thousands and thousands of snow geese, Canadian geese, ducks, native birds, Sandhill Cranes, for example, also our National bird the Bald Eagle, and even endangered birds call this area home at some point during the year. I enjoy listening and watching these birds fly over my home in the Horse Heaven Hills but it kills me inside knowing they all could be chopped up into wasted bird burger by the proposed ungreen energy machines. The Yakama Indian Nation has worked with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to reintroduce pronghorn sheep/antelope back into this area. They are beautiful roaming through the Horse Heaven Hills. These large ungreen farms will impact all of the wildlife and their mating routines. Why are dams evil regarding salmon and windmills thought of as not evil regarding birds, bees, wildlife, human health and safety, etc.? I am so confused by this whole push for ungreen energy. It is like an electrical car. You plug it in but where does the energy come from? It just doesn't sit in an outlet the energy was created somewhere. Having a bunch of electrical cars that the energy is produced from a coal plant doesn't gain anything except maybe a net loss of energy from the transmission reductions. Small modular nuclear reactors are a much more green energy creator. They take up a very small amount of land, while the proposed ungreen energy producers require massive amounts of land. We have a huge amount of land in this same area called the Hanford Nuclear Reservation that we dedicated to nuclear operations so the land is perfect for continued nuclear use. I am a third generation Hanford scientist and I think that is truly green and wise choice for the earth. For nothing can compare to the amount of energy created by a nuclear reaction. It is reliable energy- not waiting for the wind to blow or the sun to shine. I do not support the massive destruction of the shrub steppe flora and fauna for these ungreen and unproven technologies that will destroy and impact our precious wildlife, human's quality of life and health and safety, for example. I have worked on Environmental Impact Statements most of my life, including Yucca Mountain, and clearly understand the evaluation process for proposed actions. Our area has sacrificed to the nation with the creation of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and the creation of these ungreen environmental destructors would be a slap in the face to our historic area and our earth. Christina Caprio, NEPA Environmental Scientist</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	General - Recyclability	<p>In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.</p> <p>Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.</p>	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential project related impacts on wildlife and habitat in Section 4.6 including the potential impacts on pronghorn antelope and birds, including bird mortality from collisions.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. This includes voluntary applicants such as the proposed facility. Project review is conducted under the requirements of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.50 and associated regulations. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC (RCW 80.50.060 (2)).	1.2.3	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109636	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I was wondering what the situation is with the wind facilities around Ellensburg (in Kittitas County).</p> <p>You granted an expedited approval because the solar company's said they had deadlines that they had to met in contracts to sell the power ... and now all these years later, I think the one on Tjossem Road is the only one that is actually up and going.</p> <p>Also, maybe I'm forgetting, but I had thought that they were supposed to add plantings and screen the chain link fence they put around the facility. I thought that was part of the company's pitch to keep the industrial look of the facility toned down since the State and County have a policy that projects need to preserve the "rural character" of the land.</p> <p>Please let me know what you can about these questions - thanks!</p> <p>Susan</p>	General - Question for EFSEC	<p>During the public comment period EFSEC accepted comments and questions related to Horse Heaven project.</p> <p>Information on visual aspects and vegetation can be found in the respective chapters of the Draft EIS.</p>	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109644	<p>External Email</p> <p>Please see video documenting bird population in the Horse Heaven Hills. These are thousands of snow geese in the sky.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109649	<p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Attached is a video showing tons of geese scattered throughout the entire 180 degrees of the sky of the HHH area - geese leaving and coming to the HHH area and to the Columbia River/Yakima River. Zoom in to see the enormous numbers.</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1109651	<p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Geese flying to HHH.</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109658	<p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Tons of snow geese flying to HHH. Zoom in to see the amounts scattered across the sky!</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p> <p>https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAikKS8tGJ2CFvoqj2fXBwsbYWZLiAd9f4ETrihUK4S2cz_VVciGGTq-%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAikUvP-XwVZRw7CqJ-NdiysGtWwhFzznBSrWjJk9poOa%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogqJT65yUd9C9Q0f6FSeGxoc9xVF5x9knbKl-l6rw9XGY5ShnCfTtXt1ZAyhcXwwEwlgEAkGkC6AMA_351Yj55BNhZku1aBIY2D5qJvJl7O_KAcV6h9y6g7_KSVNMot2-wp-fbtpT1AVz2Vjzsu4GtyJRMgJK09gN6FKuTdlME8HbcDX0eRfU8F_xaRd1LnDywtg8f%2526e%253D1675443839%2526ff%253D%2526r%253D17E117F7-4E84-491B-B144-BF60A91E1F25-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DjHbTRtsdnI5ysHoyvq1BjJaFuX4%26uk%3D0gmDGo7_Q7NWDoLJlnkug%26f%3DIMG_0776.MOV%26sz%3D143087786&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cacf845a864634fe8532808daee75ad0%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638084487926956403%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoiv2luMzIlLCJBtI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C2000%7C%7C%7C&mp:reserved=0</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109662	<p>External Email</p> <p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Geese flying to HHH.</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p> <p>Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAWuc84VGdPRRZ_6mPNe1I7KsY_P4AS8Mve4C71nKiauh4MXeJzWGeoy%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAsfIQbYXmquyGl_UFQUwhCCQE0phObS_hpop7iqCXqT%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAog00X5NyeedL2DP7PY3EW0VB20GyOQxS2UfsozNs6wSdhCirJXv1zAYoryQw-EwlgEAkGkC6AMA_yhnGthSBKxj8_haBNYzX7JqJfvsBRivO692S18pXY991SB8r7I5dQMTCAJaWlrm4IQOyde3FqhyJXMRK_peQjrhJlIOLaubaw08wZdv0O34li-aUQuT_AEKY-F5RM%2526e%253D1675446459%2526ff%253D%2526r%253D1DF243AD-2D53-4923-B236-FDFE448BF5C7-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DhXl-N5S802I7aAWfG2ADm3dLk%26uk%3D8CdqE6KsSuuu6JpXACg9OQ%26f%3DIMG_0771.MOV%26sz%3D66722053&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C7C7d947df95054c-ba2e9608daee7bc91b%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638084514091415082%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoiv2luMzIlLCJBtI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C2000%7C%7C%7C&mp:reserved=0</p> <p>0 bytes</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109663	<p>External Email</p> <p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Geese flying to HHH. This is a all day event.</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p> <p>Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAeTq_-6Kx60u-P8obMlm8q7JlNyKAUd8P-y1kXzxG5G-v3GusPp_ATKF%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAnmaZzvXlJdQIKPmudQULgnRWQ6l_-g8dDuU3MsU0F%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogxEdYtot8JmaGxShc5ntFM8VVBW10X3bjShY2EbMRgSdhDn3p1v1zAYze6T-w-EwlgEAkGkC6AMA_2mPzPISBMmM3lpaBH8BMP9qJv7yo1BUyINX3rwDGBxlcD8oGU1SopGupH6NHU--RqLDM-u5NyJdeLq0T735cHazA2AxYYbc0twzpyh0yIfVzNaoETnBxwYR3yOIU%2526e%253D1675446515%2526ff%253D%2526r%253D92B63AC8-3247-48BE-A714-D0813C162F14-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DnyYtbW1eM152WxwHdZ020Zzg%26uk%3Dx1N67DNWKNHPm49s2Cg%26f%3DIMG_5238.MOV%26sz%3D66617544&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C5d17959daee42fa608daee7be8d1%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638084514378176201%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoiv2luMzIlLCJBtI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C2000%7C%7C%7C&mp:reserved=0</p> <p>0 bytes</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109666	<p>External Email</p> <p>Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023</p> <p>Geese flying to HHH. Zoom in to see an ENORMOUS amount of geese flying to and from the HHH area to the Columbia and Yakima Rivers.</p> <p>Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist</p> <p>Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAe6duMLbQBHni89Wpi3VEY7K7shHAV-3ssvGyKjKZ1adAsPD6Md001C%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAhKSiQOoTlLvUE9-JyV5G5z4-t5nCew0Hvrtg9Yz%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogqYqySc8y3Ka2HvHxIwZyWjySeis3J86Sgi5ZQ50SpIgsdhD3k-Dv1zAY96Pbw-Q2e5yJVEijCLTIAmus5cPdsRhoBOPbl0aVl7I5THkryLqnCBwcho0z4M%2526e%253D1675447685%2526ff%253D%2526r%253D6FCB95CD-6D94-4136-8214-E536CD4C9009-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253Dh6w1nyX3TspZKb9uJXGdgXyA%26uk%3D5iOoqf37YYGdLB1v6Zj2g%26f%3DIMG_0775.MOV%26sz%3D139369396&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C42914e049bf418ea1298daee7ae256%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638084526494154566%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoiv2luMzIlLCJBtI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C2000%7C%7C%7C&mp:reserved=0</p> <p>0 bytes</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1109669	External Email Hawk in HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109679	External Email Chukar in the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109681	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 3, 2023 Hawks flying and hunting together in the HHH. Click to Download https://gcd02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fovws.icloud-content.com%252F%252F%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253Fo%253DAnQq29Z7p6FwsQsTnVQOHObcGxvqjDV4tGzBd0yvnpm%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogKOF0qRy7tJ_rg2gFmL_qdoD%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253Fo%253DAnQq29Z7p6FwsQsTnVQOHObcGxvqjDV4tGzBd0yvnpm%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogKOF0UO8thPZ9BkTbWz6sjAZFqeH_ykYDw2ZEbaIFHvkSdhCW44w1zAYlvOGxOEwlgEAKgC6AMA_w_73YFSBHNNkUtaBH-p2gNqJZRSoPHq5kpK_SmjN_57BLxz5GIS6KJQF9NvoG9jFDz_r_Rzc2pyJaJ836PdNY8t6TebwHuSSV_9qj8di2SwCOT6sYELIRb2ZWUn2AM%2526e%253D1675448400%2526f%253D%2526r%253D2FCC896D-738C-4525-82F1-7A4C34416B22-1%2526k%253D%2524%2527Buk%2527D%2526ckz%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D0tW6PQMOLV5SEgs36xByU_yanzY%26uk%3DhMtciz1fL4X0g8AlcQmugw%26%3DIMG_9829.MOV%26sz%3D25631608&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C1dc92df40bcc48863a0308daee804c3a%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638084533260380584%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCjQljoiv2luMzIlLCjBTiI6Ik1haWwILCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C2000%7C%7C%7C&sd=lvCKRCTvNj5S%2FqBPLgnzJdJZ%2FaeZq9N43%2B1AsA6xeQ%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109685	External Email Falcon flying in HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109703	External Email I am deeply concerned about nuclear waste still shipping in to Hanford, in open, unlined pits, with leaking tanks not fixed, and a 5 year cleanup plan that looks good on paper, but will amount to nothing if not fully funded - with no accountability for progress - even as vested interests promote more nuclear energy and more radioactive waste. I am writing to express my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and the role it will play in helping Washington achieve the ambitious decarbonization goals we set for ourselves with the passage of the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) in 2019. I believe strongly in impact mitigation and value EFSEC's process, but know that Washington's ability to realize a carbon-free future will depend on permitting large-scale clean energy projects in a timely manner just like the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. This is a good project with appropriately identified mitigation measures, and backed by an experienced team that will produce up to 1,150 MW of renewable energy through a combination of wind, solar, and battery storage technology. With the passage of CETA, Washington established itself as a leader in the fight to curb global emissions. The state now has a responsibility to ensure the clean energy transition can be achieved in the necessary timeframe to facilitate fossil plant retirement, and in doing we can set an example for the rest of the nation to follow. Thank you for your consideration. ... peace in one breath one breath at a time	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109707	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 6, 2023 Really low geese flying to HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcd02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fovws.icloud-content.com%252F%252FAQp9t98J_gAUOIdcMatpKIX6dVAEAZIL9xQ7czdHOlfoDZsG_bIKuaFd%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253Fo%253DApI92dSDax7RaEmYG0zqF_FgTWTi8lcledbSFxLmx3VE%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogVclhpRli6yU7j0duJcGaM3YOP-jgXgFgQ_Py9J9TJASdhCQl-p2DAyKkIqvelwigEAKgC6AMA_1SoN6JSBPp1UARaBEq5oV1qJYmDu8i8tyD16azEJf5yi-Pv-CtsRvkOpvLIGTUh7WxNYYnjegJyJTwsCV9DJHX04QYiBqbQY6hSC2lVPBs-nrpgliv64eF94V66Pk%2526e%253D1675703784%2526f%253D%2526r%253D8685F065-9F72-4D29-9EA9-0DC323CD8CEC-1%2526k%253D%2524%2527Buk%2527D%2526ckz%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DxLjYjVx3NPM6csqk_xwqCbl3N9z8%26uk%3DJLGL2LVPjgwhck2JJPJNsasA%26%3DIMG_0844.MOV%26sz%3D132129802&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cb0516de4e04c47bf1aa908daf0d2e9dc%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638087087495800782%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCjQljoiv2luMzIlLCjBTiI6Ik1haWwILCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sd=rh5l0cO88cVJyXyLdeCUUURAoxdVZvzZgzGazj961A%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1109713	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 6, 2023 More geese an hour later flying into the HHH at a low elevation. Can you imagine them all being chopped up? Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcovws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAV2Q2gFGRib2iGq31SP0t-nnhhRSaVSwkJpiAdfMD8tqvCw9AX_ar75v%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAocwqgYCziL9BvHRvoDBN2N1gCBoudE-kI_LZ_T-olNq%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogf8xyAWk1vTkSaxjnaA26CoX1-kljplHBuABAUshq2ASdhCSho3s2DAYkpalwOlwlgEAKgkC6AMA_w-7JiZSBOeGFFJabNqvm9qJXbwqjSiXv8splc1er4bsplTGddCH_ahPDFffH6MvGpVkbEPAfYJV52fhOUBBLObVYiLiDhSSJXhCqE7ultgV2WGowSEf9rbbkAs%2526e%253D1675708467%2526f%253D%2526r%253DBA305F45-50C8-484C-A60A-ABB70901783A-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253Dm85JCRCCKNkpXQNDR8bjn1KISks%26uk%3Dwun1OePJfVoAV_wvTBPhyQ%26f%3DIMG_0847.MOV%26sz%3D27325123&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C2feb8a7d32b24560d13808da0d0dd12e%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638087133911312617%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoIv2luMzIlCJBtIi6Ik1haWwLlCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=ohZw4rt%2BB8ypikZOJhBGpAYp1DRZXta5bGWermOLLjM%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109721	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 7, 2023 Large eagle flying over HHH. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcovws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAWNgjiI4J0Cnj8E7TiCNZ0K5ip_ARtx6r0CoFYyxVUQbGtudzbaHNrk%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAakdKr8YjppG3B6JY1BnVKV1jzGGBJTKhU8Y_uqSy35s%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogfG0Eex_nW7jsO7hu70uoJtqg27A9xeoRSKDaiJ1h5b-QSd#COL_CU2TAYqdr6OlwlgEAKgkC6AMA_zfb7aRSBKXmKn9aBNoc1GRqJZjCR16YcGBMgGT7HWW_pdi-dyl70ddxaOuHc-TZL_UzMO6gtaujJfRM2EpGRv2ty_ZbvxmgurP9MXPY85A25MzSJ2JcX8NoVQfT2co%2526e%253D1675793978%2526f%253D%2526r%253D16CA9B08-4C6C-45E7-A245-78CF6B348D33-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DJ5EY_E_f5l7qm2QZrW8Dyy1ThQFk%26uk%3D8RjnExrNONiFY3FraoP8Q%26f%3DIMG_0857.MOV%26sz%3D23784325&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C0139e22628804a0eaa2008daf1a4e9d8%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638087988872654889%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoIv2luMzIlCJBtIi6Ik1haWwLlCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=vtkVzczgFMh7nSZIT1%2B5gWW2LZJv%2F%2BL7iOD79fXDcY%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109724	External Email So many ducks in the HHH are we even have couples nesting in back yards and a Bald Eagle nesting in local trees. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1109733	External Email Pheasants in the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110852	External Email Pheasants in the HHH. Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110854	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Geese flying towards HHH. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcovws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FASkugmBIUHEx4HTTVkpd2qWWQTK3XAelD_5uVK0ZpXFVAjizh4ZBPhkEQ%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAIH6Y2bjshoQVSCi8KnOy9jJuO3Kz3CKPRI0a1u4WoWl%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogNJs4EE9UxiQOIDOzQINi3Cs890BxMYxUmoyyRHPAwYSdhDY0Om72TAY2LDkj-MwlgEAKgkC6AMA_2HwWJISBJBMrdabE-QORBqJZr9zSEGNwvQhMopfNPgNEXGOBVqKANSQQ3X8kMp9WyoLUITwlyJX-jA-dikw8A_MxxY7OQ-1wX64pOiP4DwshCm1mYns1z8pS3WmM%2526e%253D1675875653%2526f%253D%2526r%253D2A467268-B65D-4B1E-B7C5-5C06B9F6ACDA-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D9qglJ_nsgzZyI8FLMCDYaAJo%26uk%3Duryom0_HxXJKxBBJ69PpuQ%26f%3DIMG_8264.MOV%26sz%3D77619281&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C5cd8f1a5f0be4890a1fb08daf263133d%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088805794188514%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoIv2luMzIlCJBtIi6Ik1haWwLlCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=M4zwLieS8iPZT1zRhD0NZhFikV9FjYmW2hoJ4SFNaPE%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1110876	External Email	Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
		Example of how much room windmills take on land. These windmills are very small compared to the proposed size of HHH windmills. Remember the windmills take a lot of petroleum to operate, kill and impact wildlife, pollinators such as bees, bugs, and bats, impacts farming and living areas, impact human health and safety, the massive windmill blades can not be recycled, and most states don't recycle solar panels since they are classified as hazardous waste, and the windmills never, ever pay for themselves- the government covers the costs. Not a smart earth or business decision. Nuclear energy is dependable - not waiting for the wind to blow or the sun to shine. We have a massive nuclear reservation in the same area with Hanford clean up and a nuclear power plant as well. Energy created from nuclear cannot compare to anything. Small modular reactor is where the future should be focused on. The footprint of the earth impacted is so small as well.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
		Christina Caprio NEPA EIS Environmental Scientist Third Generation Hanford Nuclear Reservation Scientist	Land and Shoreline Use	The Project would be micrositest to avoid and minimize disruption to existing cropland and would provide new revenue to agricultural landowners via lease agreements (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC 2021). Of the acreage permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 6,866 acres are agricultural lands. Of the agricultural lands permanently impacted by the Project, approximately 99 percent are being managed for dryland wheat. Table 3.8-1A shows an analysis of the Project's consistency with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan's relevant goals and policies. For aspects of the Project's design that are not in alignment with the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, EFSEC would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and the Applicant.	4.8.2, Appendix 3.8-1	n/a
		Sent from my iPhone	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110878	External Email Pronghorn Antelope roaming the HHH. These have been r established by the Yakama Indian Nation with the Fish & Wildlife. The proposed windmill and solar farms will impact their roaming and mating rituals. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110880	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhills cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAiBilLVbi7HBJgK_9vdeuRN28k3ATHYVZUO9i2dnjblDIBloU033kRV%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253F%253DAr155nCCIMSBweY8s1lxNihE1GEh7_oIGZcykTRCdPko%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAog1lomzrE2NndCfC4B-dY6f-LjdncLvj_nZreHDnmeDwYSdncCfncC82TAyn627kOMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_2uDHABSSBE3byTdaBDteRFVqJeYO2mvpPSmDd7zSuFc8cqJrXmsf1ENE8HukqMmZS-26lqJnkZrYJWaxNLUWDoahT4KV4vS4wWDX_dwU_kUqn8WDMjRT-QANNR8aCXtY%2526e%253D1675877078%2526t%253D%2526r%253D948BA724-E629-4F93-A627-5FF7094EAFf5-1%2526k%253D%2524%257BF%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largetattachment%2526kc%253D01ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DU5Nir8mqdYVxxgdfLUCIOl3RH8%26uk%3DmlIV7VH5gP6ikPmCaUJYSA%26f%3DIMG_2008.MOV%26sz%3D78559452&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C02958eb52db4472caa7a08daf2666489%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088820038166442%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAICLJCjQjoiV2luMzIiLCJBtIi6Ik1haWwLjCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sd=MQgJGvwPNF44p3rTQL11RiDGqQInQhZmwZwbWyKp3A%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110912	External Email Pronghorn Antelope roaming the HHH. These were just reintroduced by the Yakama Indian Nation. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110922	External Email Hawks hunting together over the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110924	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAiEh9s1miBuKjX8xTWDWu0BFBsUIARQsiFdwGGR_joO03xttWOT7hQDs_%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253F%253DAr155nCCIMSBweY8s1lxNihE1GEh7_oIGZcykTRCdPko%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAog1Bg1SevA8H8wxj68K8jJGOvhlYVgksCIzSnsIs7DKgSdhCQyMy82TAYkNjHkOMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_2qWlwBSBEUGxSVaBOFAOz9qJXM8EQ7_zES8OUFsaqvXoJjZnzpxc7-S7e6JV-LmLdsTlqYdxxyJYQHwhTIAxwsFcsQewModzw0ID7-g92zy0ZkIM1iJP4ME8KH2%2526e%253D1675877280%2526t%253D%2526r%253D157DB97C-CD43-44F9-B32A-529F84FDEF63-1%2526k%253D%2524%257BF%257D%2526kc%253Dcom.apple.largetattachment%2526kc%253D01ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DU5Nir8mqdYVxxgdfLUCIOl3RH8%26uk%3DmlIV7VH5gP6ikPmCaUJYSA%26f%3DIMG_8188.MOV%26sz%3D22801253&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C720c70852461466ed3708daf266dd19%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088821899420837%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAICLJCjQjoiV2luMzIiLCJBtIi6Ik1haWwLjCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sd=LadQ2NslWJm5gq4qvve6bTbrCrlvTpuX7otenuhrl0%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1110926	External Email View of two hawks hunting together over the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110932	External Email Hawks hunting together over the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110937	External Email Beautiful HHH with the shrub steppe hills and beautiful views for the Tri-Cities, Washington to look at. Priceless. Sent from my iPhone	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1110941	External Email Owls calling in the night at the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110946	External Email Owls calling in the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110949	External Email Hawk flying in HHH. See mid picture to left of gray home. Bird is flying and hunting. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110954	External Email Hawk eating a meal in the HHH. Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110960	External Email Cottontail rabbit and birds in trees in HHH winter. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1110964	External Email Pheasant and cottontail rabbit in HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111062	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Hawk hunting in HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAbFW595wuJ9ocwUHOyPRbtbkv2QdAeNKU6RHiaT2OI-D4yoMArseJUYVW%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAIECrHDA6gZC9ldg4bRo-GdTkc-BRQqmJWJZygPvD3e4%2526%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogguvi2o6sTaRt4AfeBq1KlcytcXBczWcNV4amwfhFYr4SdhDQhZS92TAY0JWPkeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_yJPdOxSBoS_ZB1aBB4IRhZqjXNqYPEXeZZiILC9SPMopWlzzqg_6GL7ZNqgR-ftbjvQVJJ0RhdYJTdTolgJ90emN84g0UQYVWg2lnqLNFENCPltBVBfScyvVLjADl8%2526e%253D1675878451%2526f%253D%2526%253DB0E42714-42CB-4407-A850-1BA5EB45FE10-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253Dq9YuzU6jVSsKpgzrObOMYmwZ0%26uk%3Dsigy_QH9_-Wh-gnccgDlZVw%26f%3DIMG_0390.MOV%26sz%3D46706814&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C992db400f6ae40b63cf408daf26996c4%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dccc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088834032487274%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCjQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLJCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C&data=JT1PCybtOITSFG%2BgsrRWOZDuM9jnKH%2F26BdVLQT4jAU%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111063	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Geese flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAW4Ztd1O5Qu3OicfWYn0GJSIEfhtaSjlpSajy0Z3TVz437iN243t1Zx3%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAhXtTy17E1G1GWHceUocx0uljP2RcXRRR7D8KvZX_T_Wht%2526x%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogf5x1blZxvnylyol-gLlVdY33yYvZ1zcShl357oAtUYSDhC5gaq92TAYuZGkMeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_0wy6JJSBKUR-NtaB03VnHdqJRFCDokongOE93Tc0odCYkZtv6i7GVUmVPDxsSyyZKl9FIWQETNjJZZUwzslDET5i1SLG8pPspLkpuajJxDbHUI6ib7hea2suf-1Y4o%2526e%253D1675878811%2526f%253D%2526%253D561312A8-2B4A-4CBA-8D92-D83FA2B620C8-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DOBzgpKMyljdjswRUImsev2v9Sxs%26uk%3D0hVSoIQvhFRZ0k6ayE-_Q%26f%3DIMG_9428.MOV%26sz%3D40336836&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cc878d66fca2640ccda1508daf26a6d6f%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dccc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C63808883752635711%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCjQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLJCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C&data=I%2Ba43pfP0bDnL2kA6EgaNunNqs2vOfmQpIAVKKYJY%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111068	External Email Sandhill Cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111074	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Snow Geese flying low over the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAQ7hCCi8UCOXdPeX4MQN5E2_-M_VAaKHBz_58boodMZMSy3v1Lm6IMEGZ%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAggtAztLdl8MxiBCd45_1pym7dWCT2mg9t7m-lliv3x6O%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogktbPGwQFmXR_500zJQpLJSwwSDCIqA-2ZNlu2P4MM8lgSdhCX_az92TAYI42pkeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_zYmzZJSBL_4z9VaBk0wQZlqJel9A16cWCBxYzme6XNlaj7nIdg-iksALtgMyawNlJ3idds116vYJc0ZDQLHsOIv7gV7m2yASTNgeI8ACUitqPszhPJWl_lhCAm_5o%2526e%253D1675878878%2526f%253DA02BBC46-E806-41BB-9D66-AFFACFE236D3-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253D-8VGKaC3Jt1185SuodOBbB74LDc%26uk%3DfoI0i03agPBKuH_QNc1CcQ%26f%3DIMG_9427.MOV%26sz%3D35368490&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C221048432e564d500c2608daf26a9437%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dccc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088837989052048%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCjQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLJCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C&data=I%2F26BdVLQT4jAU%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111090	External Email Beautiful HHH hills without windmills. Priceless. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111094	External Email Sandhill cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111100	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Snadhill Cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAbyUJP3M4Tth8z5KNPySX9E-ZSdJAXM75EoVQJN4zhKPNdUkmcqmb%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253Fo%253DAr_IJy_hJwTcvsyPnsHzEj0mk5r8RmjyQ3MFH0M56iX%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogHwJwseoKJ-kCpSQ1DxKaDRguXdx6nGk1RTe1_TJSJ3ZoSdhCw-clW92TAYslnBkeMwlgEAKgKC6AMA_2s2x5VSBDSIJ2NBjyqZshqJagPmfGev2ya8ls0b_kmO1JuV8AmPbalsKtdQnHSWgUA8io6gp9yJWHiBcQ809xwmKzuqlc-HsPq-ulaNMn628S2UlpF06rFwsVtkjMk%2526e%253D1675879269%2526f%253D%2526r%253DC118EF28-4C91-492D-AEA0-589911FDB8FB-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DCpB7qSuXNm-UjaMcFkSij8S-ZAo%26uk%3D_B0QTaj4aL45Va-LiY-00w%26%3DIMG_6920.MOV%26sz%3D61034830&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C544052cc025545a85fe008daf26b7e90%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088842086811004%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=As%2FwZPIU5Gdxa%2BFYZhbOMmZVWUKeeJzhjqAa8NYhtg%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111101	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill Cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAevFpS5q-cdyIVkGHYSilyOCA65AZ_-TgKD_eGWHjFDLO8ucBXIB-lj%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAsFH2zpvaAIgBwWwL60c3ekznSikpylFb5ed27sYQ8p3%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogMkTevqyueUJvwHpX07Z2nh6TmAVj4hPTGZJf_7uh8sSdhCw%2527AYslnBkeMwlgEAKgKC6AMA_0-gJw1SBI4JmabMgh4HnqJTPymqwwN4JmM2Mpo-93AyaW_ap3G7IJG3P8S9d3EDf-UssodyJUictSV1q7VIGV6_-Lp3rPLGGvOLTTHFq-Hz24LLSN3xR04VzWdQ%2526e%253D1675879392%2526f%253D%2526r%253DCE13D3D6-11B5-4DDC-94GE-4CB40B8AA115-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DEtEzSVqnYerxl9cl6l1plfEKLs%26uk%3DE0hL32JkceTn8stviCksKQ%26f%3DIMG_6905.MOV%26sz%3D41490283&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Ce3d55da6ba774c4ce3df08daf26bc745%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088843157747455%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=Fklp9YjJFEH6Mr%2FHJ1OvVGGvcG8ilblzNRmpL%2FdQuG4%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111104	External Email Local birds being raised in the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111132	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Chukar hanging in the HHH. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAXTCNVNqp6Gp7Rdx6K-tpPQUJZSCAaJ66csioioZJUMXEJ5nxbRqyqw%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAvfa6D09VkJJ8xUWgbqwDXtHl53JvTgToxGxncKlZur%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogmTKNvc_7ZNsUJsoX-r2SO7LK8_1VAiE0j6kzHc1SZoUSdhDI3dS92TAYyO3PkeMwlgEAKgKC6AMA_ynNIVYVSBBR9IJaBFGRkBgJR3hxg8mIDdAC3woZK_r_a-iHX4pXszziRSSlMTY1_7ioBLZVR9yJVYwYKyTeqT-eh0kv_9Oxyi2qk-VglJUFuRL50ys2YmPfl8qHoU%2526e%253D1675879511%2526f%253D%2526r%253D77AF8490-C39B-4322-BEB1-62EC971EE320-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DWWeTWwuZ3KEQPok7R8cmN9A5Nwc%26uk%3DL22yNyCWoe05_wVthSzKCQ%26f%3DIMG_6352.MOV%26sz%3D55405807&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C7190396ad2174ee2a80b08daf26c0e8%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C6380888448478505%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=gxbslFShMJMiz4NnFCmSzpnt9ap7aUF%2BF7l8GzPKLz%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111137	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill Cranes in HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAhH2GpHmHlveC76FZOmPiZpvrRAIOgJ77OiSiBOR-B1ph_gFKOpVb%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAJf-70KcZIKLJVvAM2epNRSATyEClwEiUEJ2WEW_7CZKN%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogaFAwVtAME2pwp_Ty3_WrrcU9X9DuLXxgpmBQ2jrhJZ4SdhDdqN92TAY3bjTkeMwlgEAKgKC6AMA_3geEg9SGOm-5FF2BEPcVtqJzHivurM1H7Z8yAMpGSsn2McNok_8iU3BJDxNBEO790H1NKI6W1yJelpnazKN8uCoNTQZ48aApUJlQig6FSijtKEQmSCV8A5Ue3tRXc%2526e%253D1675879570%2526f%253D%2526r%253D674192-9910-47B9-A4B9-80DE9B7603D1-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D-uy0-Qh1H7nyKCKkvFTIbhAcH4%26uk%3D9Fins9ErMqa0lQITaXht2g%26f%3DIMG_4743.mov%26sz%3D36329972&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C8e6d8950e671445778c208daf26c316d%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088845220705645%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=yBapD7vzPoy11GbGHAL2pJbvufTxo28n2SxTAUODnqE%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111139	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Cottontail rabbit fun in the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAhNhRrWk94X_xfY3cjb_YIAhNTbAOA_Sl2Tg59ZlZ7vxDkP2Xvc1cnC%252F%2524%257B%257D%253F%253DAv0JDfJAnG0zJMoakqJ0EIABBAhIMSK2soqj_zLrt4P0%2526v%253D1%2526%253D3%2526a%253DCAogAs0RY3pP5QHYZ57y-XMSKMnmOEh87Eb-586JSdjZ7vwSdhD7pd692TAY-7XZkeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_xW55UVSBIA1MdtaBNzVycJqJSQMKOacND09H71KpYZjKVVCPIJK-b-D9dmONJXxQUJwGfnd11RyJSMNCOA-2nOyraaqDLcldjBCRQ0hOwUvm9ndwFrGbGDO0JH0bs%2526e%253D1675879668%2526f%253D9%2526%253D987B7D24-3BF0-487E-97AD-533C5E7C4B35-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253D08088ISRRpBni7-gkIsWp6MslRUU9%26uk%3DRxCZ7O3503K20aO5BMIPRg%26f%3DIMG_3548.MOV%26sz%3D25430314∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C8090345243e84d04c4bb08daf26c6bf9%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088846055749884%7CUnknown%7CTWTFpbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJlQljoIv2luMzILCJBtIi6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C7C∓sdata=%2BoYo%2BS0uSPBCBZwr0rtpqW9a4DHlbdzSOmLKzAkveE%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111142	External Email Sandhill cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111144	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill cranes flying over the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAab7i4f2-YhaS-3qoq-MjP0Y7-jAVT4-RiVzvgIdeas8kOgupkUfsJy%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAuwPhQ32Qpr5b59aetmNhycF8wb_aUA9N6V7Vze2WJL%2526v%253D1%2526%253D3%2526a%253DCAogHYk-wkIR96C1dh6vld_AMK9L-bfOr8gX83qPenl6DBrYSdhCn8Oa92TAYp4DikeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_zvV7YpSBPRjv6NaBBR-wnJqJWBYNzeEBPCTkNGMMBUAKP_rKngG8alvhNQ7yzHgHgyBp0zToMvYJSmMoApYXX2-bKYHyRmQoxlCFz5emCGN3o7JvFJEOc46PkJpr%2526e%253D1675879809%2526f%253D%253Df3162BAD-A844-4660-987A-1A5F176CF5E6-1%2526%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253Dq3CmK222JvR_nBQDl4PTDGSK20%26uk%3Dz2EYJ2J5OQ1OIQblyp01Ug%26f%3DIMG_1888.MOV%26sz%3D27819929∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cc137c4fab2694c9caa9308daf26cblc7%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088847460354101%7CUnknown%7CTWTFpbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJlQljoIv2luMzILCJBtIi6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C7C∓sdata=1bK04fPKG%2FDaETfmc28ZD%2BFn3bKfM3Kv6MxpSD8tA4%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111146	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill cranes flying over the HHH. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FA2yaV4cs37zqQgn9shUd5dSthSdAb3p6hevSIDXl7KB1bgY0di9DPzN%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAuuU-d2Nb7vPYO6_Zv2ehW7rHDzxD60h39OnK2pOgZ5%2526v%253D1%2526%253D3%2526a%253DCAogZLruKBsu0qam0SN6WwLqMQTMOgr3wtQHSgJ0Yr_YVOJQSdhDzheq92TAY85XlkeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_wjKcDhSBFJ-FJ1aBL0M_M1qJRpjS_5CDj9Bik2NCFHL8MzgyqbX_j0uhZMlknfdmRdSpVwJ1JyJUrpk7m5y2knUWeGXQH0TD4nbJ3slounZEzm3umKwblFw6KQDl%2526e%253D1675879860%2526f%253D%2526%253D7F532667-1B98-471E-BA00-1C2ACB1F727B-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253D-RgGcbQX4cFdYgGARoYK-OJ07k%26uk%3DXEdpClmy_0iHB15EkDnqPQ%26f%3DIMG_1887.MOV%26sz%3D34255511∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cc99ec0a076fc457b575708daf26cdec6%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088848021418797%7CUnknown%7CTWTFpbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJlQljoIv2luMzILCJBtIi6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C7C∓sdata=mhusqv0%2FhTxexJufuZ5nLHwYENEliaOPTqj5RbyWcy%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111154	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Geese flying over the HHH Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAdpInx3F9xWQfY09lyXruJlQSI1AdRd2W-l3nDf5Lw8ZysVRmUcZBu%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAIRh7UQXXl_w5PwHD8UW1txOHV786B32ow34QAYf5Ks%2526v%253D1%2526%253D3%2526a%253DCAogZ8gLUyT50gzBxj-wwD07sQOEL9evUj5SYBxnB_8bQs0SdhCzvO-92TAYs8zqkeMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_xvXMQISBJSVBLVaBJRxnysqJcMvVhLerfoaKW-elXxytNy2PrEHlX_sSK6cClWxrHEcvNjupyQ4txUch63aNRH8PDsbVRPT1COaMd5ogUHoERP1wpkUHAueVdy%2526e%253D1675879949%2526f%253D%2526%253DE6A890C3-0B89-4167-9FF0-39052F8E446B-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DMijexikWCGs1zA7sJlxP1XV_Jzg%26uk%3D5BvvuolAJVETR5FxiheG%26f%3DIMG_1353.MOV%26sz%3D26556203∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cfe309e41cd3640c5fb7c08daf26d13ce%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088848920191278%7CUnknown%7CTWTFpbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJlQljoIv2luMzILCJBtIi6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C7C∓sdata=Wc3xW0HT5awp8eftzErq3tIMR%2FNemraSX1cgbE2XKyU%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111208	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Snow Geese flying low over the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAQ7hCi8UCOvDPeX4MQN5E2_M_VAfarddTmY_4SHorQ1_Q_o0BmhRJ0%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAtaMBJosa0nA8lroh6fpeBAW1wBnp1WjYRH9kX3mZG%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogNDt-CfLAunBezAeavVvcm08pst9Yk7XBYNI2KcTx4QSDhCovPg82TAYqMz1keMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_wbUCY1SBL_4z9VaBGaFGPRqJYJg-BolCHlyXxu3tZJ1ry_8srV0iBU8kx86gaBq4gLwmBT3OdyJWuAuHOKhic-_ufnuqE3klmpuDMCQM7EZPy_LgEek1UG0yrJS7c%2526e%253D1675880130%2526ll%253D%2526%253DDFF660DA-DCFD-4B16-8099-D9D336E31119-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DP8th3hMK11FCEsrgWXAFVs6ln4o%26uk%3D-X01e2ZuPL88YuPIYenlYA%26f%3DIMG_9427.MOV%26sz%3D5368490&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C8371f1c154e224382424508daf26d8412%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057doc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088850761685288%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLClJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=s08pb8shA65qAaZijW6vrCxNLQ8QBJDVuVpC4jd%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111210	External Email Hawk in HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111211	External Email Geese flying to HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111214	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Lots of quail in HHH. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAbDuiEo4QNXIKDzrPCASmpg8-vAYgMZ6UIGwPzBV'sVXPpQWIL6nFaG%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAv7zJw_Xi6rbulopA3DY0o02Qk8BHUT1B-NrglMEV9uakX%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogjke2w8d909AyR3nCvLClmBOaNdHJ5xUwrgCaonneX0sSdhDq7Jy_2TAY6vyXk-MwlgEAKgkC6AMA_wbJD8VSBF6Dz69aBPqcVoZqJddm9apa_uMvs_WWJpYdg5KFQW's4Y2IAZbHilGt0DwKRZu3mIK5yJUhctx-2mZM0S6WlpfcJEVqBDTW2ySAnNxKxeAqQ9sXKc2EalY%2526e%253D1675882790%2526ll%253D%2526%253DDCA08550-EA2F-4C02-A3E4-E23ADEE74442-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DTYMIJitkEekhKuXqZKpzyotvAEf%26uk%3Dn1Pouue3LThOs08DTzShCg%26f%3DIMG_9558.MOV%26sz%3D36095762&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cdf7980c3ac9f4306ac708daf273b14f%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057doc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088877107853948%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLClJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=ZyYqD5uf%2FmyVp5rR4Q3IPmwr9BIT8heZOKCzXNqsEic%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Christina Caprio	1111219	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Geese flying to hhh. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAbFPdhwR_GmAS94mmYKkEaWoxBARdQIKZWbELkWFpjkXeNHD3928%252F%2524%257Bf%257D%253Fo%253DAvwsQnEXa1JaY8vYiVvk1h3rf069nRfNwVp0i0N4GyA%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogIcAAXJROEhpTYe_thd7fHEkqf32yNimPKmchKvyIRPuSdhDSvaK_2TAY0s2dk-MwlgEAKgkC6AMA_1JW09RSBK1ahcFaBPf1nzFqJc_87nzhpV4tuXW1bsx4T59qPGkiflyJnxqdRaGCw4sFInaRyJbLsD4u0wREpGL5eE4BzAU2NqxoDIqBbh7ezgQ9Oulmlnr1iA4%2526e%253D1675882882%2526f%253D%2526%253D5A880C1F-0C17-4E99-BBC7-7724D89F9AED-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DTikivxuHQGNEQZK4nftKrrqicEM%26uk%3DKo783NLg1y8GRDJQ3vRjJdA%26f%3DIMG_9471.MOV%26sz%3D76810160&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cf174e50ab0cd45cf4c9108daf273e871%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057doc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088878428983599%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljoV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLClJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=kzc43dEFTSo%2FK%2Fy1oShT7yH74a7DIOd4llsEaaB5YyMI%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111234	External Email Hawk bathing in HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Christina Caprio	1111237	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Hawk in HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAclKjKzreuU3JPVPWNXxqJEWcfAZvZ1xfRxihaIH75V77QRAh3N%262F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAmmr1Q3I-9Je7kkQdpjH3usnGONcnCJaO4fImBvIVZ2?%2526v%253D1%2526%253D3%2526%253DCAogexhwQ8f1c-f7xhEaLuwwaOMcUGaCHFLr1T5AggKpMSdhCSuYnA2TAYksmEIOMwlgEAKgC6AAMA_woPyntSBMkRZwVaBBFofc1qJZ8MFIzD4bAx1vbpHmjKQ41e9bc0OEngA-9ctgEYr2AUJOpRtVJJeVgxs8GJkX_b4k2wd0FTBGhzRLuoYqYEz-arZlTf5U98YVE3M%2526e%253D1675884569%2526f%253D%2526%253DB41850F0-86B5-4661-80F4-4BD8F4635FCC-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DOo08RvY2SHcUQGc5ccpdm22PN4%26uk%3DkEyvtdI4SrLQgldvja12Rg%26f%3DIMG_9065.MOV%26sz%3D41494299&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Ca6952462e0c24e1f31d408daf277d593%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088895108926795%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoIv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=ujZGE91d0LAFISxq%2BXMyC9ZFM%2BYGa9TRGH44ETCruk%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111238	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Quail in HHH. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAddi6TzrdQQAHzhp1c3WX3gBoKq2AQLPcmSmXpl8vJea-bDILPvIvJD%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAiojWvX-tfP_pXCYGfGvLsWfD5g1SJOkgHP0-n51pvUA%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526%253DAogzHDx5LFIC4LP7ImKUXFAAjpqxHDXLI7GdIRYFA4TrgSdhCY4Y7A2TAYmPGJlOMwlgEAKgC6AAMA_2KLs5ISBAGqqrZaBnWYtKNqJSBogEVP1ABJ4zBmUGCa_p2yWmof1AkZS7fJcGf-rRQablctjZzmYkKZu6d_5XpVSRG5swP6jhwCKgyaSR8a11TP3wHwVtUE%2526e%253D1675884656%2526f%253D%2526%253D329EEAF9-1AC6-4EA4-9B8D-B6C7502CF206-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DkDbkXPpKMaVNFQG_-2P8HRqj_oU%26uk%3D-EG1prsdMEPadgWuwpUlg%26%3DIMG_8982.MOV%26sz%3D50288930&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cb379b62cf2d4455c9d5408daf278097a%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088895944961385%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoIv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=wu2LI%2BTc2npwKmUSZPjofvqsnXVB1MOzTQEx8ERgdI%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111241	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Proposed area for wind/solar farm expansion. Shows existing Finley small windmills and expansive Horse Heaven Hills of rolling wheat and shrub-steppe environment full of wildlife and upper end custom homes within the farming plots. Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAS-Rlm3B8SIR9fKrVKRBV3CsT2Ad-WHV4J6v7K8H90If8IM3BRJS0q%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAsqnT2UDtoQxN8KGhPHfRtn4ql7Q0QlZLajbLYzeKJu%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526%253DCAogFdAcVhzwp9UGIADEw7qfP-QxqYHynIASatMorGhbwSdhDm5ZbA2TAYsvWRIOMwlgEAKgC6AAMA_xfDzuhSBHckXPZaBFGNLSpqJXKHc2AnzWlaiHnTOJ-IRLzLzArmM1RFJ6WVWZyYyhiX7v4qVs5yJVIEw64cRhEr9XWufmV8j486pkYlsmw9E7GvDoU170SIRku1cU%2526e%253D1675884788%2526f%253D%2526%253D5991A541-BF1F-4979-A151-D77478B850C6A-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DXg8RyuqB0Z24lOxddV0vEgTtli%26uk%3D930qGUSWVoMu3sdrRKWug%26%3DIMG_8924.MOV%26sz%3D34475107&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C0884e1ef987d4142ba9008daf2785829%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088897247237075%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoIv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=1zCJF2x7O6Gv1lvNdrH4xv24tDZsYqL9gseVVRz%2FSp%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Attachment was not found.	n/a	n/a
Christina Caprio	1111248	External Email Geese flying in the HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111249	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Quail in the HHH. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAYP60duJl24mivauMak7W5sJIVh_LAW_EKkQ-DjpwQ-YkOB7yJdeYw1%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAEdokMeXTUqso0qj3lDEo8yTfWn_4FKBEbjp6FM1%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526%253DCAog9JwUoQ3fmkYzSgF4uTFkr82AV2kuMDjpuJPVURAzxdSdhCGwJzA2TAYhCfOIMwlgEAKgC6AAMA_0ijyghSBEhWH8taBISvLDVqJaS2Owc2ldfHfheaFataPGY5NG9cD_s6CChocCBh89lYtj49FrqBRJYJly4qZSLrHl4bHlyiqt1sd0F1ScU9E0CaLVuNyybOaQhTXke3A%2526e%253D1675884881%2526f%253D%2526%253DD71E2373-8C5D-4DA0-82D2-B579E56DBE46-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526%253DTNp4mQm0ClzI7AvR-eJqApH7PHw%26uk%3Dkd992sm98Z_rUgX-CAICyw%26%3DIMG_8854.MOV%26sz%3D27801358&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C9c957f3583c1c46d9575708daf2788f94%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088898183268976%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoIv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=ONcfxwVG15gLae23%2BCNnDJvEAe2yXZJswxv3CBsWLE%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111252	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Snow geese flying from the HHH to the Columbia River. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gc002.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252F%252FAVnuJFLyp%2ZSaUURRkFP4iLeXP3AWWA8pmkg0d8pfzpVfVvo3B9l-Ax%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253F%253DAj%6i75UdWbssaaPuf8bOdKN-X97HQnmI2jpX2HGKI%2526%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogw11TrSqH46yh3ugZ7ekUwdQxc7dVtS0kPicR4lxBgroSdhCA2alA2TAYgOmilOMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_wO0sQZSBltfSc_daBH2X4DFqJYNz4CkKk7lB2L28SGCUsIWkW2g19E3VbgWgGE-hfz1Ja00DielyJSIUQZo8hn4PDzn0djKZudhF6sWHE5zxKnpDUISUJK4zlHUg%2526e%253D1675885065%2526f%253D%2526r%253D891AD918-2BD4-4B7C-88D9-2B7930ED44B4-1%2526k%253D%2524%2527Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largetattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DRXBgKtIGOC_Txk5ly5WTzEDqLXY4%26uk%3DXjDPsdai4ZlB1d6KuJyeDA%26f%3DIMG_8779.MOV%26sz%3D71341398&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C2476c36376bf421ccoc008daf278fcec%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088900022842138%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAilLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=NF%2BVcodk2zXQkmX%2Fa2khNoy4S6BCovrCIU8yX7vCYU%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111253	External Email Sandhill cranes flying in the HHH. Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111254	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Sandhill cranes flying in the HHH. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gc002.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FACBvQQCyOvrXB7gg9sYcQYnrQUYAbQIOvOpVchlidG0A-FR4rWv2P2%252F%2524%2527B%2527D%253F%253DAml2veLxrPMBNgH6Z0uJBPyCQjQXgHml9LYys65RsBwE%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAog7DUJGRlqqR201Wq6pP0bsdT9Kc5swYvPLiIG9QR9uV4SdhDPwqvwA2TAYz9KmlOMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_3NR73ISBCetBRhaBNa_Y_ZqJeekLIGOStrf-ZxJ-QIsVgpHKmrIp-xx-VbeGHNss-muvIT-IRyJSbdaZJomL-fSAkJH5alo9DyeimjuBvaz-yKTktS3wy6JAFvTuA%2526e%253D1675885128%2526f%253D%2526r%253D646F32B3-525E-4114-9435-652A11D4733F-1%2526k%253D%2524%2527Buk%2527D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largetattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253Dah7BBomVqk_AnbulMq4OKbZJBqvk%26uk%3DIH6h3F2PNIWNUnUj_RizBuQ%26f%3DIMG_8767.MOV%26sz%3D60003983&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cebc7b90886734c9a529c08daf2792200%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088900672058551%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAilLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&data=4Eu2mQcUTerr0L9ZaEB3oRlr21IOlUq20bJHSS75Ph4%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111258	External Email Sandhills cranes flying in the hhh. Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111260	External Email The HHH with wheat and shrub steppe without windmills on vistas. The wine industry and the citizens enjoy sweeping vista views. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1111263	External Email Beautiful shrub-steppe and clean Horse Heaven Hills without solar and wind farms. Priceless. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	Vegetation	The FEIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111264	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Remaining Shrub-steppe in Benton County is a huge deal for supporting the wildlife. This shows the shrub-steppe and rolling wheat hills with custom homes that the solar/wind farm is proposed. The beauty is breathtaking and priceless. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAdC-SBopYVR7D6lCq3QeXG-ULu5aAc3fhgkdJAXYaHNok9MQ8lt-KKBU%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAIEn4rtx9u_ujZePEaNKKiaQUBGsEW7SoRelcqNpQ-sS%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DAogVolGmKZEIOER9mciRucbHhoFm_O1mLcW9Cbb5QJ01h0SdhD79__A2TAY-4770OMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_1nhKbVSSJQu7ipaBH4ooFRqJY4iQhefcdwJAFVNYX_oy5XNb69ILEBWJsvh00Ro7IAVEFGFkryJVpyGugjXTSuNnCEXy3Xi_vuLRqWUuJiz1feRVokFYIIQGFzBRw%2526e%253D1675886511%2526R%253D%2526%253D34C89DD3-A92B-43EF-874B-918D77EC03A0-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D0Hh-dT6-xlwRk7MirNmxJ-mX8y4%26uk%3Dqh8l9vWJnQGGRHaG--A77Q%26f%3DIMG_4374.MOV%26sz%3D21466153∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C457/bad5e391479da90708daf27c5a67%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057d0c127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088914734346735%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjolMC4wLjAwMDAlLCJQJoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C∓data=xCP%2BIJDXn3SDRu55JK6Hh6%2B6btBwCvHUyH1E2H9lUA%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111274	External Email Gorgeous hills of the unobstructed HHH. Priceless. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Attachment was not found.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111276	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Proposed Horse Heaven Hills solar/wind farm area with sweeping views and custom homes. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAWUmoQ3NTDBzW0oICt0BhEWTueanATs6RSVWyoHlUY82F08j_FYEVJNT%252F%2524%257BF%257D%253Fo%253DAswKo-_keoltUBorekqdRlwxL9hAbND4O6EysNGho7eC%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogjIDxJb_ImgGc2hN4mI8ItcaxQUirBe3vn0ReYN721YSdhCm35LB2TAYpu-NleMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_w7SJH9SBJO55qdaBARWM1NqJbvZqCkGS9XQLDyC_7IQEt-r5w0qXh3b5EEbFnHLmq5MxTnHZyJY8GkNhIWmYIM-C8nzoAw1wuqP-Hmmmh5BOgbYUrfOI_PT1pdA%2526e%253D1675886819%2526f%253D%2526r%253D8EA976C1-503F-4C90-96FD-BAE72EAFAC35-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DKXkAG61rJiA1c2BjBDWaf4enj4s%26uk%3DBIRqJDa5JplCJQGSV_IP3A%26f%3DIMG_4324.MOV%26sz%3D78987379∓data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C638088914734346735%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjolMC4wLjAwMDAlLCJQJoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C∓data=ISPaFKIMUleYxM%2BQFYVgAFMZS6x33pp%2FBYYPyXOb3WE%3D∓reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Attachment was not found.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111278	External Email Jack rabbit in HHH. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111282	External Email Ducks in HHH. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111285	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 Listen. Silence and peace. Priceless. Save the HHH for the citizens, for future generations, for the wildlife, for the flora. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAR8CRUb1H8uJ9-An1eAPV65hZEW1Acsvz1CGlymSNFmhF2pkV_nKe5hh%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAiSdXhTvkW4Jj96bf9zJg_il6ypSNVU__6kyKwTAQO68%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCaog0ZpsbGR7VBe9asnsDg3LD_M8uptNZPmlc1u04LGJlMSdhDfxZzB2TAY39WxleMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_xmZ_FZSBGFkRbVaBMp7mGFqJaz82HqO0KPeSGmm0DIQa_sUVsSQDEkor6Jng7kmlEHhjQcjin1pyJdgBJMD-lyBjGpGkw2fI6dGLvFtGf_UFZOLHs09qfQnWXfTMu4%2526e%253D1675886979%2526f%253D%2526%253DF9CFFAD4-51DB-4C48-B9B0-8521906320DA-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DrWAZrmDgtDGNgKUNUTb_p4irJqY%26uk%3DNoF6QTFwkh0ZajEAWuQ1zw%26f%3DIMG_4268.MOV%26sz%3D46414106&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cb7514d0e00a044ca65b308dal27d71b2%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C09%7C0%7C638088919303196098%7CUnknown%7CTWTFpbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDALCjQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6ik1haWwLjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sd=8WYQA6n2IaykYeUibWetOJYmMdkPnHCUWkKW0dBc64%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Attachment was not found.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111287	External Email Perspective for the size of the windmill parts. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111324	External Email Perspective for size of windmill parts. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111328	External Email Perspective for size of windmill parts. Christina Caprio Environmental Scientist Sent from my iPhone	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111479	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 8, 2023 These windmill blades are enormous and are not recyclable. Windmills do not pay for themselves in their lifecycle. Let's do something smarter with a smaller footprint that doesn't hurt the earth and it inhabitants so much. Try small modular reactors that produce an enormous amount of energy continuously. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAYUTJGL1U_kW6bBdkhNjgrT1ScIvAaib_CAYAtlyEGBi8ZYLKPOKcr1%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAq_48yYOdnNnU3nCC8YIRUJJS11_m8DV0yWqJHonyEHv%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAoghY6rWTRpuuOZN5jd_tBCloh8IED-nqC9wx2ISwIAISdhCV59H82TAYlfe8leMwlgEAKgkC6AMA_ztARV5B9VJyVvVaBM4pysfhqJQ5GaFD0lVf7C4eVluuv3TPaA29xF_vriCQLnYs1r2iOE3iPl1yJcDOsdbEINvyv78P17z6AJmW_L-3rXN87eG8qVsb-LZD6EipQRE%2526%253D1675887590%2526f%253D%2526%253DB909f3DC-EC2F-4162-6C24-BBAE8DE946E6-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DrXseX7EQaYSUTD11DclLJUQI-5Nw%26uk%3DD72ivEV4d4yKz3e8x-OduA%26f%3DIMG_9161.MOV%26sz%3D57301647&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cbc54c41eb6924c8f720708daf27ede3%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638088925153017151%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDALCjQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6ik1haWwLjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sd=NxrbOjhu%2FVwzJ2zTU79rVRsv%2FhudpGh2%2FqDbhok%3D&reserved=00 bytes Sent from my iPhone	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
joan.owens	1111484	External Email HHH view of hummingbird, local birds such as and Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Audubon Washington	1111492	External Email Dear Director Bumpus, Please see attached letter requesting a 15-day extension on the public comment period for Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sincerely, Trina Bayard ... Trina Bayard, Ph.D. Director of Bird Conservation 206.704.4303 Pronouns: she/her Audubon Washington 5902 Lake Washington Blvd. S. Seattle, WA 98118 wa.audubon.org	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111599	External Email I'm writing to request the public comment period for the Horse Heaven Hills Project be extended from January 31, 2023 at least two weeks to Feb 15, 2023. I am a resident of Kennewick WA and I live in the area that will be affected directly by the project. The DEIS is exceedingly large, the online version is not user friendly, and takes significant time to read and comment on. Two weeks will grant reviewers extra time to conduct a more thorough and conscientious review and comment. This will greatly enhance the quality of the work and results that can be achieved by EFSEC through the public commenting process. I would greatly appreciate knowing if this extension is feasible and can be granted forthwith. I believe that letting the public and the many interested parties and agencies know at the earliest possible time will greatly aid the process. Appreciatively, Paul Krupin, BA MS JD 2404 South Lyle St. Kennewick WA 99337 509-531-8390 cell 509-582-5174 landline Paul@Presari.com	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111655	External Email I am writing to express my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and the role it will play in helping Washington achieve the ambitious decarbonization goals we set for ourselves with the passage of the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) in 2019. I believe strongly in impact mitigation and value EFSEC's process, but know that Washington's ability to realize a carbon-free future will depend on permitting large-scale clean energy projects in a timely manner just like the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. This is a good project with appropriately identified mitigation measures, and backed by an experienced team that will produce up to 1,150 MW of renewable energy through a combination of wind, solar, and battery storage technology. With the passage of CETA, Washington established itself as a leader in the fight to curb global emissions. The state now has a responsibility to ensure the clean energy transition can be achieved in the necessary timeframe to facilitate fossil plant retirement, and in doing we can set an example for the rest of the nation to follow.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Becky Hughes	1111657	External Email Letting a An Australian investor (motivated by our tax payers subsidy) that hired a Colorado based Company (Scout Energy) to erect 244 wind machines 671 feet high, this is a protected Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail along a ridge/canyon area. These are placed in the Pacific Flyway migration path, degrading the shrub steppe ecosystem. They will have red lights flashing day and night and the noise will be outrageous. This also is desert and limited water which we pay highly for irrigation, we do not have water to spare. We are already being forced to have an expanded retention pond pushed into our land just for the farmers what more would we be required to pay for with these ugly monsters wasting gallons of our water daily. We have only 45 days to protest before Gov inslee pushes this Tax payer financed program down our throats. And ruins our community. This a residential area with nice homes, farms and vineyard's. This Australian company wants to ship this power out of state as it will be too costly for Kennewick residents to pay for but it will be destroying our land and using our restricted water and destroying our aquifers. This area is also the home of many large predator birds needed to keep the snake and rodent population under control as well as many endangered species who live here year around. it is also a major bird migrating path and their environment will also be destroyed. https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa This is invasive will cause the land to be destroyed produce horrible air quality blowing dust around and forcing me to not be able to go outside. The dirt already can be restrictive but the construction will be unbearable. Also according to the Harvard study it will increase the temperature another 8"! That is outrageous! We had 110° some days last summer, you will destroy this land. How much more air condoning will we need! This is a Simulated view by developer off Badger Mountain looking over Dallas Road and Badger Canyon at HH wind farm This area has only a 2 landed farm road allowing all of our residents to travel to exit the area or get farm equipment from one field to another the construction would impact our community negatively! We already are having to deal with KID's unwanted construction and the massive power line they are planning on constructing for them tearing up our community and costing taxpayer money in our area. Residents need to be addressed. This is very unreasonable, if you want this put it in a uninhabited area not a residential area! This Project is backed by Australian investors (motivated by our tax payers subsidy) that hired a Colorado based Company (Scout Energy) to erect 244 wind machines 671 feet tall for 24 miles on private wheat farms, protected Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail along a ridge/canyon area. These are placed in the Pacific Flyway migration path, degrading the shrub steppe ecosystem (federally protected birds and plants.) There is no energy/economic impact of this project other than the out of state user or large corporation that will benefit from purchasing a "green energy source" with transferable tax credits to another facility not meeting energy guidelines (no penalty.) Other states denied this project. Our local authorities and public were bypassed input and it was directly placed in Olympia! Negatively impacting our wine and agriculture, higher energy bills for consumers. Currently Europeans are rethinking this minimum producing wind turbine energy and beginning to dismantle them. European data points to health hazards including the environmental impact (Netherlands and Germany dismantling has begun). One of the Hawk pairs that lives in the tree at the intersection of Badger Rd and Badger Canyon Rd. There are many nests in our canyon this is only one. We also have other protected species living in our land. There has been no real impact statements produced locally only the investors who bypassed us. --- Becky Hughes Concerned citizen of Badger canyon Kennewick, WA 99338	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Water Resources	The EIS includes estimates for water usage for construction and operation phases in Section 3.4.1.5. An estimated 120 million gallons of water is required for Project construction. Project operation is estimated to require 5,000 gallons per day for facilities and 2,025,000 gallons annually for solar panel washing. Impacts to water are assessed in Section 4.4 and no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified. The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. According to Appendix J the Wallula-Dodd Road Water System would be willing to enter into a contract with the Horse Heaven Project to supply the required water for construction.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Vegetation	The FEIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 3.5 and 4.5	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary. The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celcius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
joan.owens	1111705	External Email Dear Chair Drew and Director Bumpus: Due to the complexity and length of the DEIS for the HH Wind and Solar Project, we request an extension to the public comment period slated to end January 31, 2023. In addition, the current 45 day public comment period has included multiple holidays (4+) making it impossible for the public to access copies of the DEIS at local libraries or to contact EFSEC staff and local agencies for information or questions on those days. Please grant our request for an extension of the DESI public comment period. Up to 30 days more would allow for local participation/commenting on this important document. An in-person public comment meeting in the Tri-Cities is also needed. Commenting online or by USPS works for many, but not for all. To allow equitable opportunities for all locals to comment, a public comment meeting for the HH Wind Project DEIS is requested. (Like the one EFSEC offered for the Watoma Wind Project). Thank you in advance for your consideration of extending the DEIS public comment period up to 30 days beyond January 31, 2023 and for scheduling an in-person public comment meeting in the Tri-Cities. Respectfully, Pam Minelli --- Secretary, TRI-CITIES C.A.R.E.S. Phone: 509-539-6788 Email: pam@tricitescares.org TRI-CITIES C.A.R.E.S Community Action for Responsible Environmental Stewardship Visit: www.TriCitiesCARES.org	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). Copies of Draft EIS along with Application for Site Certification were available at 8 local libraries on December 19, 2022. Names and addresses of these libraries were provided in the notice. In addition, EFSEC's phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111706	External Email Please stop destroying the views and environment in the Columbia Basin/Horse Heaven Hills. No more wind farms! Sent from my iPhone	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1111708	External Email This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." Judy Guse 104902 E Triple Vista Dr Kennewick, WA 99338	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa. The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111778	External Email I would like to request for a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Hills wind farm project. Thanks Vince Shawver West Richland Wa	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa. The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1111779	External Email The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal,make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS. thank you Scott Siefken 2306 hood ave apt H Richland wa,99354 Sent from my iPad Begin forwarded message: From: Judy Date: January 14, 2023 at 3:59:48 PM PST To: goosie1515@aol.com Subject: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Public Hearing Request- Please send request by 1/18/23 Reply-To: Judy Hi Everyone! According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, EFSEC is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local people make a written request. This request must be made within 30 days of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement release date which was 12/19/22. Therefore, all requests must be sent on or before 1/18/23. Will 50 of you make this request? When you do, please notify me so that I can keep track of how many requests have been submitted. Follow these email instructions: Send to: email addresses listed below, enter the subject line and the body text shown below, remember to include your contact information. To: efsec@efsec.wa.gov; sonia.bumpus@efsec.wa.gov; kathleen.drew@efsec.wa.gov Subject: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Public Hearing Request This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." Thank you, [Your name] [Your street address] [City, State, ZIP]	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1111863	External Email I am writing a formal complaint on the attempted horse heaven wind farm project. This project will adversely affect my family in a negative way. The wind farm also affects TRI cities in a negative way and the negatives outweigh the benefits. I bought land at my location to be able to see the hawks fly in the badger canyon. The wind farm will decimate our hawk population. I bought my land for the beautiful rolling hills and the starry county night skies. The eye sores of a wind farm in my back yard will ruin the value of my most valuable asset which is my home. The bright blinking lights will be a nuisance and diminish my quality of life. Not to mention the noise, traffic, and dust that will affect my family's health and we'll being. I reject the proposal to put any wind farm in our back yard that will do nothing but make our lives worse. I am prepared to pursue any legal action to stop you from harming my family and those around me. Brett Turner Get Outlook for Android	Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	n/a	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			General - opposition	Comments acknowledged. For discussion of potential project impacts and proposed mitigations refer to respective chapters of EIS on visual aspects, noise, Public Health and Safety.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114799	External Email This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing for the Horse Heaven Wind/Solar Farm project. Hailey Caprio 32604 Pico Drive Kennewick, Washington Get Outlook for iOS	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114828	External Email To whom this may concern Please listen to the public opinion and owners of this beautiful land you want to destroy. We Tri Citizens don't want this Solar project to transpire, we say no! We want, we have the right to look out into the horizon and see our God given Sky we have the right to our natural beauty, our land, our view. It belongs to us, not a our Governor, nor a Bullheaded solar-power company. Don't come here with false hood about green energy, we know this is false. Refer to Sharyl Attkisson: Is "Green" really clean. These also will be obsolete very soon and you will walk away laughing all the way to the bank leaving us with the eyesore. We feel we are not ready to allow such a drastic forever project that would impact our Community and our Beautiful Columbia Basin. We are not on board with those making this permanent decision. There are better out of the way hills to go to. We have done enough on our part as you can see anywhere you go. Driving into Tri Cities from Walla Walla, Turbines everywhere. ENOUGH!!! Enough is enough! You have failed to show the benefits other than buying out politicians you have failed to provide alternatives, like the Tulip flower design and others. We want you and many companies to stay away from rural farm Land and population. We take it seriously when you kill our wildlife foul And is this possibly a culprit in aviation bird flu virus with carcasses piling up at base. NO NO NO! Just No! Seriously, Sonia Ayala 7000 rd. 32 Pasco, wa 99301	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1114894	External Email As required by the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018: The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local personal within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS. If this email does not suffice as a "written request" then please promptly inform me and others that have emailed of the proper address to direct a formally written and signed request. Jerrod Sessler 84009 West Old Inland Empire Highway Prosser, WA 99350 The proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm project is problematic in several ways. The first and most importantly is that it is a collaboration of private and public organizations that do not uniquely have the authority to acquire and use the land for a for-profit venture under the 5th Amendment of the US Constitution or under any other section of the state or federal Constitutions. Furthermore, there is no demonstration that the resulting energy generation is needed to support the demands of Washington residents. If it is needed for Oregon or California residents then it would be questionable why a prized portion of our landscape, not to mention the environmental concerns would be sacrificed for such a project. The overall environmental impact of wind energy generation has not been thoroughly researched and proven to be resilient without the subsidization as a result of political persuasion which creates an unfair and unreasonable imbalance economically for all other forms of energy. There are other factors that must be studied and considered in a non-partisan way prior to making any decisions as to how to proceed or even if a project such as this should be allowed. Let's say YES to America, together! Jerrod Jerrod Sessler Congressional Candidate about.me/jssessler	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114901	External Email We need a hearing A other complaint is they have not done adverse testing on each proposed wind turbine, they have not even given exact location of each turbine. We need testing as to the affects on people health, noise studies or killing wild birds, animals and environment! Lights, noise and killing protected animals! Latest is the deaths of Whales off the east coast! Here it is not only flashing lights increased land temperature, pollution of the land as each unit requires 80 gallons of oil to be changed out every 3 months that is known to leak into the soil, massive water needs. The fact that the fiberglass blades are not recyclable and massive blades have to be buried in landfills. Each unit only lasts 20 yrs and costs almost 1 million dollars to replace. New infrastructure has to be laid to transport this massively expensive power to where it is needed. -- Becky Hughes 25102 s sunset meadow loop Kennewick wash 99338 Becky@wmhughes.com	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
joan.owens	1114925	External Email This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." Thank you, Gary Schaefer 54807 E.Badger Road Benton Cit, Wa 99320 I have some major concerns about the healthy effects for us that are living near those with large windmills not to mention the devaluation of land prices we are relying on for resale and also the total lack of concern for the legal process of county regulations that we have in place also the damage to all of the animals be it owls, hawks, deer, antelope, and all other animals that I have not mentioned	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	n/a	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
joan.owens	1114927	External Email This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." I do not want the Windmills. They are an eye sore to look at, they are loud, they are harmful to wildlife. Thank you, Tara Kentch 9 S Goose Gap Rd Benton City WA 99320	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114928	External Email Dear EFSEC: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Public Hearing Request This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." The mere thought of all those mega tall space needle sized ugly windmills that will only generate electricity 40% of the time and often in spring and fall when we don't need it and their red light district flashing all night, every night of the 365 nights of the year would be an impact that is not currently considered. I can already see on my eastern horizon hundreds of those flashing red lights in western Walla Walla county on the 9 mile Windmill farm and if scum bag Scout jams these down our throat to see them to the western horizon as well on the unspoiled Horse Heaven Hills would be worse yet. Thank you, Kurt D. Clemmens 987 Lake Rd. Burbank, WA 99323 Sent from my iPhone	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Potential Project impacts and mitigations on visual, light and glare are comprehensively discussed in chapter 4.10 of EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1114937	External Email Dear EFSEC: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Public Hearing Request This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." The mere thought of all those mega tall space needle sized ugly windmills that will only generate electricity 40% of the time and often in spring and fall when we don't need it and their red light district flashing all night, every night of the 365 nights of the year would be an impact that is not currently considered. I can already see on my eastern horizon hundreds of those flashing red lights in western Walla Walla county on the 9 mile Windmill farm and if scum bag Scout jams these down our throat to see them to the western horizon as well on the unspoiled Horse Heaven Hills would be worse yet. Thank you, Rodney Scrimsher 6821 W 20th Ave Kennewick, WA 99338 rodneyscrimsher@gmail.com	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Potential Project impacts and mitigations on visual, light and glare are comprehensively discussed in chapter 4.10 of EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114958	External Email Here are pdf files for the latest Herald newspaper articles If you have any questions please feel free to call or email me any time.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Potential Project impacts and mitigations on visual, light and glare are comprehensively discussed in chapter 4.10 of EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114960	External Email Dear EFSEC: Horse Heaven Wind Farm Public Hearing Request This email is being sent to you as the lead agency to request a public hearing on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. According to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Handbook 2018, "The lead agency is required to hold a public hearing if 50 or more local persons within the agency's jurisdiction or who would be adversely impacted by the proposal, make a written request within 30 days of the issue date of the draft EIS." The mere thought of all those mega tall space needle sized ugly windmills that will only generate electricity 40% of the time and often in spring and fall when we don't need it and their red light district flashing all night, every night of the 365 nights of the year would be an impact that is not currently considered. I can already see on my eastern horizon hundreds of those flashing red lights in western Walla Walla county on the 9 mile Windmill farm and if scum bag Scout jams these down our throat to see them to the western horizon as well on the unspoiled Horse Heaven Hills would be worse yet. Thank you, John Rose 2912 Rd 48, Pasco, WA. 99301	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Potential Project impacts and mitigations on visual, light and glare are comprehensively discussed in chapter 4.10 of EIS and will be finalized in respective chapters of FEIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114964	External Email I am not in favor! My concerns are the INVASIONS!! The invasion on the natural beauty of the land. The invasion on all the natural wildlife. The invasion on tranquility of residents who live there for a reason..to enjoy the tranquility, wildlife and natural beauty!!! Overall bad idea!!!! Jan Brown Sent from the all new AOL app for Android	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114975	External Email Considering the DEIS is 1331 pages and the release date was close to the holidays and people not available I respectfully request an extension of 90 days for comments by the public regarding this project. Topics to be considered: impact to local business impact to diversified agriculture recreation loss property devaluation damage by construction of the project Environmental damage (Pacific Flyway and shrub steppe) Respectfully, Gayle Graves 73206 E Sundown PR SE, Kennewick, WA 99338	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1114997	External Email I am reading and reviewing the Horse Heaven Hills DEIS. This is one complex and lengthy document that is filled with serious quality issues of note. I am requesting that at least one public meeting be held in the Tri-Cities and that the comment period be extended to accommodate providing the public adequate note and opportunity to comment at that public meeting. This project will have a disproportionate impact to the citizens of Benton County when compared to the number of people in proximity to every other wind project in the state combined. There are concerns about the risk of negative impacts on real estate values, on the wine industry, and on tourism. The public deserves to be recognized, listed to and understood. A public hearing will contribute to fulfilling the purpose of SEPA and assuring that a just and rationale outcome is achieved. I request that EFSEC reply to this request. It is being reported to me that more than fifty requests for a public meeting have been submitted. Appreciatively, Paul Krupin, BA MS JD 2404 South Lyle St. Kennewick WA 99337 509-531-8390 cell 509-582-5174 landline Paul@Presari.com	General - Question for EFSEC	In accordance with SEPA 2018 handbook and WAC guidelines, notice of public hearing was published on EFSEC website on January 20, 2023 on https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/horse-heaven-wind-project/horse-heaven-sepa . The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period Regarding request for extension, under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115002	External Email Please do not let more wind turbines be built in Benton county they are terrible for the wildlife and are an eyesore to the people. Thanks, Dave Locke Sent from my iPad	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1115297	External Email Dear Site Evaluation Council Members, I support the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. We need clean energy, and this will be a good source. Please approve the project! Thank you, Peter Fiddler 5744 28th Ave. NE Seattle, WA 98105 206-779-0309	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1115453	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 20, 2023 Lots of quail and other birds in the Horse Heaven Hills. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gco02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252F%252FASTY6wlo1eBN-OuHlSBAAsSUzPbxAYqvebL-AFhXiB6hWQJIVZ5f0%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAm1dxeGso53_idmM-PeEkCwz7d1RHsSyZxbIU49JhNU%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAogyRthYR05_-uVIA9HIGZJunRli_VCZUk0rW-6Y32rLBMSdhCMhoy23TAYJJaHiuocwgEAKgkC6AMA_24C5OFSBJTm9vFaBNVnI_RqJZCVjz5MMWkBHtQ74q5-qAA3GPjti1mOUFT_XJ6SkI2uLD2rine9yJdTAE3ZH_erJAJTjz1vj51a0ZxJwG7s6o3l0mOHycTui_BT0%2526e%253D1676937382%2526f%253D%2526r%253D84675DC6-7A14-4D45-9586-D525DF6E631C-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D1EVc7eKy72kBQyXNPV3JGogKI7A%26uk%3DnEXWQvpgkCIKg_59YZ08Q%26f%3DIMG_1022.MOV%26sz%3D29602729&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C9700e02b0046465fccde08dafc0b1d61%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638099423434717425%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLlCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C&data=KXLwLrIsZ87EbbGAjUpGzGaouy3Zw0l4CbzGZqPK%2Fc4%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115455	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 20, 2023 Many quail and other native birds as an every day event in the HHH. Dawn and dusk are the biggest feeding times. Though this is midday. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download https://gco02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252F%252FAxytH%kAEVsewWxhNvylcWjwkDZAxtsAGEfiuDY6A4IAKxmWIC6C6BKp%252F%2524%257B%257D%253Fo%253DAkghY6yK1Z4QhSpy_FxAdJRfe4nuUq-qj5waCFr8d7%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAoggg8N12OT12oam0zNSpV1O7KrrXt0v4gEVFgO8JA-oggSdhDA1pC23TAYwOaLiucwlgEAKgkC6AMA_xpvcczSBKPCQnLaBLLoGQ9qJY04I8DEwpC3Jn1nZ7phngqcPMtrfIOFeZYQT4yhi6kK20Yhuo1yJdlbU01pxXUeMRXij7DdqF0V344M9qC2itKur_5xGINYieUsYm%2526e%253D1676937458%2526f%253D%2526r%253D878780C4-A5B9-4D16-987C-499CE1954E74-1%2526k%253D%2524%257Buk%257D%2526ckc%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526ckz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253D5PUeAlgYvyR8tPhrfCzKjLM_LI4%26uk%3DxhJuTYE9KyDZBCgIFQiuHw%26%3DIMG_1021.MOV%26sz%3D24818255&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7C89ae9da4388c4155e21b08dafc0b4887%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638099423962117734%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQJjoiV2luMzIlLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLlCjXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C7C&data=e8oJ1FzUNcJJjRYmUVi23%2FkI0iOnS7l8le6u%2FyuaGHg%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115456	External Email This project is massive and a horrible idea. This would destroy scenic vistas . Our tourism values and economic growth would be negatively affected. It needs to be put somewhere so many people would not be effected and not so conspicuous. 100 turbines would be visible from downtown Richland the main I-82 entrance to Kennewick would have towers on both sides. It would look terrible. Has an adequate analysis been completed to address the impacts it will have on the Tri-Cities, one of the largest populations in the State. There would be zero effect on carbon emissions because it would replace hydro power, a renewable energy. Washington State does not have a fossil fuel problem.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
		Forget about this. The only people that would be happy are Gov. Insley and Olympia politicians. They would have a warm fuzzy feeling at our expense. Ted Lewis 686 S. Idaho Street	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115457	External Email To whom it may concern, The Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center underscores the significant economic opportunity of building out Washington state's clean energy future. The project will help advance the state's ambitious climate goals while creating a substantial number of family-wage jobs and economic activity in Benton and Franklin Counties. Developing the project's hybrid combination of wind, solar, and battery storage applications will create as many as 930 jobs for skilled construction workers. Through building local access roads and foundations to support the technology, the project will employ crane operators, electricians, and skilled laborers. The project will be a significant source of employment in the local area. The jobs required by this project are high-paying, family-wage opportunities. Economic impact studies examining the project estimated the typical income per worker during the construction phase to be \$113,500. That's nearly 60% higher than the average regional compensation across industries and 37% higher than the compensation in the construction industry for Benton and Franklin Counties. The studies also showed that at full build-out, the project could amount to at least \$73 million in labor income and \$143 million in total economic output. Following construction, the project will also create a combined direct, indirect and induced total of 56 long-term high-paying jobs during its estimated 30-year life span. While the project brings clear and substantial benefits to families and workers in the local area, it will also help advance Washington state's broader clean energy economy. The project will keep workers busy in our Ports and shipping industry as the turbine parts make their way to the Tri-Cities. It will also drive further investments in new and existing workforce development and educational programs to prepare students for careers in the growing renewable energy sector. Such programs already exist at Walla Walla Community College, Bellingham Technical College, and Centralia College, all of which will increasingly be important as these projects continue to move forward. I urge EFSEC to advance this project to take advantage of these clear opportunities. Thank you for your consideration. Carly -- Carly Rang (she/they) Tri-Cities, WA	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115458	External Email I'm sending this email to the Public Hearing and Request for Comments. I pray that the people who have the power to approve or disapprove the installations of the wind farms on the Horse heaven Hills will decide to not approve installation. I'm sure you have read all the pros and cons for the installation of these wind turbines. First and foremost is the damage they will do to our beautiful hills, birds, animals and air. I'm told that the energy they produce will not be used by the tri-cities. So if that is true, then don't build them in our backyard. This is one project that shouldn't happen. They are both environmentally and economically a disaster. Wind turbines never pay for themselves. The only reason for their existence is because taxpayer money supports them. Again I will close begging you to not approve this. Sincerely Ira Johnson 509-987-3013	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1115465	External Email Good day, I want to express my support of the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project for the following reasons: 1. We cannot continue to paint ourselves into a corner with fossil fuels - we must move to clean, renewable energy. This project lets us create clean, renewable energy right here in the TriCities. 2. We need jobs. This project will create nearly 1,000 jobs during construction and some after to maintain the site. 3. The farm just increases our existing wind farm so is already in place, just being expanded. 4. Money will go to Benton and Franklin counties and towards education. 5. Farmers need to continue to own and use their land. This revenue will help them survive and thrive without selling out to developers. I am a resident and home owner in Pasco, WA. Thank you, Pamela Gaudet	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115467	External Email I am writing to you today to tell you that the wind project on Horse Heaven Hills is terrible! The Horse Heaven Hills are a beautiful view seen from all over the Tri-Cities and the wind turbines will ruin that view. I live in West Richland and will be affected by this view, as well as the noise, wind issues and sunlight glaring off the turbines. The "power" that will be made by these turbines will go to Western Washington! Why would we do that? Western Washington needs to figure out their own energy issues, not use our land and views for their benefit. For so long we on the eastern side of the Cascades, have been the step children of the west side of Washington. It's time for western Washington to take care of itself. I respectfully ask that you don't let the wind turbine project go forward. Thank you, Geneva Carroll West Richland, WA	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115495	External Email I am writing to express my STRONG OPPOSITION to the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center! This project should NOT be placed so closed to a growing urban center like the Tri-Cities, WA. It will destroy much of the visual and desirable appeal of living in southeastern Washington State. Thank you for your consideration. Thank you, David L. Mitchell	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1115540	External Email I'm writing to express my disapproval of the "Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center" plan proposed by Scout Clean Energy. Wind turbines are inefficient in Washington and are not made of sustainable materials. In addition, it would largely be replacing what is already considered "clean energy," as less than 10% of our state is powered by gas or coal. While hydro and solar power both present problems, those problems will not be solved by destroying valuable land or creating more unrecyclable garbage—to say nothing of how such a farm would disrupt our local and migratory flighted populations. Our focus should be on renewable, sustainable energy such as nuclear and fission power. Solving the issue of power storage should also take high priority, as lithium mining is in no way "clean" or renewable. This is a cash grab by a company not remotely invested in Washington's future; they don't even live here. Please do not allow this docket to pass. Thank you for your consideration.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115541	External Email The windfarm and solar project is far more than just solar panels and wind mills. The Governor of Washington State is also pushing for the removal of the snake river dams. These dams produce no carbon footprint, they produce clean, inexpensive power, the dams help control flooding and provides the means to ship products by water, witch is very important for food producers in Eastern Washington. The dams also allow access to water for irrigation to farms in eastern Washington. I believe that Jay Inseele is putting his wanting to profit from his personal investments in stocks in these company's That will be putting in the wind mills and solar panels. We do not need anymore of Nancy Pelosi style stock Investing in our State. That is why I for one Washington Resident say NO to unreliable wind and solar power. Sent from Mail for Windows	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1115554	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 24, 2023 Attached is a video showing a large amount if robins flying around the Horse Heaven Hills in the proposed action area.. The impact from the proposed action is immense to human health and safety, the fauna and the flora. All for windmills that never ever pay for themselves. That is not green at all. Then the windmills are mixed waste and can't be recycled- like the immensely sized blades for these Seattle Space Needle sized windmills. Christina Caprio Click to Download https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.icloud.com%2Fattachment%2F%3Fu%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fcvws.icloud-content.com%252FB%252FAblEtEt7hGcn7sB-VCy2GjKDWMOxAe59_ch7Vnt0ECUvmOXRv2kGuu37%252F%2524%2527Bf%2527D%253Fo%253DAgs0r2bDvUgYUOJv9nNkRoQw_ISRUEc2NkpQXbhO_8BU%2526v%253D1%2526x%253D3%2526a%253DCAoq7o-wDk943kANa987AQI4WCBZtwOijkK0wxdiSVtNjwSdhCaxuXN3jAYmtbgoegwlgEAKgkC6AMA_09TIFxSBINyyjFaBAa67ttqJaSd-Jq42UuVv5meqPcnE0Z0WUoSRVtEBSmp6DcuOHe365MHdYIMNyJVBUKZJB2WAXsaprCzXwjmgRkXVVEG8-oiHepm9BextEIQebkxw%2526e%253D167725519%2526ff%253D%2526r%253DE25116DD-A7B6-4862-87C4-C95A2D0Bf59F-1%2526k%253D%2524%2527Buk%2527D%2526ck%253Dcom.apple.largeattachment%2526kz%253DD1ED61DC-CB9F-454B-A2E4-BF1F96412F6F%2526p%253D57%2526s%253DvBLUCpqasSiZAGyFVSBuY2Aomk%26uk%3Duhkby7Q-2_3fDXnyUGt6mg%26f%3DIMG_1055.MOV%26sz%3D66478562&data=05%7C01%7Cefsec%40efsec.wa.gov%7Cb143598a16994074fa8f08d4feef4d47%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dct127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638102604505647353%7CUknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWJjoiMC4wLjAwMDAilCJQJloiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6lk1haWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=6zmIa6S18PBK5GNKTMdMV2b%2FDC7DU%2FP7XoAoYkVpOa8%3D&reserved=0 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1115555	External Email Hi, I would like to attend the public hearing on the wind turbine project in Horse Heaven Hills. Are you able to share when public commentary will be shared during the meeting? I probably won't be able to stay for the whole meeting so sharing my feedback below. I'm extremely concerned about this wind turbine project as a citizen of Kennewick. I don't understand why this project has to be so close to our city and impact the natural beauty that we enjoy everyday. There is so much land between Tri Cities and Oregon where these turbines wouldn't have to impact our everyday life. I enjoy views of the Horse Heaven Hills everyday from my house and I do believe my property will be devalued but I'm more concerned about everyone losing the natural beauty and landscape that we enjoy so close to us. Not to mention the nighttime flashing red lights, shadow flickers, and overall visual aesthetics. We already provide nuclear energy and hydro-electric energy in this region. Please let us enjoy our natural beauty and move this project somewhere it doesn't impact the citizens of Tri Cities so much. It starts to feel like we are being taken advantage of. We know this energy isn't necessarily needed here and we also know that although it can be windy here off and on, majority of the time these wind turbines will not be harnessing much energy. Thank you for considering. Regards, Lisa Smith	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
		Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a	
		Socioeconomics	Project location is selected based on several factors including but not limited to: viable above-average wind speeds in the area, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panel, proximity to existing transmission lines and willingness of to participate in the Project. Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values	
joan.owens	1115567	External Email RE: Benton County Proposed Wind Farms The proposed Scout Wind Farm project would permanently block all future growth to the south of the Tri-Cities and yield no benefit for the Tri-Cities. Billions of dollars would be lost to Real Estate development. There are hundreds of geese and other wild birds that leave the river daily to feed in the Horse Heaven Hills area. They would be slaughtered by the Turbines. A guarantee must be made saying that the birds will not be harmed! Wind Turbines are poor power producers. European wind power cost has increased by a factor of 5, because of the turbine costs and the power needed to fill in the void. We have excellent and low cost Hydro-Power. We DO NOT NEED wind power! Life-time turbine costs would increase our electrical cost from this time forward. A total waste of our money! We should not be forced to pay for a company to burden us; so that they can make money from the subsidized power. We would get higher cost power and taxes to pay the subsidies. Turbines make noise, typically in low frequency for travelling sound. It could ruin our living conditions. The use of wind turbines will never reduce globe warming. We will never be able to measure any improvement from their use. Will the change of wind patterns change grape growing conditions? The visual change to the Tri-Cities would be damaging to our entire area, with lowered property values and limited growth potential. I believe that the State Government support for this project is simply, "It's the In Thing to do politically" regardless of the damage that it will do to the Tri-City Citizens. Solar Panels should be placed on existing building roof-tops; so as not to use virgin land. This whole project is a bad idea and would penalize the Tri-Cities and the State of Washington. Sincerely, Wallace G. Ruff and Margarete G. Fleming	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Seciton 4.11 of the EIS. Neither noise nor vibration are expected to cause impacts detrimental to human health.	4.11 (LFN)	Revise FEIS to directly address LFN.
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens Mark Morton	1115577	External Email Attached pdf with my comments named - 20230125 Morton Comments Mark Morton West Richland WA 509 727 2929	n/a	Please refer to Submission 1097189	Please refer to Submission 1097189	Please refer to Submission 1097189

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society	1115585	External Email Attention: I have sent a copy by US Mail so this will be the same letter. It is attached to this email, but my system acts weird so you may not be able to open it. I have also copied and paste the document below I would prefer that you use the mailed copy since the electronic copies may not be as understandable. Thank you, Dana Carl Ward Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society Conservation Chair 509-545-0627 ----- January 26, 2023 EFSEC 621 Woodland Square Loop SE, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 Attention: Comments on the Horse Heaven Hills Draft Environmental Impact Statement by the Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society General Comments: • The DEIS is long with many acronyms. An acronym table should be part of the document. A reader cannot clearly remember each acronym from page to page and from day to day. Most large DEIS have an acronym table where all acronyms used in the document are compiled. • The DEIS should contain, in one location, explanation of scientific terms used and their definitions. An example would be what a kilometer is or what is meant by the word flicker. • The DEIS lacks specificity of location of turbines. This makes a complete review impossible. • A commitment to utilize future technological advances to lessen bird strikes on turbines should be made in the DEIS. It is understood that worldwide studies are ongoing to resolve bird strikes. Some of these technologies, such as radar, lighting patterns, paint patterns could be retrofitted to lessen the bird strikes if found to be practicable. • An escrow account should be established for restoration of the multiple sites impacted by the project to assure complete and sustainable habitat recovery. Specific Comments: ES-2.2 Alternatives to the Proposed Action It is stated in the text that "Several alternatives were considered for analysis but were eliminated from detailed evaluation in the draft EIS ..." Comment: The reader is not enlightened as to what these alternatives would have been. It only states the no action alternative was considered. A complete DEIS should review in appropriate detail other alternatives to the proposed action. It appears that the reader must accept the applicant's word that appropriate alternatives were considered and rejected. ES-24 Wild-9 states: "Vegetation clearing and grubbing would avoid bird breeding periods, when feasible, to reduce potential destruction or disturbance of nesting birds." Comment: The applicant must follow the Federal Law titled; "Migratory Bird Treaty Act" There is no leeway to not follow this requirement. Work must stop if nesting birds or breeding activity is noted. The USFWS can allow a "take" with appropriate documentation and permit(s). Remove the words, "when feasible" from the text. Firm up the text with reference to the Migratory Treaty Act. ES-50 Table ES-3a Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Construction of the Proposed Action Comment: (It would be best for the applicant to look at Table ES-3a to visually track what is said to follow this comment.) Follow the table to the heading, Section, drop down to Wildlife and Habitat, scroll right to under Topic where you find Barriers to Movement and Fragmentation, scroll right again to under Magnitude of Impact. The texts states "Low". This is not correct. The Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society disagrees with the designation "Low". It should be "Medium or High". LCBAS considers this to be "High". Corridors and fragmentation are considered critically impacted by the project as stated by the WDFW in their April 1, 2021 letter to Ms Moon, EFSEC. Continuing left to right across the columns to Special Extent or Setting of Impact under this column it is stated, "Confined". The impact should be "Regional" due to its impact to movement from areas well outside the project area. Migratory birds move through this area in the nationally recognized Pacific Flyway. Mammals both small and large such as the Townsend's ground squirrels, a WDFW candidate species, and the recently reintroduced culturally sensitive prong horned antelope and resident deer populations use this migration corridor. Curtailing or stopping this migratory pathway could have disastrous consequences for these cited species and many others that could be listed here. See WDFW April 1, 2021 letter to Ms Moon. ES-55 Table ES-3a Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Construction of the Proposed Action Comment: To be as succinct as possible and to maintain comment accuracy the applicant needs to look at the species of bird listed as Sagebrush Sparrow and Sage Thrasher. These birds are listed as "Low" under "Magnitude of Impact". LCBAS disagrees with this classification. These birds should be listed as "High" because of their vanishing numbers in Washington State. Audubon Washington's recent study titled, "Sagebrush Songbird Survey, 2015" found these species are in decline state wide. WDFW has also listed this species as in decline and has listed these species as a State Candidate Species in their revised listing of March 2022. Also note that these two species are listed under the heading, "Special Extent or Setting of Impact" as "Confined". This is not correct; they should be listed as "Regional". The impacts at the project site will have consequences for a species in decline both at the extensive Horse Heaven Hill Project and regionally for central Washington State as noted above by Audubon Sagebrush Songbird Survey and WDFW various letters to Ms Moon April, March 2021. ES-67 Table ES-3b Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Operation of the Proposed Action. Comment: To be succinct as possible look under the heading noted as "Topic" for "Barriers to Movement and Fragmentation" the applicant lists under "Magnitude of Impact" as "Medium". LCBAS disagrees and believe this should be elevated to "High". Also, change the word "Confined" to "Regional" under the heading "Special Extent or Setting of Impact". The applicant's Figure 3.6-2 on page 3-97 of the DEIS shows the important migration route. It cannot be stressed enough how important migratory routes are for the free flow of genetic material and the viability of individual species both avian and mammal. Reference April 1, 2021 Letter from WDFW to Ms Moon, EFSEC. ES-69 Table ES-3b Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Operation of the Proposed Action Comment: To be succinct, look at Ferruginous Hawk under the heading "Topic". Under the heading, "Spacial Extent or Setting of Impact" the bird is listed as "Confined" this should be changed to "Regional". The WDFW lists this bird as "State Endangered" which is the highest category of all species to be threatened with extinction. The loss of any individual could have dire consequences to the regional population of Ferruginous Hawks. The numbers of Ferruginous Hawks has been declining in recent years as noted in Cornell Lab of Ornithology, tabulation through ebird tracking for Washington State and the Pacific Northwest. Also the WDFW has noted this species as declining in recent surveys done out of the Pasco, WA Field Office. Contacts: J. Fadoña, M. Ritter, proprietary information on nesting, population trends and range. ES-71 Table ES-3b Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Operation of the Proposed Action Comment: To be succinct, see Sagebrush Sparrow/Sage Thrasher under "Spacial Extent or Setting of Impact" should be listed as "Regional" rather than "Confined". These sagebrush obligates are a vanishing species in Washington State and are designated a State Candidate Species by WDFW which means the loss of habitat and development can severely impact these two species. The Audubon study titled, "Sagebrush Songbird Survey, 2015" found that these species were declining in Washington. ES-83 Table ES-3c Summary of Potential Impacts of Comprehensive Project during Decommissioning of the Proposed Action Comment: To be succinct, see under "Topic" Ferruginous Hawk under "Spacial Extent or Setting of Impact" should be "Regional" and not "Confined". The Ferruginous Hawk is listed as Endangered by the WDFW and it has regional consequences by the loss of any individual. Summary of comments for the Tables and pages sighted above. The Project should consider eliminating or moving turbines in migratory routes as depicted in Figure 3.6-2 of the full DEIS. The LCBAS would like to stress that the applicant has consistently lowered the impact to "low" or "confined" for Ferruginous Hawk, Sagebrush Sparrow, Sage Thrasher and wildlife habitat. We feel that these species and habitat, due to their continued decline in numbers and extent in Washington, needs to be upgraded to high and regional in the DEIS. Therefore the project needs to provide more robust protections and reissue an improved DEIS for review before the final EIS is written. The solar arrays need to be repositioned to minimize or eliminate impact to migratory routes. Any fencing needs to be repositioned to reduce impact movement. Fencing should be designed to be animal friendly. These are significant avoidable adverse impacts if project components are reduced in number such as turbine towers, relocation of towers and support facilities such as roads and powerlines. Habitat such as mature sagebrush steppe must be preserved and the project moved out of these areas. This would include wind turbine towers and all support facilities and portions of the three separate solar arrays. ES-91 Table ES-4a Summary of Potential Impact by Component during Construction of the Proposed Action General comment: This set of Tables illustrates multiple actions under the heading "Component". Since there are so many different components such as turbines, solar arrays and substations it is difficult, to analyze the impacts of each one through these tables. It is understood that this is a summary, but it defeats the process for a reasonably good review. The different components should be analyzed separately since they are located miles apart where impacts could be significantly different due to vegetation types, habitat and migratory routes.	Executive Summary Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. Wildlife and Habitat The purpose of Mitigation measure Hab-4 – Formation of a TAC was to require the development of a technical community to support EFSEC with reviewing and approving Project components and mitigation as the Project develops. The TAC would not have decision making authority but would be composed of a group of experts that are able to advise the Applicant and EFSEC on additional mitigation measures that may be required as additional information on wildlife presence and project design become available. WDFW was consulted through the development of the EIS. The proximity of infrastructure to draws and canyons was reviewed and captured in the development of mitigation measures (Hab-1 and Hab-2) requiring the Applicant to avoid modelled movement corridors, draws, and canyons. Adaptive management in the form of mitigation plans are required if avoidance is not feasible. Final infrastructure placement and mitigation plans would require approval by EFSEC prior to implementation. Mitigation measure Hab-2 will be updated in the FEIS to provide additional clarity as to the mitigation measures and follow up management required to reduce impacts to wildlife movement Habitat loss calculations provided in the EIS were developed based on input from WDFW including information on species core habitat provided by WDFW ferruginous hawk experts. Information on potential impacts to ferruginous hawk was obtained via a literature search and discussions with WDFW scientists with local expertise. While ferruginous hawks may return to old nest sites, several of the sites reported in PHS data have not been active for many years. The calculations provided in the dEIS are of expected habitat loss based on current conditions (e.g. current use) and not reduction in habitat capacity, which considers the impact to the landscape's ability to support future ferruginous hawk populations. While this was the approach used to calculate impacts, mitigation measures for ferruginous hawk (Spec-5) were developed using a conservative approach by requiring that the Applicant buffer nests documented as active and documented in PHS with the intention of preserving future landscape capacity. Mitigation measure Spec-5 requires that EFSEC approves any infrastructure within 2 miles of a ferruginous hawk nest. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Spec-5 requires that the applicant provide additional mitigation measures to reduce risk of collision (e.g. curtailment when nests are active, See Spec-5 1(b)) and habitat loss (e.g. offsetting, see Spec-5 1(c)). Flight behaviour does contribute to the risk of bird collision with turbines as some species are more maneuverable and better able to avoid collisions (micro avoidance) or avoid wind power project as they approach the area (macro avoidance). However, as noted in Adams et al (2017) data is not available for all species to adjust the species exposure index to account for avoidance of turbines (micro avoidance). Adams et al (2017) accounted for macro-avoidance (e.g avoiding the area where turbines are) in their calculation, which would result in reduced risk indices by reducing the likelihood of birds entering the wind project area. As this factor was not accounted for in the Horse Heaven calculation it may be more conservative. The adjacent Nine Canyon project was used as a surrogate to predict the rate of bird mortality at Horse Heaven based on its proximity to the Lease Boundary, similar habitat, and anticipated similar species diversity. It is acknowledged in the EIS that the total number of mortalities at Horse heaven would be larger given the size differences between the Projects. The EIS describes the resiliency of special status species to impacts, which includes mortality. For ferruginous hawk, the EIS notes that the species is declining in the baseline case and is not considered resilient to imposed stress. Resiliency was considered in assessing magnitude. Ferruginous hawk was assigned a magnitude of high because it is predicted that the project could result in impacts that could impact the regional population. The information provided will be reviewed and incorporated into the FEIS where appropriate.	n/a 2.0 4.6	n/a n/a n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>ES-101 Table ES-4a Summary of Potential Impact by Component during Construction of the Proposed Action Comment: The applicant should look at the referenced table for clarity of this comment. The first row states, "Wildlife and Habitat (Section 4.6)" and as you move to the right the reader see that "Barriers and fragmentation created during construction would predominantly remain through operation." Then it states, "Magnitude of Impact" is "Low" then to the right it states, "Likelihood of Impact" is "Probable". The "Magnitude of Impact" should be "High" if the "Likelihood of Impact" is "Probable". Wildlife and habitat will be severely impacted over the life of the operation. If there was no operation, there would be no impact to habitat for wildlife. Summary of comment: If the impact is probable the impact would be high.</p> <p>ES-104 Table ES-4a, ES-107 Table ES-4a, ES-121 Table ES-4b, ES-124 Table ES-4b, ES-147 Table ES-4c, ES-149 Table ES-4c, and ES-151 ES-4c. Comment: In an attempt to combine comments to avoid the tedium of repetitive statements the general statement will be made for each "Topic" while the "Component" will remain "Solar Array".</p> <p>For the "Topic" "Wildlife and Habitat" with "Barriers to Movement and Fragmentation" the spacial extent should be "Regional" and not "Confined". For the "Topic" "Ferruginous Hawk" the "Spacial Extent" should be "Regional" not "Confined". For the "Topic" "Sagebrush Sparrow and Sage Thrasher" the "Spacial Extent" should be "Regional" not "Confined". Summary of Comments for the above tables under the component solar. The applicant has repeatedly downgraded the "Spacial Extent" to "Confined". LCBAS from information gained from the Audubon Sagebrush Songbird Survey and the April 1, 2021 letter from WDFW to Ms Moon believes the "Spacial Extent" should be "Regional" not "Confined".</p> <p>3-54 Table 3.5-2 Habitat Types and Subtypes in Each Siting Areas Comment: The Table shows that the East Solar Field will impact 1,024.9 acres of rabbit brush, shrub land and 50.9 acres of sagebrush-steppe. This is unacceptable due to the disappearing extent of these two habitat types in the state of Washington. The Nature Conservancy of Washington, Biodiversity Inventory and Analysis of the Hanford Site 1994-1999, has estimated that 70% of these two habitat types has disappeared within the state. This is particularly evident in the Horse Heaven Hills where it appears that more than 70% has been lost. The project should not construct facilities in these areas to preserve habitat for sagebrush obligate birds.</p> <p>3-97 Figure 3.6-2 Wildlife Movement Corridors within the Project Lease Boundary and Project Footprint Comment: From this figure it is abundantly clear that a critical migratory route colored yellow and orange dissects the project area from north to south. This area should be free of turbines and the western section of the Eastern Solar Array should not be constructed here to maintain regional connectivity from habitat areas north and south as well as east and west of the project area. The WDFW in its letter to Ms Moon dated April 1, 2021 reviews the critical need for uninhibited connectivity for the survival of wildlife.</p> <p>4-133 Mitigation Table 4.5-11: Habitat Offset Ratios Presented by the Applicant for Project Disturbance Habitat Type Habitat Class(a) Temporary Disturbance Offset Ratio Permanent Disturbance Offset Ratio Modified Habitat Offset Ratio Agricultural Land Class IV N/A N/A N/A Developed/Disturbed Class IV N/A N/A N/A Eastside (Interior) Grassland (Eastside Steppe) Class III 0.1:1 1:1 0.5:1 Non-native Grassland Class III 0.1:1 1:1 0.5:1 Planted Grassland Class III 0.1:1 1:1 0.5:1 Dwarf Shrub-steppe Class II 1:1 2:1 2:1 Rabbitbrush Shrubland Class II 0.5:1 2:1 0.5:1 Sagebrush Shrub[1]Steppe Class II 0.5:1 2:1 2:1 Source: Tetra Tech 2022 Note: (a) Based on WDFW (2009) habitat classification for mitigation and the Class assigned to habitat types in Tetra Tech (2022). N/A = not applicable Comment: The table above, which did not copy well, reviews the recommended Habitat Offset Ratios for various plant classifications. Please follow this logic line: The Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society with concurrence of Audubon Washington and National Audubon has designated the Hanford Reach National Monument and Central Hanford as an Important Bird Area (IBA). The area designed an IBA is owned by the US Department of Energy. The biological resources on the 586 square mile IBA is managed under the Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMP) (DOE/RL-96-32 Revision 2, Published February 2017). This plan was written and reviewed by government agencies and non-government organizations. The Offset Ratios provided in the Hanford document are more robust than those based on the WDFW and are supported by LCBAS. These ratios have set the standard for this region which the Horse Heaven Hills are located within. Page ix of the management plan states that any area greater than .5 acres should be mitigated at the following ratio: Level 2 mitigation at 1 to 1 Level 3 mitigation at 3 to 1 Level 4 mitigation at 5 to 1 Level 4 of the BRMP is denoted as high quality mature shrub-steppe. LCBAS supports this ratio and firmly request that the Final EIS use these ratios to offset any damage to sagebrush habitat.</p> <p>3-91 Figure 4.2.4-1 Map 1 of 4, Comment: Note the error on the key to the map. The key shows that the Hanford Reservation is DOD, Department of Defense property. This is incorrect. The Hanford Reservation is under ownership and management by the Department of Energy, DOE. (Historically the site was owned by the DOD but that was more than 50 years ago.) 3-92 Figure 4.2.4-1 Map 2 of 4, Comment: See note for page 3-91. DOD for the Hanford Reservation should be changed to DOE.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Horse Heaven Hills Project DEIS. The seriousness of climate change and resulting impact to human life, the environment and the welfare of the earth relies on intelligent actions to limit emissions from fossil fuels and other sources such as cattle and methane. The construction of solar arrays and wind turbines are important steps to slow or reverse global warming. The Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society is not against solar or wind turbines but they must be sighted responsibly and must take into account the habitat and biological resources that would be impacted. It is expected that the comments above will help the applicant to better understand, appreciate and recognize what impacts their actions will have on the human and biological environment. The applicant must correct the weaknesses presented and adjust the project accordingly for least impact. This might entail moving the solar array out of shrub-steppe habitat or limiting the number, height or location of wind turbines to protect resources.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dana Carl Ward Conservation Chair Lower Columbia Basin Audubon P.O. Box 1900 Richland, Washington 99352 509.545.0633</p>	Vegetation	<p>The Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan (DOE 2017) was prepared for the Hanford Site Boundary and is applicable to lands within this area. The Hanford Site Boundary is located north of the Project Lease Boundary and includes the Hanford Reach National Monument and central Hanford that are managed by Department of Energy (DOE). The purpose of the Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan is to provide a consistent approach to managing the site's natural resources and DOE is responsible for applying the Management Plan within portions of the Hanford Site managed by DOE. As the Project Lease Boundary is not within the jurisdiction of DOE, nor within the Hanford Site, this management plan does not apply.</p> <p>The offset ratios within the EIS are based on offset ratios provided in the Wind Power Guidelines (WDFW 2009) and based on consultation among WDFW, the Applicant, and EFSEC, where offset ratios for the various habitat types within the Project area were agreed upon. This included an greater offset ratio applied to rabbitbrush shrubland where permanent and temporary disturbance occurs, recognizing that this habitat type is an early seral shrub-steppe ecosystem. This is consistent with the application of habitat offset ratios applied to similar combined wind and solar projects in the area.</p>	Section 4.4.3	n/a
joan.owens	1115586	<p>External Email</p> <p>We are very much against the placement of these windmills in Badger Canyon! Mike & Karen Mellison</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1115587	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>I am writing to ask that the Final EIS for Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project in Benton County take a stronger and more specific look at how the project can be designed to avoid impacts to the environment.</p> <p>I support Washington's 100% clean energy target to combat the climate crisis. Audubon's science suggests that we may lose 389 species of N. American birds if warming climbs to 3 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. We are also in a biodiversity crisis. Conservation and clean energy must go hand in hand.</p> <p>The Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project will be the largest renewable energy project in our state's history. As currently proposed, the project may cause unacceptable harm to state-listed Ferruginous Hawk and create barriers for landscape connectivity for shrub-steppe wildlife across a 113-square mile area. But the project could be considerably improved with more clarity on conservation measures and an alternative design.</p> <p>The final EIS must include the following information and analysis to uphold our state's commitment to, and appreciation for, our wildlife and the connected landscapes they need. The final EIS must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Identify specific design features, mitigation measures and associated performance standards that will avoid adverse impacts related to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity within the Project Lease Boundary and at the regional level.- Commit to how the proposed Project will avoid significant impacts to the Ferruginous Hawk population at the regional level by avoiding turbines within two miles of all documented nests and mitigating for direct and indirect loss of core and range habitat for all nests within six miles of the project.- Include an alternative for analysis that features an explicit design for and commitment to turbine siting and other project components that minimizes impacts to the state-listed species and wildlife connectivity.- Use the best available science to evaluate the magnitude and scale of impacts to birds due to turbine operation. <p>The build-out of renewable energy in Washington can be achieved in a way that honors the legal and sovereign rights of Treaty Tribes and balances the needs of both people and wildlife. We look to this Council and its staff to provide the leadership needed to achieve this vision.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mrs Helma Welles 1059 NE 92nd St. Seattle, WA 98115-2835 helnawelles@gmail.com</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
joan.owens	1116720	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>Birds are threatened; that's heart-breaking to birders like me.</p> <p>Please assess this project (and all projects) to minimize harm to birds and their habitats.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Jean M. Avery 13314 SE 19th St Apt T4 Vancouver, WA 98683-6595 JeanMAvery@gmail.com</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.</p>	4.6	n/a
joan.owens	1117215	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>I am writing to ask that the Final EIS for Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project in Benton County take a stronger and more specific look at how the project can be designed to avoid impacts to the environment.</p> <p>I support Washington's 100% clean energy target to combat the climate crisis. Audubon's science suggests that we may lose 389 species of N. American birds if warming climbs to 3 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. We are also in a biodiversity crisis. Conservation and clean energy must go hand in hand.</p> <p>The build-out of renewable energy in Washington can be achieved in a way that honors the legal and sovereign rights of Treaty Tribes and balances the needs of both people and wildlife. We look to this Council and its staff to provide the leadership needed to achieve this vision.</p> <p>Sincerely, MS Joyce Weir HERBS Dr Newport, WA 99156 jaweir@povn.com</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1117389	<p>External Email</p> <p>My name is Cheryl Sutherland. My grandfather, A. A. Edwards, homesteaded in the Horse Heaven Hills in 1904 and the property is still being farmed today by family members. I am a participating landowner in the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and support the proposal for many reasons including positive economic impacts of jobs and increased tax revenue for the county. It makes sense to proactively develop new sources of renewable energy - the wind will always be beneath our wings so let's put it to productive use. The project will allow us, as dry land farmers, to put to use a constant, the wind, and not be solely at the mercy of fluctuating elements such as the weather; and will help to diversify our farm's revenue stream and help keep this land in our family for posterity.</p> <p>Please approve this project so that the benefits it provides can be enjoyed by the local community.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cheryl Sutherland, Personal Representative Estate of Geraldine O. Edwards 4105 Justin Way Sacramento, CA 95826</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
WDFW - Michael Ritter Lead Planner: Solar and Wind Energy Development	1117635	<p>January 31, 2022 Amy Moon Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council 621 Woodland Square Loop SE PO Box 43172 Olympia, WA 98504-3172 Subject: Draft Environmental Impact State: Horse Heaven Hills Wind/Solar/Battery Storage Ms. Moon, The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is committed to working with EFSEC and renewable energy projects to ensure that these projects are sited in a manner that avoid impacts on fish and wildlife resources and that fully support Governor Inslee's goals for decarbonization in Washington State. Over the last two years since the Application for Site Certification (ASC), WDFW has participated in meetings with EFSEC that frequently included the applicant. We have provided defensible biological information regarding conservation areas, avoidance areas (specifically for Ferruginous Hawks) (FEHA), avoidance and minimization to WDFW Priority Species and Habitats (PHS), and mitigation concepts and sites. We did this with the understanding that some of this information might aid the project in designing a layout (i.e. alternative build options) that would avoid and minimize impacts to PHS. Unfortunately, the layout in the Draft EIS is identical to that in the ASC along with the ambiguity of turbine types and number and total solar development areas. We identified significant PHS issues in our original comment letter and even recommended an alternate project layout of only solar on the agriculture lands in the southwest of the lease area and beyond to preserve the ridgeline, associated corridors, and avoid/minimize adverse impacts to PHS. Specifically, we stated, "to reduce the landscape-scale impact of the HWSB and reduce impacts to connectivity, we recommend that the project focus on solar development only on agricultural and grasslands in the southern edge of the HWSB lease area and to the southwest. This includes transmission corridors and all supporting infrastructure." Based on this we do not agree on how the Solar Only Alternative was presented as being limited to 10K acres--areas that the project designated--and subsequently eliminated in the Draft EIS when in fact there is 72K acres under project control. Similarly, we do not agree on how the Wind Only Alternative was presented as being limited to only the existing 11k micro-siting corridor of a 72K acre project area. We appreciate that some of the information we shared in our meetings, specifically related to avoiding development within FEHA core areas (r = 2 miles around a nest site/territory), has been incorporated into the Draft EIS. In our meetings we recommended that all nest territories identified in PHS be under this protection and the Draft EIS supports this stating "specifically, mitigation measures for ferruginous hawks would require avoiding siting Project components within 2 miles of ferruginous hawk nests documented in PHS data..." However, the Draft EIS goes on to say that, "the extent to which ferruginous hawk mitigation may be implemented will be informed by the final Project layout and field data on ferruginous hawk presence and habitat use of the Lease Boundary collected through pre-construction monitoring programs." If this is referencing the active FEHA nest data (n = 2) collected by the project from 2017-2019, we shared with you in January 2022 that, "WDFW considers the relevance of all historical FEHA nest (territory) locations (n = 16) as relevant for management to provide known historical habitat for recovery and to meet recovery goals." Then in February 2022, we shared with EFSEC that, "...there are 4 FEHA core area exclusion zones -from West to East - Webber, Badger, Sheep, and the eastern one, which is in the area of the Coyote Canyon FEHA nesting territory. Based on research, these core areas are where FEHA use is the highest but does not include the entire home ranges, so FEHA will still be exposed to turbines outside of these areas. Additionally, there are two turbines to the north just outside of the Webber exclusion zone that we also discussed with you that should also be excluded." Additionally, we pointed out that two FEHA nesting territories (Beck Road and 4-mile) are both within the eastern solar development area just to the east of Highway 395. Also in February 2022, we met with EFSEC and the applicant and provided the figure below and justification for recommending the central blue polygon as mitigation, offered ideas for project infrastructure and operations and vegetation management within the mitigation area, and identified turbine exclusion zones within the red FEHA circles. Hot Pink = project area; Green Diamonds = 244 wind turbines, Orange = solar; Yellow Diamonds = Historic (and active n = 2) FEHA nests that represent 16 territories; Red Circles = an example of active nest core areas (r = 2 miles); White = habitat mitigation proposed by project; Blue = Landscape mitigation options proposed by WDFW; Dark green = Arid Lands Initiative (ALI) priority core areas; Light green = ALI priority linkages; Brown route = least cost pathway for mule deer; Green route = least cost pathway ground squirrels; Grayish/green polygons = ground squirrel habitat concentration areas. And finally, in a May 2022 correspondence to EFSEC, "...we have the information we need to determine if the FEHA population within the Horse Heaven Hills could potentially be impacted by the project. We have made this determination based on best available science and information from the Periodic Status Review (Hayes and Watson 2021) that recommended and resulted in this bird species being listed as a State of Washington Endangered Species. Our assessment is based on core nesting habitat areas (r = 3.2km) of both active and unoccupied nests and the 244-turbine layout. By using the smaller core nesting area, and not the home range area (r = 10km), we have already provided a meaningful compromise for renewable energy development and for the conservation of FEHA within and adjacent to the project. Within these smaller core areas, we have recommended the project consider no development of wind turbines and/or curtailment based on seasonal timing, ongoing avian monitoring and field observations, or using Identiflight-type technology. At this time, we are most interested in examining how the fewer (but larger) layout of 150 turbines and alternate turbine siting could further avoid and minimize potential impacts to FEHA and provide conservation of FEHA core nesting areas." Comprehensively regarding FEHA, we do not agree with the DEIS that impacts to this Washington State Endangered Species would be "Limited", "Confined", and "Local" as described in Chapter 4. The information in the Periodic Status Review (Hayes and Watson 2021) that the FEHA breeding population in WA State is in a sustained decline and that "...the percentage of surveyed nesting territories supporting breeding pairs has significantly declined in the core breeding range of the species in Benton and Franklin counties..." provides justification to list any impact to FEHA from direct and indirect causes as "Regional." We do not support the establishment of a Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) as a mitigation component to initially review and provide input to pre-construction surveys and project layout. In our opinion, the project needs to provide additional reasonable alternatives based on information they have already received. TAC are typically formed to review, monitor, and make recommendations regarding post-construction project operations related to bird/bat monitoring, revegetation, noxious weed control, etc. Issues, for example, such as project feasibility, siting and layout, avoidance, minimization, and to some extent a mitigation framework should be determined through a public process that results in more than just a single Build Alternative proposed by the applicant. If the project were built with 244 turbines and three solar areas and all supporting infrastructure, then we would agree that the Zone of Influence (ZOI) analysis and conclusion that the project will result in over 53K of indirect habitat loss created by disturbances. This is in combination with the almost 7k of direct habitat loss results in 83% of the 72k project area. Most of these impacts are to agricultural lands around which are isolated native habitats that together form a mosaic of habitats that provided wildlife connectivity, foraging areas, and den and nest sites. As we stated in our original comment letter, the sheer size of this project, and the impacts to WDFW PHS and connectivity corridors will be difficult if not impossible to mitigate. Knowing this, we have worked with EFSEC and the applicant to provide reasonable solutions to avoid, minimize, and mitigate that supports both conservation and renewable energy, but little of our input was used in the DEIS and none was considered for alternate project layouts. In closing, WDFW recommends that the Draft EIS be re-issued after first considering the comments received from WDFW and others on this project and work with the applicant to develop reasonable alternatives for analysis and consideration. Please contact me at 509-380-3028 or at Michael.Ritter@dfw.wa.gov with any questions. Sincerely, Michael Ritter Lead Planner: Solar and Wind Energy Development</p>	Vegetation	<p>Offset ratios for habitat including priority habitats presented in the EIS are consistent with the recommendations provided by WDFW and the Wind and Power Guidelines. The offset ratios for temporary and permanent disturbance were agreed on through discussions among EFSEC, WDFW, and the Applicant. This included the Applicant voluntarily offsetting rabbitbrush at temporary and permanent offset ratios usually applied to shrub-steppe recognizing that this is an early seral shrub-steppe community. The acres of temporary and permanent disturbance are calculated based on the Project components footprint and the associated habitat impacted. The EIS considers the impact from each Project component individually and for the comprehensive Project for the impacts to vegetation. Ratings are provided in Section 4.2.2.8. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.</p>	Section 4.5, 5.2.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor. Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1117638	EFSEC Council, My name is Jessica Wadsworth and I'm a resident of the City of Benton City I am also a city council member. I believe the Horse Heaven wind project will be very beneficial to our community. This project would not only bring local hire family wages construction jobs but the money from these jobs would be spent local throughout our community. The Total economic output of approximately \$73 million to \$85 million this is life changing for the construction workers. This project would generate almost \$20 million in revenues during the first full year of operation and \$260 million over the 35 year operating life of the project. These fees will be paid to Benton county and under current allocation, the largest proportion of those funds would support local schools. Growing up in a farming community I understand what the farmers have to go through and this is a great opportunity for them to continue growing crops while generating supplemental revenue from the turbines. I stand with our local framers who have made the decision to be part of the Renewable energy sector. We also need to keep in mind that this land does not belong to us. As a council member I believe we need to be part of the renewable energy sector. As a county we need to embrace all kinds of renewable energy resources. Thank you, Jessica Wadsworth	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117650	There should be another public comment hearing, I didn't get to comment. I called you to get scheduled at this hearing but no one called me back. I feel this windmill farm solar panel project is a very bad idea and should not be allowed to happen. Vince Shawver West Richland vince.shawver@gmail.com	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment acknowledged. EFSEC requested that speakers to sign up ahead of the meeting. Anyone wishing to speak during the public meeting should have notified EFSEC by phone at (360) 664-1345 or email at efsec@efsec.wa.gov before 5:00 pm on February 1, 2023.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1117653	External Email Dear Director Sonia Bumpus, I am writing to ask that the Final EIS for Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project in Benton County take a stronger and more specific look at how the project can be designed to avoid impacts to the environment. This problem of ignoring birds and wildlife has been a negative for wind projects since before the first windfarms were erected in Kittitas County more than a dozen years ago. Certainly the industry can find a solution to deterring birds on these vast landscapes where valuable and disappearing sage-steppe is destroyed in the process of erecting wind towers. Improve the project by considering what is being erased! The Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project will be the largest renewable energy project in our state's history. The final EIS must include the following information and analysis to uphold our state's commitment to, and appreciation for, our wildlife and the connected landscapes they need. - Identify specific design features, mitigation measures and associated performance standards that will avoid adverse impacts related to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity within the Project Lease Boundary and at the regional level. - Commit to how the proposed Project will avoid significant impacts to the Ferruginous Hawk population at the regional level by avoiding turbines within two miles of all documented nests and mitigating for direct and indirect loss of core and range habitat for all nests within six miles of the project. - Include an alternative for analysis that features an explicit design for and commitment to turbine siting and other project components that minimizes impacts to the state-listed species and wildlife connectivity. - Use the best available science to evaluate the magnitude and scale of impacts to birds due to turbine operation. We look to this Council and its staff to provide the leadership needed to achieve this vision. Sincerely, Gloria Baldi 803 S Willow St Apt 1401 Ellensburg, WA 98926-4123 gloriabaldi55@gmail.com	Wildlife and Habitat	Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted. Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which: 1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor. Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read: Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Sarah Reyneveld, Counsel for the Environment	1117655	February 1, 2023 Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council PO Box 43172 Olympia, WA 98504-3172 RE: Horse Heaven Wind Farm LLC - EFSEC Docket No. EF-210011 Dear Manager Bumpus: As Counsel for the Environment (CfE), I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. The CfE has an independent statutory created role to represent the public interest in protecting the quality of the environment. RCW 80.50.080. The siting of energy facilities in Washington State requires the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." RCW 80.50.010. The Council must also ensure that the operation of such facilities "produce minimal adverse effects on the environment, ecology of the land and its wildlife, and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life." Id. CfE submits this comment to help ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will protect the public's broad interest in preserving the environment and produce minimal adverse effects. As the DEIS accurately concludes, the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project) will have a unique and significant impact on the vegetation, wildlife, habitat and cultural resources of the Horse Heaven Hills. The DEIS identifies "loss of priority habitat, wildlife mortality, and creation of barriers to movement and habitat fragmentation" as potential impacts of the Project.1 Generally, the DEIS comprehensively analyzes the Project's adverse impacts to this unique habitat and species, addresses mitigation measures, and unavoidable impacts. RCW 43.21C.031, Adams v. Thurston County, 70 Wn.App. 471, 855 P.2d 284 (1993). CfE appreciates that EFSEC has identified mitigation measures, in addition to those proposed by the Applicant, to reduce impacts on vegetation, wildlife, and habitat. The DEIS proposes project-specific impacts on priority species such as the ferruginous hawks, including, but not limited to the exclusion of turbines within core habitat, curtailing turbine operation when ferruginous hawks are present, and avoiding siting project components within two miles of ferruginous hawks nests.2 CfE further appreciates that the DEIS recommends measures to avoid sensitive features and habitat specific. 1 See EFSEC, Horse Heaven Wind Energy Farm Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (DEIS), (Dec., 2022), Executive Summary (ES) at 12. 2 See id. at 12-13. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023 Page 2 management plans, develop wildlife and habitat specific management plans, and conduct additional preconstruction and post operation monitoring by a Technical Advisory Committee to review and provide input to pre-construction surveys, post-operation monitoring, and implementation of mitigation measures. 3 CfE recommends that the FEIS include a statement of need for the Project and how the Project would relate to Washington's broader statewide energy mandates. The FEIS should also more accurately quantify and represent the estimated total bird and bat mortality resulting from the life of the Project, consider the Project's cumulative impacts on bats, and recommend the applicant consider additional mitigation measures to reduce bat mortality. The FEIS should provide a clear rationale for siting the East Solar Field in priority habitats, consider alternatives to avoid direct habitat loss and fragmentation, and recommend removing additional barriers to wildlife movement. Additionally, the FEIS should consider and analyze alternatives to the action and no-action alternative presented and fully consider the environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives on greenhouse gas emissions as part of Washington's broader statewide energy mandates. Finally, CfE wants to ensure that EFSEC continues to engage with affected tribes to avoid and mitigate impacts to cultural resources. 1. The FEIS Should Include A Statement of Need for the Project The DEIS includes a purpose for the Project, but does not include a statement of need. The DEIS should briefly describe the Project's objectives, specifying the purpose and need to which the proposal is responding. WAC 197-11-440(4). It seems clear that the Project is responding to the "pressing need for increased energy facilities" to meet Washington's statewide Clean Energy Transformation Act, RCW 19.405 (2019), and Climate Commitment Act, RCW 70a.65 (2021) goals. RCW 80.50.010. But the DEIS is silent on the need, and how it would relate to Washington's broader statewide energy mandates. The FEIS would benefit from a clear description of the Project need and how the Project would meet that need. 2. The FEIS Should Accurately Quantify and Represent the Estimated Total Bird and Bat Mortality Resulting from the Life of the Project The DEIS does not create a complete or accurate estimate of bird and bat mortality resulting from the Project. First, the bird mortality rates presented in the DEIS need to be reconciled and more accurately quantified. The DEIS states that the Project may result "in a bird fatality rate similar to that of the nearby Nine Canyon Wind Energy Project" of 2.6 bird fatalities per megawatt (MW) per year.4 It also cites the Horse Heaven wind farm application which states that 22 bird fatalities were reported from the Nine Canyon Wind Project over a 16-year reporting period.5 However, the Nine Canyon Wind Project is a 95.9 MW project.6 Therefore, based on the 3See id. at 23 4 DEIS at 4-156. 5 Id. 6 Energy Northwest, Nine Canyon Wind Project (2023), https://www.energy-northwest.com/energyprojects/nine-canyon/Pages/default.aspx . ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023 Page 3 estimate of a 2.6 bird fatality rate per megawatt the resulting project's annual fatality rate would appear to be 249 birds per year—significantly higher than the DEIS estimates. 7 The FEIS should address these discrepancies and more accurately quantify the annual bird fatality rate. Second, when the annual estimate is clarified the FEIS should more clearly represent the total bird mortality impact of the Project. While estimating bird mortality as a rate based on a nameplate generating potential is standard industry practice,8 it does not create a complete picture of the estimated bird mortality resulting from the life of the Project. Assuming estimated bird fatalities from the Project are 249 birds per year that could result in estimated fatalities in the range of 8,715 birds for the life of the Project up to 35 years and beyond.9 This estimate is sufficiently greater than the estimate of 2.6 birds per megawatt per year portrayed in the DEIS and should be clarified in the FEIS. The DEIS should also clarify and reconcile estimates relating to bat mortality rates. Accurate estimates of bat mortalities are particularly critical for the hoary and silver-haired bat as both are classified as species of greatest conservation need under the Washington State Wildlife Action Plan.10 Accurately estimating fatalities resulting from the Project's impacts on hoary bats is also important because they are predicted to experience severe declines in the next 50 years due to wind energy.11 Similar to the projected mortality rate for birds, the DEIS cites one source of Nine Canyon Wind Project data which estimates 2.47 fatalities for hoary and silver-haired bats per MW per year.12 The DEIS then cites a different study at the Nine Canyon Wind Project which documents 27 bat fatalities of the silver-haired bat and hoary bat and estimated fatalities of 3.21 bats per turbine per year.13 Recognizing that the population sizes of hoary and silver-haired bats is poorly understood,14 it is still critical to reconcile this data and to the extent possible accurately estimate the Project's impact on bat fatalities. Finally, similar to birds, the 7 See Id. According to Energy Northwest 2023 the Nine Canyon Wild Project is a 95.9 MW project. Assuming this is correct, the annual fatality rate would be 2.6 birds/MW/yr x 95.9MW = 249 birds/yr. 8 USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines (2012), https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/land-based-wind-energy-guidelines.pdf , at 37-38. 9 DEIS at 2-20. "The Project is anticipated to have an operating life of up to 35 years, which may be extended by repowering." Assuming a 35 year life of the project= 249 x 35 = 8,715 bird fatalities 10 See WDFW, Washington's State Wildlife Action Plan: 2015 Update (2015), https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/01742/wdfw01742.pdf ; see also Scout Clean Energy, Application for Site Certification Horse Heaven Wind Energy Farm (Feb, 8, 2021) at Appendix K. 11 See generally Bat Conservation International, Hoary Bat (2023) https://www.batcon.org/bat/lasiurus-cineurus/ (last accessed January 29, 2023); N.A. Friedenberg, et al., Assessing fatality minimization for hoary bats amid continued wind energy development, (2021), https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320716310485 (Friedenberg); See also W. F., E. F Frick, et al. Fatalities at wind turbines may threaten population viability of a migratory bat, (May 2017), https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320716310485 . 12 DEIS at 4-157. 13 DEIS at 5-185. 14 Friedenberg, Assessing fatality minimization for hoary bats amid continued wind energy development, supra n 11. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023 Page 4 FEIS should rely on the most up to date data to estimate bat mortality resulting from the life of the Project to provide a more complete picture of Project impacts. 3. The FEIS Should Recommend the Applicant Consider Additional Mitigation Measures to Reduce Bat Mortality Silver-haired bats and hoary bats represent the majority of bat mortality at wind farms in Washington. Bat surveys at the Project suggest temporal and spatial features important to potentially mitigate impacts to silver-haired and hoary bats.15 First, bat use of the area is not consistent across the landscape and some turbines are likely to be located in areas of greater bat activity. Therefore, bat mortality could be higher at specific turbines or areas of the Project. Second, bat use of the Project area peaks in the Spring and Fall likely associated with migration. The applicant has reported little or no suitable roost or shelter sites in the Project area. CfE appreciates that EFSEC is recommending that upon completion of a "two year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigating measures are necessary."16 But the DEIS does not recommend mitigation measures that would be triggered in the event of high rates of bat fatality. CfE recommends the FEIS consider adopting additional mitigation measures, including, but not limited to adaptive management plans and curtailment of the turbines associated with high mortality rates potentially during Spring and Fall migration periods.17 4. The FEIS Should Fully Assess the Project's Cumulative Impacts on Bats The DEIS considers and discusses the cumulative impacts of the Project with the existing and reasonably foreseeable developments.18 As part of this cumulative impacts analysis, the DEIS assesses the cumulative impacts of the Project on wildlife, including, but not limited to impacts on the pronghorn antelope, ferruginous hawk, birds, and bats. The DEIS concludes that mortality of these "species associated with the Project is expected to occur cumulatively with the mortality associated with other regionally occurring projects, particularly other wind power projects such as the Nine Canyon and Stateline Wind Projects."19 But migratory species such as birds and bats that are exposed to mortality risks from the Project are drawn from metapopulations that likely 15 HHWF (Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC). Horse Heaven Wind Farm, Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, Application for Site Certification (2020) Appendix M: Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy. December. 16 DEIS 4-193.	Wildlife and Habitat	See Response to Comment 1110773	4.6	n/a
		Vegetation	Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	Section 4.5	n/a	
		Chapter 1 - Project Background	In accordance with RCW 80.50.010, it is the policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities, and to ensure, through available and reasonable methods, that the location and operation of all energy facilities and certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities produce minimal adverse effects on the welfare of the population and environment; including ecology of the land and its wildlife and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life.	Section 1.3	Update Purpose and Need	
Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a			

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>17 See generally J. L. Rydell, Bat mortality at wind turbines in northwestern Europe, <i>Acta Chiropterologica</i> (2010), https://doi.org/10.3161/150811010X537846; See also American Wind Wildlife Institute, Bats and Wind Energy: Impacts, Mitigation, and Tradeoffs, <i>American Wind Wildlife Institute White Paper</i> (2018), www.awwi.org/resources/bat-white-paper/; see also American Wind Wildlife Institute, Wind Turbine Interactions with Wildlife and Their Habitats: A Summary of Research Results and Priority Questions. (2019) www.awwi.org, https://rewi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Wind-Wildlife-Impacts-Summary-2019.pdf.</p> <p>18 DEIS at 5-7-8.</p> <p>19 DEIS at 5-14.</p> <p>ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023</p> <p>Page 5</p> <p>reflect the distribution of species occupying a larger geographic region. Consequently, it is unknown whether the birds and bats impacted by the Project site are from a population whose breeding location is proximate and confined to a limited geography, or possibly a more random selection of the metapopulation representing a broader geographic distribution. We know that population size is a critical data gap to determining the population viability of most bat species, especially tree bats like hoary and silver-haired bats.20 The FEIS should reassess the cumulative impacts of the Project by evaluating the impacts to migratory species on a larger geographic scale, particularly silver-haired and hoary bats.21 This analysis should take into account issues with the viability of bat populations and their lack of resilience due to low reproduction rates.</p> <p>5. The FEIS Should Adequately Analyze Alternatives to the Action and No-Action Alternative</p> <p>The DEIS is required to include a detailed discussion of alternatives to the proposed action. RCW 43.21C.030(c)(iii). <i>King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Bd.</i>, 138 Wn.2d 161 (1999). That includes “actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal’s objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation.” WAC 197-11-440(5)(b). If the action is for “a private project on a specific site,” the agency only is required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives (i.e., building the project with mitigation measures). See <i>Weyerhaeuser v. Pierce County</i>, 124 Wn.2d 26, 38 (1994). WAC 197-11-440(5)(d). Here, the DEIS only considers the applicant’s proposal with recommended mitigation measures, and a no-action alternative, but fails to consider any onsite alternatives to the Applicant’s proposal. The DEIS explains that “several alternatives were considered for analysis, but were eliminated from detailed evaluation in the DEIS because they would not generate the designed nameplate capacity required by the Applicant.”22 However, the DEIS fails to provide any analysis of the alternatives that were eliminated and why they could not feasibly attain or approximate the proposal’s nameplate generating capacity. The FEIS should address this deficiency by considering a less environmentally impactful alternative that includes alternative project layouts such as those proposed by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).23 This should include consideration of an alternative that does not site the East Solar Field located in a highly concentrated priority habitat to avoid direct habitat loss and fragmentation.</p> <p>20 Friedenber, Assessing fatality minimization for hoary bats amid continued wind energy development, <i>supra</i> n. 11, at 10-11.</p> <p>21 <i>Id.</i></p> <p>22 ES-6.</p> <p>23 WDFW, Agency Comment #0004 (April 1, 2021), https://www.efsec.wa.gov/sites/default/files/210011/00024/A0004_WDFW_Rvw3.pdf.</p> <p>ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023</p> <p>Page 6</p> <p>6. The FEIS Should Provide a Clear Rationale for Siting the East Solar Field in Priority Habitats, and Consider Alternatives to Avoid Direct Habitat Loss and Fragmentation</p> <p>Most of the Project’s impacts to priority habitats are within the microslitting corridor and East Solar field. These impacts manifest themselves through direct habitat loss and fragmentation. The DEIS concludes that impacts to priority habitat include the permanent disturbance of 72.5 acres of Eastside (interior) grassland and temporary disturbance of 16.2 acres; permanent disturbance of 1.1 acres of dwarf shrub-steppe and temporary disturbance of 8.9 acres; permanent disturbance of 1.4 acres of sagebrush shrub-steppe and temporary disturbance of 31.4 acres; and permanent disturbance of 717.2 acres of rabbitbrush shrubland and temporary disturbance of 152.3 acres.24</p> <p>CIE appreciates that EFSEC has proposed additional mitigation measures to priority habitat in these regions, including an as-built report and calculation of offsets based on final temporary, permanent, and modified habitat impacts.25 But the DEIS does not address why the East Solar Field has to be located in this highly concentrated priority habitat area in the first place. Additionally, the DEIS suggests that the “applicant has also proposed three different solar facility locations, though all three may not be constructed.”26 Considering this, the FEIS should provide a rationale for the location of the East Solar Field, and consider an alternative such as the one recommended by WDFW that avoids development in the East Solar field and focuses solar development only on agriculture and grasslands in the Southern edge of the lease area and to the Southwest.27 The FEIS should only recommend constructing the East Solar Field after a complete evaluation of alternatives and whether impacts can be avoided.</p> <p>Finally, CIE appreciates that the DEIS recommends the use of non-barbed wire fencing for Pronghorn antelope. However, in addition to non-barbed wire fencing the FEIS should recommend minimizing fencing whenever possible and raising wire fencing for Pronghorn antelope to pass under strands when fencing is proposed within migration routes.28</p> <p>7. The FEIS Should Recommend an Option to Avoid Townsend’s Ground Squirrel Colony Relocation and Analyze the Likelihood that a Squirrel Colony Cannot be Successfully Relocated</p> <p>The Project could also impact two of the known Townsend’s ground squirrel colonies in the Lease Boundary. The applicant reports that of the two known ground squirrel colonies that occur in the Project, one of them would be directly disturbed.29 Because species-specific studies were</p> <p>24 DEIS at ES-13 at 4.4.2.</p> <p>25 <i>Id.</i></p> <p>26 DEIS at 4-147.</p> <p>27 WDFW, Agency Comment, <i>supra</i> n 23.</p> <p>28 DEIS at 4-202</p> <p>29 DEIS at 4-186.</p> <p>ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023</p> <p>Page 7</p> <p>not conducted, there is a potential for additional colonies to be present.</p> <p>30 The DEIS notes that while the Townsend’s ground squirrel population and population trends specific to Washington State are unknown, some studies estimate that the population may have declined more than 70 percent, with only ten percent of natural habitat remaining within the historic range.31 The DEIS requires that the applicant consider how to avoid habitat loss in Townsend’s ground squirrel habitat concentration areas and known colonies, develop a plan with a “rationale for why colonies cannot be avoided,” and provide “additional mitigation measures, such as colony relocation and reconstruction of habitat features.”32 The FEIS should recommend an alternative to entirely avoid ground squirrel colony relocation and address the likelihood that a squirrel colony cannot be successfully relocated.</p> <p>8. The FEIS Should Recommend Removing Additional Barriers to Wildlife Movement and Include Bottom Less Culverts where Grade Crossing is Necessary</p> <p>The movement corridor between the Rattlesnake Hills area to the north of the Habitat Concentration Area in Oregon allows for the movement of wildlife. Loss of this important corridor function could contribute to barriers to movement and resulting isolation of wildlife populations. Disturbance from the project footprint in the area associated with the East Solar Field would occur primarily on the east side of the wildlife movement corridor.33 But the wind towers and facility access roads that cross the north-south movement corridor in the east-west direction could potentially cause more significant fragmentation than the East Solar Field. Access roads up to sixteen feet in width could particularly constitute barriers to movement for smaller species.34 The DEIS recommends an adaptive management approach in which the applicant would review road based mortalities annually and propose “additional mitigation for areas” including “control, signage, temporary road closures, or wildlife passageways.”35 In addition to this mitigation measure, the FEIS should consider adding bottomless culverts to any road development or upgrading in movement corridors where a grade crossing is necessary.36 These culverts could be moderate in size so as to facilitate the crossing of smaller wildlife.</p> <p>30 DEIS at 4-186.</p> <p>31 DEIS at ES-32; 4-185.</p> <p>32 DEIS at 4-202.</p> <p>33 DEIS at 3-97, Figure 3.6-2.</p> <p>34 DEIS at 4-164.</p> <p>35 DEIS at 4-193—194.</p> <p>36 See generally L.B. Stewart, et al. <i>Wildlife Crossing Design Influences Effectiveness for Small and Large Mammals in Banff National Park</i> (2020) <i>Case Studies in the Environment</i> 4 (1): 1231752, https://doi.org/10.1525/cse.2020.1231752; T.M. McGuire, <i>Innovative Strategies to Reduce the Costs of Effective Wildlife Overpasses</i> (2021) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA. General Technical Report PSW-GTR-267, https://www.fs.usda.gov/psw/publications/documents/psw_gtr267/psw_gtr267.pdf.</p> <p>ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager February 1, 2023</p> <p>Page 8</p> <p>9. The DEIS Should Consider the Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Alternatives on greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>The DEIS includes a specific discussion of direct and indirect impacts to each alternative. However, the DEIS fails to show how each alternative would reduce or not reduce the State’s greenhouse gas emissions as part of our broader statewide energy mandates. Projects such as Horse Heaven are “critical to advancing the state’s objectives in providing affordable electricity, promoting renewable energy, strengthening the state’s economy, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.” RCW 80.50.010. But the DEIS notably lacks any analysis of the emission reductions estimated to result from the Project or how the Project would fit into meeting the State’s energy goals outlined in the Clean Energy Transformation Act, and the Climate Commitment Act. Similarly, there is no estimate of the impact on meeting our statewide energy goals if the Project was not developed.</p> <p>The no-action alternative would certainly have adverse environmental impacts if it would result in additional emissions that would contribute towards climate change. Therefore, the FEIS should include an assessment of how the Project would reduce the State’s greenhouse gas emissions and help to meet the State’s energy mandates. Similarly, the DEIS should include an analysis of the environmental impacts if the Project is not developed, including potential emissions. EFSEC should estimate this impact to provide guidance to the public and decision-makers on the tradeoffs involved if the Project is not developed.</p> <p>Finally, this Project could have significant impacts on historic and cultural resources. CIE recommends the EFSEC continue to engage with the tribes to develop additional measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to important cultural resources.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this comment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sarah Reyneveld Counsel for the Environment 206-389-2126 sarah.reyneveld@atg.wa.gov</p>	Air Quality	The FEIS will include an assessment of the net effect of the proposed project and no project alternatives on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.	4.3	Inclusion of assessment of the net effect of the proposed project on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. EFSEC will continue to engage with Tribes. EFSEC will also initiate formal consultation with Tribes and other state agencies. The FEIS will report the results of formal consultation.	3.9, 3.9.2.1, Table 3.9-1, 4.9, 4.9.3, Table 4.9-2, Table 4.9-3, Table 4.9-7, Table 4.9-10, Table 4.9-11 (a-c)	The FEIS will report the results of continued formal consultation with the Tribes.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1117659	I would like to know why orchards and other agricultural industries use small wind mills to help regulate their crops. Why are the big windmills going to do to our temperatures and affecting our crops here. Also But hidden from view below ground are the massive concrete foundations that keep wind turbine towers upright. These poured-in-place foundations are 10-20 feet thick, 60 feet in diameter, weigh almost two million pounds, and use 40 truckloads of concrete, or approximately 400 cubic yards. The amount of fuel for the concrete trucks and for all the other truck that's going to be need is going to cause more pollution. Thank you Bennett Olsson	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117673	My spoken comments. I am a lifelong resident of the Tri-cities and I am a representative of IBEW local 112 and we represent 1300 electricians in southeastern Washington that would greatly benefit from the job that will be created by this project. My brothers and sisters of IBEW local 112 have been at the forefront of green energy production including a recent repower at the van cycle wind power project in Athena Oregon successfully extending the life of the towers down there. My brothers and sisters built the first wind and solar project in America that could put power on to the grid 24/7 through battery storage in Lexington Oregon just last year. Low-cost power is the key to attracting new industries to the area and we need the supply in whatever form it takes. My brothers and sisters depend on a steady stream of construction jobs and denying this project would not only deny them these but future jobs as well as industry turns away from the area. I understand the desire to build this project far from view but I would ask those opposed how long their commute to work is? Many of my brothers and sisters drive an hour and a half one way to work every day. This would be a welcome change of pace for many of them. IBEW Local 112 and I support this project thank you. Rylan Grimes IBEW LU 112 Organizer Cell: 509-619-4547 Office: 509-735-0512 Fax: 509-735-0514 Email: rylang@ibew112.com ibewlu112.com	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117677	The Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project would be terrible for this area and it's not needed. We are totally against this development. It will kill birds, negatively impact tourism, degrade the quality of life for those of us who live in this area, and leave behind mammoth turbine blades that do not biodegrade. We live in an area rich in avian diversity. I see hundreds of Sandhill Cranes migrating back and forth each Fall and Spring, and the flocks stop to rest in the area. There are thousands and thousands of raptors, waterfowl, songbirds, owls, and other bird life. All will be subject to strikes by the wind turbine blades, with hundreds to thousands of deaths every year. We have world-class American Viticultural Areas here, accompanied by scores of wineries, that are a huge tourist attraction. A large part of that attraction is relaxing on a terrace enjoying a bottle of wine while taking in the big vistas of our region. That will take a huge hit if the vistas become blighted with ranks upon ranks of ugly wind turbines. It similarly degrades the quality of life for those of us who have made homes here. Most of the electricity would be sold to California or other states, so why don't they build out their own energy infrastructure? It's very inefficient to send power hundreds of miles, they need to build their own power sources locally. This project is a terrible idea, we are totally opposed to it. Dave and Kathy Blanchard Benton City, WA	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. A discussion of the wine industry within the study area is included in Chapter 3.8 and an analysis of the Project impacts on vineyards and wine related businesses is provided in Section 4.8.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
TC Cares and Save Our Ridges	1117695	February 1, 2023 Via Email to EFSEC and the EFSEC SEPA Comment Page Web Form TC Cares Comments on the DEIS for the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement On behalf of TC Cares and Save Our Ridges, and numerous individual reviewers, we are submitting the attached comments on the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We do not believe this project should move forward in its current condition. The SEPA process is flawed and the DEIS is filled with errors, omissions, and misrepresentations regarding the Project's purpose and need, premise, financial feasibility and viability, proposed action, lack of feasible reasonable alternatives, lack of mitigation measures, and the significance of environmental and community impacts that cannot be avoided. Even in spite of these flaws and issues, the DEIS clearly demonstrates that the Project will bring about more harm than good. It is imperative that EFSEC search, develop, analyze and present alternative solutions that actually meet the need for power generation and do not impose such damage on the environment and the communities of Benton City, Richland, Kennewick, and Finley, as well as the rest of Benton County and the Tri-Cities and beyond. The following summarizes the list of contestable issues describing the many flaws of the project, the DEIS, and EFSEC's review of the project: The EIS is Poorly Done •The DEIS is lengthy, complex, piecemeal, filled with obfuscation, and contains a plethora of would's and may's vs wills. •The DEIS fails to describe the project, impacts, and mitigations with any certainty which makes a mockery of the SEPA process and abuses the SEPA process and the public. •The developer appears to be using the SEPA process to push a foregone conclusion without proper rationale and justification. •There are repeated and re-iterated errors, omissions, and misrepresentations. The DEIS contains cascading errors and omissions that render the document unusable for rational decision-making. •The DEIS is poorly done and uses out-of-date publishing technology. It contains poor maps that are too small and fuzzy with misleading coloration and not enough detail. It is very difficult to see the project component locations which means the public is unable to identify exact turbine locations in order to complete an accurate analysis of the impacts. We needed to create our own turbine location maps. •The DEIS fails to make use of digital GIS mapping tools to help the agencies explore and fully understand the environment and the impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. •The DEIS does not contain maps of the project that identify microslitting corridors and turbine locations suitable for a reasonably accurate analysis of the impacts. Integrity of the SEPA Process Is Questionable •The ASC was updated on December 1 without proper public notice. The scope and magnitude of the changes in the ASC Update on December 1, 2022, makes the entire SEPA Process questionable. The ASC should be revoked and reissued and the DEIS should be reissued with a new comment period. •EFSEC did not perform independent validation of the data contained in the many SEPA Elements of the Environment. Any proof of quality validation by EFSEC is lacking and there are a myriad of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations throughout the DEIS that should not be there if a validation had been properly performed.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	In accordance with RCW 80.50.010, it is the policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities, and to ensure, through available and reasonable methods, that the location and operation of all energy facilities and certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities produce minimal adverse effects on the welfare of the population and environment; including ecology of the land and its wildlife and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life.	Section 1.3	Update Purpose and Need
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comments noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including assessing views within 25 miles of the proposed wind turbines. The viewshed map from Appendix 3.10-2, correctly showing the analysis out to 25 miles, has replaced the maps in Chapter 4 of the EIS with additional locational information included. The current analysis includes the assessment of the three criteria identified in the CESA visual impact assessment process (see Section 4.10.1.1), as well as applying methods from the BLM VRM system, to identify Unreasonable or Undue Visual Impacts. Based on this analysis, the Project would result in significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character. Lighting comment noted and additional mitigation measure recommendation will be considered.	4.10 / 4.10.2.4 Lighting	Yes - Will use correct turbine viewshed maps from Visual Technical Report
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary. The FEIS will include an assessment of the net effect of the proposed project and no project alternatives on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM Inclusion of assessment of the net effect of the proposed project on GHG emissions and their relationship to Washington State GHG reduction goals.

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
		<p>The EFSEC consultant repeatedly just incorporated the developer's consultant's work verbatim using copy and paste. This raises serious conflict of interest issues since work done for the Applicant carries a risk of inherent bias in favor of the Applicant's project.</p> <p>•The DEIS lacks "impartial discussion" and is plagued from beginning to end by a noteworthy lack of detail and a verifiable lack of commitment to WAC requirements and mitigation.</p> <p>Purpose and Need for the Project</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to adequately establish a feasible purpose and need for this project. The project's funding and high price tag, as much as \$1.7 billion, is not described and renders the project impracticable.</p> <p>•The DEIS does not contain a reasonably detailed description of how this project is being funded. Who is going to pay for this project and how? Who paid for the consultants and how much did they get paid?</p> <p>•No off-taker for the power has been identified at all.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to explain the purpose and need for a 19-mile transmission line.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and analyze the impact the project will have on climate change.</p> <p>oThe DEIS fails to identify, document, and demonstrate that the project does anything at all to mitigate the cited near-term and long-term impacts from climate change.</p> <p>oThe DEIS fails to establish a pressing need for the energy that will be produced by this project.</p> <p>Proposed Action and Alternatives</p> <p>•The history of the power generation requests (BPA LGIP) are not consistent with the Project's nameplate power generation claims. They claim to have the necessary authorizations to provide 1150 MW, but the documentation only indicates 850 MW.</p> <p>•The project nameplate capacity of 1,150 MW is not supported by the record. The DEIS and the Updated Redlined ASC repeatedly describe the nameplate capacity in error.</p> <p>•Fails to justify the need for the proposed action at 1150 with interconnection capability, is only supported at 850 (LGIP requests), and fails to clarify the Boffer Canyon Substation limit of 350 MW.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and analyze the impacts the project will have on the Nine Canyon project.</p> <p>oThere has been no identification or analysis of the effects and impacts of a phenomenon known as blocking, which decreases turbine performance when an upwind wind project is too close to a downwind project.</p> <p>•The DEIS dismisses consideration of alternatives other than the proposed action without a rational basis and justification.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate the costs and benefits of any reasonable alternatives that can be demonstrated to feasibly attain or approximate the project's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental damage.</p> <p>Impacts on People in the Affected Environment</p> <p>Visual</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to adequately identify and evaluate the visual impacts of the project on people in the Tri-Cities.</p> <p>•The DEIS Visual Assessment Report contains numerous errors, omissions and misrepresentations which render the document ineffective as a basis for decision-making under SEPA.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the project based on the CESA Guidance 2021 regarding "Unreasonable or Undue Visual Impacts".</p> <p>•The DEIS visual simulations contain numerous errors and omissions and misrepresentations.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to accurately describe the visual impacts of Option 1 and Option 2 on people.</p> <p>•The Applicant's commitments to mitigation of visual impacts in the DEIS are minimal, ineffective, and unacceptable.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to recognize that visual impacts on Benton County are significant and disproportionate when compared to every other wind project in the State of Washington.</p> <p>•The DEIS visual assessment fails to apply the BLM and CESA Guidance adequately to describe and evaluate the impacts on people in proximity to the project. An area of analysis of 25 miles will be more appropriate in midwestern and western landscapes, open terrain, drier air, and larger wind projects (hundreds vs. dozens of turbines) creating a larger mass visible over greater distances.</p> <p>•The Applicant's, and therefore the DEIS's, visual assessment did not select Key Observation Points and Representative Viewpoints adequately.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the value of the dark skies at night on the Horse Heaven Hills project.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to describe and commit to commonly used, FAA-approved light mitigation technology utilizing aircraft detection lighting systems to mitigate light pollution.</p> <p>Population</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to characterize, analyze, or provide enough information to allow reviewers to quantify the level of impact to population.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to accurately identify and quantify that a large number of mid-range viewers, in particular, are impacted. There is no substantive mitigation offered.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate the Benton County policy goals meaningfully and then fails to recognize the importance that the features hold for the County and its residents.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate the visual impacts on wineries.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to accurately describe and evaluate the scenic resource attributes and sensitivity levels.</p> <p>•The DEIS does not accurately describe and evaluate the location, proximity, and impact on people who live in close proximity to the project. The distances described in the DEIS are in error and misrepresent the real conditions found at the present time.</p> <p>•The ASC and the DEIS fail to identify and evaluate the impact of the project and feasible alternatives using a suitable analysis of population within the affected environment.</p> <p>Fugitive Dust Emissions</p> <p>•The DEIS fails adequately identify, describe, and evaluate the significant and unhealthy adverse impacts fugitive dust emissions that will be caused by the project.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify, describe, and evaluate feasible alternatives that can reasonably control and mitigate the health hazards from the fugitive dust emissions caused by the project.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to adequately identify, describe, and evaluate that unacceptable conditions will occur from the road construction disturbance and cause significant environmental impacts that will affect over 100,000 people in the Tri-Cities. Project monitoring of PM2.5 and PM 10 is inadequate.</p> <p>•The DEIS does not provide for adequate project air monitoring and mitigation plans do not identify and commit to any increased monitoring of PM 10 and PM 2.5.</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to describe and evaluate special status wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p>•The DEIS contains numerous errors, omissions, and misrepresentations regarding the project wildlife resources and the impacts on wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p>•The DEIS assessment of wildlife is shallow and fails to adequately describe and evaluate the significant near-term and cumulative impacts the project will have on 20 special status wildlife species (two are endangered) and on their habitat and prey.</p> <p>•The DEIS ignores and disregards the mitigation recommendations in the several Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife letters.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and evaluate specific turbine locations that are known to cause significant impacts.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to propose or even contemplate any remedy if that remedy entails turbine elimination or relocation.</p> <p>•The DEIS makes no mention of the elimination or relocation of turbines located in essential wildlife corridors that preserve connectivity of wildlife habitat and foraging areas.</p> <p>•The DEIS does not identify, describe, and evaluate wildlife resources, in particular special species, outside the boundary area even though they are clearly in the affected environment under the WAC.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to evaluate impacts the project will have on wildlife outside the project boundary.</p> <p>•The DEIS contains no analysis of cumulative effects to habitat, especially the east/west wildlife corridor along the ridgeline of the Horse Heaven Hills.</p> <p>Inadequate Mitigation</p> <p>•The DEIS avoids mitigation commitments and defers the development and selection of mitigation measures to the FEIS and a Technical Advisory Committee selected by the Applicant.</p> <p>•The DEIS does not include an adequate planning horizon that considers mitigation.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to provide adequate information about the indirect and cumulative impacts from the proposed action, and any reasonable feasible alternatives.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to identify and describe reasonable measures that can be taken to mitigate and minimize the visual impacts on the environment.</p> <p>•The DEIS fails to adequately identify and describe effective mitigations for wildlife habitat and special species.</p> <p>The Horse Heaven Hills Project isn't green at all. The project need for the project is unproven and will force dependence on giant, mechanical monsters which have very little impact on climate change at all.</p> <p>This project has nothing to do with protecting the earth from the impacts of climate change and power. Instead, it is dedicated to corporate profits at the expense of the public and the impact on the local environment. Spending \$1.7 billion dollars on this project, much of it is taxpayer money, is irresponsible, unnecessary, unacceptably damaging and wasteful.</p> <p>The complete version of the comments are provided in the attached pdf file. This file is also being transmitted to EFSEC via email with attachment. The file can also be downloaded here:</p> <p>https://presari.com/s/T92230000463680</p> <p>If you have any problems receiving and opening the file successfully please let me know.</p> <p>Paul J. Krupin</p> <p>Appreciatively,</p> <p>Paul Krupin, BA MS JD 509-531-8390 cell 509-582-5174 landline Paul@Presari.com</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Special status wildlife species are described in Chapters 3.6 and 4.6. Chapter 3.6 describes how special status species were defined and Chapter 3.6 describes the potential special status wildlife species that could occur in the Horse Heaven Lease Boundary, habitat requirements, threats, and population status. Chapter 4.6 evaluates potential Project specific impacts on special status species with potential to occur in the Lease Boundary.</p> <p>The final locations of wind turbines were not available at the time of writing the dEIS. As such, conservative assumptions were applied when evaluating potential impacts to wildlife and special status species. For example, the dEIS acknowledges that the Project could result in indirect habitat loss due to disturbance to wildlife. The extent of indirect habitat loss (estimated at 0.5 miles) was measured from the micrositng corridor instead of a turbine location thereby accounting for various permeation of turbine placement. This approach overestimates the potential Project indirect impact as it does not account for micrositng of turbines away from sensitive habitat. A similar approach was applied when estimating the direct and indirect loss of special status species habitat such as Ferruginous hawk.</p> <p>"WSFW data may not include private property" was included to describe the limitations of available background data. WDFW maintains databases on known occurrences of special status species; however, data may be limited by where surveys have been conducted and data reported. Access is not necessarily available on private lands, as such, information pertaining to special status species on these properties may not be available. Lack of documented occurrence should not be taken as species absence. In lieu of confirmed species presence, the dEIS assumes species presence based on the availability of suitable habitat.</p> <p>A technical advisor committee is a useful tool developed to bring technical experts together in management of environmental impacts. The purpose of the TAC would be to provide input to mitigation measures that can be implemented and adapted based on the results of pre-construction surveys, and operational surveys. While the TAC would provide input into project mitigation, the ultimate approval of mitigation measures would be with EFSEC. The Applicant will propose TAC members but EFSEC will approve the TAC members.</p> <p>Exposure indices were developed for species for which flight height data was collected during field surveys. Exposure indices could not be calculated for species that were not recorded during flight (e.g. singing, perched). These species are typically species that remain closer to the ground, moving between bushes (e.g. sagebrush sparrow) and are unlikely to interact with blades.</p> <p>The design of baseline programs, such as acoustic surveys, were developed by the Applicant in consultation with WDFW.</p>	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117702	<p>I am stronly against the proposed wind farm for the Horse Heaven Hills.</p> <p>We live in an area blessed with natural electrical production from the current hydro dams that provide some of the lowest electrical powere rates in the country. Wind farms are not cheap, they are an eye sore, and most of the power will not be used in this area but will be shipped to other large cities and states. If these areas need more power they should be willing to have these wind farms in their locales instead of ruining ours. Please keep this windfarm away from our area.</p> <p>Thank you, Richard E. Carpenter 27805 S. 887 PR SE Kennewick, WA. 99338</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1117706	Do not put windmills on our beautiful Hirse Heaven Hills!! We object! There are many hills to use... ours are not necessary. Jim and Mary Jacobs 6445 Sapphire Street West Richland , WA 99353	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117737	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed horse heaven hills wind farm project. As a resident of the TriCities who lives in Pasco and one who views the Horse Heavens, daily from my home, the materially adverse impact on viewsheds of thousands of TriCitians appears to be given very little consideration ii the DEIS. No one would dare propose such a project outside the front windows of those living on Magnolia or anywhere in Puget Sound. The draft EIS fails to adequately assess the impacts upon destruction of viewsheds upon thousands of future reasonably foreseeable TriCity residents, especially the more than 40,00 new residents expected to be living in the West Pasco area north from I-182 out to Sagemoor Hills. The majority of these 40,000 new residents of Pasco will have views of the wind farm and their viewshed will be detrimentally affected. These future residents must be considered in the in EIS, as they are readily foreseeable, and residential building in the Broadmoor area of Pasco and areas north is now beginning in earnest. This is a readily foreseeable impact. The EIS should analyze the alternative of building the wind farm in areas closer to the population centers that will benefit from the power generated. The alternatives should include siting the wind farm as a floating wind farm in Puget Sound, as well as along the Washington Coast. This alternative would provide the state with additional income as it would own the aquatic land leases that would be needed if they were sited there. It would place the wind farm at a location closer to the power users and increase efficiency by reducing transmission losses. The TriCities has for years been the power generation center of the state, and has already done its share. It is time for other parts of the state to do their part and localize elsewhere the adverse effects that all power generation entails. The DEIS fails to adequately consider the impacts upon wildlife that will be killed by the massive number of windmills that will be built by this project if it is sited in the Horse Heavens. The DEIS fails to adequately analysis in sufficient detail, the adverse impacts of mining, processing and manufacturing all the materials needed to construct this project, especially the materials for the proposed battery component of the project. The failure to adequately analyze the environmental costs of these activities, are integral and necessary for the project to proceed, results in a unrealistic consideration of the environmental costs and benefits of the project. The public is tired of being given inadequate environmental reviews that exaggerate the benefits of a proposed action while not adequately considering the costs of a proposed action. It is especially worrisome that long term decisions are being made on projects that are cost ineffective, such as this one, when the actual total costs are considered, and where even the stated benefits are only present because of tax credits that hide the ineffectiveness of this method of producing power at this particular location. Therefore I firmly urge the EFSEC to deny a permit to this project. Thank you, Robert M. Carosino 130 Terrace Drive Pasco, WA 99301	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117744	The proposed Horse Heaven windmill farm will have by far the largest size windmills this area has yet seen at 500 feet tall and will cover about 10 square miles or 6,500 acres. The power they will hopefully generate will not really be needed as most of that "intermittent generation" will happen in the spring, the area's most windy season which is also when power consumption is low due to no / minimal need of heating or AC as in the summer and winter and on top of that Hydro output is at its seasonal high due to the spring runoff The sad fact is that these ~ 244 Monster Windmills won't eliminate or reduce any CO2 emitting power generating sources since there is none in WA State to begin with. Worse yet, these added Monster Windmills will further hamper the ability of the existing hydro system, to follow the daily load of powder need as the hydro system and overall grid has done very well at for about the past 70 years. At a "best case" calculated 25 to 30% capacity factor; these Monster Windmills will only work to earn their keep 2.5 to 3 days out of every 10 days. The Monster Windmills will mostly produce the most power in the spring when power demand is low. During the heat of summer and the cold of the winter the wind blows little in this area, so there is no to minimal windmill output then when its needed the most. In summary, windmill power generation makes minimal and unpredictable contribution to the power grid during peak demand. Another big disadvantage is that the BPA is already FORCED to buy windmill power at well over their real costs of generation whether they need the power or not; and at high prices passed to ratepayers. These monster Windmills will provide a few temporary blue collar jobs only related to the construction and then those few jobs will go away. These Monster Windmills will have no positive effect on CO2 levels, climate change or carbon emissions and will not reduce fossil fuel use. Don't be deceived about Scouts "big tax \$\$\$ will be paid to the schools" claim. Fact: The Stateline windmill farm in Walla Walla County since 2001 has paid less than a single teacher's annual salary per year to the local school districts. Scout will "blow" into town, put up their Monster Windmills, lay off the few that got the temporary construction jobs to erect those Monster Windmills; collect the huge PTC subsidy, and leave us to pay the bill and see Horse Heaven littered up for literal decades with these massive windmills not generating power for many days per year. Until storage technology on this scale is commercially available AND affordable which is probably another 10-15 years away, the last thing the Tri City area needs more windmills. Let the Western WA green activists and money grubbers like Scout build windmills on their skylines, not ours. Michael Scrimsher	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117763	Eight whales have died in the last two months highly likely from the off shore windmills, since that is the only new item. These windmills have issues that affect life. Christina Caprio	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117765	The many migratory birds that would be killed by the windmills are protected under the CFR Title 50 Part 10.13, List of Birds Protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (2020). For example the Sandhill cranes that fly over the HHH at many different heights by the thousands each year. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential bird mortality in Section 4.6.	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117783	We are opposed to this project. We are neighbors off Clodfelter (382 PrSE) and in direct view of this project to the South. I agree wholeheartedly that these wind operations are not in the resident's best interests, especially considering our area provides plenty of hydro and nuclear power, enough to be sold to other areas of the PNW and California. Electricity and solar generated, are not enough to warrant such a vast operation. Thanks for your consideration, Monica Randall 96707 E 382 PRSE Kennewick, WA 99338	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117788	Today even the environmentalist are calling for a moratorium on east cost wind farms because the noise is interfering with the wales and killing wildlife well being! No substantial studies were done on humans and whales before these were forced on the people and built costs are enormous, 20 million per unit! This folly is our tax payer money! All indications suggests harm is being done to everyone and every creature living in the areas of these turbines! We are not Guinea pigs or lab animals. Maybe they should be called death wind turbines 9 wales dead now and countless wildlife. Do not put these in badger canyon! --badger canyon resident Becky Hughes	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Brent Gerry, Mayor/CEO, City of West Richland	1117800	<p>January 31, 2023 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Manager 621 Woodland Square Loop, PO Box 43172 Olympia, WA 98504-3172 Re: DRAFT EIS Public Comment: Horse Heaven Wind Turbine Project Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council: On behalf of the residents of West Richland, the Mayor and City Council would like to voice our opposition to the Scout Clean Energy's Horse Heaven Wind Project. It is not the appropriate generation resource needed for baseload service in this region and results in negative attributes for local communities. Furthermore, any project benefits are transferred outside the region, creating an inequity in impact versus benefit. The decision and recommendation for development are best made locally by communities with representation and a vested interest in the short-term and long-term repercussions. Having the Horse Heaven Wind Project decision made by the EFSEC process diminishes and circumvents local community's jurisdiction and participation to a formality rather than local community representation through county and city development processes. While the Horse Heaven Wind Project's energy generation through solar, wind, and energy storage provides diversity, the 20-30% capacity factors for wind and solar resources do not adequately contribute to resource adequacy needed in the Northwest as the region decarbonizes and loses other baseload generation resources. Even with the generation diversity, the Horse Heaven Wind Project will not provide a block-shaped resource that can be secured for meaningful customer service. This makes the value of the indeterminant generation proposed by the project less valuable locally and only beneficial with production tax credit subsidies for the project's shareholders outside the local community. The Draft EIS fails to adequately recognize or mitigate the project's limited generation benefits compared to the negative impacts on the environment and local communities. Many of the public power utilities in the Benton and Franklin Counties have a fuel mix near 90% carbon-free and are well positioned to meet the state's clean energy requirements. Yet EFSEC and SCOUT want to exploit our region for a project with intermittent generation which is unfavorable for providing reliable electrical service.</p> <p>Our electric utilities in Benton and Franklin County are unlikely to benefit from the Horse Heaven Wind Project's incremental carbon-free power compared to more carbon-dependent utilities outside the local community. The cost benefit analysis doesn't justify a significant impact to our community for a power source whose generation is less than 9% efficient. Ironically, when it does provide energy, it will be off-peak and take away from other energy sources that have greater than 98% efficiency rates and are also clean energy. This adds to the project's negative attributes to the local community, where benefits are transferred to remotely located utilities, likely in more affluent communities than Benton, Franklin, and Yakima County communities. The Draft EIS does not recognize or mitigate the project's negative attributes to the local community or social equity while benefiting more wealthy and less diverse communities outside Benton, Franklin, and Yakima Counties. The DRAFT EIS lacks state required process. State law (WAC 197-11-535(6)) and Governor Inslee push for public involvement, however, this project has had no local public outreach, engagement, or meetings to allow for public input for due process. In addition, WAC 197-11-440(5) requires the EIS to include a reasonable alternative. The proposal only includes the Action and No-Action alternatives. This application is lacking and needs to be fully vetted and processed to follow state law. The DRAFT EIS needs to be reprocessed to include proper public process, an analysis of a reasonable alternative and an additional public comment period to allow review and comment on the reasonable alternative to be compliant with state law. Based on the Draft EIS, the Mayor and City Council of West Richland oppose the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project. This Draft EIS does not adequality address or mitigate the negative impacts on the environment, air quality, and local communities. Sincerely, Brent Gerry, Mayor/CEO, City of West Richland CC: City Council, City Attorney</p>	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor. Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	2.0	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Question for EFSEC	<p>Comment acknowledged. Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility. Several opportunities were given to the stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the Project and Draft EIS. EFSEC considers all submitted comments and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation.</p> <p>Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.</p>	n/a	n/a
Tri City Regional Chamber of Commerce	1117808	See attachment	n/a	Please refer to submission 1106756	Please refer to submission 1106756	Please refer to submission 1106756
andrea.grantham	1117812	<p>I am sorry, I cannot attend this evening's meeting. Thank you so much for receiving our comments.</p> <p>Please understand we do not want this wind farm in Benton County. Its wild promises only emphasize what a boondoggle it will be for our county. Instead of benefits it will provide unlivable conditions for a large population of the county and destroy a tenth of our agricultural lands. In short it is a VERY expensive but unnecessary interruption our our power grid which presently provides carbon-free power to five states.</p> <p>Stay out of Horse Haven Hills.</p> <p>Karen Batishko</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Table 4.8-5 shows an analysis of the agricultural management practices for GMA Agriculture designated lands within Benton County, and the impacts that the Project would have on these land use types.	4.8.2	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Randy and Marleen Lechelt	1117816	We object to the HORSE HEAVEN WIND FARM , for the following reasons	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
		1. Washington State is taking away our right to be protected by our local county examiners process for this windfarm, which would fail the 5 conditions set up to protect our property value, health, personal safety and safety of our surrounding wildlife. My husband was born here 74 years ago and I have lived here 73 years, we love our beautiful land.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
		2. The bright lights these huge industrial windmills will change our skyline forever at night.	Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
		3. These windmills are not perfected, they take oil, they fall down, they cause fires and cause numerous health problems from the low frequency noise, vibrations and flicker which causes vertigo.	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential impacts to pronghorn antelope in Section 4.6. Spec-13 provides mitigation measures recommended to reduce impacts on pronghorn antelope.	4.6	n/a
		4. The batteries are not perfected and only hold 30 percent of the energy produced, how can we justify our tax dollars to be wasted like this? This cost will be passed on to the customers.	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	The FEIS includes the addition of a new Applicant Commitment from the Final ASC regarding the Traffic Management Plan.
		5. Herds of antelope have been placed here by fish and wildlife, what will be done to protect them ? What will be done to protect the shrub steppes that are homes to our wildlife? What will be done to protect the Eagles we see perched across the street from our home?	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
		6. Small nuclear reactors have been approved as safe and perfected, they take 6 acres of land, why can't we put those in for our power source and avoid all this damage that will take place.				
andrea.grantham	1117821	I am writing to NOT xpress my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. Although I am extremely "green" and know that we need to rid ourselves of fossil fuel based energy sources, this project will have severe negative impacts to our wildlife, especially our birdlife. These birds are having enough issues surviving in the changing climate and being wacked out of the sky by a blade or having their hunting grounds devastated by solar cells will affect not only the individual bird but the entire avian population and the greater ecosystem. Thank you for your consideration.- - Ms Levy Long term Pasco resident	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117829	I am writing to voice my opinion in opposition to the Horse Heaven Hills Windfarm. This is an unneeded destruction of the beautiful view of our ridgetops here in the Tri-Cities. Wind farms do not produce enough electricity to justify their intrusion on our ridgetops and they erroneously report their true impact on our environment. This project is simply a profit grab for Scout to take advantage tax credits and other programs Washington state has in place to further this administrations pie in the sky ideas for clean energy. We have nuclear and hydro right here and could easily produce energy in amounts greatly exceeding this project with simple small nuclear all the while taking up very, very small areas of land in unseen locations on the Hanford site and still provide jobs to the local area in similar numbers. Wind and Solar are not the answers yet though they may be in the future but they are too inefficient to bet on right now. Refuse to permit this money grab for an outside Washington entity and make the decision to have this administration look to what the people want not to want they want in their efforts to further their own political green energy agendas. Thank You	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117830	2-1-2023 Dear EFSEC: I am not in favor of the windmill project Horse Heaven hills. Keith E. Deaton	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1117846	I am Jim Chesley and I am writing in support of Horse Heaven Wind project. I find it very frustrating that Energy NW is opposed to it because it's not one of there own like the Existing Nine Canyon Wind Farm! Yet the public of the area don't live in fear of it. The birds still survived it's existence. I'd challenge people to go for the short drive to visit the wind farm from the road, the turbines are not much louder than the wind it's self. Go visit a Dam you can hear them also, yet the fish & birds survive. Go out and observe them for yourself. Form your own opinions. You won't ever find a flock of dead birds knee deep piled around a wind turbine as some would claim. Geese and other migratory birds fly over or around them. The public also ignores the fact the Nuke Plants & Dams also have changed where and how we live here in the Beautiful North West. We don't live with Spring time flooding or Summer Drought like my Grandparents spoke of, go visit the museums and see the pictures. Back about 30 years ago I recall that some of the Dams were actually pumping water back up above the dams at night when energy demands were low to conserve water because water run off from the mountains were low due to dry winters. Then after the wind farms entered production the dams didn't need to release as much water in the past to provide electricity needed. So the Dams are able to Store Water above the dams in effect Storing Energy. Wind and Water working together isn't a new thing. All forms of Energy are Needed. Remember when local Energy Northwest PUD's purchased and install their own Gas Turbines to help support the Energy Demands? The bottom line is Everything changes something. All forms of Energy are needed and a Balance is needed. We don't need to remove any Dams or shut down Nuclear Energy Production because of the potential of disaster that has to be managed daily and the challenges of storing the waste and ground water hazards. I am writing to express my support for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center and the role it will play in helping Washington achieve the ambitious decarbonization goals we set for ourselves with the passage of the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) in 2019. I believe strongly in impact mitigation and value EFSEC's process, but know that Washington's ability to realize a carbon-free future will depend on permitting large-scale clean energy projects in a timely manner just like the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. This is a good project with appropriately identified mitigation measures, and backed by an experienced team that will produce up to 1,150 MW of renewable energy through a combination of wind, solar, and battery storage technology. With the passage of CETA, Washington established itself as a leader in the fight to curb global emissions. The state now has a responsibility to ensure the clean energy transition can be achieved in the necessary timeframe to facilitate fossil plant retirement, and in doing we can set an example for the rest of the nation to follow. Thank you for your consideration.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation's	1117872	Please find attached the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation's comments regarding the December 19, 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Project.	Historic and Cultural Resources	<p>It is understood that your comment letter does not constitute formal consultation with the Yakama Nation Tribal Council.</p> <p>Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. We acknowledge your comments regarding the proposed mitigation measures, discrepancies in the DEIS, correspondence tracking, magnitude and likelihood impact ratings to cultural resources, the Yakama Nation's request for avoidance of all archaeological resources, protective buffers for archaeological resources, additional visual impact assessments, impacts to Treaty-reserved gathering and rights to harvest, and reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The FEIS will incorporate and address your comments. Factual errors and inconsistencies identified by your letter will be corrected. The FEIS will reflect your concerns about avoidance, impact ratings, proposed mitigation measures, compliance with SEPA, impacts to Treaty-reserved rights, and impacts to TCPs and the traditionally important landscape.</p> <p>Discussion of correspondence with the Yakama Nation will be removed from FEIS. Any discussion wit the Yakama Nation will be kept confidential and will not be reported without the consent of the Yakama Nation. In additiona, the FEIS will clarify whether any of the cultural resource reports have been formally submitted.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	3.9, 3.9.2.1, Table 3.9-1, 4.9, 4.9.3, Table 4.9-2, Table 4.9-3, Table 4.9-7, Table 4.9-10, Table 4.9-11 (a-c)	<p>Acknowledge that the Yakama Nation has requested the protection, preservation, and perpetuation of TCPs and archaeological resources.</p> <p>Revise Affected Environment to clarify the number and types of sites identified.</p> <p>Remove discussion of correspondence with Tribal entities and state agencies.</p> <p>Clarify if/when government-to-government consultation has taken place, and whether cultural resource reports have been formally submitted.</p> <p>Revisit magnitude ratings for unevaluated cultural resources.</p> <p>Revise statements about Yakama Nation's avoidance request.</p> <p>Revisit discussion of likelihood of impacts to unknown archaeological resources.</p> <p>Revise discussion of construction and operational impacts to TCPs given the Yakama Nation's comments on the location of, access to, and use of TCPs.</p> <p>Revisit minimum buffer size for documented archaeological resources.</p> <p>Address the Yakama Nation's criticism of the Proposed Mitigation Measures.</p>
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comments noted in regard to visual-specific impacts. Effects on TCPs and other cultural properties are described in Section 4.9 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Vegetation	<p>The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.</p> <p>Applicant commitments and identified mitigation for vegetation are provided in Section 4.5.2.4. The Applicant commitments include offset ratios in alignment with WDFW Wind Power Guidelines for loss of habitat, including voluntary offset of rabbitbrush temporary and permanent disturbance at shrub-steppe ratios. The identified mitigation measures include more than just tree avoidance. Additional mitigation include: pre-disturbance surveys for special status plant species; special status plant education; as-built report and offset calculation; operation and decommissioning dust control plan; decommissioning legislated requirements; and, decommissioning noxious weed management plan.</p> <p>Invasive plant surveys were conducted by Tetra Tech in 2020 and 2021 in separate portions of the project lease boundary. Knapweed was observed in the areas surveyed in 2020 and also in areas surveyed in 2021, but these were not repeat surveys and any changes in abundance comments should be attributed to different areas not to eradication. The differences in identified species or their abundance reflect the different survey areas. Locations of noxious weeds are provided in the ASC in Appendix K Biological Reports (2020 Botany Surveys) and in the updated ASC documents for 2021 Botany Surveys. Maps included in these appendices show the locations as point sources of invasive plant observed during surveys, which provide information on the distribution of invasive plants. SEPA requires "list all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site". This requirement is met by the application. The noxious weed management plan is outlined in Appendix N of the Application for construction and operations. In addition, a decommissioning noxious weed management plan is an identified mitigation. The noxious weed management plan includes proposed methods for treatment and monitoring.</p> <p>Panel washing impacts to vegetation and potential changes to water availability is addressed in Section 4.5.2.1 for construction under Indirect Impacts Surface Runoff. The impacts of solar panel washing on vegetation will be discussed in FEIS.</p>	Section 4.5; 5.2.2; 4.5.2.4; 4.5.2.1; ASC; Appendix N; Appendix K	4.5 - Include assessment of the impact of solar panel washing on vegetation with respect to invasive plants.
			Wildlife and Habitat	<p>The EIS evaluates to the potential impact on Pronghorn antelope based on background data summarized in Section 3.6.2.2, including data provided in Fidorra and Peterson (2021), Fidorra et al (2019), and information provided by the Applicant. If the Yakama Nation Wildlife Resource Management Program has additional information regarding pronghorn antelope movement that can be shared with EFSEC it will be reviewed and considered in the FEIS.</p> <p>The EIS (Section 4.6.2.4) describes the potential Project related impacts to Pronghorn antelope including animal avoidance during construction and operation, mortality, habitat loss, and barriers to movement. Mitigation measure Spec-13 would require the Applicant to conduct seasonal surveys to understand how pronghorn use the Lease Boundary and monitor changes in movement patterns.</p> <p>The mitigation measures proposed for ferruginous hawk (Spec-5) would require the Applicant to maintain infrastructure 2 miles away from known ferruginous hawk nests. Deviation from this mitigation would require review and approval by EFSEC and would require the Applicant to propose additional mitigation measures to avoid strikes (e.g. curtailment), additional offsetting specific to ferruginous hawk, and follow up monitoring.</p> <p>The Horse Heaven Project does not overlap sage grouse habitat concentration areas or modelled suitable habitat (e.g Washington Gap Mapping Distribution Map - Sage Grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) (naturemappingfoundation.org)). There are no reported occurrences of greater sage grouse in PHS data or recorded by the Applicant during the field surveys. Sage grouse were not identified as a species of concern for this Project by WDFW. Modelled corridors joining habitat concentration areas in Yakama County are located generally west of the Lease Boundary. If the Yakama Nation Wildlife Resource Management Program has additional information regarding greater sage grouse that can be shared with EFSEC it will be reviewed and considered in the FEIS.</p>	4.6	n/a
			Executive Summary	The executive summary provides an overview of the larger report. It is written to share the main points of the report with individuals who may not have time to review the entire report. The intent of the executive summary is not to present an in-depth analysis of the Project and detailed impacts to the affected environment.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119004	I am writing to express my disapproval of this project to be considered Thank you	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119025	I do not support the HHH wind farm due to the fact that it will have an adverse effect on the economy, the environment, and the health of local citizens. Agriculture is a huge part of our local economy and I feel that the wind farm may have a dramatic effect on our diversified agricultural production. I also feel that the destruction of local shrub step can not be easily remediated and that the impact on several endangers species that rely on that habitat will be adversely affected. Finally, I am concerned at the close proximity that this farm will have to many local residence and the health effects that it may have on families living within a 6 mile radius from the turbines. I hope that you will make the right choice and not allow this farm to cause such a dramatic impact to so many things within our state, a state that prides itself on environmental concern and the health and safety of its citizens. Denise Senior	Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. This analysis did not identify negative economic impacts.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Table 4.8-5 shows an analysis of the agricultural management practices for GMA Agriculture designated lands within Benton County, and the impacts that the Project would have on these land use types.	n/a	n/a
				Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119035	I would like to voice my objection to the proposed wind farm for the following reasons: Because of their massive size they will be an eyesore to our community. Approximately half are planned to be approximately 60 feet taller than the Space Needle. Taller for sure, and likely hundreds of feet wider. They're very invasive of our natural space. The footprint of the proposed development is larger than all of our communities combined. That being five cities of Kennewick, Pasco, Richland, West Richland and Benton City. Wind turbines have proven to be devastating to the habitat of birds and a disruption to the other local species. We are fortunate to have many varieties of waterfowl, hawks and upland birds in our area. We have not been advised where this power will be utilized. We in the Tri-Cities have had adequate power with our local production through Hydro, Nuclear, and some wind generated power. If this power will be sent elsewhere, then let those areas find their own solution without destroying our serenity. Because of the massive cost of construction of these facilities, we Tri-City residents will almost positively be forced to pay higher electric rates than we currently have. So this represents another cost increase for our residents. This is very difficult for many of our residents, particularly we who are on fixed incomes. Now, where will all of those massive blades come from? And when the lifespan is complete where will you bury those hundreds of blades that cannot be recycled? Has there been a cost comparison completed that shows the cost effectiveness of a wind farm versus nuclear power? Nuclear could likely be produced with a much smaller environmental impact than hundreds of wind turbines. And finally, I suggest concession if necessary, that these outrageously large turbines be located at least five or ten miles south of miles of our Tri-Cities. Thank you for your consideration of my viewpoint. Gene Torrey 1814 s. Jefferson Pl. Kennewick, WA 99338 Grtorrey@Charter.net	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. This analysis did not identify negative economic impacts.	4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119037	I support the Wind farm project because: 1. It will increase jobs in our area 2. It will provide more clean energy for us (and if it goes to California, there will be less pollution there to blow up to our area) 3. It allows continued use of the land around it. 4. It is more attractive than oil spills, tar sand mining, coal mining, refineries, pipelines. 5. It gives us more independence from the fossil fuel industry, keeps more of the profits local. 6. It is a less expensive form of energy generation. 7. The batteries that are part of the project will allow for more consistent energy availability from these sources. Bruce Kerr Renee Kerr	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Audubon Washington	1119045	To whom it may concern, I'm submitting our comment letter via email as well as through the portal, as there is no confirmation of receipt available when using the portal. Thank you for your consideration of our comments, Trina Bayard -- Trina Bayard, Ph.D. Director of Bird Conservation 206.704.4303 Pronouns: she/her Audubon Washington 5902 Lake Washington Blvd. S. Seattle, WA 98118 wa.audubon.org	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Issue 4: The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Comment: The DEIS does not provide enough information to analyze likely environmental impacts Analysis: Project Design and Siting: Technical committee The purpose of Mitigation measure Hab-4 – Formation of a TAC was to require the development of a technical community to support EFSEC with reviewing and approving Project components and mitigation as the Project develops. The TAC would not have decision making authority but would be composed of a group of experts that are able to advise the Applicant and EFSEC on additional mitigation measures that may be required as additional information on wildlife presence and project design become available. Analysis: habitat fragmentation WDFW was consulted through the development of the EIS. The proximity of infrastructure to draws and canyons was reviewed and captured in the development of mitigation measures (Hab-1 and Hab-2) requiring the Applicant to avoid modelled movement corridors, draws, and canyons. Adaptive management in the form of mitigation plans are required if avoidance is not feasible. Final infrastructure placement and mitigation plans would require approval by EFSEC prior to implementation. Mitigation measure Hab-2 will be updated in the FEIS to provide additional clarity as to the mitigation measures and follow up management required to reduce impacts to wildlife movement Ferruginous hawk Habitat loss calculations provided in the dEIS were developed based on input from WDFW including information on species core habitat provided by WDFW ferruginous hawk experts. Information on potential impacts to ferruginous hawk was obtained via a literature search and discussions with WDFW scientists with local expertise. While ferruginous hawks may return to old nest sites, several of the sites reported in PHS data have not been active for many years. The calculations provided in the dEIS are of expected habitat loss based on current conditions (e.g. current use) and not reduction in habitat capacity, which considers the impact to the landscape's ability to support future ferruginous hawk populations. While this was the approach used to calculate impacts, mitigation measures for ferruginous hawk (Spec-5) were developed using a conservative approach by requiring that the Applicant buffer nests documented as active and documented in PHS with the intention of preserving future landscape capacity. Mitigation measure Spec-5 requires that EFSEC approves any infrastructure within 2 miles of a ferruginous hawk nest. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Spec-5 requires that the applicant provide additional mitigation measures to reduce risk of collision (e.g. curtailment when nests are active, See Spec-5 1(b)) and habitat loss (e.g. offsetting, see Spec-5 1(c)). Species Exposure Index Flight behaviour does contribute to the risk of bird collision with turbines as some species are more maneuverable and better able to avoid collisions (micro avoidance) or avoid wind power project as they approach the area (macro avoidance). However, as noted in Adams et al (2017) data is not available for all species to adjust the species exposure index to account for avoidance of turbines (micro avoidance). Adams et al (2017) accounted for macro-avoidance (e.g avoiding the area where turbines are) in their calculation, which would result in reduced risk indices by reducing the likelihood of birds entering the wind project area. As this factor was not accounted for in the Horse Heaven calculation it may be more conservative. The adjacent Nine Canyon project was used as a surrogate to predict the rate of bird mortality at Horse Heaven based on its proximity to the Lease Boundary,	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119047	Attached, for your reading pleasure, are my revised comments on the December 2022 Draft HH EIS. I would appreciate detailed written responses to address/answer all of my comments contained within the attached comment review form. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely- Kevin Leary	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
			Fact Sheet	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources. Comment regarding flashing red FAA lighting noted and additional mitigation measure recommendation will be considered to reduce the operation of these ligts. Commetn regarding light pollution noted. The lights while visible at night, will not illuminate any property nor degrade sky glow.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. Project impacts on property values will be assessed in the final EIS. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS. Regarding benefits of the Project, the Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16, 4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The bird study referenced is provided in Attachment 4.6-1. It discusses the risk of mortality of avifauna based on site specific data including bird flight heights and abundance.	Attachment 4.6-1	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Once government-to-government consultation is initiated with the Yakama Nation, EFSEC can better assess the impacts to TCPs, including any cultural resources associated with the Missoula Flood landscape and Rattlesnake Mountain. The FEIS will present the relevant information on impacts to TCPs. The location and nature of impacted TCPs may not be included in the FEIS to protect these resources.	4.9	Address visual impacts to TCPs, if pertinent information is available. Include results of government-to-government consultation, if initiated, on impact analysis.
			Executive Summary	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Clark Stolle	1119048	Hello, My name is Clark Stolle and I am a resident of the City of Kennewick, Benton County, WA. I am writing in opposition to the Horse Heaven Wind Farm proposal. My comments are attached for your consideration. I respectfully ask that you deny this project. Thank you, Clark Stolle	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
andrea.grantham			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119053	I'm sending this email to the Public Hearing and Request for Comments. I pray that the people who have the power to approve or disapprove the installations of the wind fam on the Horse Heaven Hills will decide to not approve installation. I'm sure you have read all the pros and cons for the installation of these wind turbines. First and foremost is the damage they will do to our beautiful hills, birds, animals and air. I'm told that the energy they produce will not be used by the tri-cities. So if that is ture, then don't build them in our backyard. This is one project that shouldn't happen. They are both environmentally and economically a disaster. Wind turbines never pay for themselves. The only reason for their existence is because taxpayer money subsidies them. If they are that good a deal why do they need to be subsidized? This project puts banks, investors and especially taxpayers at risk.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. The economic analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts resulting from the project. Also, the Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16, 4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
Kahryn Campbell- Owner of Anelare Winery	1119058	Hello, My name is Kahryn Campbell. I live and work in Benton City on the McBee hillside, and would like to submit my public comment regarding the Horse Heaven Hills wind turbine project. Please see attached. I would also like confirmation that this has been received and reviewed. Thank you kindly, Kahryn Campbell Proprietor Anelare Wines 19205 N. McBee Rd NW Benton City, WA 99320 (509) 303-5869 Cell: (509) 521.8926 www.anelare.com	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The viewshed analysis maps, which identify how many turbines would be visible within the area of analysis, have been updated to show more context. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	Yes - Will use correct turbine viewshed maps from Visual Technical Report
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project. Specific to Item #4: The comment is correct that McBee Trailhead is not shown on Figure 3.12-1. McBee Trailhead is part of a greater network of trails within the Horse Heaven Hills Trailhead shown on Figure 3.12-6.	4.12	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119060	I am strongly opposed to any such project on the Horse Heaven Hills that overlook the Tri-Cities (Richland, Kennewick, Pasco) and surrounding areas. You've heard all the arguments against such project and I could and have added my own at different times during this process. One thought that keeps occurring to me is the ugliness of the wind turbines on the land. I see that many of you making the decision on the project are from the "West" side of the state, as such this in no way impacts your lives on a daily basis, nor even in some cases in a lifetime. I like to imagine wind turbines in the Seattle and Tacoma area and how adamant the opposition would be if we were to site the area around the Space Needle, or the area in Puget Sound off Elliot Bay. Or perhaps off Point Defiance in Tacoma. Neither of these sites would pass first muster. Given all environmental conditions the same at all sites as the Horse Heaven Hills, no way would Seattlites or Tacomans want to look at the ugly blight on the landscape of wind turbines. We in the Tri-City area feel the same way about not wanting the blight here to take away the panorama of the magnificent Horse Heavens. I've lived here my entire life, born and raised in Prosser, and those hills might be barren and void of any trees; however, that is also the beauty of the landscape. Don't take away the one thing that makes this area standout in it's beauty. Respectfully, Bill Letourneau West Richland Washington	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Rick Dunn, General Manager of Benton Public Utility District (PUD)	1119061	Attached is an OpEd piece by Rick Dunn, Benton PUD General Manager, highlighting the fallacy of continuing on the "wind energy as a viable clean energy alternative" path. It needs to be included in the public record. I also sent this through the website but the file name looked very strange so I don't trust that it actually will be included. Karen Brun 105506 Triple Vista Drive Kennewick, WA 99338	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	
andrea.grantham	1119073	<p>Dear Council Members: please know that I am ADAMANTLY OPPOSED to the proposed above subject wind farm. I never thought I would ever see a proposal to build a project like the HHH windfarm which has so many negative facts against it that it would even be considered by people in government to put such a terrible project in someone's community - especially when our government passed a law that says we have no say in whether or not this project is built. We elect government officials to protect us from this kind of a worthless and damaging farce, and to not strip our rights to have a say in what is appears is trying to be forced on us.</p> <p>The reasons this project should not be built are far too many to properly address and list in this type of communication. However, following are some of the main items why this project should be killed immediately:</p> <p>1.It is financially unfeasible. The cost to build and maintain it far exceeds the economic benefit. A few short term construction jobs that benefit the Governor's union supporters are not enough of an economic benefit to ruin life for the rest of us.</p> <p>2.It will never produce electricity even close to its maximum capacity on a consistent basis because it relies on the weather and wind that doesn't blow on a consistent, predictable basis, especially in the winter and summer when energy in all areas is most needed, when the Tri-Cities power-producing sources more than meet that need.</p> <p>3.When it is producing electricity, it is extremely hard to enter that electricity into the existing power grid while other reliable, cheaper sources are producing and supplying all the electricity needed and usually all the grid can handle.</p> <p>4.Storing in batteries the electricity it produces that can't be put into the grid is not even an option: i). the total carbon produced and released into the atmosphere to mine the materials to manufacture batteries is much larger than the carbon supposedly saved by these windmills, and ii). China, whom hates the US, controls a lot of the major world's supply of the materials needed to produce batteries and they won't help us by selling us these materials because their stated goal is to destroy the USA and iii). It came out in the news 2 days ago that the only lithium mine in the USA is being tied up and controlled by Pres. Biden and General Motors to be used to manufacture batteries for electric cars.</p> <p>5.These windmills would destroy the scenic view we enjoy every day as we look at these ugly, worthless behemoths. The Golden Rule says to do unto others as you would have them do to you, which then begs the question: would you want me or any other Tri-Citian to dictate to you and Gov. Inslee that you have wind mills in your back yard? That would be quite inconsiderate of us to do that to you and spoil the value and comfort of what is probably your most valuable asset – your home?</p> <p>6.They would drastically lower property values because who wants to live in area where one has to look at them and, in some cases if close enough to them, hear the blade noise, including the vibrations (for lack of a better word) they emit.</p> <p>7.They would be in the habitat of the endangered ferruginous hawks; years ago, the lumber industry was severely curtailed and/or eliminated in certain areas when the spotted owl was put on the endangered species list, so why would the owl have more value than the ferruginous hawks? They are also in the migratory path of many other fowl and hamper the viability of other wildlife.</p> <p>8.There is no recycling center for these huge turbine blades when they wear out and fail, or catch on fire and are no longer usable. Where are we supposed to dispose of them? Burial is unacceptable.</p> <p>9.The Tri-Cities does not need what little electricity they produce, therefore, all of it will go to the west side of WA or some other state. Let these recipients of this power put them in or near their back yards and enjoy them! Oh, never mind, the west side of the state has previously REFUSED to have any of these in their area because of the same reasons the Tri-Cities doesn't want them. However, they need the power and we don't so they need to go in their area.</p> <p>10.The Tri-Cities has done way more to provide power to everyone else, so it's time those in need of power make the sacrifice which is being asked of us.</p> <p>11.These wind mills contribute to the growing debt of this country as they have to be subsidized because they are not economically feasible. If they are such an economic asset as Scout Energy claims they are, then let them finance, build and operate them without taxpayer/government subsidies which make them wealthy! There is no private company that would build these on their own dime.</p> <p>12.A poll came out today that said the largest problem facing the citizens of the USA is - government! Proposing a project like this and allowing it to happen will be providing more reason why we citizens believe this way.</p> <p>13.There are a lot more reasons why this project should not be built; you will be hearing them from others so I'll stop here.</p> <p>I challenge you, Council, to listen with an open mind to all the FACTS that will be presented to you as to why this project should be killed; it is a request for you all to be intellectually honest.</p> <p>Please don't let environmentalism to be your religion. We do not want to be forced to worship at your church.</p> <p>If any of you or Gov. Inslee are convinced you can save the world, then build some small modular nuclear reactors. Consider that what you are proposing will do the opposite of saving the world but will, in reality, cause much more harm to the world.</p> <p>Please give us citizens a reason to be proud of our government by doing the right thing: stop this project – PLEASE.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Robert A Johnson Pasco, WA 509-948-1878</p>	General - Question for EFSEC	<p>Under Washington State law, EFSEC is responsible for siting and licensing the construction and operation of major energy facilities in Washington State. EFSEC is conducting its review process as outlined in Chapter 80.50 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Title 463 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the Proposed Facility.</p> <p>Several opportunities were given to the stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the Project and Draft EIS. EFSEC considers all submitted comments and public opinion in its decision making and recommendation.</p> <p>Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to:</p> <p>-On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances.</p> <p>-On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public.</p> <p>-On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS. Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies.</p> <p>-On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period.</p> <p>The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.</p>	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to ferruginous hawk are addressed in section 4.6.2.4. of the EIS.	4.6.2.4	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	3.16, 4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119075	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>My family and I are NOT in favor of this massive, intrusive wind turbine project.</p> <p>The future growth of our growing MSA is confined by the Columbia river which leads to the future commercial and residential growth along the southern boundaries of Kennewick. This project not only interferes it stops the ability from our economy to grow in this region which will severely hurt our supply and demand for our local population growth, economic prosperity and free market principles.</p>	Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. The economic analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts resulting from the project.	3.16, 4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Kathleen Stricker	1119077	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I would like to register for the HHH windmill hearing tomorrow. Please let me know if you need more information.</p> <p>Additionally, I would like to note the following comments:</p> <p>My family is NOT in favor of this wind turbine project. We are specifically concerned about the following issues:</p> <p>Low frequency noise and vibrations</p> <p>Flashing nighttime lights</p> <p>This area does not need wind power as our electricity consumed is 99% carbon free</p> <p>Traffic disruption (road amending and maintenance as well as component transport)</p> <p>Property devaluation</p> <p>Impact to wildlife forage, breeding and nesting areas</p> <p>These are only a small representation of the multitude of negatives that demonstrate that this project is terrible for our area, terrible for our children and terrible for our future as a whole. Don't let multinational companies take advantage of capitalism at the cost of our current and future generations.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kathleen Stricker 509.863.4550</p>	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11 (Vibration and LFN)	Revise FEIS to directly address Vibration and LFN.
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Transportation	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.14	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Kevin D. Leary	1119078	Attached are my comments for your consideration, review, and comment resolution. I do expect you to reply to all of my comments that require a written response. Please note that I may send a revised copy tomorrow, February 1st, if I develop additional comments and/or revisions. However, for now, please consider these my final comments. In addition, I will also upload these comments tomorrow to your respective website. Thank You- Kevin D. Leary	General - Question for EFSEC	Public outreach and engagement for the project included but was not limited to: -On March 30, 2021, an informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing was held to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances. -On May 11, 2021, EFSEC issued the SEPA Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of Environmental Impact Statement for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, requesting comments on the Project EIS scope from agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public. -On December 16, 2022, EFSEC notified the public of issuance of Draft EIS on December 19. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension). The Draft EIS was available for public review on EFSEC website and copies were sent to public libraries. Additionally, EFSEC phone number, email address and mailing address were provided in the notice for requests of physical hard copies. -On January 20, 2023, EFSEC published the notice of the public hearing scheduled on February 1st 2023. Members of public who were not available to attend the meeting, were invited to submit their comments to the comment database at https://comments.efsec.wa.gov/ or send their comment in writing to efsec@efsec.wa.gov or P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172 during the 45 days comment period. -The Public Hearing was held virtually on February 1st 2023. Public comments were accepted during the Public Hearing. In accordance with statements provided in the public hearing notice, members of the public had the option of attending the meeting via Microsoft Teams online or via phone using the phone number provided in the notice.	n/a	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	RCW 80.50.010 requires the council to "recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities." For that reason, WAC 463-60-021, states that applications for site certification need not demonstrate a need for the energy facility.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities.	3.16, 4.16	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Earth Resources	See Section 4.2 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to earth resources from the Project.	4.2	n/a
			Historic and Cultural Resources	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Once government-to-government consultation is initiated with the Yakama Nation, EFSEC can better assess the impacts to TCPs, including any cultural resources associated with the Missoula Flood landscape and Rattlesnake Mountain. The FEIS will present the relevant information on impacts to TCPs. The location and nature of impacted TCPs may not be included in the FEIS to protect these resources.	4.9	Address visual impacts to TCPs, if pertinent information is available. Include results of government-to-government consultation, if initiated, on impact analysis.
			Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar." EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources. Comment regarding flashing red FAA lighting noted and additional mitigation measure recommendation will be considered to reduce the operation of these lights. Comment regarding light pollution noted. The lights while visible at night, will not illuminate any property nor degrade sky glow.	4.10	n/a
			Air Quality	A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analyses (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO2e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO2/kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO2e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#::~text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020). As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.	4.3	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Introduction	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The referenced bird and bat report was provided in Attachment 4.6-1 of the EIS. The report uses Project specific bird risk indices developed from flight height data collected at the Lease Boundary. The report uses Project specific turbine dimentions along with available literature to compare the potential impacts of turbine options.	Attachment 4.6-1	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119081	<p>Greetings – My name is Patrick Grengs. I am writing in regards to EFSEC NOTICE: HHH Wind Farm Notice of Public Hearing and Request for Comment on DEIS / Horse Heaven Wind Project EFSEC - The State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council</p> <p>As a 30-year resident of the Tri-Cities, owner of 40 acres of farmland under cultivation (West Richland) I am writing to make clear my statement against any construction related to the "Clean Green" Wind turbine farm. My reasons are outlined below.</p> <p>First and foremost, wind turbines are not economically viable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Wind power is intermittent – when the wind stops, the power must be provided by hot-standby sources. These include hydropower, nuclear, coal-oil-gas.•Every watt of power produced by base-plate wind must be supplemented by backup sources. At a minimum, this doubles the cost of wind power.•Additionally, the backup power (hydro, nuclear) will need to be on stand-by mode while the wind power is feeding the electric grid.•Wind turbines have a cut-in and cut-out wind speed. That is, the turbine will not generate power until the wind reaches the cut-in speed. The cut-out speed is the wind-speed where the turbine is brake-locked. As such, during very high winds, the wind turbines will not even be rotating; all the while, the blades are wearing out due to stress fractures.•The recent wind turbine debacle in Texas was just one example of where the failure of wind power results in catastrophic failure of the electric grid. <p>Wind power is not "green" – although the wind is renewable the wind turbines must be replaced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The standard windmill with a 2Mw baseplate generation capacity (those commonly seen throughout the U.S. with the 200' tower and 100' blades) requires a foundation consisting of 2,500 tons of concrete. Concrete is made from a mixture of cement, water, sand and gravel. The cement, 600k pounds in total, is created in a process that requires heat curing and the expenditure of fuel that generates 0.93 pounds of CO2 for each pound of cement. The windmill, before it generates 1kw of power, has already generated ~560,000 pounds of CO2.oThe National Ready Mixed Concrete Association says that, during production, each pound of concrete releases 0.93 pounds of CO2.ohttps://www.ecoi.org/climate-change/2019/10/4/global-warming-has-a-co2ncrete-problemoIn addition to the concrete, you have the several tons of rebar reinforcement, plus the metal tower along with the gearbox and other components that must be mined, refined and fabricated.•All the components for a turbine must be transported by vehicles (trucks, trains) that require fuel which generates more CO2.•Wind turbine blades must be replaced every 15 years; they wear out like aircraft wings. Stress fractures break down the effectiveness of the blade which requires replacement prior to catastrophic decay. Germany is already experiencing the result of this as wind farms have been decommissioned due to known material degradation of the blades. Most of the turbines in the Columbia Gorge were installed during the period 2008-2010. These will need to be replaced no later than 2025. Watch for the online films of an ever-increasing number of turbine failures.•Offshore wind turbines need to be replaced more frequently due to the adverse effects of salt water. Every wind turbine currently in operation, along with the future construction of offshore turbines, five years out, will need to be replaced in 15 years.•See here: https://srsccc.org/report.com/major-flaw-in-the-wind-power-industry-terrible-hidden-secret-the-wind-industry-doesnt-want-you-to-see-3/•Wind turbine blades can only be "recycled" at exorbitant costs. Instead, government municipalities have taken in spent turbine blades; for this, they receive tax-credits and other State-incentive subsidies. Instead of burying them in landfills, the are piled up out in the desert or open spaces of sparsely populated areas – out of sight, out of mind.•Hydropower is 100% renewable. In Washington State, hydro is not classified as "renewable" – this is to mandate the construction of wasteful, economically bankrupt wind turbines and solar to meet politically-mandated "Green Targets." <p>Consider the destruction of property values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•These huge wind farms destroy the scenic vistas and natural open spaces. They require orders of magnitude more land per kWh when compared to nuclear.•They reduce property values to homeowners and landowners because of their adverse effects on the environment and natural surroundings.•Knowing what I know about the false economics of wind turbines, I see them as a vast pollution across the landscape. <p>Looking at the fundamental rational for wind turbines – to address so-called "Climate Change."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Whether the sea levels are rising or falling, glaciers are advancing or retreating, mean atmospheric temperature is increasing or decreasing; know this: the climate is always changing. If we lived in a static climate, this would be cause for concern.•"Climate Change" as advertised by the MSM and state scientists, is bunk – to wit, the 97% consensus is a fraud:•The Cook study of climate paper abstracts and its resultant 97% consensus has been roundly discredited.oThe online climate survey by Doran, et. al, with its 97% results, when looked at mathematically, has similarly been revealed to be without merit.o10 minutes of research on the internet illustrates the 97% figure to be an arbitrary fabrication.•The sea levels have been rising at the rate of approximately 2mm per year over the past 150 years. That's one foot over 150 years. This is not an emergency. This is not a crisis. This is normal.•When 25+ years of IPCC reports slowly remove any notion of the existence of the Medieval Warm Period – the premise of which would invalidate the necessity for AGW (Anthropogenic Global Warming) you must know that something aside from Science is taking place.•When 95% of all the greenhouse gasses consist of water vapor, and you cannot put a tax on water vapor ... and life-giving CO2 is labelled a pollutant, then you need to be assured that something is rotten at the very core of the Great Climate Change Fraud.•When children are used as tools to further the notion that Climate Change, as the result of man-made use of fossil fuels, is changing or otherwise damaging the Climate, then know that you are dealing with Climate Charlatans.•Consider the direct effect that wind turbines have on the climate:oWind turbines change the wind velocity to such an extent, that in the larger wind farms (report by US Wind Power 2016), the rows of turbines at the trailing end of the wind vector move more slowly because of the momentum of the wind being significantly dampened by the turbines on the front of the wind wave. In short, the actual amount of power produced is significantly less than the calculations from the models.oWind turbines directly change the climate by parasitizing the surface convective air currents which place a drag on the vertical atmospheric mixing. This effect is mostly evidenced in offshore turbines that dampen the smooth laminar flow of air that oscillates between the land and the sea.oWhen you have over 250,000 wind turbines, around the world, that directly change the climate via parasitization of surface convective air currents which dampen atmospheric mixing and nobody from the Union of Concerned Communists or the Friends of Global Progress, is even bothering to wave a flag, then you can be assured that Climate Change Catastrophism is less a matter of science and more a matter of politics and taxpayer financed corporatism.•"Climate Change" and the push for so-called "green energy" as advanced by The State is easily the largest scam in recent history. <p>Electricity produced by the hydroelectric dams provides the most cost-effective and reliable form of energy. The dams do not shut down at night. They do not shut down when the wind stops. The fluctuations of so-called "green power" (solar and wind) are highly dependent on power from 24/7 sources including hydroelectric dams and nuclear plants. Solar and Wind farms require far more land area per kilowatt hour produced when compared to Hydro and Nuclear. Additionally, solar panels have a tremendous cost in terms of the waste products from both their manufacture and disposal. Every wind turbine now in operation will need to be replaced in 15 (or fewer) years. Instead of desecrating our beautiful landscape in Eastern Washington, we should focus our efforts on preserving the hydropower currently in operation and advance the build-out of nuclear reactors.</p> <p>In summary, I am fully opposed to HHH wind turbine project. I encourage you to work to ensure that the Horse Heaven Hills remain unblemished by the appearance of the proposed windmills.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Patrick D. Grengs II / Sandhill Landowner and Rancher, West Richland, Washington</p>	Air Quality	A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analysess (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO2e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO2/kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO2e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#&--:text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,o%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020). As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.	4.3	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications and others.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Becky Hughes	1119085	<p>I will not be able to speak at your meeting feb 1, but please enter my objections to this project. I do not want these wind Turbines built in my neighborhood. Many individuals neighborhoods, animal, wildlife, bird sanctuaries, back up to the hills which are the raptors hunting grounds. The high powered electric lines they will be installing to service the wind turbines can impact health too not mention the actual construction will have on the environment badger is the only 2 lane rural road for the residents to move thru the area and if they tear up the sand it will be blowing everywhere making outdoor life unbearable.</p> <p>This Project is backed by Australian investors (motivated by our tax payers subsidy) that hired a Colorado based Company (Scout Energy) to erect 244 wind machines 671 feet tall for 24 miles on private wheat farms, protected Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail along a ridge/canyon area. These are placed in the Pacific Flyway migration path, degrading the shrub steppe ecosystem (federally protected birds and plants.) There is no energy/economic impact of this project other than the out of state user or large corporation that will benefit from purchasing a "green energy source" with transferable tax credits to another facility not meeting energy guidelines (no penalty.) Other states denied this project. Our local authorities and public were bypassed input and it was directly placed in Olympia! Negatively impacting our wine and agriculture, higher energy bills for consumers. Currently Europeans are rethinking this minimum producing wind turbine energy and beginning to dismantle them. European data points to health hazards including the environmental impact (Netherlands and Germany dismantling has begun).</p> <p>One of the Hawk pairs that lives in the tree at the intersection of Badger Rd and Badger Canyon Rd. There are many nests in our canyon this is only one. We also have other protected species living in our land. There has been no real impact statements produced locally only the investors who bypassed us.</p> <p>Dust blowing in residential environment both from the wind turbines and the construction. Demand for Water, depleting the aquifers, all residents are on well water with no other source This is Protected Birds breeding/hunting grounds and migrating fly way Wildlife &mp; protected antelope range in the living environment Construction of both kid storage and the power lines will make living and traveling thru the area unbearable. Restricted small 2 lane road Noise and heavy equipment tearing up Terrance, roads There has been no Placement plans of turbines and no noise, dust temperature studies. Our Health and air quality will deteriorate to unbearable levels Harvard study showed an Increased heat 8° our temp last summer were often in the 100° already! This is Poor, unreliable and costly power production that has been proven to cause Heath problems for people forced to live in immediate area. I do not want the wind turbines in anyone's living environment. Look what is happening to the wales on the east coast.!</p> <p>Becky Hughes Concerned citizen of Badger canyon Kennewick, WA 99338</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. Appendix J of the updated ASC indicates that Wallula-Dodd Road Water System would be willing to eneter into a contract with the Horse Heaven Project to supply the required water for construction.	3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Air Quality	<p>A substantial range of life cycle green house gas (GHG) emissions has been reported in the literature. In 2021, the United States Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) published a comprehensive review and comparison of life cycle analyses (LCA) of GHG emissions from electric generation (Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation: Update, accessed on February 23, 2023 at https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/80580.pdf). The evaluation indicates that median reported life cycle GHG emissions from wind and solar photovoltaic electric generation, 13 and 43 g CO2e/kWh, respectively are more than an order of magnitude lower than median reported life cycle GHG emissions from natural gas, oil or coal-based generation (486, 830 and 1001 g CO2/kWh) and comparable to median life cycle emissions from nuclear and hydropower of 13 and 27 g CO2e/kWh, respectively. Natural gas, nonhydroelectric renewable resources (mostly wind), nuclear energy, and coal generate almost all the rest of Washington's in-state electricity. Natural gas is the second-largest source of in-state net generation, and it fueled 12% of the state's total electricity generation in 2020 (Washington State Profile and Energy Estimates, US Energy Information Administration as accessed February 23, 2023 at https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=WA#~:text=Natural%20gas%2C%20nonhydroelectric%20renewable%20resources%20%28mostly%20wind%29%2C%20nuclear,o%20the%20state%27s%20total%20electricity%20generation%20in%202020), As a result, life cycle GHG emissions from the Horse Heaven project are expected to result in generation that is comparable to or less than other forms of bulk generation available from the grid.</p> <p>As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.</p>	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) is the state agency responsible for evaluating and making recommendations to the governor on approval or denial of certain major energy facilities in Washington. The proposed Project falls under EFSEC's jurisdiction because RCW 80.50 allows Scout (the Applicant) to choose to apply for site certification through EFSEC. The Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar". EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change.	12.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities	n/a
			Public Services and Utilities	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. Impacts to air quality are discussed in Section 4.3.2.1 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated. to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Cumulative Effects	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119088	I'm again't windmills as a energy source. I remember growing up in Richland as a child and one day my mother telling me to quit throwing our trash out the car window. There was a new law that forbid it. These windmills are a million times worse at littering our landscapes. I'm distressed and totallly opposed to locating these behemoth eyesores anywhere they can be seen. I know we have climate concerns but this borders on insanity and our mental health is a real concern going forward. Since scout proposed this horrid idea I've not heard one positive comment from friends, family and other Folks in Benton County - not one! -. Sent from my iPad. Thank you Larry and Cherry! Worley	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119091	I am not in favor of the wind turbines being considered for the hills around the Tri Cities, WA. Environmentally they are a disaster. Visually they are intrusive. This is not a long term solution.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119099	Please know that I am personally very opposed to the proposed wind turbine project here on the Horse Heaven Hills. Of all the ways to generate electricity, I believe that this is the least productive and I'm sure very costly. Please do not permit this project in our area. Thomas Brun Kennewick WA	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119100	I would like to submit my objection to the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project. This project would be situated in an area unsuitable for such a large project. The skyline of the entire Tri Cities area would be ruined by this. I am not against "green energy" but this proposal is short sighted. Windmills have a projected lifetime of only 20 years before replacement. The disposal of the components would seem to cause more harm to the environment than any good the windmills might offer. All of the energy produced would be used on the opposite side of the state. If the project went forward it would be more suited for a western Washington location. The better idea for energy production would be small modular nuclear reactors. Thank you, Lydia McMillin Richland, WA	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare General - Recyclability	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.10 4.7.2.4	n/a n/a
J. Polehn	1119105	Dear EFSEC: 1/31/23 Listed below are my comments on the subject project and EIS I ask you do provide me with a written response for each of my comments. Thank you. J. Polehn jpolehn1@yahoo.com =====	Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2.	4.8.2	n/a
		Horse Heaven EIS comments, 1/29/23 * The EIS/project does not address adequately impact to humans and mitigation of the wind/solar project at the start of the project (i.e., obtaining and constructing materials for the project). CO2 emissions to obtain/dig up and produce the wind turbines, batteries, and solar panels for installation, during operation, and to the end of the project (i.e., decontamination ∓ decommissioning). Specifically not addressed: 1) Loss of farm land needed to produce food for humans (i.e., animals as the World Economic Forum calls humans) as literal rehabilitation to the site's current conditions (e.g., no contamination left from rare earths used in the project, no contamination left from batteries used, etc.) will be possible. * https://www.scc.wa.gov/ofp 2) Impact on the loss of visual scenery on the humans and loss of property value and potential hazardous material contamination of the site and nearby properties from weather leaching from the wind turbines and solar panels. No photos of the wind turbines from the views the public and home owners will have are provided. 3) Blowing dust during and after excavation, including decontamination and decommissioning, impacts the respiratory system of the Tri-cities residents (i.e., Richland, Kennewick, Pasco, Benton City, Finley, etc.). The EIS does not provide specifics on how it will prevent adding to the already heavy dust load and does not provide detail on how it will replace the site soils so current soils are returned to original condition. The EIS provides no specific detail on mitigation of the project depleting water supplies to suppress the dust. * 2/23/2020, (video) https://keprtv.com/news/local/7-8-cars-crash-during-severe-dust-storm-in-benton-county https://www.cha.wa.gov/news/2022/3/14/its-dust-storm-season * 2/29/21, (video) https://www.nbcrightrightow.com/news/watch-high-winds-cause-crashes-and-zero-visibility-on-local-roads/article_91d2bf98-90ed-11eb-bba7-b325b844d041.html * 3/28/21, (video) https://www.kxly.com/news/regional-news/7-car-crash-amid-blowing-dust-closes-i-182-in-richland/article_0c776306-7915-5ccf-a859-d04cd490c8fe.html * 12/2/22, https://www.tri-cityherald.com/news/weather-news/article268330322.html *https://www.khq.com/news/wsp-investigating-7-car-pile-up-near-richland-as-dust-continues-to-impact-visibility/article_2773517e-9022-11eb-bb45-334da3c2fbad.html	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2 including views from residences, recreation areas, and travel routes .	4.10	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. Impacts to air quality are discussed in Section 4.3.2.1 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			General - opposition	Potential project impacts on human environment aspects are discussed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to asseCTIONS 4.3 air quality, 4.8 land and shoreline use, 4.10 visual aspects, light and glare, 4.11 noise, 4.12 recreation, 4.13 public health and safety, and 4.16 socioeconomics.	n/a	n/a
Protect Our Winter	1119107	Please find Protect Our Winters comments regarding the Horse Heaven Draft EIS attached. We appreciate the opportunity to submit public comments, and please contact me, Spencer Shaver, with any questions regarding this comment. Sincerely, Spencer Shaver -- Spencer Shaver Campaigns Manager Protect Our Winters 612-219-8769	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119108	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Horse Heaven Hill Wind Farm. I believe there will be far greater negative impacts to wildlife than expressed by the developer. The local communities will be saddled with the terrible visual aspects that will negatively impact property values and tourist trade. As a tax payer, I am opposed to the government subsidies that are the only reason that justify the project feasibility. The cost of electricity generated will cost more than locally produced hydro and nuclear power. If California wants to buy the power let them produce it in California! Do not allow this wind farm to be built in the Horse Heaven Hills. Dale Schielke 2635 Harris Ave Richland, WA 99354	Wildlife and Habitat Visual Aspects, Light and Glare Socioeconomics	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.6 4.10 4.16	n/a n/a 4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119109	Is it true that the power will not be used locally, but rather sent to Southern California via the the Pacific Intertie Trans-mission Line? Regards, Kevin Smith Richland Resident	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment. According to the Executive Summary, "Power generated by the Project would be transmitted to existing Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) transmission lines via two interconnections. Power could interconnect to the planned BPA 230-kilovolt (kV) Bofer Canyon Substation. Power could also interconnect to the planned BPA 500-kV Webber Canyon Substation. Power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant. Such power purchasers could include any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users, with potential off-takers having distribution outside of Washington state."	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119117	<p>My name is Todd Hue. We live at 28506 Spirit lane in Kennewick, WA 99338 located in Badger Canyon. Our house is roughly 2-3 miles from the nearest proposed Turbine. I Do Not approve of this proposed wind farm, especially this close to to Tri cities. Scout energy has done a very poor job with there pictures being provided falsely showing relativity to the denseness of population that will be effected as well as the urban growth areas effected. the draft EIS is something to be desired, hardly relative and overgeneralized to our area. My main concerns are the climate change created by the windfarm effecting our local agriculture and viticulture. wind inversions that exist already have spread herbicides over 300 miles in the 80s and 90's when aerial applications were permitted, i fear that the herbicides will again spread from applications due to wind inversions created by the windfarm. As well as the 120 miles of roads with herbicide laces soils blowing down on residents. The City of Kennewick has stated they cannot supply 250,000 gallons of water for road construction which leads me to believe scout will be permitted to drill a well or multiple wells, my concern with this is the state of our aquifers. in the last year, 10% of my neighbors have had to drill deeper wells due to wells drying up. who'll be responsible for these and other problems created by this wind farm?</p> <p>Im very disappointed in my voice as well as the voices of people in Benton and surrounded counties not being heard or even notified of this windfarm being pushed through. this should be a locally decided issue. residents here know what the environmental impact will be of this windfarm. there couldnt be a worse location. there are 20,000 washington residents within 5 miles of a windfarm statewide. If this windfarm is approved it will put 90,000 people within 5 miles of this windfarm, all in Benton County. That is quite the affected area for side effects of this windfarm. From noise and vibration causing underlying health issues to environmental issues of our eagle and hawk populations, loss of hunting ground, and so on. There is so much hype calling these turbines green, Germany has had more pollution than ever due to the greenhouse gases released from the wind turbine generators. the disposal of blades is abhorrent, the petroleum and coal needed to fabricate the blades and steel is hardly what i would call GREEN. This whole windfarm project running at full capacity (which they never do) is comparable to one turbine generator at one of the dams on the Columbia River.</p> <p>Todd Hue Michelle Hue Mattea Florea Joseph Florea</p>	Land and Shoreline Use	On March 9, 2021, EFSEC issued an announcement for a Public Informational Meeting and Land Use Consistency Hearing on the EFSEC website and mailed the announcement to those on the interested parties distribution list, tribes, and EFSEC's general distribution list. Public Notice was published in Tri-City Herald for the SEPA Scoping on May 12, 2021 and the Scoping Notice was posted to the SEPA Register on May 14, 2021. An informational public meeting and land use consistency hearing were held on March 30, 2021, to inform the public about the Project, receive public comments, and review information regarding the Project's consistency and compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances.	1.4.1	n/a
			Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. New water rights are not part of the Application and are not assessed.	3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119347	Attached is a native hawk that hunts daily in the HHH and rarely can be seen to get a picture of. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119354	<p>I am against this wind farm for the following reasons; 1 There is no infer structure invented yet to move the generated power from this wind farm to another state.</p> <p>2 We don't need more power generated. The present turbines at our local dams can generate all the power we need at 30% capacity</p> <p>3. There won't be any local jobs to build this wind farm. The workers will come from Colorado or Montana.</p> <p>4. The life expectancy of a wind turbine is 10 to 15 years. Once it is dead it will just remain there rusting away.</p> <p>5. The turbines that will be used if this farm is approved won't even be made in America. None are!!</p> <p>John Archibald 2920 S Keller Pl Kennewick, Wa 99337</p>	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. During construction of Phase 1, the Project will directly employ an average of 300 workers on-site with an estimated 62 percent of these positions expected to be filled by local workers.	4.16, and updated ASC	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119358	I am NOT in favor of this massive wind farm. It will be intrusive and destructive to the Tri Cities quality of life! Surely there are other less populated areas to install these huge windmills. Sincerely, Niki Hughey	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119363	<p>While I appreciate efforts to develop alternate energy sources, this project is incredibly short-sighted. Besides just the ruination of the Tri Cities uninterrupted horizons, the following is all you need to consider in rejecting this project.</p> <p>1)The new jobs they keep touting are only for the very few years it takes to assemble the wind turbines. Then only 20 permanent jobs will remain. Definitely not worth all the harm this project will do.</p> <p>2)The turbines only have a lifespan of 35 YEARS!! Then what? The ugly non-functioning monstrocities will then still be standing there, ruining the landscape, contaminating the views, blocking agriculture and grazing. All for just 35 YEARS!! No one will come to take these horrible things down once they stop functioning. It will be way to expensive, and even if they did, what about the thousands of tons of concrete that will remain? It will never be removed!</p> <p>3)If your reasoning for this location is because of the rumors of constant wind, you need to look at the facts. Because of climate change it no longer blows here nearly as much as it used to. If you want constant wind, shouldn't these be put on the coast where the wind blows 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?</p> <p>4)Just for reference: I live in North Richland (Horn Rapids area) and from the top of my street I can see the wind turbines southeast of Kennewick which are 30 miles away!! So if you think they won't be that intrusive, think again!!</p>	Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Nancy Richter	1119365	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>Everything about wind turbines is repugnant to me...the disturbance to land, view, quiet, darkness and wildlife.</p> <p>The construction process is long and disruptive, bringing noise, traffic delays and dust.</p> <p>I own property in the Horse Heaven Hills. The turbines will surely negatively affect property values.</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119374	I am against the installment of the proposed Wind Turbines on Horse Heaven Hills Susan Lee Independent Advanced Skin & Color Consultant www.Marykay.com/susanlee03 509-942-8511	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119412	<p>Jobs: The wind turbines will not provide additional jobs or benefit the economy. Any jobs preparing the sites and constructing the wind turbines will only be temporary. The craft workers are transitory and will move on to the next project once work in this area is done.</p> <p>Esthetics: I chose to live at the base of the Horse Heaven Hills for the wide-open views of farmland, natural sage grasslands and wildlife living within. The wind turbines will change the landscape from its current natural beauty to an industrial wasteland. The red lights at night will create major light pollution which will lower my property value.</p> <p>Wildlife: The Antelope population that has steadily increased since introduction to the Horse Heaven Hills. Their habitat has been a safe environment for the herd to raise young and thrive. I am concerned that the protected antelope population will be negatively impacted by the industrialization of their habitat. The avian and wildlife habitat will never recover.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Travers Bracy 509-521-8224</p>	Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS includes pronghorn antelope as a Special status species. Impacts to pronghorn are discussed in Section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119423	I live too close to the area of the proposed massive, intrusive turbine wind project and I am NOT in favor of it. I am pleading with you to include my No vote against this project. Deborah Santo Pietro 2850 Kyle Road Kennewick WA 99338	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119426	The Horse heaven hills wind farm project should not be allowed to happen. it amounts to a very inefficient unreliable source of electrical power generation with a very large enviro mental foot print. It creates asthetic pollution that can be seen for miles not to mention the noise. It is a disater for wildlife and is directly in the path of migratory birds another energy source would be much better, at the very least it should be moved else where. Sincerely, Vince Shawwer, West Richland	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications and others.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119429	To Whom It May Concern, I could not be more against having this horrific wind farm in our backyard. There are so many negative about this farm and yet no one cares about what the great people of Eastern Washington say about it. from the lack of integrity with the company that wants to build it, to the horrific views and destruction to wildlife, to the loss of future farm land, there is not one thing that resonates with so many in our community. Monte Ingersoll	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119431	To Whom it May Concern: I am definitely NOT in favor of the proposed turbine wind project in Horse Heaven Hills, Kennewick, Wa Thank you, Linda Engelhard	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119434	Our view from our home now towards Horse Heaven Hills. Though the wind mills may not be in direct view, I am concerned for all Tri Cities area when the Natural Skyline is obstructed with MANS machines. This is looking from our home towards Horse Heaven Hills in the Prosser direction. This much be moved.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119442	https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/wind-turbines-not-up-to-the-job-literally/	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119449	I am STRONGLY against the wind farm proposal. You MUST stop this project. I am against this project for numerous reasons, but key among them is the devastating impact to our native ecological systems and the direct violation of the WDFW protections offered to endangered species. In 1983, WDFW listed the Ferruginous Hawk as a threatened species. Over 60% of their population for WA state is within Benton/Franklin county's. Specifically, in the shrub-steppe areas and rocky outcrops of the Horse Heaven Hills. They stated in their 50 year protection plan, that areas critical to the hawks survival should NOT be tampered with. They have declined since that time and in 2021, we're officially declared endangered within Washington state. The area scheduled for development is critical for their survival. As the largest and most rare buteo hawks around, it is horrible to think that an unneeded project would rob our state of such a precious asset. They are very picky nesters and don't stand a chance if we take away some of their last observed nesting sites. The area overlooking the river is also protected under the Migratory Bird Act as part of the Pacific Flyway. This project will be directly in the path of hundreds of thousands of migratory birds that travel from the tip of North America all the way to South America every year. The loss to their populations can never be recovered. Windfarms across the states kill anywhere between 380,000 to 25.5 million birds each year in rough counts. Actual numbers can be 20 times higher in specific locations. Not to mention the bat deaths. We need pollinators, if we loose our native bat populations, we devastate even our crop production. This farm CANNOT be allowed where they intend to build it. The HHH are critical to our local and continental ecosystems. I vote NO to this project. -Stephanie Brubaker	Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS provides an assessment of potential project related impacts to wildlife, including bird and bat mortality, in Section 4.6	4.6	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119452	I OPPOSE the wind and solar farms that are being shoved down our throats. Our lovely hillsides to the south of me are already ruined with the windmills, ruining our once beautiful view. At night, all I see out of my living room window are blinking red lights! No one has proven to me that these windmills even produce enough electricity offset the cost, maintenance and lifetime. Shall we talk about how they are not even recyclable but buried? How green is that! Why do we not have the FINAL say in them being built in our area. We love our hilltops, desert lands and our unique environment! How many animals will die. How many birds and hawks will die. Why should our lifestyle be changed to benefit Western Washington and other States. We have an abundance of hydro-electricity being produced. We have a nuclear plant sending electricity to many states! I could live with intelligent small nuclear units, much better than the butt ugly wind and solar farms that are a waste of our tax dollars!!! Cheryl Stevens Pasco, Washington resident 36 years!!!	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119454	To Whom it may concern: I wish to add our STRONG OPPOSITION to this HHH Turbine wind Project. We feel this is a HORRENDOUS project to put in our back yard. The environmental impact statement does little to address the endangered wildlife that will be effected by this senseless project. Please add our names as to voting NO on this catastrophe. Thank you, Meredith M Steward George W Steward 2376 Delle Celle Drive Richland, WA 99354	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119464	<p>The proposed Scout Wind Farm project would permanently block all future growth to the south of the Tri-Cities and yield no benefit for the Tri-Cities. Billions of dollars would be lost to Real Estate development.</p> <p>There are hundreds of geese and other wild birds that leave the river daily to feed in the Horse Heaven Hills area. They would be slaughtered by the Turbines. A guarantee must be made saying that the birds will not be harmed!</p> <p>Wind Turbines are poor power producers. European wind power cost has increased by a factor of 5, because of the turbine costs and the power needed to fill in the void. We have excellent and low cost Hydro-Power. We DO NOT NEED wind power!</p> <p>Life-time turbine costs would increase our electrical cost from this time forward. A total waste of our money! We should not be forced to pay for a company to burden us; so that they can make money from the subsidized power. We would get higher cost power and taxes to pay the subsidies.</p> <p>Turbines make noise, typically in low frequency for travelling sound. It could ruin our living conditions.</p> <p>The use of wind turbines will never reduce global warming. We will never be able to measure any improvement from their use.</p> <p>Will the change of wind patterns change grape growing conditions?</p> <p>The visual change to the Tri-Cities would be damaging to our entire area, with lowered property values and limited growth potential.</p> <p>I believe that the State Government support for this project is simply, 'It's the In Thing to do politically' regardless of the damage that it will do to the Tri-City Citizens.</p> <p>Solar Panels should be placed on existing building roof-tops; so as not to use virgin land.</p> <p>This whole project is a bad idea and would penalize the Tri-Cities and the State of Washington.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Wallace G. Ruff and Margarete G. Fleming</p> <p>4236 King Drive West Richland, WA 99353-9329 Phone: 509-967-5087</p>	Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	3.8.1.2	
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Project would supply renewable energy which is aligned with the State of Washington goal of making its energy supply carbon neutral by 2030 (Senate Bill 2116, enacted into law in 2019). Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. Lease payments to landowners would also generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. The Project will pay taxes to Benton County. Decommissioning of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS addresses impacts to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including direct loss due to permanent and temporary disturbance and indirect impacts such as habitat fragmentation and degradation. Applicant commitments and identified mitigation are provided in Section 4.5.2.4, which include offsetting for direct disturbance and mitigation measure such as noxious weed control and dust control to mitigate indirect disturbance. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat, including shrub-steppe, were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	4.5, 5.2.2	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119482	The size of the project in capacity is a reasonable amount. If wind turbines are not desired, then replacement with an equivalent amount of solar capacity should be reasonable	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119486	<p>My name is Janine Terrano and I am the CEO of Topia Technology. I am writing to the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) in full support of the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center.</p> <p>I grew up in Spokane, Washington, and have spent a great deal of time in the Tri-Cities over the years. I have two sisters who live in the Tri-Cities and I enjoy visiting the many outstanding wineries in the area. As a person who has made a career in technology, I am excited about the ability to provide our region with 1,150 MW of green power through this new renewable energy facility. It combines wind, solar, and battery storage capabilities. The facility will be able to capture wind that peaks in the winter, solar energy that peaks in the summer, and store power for when it is needed the most.</p> <p>There is no doubt we need the energy. Most estimates indicate that we will need a minimum of 3,500 MW of renewable energy by 2027 to offset our dependence on coal and other fossil fuels. We have simply run out of time to listen to the old and tired arguments of those that do not consider the common good a project like this creates for the Tri-Cities and the entire region. In the technology industry you either innovate and adapt or you perish. We need to adapt and permit these types of energy projects, or we run the risk of falling further behind in responding to our climate change challenges and building a robust local economy for the betterment of all of Washington State prioritizing poor land use, planning, and building McMansions and having outdated views on renewable wind and solar projects will not build a resilient and robust local economy.</p> <p>I encourage EFSEC to look to the future, follow the data and science, and approve the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center project.</p> <p>Janine Terrano</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119490	<p>The massive windmill project being proposed for the Horse Heaven Hills from about Findley to Benton City is very intrusive and objected to by a lot of people.</p> <p>Why put it where it is opposed by so many people? The power is needed mostly in the Puget Sound area. So why not put the windmills there? And if you're bound &amp; determined to put them in the Horse Heaven Hills, why not put them farther south where they wouldn't be visible from the Tri-Cities?</p> <p>Put a nuclear plant here and we'll ship the power to the Puget Sound area. But if you want windmills, then put 'em in your own back yard.</p> <p>Walt Gray Richland, WA</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119498	<p>Please do not do this! I would be able to see the turbines from my home. I'm not sure how much noise I would hear, but the noise from much smaller closer turbines, which dry off cherry trees in the spring, blasts me out of bed in the middle of the night. Your proposed project would essentially destroy the quality of life and the property values in the Tri-Cities. We do not need the intermittent energy the turbines would provide. Put them near someone who does need the energy. I'm fine with hydro and nuclear but not wind!</p> <p>M.L.R. Young</p>	Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Jan Link	1119528	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to share my voice. We, as adults, are responsible for the future of our children. Is that not our most important task in life. To do anything less would be selfish.</p> <p>Everyone needs to do what is needed to make sure we have the electricity and power we need. Horse Heaven can help with this.</p> <p>Jan Link 186 N Waverly Place Kennewick, WA 99336</p> <p>Please read the attached letter...two times....and picture the effect your decision will have 7 generations from now. Please copy and give to the people making the decision.</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119539	<p>I am writing to object to the Horse Heaven Hills wind farm proposal.</p> <p>If Washington was really concerned with renewable energy they would look at adding another Nuclear plant. Wind farms are notoriously unreliable. They produce 1/1000 the energy of a nuclear power plant and can only produce electricity in specific weather. Several studies have shown, for wind, the average power density — meaning the rate of energy generation divided by the encompassing area of the wind plant — was up to 100 times lower than estimates by leading energy experts. When taking into account the additional issues of turbine-atmosphere interaction and a rise in temperature, there is not a positive environmental impact, in fact it is a negative environmental impact.</p> <p>Not only are they a poor use of taxpayer money, but research has shown environmental impacts are minimized only when wind farms are located on the ocean. If Washington is looking to maximize their output, then another location needs to be used (the coast). The reality is that wind power is not a viable alternative, we should be using more nuclear power.</p> <p>I in now way support this proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Shanon Brown</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications and others.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1119545	<p>As a resident of Benton County, I oppose the wind turbine project proposed for the Horse Heaven Hills.</p> <p>Not only will the natural landscape be grotesquely destroyed, but all of the communities will be forced to face the disruptive blinking turbine lights, increased fire risk and deal with the loss of property value these turbines will cause. A business owner in what the State of Washington deems "wine country" to drive tourism...this project will make our property unusable as an outdoor event venue. No one wants to wine tasting or get married with hundreds of gargantuan machines covering their line of site. Why destroy the tourism of what a significant wine destination when there are better locations.</p> <p>Sydnie Roberts Beta Vita Vineyards 509-378-0638</p>	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
andrea.grantham	1119551	<p>Please register me for the subject meeting and send me a TEAM link for this public meeting on Feb 1 for the HHH Wind Farm Project.</p> <p>For the record - I am not in favor of this massive, intrusive turbine wind project as it is currently planned and evaluated by this DEIS.</p> <p>Please send me a TEAM link for this public meeting on Feb 1 for the HHH Wind Farm Project.</p> <p>Mark Morton 3262 Mt Adams View Dr West Richland WA 509 727 2929</p>	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. The Teams link for the February 1, 2023 Horse Heaven EIS Public Comment Meeting was made available on the EFSEC website and project notices.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
andrea.grantham	1119562	<p>I would like to provide testimony as part of the subject public meeting scheduled for February 1, 2023, 5:00 – 8:00 PM.</p> <p>In support of my public comments which will be brief and respectful of the “limited minutes” allowed, I am including the attached documents for EFSEC consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Rick Dunn General Manager (509) 582-1281 Direct E-mail: dunnr@bentonpud.org</p>	Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an “alternative energy resource” that includes “wind” and “solar”. EFSEC’s review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state’s economy, meet the state’s greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project’s output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state’s nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project’s Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
joan.owens	1120826	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>There is no climate change. It’s a political hoax to take away more of our money on wasted projects.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steve McMillan 17713 Dunbar Rd Mount Vernon, WA 98273-4783 trnw8919@yahoo.com</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1120860	<p>Eastern Washington in the perfect place for wind turbines. We have the bare rolling terrain as well as wind. As most of the area is planted in wheat and other grains, the land can now have a dual use, and dual income.</p> <p>Yes, we will see the turbines afar, but mostly if we take a drive through the country’s back roads. Yes, we can see some from Pasco, and other Tri-city towns; but so can we see new homes being built on the hillsides as well. Pasco and Richland have tall water towers; the area is full of cell tower (no complaints there, I don’t want dropped calls).</p> <p>The real reason we need these turbines is that Global Warming is real. We are decades behind in our attempts to turn it around. The people complaining about these turbines are well enough off to turn their A/Cs down to 68 degrees. Our warming climate will soon bring pestilence and drought to the crops. We will be defenceless.</p> <p>The turbines are wanted by farmers that want a steady income; workers that want steady jobs. The fact that we in Eastern Washington are not using this power resource is the same as we are not eating all our wheat, or our apples and wine.</p> <p>I would love to see Scout do the job as proposed.</p> <p>Raymond Williams 3920 Road 105 Pasco, WA 99301</p>	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1120869	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>Please examine more carefully the environmental impacts of the proposed Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project in Benton County.</p> <p>I support the project in principle but am concerned the current configuration may lead to adverse impacts to wildlife, specifically the Ferruginous hawk. It may also have negative impacts on wildlife travel corridors and landscape connectivity. Please explore alternative designs that will reduce and mitigate these types of concerns.</p> <p>I support the more specific and detailed recommendations outlined in Audubon’s policy proposals regarding this project.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms Nancy Sutton 7887 SE Banner Creek Ln Port Orchard, WA 98367-4550 pithy816@gmail.com</p>	Wildlife and Habitat	<p>Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which:</p> <p>1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range.</p> <p>Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council’s statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant’s Proposed Action.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read:</p> <p>Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.</p>	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
andrea.grantham	1120907	<p>Dear Director Sonia Bumpus,</p> <p>The Horse Heaven Hills is a marvelous place. LOnge range views, rolling hills and hollows, native vegetation in the wonderful places too steep to be farmed.</p> <p>There is a windfarm project proposed to go there, but it has no consideration of the impact to the land, the plants and animals, high flying birds and tiny evening primrose.</p> <p>We need to have environmental studies on how best to leave the ecosystem livable for the natural stuff that God put there. Changing things, leaving areas untouched, or mitigating the situation must be considered.</p> <p>Thank you for paying attention to all aspects of this proposed project.</p> <p>Kay Forsythe</p> <p>Sincerely, ms Kay Forsythe PO Box 1299 Ellensburg, WA 98926-1903 forsythe@elltel.net</p>	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1120915	<p>External Email</p> <p>I want to oppose this ongoing process. We at the Local level (and not just the landowner who leases/sells the site) should have the MOST say in this matter. Besides the view being changed from a natural form, animal life, ground vibrations, and mostly the fact that fossil fuels are still a part of this FAUX clean energy project., this is not providing energy to our immediate area. The so called clean energy is for sale to other regions while we get the negative side effects. We are still learning about this energy. There is more to be learned and more need to get the old parts recycled. PUT these in a place that is isolated from community viewing. WE get beautiful sunsets over this area and the skyline is a delight. WE DON’T need this energy here in Benton CITY. PLEASE stop and find another spot. It is not an impossible request.</p> <p>Ron and Paula Nolte 36604 N Flagstone Dr Benton City WA 99320</p>	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1120917	<p>External Email</p> <p>https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-01-23/wind-turbine-collapses-punctuate-green-power-growing-pains</p>	Public Health and Safety	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1120921	External Email https://www.indystar.com/story/news/2023/01/23/scrub-hub-why-do-wind-turbines-spin-others-stand-still/69815694007/ There are many times we have very high winds here. Well over 10 miles per hour.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1120925	External Email https://phys.org/news/2023-01-offshore-farm-noisybut-gadgets-marine.html Now we are not doing this in the ocean by our house but even more reason to consider all the animals underground and the effects as well as our many flying birds.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
joan.owens	1120929	External Email 1. There is no infer structure to get the proposed wind farm energy to California or other states needing additional energy. In fact it hasn't even been invented yet. 2. Why do we need to build this farm when our local dams can only find uses for 30% of the power they are currently generating? 3. The wind farm turbines have an operating lifespan of 10 to 15 years. You can tell the dead turbines on existing wind farms, they are the ones not turning when others are. Will the dead turbines just stay there forever? 4. The turbines that will be used if this farm is approved won't even be made in America. None are!! 5. Don't be fooled into thinking that all kinds of jobs will be generated to build these monstrosities. The construction crews will be coming probably from Montana or Colorado . John Archibald Kennewick Wa 99337	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121014	External Email To whom it may concern : No more windmills in the south east Washington.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
joan.owens	1121041	External Email Dear Director Sonia Bumpus, I am writing to ask that the Final EIS for Horse Heaven Hills Wind Project in Benton County take a stronger and more specific look at how the project can be designed to avoid impacts to the environment. The final EIS must include the following information and analysis to uphold our state's commitment to, and appreciation for, our wildlife and the connected landscapes they need. The final EIS must: - Identify specific design features, mitigation measures and associated performance standards that will avoid adverse impacts related to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity within the Project Lease Boundary and at the regional level. - Commit to how the proposed Project will avoid significant impacts to the Ferruginous Hawk population at the regional level by avoiding turbines within two miles of all documented nests and mitigating for direct and indirect loss of core and range habitat for all nests within six miles of the project. - Include an alternative for analysis that features an explicit design for and commitment to turbine siting and other project components that minimizes impacts to the state-listed species and wildlife connectivity. - Use the best available science to evaluate the magnitude and scale of impacts to birds due to turbine operation. The build-out of renewable energy in Washington can be achieved in a way that honors the legal and sovereign rights of Treaty Tribes and balances the needs of both people and wildlife. We look to this Council and its staff to provide the leadership needed to achieve this vision. Sincerely, Ms. Sandra Aseltine 2790 Tracyton Beach Rd NW Bremerton, WA 98310-2032 seaduckie@aol.com	Wildlife and Habitat	Section 4.6 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addresses potential impacts on wildlife and habitat resources, previously identified in Section 3.6, that could result from the Horse Heaven Wind Farm (Project, or Proposed Action) or under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation measure HAB-1 addresses impacts to movement corridors and requires the Applicant to place project components outside of wildlife movement corridors or else provide rationale to EFSEC. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measure based on specific impacts. Should the Applicant intend to site project components in a corridor, the Applicant must subsequently create a Corridor Mitigation Plan that demonstrates the implementation of effective mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. EFSEC will review and approve all Mitigated Plans prior to implementation, including a Corridor Mitigation Plan if one is warranted. Mitigation Measure HAB-1 will be updated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in response to comments received to require applicant to create a Corridor Mitigation Plan, should one be required based on final project design, which: 1.Describes impacts to the corridor 2.Reduces identified impacts to the corridor 3.[NEW] Includes performance standards measured prior to and during project operation to document impacts have been mitigated such that there is continued wildlife use of corridor. Mitigation measure SPEC-5 addresses impacts specific to the Ferruginous Hawk and requires the Applicant to site infrastructure outside of a 2-mile nesting buffer. This requirement provides EFSEC with the ability to consider rationale from the applicant for placement of a feature and require additional measures based on specific impacts. It also provides EFSEC with the ability to restrict development within this 2-mile buffer. Siting within the buffer would require habitat compensation. The 2-mile nesting buffer is based on data received from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and other experts regarding core Ferruginous Hawk range. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, the FEIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 builds on the applicant commitments to 2 years of post-construction monitoring of impacts to birds and bats. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated in the FEIS to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process. WILD-1 will be updated to read: Wild-1:Prior to initiation of Operation the Applicant would develop, in coordination with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, an adaptive management strategy to be implemented if bird or bat fatalities exceed mortality thresholds. The adaptive management strategy will include a description of mortality thresholds and additional mitigation measures to be applied if thresholds are exceeded. Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures outlined in the adaptive management strategy are necessary. Examples of adaptive management mitigation strategies that may be considered include altering the operation of the turbines (e.g. increasing the cut-in speed to above 5.5 m per second [Alberta Government 2013]), curtailing turbines at nights when bats are migrating). Mitigation strategies may be limited to groups of turbines based on the results of post-construction monitoring. The mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential project related wildlife mortalities.	4.6	Mitigation Measures HAB-1 will be updated to require any Corridor Mitigation Plan to include performance standards and measurements. Mitigation Measure WILD-1 will be updated to provide clarity on the monitoring and reporting process.
joan.owens	1121080	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 27, 2023 Small Finley windmills seen from Eltopia. Christina Caprio NEPA Environmental Scientist Click to Download IMG_1166.MOV 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	n/a	Attachment did not find	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121083	External Email Download Attachment Available until Feb 27, 2023 Tri City Skyline of existing Walla Walla and Finley windmills flashing at night on ridges. Enough is enough and allow some beauty and peace. Christina Caprio Click to Download IMG_1168.MOV 0 bytes Sent from my iPhone	n/a	Attachment did not find	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121087	External Email Finley windmills flashing. Christina Caprio Sent from my iPhone	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment unclear. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
joan.owens	1121149	Caprio Video 001 https://youtu.be/gSmCcOTQv3I	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121156	Caprio Video 002 https://youtu.be/ySSS_1DIckA	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121157	Caprio Video 003 https://youtu.be/7RBelGgZ4a8	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121161	Caprio 004 https://youtu.be/PNbGWzw1m4M	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121168	Caprio Video 005 https://youtu.be/hcO7xGTbNXw	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
joan.owens	1121181	Caprio Video 006 https://youtu.be/gCaU_1dXFbQ	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121187	Caprio Video 007 https://youtu.be/x67e_XoWY2s	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121190	Caprio Video 008 https://youtu.be/VHshy6yOKWo	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121195	Caprio Video 009 https://youtu.be/P1sgQaODcO8	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121199	Caprio Video 010 https://youtu.be/VQ9HMALfMvI	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121204	Caprio Video 011 https://youtu.be/-QhU3Q9f8U	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121224	Caprio Video 012 https://youtu.be/9XOOILlQczA	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121225	Caprio Video 013 https://youtu.be/AJ6Al9g_1pE	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121227	Caprio 014 https://youtu.be/vLDyzGMNjZI	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121229	Caprio Video 015 https://youtu.be/KKA3m4lr9wm0	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121232	Caprio Video 016 https://youtu.be/VKLxliPsoW	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121236	Caprio Video 017 https://youtu.be/bBTQ1JacAhQ	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121242	Caprio Video 018 https://youtu.be/vna25sxF7Ek	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121243	Caprio Video 019 https://youtu.be/axjkPc5B03Q	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121253	Caprio Video 020 https://youtu.be/feBTUJgoCSU	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121256	Caprio Video 021 https://youtu.be/prym2wsM0Y0	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121261	Caprio Video 022 https://youtu.be/4YFbvvAMN-M	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121262	Caprio Video 023 https://youtu.be/Jv7s6lC-xoQ	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121263	Caprio Video 024 https://youtu.be/_DZ1jZj2Se4	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121268	Caprio Video 025 https://youtu.be/p3dglEUWwA	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121270	Caprio Video 026 https://youtu.be/UBO9ESDAWak	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121273	Caprio Video 027 https://youtu.be/ElaMQ-b5xuA	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121277	Caprio Video 028 https://youtu.be/QX6g-xHoUJo	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121292	Caprio Video 029 https://youtu.be/pb3bwpiqL_A	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121294	Caprio Video 030 https://youtu.be/SyXNvX6HoWE	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121299	Caprio Video 031 https://youtu.be/slVvn_9zAqI	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
joan.owens	1121304	Caprio Video 032 https://youtu.be/0xyKGhZQ6gg	General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Karen Batishko	1090063	Attachment only	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS address indirect impacts from dust to vegetation in Section 4.5 for construction, operations, and decommissioning. Applicant commitments include a dust control measures during construction. Identified mitigation includes an Operation and Decommissioning Dust Control Plan. These mitigation measures result in the determination of no significant impacts to vegetation from dust.	Section 4.5	n/a
Carolyn A. Jones	1091762	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including songbirds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
City of Kennewick, W.D. McKay	1092339	Attachment only	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Anonymous	1092359	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. As a final project layout was not available, the dEIS applied conservative assumptions to predict potential impacts. For example, the area of indirect (sensory disturbance) habitat loss was calculated as 0.5 miles from the micrositng corridor to account for various turbine options.	4.6	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS considers each component of the Project (e.g., micrositng corridor, east solar field) separately in the impact analysis for vegetation. The potential impacts from each component on vegetation are described in Section 4.5. Impacts to shrub-steppe and other priority habitat are assessed based on the present Project plant and layout. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional mitigation measures. The Applicant is bound to the maximum disturbance provided in the Application to habitats. Any additional disturbance would be a deviations from the Application. A final As-Built Report is required, which would include final areas of disturbance to be used to calculate final offset requirements. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	4.5, 5.2.2	n/a
Curt Smith	1092958	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Franklin County Democratic Central Committee	1094043	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Spadaro	1096700	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sam Dechter	1098897	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
Benton County Democratic Central Committee	1099182	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Pam Minelli	1100589	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	The Avian Use Survey (AUS) conducted by the Applicant documented small and large birds within a standard survey plot. The data was used to calculate an exposure index for species, which is a species-specific relative risk measure of turbine collision. The calculation is based on species abundance, time spent flying, and the proportion of flight height spent in the rotor swept height. An exposure index could not be calculated for species that fly low to the ground and may not enter the rotor swept height or species not observed during surveys. While an exposure index may not be available for each special status species, the dEIS assesses the potential impact, including mortality, on twenty one special status species with potential to occur in the Lease Boundary.	4.6	n/a
Citizen, Kathy T Dechter	1100708	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Protect our winters (POW)	1103757	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1119107	Please refer to submission 1119107	Please refer to submission 1119107
Washington Green Hydrogen Alliance	1104072	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Pam Minelli	1104574	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	The purpose of the TAC would be to provide scientific expert advice to the Applicant and EFSEC regarding final project layout and mitigation. The Applicant may suggest TAC members; however, the final composition would be at EFSECs discretion. Further, the TAC would not have the authority to approve Project components or plans. EFSEC would remain responsible for approval of plans and mitigation measures. The TAC mitigation measure will be updated to provide additional clarity regarding the role of the TAC	4.6	Update the TAC mitigation to provide additional clarity as to TAC role
Audubon Washington, a state field office of the National Audubon Society	1104648	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1119045	Please refer to submission 1119045	Please refer to submission 1119045
Conservation Northwest	1104835	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	The dEIS considers each component of the Project (e.g., micrositing corridor, east solar field) separately in the impact analysis for vegetation. The potential impacts from each component on vegetation are described in Section 4.5. Impacts to shrub-steppe and other priority habitat are assessed based on the present Project plan and layout. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures include a As-Built Report and Offset Calculation (Veg-4) and Detailed Site Restoration Plan (Veg-7). The As-Built Report and Offset Calculation would include a final calculation of all areas of disturbance which will be used to calculate final offset requirements. The Applicant has voluntarily included rabbitbrush shrubland at the temporary and permanent offset ratios of shrub-steppe. It also includes provisions to require offsets at permanent disturbance ratios if temporary disturbance areas are not successfully revegetated within the timeframe determined by EFSEC. The Detailed Site Restoration Plan would outline the revegetation plan for decommissioning. In addition, this would include provisions for adaptive management based on the revegetation following construction and a requirement for monitoring. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5, 5.2.2	No
			Vegetation	The EIS considers each component of the Project (e.g., micrositing corridor, east solar field) separately in the impact analysis for vegetation. The potential impacts from each component on vegetation are described in Section 4.5. Impacts to shrub-steppe and other priority habitat are assessed based on the present Project plan and layout. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures include a As-Built Report and Offset Calculation (Veg-4) and Detailed Site Restoration Plan (Veg-7). The As-Built Report and Offset Calculation would include a final calculation of all areas of disturbance which will be used to calculate final offset requirements. The Applicant has voluntarily included rabbitbrush shrubland at the temporary and permanent offset ratios of shrub-steppe. It also includes provisions to require offsets at permanent disturbance ratios if temporary disturbance areas are not successfully revegetated within the timeframe determined by EFSEC. The Detailed Site Restoration Plan would outline the revegetation plan for decommissioning. In addition, this would include provisions for adaptive management based on the revegetation following construction and a requirement for monitoring. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	4.5, 4.5.2.4, 5.2.2	n/a
WDFW - Michael Ritter Lead Planner: Solar and Wind Energy Development	1104882	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1117635	Please refer to submission 1117635	Please refer to submission 1117635
Anonymous	1105237	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
		Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Section 4.6 of the EIS provides an analysis on the potential impacts to wildlife from habitat fragmentation and wildlife mortality. Mitigation measures recommended in the EIS require the Applicant to collect additional information, apply buffers from sensitive features, and development mitigation plans. EFSEC would be responsible for reviewing and approving Project layout and additional mitigation.	4.6	n/a
		Attachment only	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
		Attachment only	Cumulative Effects	An analysis of cumulative impacts is presented in Section 5.0. Section 5.2.1 provides the methodology used to analyze cumulative impact.	Section 5.0, Section 5.2	n/a
franklin county board of commissioners	1105787	Attachment only	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities. The Project is not anticipated to result in increase in utility retail electricity rates.	3.16, 4.16	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The proposed Project meets the definition of an "alternative energy resource" that includes "wind" and "solar". EFSEC's review of the proposed Project is guided by RCW 80.50.010 which states that it is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change. The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.2.3 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Role and Responsibilities 1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
kennewick public facilities district	1106254	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
		Attachment only	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
		Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Kevin Leary-Soil Scientist/Hydrogeologist/Hydrologist	1106339	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to Submission 1119047	Please refer to Submission 1119047	Please refer to Submission 1119047
Kenneth Spencer Jr	1106663	Attachment only	Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions. As noted in Section 2.1.2.3, the Applicant would comply with Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 463-72, Site Restoration and Preservation requirements. The Applicant submitted a preliminary Decommissioning Plan with the ASC for EFSEC's review and would submit an initial Site Restoration Plan to EFSEC at least 90 days before the beginning of construction.	3.8.1.2, 2.1.2.3	n/a
		Attachment only	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
		Attachment only	General - opposition	Thank you for your comments; your concerns have been noted. Please note the Proposed Project has not yet been approved.	n/a	n/a
		Attachment only	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Richland City Council, Terry Christensen, Mayor	1106712	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations (determination of high impacts on most views within 5 miles of the proposed turbines) as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
		Attachment only	Air Quality	The air quality analysis consisted of two components: 1. a comparison of expected project emissions with regional emissions based on the most recent emissions inventory available 2. a computerized dispersion modeling assessment of the stationary sources (concrete batch plant and diesel generators) proposed to support construction. For the first component above, Richmond meteorological data were not used to complete this comparison. As such, the percentage comparisons noted apply irrespective of the location of meteorological data. For the second component, 5 years of surface meteorological data collected at the Tri-Cities Airport in Pasco, WA were combined with upper air data collected at Spokane, WA to complete the dispersion modeling assessment. These locations are the locations closest to the Horse Heaven project with existing, approved, model run-ready meteorological data with which to complete the dispersion modeling assessment.	4.3	n/a
		Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Comment acknowledged. EFSEC has the authority to go above and beyond the guidelines that are created by other State agencies and can and should propose additional solid mitigation measures for each project, based on current scientific information and up to date knowledge of the existing conditions and potential project impacts.	n/a	n/a
Renewable Northwest	1107153	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Citizen, Jarold Strickler	1107385	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Crizen, Justin Raffa	1107460	Attachment only	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Anonymous	1107600	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Thank you for your comments; your concerns have been noted. The term "would" is used in place of "will" in the EIS since the EIS approaches the narrative with a "Proposed" Project. If approved, the Applicant would be required to comply with all mitigation measures and conditions set by the approving agencies. Plans such as wildlife and habitat restoration plan and revegetation and noxious weed control plan are available to public for review on EFSEC website.	n/a	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Sam Dechter	1107607	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous	1107854	Attachment only	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. This analysis did not identify negative economic impacts because of the project. Project impacts on agricultural lands and wine industry are discussed in sections 3.8 and 4.8.	3.16, 4.16 and Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	The visual analysis relies upon methodologies from the BLM and Clean Energy States Alliance including the concepts of viewer sensitivity and viewing distance as part of the determination of project impacts. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations (determination of high impacts on most views within 5 miles of the proposed turbines) as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	"For example, viewers at a scenic overlook would have a higher concern regarding changes in view because in this case the landscape would be viewed for a long duration and the view is integral to its use, compared to motorists on a non-scenic designated highway, in which landscape is viewed for a shorter duration and is not the focus of the viewer's activity"
			General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
Clean & Prosperous Institute	1117852	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
TC Cares and Save Our Ridge	1118996	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to Submission 1107593	Please refer to Submission 1107593	Please refer to Submission 1107593
Rick Dunn, General Manager of Benton Public Utility District (PUD)	1119051	Attachment only	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Anonymous	1119341	Attachment only	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
		Attachment only	Water Resources	The elements of (i) surface water movement/quantity/quality; (ii) runoff/absorption; (iv) groundwater movement/quantity/quality from WAC 197-11-444 are addressed under Section 3.4 and 4.4 Water Resources. The Clean Water Act is the responsible authority of the US Army Corps of Engineers. The Applicant has included provisions for a Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) submittal, which provides a consolidated permit application process for federal, state, and local permits for construction and development activities near aquatic environments. In addition, the Applicant has included the application for a Construction Stormwater General Permit through the Washington Department of Ecology. Laws and Regulations relevant to water resources is provided in Table 4.4-3.	Table 4.4-3	n/a
Anonymous	1119344	Attachment only	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS.	4.8.2	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
Linda Leman, City of Benton	1119370	Attachment only	Socioeconomics	Comment letter acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Benton City	1119372	Attachment only	Socioeconomics	Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. During operation, lease payments to landowners would generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. Also, the Applicants will pay taxes to Benton County. In summary, the Proposed Action would generate local jobs and tax revenue. As a result of these benefits, the Project is not anticipated to have adverse impacts on the study area's economic conditions.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
		Attachment only	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
		Attachment only	Public Health and Safety	Recommend adding mitigation measure to shut down turbines in the event of fire to allow fire suppression aircraft access.	4.13.2.4	Add mitigation measure to shut down turbines in the event of fire to allow fire suppression aircraft access.
		Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Additional viewpoints and visual simulations have been included in the Final EIS including an additional KOP in Benton City and from I-82 located less than 1 mile from the closest wind turbine. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals have been proposed by the Applicant with additional turbine removals to be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources.	4.10	New simulations included in updated analysis in the Draft EIS including one from Benton City and one from I-82. Applicant proposal to reduce turbines and other project infrastructure has been analyzed in the FEIS.
		Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Additional clarity will be added in the FEIS to describe potential bird and bat mortality rates. Mitigation measures in Section 4.6 of the EIS require the applicant to site turbines outside of sensitive areas such as core ferruginous hawk habitat and migratory corridors. Where infrastructure is required within these areas, the Applicant would be required to develop additional mitigation, such as curtailing turbines and offsetting, to address impacts. Mitigation measure Wild-1 will be updated in the dEIS to provide clarity regarding how additional mitigation measures will be considered and applied to respond to bird and bat mortality. This could include changing cut in speed during bat migratory periods. Painting blades was considered as a mitigation measure during development of the dEIS; however, FAA regulation require that blades are painted white.	4.6	Update description of bird and bat mortality rates.
		Attachment only	General - Question for EFSEC	Under WAC 197-11-455, any person or agency shall have thirty days from the date of issue in which to review and comment upon the Draft EIS. Upon request, the lead agency may grant an extension of up to fifteen days to the comment period. In accordance with EFSEC Notice of issuance of Draft EIS, issued on December 16, 2022, the Draft EIS published publicly on December 19 on EFSEC website and public were invited to submit their comments related to the Draft EIS, Project, and/or affected resources by February 1, 2023, which represents the end of the 45-day commenting period (30 days public comment period plus fifteen days of extension).	n/a	n/a
		Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to Submission: 1119562	Please refer to Submission 1119562	Please refer to Submission 1119562
Anonymous	1120942	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Jacob Devries	1121158	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jeff Leblanc	1121159	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Brice Cullobun	1121160	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Matt Chapman	1121162	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Vincent Marchi	1121164	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
James Rickman	1121165	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anthony Simpson	1121167	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Howard Rickf	1121170	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mike Keith	1121174	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Arturo Birreceta	1121176	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Justin Salling	1121178	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jim Sommerlund	1121180	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1121184	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ederak	1121188	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lorraine K	1121189	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Loura Keykendall	1121191	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Damil Keykendall	1121194	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Andrew Delatgup	1121196	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gunnar Vabiper	1121197	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Rylan Grimes	1121241	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nolan Galleyos	1121245	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Louis Morfin	1121246	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Moelcoelyn Jennigs	1121251	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nilu Myles	1121274	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Brian Cisherios	1121279	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mike Mitchell	1121284	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nancy Mitchell	1121286	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Melinda Sommerlund	1121288	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Hector Ortiz	1121290	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1121293	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1121295	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lanee Fox	1121296	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ken Marin	1121298	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marry Elliaiy	1121300	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Huels	1121301	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nathan Hicks	1121303	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mario Uvalle	1121305	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Arthur B	1121306	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Felipe Auziak	1121309	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Charles Eliuger	1121311	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Richard Stelter	1121312	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joe Dunn	1121330	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Pete Waller	1122059	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kimberlity Bell	1122062	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jimmy Tyler	1122063	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Noel Macias	1122065	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michelle Fox	1122067	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Stephen Shikeskovosky	1122071	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Moses Torrescoano	1122073	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1122076	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Robert Bryson	1122078	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Patrick Mehhan	1122080	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Bud hantley	1122082	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ryan Sims	1122083	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Richard Glazier	1122085	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cisco Elsuezabel	1122087	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jermine Allen	1122088	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jonah Richardson	1122094	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Anonymous	1122096	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Russ Dugger	1122097	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ossiel Martinez	1122098	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1122100	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
James Thrift	1122101	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Thomas Blakeny	1122102	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1122105	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1109630	Please refer to submission 1109630	Please refer to submission 1109630
Jobette Eby	1122107	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Barbara Tweißen	1122110	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ira Johnson	1122112	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications and others.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
David Klees	1122114	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Warren hughes	1122117	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tony Orzoo	1122119	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Hurd	1122120	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joel Obedorfe	1122122	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tyler Gales	1122133	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1122136	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Rom Nuttluren	1122138	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kurtis Hickey	1122139	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sh Shipps	1122148	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Enola Thomas	1122149	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ventura Rodriguez	1122150	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Frank Verduzio	1122151	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
K. Kelly Kaloi	1122155	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Matthew Passaez	1122156	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anthony Swift	1122160	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Garry Rader	1122163	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tim L. David	1122164	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dave King	1122165	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Greg Gales	1122168	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michael Gohee	1122173	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Danny Baer	1122175	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Taylor Smith	1122180	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jesus Mesia	1122182	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
James H. Ford	1122185	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ann Marie Ferriole	1122188	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Audubon Washingtgn	1122191	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1111492	Please refer to submission 1111492	Please refer to submission 1111492
Arron Palomarez	1122193	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Doug Knisley	1122195	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Fred Reed	1122196	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ryan Faeppel	1122198	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Patrick Hunt	1122200	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Hemperly	1122201	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kit Ayers	1122202	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nathan Hunt	1122203	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Garich Earley	1122204	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David E Oerton - EE Overton	1122205	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jan Link	1122231	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mary R smith	1122232	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gary Wooden	1122234	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
	1122235	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Allen B. Simmelink	1122237	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Lower Columbia basin Audubon Society	1122238	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. An Acronym Table is included after the Table of Contents. The section is labeled "ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS".	n/a	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	The action is for "a private project on a specific site." The agency is only required to consider a no-action alternative and onsite alternatives. Analyzing the Project as a whole allows the interpretation of the most probable worst-case scenario, while providing the impacts at the component level. This methodology allows the council to identify components that have higher impact than others. The council has the authority to approve or deny any single component of the Project, including individual turbines or solar arrays that would lead to a higher impact than others. The Council's statutory authority is contained in Chapter 80.50 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). Using this methodology, this Final EIS is inclusive of any number of design and construction alternatives to the Applicant's Proposed Action.	2.0	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	ES-24 The Migratory Bird Treaty establishes protection for migratory bird species by prohibiting the taking, including incidental take, of migratory bird species, including a bird, nest, and egg. This includes incidental take, which is the mortality of a bird or egg that occurs incidentally during an allowed action, such as land clearing. Risk of incidental take associated with construction increases when those activities occur during the nesting season. Mitigation measures Wild-8 and Wild-9 are proposed to reduce the risk of incidental take. Wild-8 would require the Applicant to establish setback buffers around raptor nests and develop a Raptor Nest Monitoring and Mitigation Plan to address variance from this requirement. Wild-9 requires the Applicant to develop additional mitigation measures if vegetation clearing or grubbing cannot avoid the nesting period to reduce the risk of incidental take. These measures could include pre-clearing surveys. This mitigation measure is expected to reduce the risk of incidental take during clearing or grubbing within the nesting period. ES-50 Based on the current project layout, Project infrastructure could interact with modeled movement corridors rated as medium to high. These models were developed based on an aggregate of information from several focal species (e.g. habitat concentration areas, landscape integrity, and existing barriers to movement); however, have not been verified through field based studies. Table ES-3a rates the impacts of Project construction while ES-3b rates the impact of Project operation. The impacts to modelled movement corridors are expected to be of low magnitude based on the definitions provided in Table 4.6-2 (low is defined as an "incremental change may be measurable and could result in minor influences on short term viability of wildlife populations..."). Further the impact is considered confined as the direct change to these corridors will occur within the Lease Boundary. Table ES-3b rates the impacts of Project operation on modelled corridors as Medium as the operation of the Project could result in a change that results in changes to the population of shorter and longer periods of times but remains below levels of impact that could exceed the resiliency and adaptability limits of the population. ES-55 Characterization of impacts, including magnitude, has been conducted per project phase using definitions provided in Table 4.6-2. The magnitude of impacts to sagebrush sparrow and sage thrasher during construction was characterized as low as the activities during this phase of construction are not predicted to result in a clearly defined population change, however, the magnitude of the impacts associated with Project operation on these species is rated as Medium as they could result in "change that could result in changes to the population over shorter and longer periods of time"; although these changes are not expected to exceed the resiliency of the population given available data on species declines (See Section 3.6). ES-67 Operational impacts to modelled movement corridors are rated as medium based on definitions provided in Table 4.6-2. The magnitude was rated as medium as it is predicted that Project operation could result in a distinguishable change in populations but not exceed the adaptability or resiliency as the Project is not expected to exclude wildlife use of this area. Recommended mitigation measures were developed to address impacts to corridors, namely Hab-1, which requires the Applicant to locate infrastructure outside of modelled corridors and develop a mitigation plan including additional measures to reduce impacts. The plan would be reviewed and approved by EFSEC.	4.6	n/a
			Vegetation	The Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan (DOE 2017) was prepared for the Hanford Site Boundary and is applicable to lands within this area. The Hanford Site Boundary is located north of the Project Lease Boundary and includes the Hanford Reach National Monument and central Hanford that are managed by Department of Energy (DOE). The purpose of the Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan is to provide a consistent approach to managing the site's natural resources and DOE is responsible for applying the Management Plan within portions of the Hanford Site managed by DOE. As the Project Lease Boundary is not within the jurisdiction of DOE, nor within the Hanford Site, this management plan does not apply. The offset ratios within the EIS are based on offset ratios provided in the Wind Power Guidelines (WDFW 2009) and based on consultation among WDFW, the Applicant, and EFSEC, where offset ratios for the various habitat types within the Project area were agreed upon. This included an greater offset ratio applied to rabbitbrush shrubland where permanent and temporary disturbance occurs, recognizing that this habitat type is an early seral shrub-steppe ecosystem. This is consistent with the application of habitat offset ratios applied to similar combined wind and solar projects in the area.	Section 4.4.3	n/a
Scott B	1122250	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Tom & Marilyn Rees	1122252	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David Carstens	1122254	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
Janet O'Neil	1122256	Attachment only	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Jan Nilsson	1122258	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged. For analysis of potential project impacts on visual aspects, tourism and recreation and proposed mitigation measures refer to respective chapters (e.g., Sections 4.10, 4.12). For information on positive benefits of the project refer to project background and socioeconomics section (section 4.16).	n/a	n/a
Lary Wilkenson	1122264	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gary L. Moore	1122265	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Karen Batishko, Past Precinct Committee officer	1122267	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
	1122269	Attachment only	Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2.	4.8.2	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	The wind turbines will generate ground vibrations at such low levels (less than 10 ⁻⁶ meters/second at 1 kilometer [0.6 miles]) that their impacts will be negligible. (Llaverro Hurtado et al., 2017)	4.11 (Ground Vibration, LFN)	Revise FEIS to include LFN and ground vibration attenuation and the following source: (Llaverro Hurtado et al., 2017) Field monitoring and analysis of an onshore wind turbine shallow foundation system Jesus González-Hurtado, Pengpeng He, Tim Newson & Hanping Hong Geotechnical Research Centre, Department of Civil Engineering, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada. Melanie Postman & Sheri Molnar Department of Earth Sciences, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy. The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed. Ice throw is caused when ice accumulates on turbine blades during cold wet temperatures followed by an increase in temperature that causes the ice on the rotor blades to thaw. If the blades are stationary at the time of the thaw, the ice will fall below the turbine. If the ice begins to thaw when the blades are rotating, ice from the blade may be thrown from the turbine. Ice throw only has the potential to occur under specific weather conditions. Using specifications from the turbine manufacturer, a safe distance from a turbine with respect to ice throw can be calculated using the following formula: 1.5 X (hub height + rotor height) (Tammelin et al. 1997). Using the largest turbine model of the two provided for Turbine Option 1 by the Applicant in the ASC (GE 3.03 MW Turbine), this safe distance would equate to 1,087.5 feet. Using the largest turbine model of the two provided for Turbine Option 2 by the Applicant in the ASC (SG 6.0 MW Turbine), this safe distance would equate to 1,401 feet. The actual throwing distance of the ice fragments will vary based on many variables not included in this calculation, including rotor azimuth, rotor speed, local radius, ice fragment size and weight, and wind speed. The Applicant has stated that no turbine towers would be sited within 1,250 feet of a residence and BCC 11.17.070(q)(2) requires turbine towers to be sited at least 1,640 feet from dwellings not located on the same parcel. The likelihood of ice throw hitting any residence, other property, worker, or member of the public is low because of the specific weather patterns required and the fact that ice would need to travel at a specific trajectory a long distance from the turbine.	4.13.2.2	n/a
Kathy Dechter	1122270	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
William and Laura Wilson	1122272	Attachment only	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Nancy R	1122274	Attachment only	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	3.16 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
International Union of Operating Engineers	1122279	Attachment only	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
City of Kennewick	1122280	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1085458	Please refer to submission 1085458	Please refer to submission 1085458
City of Kennewick	1122282	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1092339	Please refer to submission 1092339	Please refer to submission 1092339
	1122283	Attachment only	Air Quality	The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celsius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.	4.3	
			Vegetation	The EIS provides a comprehensive assessment to shrub-steppe in Section 4.5 including impacts from temporary and permanent disturbance in all phases of the project and potential indirect impacts. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional recommended mitigation measures. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. An evaluation of down winder effects resulting from the Project will be added to the FEIS.	4.13.2	Provide evaluation of "down winder" effects resulting from Project construction, operations, and decommissioning.
Charles Kaleta	1122285	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Florence Harty	1122286	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Patricia Bryant	1122287	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Connie Nelson	1122288	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lehman Holder	1122289	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joy Marley	1122298	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Janet Swihart	1122301	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Karen Genest	1122302	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mark Hughes	1122303	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
David Scheer	1122304	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ursula Mass	1122306	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dan Freeman	1122307	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Weinstuck	1122325	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gregry Loomis	1122327	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gerald Salais	1122331	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Linda L'Esperance	1122333	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nancy Kerwin	1122337	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Richard Frye	1122342	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dale Walter	1122344	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sandra Peterson	1122345	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Diane Diprete	1122346	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Barbara Bower	1122349	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Rae Pearson	1122350	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mahira Zook	1122352	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Rosalie Beer	1122354	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Arthur Miller	1122356	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jennifer Larsen	1122359	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cynthia Steussy	1122362	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nancy Bowden	1122363	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Robert Jensen	1122364	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Federick Wepfer	1122365	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jennifer Coble	1122366	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joan Rahbar	1122368	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joann Tryfon	1122370	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ken Benoit	1122443	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
George Morgan	1122444	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Melody Reasoner	1122447	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Holly Graham	1122448	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Bonny Jean Austin	1122452	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Bryan Goffe	1122453	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Paula Allison	1122454	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jason Modernmatt	1122455	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Juliana Lave	1122456	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Augustia Elias	1122459	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kristi Hanziker	1122461	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Olga Mill	1122463	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Pricilla Martinez	1122464	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
April Poirier	1122465	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cheryl Sanders	1122467	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Alfred Colter	1122470	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Claire Yurdin	1122473	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cory Dawsu	1122474	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jay Moyer	1122475	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Rick Poor	1122476	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Louis Brigman	1122477	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Steven Johnson	1122478	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Thomas Selley	1122479	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David Varney	1122480	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anonymous	1122482	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Christopher B	1122483	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Chrystyne Bratten	1122484	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cliff Hansen	1122485	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Elaine Root	1122486	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joe Nichols	1122487	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Patricia Marshall Fisher	1122489	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Leanne McMurrian	1122496	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
James Nevess	1122498	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Steve Redman	1122500	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Renee Fife	1122502	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Diana Williams	1122504	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mike Conlan	1122506	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Barbara Laudan	1122509	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Daidre Cochran	1122510	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
M Forman-Mason	1122513	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
James Brumback	1122516	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Karen Ramey	1122517	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michael Heaton	1122519	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Eilen Prior	1122569	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joseph Franetic	1122570	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Margie Jensen	1122572	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Quentin Reuer	1122574	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Catherine Madole	1122575	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
April Nimick	1122576	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dolores Segger	1122577	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Elizabeth Rosenthal	1122580	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Greg Ballard	1122593	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tara Sparkman	1122595	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David Stetler	1122597	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Virgine Link-New	1122600	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Margaret Woll	1122604	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Annet Skyelley	1122608	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Greg Spe	1122609	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jean Jensen	1122611	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Brigetta Johnson	1122612	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ms. Lasley	1122613	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Leslie McClure	1122615	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Diana Covington	1122616	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Barry Hutchinson	1122623	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dwight Pardue	1122624	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dean Rhodes	1122628	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Drew Alexander	1122636	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Nicholas Quintana	1122644	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Duncan Alger	1122648	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lyle Smith	1122649	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Joy Wooldridge	1122651	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Raymond Hayes	1122652	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Christina Davis	1122653	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lori Koon	1122654	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Christina Eberle	1122655	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Shemayim Elholm	1122660	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ken Mincin	1122663	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tatiana Zolotareva	1122666	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Chris Guillory	1122668	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jeramie Zerger	1122669	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michael Siptroth	1122670	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michael Siptroth	1122677	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Frances Jarrel	1122679	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Candle Derrick	1122680	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Carla Rei	1122681	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Peter MastenBroek	1122682	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Shannon Markley	1122685	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lorraine Hartmann	1122689	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Gerry Flaten	1122692	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Wisinyer Austin	1122694	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kevin Harder	1122696	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
William Simpson	1122698	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Besia Lukos	1122702	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Josh Graham	1122704	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kathie Grignon	1122706	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sandra Robison	1122708	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Katharine D Clark	1122713	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Bettina Binder	1122714	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kelly Tansey	1122719	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cigdem Capan	1124835	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Paula Shafransky	1124837	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Terry Hogan	1124839	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Melody Goad	1124841	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marc Samason	1124844	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sandra Crider	1124846	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Pamela Harris	1124850	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michael Leff	1124851	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Keith Van Meter	1124852	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Chris Allan	1124854	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Richard Grassl	1124856	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lavonne Paul	1124857	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sonja Miner	1124859	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Susan Montacute	1124860	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ellen Madsen	1124867	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Frank Puckett	1124869	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kc Young	1124870	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
thomas Faurie	1124872	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marilyn Overton	1124873	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Patrick Allen	1124874	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Hayley Mills-Lott	1124876	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Heather Sparks	1124879	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Deanna Peters	1124882	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Laurie Burns	1124885	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ella Valdez	1124887	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
McIntosh Scott	1124889	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jill Timm	1124890	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Anna Morrison	1124891	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tom Godbold	1124892	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Hudson Mann	1124893	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kasko	1124894	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cody Fackiell	1124897	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Saralyn Beckius	1124898	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marvin Foland	1124899	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kathryn Wrede	1124900	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Diana Hoffmann	1124901	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kris Moyer	1124902	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Victoria Rangel	1124904	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Erin Shirey	1124907	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mark Zetterberg	1124909	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Carol Hildenbrand	1124920	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Asko Hamalainen	1124921	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David Chaney	1124923	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
John Kaiser	1124924	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Alice Nicholson	1124926	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ali Williams	1124927	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Charlene Davis	1124931	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Hache Marlene	1124933	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Delia Gerhard	1124934	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Margaret Alva	1124935	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jerry mith	1124936	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jill Feuerhelm	1124938	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
David Brooker	1124941	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Cyndykay Webster	1124943	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Susan Marret	1124945	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ronald Gardiner	1124946	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mark Freeland	1124949	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Linda Taylor	1124951	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Kimberly Rex	1124952	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marylin Mosley	1124955	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Carolyn Cleaves	1124957	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
William Sherertz	1124960	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Eileen Perfrement	1124963	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Tina Minjares	1124966	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Maureen Knutson	1124967	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Susan Olson	1124971	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Larry Emley	1124973	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Daryl Bulkley	1124974	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
June Macarthur	1124975	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Aubrey Edwards	1124976	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dean	1124978	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Carter Farmer	1124979	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Ben Wildman	1124981	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Karen Hunter	1124985	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Mary Hanson	1124987	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Marjorie Sterling	1124988	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Barbara Painterwondra	1124989	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Todd Keyoth	1124993	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Jerri Ostendorf	1124994	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Faye Bartlette	1124996	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Steve Gaulke	1124998	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Siobhan Peterson	1124999	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Robin Harper	1125000	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Michelle Fairrow	1125001	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Shelly Blazich	1125002	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Leona Ansley	1125003	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Shari Hamilton	125004	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Dorethea Simone	1125005	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Sue Laird	1125006	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lorraine Lewis	1125007	Postcard	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Bonnie Hallet	1125008	Attachment only	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
??	1125011	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1100689	Please refer to submission 1100689	Please refer to submission 1100689
Franklin County	1125013	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1105787	Please refer to submission 1105787	Please refer to submission 1105787
Sue Frost	1125014	Attachment only	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	3.8.1.2	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a
Margaret Hue, Decide Locally	1125018	Attachment only	General - opposition	Thank you for your comments and petition. It has been received and acknowledged and will be considered for the adjudication process.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	The EIS assesses the potential impacts to wildlife, including birds, ferruginous hawk, migratory birds, and sandhill cane in Section 4.6. Impacts considered included habitat loss (direct and indirect), mortality (e.g. from collisions with turbines), barriers to movement, and habitat fragmentation. Section 4.6 also provides recommended mitigation measures intended to reduce potential impacts to wildlife.	4.6	n/a
			Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Impacts of shadow flicker resulting from the Project, including health impacts, are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Impacts of Project lighting are discussed in Section 4.10.2.2. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
Applicant	1125021	Attachment only	n/a	Please refer to submission 1102200	Please refer to submission 1102200	Please refer to submission 1102200
Dave Kobus	1131267	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 23SPEAKER KOBUS: Thank you for the opportunity 24to present comments. This is Dave Kobus -- D-A-V-E, 25K-O-B-U-S -- and I'm speaking for the applicant as well as a 1local resident. 2So this DEIS demonstrates that sufficient analysis 3has been conducted by the applicant and EFSEC to confirm 4that with appropriate mitigation, the project's 5environmental impact does not pose significant detriment and 6is compatible with the agricultural character of the county, 7as it is located in the land use types specifically 8recommended by the Washington Department of Fish and 9Wildlife wind power guidelines. And the analysis didn't 10stop with our application, as the applicant has continued to 11analyze special species impacts and has provided the best 12available science to justify development plans. 13The applicant's comments on the DEIS generally 14identify where corrections must be made, comments to improve 15clarity and recommendations for enhancements, and we have 16submitted those comments in writing. However, several 17concerns have been highlighted for consideration that we 18believe do not meet reasonableness and attribution of 19impacts, tests in SEPA or reasonably align with the wind 20power guidelines. 21In general, the applicant believes that some of 22the mitigation measures exceed established precedent and 23several must be reconsidered. We provide justification for 24those we feel should be removed for the reasons I just 25noted. 1The applicant appreciates the effort that was 2provided by EFSEC staff and independent consultant to, in my 3view, leave no stone unturned in the DEIS preparation and 4review activity. The need for clean energy projects such as 5this is recognized nationally by the state and by the 6region.	General - Question for EFSEC	Comment Acknowledged. All applicant comments received and were responded to under submission 1102200	n/a	n/a
MCKAY	1131273	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 8SPEAKER MCKAY: Thank you. 9Scout requested that Kennewick supply water to 10them and was later notified by the City of Kennewick that 11they would not be providing water to them. They were denied 12because they were out of -- outside city limits and also the 13urban growth area. Because of the vast amount of water 14requested, in a year of drought, there was a high 15possibility that water would have to be limited to city 16residents to fulfill the commitment to Scout. 17Since the City of Kennewick's notification to 18Scout they have not modified their application, nor notified 19the public of what their source of water would be. As far 20as we have been able to determine, they still have not 21revealed what their source of water will be. 22Governor Inslee's comment including -- excuse me. 23Let me back up. 24While attending a UN climate conference in Egypt 25in November 2022, Governor Inslee was quoted as saying: 1Governments will have to overcome nimbyism, 2including in Washington, to achieve clean energy goals. 3He went on to say: 4Regulatory reforms are needed to prevent local 5opponents from delaying projects. We've got to make 6decisions, and this will be controversial. We have to 7confront it. We have to succeed. Unquote. 8However, it's important to note that Governor 9Inslee's words are the polar opposite in what was promised 10in the Washington 2021 State of Energy Strategy, SES, which 11states: 12Public and community participation is important to 13ensure energy policy is informed by local knowledge, meets 14local needs and is viewed as legitimate by the local 15community. Additionally, community and community members 16must have a seat at the table in designing programs and 17selecting projects.	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
John Cowling, deputy public works director for the City of Kennewick	1131277	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 8SPEAKER COWLING: Good evening. John 9Cowling, J-O-H-N, C-O-W-L-I-N-G. 10Good evening. I am the deputy public works 11director for the City of Kennewick. And just following up 12on the mayor's comments, I've been the primary contact with 13Scout Clean Energy as it relates to the use of Kennewick 14water for this project. 15As Mayor McKay indicated, Kennewick will not be -- 16or cannot provide water for this project. Specifically, the 17Kennewick Municipal Code prohibits provision of water 18outside the city limits or urban growth area. 19I'd like to add that this information, as well as 20a section of code, was provided to Scout Clean Energy in May 21of last year. So we felt it's important that EFSEC know and 22the draft EIS did not identify Kennewick as a potential 23water source for construction and ongoing operations of this 24project due to our inability to provide water with our 25current municipal code. 1 Thank you	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
Wendt	1131279	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 12SPEAKER WENDT: G-R-E-G. Last name is 13W-E-N-D-T. 14On January 31st, the board of county commissioners 15did submit written comments regarding this draft DEIS for 16this project. And while the DEIS has many inadequacies, the 17county is deeply concerned that in its current form, the 18DEIS does not meaningfully discuss or disclose impacts to 19our county agricultural lands of long-term commercial 20significance. 21Specifically, the project will result in a 22conversion of ag lands of long-term commercial significance 23without disclosing the environmental impacts of the 24conversion. The GMA imposes on Benton County requirements 25for the conversion on natural resource lands, which includes 1the county's ag lands of long-term commercial significance. 2Benton County is required to designate these ag lands, 3assure the conservation of these ag lands, assure that the 4use of adjacent lands do not interfere with their continued 5use of agricultural lands, conserve agricultural land in 6order to maintain and enhance the agricultural industry and 7discourage incompatible uses. 8The conservation of agricultural lands of 9long-term commercial significance is a State of Washington 10mandate that Benton County must and will continue to follow. 11The county has met this mandate and properly designated it 12agricultural lands. These ag lands cannot be de-designated 13or allowed non-agricultural uses in these areas without 14issuing a determination that the lands are no longer meeting 15the long-term commercial insignificant status. 16Approval of this project would undermine GMA's ag 17lands conservation mandate and allow the permanent 18conversion of 6,869 acres of a temporary conversion of 2,957 19acres of (inaudible) terms commercially significant ag land. 20This results in long-term removal of commercially 21significant ag lands, and in turn, the Horse Heaven Hills 22farming area will suffer irreversible losses as a viable ag 23area of agricultural resource lands. The impacts from the 24loss of ag lands and long-term commercial significance as a 25result of this project must be thoroughly analyzed and 1discussed before a final EIS. Thank you very much.	Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS.	4.8.2	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Michelle Cooke	1131280	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 5SPEAKER COOKE: Michelle Cooke. 6M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E, C-O-O-K-E. 7Thank you for the time. 8First of all, Benton County is concerned that the 9conversion of agricultural lands of long-term significance 10will have a high cumulative impact. The DEIS is required to 11meaningfully disclose and discuss the impacts of permanently 12converting almost 7,000 acres of agricultural lands to new 13land uses. 14These new uses will replace and eliminate not only 15these agricultural lands, but also the function and values 16that these lands provide as a type of natural resource land. 17Additionally, the DEIS fails to discuss the 18economic impacts to the overall agricultural community, and 19further, does not disclose the economic impacts for the life 20of the project. 21The DEIS does not support its own conclusions when 22it states that the proposed action does not contribute to a 23cumulative impact on agricultural productivity. 24profitability, or farm operations within a project area. 25This conclusion is misleading because it implies 1that Benton County conditional use criteria will prevent or 2mitigate any project impacts. The project impacts will 3clash with, rather than meet the tests laid out in the 4Benton County code. 5Secondly, the proposed mitigation measures are 6inadequate to appropriately mitigate the environmental 7impacts of the conversion of agricultural land's long-term 8commercial significance. The mitigation measure, LSU5 9requires that the applicant submit a site restoration plan 10to EFSEC. The DEIS identifies that this plan is to be 11submitted and it's not an actual part of the SEPA record; 12therefore, it cannot be evaluated and does not constitute an 13effective mitigation measure. 14Lastly, there's no discussion of the introduction 15and integration of a large-scale non-agricultural industrial 16use onto the Horse Heaven Hills landscape. Changes to the 17facilities and roads and power lines will impact existing 18grazing and farming activities. 19In closing, the impacts mean a loss of 20agricultural lands with long-term commercial significance. 21As a result, this project must be thoroughly analyzed and 22discussed before a final EIS can be issued. Thank you for 23your time.	Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS.	4.8.2	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. The economic analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts resulting from the project. The economic relationships modeled by IMPLAN allow the user to estimate the overall change in the economy that would result from construction and operation of a proposed project. The dollars spent on project construction and operation were analyzed to determine the total economic impact within that area.	Appendix 4.16-1	n/a
Delvin, Benton County Commissioner	1131282	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER DELVIN: It's J-E-R-O-M-E, Delvin, D 2as in David, E-L-V-I-N. 3Thank you, Madam Chair, and I want to thank EFSEC, 4too, for holding this meeting so we can -- our community can 5have comments. 6I'm the Benton County Commissioner. You just 7heard from Benton County staff about the DEIS and some of 8their concerns, and we share those, the commissioners share 9those. 10I've spent a lot of time in this community, born 11and raised here, and I've always enjoyed the views in this 12area when I hike. What these windmills will do is destroy 13that, in my mind, destroy those views. 14You'll hear from a lot of passionate citizens here 15that really have concerns about what those windmills will do 16to our natural landscape. 17I think you can put it to what -- it would ruin 18our view shed and our views in this area. If you put these 19windmills, say, on the hills around Issaquah or if you put 20them in the Puget Sound or off the coast of Washington, 21there would be a lot of outcry. 22Well, we've been hearing a lot of outcry today 23about this, We don't want those here. There's better places 24for those. If you really want to do those, a lot of people 25may speak about the inefficiency of those windmills. 1There's a lot of data that supports that view. 2So I just ask EFSEC to really give it an honest, 3honest, and not be pressured by all the Go Green and those 4type of -- type of statements because, you know, we just 5don't want to be the dumping ground for all the green 6energy. 7We have hydro, which, unfortunately, is not 8considered a renewable energy in this state, the only state 9in the country, and also, we have nuclear power here. We 10encourage more nuclear power. They don't affect the view 11shed like these windmills. 12So urge you to say "no" to this project, and 13appreciate your time. 14Thank you.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS..	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Ken Spencer	1131287	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 17SPEAKER SPENCER: Thank you. K-E-N, 18S-P-E-N-C-E-R. 19Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment 20on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. You, as a committee, have 21given approval for the project despite our county and 22citizens' objection. 23I have a couple points to make regarding the 24approval over the objections of the citizens of our county. 25You have bypassed the urban growth act giving approval for 1an industrial development. If you look back a few years 2ago, the City of Kennewick in Benton County had applied to 3that body for an increased area of industrial development 4south of the I-82 corridor, saying it would not be part of 5the current growth plan. Well, Horse Heaven Wind Farm is 6south of I-82 corridor, and by your authority, you have 7created something that could -- that we could not do. This 8may create some intended -- some unintended consequences. 9If you were the city -- if I were the City of Kennewick, I 10would start developing that area south of the I-82 corridor 11based on your decision. 12No. 2, what is a plan for decommissioning these 13large towers and wind turbines? I have reviewed, as I 14could, some of the cost studies that have been done on that 15topic, and it looks like the estimated useful life of this 16project is between 20 and 30 years. And at the end of the 17useful life, what is the plan to dispose of these, either by 18salvage or disposal at a hazardous waste site? 19The best report and with the most complete details 20was done in 2017 out in South Dakota. At that time, the 21estimate of the cost of decommissioning was \$2 million per 22turbine. If we apply inflation over the last six years, 23that cost has risen to over 2.2 million. Now, who is going 24to cover that cost? The taxpayers of Benton County? 25Because we are the ones who are not profiting from this 1project, so I feel there needs to be a funds setup or some 2other reasonable means to pay for the estimated cost to 3return the site to its present condition. 4As has been seen in other developments where the 5subsidies sometimes end at the end of the project and the 6developer or the companies that develop it, they have run 7these developments, disappear when it's time to clean up or 8dispose of the site. They are no longer --	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Lisa Smith	1131289	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 17SPEAKER SMITH: Hi. My name is Lisa Smith 18L-I-S-A, S-M-I-T-H. 19And I live in the Summit View neighborhood of 20Kennewick, which is in Southwest Kennewick. I am a 21proponent of clean energy, but am extremely opposed to this 22massive wind turbine project. 23We already provide efficient, clean energy through 24nuclear power and also the hydroelectric power in our area. 25I don't understand why we'd let an out-of-state company come 1in and completely destroy our natural landscape and ridges 2with these wind turbines. We do have some wind turbines 3already that are visible from my house, and I can see that 4they are idle the majority of the time. We do get wind 5here, but it's actually quite infrequent. It seems crazy to 6forever change a huge part of our landscape to have massive 7wind turbines sitting idle. 8I also don't understand why these wind turbines 9have to be right at the top of our ridges where they are the 10most visible to thousands of people in Finley, Tri-Cities, 11and Benton City. There's a lot of land even just south of 12here, you know, between our cities and Oregon with almost no 13population where these turbines could be and not have so 14much impact on our people. 15Thank you.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Margaret Hue	1131293	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 23Okay. It's Margaret, M-A-R-G-A-R-E-T. Last name 24is Hue, H-U-E. I'm a resident from Badger Canyon. The 25location where some of these turbines are going to be is 1within a mile and a half of our location, directly above it. 2I've lived in Badger Canyon for 40 years, so I've seen a lot 3of things and know the land and the terrain and so forth. 4But what people don't understand is all of these 5big canyons that drain off of Horse Heaven, they bring wind 6turbulence down. The DEIS refers to Badger Canyon as kind 7of sloping hills, whatever. It is very complex. And all 8these canyons that feed in are -- pull air down, they cause 9wind turbulence, but the wind farms that are coming up, 10there are 150, six rows deep, directly above Badger Canyon 11or to Kiona for nine miles. 12And with that, we have some of the most pristine 13farm ground in Badger Canyon, Red Mountain, Kiona, but also 14down to Finley, but this area here is going to receive all 15of the warm air that's going to damage our diversified 16agriculture. The wind turbulence can be carried up to 15 to 1720 miles, causing chaos on our diversified ag. This will go 18way into Pasco and North Franklin County. 19The other thing is with the warming temperatures, 20most from the wind farms, most of these are in the evening 21or in the afternoon to 10 in the morning. If you're a 22cherry grower, you go out to pick your cherries and the 23orchard is warm, you're not going to be able to pick your 24cherries. That is an economic loss to our community. 25I was concerned because some growers brought out 1small cherries. We found out WSU IAREC is releasing a 2study. It is not out yet, but it will be. And it shows 3that damage from warm temperatures can affect the quality, 4the size of the fruit, which is tonnage. That's money, and 5then also the color on the apples, color on the -- 6CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 7SPEAKER HUE: -- economic loss.	Air Quality	The Harvard study of 0.24 degrees Celsius warming is theoretical model that is based on the assumption that one third of the continental U.S. is covered with enough wind turbines to meet present-day U.S. electricity demand. The Horse Heaven project is a minuscule fraction of the total area included in the Harvard estimate and even if the modeled result were true, the relative magnitude of the purported temperature change would not be expected to result in a measurable change in local climate conditions.	4.3	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS.	4.8.2	n/a
Rita Porter	1131299	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 25SPEAKER PORTER: Hello. My name is Rita 1Porter, R-I-T-A, P-O-R-T-E-R. 2One of the things that has not been addressed so 3far is the blinking red lights, and I'm concerned about the 4blinking red lights. They'll be visible from my home by, at 5times, probably 50 or 60. I live in Badger Canyon, and I'm 6vehemently against the intrusion of the windmills for all 7the reasons that's been addressed and the reasons that are 8yet to be addressed. I don't -- I don't -- I think it's a 9huge show of disrespect of the residents of the Tri-Cities 10not even to give them a voice until after the fact. And I 11didn't really have anything to prepare, but I just wanted to 12show up and give my support to people of the United 13States -- or people of Tri-Cities and voice my opinions. 14Thank you.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Richardson	1131301	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER RICHARDSON: Good afternoon. My name is Karen Richardson, K-A-R-E-N, R-I-C-H-S-O-N (sic). This has been the culmination of an over two-year journey. I've sent EFSEC pictures of animals: Burrowing Sowsls, sandhill cranes, the red tail fox, and the pronghorn antelopes that graze on our steppe shrub. As endangered animals, they've been reintroduced by the Central Washington Chapter of the Safari Club. I've sent pictures of landscapes, sunsets, vast open -- vast, wide-open spaces. I've sent pictures of broken turbines; turbines on fire. I like the ones in Williamsburg, Iowa, but the people in charge don't seem to care. US Fish and Wildlife Department with help from the Department of Defense just granted a 2.4 million REPI, which is a readiness and environmental protection program for butterflies, gophers, and horned larks on acreage adjacent to the Joint Base Lewis-McChord property. The Tri-City Herald just reported that Washington-based wind power provides the lowest effective capacity in winter compared to surrounding regions. According to western resource advocacy programs, a quote from a utility planning company: Washington-based wind farms should be low on the list of alternatives if you're trying to balance CO2 emission reductions, grid reliability, and land-use impacts in the most cost-effective manner possible. The draft study is lacking a failure to analyze proposed wind projects impact on residents. With Horse Heaven Hills high pressure inversions, cold freezing weather, and windless days, this makes no sense to place the wind farms in this area. Thank you.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			General- video or photo	Submitted video/photo received.	n/a	n/a
Tammy Wolfslack	1131303	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 9SPEAKER WOLFSLACK: Hello. My name is Tammy Wolfslack, T-A-M-M-Y, W-O-L-F-S-L-A-C-K. Hi. I am here to talk about a couple articles Washington Times had. The title of the article is, "Death by Solar Farm. 71 Species of Birds Killed. Entire Food Chains Disrupted." This article talks about 800-degree temperatures above solar fields, and apparently one type of bird in the study was observed to be smoking of its feathers as it flew. College of National Sciences article dated January 2021, a 1.6 million DOC grant supports scientists studying bird deaths at solar facilities. It discusses the incineration of birds, to the point that in some cases there was only a puff of feathers remaining. They couldn't even identify the remains. We are in a wildlife migration route. We are a major flyway, according to the United Nations Food Agricultural Organization, and I have a lot of photos here to show different types of birds as some of them were discussed. And when I read the wind solar table ES-6 discussing special status -- and that means protective endangered, I'm guessing -- recommended mitigation measures should read as allowable killing protected status species. In particular, you're talking about eagles. How many eagles are okay? They're going to be given take permits, which my understanding is "take" means kill. How many are acceptable? Five, ten, 100? I have concerns that these shouldn't even be placed here in a flyway. So there are other options. I think that starting to create things at a point of use is critical. Do it in college and a high school. Give them competitions and say, Hey, can you attach this to a car tire and make the battery generate itself? Solar cells on top of a car. Other types of something that can capture the wind on top of a vehicle. There's other ways to look at this. We don't have to go this way. We should stop jumping out of the airplane without checking our parachute for holes. Thank you very much.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Gayle Graves	1131304	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 24SPEAKER GRAVES: Good evening. My name is Gayle, G-A-Y-L-E; Graves, G-R-A-V-E-S, and I reside in Canyon -- or excuse me, Sunrise Canyon. Thank you for holding this meeting. I am against the project as it's environmentally devastating. For one example, the diversified agriculture will be impacted, raising local temperatures four degrees higher annually. Annually. Diversified agriculture is one of the economic drivers of the Tri-City area. The project is economically not sound as it will not create the energy proposed. It's taxpayers expense and will not create the employment as broadcasted by the supporters of the project. The shrub steppe and wildlife in our community care will be decimated without rehabilitation. How does this affect me and my family? My home is at the base of the hills. I'll be breathing the herbicides and pesticides brought down by the winds and the construction. Living in higher temperatures with higher utility bills, tolerating red lights, noise pollution. Missing the wildlife that once flew in the Pacific flyway that was once ours to enjoy. Thank you for your time.	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. During operation, lease payments to landowners would generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. Also, the Applicants will pay taxes to Benton County.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS considers each component of the Project (e.g., micrositng corridor, east solar field) separately in the impact analysis for vegetation. The potential impacts from each component on vegetation are described in Section 4.5. Impacts to shrub-steppe and other priority habitat are assessed based on the present Project plan and layout. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures include a As-Built Report and Offset Calculation (Veg-4) and Detailed Site Restoration Plan (Veg-7). The As-Built Report and Offset Calculation would include a final calculation of all areas of disturbance which will be used to calculate final offset requirements. The Applicant has voluntarily included rabbitbrush shrubland at the temporary and permanent offset ratios of shrub-steppe. It also includes provisions to require offsets at permanent disturbance ratios if temporary disturbance areas are not successfully revegetated within the timeframe determined by EFSEC. The Detailed Site Restoration Plan would outline the revegetation plan for decommissioning. In addition, this would include provisions for adaptive management based on the revegetation following construction and a requirement for monitoring. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2.	Section 4.5, 4.5.2.4, and 5.2.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts from lighting are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. The Project is not expected to increase sky glow nor be a source of light trespass. Lighting will be visible at off-site locations.	4.10	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brutzman	1131306	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 24SPEAKER BRUTZMAN: Karen Brutzman. 25K-A-R-E-N, B as in boy, R-U-T as in Tom, Z as in zebra, 1M-A-N. 2 I am against this project. Scout Clean Energy 3wants you to believe that a small group of vocal residents 4is threatening to stop this clean energy project, which 5would generate up to 1,000 jobs and millions in tax revenue 6to Benton County. Don't be fooled. 7These 1,000 jobs will be short-term jobs for wind 8turbine installation. Once in place the project will employ 9fewer than 50 people. Wear and tear on our roadways will be 10immense. Trucks will bring wind turbines to our area in 11several sections. Roads will need to be straightened. 12There will also be hundreds of concrete trucks traveling 13county roads to provide concrete for wind turbine 14foundations. Many of our county roads were not designed for 15these type of heavy loads. 16Clean energy is a misnomer. Concrete has a huge 17carbon footprint. The environmental impact of concrete, its 18manufacture and applications are complex, including CO2 19emissions. The cement industry is one of the main producers 20of carbon dioxide, a potent greenhouse gas. One reason why 21carbon emissions are so high is because cement must be 22heated to very high temperatures for clinker to form. 23The Tri-Cities is already a hot spot for ozone 24health risk. The Tri-Cities' ozone precursor study final 25report dated December 12, 2017, was prepared by the 1laboratory for atmospheric research, the Department of Civil 2and Environmental Engineering, and Washington State 3University. The link is provided in my written comments. 4This study was conducted because air quality 5managers started paying close attention to ozone levels in 6the Tri-Cities when the daily predictive air quality 7forecast model, operated by WSU, consistently showed 8elevated ozone in the Tri-Cities area. 9The ozone in this study is attributed to car 10emissions, but we can't ignore the pollution created by the 11millions of tons of concrete that will be used to erect 12these gigantic wind turbines and the emissions from the 13trucks transporting concrete to the work site. The 14standard --	Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits.. During operation, lease payments to landowners would generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35 year operating life of the Project. Also, the Applicants will pay taxes to Benton County.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			Transportation	Transcript was cut short. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.14	n/a
			Air Quality	With respect to impacts on regional ozone levels, construction impacts would be temporary and the expected emissions of the main ozone precursors (NOx and VOC) are very small when compared with the overall inventory of countywide ozone precursor emissions. Mobile source emissions of ozone precursors are considered exceptional small relative to regional emissions and expected to have a negligible impact on regional ozone levels.	4.3	n/a
Christopher Kuperstein	1131309	20SPEAKER KUPERSTEIN: Hello. My name is 21Christopher Kuperstein. C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R, 22K-U-P-E-R-S-T-E-I-N. 23What I say tonight I have to preface by saying 24that I'm an affected landowner, and it does not reflect my 25employer or any other organization that I may associate 1with. 2 I reside, by my calculation, as one of the closer 3residences to these wind turbines. The closest four 4turbines will be placed approximately three quarters of a 5mile to one mile from my house. 6During the pandemic, great care was taken in 7saving the lives of citizens of Washington State. Part of 8this care was to listen to experts who were experts in 9pandemic and in disease and developing mitigating measures 10to protect people from the disease. 11I submit, for the record, an expert medical 12doctor, Dr. Nina Pierpont, who earned her Ph.D studying the 13effects of existing wind turbines on existing people. This 14book titled Wind Turbine Syndrome details medical impacts of 15varying types on real people by real turbines. 16On page 20, I read the chief recommendation: 17Two kilometers or 1.24 miles remains the baseline shortest 18setback from residences and hospitals, schools, nursing 19homes, that communities should consider. In mountainous 20terrain 2 miles, 3.2 kilometers, is probably a better 21guideline. 22My first recommendation is that for this project, 23that EFSEC follow her advice. Instead of the turbine 24placement being one-half of a mile from a nearest residence, 25as the current EIS suggests, that a buffer of two 1kilometers or 1.25 miles be placed between turbines and the 2nearest residence so as to minimize the health impacts to 3those affected residents. 4Thank you for your time.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
Mary Cloningerm	1131310	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 7SPEAKER CLONINGER: Hello. My name is Mary 8Cloninger, M-A-R-Y, C-L-O-N-I-N-G-E-R. 9I am not as eloquent as the people that have 10been -- that are previous to me, and I do not have a lot of 11information. But I'm a native Tri-Citian, born and raised 12in this vicinity, and I am against building the wind farm in 13the Horse Heaven Hills. They are a blight and an eyesore on 14our beautiful hills. The construction will cause damage to 15the ecosystem and cause dust pollution in our air in town. 16The energy produced is not very much, and it's not 17worth destroying our landscape. It is not clean energy. It 18uses oil. It leaks oil into the dirt, and it kills birds 19and disrupts wildlife. And I don't know if anyone has ever 20done a study on what the vibration would do to our basalt, 21and I would suggest that something like that happen before 22you make any decision. 23Thank you for your time.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's construction, operations and decommissioning stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Noise and Vibration	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.11	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Art Kelly	1131311	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER KELLY: Good evening. My name is Art 2Kelly, A-R-T, K-E-L-L-Y. 3We are very blessed to have sufficient and 4reliable power via hydroelectric power and nuclear power 5here in our region; therefore, projected amount of massive 6land for this project is not warranted at this time for 7windmills to be constructed. 8There's no guarantee that whatever power that can 9be generated will not be sold to California, Oregon, Canada, 10or other territories or even benefit the Tri-City area. 11What contingency plans are in place if Scout 12Energy should by chance go bankrupt, federal subsidies are 13depleted, et cetera? Who has the responsibility of removing 14all these wind turbines and restoring the land back to its 15original status? According to the Manhattan Institute, 16windmills provide less than three percent of the world's 17energy. Netherlands and Germany have come out with a very 18progressive technology, using what they call tulip-shaped 19small wind turbines that can be installed on private 20property household, business, et cetera. They're extremely 21quiet. They provide 20 to 50 percent more efficient energy. 22They produce energy to power at least one-third energy of 23consumption of a household. 24There's also the issue of the recyclability of 25windmill blades. I think we need to take advantage and 1re-evaluate our other forms of progressive technology and 2put this on the back burner. 3Thank you for your time.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	The Site Certification Agreement issued by State of Washington to the Applicant states that they shall post funds sufficient for Decommissioning in the form of a guarantee bond or a letter of credit to ensure the availability of said funds to EFSEC.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility. The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. This section is also inclusive of recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's operations stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications and others.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action 3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Dave Sharp	1131314	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 6SPEAKER SHARP: My name is Dave Sharp, 7S-H-A-R-P. 8The developer has stated that the Nine Canyon 9project establishes a precedent for the proposed project. 10That is not the case. Each of their turbines can produce 11two to three times what an NC turbine can produce. 12The number of turbines, the height of turbines, 13the 25-mile expanse into the project, the amount of 14generation, 100-plus miles of road, 110 square miles of the 15project, and an apparent lack of respect for wildlife 16corridors and habitat disturbance. There is no comparison. 17Horse Heaven Project is another dimension. 18Wind projects have been in Washington since the 19early 2000s. Since that time, there have been nearly 2000 20turbines installed over 20 projects. In all prior cases, 21the developer respected wind industry practices, that sited 22wind projects in rural areas away from high population 23zones. 24This project will have approximately five times 25the population impacted as all other counties in the state 1combined. This will be a disparate treatment of Benton 2County. And what about the precedent that will be set if 3this project is approved with a perceived bias, such as no 4alternative builds and no subsidy of mitigation or a lot of 5unresolved issues being solved by a team separate from the 6main process? Future process -- future projects will 7motivate developers to bypass local officials and use EFSEC 8for every project with sloppy, nonspecific applications and 9expecting approvals with minimal mitigation. Developers 10study previous applications, and they study the decisions 11that EFSEC makes. Those decisions guide how they approach 12and present a new application. 13We are hopeful that EFSEC does not set a new 14precedent with their decisions on this project. This is a 15slippery slope. I hope that you recognize that. Since I 16have a couple minutes -- or a couple seconds, jobs -- the 17real number of jobs from the application is 450 and 18approximately --	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Paul Krupin	1131317	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 22SPEAKER KRUPIN: Good evening, everyone. My 23name is Paul Krupin. That's P-A-U-L, K-R-U-P-I-N. 24I am a retired environmental protection specialist 25with the BAN (inaudible) well-used law degree, over 40 years 1of work experience in the Pacific Northwest, and I live in 2Kennewick, Washington. 10SPEAKER KRUPIN: I did submit my comments, and 11I'm -- I'm just going to read from them. Okay. 12So on Tuesday, yesterday, President Biden said 13that climate change is a bigger threat to United (inaudible) 14than a nuclear war. And Governor Inslee is on record 15committing to (inaudible) on greenhouse gas emissions. 16I have really serious doubts about the underlying 17need for this project and whether it can really contribute 18to any of these problems, you know, with meaningful 19solutions. What does the best science really tell us? How 20are we going to identify the good projects from the bad? In 21other words, I cannot -- I respectfully want to cooperate to 22following the recommendation of EFSEC with concurrence of 23the governor in cooperation with the tribes and the local 24counties and cities (inaudible) commission with exceptional 25people who are appointed to independently investigate 1studying (inaudible) difficult and complex problems caused 2by climate change. 3The members of this commission -- community 4commission should be selected using the best and the 5brightest approach to ensure independence from political 6influence and authority. The commission should utilize 7their expertise and experience to consider and evaluate 8size-based limits and then issue scientific and 9project-specific findings and recommendations which can yet 10be used by decision makers. 11The commission should be charged with identifying 12(inaudible) and evaluating the validity of the purpose, 13meaning and underlying premises of energy projects. The 14revision also evaluated project proposals and alternatives 15proposed by (inaudible). 16No formal action should be taken by EFSEC or the 17governor until the findings and recommendations regarding 18the validity of this purpose, meaning the projects, can be 19provided by the commission. This commission should then 20prepare a report (inaudible) presentations, take public 21comments and then file these findings and conclusions that 22protect recommendations for consideration (inaudible) 23legislature integrated federal, state, tribal, local 24government agencies, tribal governments, public stakeholders 25and the public.	Chapter 1 - Project Background General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a n/a	n/a n/a
Clark Stolle	1131320	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 5 SPEAKER STOLLE: Good evening. Clark, 6C-L-A-R-K, Stolle, S-T-O-L-L-E. 7Thank you for the opportunity to voice my 8opposition to the proposed project. My family's lived in 9the Kennewick area for over 70 years. We shared a feeling 10of pride with the Horse Heaven Hills, believing that they 11should be preserved as much as possible as part of the 12heritage of our area. 13Allowing this project to be built at the proposed 14locations has long-term consequences that will cause 15significant and irreparable harm to the environment and 16overall quality of life for an urban area of over 300,000 17people. 18There are two options proposed for this 25-mile 19long project running along Horse Heaven Hills' ridgeline. 20244 turbines of up to 500 feet or 150 of up to 670 feet 21tall. Both create visual impacts that cannot be mitigated. 22This is not a visually aesthetic wind farm turning 23away in the middle of nowhere. It's an industrial complex 24of enormous proportions of many components and impacts. 25These towers are going to be taller than a 60-story 1building. The Space Needle, Statue of Liberty, Washington 2Monument. I think you get the picture. They're big, and 3they're very visible. If approved, our community will be 4forced to live within eyesight of the towers, and no one who 5lives here or visits can escape seeing them. 6I feel the EIS does not perform balance and 7serious analysis of the impacts that will be so detrimental 8to our community. It glosses over tough economic issues and 9impacts on tourism, quality of life, land value, aesthetics, 10recreation and future development. It fails to discuss the 11backlash wind farms are facing in California and other 12states. And there's no discussion regarding alternative 13locations in Benton County, Eastern Washington, or other 14states. It also appears the project will have no positive 15impact on climate change or carbon emissions in Washington, 16and any power generated is likely to be sent out of state. 17Scout selected a poor location far too close to a large, 18growing urban area, and our community should not have to pay 19the price for this bad decision. It can and should be 20located further from urban areas. Please deny this project. 21Thank you.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare Land and Shoreline Use	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations. Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	4.10 n/a	n/a n/a
			Socioeconomics	Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities. The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	3.16 and 4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Harvey Faurholt	1131321	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 24SPEAKER H. FAURHOLT: Good evening. My name 25is Harvey Faurholt. H-A-R-V-E-Y, Faurholt, F as in Frank, 1A-U-R-H-O-L-T as in tango. 2I'm a resident of Kennewick, and I've been a 3resident of Kennewick for about 50 years now. There was 4something humorous, I saw it on -- so serious -- reading on 5the news off my iPhone. And they were talking about, they 6lost about seven whales on the East Coast. And they're 7worried that the wind turbines are causing the death of 8whales, and it's getting an awful lot of attention. And I 9was thinking maybe if we were whales, we would get more 10attention than we're getting here by the State of 11Washington. 12We do not need more intermittent electricity in 13Benton County. The electricity we have now is 90 percent 14renewable, which is probably the best in the country, if not 15the best in the world. When, and if, the wind turbines are 16making electricity, the dams have to be shut down to 17accommodate the wind turbines, which is not good for the dam 18turbines. 19The wind turbines should be placed where the 20electricity is needed. California, the State of Washington 21along the ocean, along the beaches, and I'm sure they would 22be happy to have them. 23When the wind turbines's useful life is completed 24or something better comes along to make -- for example, if 25something happened with -- with the -- without, excuse me -- 1why I stop sometimes -- nuclear energy, then they will have 2to be disposed of. But they are not -- they are not 3biodegradable and will exist forever in the garbage dumps, 4if they make it that far. They're an eyesore that we -- 5that we will have to live with for the next ten, 20, 630 years, and then -- they have enough money to take them 7down forever. 8As for the unions and people who want to have 9these put up, I can certainly understand their position. 10They want jobs as long as they -- as long as they're union 11jobs.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, a forecast of regional electricity demand is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS, which suggests that by 2041, the region could see a 22.5 percent increase in demand.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Victoria Faurholt	1131323	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 17SPEAKER V. FAURHOLT: My name is Victoria 18Faurholt, V-I-C-T-O-R-I-A, F-A-U-R-H-O-L-T. 19I am -- my head's just spinning. I listen to all 20these people, and they've given so -- all the facts. Here 21is an article from Forbes magazine June 15, 2021: 22Washington State's Approaching Energy Crisis, Good 23Intentions Gone Wrong? 24The trouble stems from attempts to decarbonize our 25society, but just getting rid of them without a realistic 1plan to replace them can do more harm than good. 2Wind power, I mean, I don't know who you guys are 3talking to, but it is not very effective. In several 4studies, it shows there is a projected capacity, but with 5wind power, you don't get warmth in the winter -- you don't 6get movement in the winter or in the summer when it's really 7hot and it's really cold. The actual capacity is 8seven percent. That means of 500, you get 500 milliwatts 9out of 70 -- 7,100 milliwatts. 10But what I really don't understand is this push on 11us citizens. I mean, we have protections for animals. You 12keep your animal in the car and you get a ticket. My cousin 13had to go to court. You have -- not here. Doesn't matter 14here. All these animals, doesn't matter. We have fines 15against noise pollution, all kinds of aesthetic pollutions 16doesn't matter here. These things are ugly. 17We have neighborhoods here with rules and 18regulations. Nobody cares here. We have individual, 19personal help, like the man who was talking about COVID. 20Nobody cares here. They do not care, and that is what is 21just upsetting me. 22And if --	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Karen Brun	1131330	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 2SPEAKER BRUN: Okay, I'm Karen Brun, 3K-A-R-E-N; B as in baker, R-U, N as in Nancy. 4I'm opposed to this project. The quantity and 5height of the proposed turbines and the proximity to a large 6metropolitan area, plus smaller communities, is 7unprecedented in Washington State, if not the entire 8country. At two miles, 52.6 percent more Benton County 9residents will be impacted 24/7 by this than the other nine 10Washington counties combined where wind projects exist. 11At four miles, 110 percent more will be impacted. 12This is extremely disproportionate to the rest of 13the state. Tri-Cities residents, including 40 percent who 14are people of color, are being asked to sacrifice our 15landscape, wildlife, habitat, and our way of life for the 16benefit of those on the west side and beyond. This is 17social and environmental injustice in the extreme. 18Governor Inslee publicly stated at the recent 19climate change conference in Egypt that he thinks nimbyism 20has no place in Washington State. If that is his 21philosophy, then why are 11 of the 13 EFSEC projects 22completed or in the pipeline located east of the Cascades? 23And how many applications did EFSEC reject because they were 24to be located on the west side? 25If Governor Inslee insists that citizens in 1Eastern Washington accept the ecological disruption and 2sacrifice of our lifestyles to forest of industrial wind 3turbines and seas of solar panels, he needs to have more 4justification than 100 percent clean energy bragging rights. 5He needs to follow the science. 6The Western Resource Adequacy Program has proven 7that wind power in Washington has an effective capacity of 8 8to 11 percent when it's needed most. What off-taker is 9going to sign a contract for so little? 10This project is going to cost much more 11environmentally, socially, and economically than it will 12ever return. One just has to follow the money to see who 13truly benefits.	Socioeconomics	Human-environment aspects and potential impacts on population were analyzed in various sections of the EIS including but not limited to Public Health and Safety, Transportation, Land and Shoreline Use, Visual Aspects and Light and Glare, Air Quality and Socioeconomics. Sections 3.16 and 4.16 present Socioeconomics conditions and impacts on socioeconomics including impacts on people of color and low income communities.	3.16 and 4.16	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, a forecast of regional electricity demand is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS, which suggests that by 2041, the region could see a 22.5 percent increase in demand.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
Jeff Banning	1131335	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 19SPEAKER BANNING: My name's Jeff Banning. As 20a resident of Kennewick for over 20 years, I'm completely 21against constructing a wind farm so close to our growing 22community. Excuse me. There's no reason that this wind 23farm needs to be sited at the southern border of the 24Tri-Cities. Eastern Washington has plenty of unpopulated 25open space available for these kinds of low density, 1inefficient energy producers. 2Appendix Q, Visual Simulations, figure 81 A and B 3is what I would see every day as I drive to work, get 4groceries, walk the dog, mow my yard, or look out of my 5living room windows. 6Instead of the greens of the wheat fields in 7spring slowly fading into hues of yellow and brown over the 8summer, my view would be dominated by over 20 spinning, 9blinking monstrosities. Part of the Tri-Cities allure is 10the open panoramic views of our vast shrub steppe ecosystem. 11244 wind turbines would make a mockery of that. 12If I bought a house within view of a wind farm. 13then that would be a choice I made, knowing full well going 14into the purchase. Placing the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm 15at its proposed location is an insult to the many South 16Richland, Kennewick homeowners who chose this area 17specifically for the views of Badger Canyon and the feeling 18of openness as you look out of your house. 19I would much rather have a single, small modular 20reactor nuclear plant built in the same general location 21than hundreds of inefficient wind turbines and solar panels. 22And SMR may not have as large a name plate generation value, 23but we all know that wind and solar never generate their 24name plate values. And a small modular reactor would give 25you consistent electrical output, versus a variable nature 1of wind and solar. In the winter, we can sometimes go weeks 2with the low cloud base and no wind. There would be zero 3output from the Horse Heaven Hills wind and solar generators 4during those weeks. 5In closing, if the State of Washington feels the 6need to install renewable energy devices to meet carbon 7emission reduction goals, they need to do it far away from 8the major population centers of Eastern Washington. 9Thank you.	Energy and Natural Resources	The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Kevin Self	1131337	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 15SPEAKER SELF: Yes. Kevin, K-E-V-I-N, 16S-E-L-F. Can you hear me? 17SPEAKER GRANTHAM: Yes. 18SPEAKER SELF: Okay. Here I go. 19(Inaudible) draft EIS. The draft EIS lacks 20critical information as required by law to inform all 21effective stakeholders. This incomplete draft is not 22allowed the proper review, which places the opportunity to 23comment at a disadvantage. 24The draft EIS states the applicant would develop a 25final restoration plan. By not providing this plan, the 1stakeholder cannot comment on how it's going to be 2implemented. 3When referring to a requirement or a plan, the 4draft uses the non-committal word "would" rather than 5"will." It uses it 5,200 times throughout the document. 6My personal objections to this project: We built 7our home in Badger Canyon 12 years ago. We moved here 8because of the openness, the country feel with endless views 9of rolling hills and unmatched sunsets. We may not have the 10trees like the west side, but our rolling hills and 11wide-open views are equally as beautiful and irreplaceable. 12My objection to this project is 100 percent due to 13the adverse visual effects. The thought of looking at these 14towers on our hilltops and the destruction of the natural 15beauty and the surreal settings is unthinkable. Our views 16will forever be destroyed by the windmills scattered on our 17ridgelines with 600-foot towers will make our views look 18like an industrial park, similar to the pumpjacks in 19Bakersfield, California. 20This project is all about politics. EFSEC became 21an independent state agency on June 30th, 2022. State 22legislature passed the bill to authorize the change as an 23important step to achieve Governor Inslee's carbon neutral 24goals by 2045. 25Most of the 7 point 70 million (sic) 1Washingtonians aren't aware of how or why it was changed. 2This new law was requested by the office of the governor to 3modernize EFSEC, giving them the authority to preempt all 4aspects of certification and regulations of energy 5facilities. Our locally elected officials representing our 6city and county offices have no authority under this law. 7We, the people, have been stripped of our right to be 8represented. 9Now EFSEC has the power to come into any town in 10our state and overrule local government. This is a result 11of a governor who has an aggressive green agenda that can 12only be achieved with radical measures (inaudible) Central 13and Eastern Washington are paying the price by forcing these 14projects into our backyard. 15The poorly prepared draft...(pause).	General - opposition	Thank you for your comment; your concerns have been noted. The term "Would" is used in the context that the mitigation measure or impact "would" occur in the event of implementation of the Proposed Project. In the event that the Proposed Project is approved and built, the project Applicant would be required to implement all mitigation measures and conditions imposed by the lead agency and other permitters.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
Marilyn Dickenson	1131338	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 18SPEAKER DICKENSON: Thank you. I'm Marilyn 19Dickenson, M-A-R-I-L-Y-N, D-I-C-K-E-N-S-O-N. 20I am not in favor of this massive, intrusive wind 21turbine project. Build nuclear plants, they are clean and 22provide consistent, stable energy. 23Thank you.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS..	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Pam Minelli	1131339	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER MINELLI: I am Pam Minelli, P-A-M, M 2as in Mary, I-N-E-L-L-I, and I'm a Kennewick resident. 3Many are asking, Why does the applicant want to 4cover over 100 square miles of the scenic Horse Heaven Hills 5with up to 244 whirring and flashing wind turbines as tall 6as Seattle's Space Needle? Why here, when wind projects are 7usually placed in remote, rural locations? 8In chapter 1, page 5 of the DEIS, the applicant 9lists commercially viable above-average wind speeds as one 10reason for selecting the Horse Heaven Hills. 11To the contrary, a study by the Western Resource 12Adequacy Program, or RAP reports Washington-based wind power 13provided the lowest effective capacity of the Western U.S. 14and British Columbia during December into February. And 15that during the hottest months, August and September, 16Washington wind capacity again declined. 17In other words -- cut, the wind doesn't blow 18enough here. 19The DEIS lists area landowners' willingness to 20participate in the project as another reason for selecting 21the Horse Heaven Hills, but fails to recognize the objection 22of local residents, Benton County commissioners, city 23councils, other elected officials, and more. 24Despite the science and local opposition, the 25applicant is committed to building this inefficient project 1that is too close, too big, and too tall. It's too close 2with 100,000 people living within six miles of the Horse 3Heaven turbines. That's compared to about 19,000 people 4within six miles for all the other projects in the state 5combined. 6Instead of trees, 150 to 244 Space Needle-sized 7wind turbines with red flashing lights will be visible 8without the -- throughout the Tri-Cities and by tourists 9visiting our famous wineries. It is so big that Washington 10Department of Fish and Wildlife fears it is impossible to 11effectively mitigate the environmental risks it poses to 12sensitive wildlife and some of the last remaining shrub 13steppe habitat in the state.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
			Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Patrick Grengs	1131344	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 19SPEAKER GRENGS: Excellent. My name is 20Patrick Grengs, P-A-T-R-I-C-K, G-R-E-N-G-S. 21Speaking as a 30-year resident of the Tri-Cities 22and owner of 40 acres of farmland here in West Richland, I'm 23here to make clear my statement against any construction 24related to the Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm. 25First and foremost, wind turbines are not 1economically viable. Wind power is intermittent, as we all 2know. Every watt of power produced by wind must be 3supplemented by back-up sources including hydro, nuclear, 4and a mix of hydrocarbons. At a minimum, this doubles the 5cost of wind power. 6Second, wind power is neither green nor 7sustainable. The wind blades must be replaced every 20 to 825 years as a result of stress-fractured degradation. Most 9of the turbines in the Columbia Gorge were installed during 10the period of 2005 through 2015, and many of these will need 11to be replaced starting in 2030. 12Recycling is not an economically viable option. 13Wind power is simply not sustainable. Instead of 14desecrating our beautiful landscape in Eastern Washington, 15we should focus our efforts on preserving the fully green 16and clean hydropower that's in operation, as well as advance 17the build-out of safe nuclear reactors. I submitted 18additional comments via email to EFSEC. 19In summary, I'm opposed to the Horse Heaven Hills 20Wind Project. Thank you.	Energy and Natural Resources	An analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS. Additionally, the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's construction, operations, and decommissioning stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand 4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Rylan Grimes	1131353	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER GRIMES: Okay. My name is Rylan 2Grimes. R-Y-L-A-N, G-R-I-M-E-S. 3I'm a lifelong resident of the Tri-Cities, and I'm 4a representative of the IBW Local 112, and we represent 51,300 electricians in Southeastern Washington that would 6greatly benefit from the jobs that will be created by this 7project. 8My brothers and sisters of IBW 112 have been at 9the forefront of green energy production, including a recent 10repower at the Vansycle Wind Project in Athena, Oregon, 11successfully extending the life of the towers down there. 12My brothers and sisters built the first wind and solar 13project in America that could put power on the grid 24/7 14through battery storage in Lexington, Oregon, last year. 15Low cost power is the key to attracting new industries to 16the area, and we need the supply -- we need the supply in 17any form it takes. 18My brothers and sisters depend on a steady stream 19of construction jobs, and denying this project not only deny 20them these jobs, but future jobs, as well, as industry turns 21away from the area. 22I understand a desire to build this project far 23from view, but I would ask those opposed how long their 24commute to work is. Many of my brothers and sisters drive 25an hour and a half one way to work every day. This would be 1a welcome change of pace for many of them. 2IBW Local 112 and I support this project. 3Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Darrell Osborn	1131355	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 6SPEAKER OSBORN: Yes. Darrell Osborn. 7D-A-R-R-E-L-L. Last name Osborn, O-S-B-O-R-N. 8Okay. What I would start with, at the beginning 9of this call we took a roll call. What I noticed absent was 10anybody representing public health. And I call that to 11attention, both the audible and inaudible effects on nearby 12locales, and the well-documented cases in other areas in 13which they are finding neurological conditions and other 14things that have been continued to be researched and trying 15to attribute exactly where these seemingly new conditions 16are arising from, which just happen to be nearby wind farms. 17This has happened in the mainland all over the US and as far 18out as Hawaii and the North Shore. 19Secondly, we talk about some of the goals of the 20county and our public lands, kind of designation goal No. 3 21is conserve visually prominent, naturally vegetated steep 22slopes and elevated ridges at the Columbia Basin landscape 23and our nuclear product of the ice age. That's a goal. I 24don't believe that this project maintains that goal of 25preserving the landscape. 1Another note in the document is that this is four 2miles south of Kennewick. I'm not sure exactly the point 3they used in Kennewick, but as Kennewick continues to 4expand, as someone already previously noted, this is upwards 5of three quarters of a mile from residents. And as we 6continue to expand out the Badger Canyon area in helping 7developments continue to grow, I'm all for clean energy, 8just not at the expense of the residents and the way of 9life. 10I commute a long ways. I don't think a shorter 11commute is a good reason for a couple of electricians to 12damage our environment and our infrastructure. 13Thank you for having me.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of the Project on public health are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate public health risks, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures, preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, and spill control and response measures. The Applicant has committed to implementing dust suppression measures, as provided in Section 4.3.2.4 of the EIS. Low-frequency noise is not predicted to be emitted based on the impact analysis reports completed.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations. Additional mitigation including potential turbine removals will be considered by EFSEC, during their project review process, to reduce impacts on visual resources including those landscapes identified in the Benton County Comprehensive Plan.	4.10	n/a
Lohr	1131356	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 18SPEAKER LOHR: J-A-S-O-N, L-O-H-R. Thank you 19all for having me. 20I think what I'd like to talk about is, I am an 21electrician. I've lived here most of my life, and I'm -- 22it's depressing to hear so many of my fellow citizens 23belittle and diminish my profession and those of nine 24percent of our citizens here locally. We account for about 25nine percent of workers and a heck of a lot more than that 1of the economy. Construction is a great deal of our economy 2out here. 3I hear a lot about, these jobs are temporary. 4Construction is temporary. I build things, and then they're 5built, and then I go build something else. My job is 6important. All of our jobs are important. I do not think 7it is a genuine, viable argument that jobs aren't important 8because they won't last for ten years. It is a huge portion 9of our economy and is the way myself and an awful lot of 10people feed our families. So I really don't like hearing, 11Who cares about a couple of electricians, particularly from 12elected officials. 13Now, with the rest of my time I guess I'd like to 14bring up a couple of weird things I've heard. I recommend 15you Google wind turbine syndrome because all the results are 16basically, it doesn't exist. 17Do solar panels vaporize birds mid flight? No. 18That's absurd. 19I have worked in wind and solar projects. I find 20it interesting that there's a bunch of people that looked up 21some things that would confirm their bias on the Internet, 22and we haven't heard from anybody who is an expert in any of 23these fields. 24I have worked in these places. I haven't seen any 25dead birds. I haven't seen any huge environmental impacts. 1I've seen crops growing right underneath these things, and I 2personally think it's unacceptable for a couple of 3homeowners to move to the edge of the city and point out 4their kitchen window and say, That's it. Nobody ever gets 5to build anything there because I bought a house over here.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Valerie Miller	1131361	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 12SPEAKER MILLER: Hello? Okay. This is 13Valerie Miller. My name is V-A-L-E-R-I-E, M-I-L-L-E-R. 14I just want to first say I am just so amazed at 15the effort that our community members have put in to really 16researching and studying what is going to go into this 17windmill project. I mean, it takes a lot of time and 18resources to do that. 19I know I've been doing my best, and I'm a busy mom 20of four. And I'm very concerned because these are going to 21go up in our backyard, and I've never heard of such a big 22wind farm ever. So this is very new to everyone. 23And the gentleman that just spoke, no one -- no 24one is downplaying jobs or electricians or diminishing what 25they do, but the concern for the rest of the citizens is how 1sustainable these are, how reliable they are. 2I mean, everything I have read, there's no -- no 3one's been able to recycle these materials, so I don't 4understand how they're considered green for energy. I mean, 5it doesn't seem like anything about them is green. I mean, 6I'm concerned that if we look far enough down the road, 7these things are going to become landfills and skeletons in 8our community and eventually could create, basically, a 9ghost town with all the effects that it creates. I mean, 10nobody really knows. Right? 11And I understand that I don't have the skills or 12knowledge about all that goes on with our environment, but 13from what I read in the EFSEC study, it sounded like the 14study didn't come up with a good reason why the wind farm 15shouldn't be in either. And that's a concern to me because 16that's what the government is going to be reading. Right? 17And so I really hope that EFSEC will help us to 18help them understand these concerns that we all have and 19that we want to create something that's going to be 20sustainable for all of us for the future, you know, looking 21far enough down the road --	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
J Miller	1131364	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 5SPEAKER J. MILLER: So, you know, my biggest 6concern on this project is, again, it seems like it's a 7project that well may provide some initial short-term 8benefits. 9The long-term repercussions of the project could 10be disastrous. You look at some of the projects in other 11areas of the country, such as in California and on the east 12coast. Many of these states no longer allow these big 13projects to even occur because they've seen the detriment of 14long-term impacts. 15I mean, you look in Southern California, these 16huge farms that are now wind farms that are now, in a large 17part, non-functional, because the long-term implications of 18what they were doing were never completely thought through. 19If you were to do any type of a project like this, 20there needs to be a guaranteed -- basically, a 21responsibility of the company, where they have to dismantle 22these if they don't work or if they're not in use for a 23certain period of time. And that money needs to already be 24collected, so it's not something they could pay in the 25future; it's guaranteed that they will take care of their 1own waste. 2Again, as has been mentioned before, the wind 3blades are highly toxic, can only be placed in a couple of 4different landfills in the country. This is not something 5that is easily taken care of. 6These windmills have a very limited lifespan. 7They don't last forever. They last for, usually, a little 8more than a decade or two at best based on a lot of the 9research. And again, you're going to create large areas 10that have significant environmental impact, and that doesn't 11even go into some of the impact on the animal species in 12this area, the migratory patterns and things along those 13lines. 14So I'm strongly opposed to this project, as I see 15the detrimental impact it has on the community, particularly 16in the long-term. It is enormous. And particularly on our 17environment, these are an environmental disaster; once these 18things are no longer functional, trying to figure out what 19to do with these toxic blades, these big eyesores, and 20basically trying to figure out how to manage them. 21So thank you very much for your time. I 22appreciate everybody's effort.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Sam Dechter	1131366	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 6SPEAKER DECHTER: S-A-M, D-E-C-H-T-E-R. 7I am opposed to the Horse Heaven Wind Farm 8Project. The Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project proposes 9construction operation of a combined wind and solar power 10renewable energy facility only four miles south of Kennewick 11and stretches for 20 miles along the Horse Heaven Hills. 12The product of this project, electricity, will not 13be used in the local area and will, in fact, most likely be 14shipped out of Washington. Once construction is complete, 15the high-paying jobs will cease. However, the several 16hundred huge wind turbines, up to 500 feet or more tall, 17will be around for many years negatively impacting the 18citizens living nearby and the area's wildlife. 19Final approval for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm 20Project should rest with Benton County and other local 21government agencies. This would more appropriately reflect 22the desires, concerns, values and priorities of the local 23community. 24Similarly, determination of satisfactory 25operational performance to meet permitted conditions and 1operational parameters should be in the hands of local 2agencies and not in the hands of the facility 3owner/operator. 4Second, if the project is allowed to proceed, it 5should be moved away from the crest of the Horse Heaven 6Hills and relocated southward, several miles toward the 7Columbia River, where it will not be visible from the 8Tri-Cities and will not present an eyesore to our citizens 9and visitors. 10Remember HD Wells' War of the Worlds when the 11martians invaded. I am concerned for the wildlife that will 12be displaced by construction and operation of this project. 13I am concerned also for the birds that will be endangered 14and destroyed by the operating wind turbine blades and will 15have their historic flight patterns disrupted and breeding 16grounds destroyed. 17If we can fight to protect our salmon, we should 18fight equally as hard to protect our birds and other 19wildlife. 20Our highly desirable scenic views, important to 21local business and attractive to out-of-town visitors will 22be lost. This will negatively impact the local and regional 23economy through the loss of business, loss of visitors and 24loss of revenue.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	While there are potential off-takers having distribution outside of Washington state that could be under contract with the Applicant as purchasers, Project generated power would be transmitted to a purchaser under a contract with the Applicant including any of the local or regional utilities, or commercial and industrial power users. Potential project impacts on land and resource use and recreational use did not identify impacts on loss of businesses or loss of victors, therefore, there potential impacts on economical conditions of existing businesses around the project area is not anticipated.	1.3 and 4.16	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations.	4.10	n/a
Ross Marturano	1131367	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 6 SPEAKER MARTURANO: My name is Ross, R-O-S-S, 7Marturano, M-A-R-T-U-R-A-N-O. 8It's difficult not to incorporate all of the 9thoughts already mentioned, so I just want to add some 10additional thoughts. 11I worked in Manhattan 35 years. Manhattan is 17 12miles long. This project is 25 miles long. 70 of the 13structures are taller than the skyscrapers in Manhattan, so 14we are essentially creating a Manhattan along the southern 15part of Kennewick County -- or Benton County. 16Additionally, none of the power is required within 17this area. We are 100 percent renewable in Benton County. 18We do not use coal, (inaudible) hydroelectric, no natural 19gas, (inaudible) to ten percent nuclear. No petroleum is 20used in generation of the power. So we're essentially a 21green community now. 22So why would this project be put in this location 23when it's not necessary locally? There's no insurance that 24the power will be used locally, and it's strictly only a 25profit incentive in doing this project. 1 So I'm strongly against this project for aesthetic 2reasonsand for common sense. And I thank you for your 3time.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
Diane McDaniel	1131371	6SPEAKER MCDANIEL: Yes. Diane McDaniel. 7D-I-A-N-E; last name is McDaniel, M-C-D-A-N-I-E-L. 8My family moved to the Tri-Cities in 1973 when my 9father was transferred here to work on the Ice Harbor Dam. 10He was career Army Corps of Engineers. He would work on 11dams throughout the west and up and down the Columbia and 12Snake Rivers. 13When Dad transferred to his next assignment, my 14brothers and sisters and I would stay here. We would put 15down roots, marry and have kids and grandkids here in the 16Tri-Cities. 17The growth of the Tri-Cities I've witnessed since 181973 is beyond incredible, and the past years have been even 19bigger, although not always the best jobs for working 20people. That's why we need to support new energy that can 21power those good-paying manufacturing jobs. Most can't 22afford the home on the hilltop. 23What I ask of EFSEC is to include in their review 24how the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center's electricity would 25contribute clean power to our local region needs. Many 1folks like to complain, and we've heard a little bit on the 2call tonight about California and others, BPA selling our 3power, turning each other against outsiders. And, well, 4let's just set that aside for now. 5The truth is we need more of everything. My 6family, we were dams, from the Libby Dam, to Ice Harbor, to 7John Day, up and down. And we all worked on Hanford, but we 8need more. And we need to attract new manufacturing to the 9Tri-Cities area, and I think this project will help do that. 10Thank you for your consideration of my comments.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Greg Gales	1131376	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 15SPEAKER GALES: My name is Greg Gales, 16G-A-L-E-S. 17And I speak in favor of this project. Like it was 18said by the electrician earlier, Rylan Grimes, that it would 19provide income for the local community. It would also -- 20this project would also contribute an estimated 260 million 21in new tax revenue for our community. 22So I guess I don't understand the other comments 23that -- why they wouldn't be in support of that to be able 24to grow Tri-Cities. 25So that's what I'd like to say is, I do support 1the project. Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Graham Zimmerman	1131378	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 4SPEAKER ZIMMERMAN: Hi, this is Graham. 5Graham Zimmerman, G-R-A-H-A-M, Z-I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N. 6I am a professional mountain climber and the 7alliance manager at Protect our Winters. I've made first 8ascents from Alaska to the Karakorum, feats that have 9resulted in awards, including the gold medal of alpine 10climbing, called the Piolet d'Or, and a role as the board 11president of the American Alpine Club. 12I also work full-time at Protect our Winters to 13engage our over 200 athletes, creative scientists and 14business leaders to mobilize the 15 million alpine 15enthusiasts in the United States, which (inaudible) the 16outdoor state, to advance non-partisan climate solutions 17that protect all communities and the places that we love to 18recreate. 19I'm Zooming in today from Bend, Oregon, where I am 20based, but I grew up in Edmonds, Washington, and the 21beautiful Cascades is where I fell in love with climbing. 22These days I'm in Washington frequently to visit my family 23and to visit those incredible mountains. 24I'm here on behalf of Protect our Winters, my 25family and community in Washington to provide support for 1the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center. Having studied 2glaciers in university and spent the majority of my life 3exploring environments, I've witnessed the impacts of 4climate change firsthand and the mountains worldwide, very 5much including Washington. These impacts have crept into 6the lower elevations in the form of wildfires, strong storm 7systems and heatwaves. All of these have expanded the 8climate issue to encompass massive impacts on community 9health. 10As you will see in our written public comment, 11without utility scale projects like this, dramatically 12decreasing snowpack and extended wildfire seasons will 13continue to threaten Washington's \$6.3 billion outdoor 14recreation economy and the health of all Washingtonians. 15In conclusion, I urge you, on behalf of the 16members of the outdoor state and all Washingtonians who 17value clean air, community health and economic prosperity, 18to move the Horse Heaven Project to its construction phase 19and issue all pending approvals on the project. 20Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Brent Strecker	1131381	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 23SPEAKER STRECKER: Yes. Brent Strecker 24B-R-E-N-T, S-T-R-E-C-K-E-R. 25Benton County's been my home for over 50 years. 1and my family live within one mile of the proposed turbines. 2I enjoy outdoors and have hiked and biked the Horse Heaven 3Hills my entire life. 4I see first-hand the wildlife that will be 5affected by the turbines. There's an owl couple that hoots 6from our rooftops during the night, and I see hawks almost 7every time out riding or biking. I generally see flocks of 8seagulls or Sandhill Cranes and geese flyover year-round. 9One time, this last December, the sky was filled with flocks 10and birds for as far as I could see in all directions. Some 11of the flocks had 500 to 1,000 birds in them, all headed 12through the proposed turbine area. 13Industrial wind turbines are not a novelty or a 14celebration of -- symbol of the environmental virtue many of 15Eastern Washingtonians who live within them as an intruding 16presence along every path we travel in and out of our 17community and as a backdrop to our favorite fishing, 18hunting, hiking and sightseeing destinations. 19The idea that my wife and I have to live within 20this intruding presence of the forest and industrial wind 21turbines in our backyard every time we step outside, day or 22night, it's dispiriting and, frankly, downright depressing, 23particularly when you consider that Washington state is 24already one of the top renewable energy producers in the 25nation and that unreliable wind farms will do little to 1nothing to solve the real problem with increasing blackout 2risk within our -- facing Washington State citizens. 3There are many reasons the turbine towers over the 4Tri-Cities are just wrong. For instance, my estimate, this 5project would reuse around 20,000 gallons of oil annually, 6but the reason -- the one reason that should be most 7considered is the western regency protection research 8because it directly addresses how the turbines in our area 9will operate. Thank you.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Rick Dunn, general manager of Benton PUD	1131384	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 16SPEAKER DUNN: Yeah. Good evening, Rick 17Dunn. R-I-C-K, D-U-N-N. I'm the general manager of Benton 18PUD and a longtime citizen of Benton County. 19It's common sense to recognize the intermittency 20and variability of the wind power is a significant 21deficiency when the power grid is expected to deliver 22continuous and uninterrupted electricity no matter what the 23weather. 24The question is, can you assign a number to this 25deficiency? And the answer is yes, and utilities in the 1Northwest have done it. In response to increasing risk at 2Northwest power grid blackouts driven by rapid coal plant 3retirements and no plans for reliable replacements, Benton 4PUD joined a consortium of utilities in an effort, called 5the Western Resource Adequacy Program, also known as WRAP. 6One major objective of the WRAP was to adopt 7common grid reliability planning and analysis standards, 8including calculating what percentage of installed wind farm 9generating capacity located in certain geographic areas can 10be counted on when electricity demand is highest. 11What the WRAP team determined is Washington wind 12farms are expected to provide the lowest effective winter 13capacity than any region analyzed, by a factor of more than 14two to three depending on the month. In the worst case, 15utilities who add Washington wind to their portfolio will 16only be allowed to use eight percent of the maximum 17generating capacity possible as credit toward their January 18dependable supply inventory. 19The 850 megawatt Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm 20boundary area is over 72,000 acres, but the project would 21only be credited by the WRAP for 68 megawatts of 22January-effective capacity. It would take more than seven 23projects the size of the Horse Heaven project to provide 24effective capacity-based, single clean burning and 25dependable natural gas power plant occupying 15 to 20 acres. 1Utility engineers like myself have been backed 2into a corner by politicians who are now designing the power 3grid to their liking. There's no doubt wind farms are going 4to be built. But if you still think the matters should 5matter, Washington wind farms should be low on the list of 6the alternatives, or in the case of the Horse Heaven Wind 7Farm, removed from the list. Thank you.	Energy and Natural Resources	The purpose of the proposed Project is to provide 1,150 MW of renewable energy using wind energy and solar energy, as well as a battery energy storage system (BESS). The Applicant selected the Project location because it meets the following feasibility and viability criteria of commercially viable above-average wind speeds, sufficient flat area and solar irradiance to site solar PV panels, close proximity to existing transmission lines with sufficient available capacity to carry the Project's output to the grid as well as area landowners willing to participate in the Project and have sufficient undivided acreage to support a commercial renewable energy facility.	1.3 Purpose of Proposed Action	n/a
Mike Bosse	1131386	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 12SPEAKER BOSSE: Thank you. Mike Bosse. 13M-I-K-E, B-O-S-S-E. 14Developing the project's hybrid combination of 15wind, solar and battery storage applications will create as 16many as 930 jobs for skilled construction workers. Through 17building of local access roads and foundations to support 18the technology, the project will employ crane operators, 19electricians and skilled laborers. 20The project will be a significant source of 21employment in the local area. The jobs required by this 22project are high-paying, family wage opportunities. 23Economic impact studies examining the projects estimated the 24typical income per worker during the construction phase will 25be \$113,500. That's nearly 60 percent higher than the 1average regional compensation across industries and 37 2percent higher than the compensation in the construction 3industry for Benton and Franklin Counties. 4The studies also show that a -- at full build-out, 5the project could amount to at least 73 million in labor 6income and 143 million in total economic output. Following 7construction, the project will also create a combination -- 8a combined direct, indirect and induced total of 56 9long-term high paying jobs during the estimated 30-year 10lifespan. 11I'd also like to add that I'm happy to hear 12there's so much support on this forum for nuclear power, as 13that will probably be coming up in the near future as well. 14Thank you for your time.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
andrea.grantham	1131390	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 2SPEAKER SEUBERT: I already submitted 3comments in writing, so I'll keep it short. 4I agree with a lot of the comments against a wind 5farm here, blinking lights and waste of space, when nuclear 6power is a lot more efficient. But I'm also a local 7paragliding pilot who flies on that ridge, basically, on 8every opportunity that I get. The wind is very variable. 9Sometimes it's way too strong; sometimes there's absolutely 10no wind, which, you know, affects wind power generation 11probably as well. 12But I'm also concerned about the effect of the 13turbines on paragliding pilots. Not the risk of getting 14hit, per se, but how much turbulence is after the turbines; 15how much does the winter ones affect, you know, the wind, 16downwind of the buildings. 17That was not addressed in any of the comments in 18the environmental statement, at least I haven't seen it. 19They mention a lot of paragliding spots, but none of those 20spots are used, except for Kiona, which is right -- the same 21which -- where the wind turbines are planned to be built. 22So just something to keep in mind.	Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Cisco Elguezabal	1131393	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 25SPEAKER ELGUEZABAL: Nope, you got it pretty 1close. Cisco, C-I-S-C-O. Last name, E-L-G-U-E-Z-A-B-A-L. 2Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. 3I'm the business manager of Labors Local 348. I represent 4over 1,200 hardworking men and women in Eastern and Central 5Washington. 6Horse Heaven Clean Energy Project will result in 7approximately 1,000 local union construction jobs, 56 8long-term family permanent jobs. 9Scout Clean has also committed to the use of a 10apprenticeship utilization for 15 percent of labor hours. 11We already have trained, qualified men and women to do the 12renewable projects, so we are in full support of this 13project. Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Russell Walker	1131396	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 16SPEAKER WALKER: Good evening. Russell 17Walker, R-U-S-S-E-L-L, W-A-L-K-E-R. 18I commend this council on the thorough analysis 19visual impact included in the DEIS for the Horse Heaven 20Clean Energy Center. This approach is based on a factual 21and sound methodology, a forthright accounting of how the 22project's visual impacts will vary widely in different 23distances between key observation points. A clear 24mitigation measure is to avoid and minimize the most 25significant potential visual obstructions. 1This impartial science-based approach is needed, 2particularly considering many of the emotional and 3inaccurate appeals that have been made about the project. 4It is true that individuals may have a difference 5in opinion about what our region's landscape ought to look 6like. It's also true that wind turbines are prominent 7features which will be seen by many, may elicit subjective 8reactions. But by relocating the project's proposed 9turbines in the foreground areas of non-participating 10residents and other sensitive viewing locations, the counsel 11is ensuring the most significant impacts will be mitigated. 12It is also important to clarify that the proposed 13project layout keeps much of the turbans out of sight from 14key population centers. This has been demonstrated through 15several visual simulations which demonstrate where the 16turbines would be in relation to specific viewpoints, but 17the current mitigation strategies identified by the DEIS, we 18need best practices for minimizing view shed impacts. Any 19reactions raised from the project's visual impacts should be 20considered subjective. They were also very widely based on 21distance and viewpoint. 22These differences and opinions certainly shouldn't 23raise the standard of further regulatory intervention. I 24highly encourage this council to carefully balance these 25dynamics against a significant contribution to the Horse 1Heaven Clean Energy Center, which will make for achieving 2our state's climate agenda, curbing the impacts of climate 3change and achieving the region's clean energy goals. 4Thank you.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted regarding the visual analysis and application of mitigation measures to reduce impacts.	4.10	n/a
Kathryn Tominey	1131401	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 9SPEAKER TOMINEY: Okay, Kathryn Tominey. 10K-A-T-H-R-Y-N; Tominey, T-O-M-I-N-E-Y. 11I'm supporting the program, the combination of 12wind turbines, solar and high capacity storage batteries. 13It's a great combination. It's not the only solution, but 14it will certainly help the area. 15I came here from college in February of 1968, 55 16years ago. So I've lived here 55 years, and, yes, there are 17lots of things that look different now than they did then. 18Drive from Bend to the Columbia River, drive from Manastash 19Ridge to Cle Elum, drive from Walla Walla and you'll see 20wind turbines. World did not come to an end. 21It is -- I hope the EIS will put some information 22into -- regarding the existing implemented recycling 23technology for wind turbine blades. It's not a maybe. It's 24being done as we speak. 25I also hope the EIS will address or cover the 1potential of the solar panels to support farmers who want to 2implement agrivoltaics. And many -- many of the speakers 3may not have focused on this, but the owners of the land -- 4farmers -- will also benefit from the steady stream of 5revenue from electricity to stabilize their farming coms and 6make it easier for them to stay on the farm. I grew up on a 7farm, so I know something. 8That's all I have to say. I think it's a good 9idea, and I hope it proceeds. Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Barbara Buckmaster	1131403	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 17SPEAKER BUCKMASTER: Thank you for your time. 18Barbara Buckmaster, B-A-R-B-A-R-A, Buckmaster, 19B-U-C-K-M-A-S-T-E-R. 20Pleased do not allow Scout Clean Energy to ruin 21our most beautiful Horse Heaven landscaping by constructing 22wind turbines. 23I own 200 acres -- a 200-acre farm that borders 24the base up the hills where the turbines are proposed to be 25erected. I really do worry that this will lower the value 1of my property for years to come. I'm concerned about the 2flashing lights that will be nothing but a nuisance at 3night, and they are monstrous eyesores. 4And I truly believe they will affect our habitat, 5and so goes the list of our complaints. I was strong -- I 6was approached by Scout Clean Energy when they first came to 7our community hunting for a pathway to transport their power 8to the power grid. And truly, at first it seemed like it 9was a great idea, says this country is working to clean up 10our environment. 11Once I really started to look into this and after 12legal advice and advice from community developers, I felt it 13was best that I ran, and I ran fast. 14I do not feel Scout Clean Energy has this 15community in heart. What they have at heart is the 16opportunity to line their pockets and the pockets of their 17investors. 18They came to our area scouting for a sweet place 19to install their turbines, and what -- that we really don't 20need at this time. We have an abundance of power. We have 21nuclear power and we have hydropower already in this area, 22and when the time arrives when this community needs support 23from -- our community will support anyone when it's time 24that we really need the extra power. 25But why? Why do we need to agree to this when we 1really do not need this windmill in our area at this time? 2Oh, sure, yes, everybody, I've heard you. We will have 3extra jobs.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
Kathryn Knutson	1131405	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 10SPEAKER KNUTSON: Kathryn Knutson, 11K-A-T-H-R-Y-N, K-N-U-T-S-O-N. 12From the research I've done, I think that the 13Horse Heaven Hills Wind Farm will have negative consequences 14for the endangered Washington state ferruginous hawks and 15the sensitive areas the hawk needs to be able to hunt and 16nest in. 17And as I stated before in my previous comments 18submitted to you, the Horse Heaven Wind Farm has no 19meaningful compensation proposals, nor any real mitigation 20efforts for the negative effects suffered from the proposed 21wind farm for the hawk. 22So please do not approve this industrial-sized 23wind farm, the endangered Washington state ferruginous hawk 24should not be sacrificed to meet the green energy goals set 25forth by Washington State. 1In addition, the US Wildlife Service estimates 2that between 140,000 and 500,000 bird deaths occur at wind 3farms each year. And the most significant threat is posed 4to species of the large threatened and high conservation 5value birds such as the Washington state ferruginous hawk. 6In addition, my farm is within a couple of miles, 7probably less, of this massive wind farm, and my farm is in 8a conservation reserve program for the ferruginous hawk. 9So that's why I have concerns about this -- of 10this massive project and how it's going to affect what I'm 11doing. Thank you.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife, including ferruginous hawk, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS. This section also describes mitigation measures intended to reduce impacts.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Barbara Thompson	1131407	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 24SPEAKER HERKE: Okay. My name is Barbara 25Thompson. B-A-R-B-A-R-A, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N. 1I am against the turbine intrusive wind turbine 2project. I heard the gentleman speak a little bit earlier 3about how they parasail, paraglide off of Heaven Hills, and 4I can attest to that because they've landed in my backyard. 5And we actually have a lot of paragliders who use Horse 6Heaven Hills to recreate in. 7The other -- I've already submitted most of my 8comments, but one of the things that blares out to me is 9that all of the wildlife and protected species, in the 101990s, a whole logging industry was shut down for the 11spotted owl, and I don't understand how all these rules can 12be submitted and changed to put in a wind farm, solar farm, 13and willy-nilly make these changes. 14So later on in an agricultural area like this and 15they put in an industry like that, it -- political climate 16changes in the state to be able to go and put other 17industries in agricultural areas. 18And I'd also like to know about the economics of 19it, since they've been building wind farms -- 2004, there is 20a number that popped up in one of the articles that I was 21reading that they spent \$90 billion on wind farms, and yet 22they only contribute seven percent of our nation's total 23electrical energy needs. Their lifespan is only 10 to 20 24years, and at the end of their operation, they have to be 25decommissioned, all tracked to the midwest and buried in 1special landfills. 2I don't understand nuclear power --	Recreation	As part of Mitigation Measure R-1, the Applicant is required to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan to keep recreation enthusiasts safe. Paragliding is an unofficial recreational activity at the launch locations on public lands closest to the Project.	4.12	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Energy and Natural Resources	The Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS includes recommended mitigation measures that would reduce or compensate for impacts related to energy and natural resources consumption during the Project's construction, operations, and decommissioning stage, such as recycling of all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications.	4.7.2.4 Applicant Commitments and Identified Mitigation	n/a
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
Carl Baker	1131411	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 9SPEAKER BAKER: Thank you. Carl Baker. 10C-A-R-L, B-A-K-E-R. 11And I'm in favor of the project. I'm pretty 12sympathetic to the concerns that have been raised, but I do 13think that the involved landowners and the business 14involved, you know, should be able to get to use their 15resources to make money and engage in economic activity in 16our community. So I don't -- I don't see any -- that we 17have enough negative effects from this project to stop it. 18So that's all I have to say. Thank you.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a
Lloyd Lieske	1131413	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 25SPEAKER LIESKE: Okay. First name Lloyd, 1L-L-O-Y-D; last name Lieske, L-I-E-S-K-E. 2I am not in favor of this oversized, badly located 3wind turbine proposal. It's located on prime land, prime 4farmland. We need to be savoring and relishing the 5bountiful farmlands in Benton County. These lands are 6highly productive and will be even more valued as 7populations worldwide continue their explosive growth. 8Two weeks ago the editorial page in the Tri-Cities 9made the statement that the Tri-Cities would be giving up 10way too much if they go for the wind farms. 11What would they be giving up? They would be 12giving up beautiful vistas that support a wine industry and 13tourism. They would be giving up views that we relish. 14They would be giving up the migratory birds that use the 15Pacific flight path over that area. They would be giving up 16far more than most people realize. 17It's funny. The Endangered Species Act has not 18been mentioned tonight. The ferruginous hawk falls into 19that, and I believe there's a burrowing owl that falls into 20that. 21The Tri-Cities already does have abundant 22electricity. We don't need these wind farms, so why are 23they put here? It just does not make sense. I fear that 24one bad decision can lead to another. 25The governor and Patty Murray did their own study 1on the removal of the Snake River dams. They stated 2alternative power generation must be in place first, before 3the dams can be removed. The four Snake River dams provide 41,000 megawatts of electricity. The proposed wind farm with 5solar panels produces 1,150 megawatts. It can happen. 6Thank you.	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Ted Lewis	1131414	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 11SPEAKER LEWIS: Okay. My name is Ted Lewis. 12T-E-D, L-E-W-I-S. 13I agree with all my neighbors who are against this 14wind farm project. It's ill-conceived -- it's an 15ill-conceived plan, and it's going to do more harm than 16good. We don't need it, and we don't want it.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
LEWIS	1131417	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 22SPEAKER J. LEWIS: Okay. For all of the 23reasons -- I'm sorry. (Inaudible) right here with his 24tablet, so I'll start over. 25For all the reasons expressed by those opposing, I 1am adamantly against this massive, intrusive turbine wind 2project. 3We need to encourage more nuclear and hydropower 4projects. Many of the new jobs mentioned at the beginning 5will be numerous, but will be reduced drastically after the 6project is completed. Again, I am adamantly opposed to this 7project. Thank you.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Derrick Stricker	1131421	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 10SPEAKER STRICKER: Good afternoon. My name 11is Derrick Stricker, D-E-R-R-I-C-K, S-T-R-I-C-K-E-R. 12My family and I are not in favor of this massive 13intrusive wind turbine project. The future growth of our 14growing MSA is confined by the Columbia River, which leads 15to the future commercial and residential growth along the 16southern boundary of the (inaudible). 17This project not only interferes, it stops the 18ability of our economy to grow in this region, which will 19severely hurt our supply and demand for population growth, 20economic prosperity and free market principles. 21As a young professional, I'm already planning and 22working towards what best helps our community by 2050. This 23project impacts our future negatively and diminishes the 24history that will be built here in Tri-Cities. Thank you.	Land and Shoreline Use	Planning in Benton County's unincorporated and urban areas is guided by the Benton County Comprehensive Plan. In addition to providing planning guidance for unincorporated areas, the plan addresses regional planning issues and coordinates growth among all jurisdictions.	n/a	n/a
Charles Barnett	1131423	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 2SPEAKER BARNETT: Charles Barnett. 3C-H-A-R-L-E-S, B-A-R-N-E-T-T. 4I'm strongly against this Horse Heaven Hills Wind 5Farm Project. I'm a licensed pilot and enjoy many hours of 6updraft flight along the proposed area of this project, as 7do many large birds and migratory birds that soar along that 8ridgeline. 9This project would prohibit my enjoyment and that 10of the birds of prey and their natural desire to soar and 11hunt for food. I fear that many birds will be killed and/or 12injured because of this project. 13Next, I live in Benton City, Washington. I'm 14about a mile and a half from the project. We have 40 acres 15there. I've lived there for 50 years. The visual 16aesthetics for this project will lower my attitude and my 17property value. 18The movement of the blades during the day and the 19flashing lights at night will be very distracting and 20unnatural to the area. 21This project does not benefit the US manufacturers 22that send our -- that send our tax money overseas. 23The power is not slated to be used here locally. 24It's set to go away from the area. And yet the people that 25are using the power doesn't want it in their backyard. 1That's why they want to put it in our backyard. It just 2doesn't make sense to me. 3I'm strongly against this project. Thank you.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat, including birds, are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS including the identification of significant impacts on visual resources associated with the proximity of the Project to residences and other sensitive viewing locations as well as strongly altering the area's landscape character.	4.10	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Dan Wirth	1131425	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 14SPEAKER WIRTH: Okay. It's Dan Wirth, D-A-N, 15W-I-R-T-H. 16And regarding the Horse Heaven Wind Farm, my 17opinion is this country needs all the clean energy it can 18produce, whether it be wind, solar, thermal, hydroelectric 19or nuclear. I am not discounting the continuing need for 20fossil fuels until we can transition to 100 percent clean 21energy. 22In regard to the Scout Windmill Farm, my opinion 23is to use the larger windmills in fewer numbers at the 24farthest distance feasible from view. I do not feel that 25they will cause a detrimental effect to the environment or 1animal habitat. The benefits of the wind and solar farm 2will outweigh any negatives.	Agreement with the Project	Comment acknowledged.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
ATKINS	1131430	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 10SPEAKER ATKINS: Okay. First off, I'd like 11to talk about the water issues. On table ES-5 it talks 12about traffic, transportation of traffic and not being much 13of an issue. But there is a letter from the Port of 14Walla Walla saying that they can support the Horse Heaven 15Hills Wind Project with 40 water trucks per day. And it 16doesn't state how many gallons these trucks are, and it 17doesn't state a route they take. So that is a significant 18impact to the community. 19Also on table ES-3-B, it says waste water is 5,000 20gallons per day, but it doesn't state how they're going to 21get rid of that. So there should be something -- it also 22states ENR-5, they're going to capture and recycle wash 23water. They should have a plan for that. And as I stated 24though, the water trucks will come from Wallula, Dodd Road. 25That's a (inaudible). 1Regarding the shadow flicker SF-2, it has a 2one-year complaint line to be reassessed after one year; 3that's if you have a complaint, you can call in and they'll 4log it down. Well, if they're going to log it down, they 5should give a log number to the person who is calling in to 6complain so that they can follow up with EFSEC and be sure 7the log -- the issue is being addressed. 8The other thing is, who is going to have oversight 9of this project? With all these mitigation issues, somebody 10needs to be oversight of what's going on. Who is going to 11pay for that oversight? Washington residents. 12And how are we to know that Scout Energy is being 13honest and truthful, because when you look at -- Washington 14state should have full and control power over all these 15mitigating issues. That means to stop what they're doing, 16to halt the project to make sure they're in compliance.	Transportation	See Section 4.14 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts on transportation resources from the Project.	4.14	The FEIS was finalized to include information provided by the Applicant in the new Transportation Impact Analysis.
			Water Resources	The ASC indicates that wastewater would be discharged to an on-site septic system during operations. The on-site septic system would be permitted and installed according to Washington's Waste Water General Permit Program and Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State. No discharges would occur to waterbodies. Impacts to waste streams are discussed in Section 4.15.	4.15	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment in regard to SF-2 noted.	4.10.2.2	Updates to the "complaint line" for shadow flicker and other areas of impact are under consideration. Revision to be drafted based on these updates.
Judy Guse	1131434	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 24SPEAKER GUSE: Judy Guse, J-U-D-Y, G-U-S-E. 25Who will be liable when there's a turbine fire 1that spits oil-laden debris over vast areas igniting further 2fires and spewing smoke and fumes from dangerous chemicals 3for miles into the atmosphere, uncontrolled or managed. 4Fires from turbines are extremely toxic. Who knows what the 5ultimate damage these toxic plumes will be to people, 6particularly to children and the elderly and to wildlife and 7fish and rivers and streams. 8Because of the turbine height, the fire department 9crew can do little but watch it burn itself out. Our county 10doesn't have a fire department with resources, knowledge or 11equipment to fight a fire on a 671-foot tall turbine in a 12desert where there are copious amounts of tumbleweeds and 13dried grasses that burn rapidly and spread quickly to 14surrounding homes. Hundreds of acres can be consumed in a 15single turbine fire, and just one fire incident can cost up 16to 4.5 million to contain. 17Who will be liable for the damage to crops, the 18loss of human life, homes and animals? 19We are dealing with high voltage machines called 20aerogenerators high in the sky, operating with hundreds of 21gallons of oil and lubricants subject to fires. Research 22suggests that one of the main ignition sources for fires in 23turbines is lightning strikes. 24We have a lot of dry lightning strikes in our 25area. Our area is a high fire risk because of our desert 1climate, where our vegetation is a primed tinder box for 2fire in the summer. 3Wind developers provide no protection to 4individuals or communities that have these wind projects 5imposed upon them with lack of control, regulation and 6protection for people, animals, landscapes and communities. 7There is no universal fire protection guideline that is 8enforceable. Any other industry would be and is required to 9have much more accountability. There needs to be fire 10protection in place that will put out a turbine fire before 11it spreads to nearby homes. Thank you.	Public Health and Safety	Impacts of fire risk resulting from the Project are discussed in Section 4.13.2 of the EIS. The Applicant has committed to measures that would mitigate fire risk, which are presented in Section 4.13.2.4 of the EIS. These include the use of fire suppression measures and preparation and implementation of an Emergency Action Plan.	n/a	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Jeanie Polehn	1131435	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 17SPEAKER POLEHN: Okay. It's Jeanie, JEANIE: 18last name Polehn, P like Paul, O like orange, L like Linda, 19E like Edward, H like Henry, N like Nancy. 20And I have submitted these comments to EFSEC 21already, but I want to bring out that I have not seen 22anything in the EIS where they have contacted Washington 23State Farmland Preservation. And we're going to be losing 24that farmland, and we need that -- the farmland to eat, 25folks. And the contamination of that farmland with 1(inaudible), which become hazardous materials and cannot be 2removed from those soils, so it will be basically poisoned. 3We'll have the loss of visual scenery. No photos 4are provided in that EIS of actually seeing what the 5homeowners will see, as well as their -- the loss and 6evaluation of their property. 7And then we have blowing dust, where we can't even 8see the streets and the houses across from us. And this 9will add to that blowing dust scenario and impact people's 10health and cause health issues. 11Also, I haven't seen anything on tectonic movement 12of the areas where the wind turbines will be located. I 13haven't seen that it's been adequately tested for or 14anything like that in there. 15And then wind turbines do not provide on-demand 16power 24 hours a day, seven days a week so it does not 17interrupt the current power system. And it will also raise 18the cost of electric power, and that hasn't been dealt with. 19On separate from the EIS, the funding for the 20decontamination and decommissioning of the project needs to 21be looked at.	Land and Shoreline Use	An evaluation of the Project's impact on agricultural productivity is provided in Section 4.8.2 of the EIS.	4.8.2	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS. Visual simulations, based on project engineering design, are included in Appendix 3.10-2 including views from residences, recreation areas, and travel routes.	4.10	n/a
			Air Quality	As noted in the EIS, the project will result in temporary fugitive dust emissions which a relatively small when compared with other sources of fine particulate matter emissions in the County. These temporary fugitive dust emissions will only occur during project construction and at the end of the project life during demolition and restoration and will be mitigated through a number of measures including among others: application of water and/or surfactants on disturbed areas to reduce dust, covering stockpiles that could be a source of dust, and limits on vehicle speed on unpaved roads to reduce dust generation. A complete list of mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.3 of the EIS. As noted in the EIS, these temporary emissions are not expected to result in a significant impact to residents. Additional air quality modeling will be performed in the FEIS to address impacts on PM25 and PM10. An onsite Air Quality Mitigation Monitor (AQMM) is proposed during construction to monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in real time and direct additional mitigation if necessary.	4.3	4.3 - additional dispersion modeling and results, addition of condition requiring AQMM
			Energy and Natural Resources	The State of Washington currently has 85 renewable power plants operating with a combined generating nameplate capacity of 23,443 MW. In 2019, wind accounted for about 80 percent of the state's nonhydroelectric renewable electricity. Hence, Washington benefits from access to abundant, low-cost energy originating from renewable energy resources. Additionally, an analysis of the Power Generation and Demand of the State of Washington is presented in the Project's Energy Natural Resources Section of the DEIS.	3.7.1.1 Power Generation and Demand	n/a
andrea.grantham	1131437	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 2SPEAKER GUSE: Yes. I just want to say that 3I'm not in favor of this massive wind project.	General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Jose Loera	1131441	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 9SPEAKER LOERA: Wonderful. So I -- let me 10spell my name first. J-O-S-E, last name Loera, L-O-E-R-A. 11I've lived in Tri-Cities for over 35 years. I've 12watched this community grow into just a beautiful, vibrant 13community, and I see absolutely nothing positive with this 14wind farm coming in the Tri-Cities. 15From my perspective, it's going to be detrimental 16to our wildlife. It's going to be detrimental to our scenic 17views. The jobs that they're talking about are going to be 18short-term and only going to be there while they build the 19project, and afterwards, our jobs are going to be minimal, 20is my understanding. 21And then finally, the power company locally is 22saying this isn't something that we need for this community. 23So I absolutely have to say this is a hard no. 24Not interested in the wind farm in Tri-Cities. Thank you.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS. Construction of the Project would generate economic benefits in the regional economy through direct expenditures for materials and services, as well as new payroll income and both indirect and induced economic benefits. During operation, lease payments to landowners would generate annual benefits to the local economy over the expected 35-year operating life of the Project. The Applicant would also pay taxes to Benton County. Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. The economic analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts resulting from the project.	4.16	n/a
			General - opposition	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
Patricia Loera	1131443	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 7SPEAKER P. LOERA: P-A-T-R-I-C-I-A; last name 8Loera, L-O-E-R-A. 9I would like to voice my opposition to this 10project. I strongly believe that this wind farm project is 11of no benefit to our beautiful local community. 12My main objections are, what is the negative 13impact it will have on our wildlife, our birds, migratory 14and otherwise, and our beautiful natural vistas. Simply 15stated, this is too big of a project. It's too close to too 16many people, and it will impact so many people. 17Our community is growing every day, and this is 18not the place to build a big, giant wind farm project so 19close to metropolitan areas. We need to protect our rural 20natural habitat and Tri-Cities. Thank you.	Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife and habitat are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a
			Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Comment noted. Impacts on landscape character and views are described in Section 4.10 of the EIS.	4.10	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Dana Ward, conservation chair for the Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society	1131445	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 1SPEAKER WARD: Yes, this is Dana Ward, 2D-A-N-A, W-A-R-D. I'm the conservation chair for the Lower 3Columbia Basin Audubon Society situated in the Tri-Cities. 4My comments will be strictly to the biological 5resources. Thank you for allowing me to make a comment. 6The seriousness of climate change and the 7resulting impact to human life, the environment and welfare 8of the earth relies on intelligent actions to limit carbon 9emissions from fossil fuels and other sources. The 10construction of solar arrays and wind turbines are important 11steps to slow or even reverse global warming. 12The Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society supports 13well-planned solar and wind turbine projects, but they must 14be sited reasonably, they must take into account, as a 15minimum, biological habitat and biological resources that 16would be impacted. From our review of the DEIS, it falls 17well short of attaining this goal. 18To allow the adequate environmental review, the 19final EIS for the Horse Heaven Hills must include a specific 20site design identification and analysis of reasonable 21alternatives that minimize or eliminate impacts to the 22environmental resources such as disappearing shrub-steppe, 23avian species such as ferruginous hawks and burrowing owls, 24as well as prey species such as (inaudible). 25In a broader sense, the EIS must address the 1likely environmental impacts associated with specific siting 2decisions and specific mitigation measures with associated 3performance measures that address the regional impacts to 4birds, mammals and plant populations and their habitat 5connectivity. 6We have submitted 20 pages of specific comments, 7and we have a review of four issues the DIS does not provide 8enough information to analyze likely environmental impact. 9Issue 2. The draft environmental impact --	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	2.0	n/a
			Vegetation	The EIS considers each component of the Project (e.g., micrositing corridor, east solar field) separately in the impact analysis for vegetation. The potential impacts from each component on vegetation are described in Section 4.5. Impacts to shrub-steppe and other priority habitat are assessed based on the present Project plan and layout. The Applicant has provided commitments that will mitigate impacts and EFSEC has included additional mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures include a As-Built Report and Offset Calculation (Veg-4) and Detailed Site Restoration Plan (Veg-7). The As-Built Report and Offset Calculation would include a final calculation of all areas of disturbance which will be used to calculate final offset requirements. The Applicant has voluntarily included rabbitbrush shrubland at the temporary and permanent offset ratios of shrub-steppe. It also includes provisions to require offsets at permanent disturbance ratios if temporary disturbance areas are not successfully revegetated within the timeframe determined by EFSEC. The Detailed Site Restoration Plan would outline the revegetation plan for decommissioning. In addition, this would include provisions for adaptive management based on the revegetation following construction and a requirement for monitoring. Based on the Project impacts and applied mitigation no significant unavoidable impacts were identified; however, impacts to priority habitat were identified as a cumulative impact due to the decline of shrub-steppe throughout Washington, which is discussed in Section 5.2.2. Priority plant species are also addressed in Section 4.5. Based on survey completed by the Applicant no special status plant species were observed. Section 4.5.2.4 includes additional mitigation measures for special status plan species including pre-disturbance surveys and special status plant species education for workers on site. These mitigation measures are designed to minimize impacts to special status plants.	Section 4.5, 4.5.2.4, and 5.2.2	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	See response to Comment 1119045	4.6	n/a
Lori Mattson, CEO of the Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce	1131450	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 20SPEAKER MATTSON: I'm Lori Mattson, L-O-R-I, 21M-A-T-T-S-O-N. I'm president and CEO of the Tri-City 22Regional Chamber of Commerce. 23As the fifth largest chamber in Washington, 24representing over 900 businesses, ranging from sole 25proprietors to the largest employers in the bi-county 1region, we urge EFSEC to consider our community's voice in 2this proposal. 3The state energy strategy asserts that public and 4community participation is important to ensure energy policy 5is informed by local knowledge, meets local needs and is 6viewed as legitimate by the local community. 7By the state's own analysis, this region's 8hydroelectric and nuclear power is 93 percent non-emitting, 9and impacts a substantially smaller footprint with several 10times the effective load carrying capacity. 11This project would be just a few miles from a 12major population center of 300-plus thousand residents. The 13size and scale is inconsistent with the Benton County Land 14Use Plan, inconsistent with the character of the surrounding 15land use, and at the height of the Space Needle, these 244 16wind structures would create an incredible barrier to our 17local economy. 18Recreation and tourism provides over \$500 million 19annually to our local economy. Suggested mitigation to 20recreation and tourism impacts amount to suggestions that 21regional partners wholly identify new recreational 22activities. 23Suggested light and glare mitigation strategies do 24not account for the vast difference in scale that the 25proposed turbines are from existing installations 1encompassing 72,000 acres of land and exceeding the Space 2Needle in height area surrounded by no other infrastructure 3of the same height and number. 4Please consider the negative impacts to the 5Tri-Cities and recognize that this project is not informed 6by local knowledge, does not meet local needs, and is not 7viewed as legitimate by the local community.	Land and Shoreline Use	For aspects of the Project's design that may not be in alignment with Benton County Code 11.17.070 Growth Management Act Agricultural District or the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) would review discrepancies through an adjudicative process intended to resolve disputes between the local government and Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (Applicant).	4.8	n/a
			Socioeconomics	Comment acknowledged. Appendix 4.16-1 of the Draft EIS presents an input-output economic modeling (IMPLAN analysis) for the project. IMPLAN is widely used to assess the economic impacts of energy and variety of other projects. The IMPLAN model divides the economy into 546 sectors, including government, households, farms, and various industries, and models the linkages between the various sectors. The linkages are modeled through input-output tables that account for all dollar flows among different sectors of the economy. The economic analysis did not identify any negative economic impacts resulting from the project. Potential Project impacts and suggested mitigations related to land and shore line use and recreation are described in sections 4.8 and 4.12 of DEIS.	4.16	n/a
			Recreation	See Section 4.12 of the Final EIS, which discusses potential impacts to recreation resources from the Project.	4.12	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Doug Fearing	1131453	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 10SPEAKER FEARING: Doug Fearing, D-O-U-G, 11F-E-A-R-I-N-G. 12I am adamantly opposed to this project. I'm a 1374-year community resident, and I'd like to address a few of 14the claims regarding wind farms and their impact. 15We hear claims made about how many houses a 16particular wind farm will power. Maybe it's 1,000 or even 172,000. The truth is if the wind isn't blowing, they won't 18even power one house. 19Claims are made that wind power's economical to 20produce. I've read wind turbines will never make it to the 21breakeven point, energy production versus cost during the 22life of the generator. We hear that wind power is a great 23energy source. Well, so is lightning. But they both share 24a common problem called reliability. 25We'll hear arguments tonight about the jobs this 1wind farm will create. Earthquakes, tornadoes and tsunamis 2all create jobs. The creation of jobs, in and of itself, 3has nothing to do with the merits of wind energy as a power 4source. 5I understand this project means income, but I ask 6our union workers to take a hard look at our -- their 7community and consider the fact that these are short-term 8jobs with long-term results, results that disfigure our 9community, destroy our skyline and essentially and 10effectively will shut down one of the only true corridors 11for growth the city of Kennewick has. 12The Horse Heaven Hills are not scalands. They're 13occupied by farms and numerous multi-million dollar homes 14and is prime view property. The undisputed fact is that 15building these machines near a residential area severely 16devalues property and homes. 17Windmills aren't built on national monuments or in 18parks because why? They're an eyesore. If these wind 19turbines are built along the crest of Horse Heaven Hills, we 20might as well build a big wall here with a sign hanging from 21it saying, Here's where Kennewick ends. 22This last year I spoke at a public meeting --	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Dave Drollinger	1131458	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 3SPEAKER DROLLINGER: Yes. My name is Dave 4Drollinger, D-A-V-E, D-R-O-L-L-I-N-G-E-R. 5I'm here to simply state that I'm adamantly 6opposed to this project. I think it's just another good 7old-fashioned boondoggle like this country has seen off and 8on since its inception. And I think it's also, 9unfortunately, a virtue-signaling scheme to make people feel 10good. 11We've got -- this type of energy is hugely 12inefficient. Nuclear power is much greener, much more 13prolific of an energy producer or of magnitude greater. 14What this project would do, this -- like the gentleman 15before me said, that the only growth Kennewick has is to the 16south, and all of that is prime real estate property whose 17property values are going to be incredibly devalued because 18of their existence. And there's hardly a way to put a price 19on it, but it will be, over the course of 50 years, easily 20in the tens of millions of dollars. 21And so the bottom line is this project is not 22necessarily for here or any other place in the country, and 23the -- the appearance of it is like a graffiti, and it's 24graffiti that the proponents and who's going to benefit -- 25the few that are going to benefit from this, they wouldn't 1want this graffiti on their home or their neighborhood any 2more than we want it. Thank you.	Chapter 1 - Project Background	Comment acknowledged and is included in the administrative record for the EIS.	n/a	n/a
			Socioeconomics	The impact of wind farms on property values is addressed in the EIS.	4.16	4.16 - Discussion of Project impacts on property values
Ira Johnson	1131461	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 5SPEAKER JOHNSON: Hi, I'm Ira Johnson. 6I-R-A, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. 7And I am against this scam. That's what it is; 8it's a scam. Take all the pros that we've heard tonight and 9all the cons for and against, and there's no reason for 10these to be put anywhere, let alone our backyard. 11They do -- first off, they're made in China. 12people. Why are we making another country rich? Why don't 13we make them here if you're going to make them. 14They're not recyclable. Where you going to put 15the junk? Do like China? We send them our garbage, they're 16going to take it out to sea and dump it; then it'll wash 17ashore? 18It's not dependable. They wear out. And mainly, 19they're not cost effective. If it wasn't for us taxpayers, 20the federal government, subsidizing those things, they 21wouldn't be put in. If they're so dependable and so cost 22effective, let that engineering company who wants to put 23them in, put them in at their expense and we'll see if it 24happens. It won't. 25This will affect banks, this will affect 1investors, and most importantly us taxpayers who are here 2faced with the consequences. 3Now, of course, you can justify anything. You've 4got to realize, I'm from Texas, and I learned years ago from 5a guy named Billie Sol Estes, who sold fertilizer tanks and 6they didn't even exist. So you can sell and justify 7anything, but I beg you to take and pray over this when you 8make your decision. 9Thank you so much for letting me speak.	General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a

Table 10-1A Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

From Granicus Engagement Tool			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Comment	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Travers Bracy	1131465	02/01/2023 Horse Heaven DEIS Public Meeting Transcript Verbal Comment 15SPEAKER BRACY: Travers Bracy, T-R-A-V-E-R-S, 16B-R-A-C-Y. 17I'm not going to say anything that hasn't already 18been said by most of the people on this call, but I'd just 19like to point out that community members that have talked 20and pointed out their opposition are all from around here. 21The people who seem to be for this wind project all seem to 22be from -- not from around here, especially the union 23members who have been put up and given the canned speeches 24and talking points by their international organization. 25There's plenty of job opportunities for 1electricians, contractors, construction workers in this 2industry -- in this area, and this wind farm won't even be a 3drop in the bucket. There's electricians that are looking 4for jobs, union and non-union, all the time, and there's 5plenty of work for them. So that's not a justifiable excuse 6to put this wind farm in. 7The best argument against that I've heard tonight, 8that I'd like to reinforced, is the lack of water and a good 9plan for where they're going to -- how they're going to get 10rid of these windmills when they're all worn out. 11Another thing that I haven't heard tonight is the 12antelope population has been reintroduced to the Horse 13Heaven Hills. It's grown greatly in the last few years. 14It's pretty awesome to see the herds up there. When you 15drive through the roads and the farmlands, you'll see them 16grazing along, very good environment for them. So that's 17another impact to the environment that these constructions 18and windmills will impact. 19I don't know any other animal population that 20lives under windmills, but I just urge the committee to do 21the right thing and turn down this proposal. Thank you.	Water Resources	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation.	Section 3.4.1.5 and 4.4	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC, which includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier and replacing with the information provided in the updated ASC.
			General - Recyclability	In accordance with recommended mitigation ENR-7, to minimize the need for future extraction of natural resources, the Applicant would recycle all components of the Project that have the potential to be used as raw materials in commercial or industrial applications. Also, as part of the decommissioning process, the Applicant would repurpose or reuse the Project's high-value components. Recyclable materials would be reduced to a transportable size and removed from the site to an appropriately designated recycling center in accordance with local, state, and federal solid waste regulations. For example, the blades would be cut down or dismantled into smaller sections for transport by regular-sized haul trucks. Steel, iron, aluminum, copper, concrete, and electronic components of wind turbine foundations, towers, and wiring are recyclable. Although, currently many wind turbine blades are being transferred to landfills, in recent years, several companies have developed recycling and repurposing technologies for retired turbine blades. These technologies include shredding the fiberglass blades and turning them into cement, textiles, synthetic materials, and plastic pellets. Therefore, it is anticipated that by the time that the project will be decommissioned, recycling of turbines blades will be a general practice and less challenging compared to current days.	4.7.2.4	n/a
			Wildlife and Habitat	Impacts to wildlife are addressed in section 4.6 of the EIS.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1B Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

Submission-1102200			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Recommendation/Contribution	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-1	Section ES-2.1 of the DEIS reflects the maximum nameplate generating capacity of up to 1,150 megawatts for the facility. The Applicant notes that the updated ASC, Section 2.3, provides clarification on the generating capacity of the project as follows: (since the time of the initial application) "BPA has since allowed interconnection requests that facilitate greater installed aggregate nameplate generating capacity, provided the instantaneous generation is controlled to not exceed the grid injection capacity, which is the maximum energy in MW that can be injected into the transmission grid at any instant in time without exceeding the allowable authorized grid injection capacity set by BPA (the transmission provider). Consequently, a generation facility may have a greater nameplate generating capacity than grid injection capacity by installing more Turbines or solar modules. This change by BPA does not alter the facility components proposed for the Project." As a result of this clarification, the Applicant requests that total nameplate generating capacity of the facility not be restricted by any Site Certification Agreement, but that any limits be identified based on project component impacts as described elsewhere in the ASC and DEIS. For example, no more than 244 turbines would be installed under any scenario; turbines would be no higher than 496 feet (under Turbine Option 1) or 671 feet (under Turbine Options 2); etc.	Executive Summary	An explanation of the Project's nameplate generating capacity and potential injection capacity will be provided in the Executive Summary and EIS.	n/a	Description of potential injection capacity
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-2	Revise CR-1 4th bullet to read " <i>Notify Tribal representatives by offering the opportunity to be included during any ground-disturbing activities (Cultural Resource Monitor)</i> " . This change is necessary to accommodate the desires of the First Nations for active involvement. Construction activities must be allowed to proceed if the First Nations choose to not be present.	Executive Summary	Acknowledged. Suggested revisions will be applied in the FEIS.	ES-35; Section 4.9.	Suggested revisions will be applied in the FEIS.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-3	Delete duplicate Vis-4 mitigation action.	Executive Summary	This mitigation measure will be removed based on technological limitations of applying a color treatment to the solar panels, the primary generator of visual impacts. Installation of opaque fencing (VIS-6) would reduce impacts where level views of the arrays would occur, such as from KOP 12 (as simulated), reducing visibility of the PV support structures. Based on application of VIS-6, color treating the PV support structures would not be required.	ES-38 and 4.10	Mitigation measure VIS-4 will be removed.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-4	Recommend replacing Tables 2-2 and 2-3 in the DEIS with Table 3.4-14 in the ASC (also Table 3 in the Revised HMP Appendix L to the ASC) submitted in early January 2023), where impacts are shown, and Table 4 in the Revised HMP, Appendix L to the ASC, where the WDFW supported mitigation ratios are shown. Utilizing the impact acreage numbers in the tables in the ASC and Appendix L will make the impact and mitigation discussions in the DEIS align with standard practice in Washington EFSEC permitting. Changes in those tables should be carried through the document to ensure consistency. Calculations of permanent and temporary disturbance in Tables 2-2 and 2-3 do not coincide with definitions of permanent/temporary disturbance used in ASC. The draft EIS definitions of permanent vs temporary disturbance are not consistent with precedent for calculating impacts for solar facilities in Washington. The EIS includes all of the acres of habitat that will be modified by the Project (e.g., vegetated areas under solar arrays) as "permanent" impacts, which result in inflated assessments of Project impacts in multiple sections of the draft EIS. In the absence of WDFW solar siting guidelines, Applicants, EFSEC, and WDFW have been relying on the 2009 WDFW Wind Power Guidelines to inform mitigation decisions on solar projects. As projects have been proposed WDFW and EFSEC have accepted the characterization of impacts to habitat under solar panels as modified or altered, rather than permanent (which is equivalent to impermeable surfaces as defined in the 2009 Wind Power Guidelines) or temporary. Along with that separate characterization for habitat under solar arrays WDFW has supported modified mitigation measures that are less than those outlined for permanent (i.e. impermeable surface) impacts in the 2009 WDFW Wind Energy Guidelines. The mitigation ratios proposed for modified habitat are consistent with other recent solar projects approved by EFSEC (e.g., Goose Prairie Solar) and were supported by WDFW during coordination meetings in 2022. The intention was to align with the permitting norms that have been established by WDFW and EFSEC in the absence of solar siting guidelines, and to distinguish between mitigation requirements for impermeable surfaces such as roads or concrete foundations vs. the area inside the solar fence line, which is modified but still provides wildlife habitat.	Chapter 2 - Proposed Action and Alternatives	Will review comment with other SMEs and provide applicable changes in the Final EIS.	Chapter 2	
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-5	A review of NWI data against the micrositing corridor did not identify any emergent or palustrine wetland features. Detailed surveys did not identify wetland features within the micrositing corridor. Request EFSEC provide a map showing the location of this feature.	Water Resources	Based on the NWI data, one freshwater emergent wetland is mapped as crossing the micrositing corridor (see Figure 3.4-1 inset map). The DEIS indicates in Section 3.4.1.1 that no wetlands were delineated within the Micrositing Corridor or Solar Siting Areas during field surveys.	Section 3.4.1.1 and Figure 3.4-1	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-6	The draft EIS estimate of 842 acres of existing impervious surface within the Project Lease Boundary is overly conservative. Recommend revising this estimate consistent with Comment #4 on ASC Section 2.1.1. Developed/disturbed habitat contains, but is not the same as, impervious surfaces. As described in Section 3.4.1.1 of the ASC, habitat mapped as 'developed/disturbed' includes roads, buildings, and other structures, but also includes vegetated areas. "Vegetation that does occur in these areas consists primarily of ruderal species (i.e., species that colonize or thrive in disturbed areas), including many non-native species."	Water Resources	Will review comment with other SMEs and provide applicable changes in the Final EIS.		
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-7	Page 3-149, first paragraph of section says "45BN2092 and 45BN2146 were identified through shovel testing.". Recommend changing the third sentence in 3.9.2.1 to read "Precontact isolates 45BN2092 and 45BN2146 were found on the ground surface and verified to be isolates through shovel testing".	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you, the suggested revision will be made.	3.9.2.1	Revise sentence to read: 'Precontact isolates 45BN2092 and 45BN2146 were found on the ground surface and verified to be isolates through shovel testing.'
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-8	Page 3-152, third full paragraph, states "...and HRA determined that neither site is eligible for listing in the NRHP...". Since HRA can only recommend action, the word "determined" should be replaced by "recommended".	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you, the suggested revision will be made.	3.9.2.1	Change "determined" to 'recommended.'
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-9	Page 3-154, the grain elevator discussed here (ID 722995) and the two Nicoson buildings (724937 and 724938) were recommended as not eligible and DAHP concurred (see Attachment 2 for concurrence letter); however, they are shown on WISAARD as eligible. HRA contacted DAHP to assess this discrepancy and DAHP subsequently issued a revised Determination of Eligibility (Attachment 2) concluding that they are eligible. However, they will not be physically disturbed by the project and there will be no significant impact to the resources. It is recommended that the 3rd paragraph on page 4-282 be revised as follows: The two remaining four historic-period architectural resources—an electricity transmission line, resource-723666 (detailed in Section 3.9), the Nicoson Rd. barn storage building (resource-724937), the Nicoson Rd. cribbed grain elevator (resource-724938), and a grain elevator (resource-722995)—are eligible for listing under the NRHP. Any impacts on these resources would be high in magnitude since they are evaluated as eligible for listing in the NRHP. The Project will impact the environmental setting of these resources via some local, short-term, unavoidable impacts are anticipated to occur on the environmental setting of the resources, through the alteration of the viewshed, though the integrity and context of location would remain (with no impacts occurring to the structures resources themselves). However, setting is not one of the most important aspects of the resources' integrity, and a change to the setting does not result in a loss of their integrity (i.e., their ability to convey their NRHP significance), so the impact on the four resources would be negligible in magnitude.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you. The revised concurrence letter from DAHP, dated December 10, 2021, will be reviewed and the FEIS will be revised accordingly. Aside from physical impacts, the FEIS must assess whether there will be direct impacts to the viewsheds of these cultural resources.	3.9.3.2; 4.9.2.1	To be determined once all relevant information is reviewed. Assessment of significant impacts is pending.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-10	Page 3-156, first paragraph of the section states "These include two sites with mixed components (e.g., both precontact and historic cultural materials)." Recommend changing "two" to "one", as only one site (45BN2153) has both types.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you. The sentence is incorrect, and it should refer to one multicomponent site (both precontact and historic archaeological materials) and one 'mixed component' resource. The latter refers to Site 45BN2148, is a cultural resource featuring an archaeological surface scatter and historic-period architectural remains (discussed in Section 3.9.4). The FEIS will be revised to state the correct number of cultural resources identified within the Area of Analysis.	3.9.6	Review all relevant information from the Applicant and revise the summary of historic and cultural resources identified within the Area of Analysis. Clarify total number of archaeological resources (precontact, historic, and multicomponent), architectural resources, and resources with both archaeological and architectural cultural materials.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-11	Table 3.9-3, Page 3-158, in the Table under 17302 County Well Road, recommend adding the other three Property IDs "724940, 724941, and 724942".	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you. The three additional Property IDs will be added to Table 3.9-3 under 17302 County Well Road.	3.9.7	Revise Table 3.9-3 to include all relevant Property IDs and updated NRHP Eligibility Statuses.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-12	Table 3.9-3, Page 3-158, in the Table under 45BN2148, this number is the archaeological component, the architectural component is the Nicoson Farmstead and DAHP Property ID's 724937 and 724938. Recommend changing "45BN2148" to "Farmstead Property ID's 724937 and 724938". Page 4-282, third full paragraph, instead of 45BN2148, it should be the Nicoson Farmstead - the archaeological site 45BN2148 is unevaluated for NRHP eligibility. Recommend changing "45BN2148" to "Farmstead Property ID's 724937 and 724938" at this location. Similarly, Table 4.9-3, page 4-285, 45BN2148 is the archaeological component; the architectural component is the Nicoson Farmstead and DAHP Property ID's 724937 and 724938. Recommend changing "45BN2148" to "Farmstead Property ID's 724937 and 724938".	Historic and Cultural Resources	Thank you. Archaeological Site 45BN2148 and architectural resources listed under 17302 County Well Road will be listed separately in Table 3.9-3. All unique DAHP Property IDs will be listed. The text in 4.9.2 and Table 4.9-3 will be revised to list archaeological site 45BN2148 and architectural resources documented at 17302 County Well Road separately.	3.9.5; 4.9.2	Revise Tables 3.9-3 and 4.9-3 to list archaeological Site 45BN2148 and architectural resources located at 17302 County Well Road separately. List all unique DAHP Property IDs. For Section 4.9.2, revise all references to architectural resources at 17302 County Well Road to include their unique DAHP Property IDs only. Remove all references to Site 45BN2148 when discussing architectural resources.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-13	Instead of the current language of mitigation measure Geo-1, "To limit erosion and disturbance of natural soil profiles, soil disturbance would be postponed when soils are excessively wet, such as following a precipitation event." if EFSEC chooses to make this proposed mitigation a condition of the SCA, we recommend revising the measure to read: "Minimize soil disturbance activities with the potential for soil compaction when soils are saturated, such as following a major precipitation event (e.g., 5-day antecedent rainfall of greater than 1.1 inches in the dormant season or greater than 2.1 inches in the growing season). Direct construction away from areas with saturated soils and where drainage may concentrate until soils are no longer saturated, and limit vehicular traffic to established access roads. Where possible, leave existing vegetation root structure intact to enhance soil stability and infiltration capacity. Where necessary, utilize BMPs such as low ground pressure and/or long-reach equipment, gravel or timber pads, and localized engineered drainage improvements (e.g., interceptor drains, detention basins). Where soil compaction is observed to have occurred, decompact subsoils to a minimum depth of 18-inches or as identified in site reclamation plans and lease agreements."	Earth Resources	Acknowledged. Suggested revisions will be applied in the FEIS.	3.2	Suggested revisions will be applied in the FEIS.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-14	Condition A-1, requiring a speed limit during construction of 15 mph, is unworkable as written and we request that it be removed in accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (c). Heavy equipment (tracked vehicles, cranes, etc) will maintain speeds below 15 mph but it is unrealistic to expect construction workers driving from one part of the site to another to maintain speeds below 15 mph. In addition, maintaining speeds of 15 mph on any public unpaved roads would unreasonably delay local residents. Other measures as described in the ASC will reduce dust generation to an acceptable level during construction. The applicant reviewed site certification agreements previously issued by EFSEC for large scale renewable energy projects (e.g. Desert Claim, Goose Prairie, Kittitas Valley, Whistling Ridge, Wild Horse) and only one had a speed limit specified in the SCA; Kittitas Valley required construction vehicles to be limited to 25 mph. This is a reasonable measure and EFSEC should not require a more restrictive measure for the Horse Heaven project.	Air Quality	Condition A-1 will be revised to limit construction equipment on any unpaved portion of the construction site to 15 mph and to limit other vehicle speeds on offsite publically accessible unpaved roads to 25 mph.	4.3	Revise condition A-1 as noted
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-15	Recommend deletion of W-1. All site ephemeral and intermittent streams are dry for most of the year and work can safely be done in a wider work period than the typical tributary fish windows, which are based on streams with water present and direct connectivity to waters with fish use. As defined in WAC 220-660-110, authorized work times are based on reduction of impacts to fish life at sensitive life stages. Because the streams within the Project boundaries are not fish-bearing and do not have characteristics of streams that can provide fish habitat even if water were present, there would be no impact to fish life stages from Project work completed in the dry. Additionally, WAC 220-660-110 authorizes work outside of the defined fish windows when sufficient mitigation measures are in place that eliminate risk to fish life. Therefore, the concern over work in the streams within the Project boundary is to prevent impacts to downstream, fish-bearing waters such as sedimentation. This protection can be provided with BMPs including working exclusively in the dry and when no significant precipitation is forecast; installation of appropriate BMPs to prevent sediment from entering the stream in the event of precipitation, and prompt restoration of all impacts within channels prior to the end of dry conditions, including returning channels to existing grade and initiating revegetation. With these mitigation measures in place, there is no need to restrict work in the dry stream channels to the August 1 to September 15 window. Mitigation measure W-1 is not necessary to protect fish; less restrictive measures are available and required and adequately protect the resource consistent with state policy and standard measures. The proposed measure is not consistent with state guidelines or policy. Therefore, in accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA.	Water Resources	Revise W-1 to include observing least risk fish windows if water is present in any ephemeral or intermittent streams.	Section 4.4.3	Revise W-1

Table 10-1B Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

Submission-1102200			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Recommendation/Contribution	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-16	Mitigation measure W-7 requires that the 100-year floodplain be clear-spanned. The floodplain is 360 feet wide at the planned crossing location and support structures can reasonably be placed outside of the floodplain. However, construction activities within the floodplain such as crossing with construction vehicles should be allowable in dry conditions with standard BMPs in place to prevent erosion. Recommend revising W-7 as follows: Clear-span the transmission line to avoid temporary disturbance to the 100-year flood plain. Site transmission line poles outside the 100-year floodplain. The mitigation measure addresses physical disturbance of the 100-year floodplain, a CARA. Clear-span would minimize physical disturbance associated with transmission line poles and is not intended to restrict other essential construction traffic activity.	Water Resources	The 100 year floodplain (also known as frequently flooded areas) is considered a critical area according to Benton County Critical Area Ordinance. Any activity or development within a critical area is regulated under this Ordinance. Under 15.08.090 "All actions nad developments shall be designed and constructed in accordance with mitigation sequencing (Section 15.08.210) to avoid, minimize and restore all adverse impacts. Applicants must first demonstrate an inability to avoid or reduce impacts, before restoration and compensation of impacts will be allowed." The Proposed Project does not qualify as an exemption nor an allowed activity within critical areas. W-7 to be revised to state: "Clear-span the transmission line to avoid temporary disturbance to the 100-year flood plain. Site transmission line poles outside the 100-year floodplain. The mitigation measure addresses physical disturbance of the 100-year floodplain, a CARA. Clear-span would minimize physical disturbance associated with transmission line poles. Essential ctruction traffic activity shall be limited in the area to only construction traffic that is essential for installation of the tranmission line. Access through the 100-year floodplain shall be avoided, except by those vehicles directly involved in construction of the transmission line and access by these vehicles will only occur when soils are dry. All other vehicles shall use roads to deviate around the 100-year floodplain. Any damage including tire tracks and ruts will be rectified to a state that is consistent with existing conditions. "	Section 4.4.3	Revise W-7
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-17	Recommended mitigation measure W-8 would require spill response equipment in every vehicle accessing the site from construction through decommissioning. As written, this mitigation measure would require vendor, agency, and personal vehicles accessing the site to carry spill equipment. Recommend the measure be rephrased to read "Spill response equipment would be stored in every all project-owned vehicles accessing the site, including work trucks and heavy equipment during construction, operation, and decommissioning. "	Water Resources	Revise W-8 as written: "Spill response equipment would be stored in every all project-owned vehicles accessing the site, including work trucks and heavy equipment, during construction, operation, and decommissioning."	4.4.3	Revise W-8
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-18	The proposed mitigation measures W-10 and ENR-5 requiring recycling of solar panel wash water should be deleted because they are inconsistent with WAC 197-11-660, which requires that mitigation measures be related to specific adverse environmental impacts and that they be reasonable and capable of being accomplished. The impact of washing solar panels is correctly identified as 'negligible, temporary, unlikely, and confined' in Table 4.4-4b. Operational impacts on the public water supply are described as 'low', based on an analysis considering that all operational water would come from the City of Kennewick. Please see the Revised ASC submitted to EFSEC on December 30, 2022, for supplemental information on water sources; an alternate water source has been identified that does not rely on the City of Kennewick. In addition, Attachment 4 provides documentation that Scout will be able to lease water from the Department of Ecology sufficient to supply water during construction and subsequent operations. Any public water supplier would not be adversely impacted by providing that water for agreed rates; if they do not have available water, they will not sell it. Therefore, the operational impact on public water supply would be negligible. Requiring such a measure is disproportionate to the degree of impact and for these reasons is inconsistent with WAC 197-11- 660 and should not be included in the SCA.	Water Resources Energy and Natural Resources Public Services and Utilities	The FEIS will be updated to reflect the Applicant's updated ASC. This includes removing the City of Kennewick as the water supplier. According to the updated ASC, water would be sourced from an off-site utility such as an off-site public utility, private irrigator, or well. The water would be transported to site by truck for use during construction and operation. WAC 197-11-660 enables EFSEC apply mitigation for adverse impacts, it does not stipulate the impact must be significant.	4.4.3	Revise FEIS to include the Applicant's updated ASC information
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-19	Recommend removal of the analysis of indirect impacts and requirements for mitigation within a 0.5 buffer (Zone of Influence) around the Project boundary. Inclusion of analysis and mitigation for indirect habitat impacts results in a change in mitigation policy for Washington EFSEC projects and is infeasible to implement as written. For full explanation and rationale refer to Response to Hab-5 in Attachment 1 .	Wildlife and Habitat	The potential for wind energy projects to result in disturbance effects to wildlife is borne out in the literature and acknowledged in the ASC. While the ASC noted the potential for indirect (sensory) disturbance to wildlife, there were gaps the assessment and mitigation of the impact. WAC 463-60-332 (2) requires that Projects address the potential indirect impacts on habitat and the species that occupy those habitats "... The application shall include a detailed discussion of temporary, permanent, direct and indirect impacts on habitat, species present and their use of the habitat during construction, operation and decommissioning of the energy facility. Impacts shall be quantified in terms of habitat acreage affected, and numbers of individuals affected, threatened or removed". The dEIS uses the term "zone of influence" to describe the potential indirect effects to wildlife, through sensory and other disturbance, that could occur due to the construction and operation of the Project. The application of 0.5 mile buffer was developed to estimate the potential indirect loss based on available literature cited in the dEIS. The literature cited in the dEIS to develop the ZOI was primarily collected from wind power facilities and used as a proxy to estimate the potential impact of the Project. The ZOI was applied to the habitat polygons provided in the ASC to estimate the potential indirect habitat loss of the Project, which is presented in Table 4.6-5 of the dEIS. This table was developed to be consistent with the level of information presented for direct loss and summarizes what type of habitats may occur within 0.5 miles of the microsting corridor and other Project features. These values were created by clipping out direct loss to avoid double counting areas addressed by the Applicant's mitigation strategy. Mitigation measure Hab-5 was developed to respond to WAC 463-60-332 (3)(d) requirement that indicates that mitigation measures should "achieve equivalent or greater habitat quality, value and function for those habitats being impacted". Hab-5 recognizes that the 0.5 ZOI used to estimate potential indirect habitat loss and may not reflect the actual indirect impacts of the Project, once operational, by not linking additional mitigation or compensation with the 0.5 ZOI or values presented in Table 4.6-5. Hab-5 provides a framework for the Applicant to develop a method to quantify the Project specific indirect impact and develop measures to achieve the goal of equal or greater habitat quality and function. The mitigation measures does not specify the ratio of mitigation required for indirect habitat loss, rather requires the Applicant to work with WDFW and EFSEC to develop an Indirect Habitat Loss Management Plan that would describe how loss would be measured, what methods would be implemented to measure loss, and what additional mitigation would be required to account for that habitat loss. The Applicant, in consultation with WDFW and EFSEC, may propose that further mitigation for agricultural land is not require. The proposed methods should consider how survey results in the Lease Boundary can be extrapolated to evaluate the potential indirect habitat loss in adjacent natural habitat that is not accessible by the Application. The Plan would also describe how potential indirect impacts from other developments that could occur during the operation of the Project would be excluded.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-20	Recommend removal of the Hab-1 Mitigation Measure from the DEIS. Regional wildlife corridor models are too coarse to be used for site-specific project siting and permitting and were not intended to be regulatory boundaries. For full explanation and rationale refer to Response to Hab-1 in Attachment 1 .	Wildlife and Habitat	Project components are expected to overlap areas modelled by the Washington Wildlife Connectivity Working Group as habitat linkages. The WWCWG (2013) identifies the modelled linkage centrality corridors as a tool to inform where further disturbance should be avoided. Hab-1 will be updated to provide more specificity to the models referenced. There is ample literature that describes the potential impacts of linear construction (e.g. powerlines, roads) on wildlife. These are discussed in dEIS. The ASC provided a general project layout; however, it is understood that further changes may be made. Once the Applicant has identified their final design and understands what linear features may impact modelled corridors, Hab-1 provides a framework to develop reasonable mitigation to reduce impacts on wildlife that may use the corridor. This could include considering how power poles may change predator-prey relationships or roadways create barriers.	4.6	Update Hab-1
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-21	Recommend changing Hab-2 Mitigation Measure to read: <i>Transmission line crossings of canyons and draws would be minimized. Where crossings are required, the Applicant would provide EFSEC with rationale for the crossings and propose any appropriate additional mitigation measures warranted to reduce potential barriers to movement and wildlife collisions. The mitigation measure reduces potential Project related barriers to wildlife movement while allowing for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential Project related barriers.</i>	Wildlife and Habitat	The addition of the word "appropriate" is not necessary as mitigation measures are required to be reasonable.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-22	Recommended Hab-4 be removed and replaced with following text. For full explanation and rationale refer to Response to Hab-4 in Attachment 1 . As a condition of permit approval, EFSEC will require a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) be formed by the Certificate Holder to advise on the implementation of minimization and mitigation measures and monitoring studies during operations. The TAC will be established prior to commercial operations with representation from, but not limited to: WDFW, the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Yakama Nation and CTUIR resource experts, Benton County, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), landowner(s) and other local interest groups. The TAC will provide a neutral forum in which independent and informed parties can collaborate with the Certificate Holder, and make recommendations to the Certificate Holder and EFSEC, if the TAC deems additional studies or mitigation are warranted to address impacts that were either not foreseen in the Application or the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or exceed impacts that were projected (WDFW 2009, Section 3).	Wildlife and Habitat	EFSEC recommended mitigation measures provided in the dEIS include pre-construction surveys required to fill information gaps on species presence and potential Project impact derived from the current limitations in baseline information and understanding of final project design interaction with wildlife and habitat. The data from pre-construction surveys would be used to inform the requirement of mitigation plans for construction and operation as well as adaptive management. As such, the design of pre-construction studies should be developed in consultation with local experts. Hab-4 will be revised to require the establishment of a pre-construction advisory group instead of a Technical Advisory Group; although, it would likely be beneficial for the Applicant to include members of the TAC in the pre-construction advisory group.	4.6	Update Hab-4
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-23	Recommend removal of Mitigation Measure Hab-6. A final Project design will be submitted to EFSEC prior to construction. Provided the design adheres to all requirements outlined in the Final EIS and Site Certification Agreement issued for the Project, no additional approvals should be required. If the Project varies from the terms and conditions of the FEIS or SCA then approvals will be sought through the standard process with EFSEC. Also refer to Response to Hab-4 in Attachment 1 regarding the role of the TAC.	Wildlife and Habitat	Hab-6 provides EFSEC the ability to work with the Applicant to understand how the final design has been developed to meet the Final EIS. There are information gaps remaining from the ASC that could affect the final design and management plans associated with implementation of the final design. Hab-6 will be updated to reference the PAG instead of the TAC.	4.6	Update Hab-6
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-24	Spec-1 through Spec-13 are species related measures with the aim of identifying and minimizing effects on species during Project-related activities. They all involve pre-construction surveys and then some determination of whether further data collection or mitigation is required. We recommend removing these measures and consolidating them into one measure that captures the intent of Spec-1 through Spec-13. This approach is a better match for how surveys will actually occur and allows for close coordination with WDFW and EFSEC to determine if any additional surveys or mitigation should be completed. The recommended new mitigation measure is located below in this comment. The scope of the response for the recommended species-specific mitigation measures do not correspond with the level of biological impact for many of the species discussed. For example, one observation of one blue heron during an avian use survey. The mitigation measure (SPEC-6) that requires the Applicant maintain a database of incidental observations does not result in mitigation measures that reduce mortality. Separate management plans for individual species and survey requirements should be consolidated into one general preconstruction clearance survey requirement for Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species (TESS) survey to adequately address avoidance and minimization measures during construction. Incidental observations to inform adaptive management measures provides a weak foundation to effectively modify Project measures that minimize impacts. Adaptive management should be based on data from rigorous post-construction biological surveys that collect systematic fatality data. None of the sensitive species listed in the DEIS are commonly found at operational wind facilities in the Columbia Plateau Ecoregion of Washington and Oregon. In an assessment of direct impacts to bird populations in the CPE, populations level effects to all sensitive species, except ferruginous hawk, from wind energy operation is unanticipated due to the relatively small number of fatalities documented and relatively large population sizes (Jansen 2023). Thus separate management plans beyond what is proposed through the Wildlife Incident Reporting and Handling and System (WIRHS), and other wildlife fatality monitoring programs is unnecessary. Therefore, in accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. As discussed in response to HAB-4 and HAB-5 (see Attachment 1), the development and advisory role of the TAC is intended to occur during the operational phase of the Project and not during the construction phase. The purpose of the TAC is advisory in nature and meant to review post-construction monitoring data and make suggestions to the project owner and EFSEC regarding the need to adjust mitigation and monitoring requirements based on results of monitoring data and other relevant data (WDFW 2009). The TAC is not meant to serve as an arbiter that deems the adequacy of a construction design or serve as a surrogate for a permitting authority. RECOMMENDED NEW SPEC-14: The Certificate Holder will complete a pre-construction survey for species identified as special status in the ASC. The survey will be completed during a time of year when species are most likely to be detected (likely spring/summer), during the survey year prior to construction start. If any special-status species are observed during the pre-construction survey the Certificate Holder will coordinate with WDFW and EFSEC to determine if any additional minimization measures should be implemented during construction and if any additional surveys or data collection should be completed and the timing of that work.	Wildlife and Habitat	There were information gaps in the ASC and subsequent information submissions regarding the presence of special status species and their habitat in the Project area. As such, characterizing the impact of the Project on special status species was based on GAP habitat mapping provided by the Applicant that suggested these species could occupy the Lease Boundary and adjacent habitat. Species specific mitigation measures have been provided in the dEIS to fill these information gaps and provide specificity regarding the type of mitigation measure to be considered in the event the species is detected. As noted by the Applicant in their comment, the level of mitigation in these measures have been scaled according to the anticipated likelihood of an impact (e.g. great blue heron). The WIRHS will provide observation of wildlife fatalities; however, collection of incidental observations of live wildlife can be used to track general wildlife trends over the duration of Project operation and provide information to be considered in adaptive management.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-25	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), proposed mitigation measure Spec-1 is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Recommend revising Mitigation Measure Spec-1 as follows: The Applicant would conduct pre-construction surveys for sensitive reptile species prior to alteration or destruction of suitable habitat such as areas within the Lease Boundary identified as core habitat in GAP mapping, as well as shrubland (e.g., shrub-steppe, rabbitbrush). These surveys will be conducted along with surveys for other special status species as described in mitigation measure Spec-14 . The results of pre-construction surveys would be shared with EFSEC and WDFW and any necessary setbacks or modifications to the construction schedule to minimize impacts on species observed would be determined. ould be contacted prior to undertaking these surveys. These species are identified through pre-construction surveys, the Applicant would prepare a Reptile Management Plan to reduce potential impacts on habitat, mortality, and barriers to movement. The Reptile Management Plan would describe: •How the Applicant would avoid suitable habitat, including where the species were observed •How the Applicant would implement management recommendations in Larsen (1997) •How the Applicant would maintain rodent burrows in suitable reptile habitat (e.g., shrub-steppe) •Additional mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce potential mortality of these species during the construction and operation stages of the Project The Reptile Management Plan would be reviewed by the TAC and approved by EFSEC prior to initiation of construction. Survey results and proposed adaptive management would be reviewed by the TAC prior to implementation (see Hab-4). The mitigation measure avoids and reduces potential striped whipsnake and sagebrush lizard habitat loss and mortality while allowing for adaptive management through Project construction and operation.	Wildlife and Habitat	Information provided in the ASC and subsequent information (e.g. GAP mapping) by the applicant indicate that suitable habitat for special status reptile species may be impacted by the Project. As such, Spec-1 is consistent with WAC 197-11-660 , which requires mitigation measures to be specific to adverse environmental impacts, such as loss of habitat and potential mortality. Spec-1 has been developed to provide clarity as to the type of mitigation that should be considered in the event a special status reptile is documented during pre-construction surveys. Spec-1 directs the Applicant to develop pre-construction survey methods with input from WDFW and does not provide direction on how the pre-construction surveys should be undertaken. As such, the Applicant and WDFW may discuss conducting the pre-construction surveys in tandem if appropriate. Spec-1 would be applicable while potential impacts to the species remain, which includes operation; however, allows for adaptive management as the type and extent of Project-related impacts changes.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1B Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

Submission-1102200			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Recommendation/Contribution	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-26	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), proposed mitigation measure Spec-2 is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Recommend removal of Mitigation Measure Spec-2. Applicant will record and report any observations of America white pelican during recommended pre-construction surveys described above in Comment 24 .	Wildlife and Habitat	The ASC reported that American white pelican has been observed in the Lease Boundary and the Project could result in mortality. Maintaining databases of incidental observations provides some information on species presence in the Lease Boundary that can inform discussions regarding whether additional data may be required. The mitigation measures will be updated.	4.6	Update mitigation measures
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-27	Recommend Mitigation Measure Spec-4 is revised as follows (see Comment 24 for proposed modified condition Spec-14): The Applicant would conduct burrowing owl surveys within areas of direct loss. Applicant will record and report any observations of burrowing owl during recommended pre-construction surveys described in mitigation measure Spec-14. (permanent, temporary, and modified) and associated ZOLs. The results of these surveys would be provided to the TAC and EFSEC for review, and used to inform the final Project layout. Active burrows would be retained and satellite burrows with characteristics used by burrowing owls would be avoided where feasible to maintain habitat capacity. If active burrowing owl burrows are documented during pre-construction surveys the Applicant will coordinate with WDFW and EFSEC on any necessary buffers around active nests during construction. Apply WDFW-recommended seasonal buffers (0.5 miles) (Larsen et al. 2004) for burrowing owl nests to avoid disturbing nesting burrowing owls, if present. Seasonal buffers (February 15 to September 25) would be applied during construction and for temporary disturbances, such as periodic maintenance, during operation. If active burrowing owls are identified in the Lease Boundary, the Applicant would develop a species-specific management plan that describes: •Time location of active burrows •Will owl active burrows would be avoided through re-alignment or reconfiguration of Project features •Additional mitigation measures that would be applied where disturbance to active burrows is expected (e.g., construction of artificial burrows) •Ongoing monitoring of active burrows The Burrowing Owl Management Plan would be reviewed by the TAC and approved by EFSEC prior to initiation of construction. Survey results and proposed adaptive management would be reviewed by the TAC prior to implementation (see Hab 4). The Applicant would monitor access roads for burrowing owl use and mortalities. Mortalities would be reported to the TAC and EFSEC within 5 days of the observation. Incidental observations of burrowing owl use would be provided to the TAC on an annual basis. The mitigation measure avoids and reduces potential loss of burrowing owl habitat, disturbance to burrowing owls, and burrowing owl mortality, while allowing for adaptive management through Project construction and operation.	Wildlife and Habitat	The mitigation measure has been developed to fill current information gaps on burrowing owl occupancy in the Lease Boundary and provide clarity to the type of mitigation measures that should be considered if active burrows are recorded during pre-construction surveys. The mitigation measures reference buffer areas recommended by WDFW (Larsen et al. 2004) and referenced in the Applicant commitments.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-28	Recommend changing Spec-5 Mitigation Measure to replace every occurrence where ferruginous hawk nests are mentioned with a new description as follows: "- ferruginous hawk stick nests that have been occupied by a raptor species within the previous year's breeding season. nests documented in PHS data and in Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC (2021a). " PHS data contains nests first documented a century ago that no longer exist on the landscape. As written, the Project would be required to avoid these locations but this avoidance would have no material benefit to the species. Ferruginous hawk exhibit high nest fidelity, meaning breeding pairs may return to the same area to nest year after year; thus relying on the nesting status of the previous year is a useful indicator of what could occur the following year; however, this nesting pattern does not always transpire. For example, Nest 03 was occupied by a ferruginous hawk 2017–2019 but did not nest in 2022. The Applicant has committed to conduct raptor nest surveys annually at the Project for the first 5 years of operation and the results will be integrated into minimization measures through the adaptive management plan. The Applicant provided a revised Attachment L: Habitat Mitigation Plan to the ASC in December 2022 which includes more specificity about mitigation commitments regarding the location of mitigation lands, which are in alignment with the criteria included in Spec-5. The Applicant has also committed to implementing specific ferruginous hawk minimization measures and to installing nesting platforms in the ferruginous hawk core use area to improve nest productivity for the species. This was based on additional studies completed and submitted to EFSEC in December 2022, including the Ferruginous Hawk Population Viability Analysis, Ferruginous Hawk Resource Selection Function Analysis, and the Columbia Plateau Ecosystem Cumulative Impact Assessment on Birds, Bats, and Land Cover.	Wildlife and Habitat	As noted in the Applicant's comment, Ferruginous hawk show high nest site fidelity; however, may not continuously occupy the nest annually, as was demonstrated by the Applicant's data for Nest 03. As such, relying on one year's worth of nest data, such as the previous year's data would not accurately capture the nesting activity of a breeding pair or account for the potential for a nest to become occupied. Further, nest territories may remain unoccupied for several years (WDFW reports territories becoming active after 20 years of inactivity). WDFW has confirmed that periodic reviews of ferruginous hawk territories are conducted to remove territories that are not expected to support ferruginous hawk in the future due to substantial loss of habitat within core territory. Buffering nests reported in PHS data is intended to preserve the suitability of currently available habitat for nesting hawks and the capacity of nesting territories that have not been active recently. The Applicants new commitments identified in the revised Appendix L are intended to increase the availability of nesting habitat for ferruginous hawk by providing more nesting platforms. It is understood, from conversations with WDFW, that nesting habitat may not be limiting in the area and therefore additional nesting platforms may not be used. WDFW noted that artificial platforms have been successful in increasing nesting ferruginous hawks in areas, such as Alberta, where these features are limiting. However, the results of similar efforts in Washington State have not rendered high success as the availability of nesting substrate is not limited.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-29	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), proposed mitigation measure Spec-6 is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Recommend removal of Mitigation Measure Spec-6. Applicant will record and report any observations of great blue heron, sandhill crane, or tundra swan during recommended pre-construction surveys described above in Comment 24 . Larsen et al. (2004) states Sandhill crane areas should be avoided but does not describe what activities would be permissible nor temporal aspects to the avoidance. Should mitigation measure Spec-6 be retained in the SCA, recommend greater clarity for buffers be provided on this mitigation measure. Recommended redline changes as follows: The Applicant would maintain a database of incidental observation of great blue heron, sandhill crane, and tundra swan foraging in the Lease Boundary during operation. Observational data and proposed adaptive management strategies would be reviewed with the TAC annually (see Hab 4). The Applicant would reduce the use of overhead power lines, where possible. If sandhill crane species are observed in the Lease Boundary, the Applicant would apply buffers recommended in Larsen et al (2004)(a) sandhill crane feeding areas (0.5 miles) and roosting areas (0.3 miles), if documented in the Lease Boundary. The mitigation measure avoids and reduces potential disturbance to and mortality of great blue heron, sandhill crane and tundra swan, while allowing for adaptive management through Project construction and operation.	Wildlife and Habitat	It is unclear from the comment what the suggested changes to the mitigation measure are. Larsen et al (2004) references new construction and increases in traffic as activities to be avoided within 0.5 miles of foraging areas. It is expected that the Applicant would seek clarity from WDFW on the application of their guidelines if work is expected to occur within 0.5 miles of a foraging area.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-30	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), proposed mitigation measure Spec-7 is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Recommend removal of Mitigation Measure Spec-7. Applicant will record and report any observations of loggerhead shrike, sagebrush sparrow, sage thrasher, or Vaux's swift during recommended pre-construction surveys described above in Comment 24 .	Wildlife and Habitat	The Project has potential to impact loggerhead shrike, sagebrush sparrow, sage thrasher, and Vaux's swift habitat and individuals (e.g. mortality). The mitigation measure has been included to reduce the potential impacts to these species.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-31	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure Spec-8 is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. If mitigation measure Spec-8 is retained in the SCA, recommend the following replacement language for Mitigation Measure Spec-8 (see Comment 24 for proposed modified condition Spec-14): Applicant will record and report any observations of prairie falcon during recommended pre-construction surveys described in Spec-14. If nesting prairie falcons are observed before or during construction the Applicant will coordinate with EFSEC and WDFW to determine appropriate buffers from construction activity to minimize disturbance while the nest is active.	Wildlife and Habitat	The proposed language does not provide specificity to the type of surveys that would be conducted for Prairie falcon (e.g. nest surveys) or clarify mitigation measures that would be applied in the event an active nest is located. Spec-8 is based on WDFW recommended buffers presented in Larson et al (2004), which was referenced in the ASC.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-32	Recommend removal of Mitigation Measure Spec-10. Recommend reduction of impact magnitude from Medium to Low for Operations of Turbine Options and removal of mitigation measure. In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Applicant will record and report any observations of jackrabbit during recommended pre-construction surveys described in Comment 24 .	Wildlife and Habitat	The mitigation measure has been proposed to address information gaps in the ASC regarding jackrabbit presence and habitat use. Data provided by the Applicant included GAP predictive mapping that suggests the Lease Boundary provides habitat for the species. Table 4.6-2 outlines the criteria used to describe magnitude ratings. A magnitude of Medium is described as "The incremental change is expected to result in a clearly defined change that could result in changes to the population over shorter and longer periods of time; however, it remains below a level of impact that could exceed the resiliency and adaptability limits of the population." Based on the information provided to EFSEC at the time of drafting the dEIS the Project could result in a loss of jackrabbit habitat availability that may result in changes to the population. However, it is expected that loss of habitat other impacts associated with the Project on jackrabbit would be within the adaptability of the population.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-33	Recommend modifying Mitigation Measure Spec-12 as follows: The Applicant would conduct surveys for Townsend's ground squirrel colonies in areas of the Project disturbance footprint (including ZOL) to inform final design. The Applicant would Applicant will record and report any observations of Townsend's ground squirrel during recommended pre-construction surveys described in Comment 25. If the species is detected during pre-construction surveys the Applicant will consider how to avoid minimize habitat loss in occupied colonies during construction within Townsend's ground squirrel habitat concentration areas, as well as known colonies detected during pre-construction surveys in final design. Additional Townsend's ground squirrel colonies identified through surveys would be shown on Project mapping and a species-specific management plan would be developed for areas where avoidance is not feasible. This plan would provide rationale for why colonies cannot be avoided and would provide additional mitigation measures, such as colony relocation and reconstruction of habitat features. The plans would be provided and discussed with the TAC and approved by EFSEC, if avoidance of identified ground squirrel colonies is not feasible. Observational data and adaptive management strategies would be reviewed with the TAC annually during operations. The mitigation measure reduces potential loss of Townsend's ground squirrel habitat, disturbance of squirrel colonies, and Townsend's ground squirrel mortality, while allowing for adaptive management through Project construction and operation. The recommended measure to conduct ground squirrel surveys outside the Project lease boundary is beyond the control of the Applicant and is biologically unnecessary. Townsend's ground squirrel colonies are commonly found along roads, transportation rights-of-way, and other human development, thus indirect impacts to squirrel colonies outside the Project Boundary (particularly 0.5 miles away from disturbance) is not expected. Compensatory habitat mitigation for loss of habitat accounts for the loss of function and value to species that use the habitat, thus additional habitat mitigation for impacts to ground squirrels would duplicate the amount of mitigation the Project has already committed to. Precedent for how squirrel colonies are addressed during development can be referenced in the Goose Prairie Solar Project, permitted by EFSEC. No adjustments were made to final Project designs based on the presence of Townsend's ground squirrel colonies. Therefore, in accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Finally, the TAC is an advisory council that serves during the post-construction phase of the Project and per the Wind Power Guidelines its purview does not include Project design or construction elements.	Wildlife and Habitat	The revised language would not adequately survey for Townsend's ground squirrel colony in order to apply further mitigation to retain habitat required to support this species. Further, this species is an important prey item for Ferruginous hawk, which is known to occur in the Lease Boundary. The mitigation measure is not intended to require the Applicant to conduct surveys in private lands beyond their control. As such, additional clarifying language will be added to the measure.	4.6	Update mitigation measure.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-34	In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. Recommend the following replacement language for Mitigation Measure Spec-13: The Applicant will negotiate access agreements for priority areas for the Yakama Nation and WDFW when needed to conduct desired pronghorn antelope surveys. Fencing around utility scale solar facilities is a US Fire and Electrical Code requirement. Pronghorn are a non-listed, introduced, and unregulated species that have limited use in the Horse Heaven Hills based on WDFW survey data. Once the Project is constructed, there are no feasible adaptive management strategies that would increase or decrease pronghorn use in the area.	Wildlife and Habitat	Pronghorn antelope were included in the dEIS due to their importance to the Yakama Nation, who have collaborated with WDFW to re-introduce the species to the region. While their presence in the Project Lease Boundary may be currently be occasional, their range may expand through the duration of Project Operation resulting in increased interactions between Project operation and this species. An example of adaptive management that could be implemented during operation may be a review of Project road use and speeds due to increased pronghorn presence (overall or seasonally). Spec-13 does not exclude the use of fencing around the solar facilities, rather requires the Applicant to consider methods, if any, to reduce the extent of fencing within the Project Lease Boundary.	4.6	n/a

Table 10-1B Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

Submission-1102200			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Recommendation/Contribution	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-35	Recommend changing Wild-1 Mitigation action to read as follows: "Upon completion of the two-year bird and bat post-construction fatality monitoring program, the Applicant would review the results with EFSEC and WDFW, the TAC, and determine whether additional monitoring and mitigation measures are necessary. This mitigation measure allows for continued monitoring and adaptive management of potential Project related wildlife mortalities."	Wildlife and Habitat	The edited changes are unclear. The purpose of reviewing results with EFSEC, WDFW, and the TAC is to allow for adaptive management, if the results of the post-construction fatality monitoring program are not consistent with the impacts predicted in the ASC and FEIS.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-36	Recommend revising Wild-5 Mitigation action to read as follows: "The Applicant would limit construction disturbance by identifying sensitive areas on maps and flagging any sensitive areas including wildlife features, such as wildlife colonies, active nests, dens, and wetlands in the field, but will be limited in circumstances to be allowed when the Applicant's biologist determines it not to be detrimental to the resource. The Applicant would conduct ongoing environmental monitoring during construction to ensure that flagged areas are avoided. This mitigation measure reduces potential loss of habitat and wildlife mortality."	Wildlife and Habitat	The mitigation measure will be updated to include: Encroachment into sensitive areas required during construction would be reviewed by the Applicant's biologist to determine the impact and recommend additional measures to required to manage impacts to the resource. The Applicant would provide information on where encroachment was required, rationale for encroachment, and additional mitigation measures implemented to EFSEC for review	4.6	Update mitigation measure
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-37	Remove Wild-6 mitigation as it is redundant to the Applicant's mitigation as addressed on Page 4: 190 "Personnel would be instructed to use the Applicant's incidental reporting process to document bird or bat casualties during construction of the Project." as well as in the Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy Section 7.2.1 Compliance and Reporting resource protection measures, including: 2) the importance of these resources and the purpose and necessity of protecting the resources, and ensuring this information is disseminated to applicable contractor personnel, including the correct reporting procedures. It also states that personnel will be instructed to use the HHWF incidental reporting process to document bird or bat casualties during construction at the Project.	Wildlife and Habitat	The Applicant's commitments are specific to bird and bat fatalities and does not include documentation of other mortalities that could occur during construction and operation (e.g. road collisions). Wild-6 is intended to fill this gap.	4.6	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-38	Mitigation measure ENR-6 would require removal of wind turbine foundations below 3 feet bgs. Removal down to 3 ft bgs is standard practice for wind energy projects because that depth is adequate to avoid equipment strike from typical farming practice. Removal below this depth does not provide significant environmental benefit and is inconsistent with precedent (see e.g. Wild Horse SCA). The applicant has conferred with landowners and agreed to lease terms that require removal of foundations down to 3 ft bgs. Request the mitigation be modified to conform to standard practice as follows: To retrieve as much of the natural resources used in construction and operation of the Project as possible, the Applicant would demolish or remove all above ground level Project-related equipment and facilities from the Lease Boundary, and concrete foundations within 3 feet of the ground surface. If the Applicant intends to leave any other portion of the facility, including concrete foundations, they must submit a request to EFSEC in an update to their decommissioning plan.	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged, but no changes will be made to ENR-6 in the FEIS.	4.7	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-39	Recommend that mitigation measure ENR-7 be revised similar to the Montague Wind condition described below to avoid ambiguity, with additional details to be provided in the decommissioning plan as it is developed consistent with timing in the SCA. The applicant is committed to recycling materials that can reasonably be recycled, such as metals, paper, glass, and recyclable plastic components. Used oils would be recycled. Appendix A to the ASC, Preliminary Decommissioning Plan, identifies additional recycling measures for solar module components, electrical wire, racking and fencing material, etc. However, mitigation measure ENR-7 as written is vague and risks requiring recycling of materials that could have theoretical potential for re-use but in practical terms no cost-effective process or plants have yet been developed. For example, some specialized project components such as lithium currently have very immature recycling markets. The Washington legislature is currently considering legislation that would support recycling such that wind turbine blades and solar panels would have markets available to allow recycling of these materials. We are hopeful that these markets will be developed by the time the project is decommissioned but request that if EFSEC opts to include this mitigation measure as a requirement in the SCA, that the measure be worded more carefully to make the requirement clear and tied to practical measures. In addition, please note that a search of previous SCAs in Washington did not identify recycling requirements for any projects but instead required development of a decommissioning plan to be approved by EFSEC. Site Certificates issued by Oregon EFSC identify recycling requirements in general but defer the details to a decommissioning plan. An example is Montague Wind, which includes the following requirement for both the construction and operations phases: (112) The certificate holder shall implement a waste management plan during facility operation that includes but is not limited to the following measures: (a) Training employees to minimize and recycle solid waste. (b) Recycling paper products, metals, glass and plastics. (c) Recycling used oil and hydraulic fluid. (d) Collecting non-recyclable waste for transport to a local landfill by a licensed waste hauler. (e) Segregating all hazardous, non-recyclable wastes such as used oil, oily rags and oil-absorbent materials, and mercury-containing lights for disposal by a licensed firm specializing in the proper recycling or disposal of hazardous wastes.	Energy and Natural Resources	Comment acknowledged, but no changes will be made to ENR-7 in the FEIS.	4.7	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-40	Recommend revision of the draft EIS definitions in Section 4.8.2 of permanent vs temporary disturbance to be consistent with precedent for calculating impacts for solar facilities. The draft EIS includes all of the acres of temporary habitat alteration (e.g., vegetated areas under solar arrays) as "permanent" impacts, which result in inflated assessments of Project impacts in multiple sections of the draft EIS. The total acreage of agricultural lands that would meet the definition of a permanent (impermeable) impact is low – only about 489 acres. The remainder of the agricultural lands would have either temporary impacts or have habitat modification to grassland. As approved by WDFW for other projects in Washington, modified habitat within the solar facility does not warrant the same mitigation ratio as impermeable surfaces. All lands that are temporarily taken out of agricultural production would be returned to agricultural production at the end of the Project.	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged, but to keep the analysis of Agricultural lands in the ASC and EIS aligned and avoid confusion no changes will be made to section 4.8 in the FEIS in this regard	4.8	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-41	Recommend deletion of Mitigation Measures LSU-1, 2, & 3; Mitigation to limit conflicts between the Project and Lessors is considered overreach and unnecessary, as Project leases require such coordination over the term of the lease. State intervention and oversight in this arena is an unwarranted cost imposed on the certificate holder. The impacts associated with construction and decommissioning are short-term in nature and any damages are compensable. Recommend modifying Table ES-3a associated with Section 4.8 "Magnitude of Impact" from "Medium (operational changes)" to "Low".	Land and Shoreline Use	Comment acknowledged, but no changes will be made to LSU-1, 2, & 3 in the FEIS.	4.8	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-42	On page 4-278, recommend revising the magnitude of impact rating scale as follows: Magnitude – Would the impact result in a direct or indirect alteration to the characteristics that would qualify the resource for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the resource's integrity, or, for precontact resources, does the impact result in a direct or indirect alteration to the resource itself or the surrounding environment? What is the resource sensitivity? Are Project-related impacts on historic and cultural resources negligible, low, medium, or high in terms of their severity? Resource sensitivity: Impacted resources are fully evaluated and not eligible for NRHP listing or are eligible but the impact will not result in an alteration to the characteristics that qualify the resource for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the resource's integrity. Additionally, applying an automatic rating of a high magnitude of impact to all NRHP-eligible resources, just because they are eligible, does not consider the fact that a resource will be impacted by the Project, but that impact is not on a characteristic of the resource that qualifies for listing in the NRHP. For example, for some resources, the environmental setting is not a characteristic that qualifies them for the NRHP, so a change to the setting should not be rated as high; instead, it should be rated as negligible. This is the case with BPA transmission line 721666; the viewshed and environmental setting of this resource not a characteristic that qualifies it for inclusion in the NRHP, so a change to the viewshed is not a high impact. The remaining historic-period architectural resource—an electricity transmission line, resource 721666 (detailed in Section 3.9)—is eligible for listing under the NRHP. The Project will impact the environmental setting of this resource via some local, short term, unavoidable impacts through alteration of the viewshed (with no physical impacts to the transmission line resource itself). However, the setting is not an important aspect of the resource's integrity, and a change to the setting does not result in a loss of its integrity (i.e., its ability to convey its NRHP significance), so the impact on the resource would be negligible in magnitude.	Historic and Cultural Resources	The recommended revisions to the Magnitude attribute will be reviewed. Discussion of the integrity of unevaluated or eligible cultural resources may be warranted. In addition, alteration(s) to precontact resources and the surrounding environment may be an important factor to consider in assessing magnitude of impacts. The recommended revision to resource sensitivity will be reviewed. Please note that the DEIS states that, "Resource sensitivity has been considered even when the intent of the Applicant's APP is to avoid the identified resource." Magnitude ratings for Project impacts to eligible cultural resources will be reviewed. Attention will be given to the characteristics that qualify such resources for inclusion in the NRHP. Project impacts to the integrity of eligible resources will also be reviewed.	4.9	Review recommended revisions to Magnitude attribute and resource sensitivity. Determine whether resource sensitivity should be evaluated separately from Project impacts. Review magnitude ratings for Project impacts to eligible cultural resources.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-43	Additional cultural resource investigations were completed in Fall 2022. These investigations demonstrated that resources 45BN2086, 45BN2088, 45BN2093, 45BN2157, and 45BN2158 are not eligible for listing on the NRHP and therefore do not require protection. This report will be provided to EFSEC as soon as reviews have been completed by tribal representatives and DAHP. Accordingly, the Final EIS should reflect updated information on eligibility and protection.	Historic and Cultural Resources	The FEIS will include all updated information on eligibility and impacts to resources 45BN2086, 45BN2088, 45BN2093, 45BN2157, and 45BN2158.	3.9.2; 3.9.7; 4.9.2; 4.9.3	Update FEIS once all relevant information becomes available.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-44	Table 4.9-3 states "Unevaluated or Not Eligible Precontact Isolates and Sites". Recommend deletion of "Unevaluated or Not Eligible" as precontact resources are not evaluated for the NRHP for this Project but are subject to state law.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Table 4.9-3 will be revised.	4.9.2.1	Revise Table 4.9-3 as recommended.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-45	Table 4.9-4 states "Not Eligible Precontact Isolate". Recommend deletion of "Not Eligible" as precontact resources are not evaluated for the NRHP for this Project but are subject to state law.	Historic and Cultural Resources	Table 4.9-4 will be revised.	4.9.2.1	Revise Table 4.9-3 as recommended.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-46	Recommend changing SF-1 Mitigation Measure by replacing "nearby" with "non-participating" with respect to residences. Because the Applicant is addressing shadow flicker concerns directly through agreements with participating residences, this mitigation measure should only apply to non-participating residences. In addition, the following statement should be deleted: "As a last resort, the control system of the wind turbine could be programmed to stop the blades during brief periods when conditions result in a perceptible shadow flicker," as it merely states the capability of software features and not required mitigation. In accordance with WAC 197-11-660, we request this change as it is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, nor is it tied to policies, plans, rules, or regulations formally designated by an agency.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Recommendations acknowledged. Will revise SF-1 to reflect added context.	4.10.2.4	SF-1a: Replace "nearby" with "non-participating". SF-1b: Delete sentence as recommended, revise previous sentence thusly: "Shadow flicker can usually be addressed by planting trees, shading windows, operational programming, or other mitigation measures."
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-47	Recommend the revision of SF-2 Mitigation Measure to refer to Mitigation Measure N-4 as they are duplicates and will be a common contact methodology.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Acknowledged that the recommended complaint resolution mitigation measures should reference the same common contact methodology	4.10.2.4	Revisions will cross over multiple FEIS sections.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-48	Recommend changing Vis-1 Mitigation Measure to read: Relocate wind turbines located within the foreground distance zone (0 to 0.5 miles) to be at least four times the maximum blade tip height of the wind turbine rotor from nonparticipating residences to avoid completely dominating views from these highly sensitive viewing locations. Siting the wind turbines this far further away would reduce the level of visual contrast and prominence (CESA 2011; BLM 2013). The draft EIS cites BLM 2013 guidance and CESA 2011 guidance for this recommended measure, but without noting the specific grounds. The report does not prescribe distance zones to be used to drive wind turbine placement or mitigate visual impacts. It actually states the opposite: These distance zones are for use in conducting VRIs only. While distance is an important factor in the perception of visual contrast in the landscape (see Section 2.2.4), BLM distance zones are not used in visual contrast or impact analyses, or to identify appropriate mitigation (BLM Document pg 9) . While wind turbines viewed within 0.5 mi from a non-participant residence would be in the foreground, EFSEC has previously established a precedent for setbacks for wind turbines of 4 x the M8TH (Kittitas Valley Wind, et al), which is an objective standard that provides a more nuanced approach to reducing impacts tailored to wind turbine size. The CESA document contains the following: In closer proximity, turbines will appear larger, more prominent, and seen more clearly with more visible detail. The concepts of foreground, middleground, and background are often used to describe our visual experience of the landscape from different distances. Due to the size and high visibility of wind turbines, the distance zones historically used in visual analysis may need to be reconsidered. Certainly views of wind projects in middleground to background areas are an important consideration. Turbines viewed at distances of less than ½ mile (foreground) are likely to have the greatest impacts, and viewers will recognize a higher level of detail. At this distance, turbines appear as part of one's immediate surroundings. They may also be audible in certain conditions within this distance.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Based on the taller turbines proposed for this Project , as well as the final result of the turbine setback requirements identified in the amended 2009 Site Certification Agreement for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, it was found that the 4x the turbine height was insufficient to reduce impacts on non-participating residences. "For each turbine located within 2,500 feet of a non-participating landowner's existing residence, micro-siting determinations shall give highest priority to increasing the distance of the turbine from that non-participating landowner's residence, even beyond the minimum four times height setback described above, so as to further mitigate and minimize any visual impacts on that non-participating landowner". This is consistent with the project's assessment of visual contrast which determined the Project would completely dominate views within 0.5 mile of the proposed turbines while, from many KOP locations, continuing to dominate views up to 5 miles away. The distance zones referenced in the DEIS correspond to project analysis and not the BLM Visual Resource Inventory Distance Zones. No changes to this mitigation measure have been made.	4.1	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-49	Mitigation Measure Vis-4 is impractical and unnecessary, and should be eliminated. In accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (a) and (b), the proposed mitigation measure is not based on policies, plans, rules, or regulations, and is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, and therefore it should not be included as a condition to the SCA. The BLM reference document (BLM 2013, Chapter 4) is not directly applicable to non-BLM land, but is simply a reference to be utilized where it may add value. Color-treatment primarily applies to solar thermal designs, not applicable to PV solar as panels cannot be treated. NHEC will utilize bi-facial PV module design. Per BLM 2013, Photovoltaic (PV) projects generally have lower visual impacts than the other technologies because of the low profile of the collector arrays and the lower reflectivity of the PV panels compared to the highly reflective mirrors used by the other technologies. While color treating large tanks or storage buildings or other structures can be very effective visual mitigation per BLM's guidance, color treating photovoltaic panels is not feasible as it would interfere with energy conversion. Applying color treatments to support structures (stringer posts) would not be effective, because the posts are of small dimension and not highly visible because they are hidden by the panels. The visual simulations illustrate how the dark glass panels are the primary visual element of the solar field.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	This mitigation measure will be removed based on technological limitations of applying a color treatment to the solar panels, the primary generator of visual impacts. Installation of opaque fencing (VIS-6) would reduce impacts where level views of the arrays would occur, such as from KOP 12 (as simulated), reducing visibility of the PV support structures. Based on application of VIS-6, color treating the PV support structures would not be required.	4.1	Mitigation measure VIS-4 will be removed.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-50	Condition Vis-6; No non-participating residences are located adjacent to the solar arrays. The term 'viewpoint' is vague in this context; Key Observation Points were identified in the ASC to depict how the project would appear from various locations, but identification of a KOP for purposes of this analysis does not constitute identification of a viewpoint that requires protection. In addition, opaque fencing would create new adverse impacts to wildlife that we are trying to avoid by implementation of other measures such as raising fence off the ground. Opaque fencing would not alter visibility of panels from higher elevation KOPs such as Badger Mountain or Viewpoint 3. The applicant requests that if EFSEC opts to retain this mitigation measure as a condition to the SCA, that it be rephrased to require that only non-participating residences within 500 feet of a solar array be screened.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	Text has been revised to state "KOPs (including the alignment of I-82)" instead of viewpoint as suggested. The purpose of this mitigation is to reduce impacts on highly sensitive viewing areas (including residences as many were not specifically analyzed by a KOP location) where the Project would dominate views. Reducing impacts on views from residences considers both participating and non-participating properties as impacts on these properties (and their viewers) would occur whether they have signed a project agreement. Correct, this mitigation measure would not reduce impacts on views from more distant KOPs but that is not why this mitigation measure has been proposed, instead it would reduce impacts on viewers located in proximity to the Project. To clarify application of this mitigation measure, if any residence or KOP location is within 0.5 mile of a proposed solar array, installation of opaque fencing would be installed on the side toward those viewers.	4.10.2.4	Changing "viewpoint" to "KOP (including the alignment of I-82)" to better match language used in section and identify a 0.5 mile buffer for its application.

Table 10-1B Horse Heaven Project Public Comments & Responses Tracking Table

Submission-1102200			Public Comment Responses			
Author	Unique ID	Recommendation/Contribution	Subject (choose from drop-down)	Comment Response	Section Number in DEIS	Revisions to be reflected in FEIS (if applicable)
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-51	Recommend that the finding of unavoidable significant adverse impact in Section 4.10.2.5 is not warranted and should be de-escalated. The applicant acknowledges there would be a high degree of visual change from specific viewpoints, including residences and public areas where numerous wind turbines would be seen skylined across the ridgeline. However, the landscape from which the wind turbines could be seen is not protected, designated, or managed for scenic quality. No designated local, state or federal vistas or viewsheds have been identified. The surrounding landscape is of a highly modified, developed agrarian to suburban visual character, as exemplified by the presence of single family housing developments on many of the ridges within the Project vicinity. Following the CESA methodology for visual impacts used for preparation of the DEIS, the first criteria to determine the magnitude of visual impacts is "does the project violate a clear written standard intended to protect the scenic values or aesthetics of the area or particular scenic resource ." The Project does not "violate a clear written standard intended to protect the scenic values or aesthetics of the area or particular scenic resource" because no such written standard or resource is documented. Because the Project is proposed outside of and away from lands designated or protected for scenic quality, it is reasonable to assume that views within Project's setting will change over time. Lacking unmitigable adverse impacts to designated or documented protected sensitive views, it is recommended that the finding of unavoidable significant adverse impact is not warranted and should be de-escalated.	Visual Aspects, Light and Glare	The Benton County Comprehensive Plan identifies conservation of visually prominent, naturally vegetated steep slopes and elevated ridges that define the Columbia Basin landscape. In particular, Policy 3 under Public Land Designation Goal 3 specifically identifies the Horse Heaven Hills as one of these landscapes. While these lands have not yet been placed into Open Space Conservation or other types of conservation, concern and preservation of the area's landscape character has been identified. The CESA methods build on the standard for visual resources in Washington Administrative Code 463-60-362(3) which does not relate significance to whether the landscape is protected, instead significance is based on impacts to the area's aesthetics and alteration of the surrounding terrain. Based on the current design of the project, including turbines along the Horse Heaven Hills ridgeline, the Project would dominate views from highly sensitive viewing areas and modify landscape character within the region. No change in the finding of unavoidable, significant adverse impacts on visual aspects.	4.10.2.5	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-52	Page 4-411: Delete sentence "The maximum modeled noise level at the one NSR with an in-pursuit status was 49 dBA at NSR 211. The maximum modeled noise level at the one NSR with an in-pursuit status was 49 dBA at NSR 211. " , since this landowner is not in-pursuit. Also delete the line item for NSR ID 211 in Table 4.11-8.	Noise and Vibration	Is this NSR now considered a participant? If not, then it should remain as it's greater than NSR 34.	4.11.2.2	TBD
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-53	Recommend revision of N-3 as follows: Monitor noise during nighttime operations (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.), when operations have the potential to impact NSRs of wind turbines that required noise reduction features or reduced operations to ensure that operational noise does not exceed state noise limits. This monitoring shall capture at least 72 hours of full power operation.	Noise and Vibration	N-3 is mitigation measure for construction not operations, see recommended revision for the FEIS	4.11.2.4	Recommended revision of N-3: Monitor noise during nighttime construction operations (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.), when construction activities have the potential to impact neighboring NSRs or reduced operations to ensure that construction noise does not exceed state noise limits. This monitoring shall capture the entirety of the nighttime hours, or until construction activities cease.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-54	The Applicant has proposed a complaint resolution procedure as identified in Section 4.1.1.3 of Updated ASC, "Utilize a complaint resolution procedure to address any noise complaints received from residents." The Applicant proposes revisions to Mitigation Action N-4 redlined as follows: N-4: Update the Applicant's noise complaint resolution procedure to better address and respond to noise complaints from the public. These updates should include the following: a complaint hotline during construction and provide a phone number to be posted on signage throughout the construction project and assure current site contact information is maintained with the EFSEC. The applicant would log all correspondence and promptly follow up with inquiries to provide appropriate resolution. The correspondence and resolutions will be logged throughout the construction process; and log will be made available to EFSEC during routine reporting or upon request. During the operations phase the site will be staffed and contact information will be available available. 1) Set up a 24-hour "noise hot line" or other form of communication that the public can use to report any undesirable noise conditions associated with the construction of the Project, with the ability to log the date and time of a complaint. This line of communication would be maintained through the end of construction; 2) Make an attempt to contact the complainant within 24 hours; 3) Require that any complaints and their resolution be reported to EFSEC during monthly reports to the Council.	Noise and Vibration	Acknowledged.	4.11.4	Revisoins to be incorporated into the FEIS.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-55	Recommend the deletion of N-6 Mitigation Measure. The Safety Manual described in ASC Section 4.1.2.5 would include contact information in case of safety issues or complaints about the Project. Complaints can be tracked through this process and responded to during normal working hours in a timely manner. Response during non-working hours to issues not related to safety is not justified and is not in accordance with WAC 197-11-660 (b) and (c) because the severity of the impact does not warrant providing extra staff to respond to complaints overnight.	Noise and Vibration	If the Emergency Plans outlined insection 4.1.2.5 have reporting instructions similar to what N-3 and N-6 have outlined, then those plans should be noted and detailed as an existing mitigation commitment.	4.11.2.4	Revisoins to be incorporated into the FEIS.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-56	The impact assessment for recreational impacts to use of DNR lands (Table 4.12-6) is overstated. DNR lands are currently under agricultural lease and are not used for recreation; therefore, conversion of DNR lands at the Sellards Road solar area to use for solar panels is not a high impact during any phase of the Project. Similarly, public roads in the Project vicinity are not often used by bicyclists; more heavily traveled bicycle trails are located along the Columbia River. Use of roads during construction for transport of equipment, materials, and workers would not significantly alter bicyclists' recreational opportunities in the Project vicinity. The actual impact on recreational opportunities resulting from Project construction, operation, and decommissioning would be negligible. Mitigation measure R-1 is disproportionate to the actual impacts on recreational opportunities resulting from construction of the project. Should EFSEC desire to retain a condition of approval relating to support for recreational opportunities, any measure requiring contribution to local recreational opportunities should be specific and measurable, such as the following: To mitigate the loss of recreational activities due to the Project, the Certificate Holder would coordinate with DNR and Benton County to identify new or participate in community planned recreational activities and/or improve existing recreational activities within the Lease Boundary and/or in surrounding communities (e.g., multi-use trails). The cost of the mitigation shall not exceed \$50,000 in fees and construction and be planned for completion within 5 (five) years of construction.	Recreation	Impacts to recreation involving cycling would not be negligible. The cycling path known as the Clodfelter Road Loop or the Horse Heaven Hills loop follows Clodfelter Road onto Plymouth, Sellards and through Webber Canyon and onto Budger Road and is a loop suggested by the Tri-City Bicycle Club. The Columbia Center Mall to Benton City loop is also suggested by the Tri-City Bicycle Club and includes a portions of Badger Road and Webber Canyon Road as part of the loop. EFSEC will not pose a minimum or maximum cost or fee structure for imposed mitigation.	4.12	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-57	In order to make Mitigation Measure R-2 more clearly defined, should the Council decide to impose an approval condition on this topic, the applicant recommends the language be rephrased as follows: <i>To mitigate the loss of uninterrupted views of scenic viewpoints, the Certificate Holder would provide a minimum of five informational boards approved by DNR and EFSEC at viewpoints within the Lease Boundary and/or in the surrounding communities associated with scenic areas of interest. The cost of the mitigation shall not exceed \$25,000 in fees and construction cost and be planned for completion within 5 (five) years of construction completion.</i>	Recreation	EFSEC will not pose a minimum or maximum cost or fee structure for imposed mitigation. Text will be updated to reflect approval by EFSEC and the five-year timeline of construction.	4.12	To mitigate the loss of uninterrupted views of scenic viewpoints. The Certificate Holder would provide a minimum of five informational boards approved by DNR and EFSEC at viewpoints within the Lease Boundary and/or in the surrounding communities associated with scenic areas of interest. The construction of the informational boards would be planned for completion within 5 (five) years of construction completion.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-58	Mitigation measure R-3 is disproportionate to the actual impacts on recreational opportunities resulting from construction of the project. Impacts to bicycling would be limited and temporary. No mitigation for impacts to bicycling is warranted because there will be no significant loss of recreational opportunities. Should EFSEC desire to retain a condition of approval relating to support for recreational opportunities, it should be noted that the measure as phrased is not well defined. In order to make the mitigation measure more clearly defined, the applicant recommends the language be rephrased as follows: <i>...This plan should identify potential hazards within the Project Area (e.g., construction on or near common bicycle paths, no fly zones, etc.) and provide opportunities within the Lease Boundary and/or in the surrounding communities to identify or improve other similar recreation use areas to offset any recreation removed from the Project area as a result of the Project. The cost of the mitigation shall not exceed \$15,000 in fees and construction cost and be planned for completion within 5 (five) years of construction completion.</i>	Recreation	EFSEC will not pose a minimum or maximum cost or fee structure for imposed mitigation. Referenced plans are required to be completed prior to construction.	4.12.2.6	Text will be updated to reflect approval by EFSEC. "... to develop and maintain an adaptive safety management plan, prior to construction and as approved by EFSEC, to continue access to recreation activities in the Project area while keeping recreation enthusiasts safe."
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-59	Recommend the deletion of TR-4 Mitigation Measure. Applicant proposal in ASC Section 4.3.3 addresses this potential for changes prior to construction. Applicant proposes to develop a detauled haul plan once wind turbines have been selected to confirm source locations and routes to be used during construction as well as anticipated loads and haul schedule. The current proposed Transportation Study provided would be verified and updated to include detailed condition assessments of roads to be used, structural assessments, and plans for improvementa and maintenance.	Transportation	Mitigation Measure TR-4 relates to decommissioning, not construction, and is required to ensure that no changes to transportation occurred during the life of the Project requiring updates to associated management plans or mitigation.	4.14.2.4	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-60	Mitigation measure Socio-ec-1 would require an additional housing analysis prior to decommissioning. The justification for this measure is not clear; impacts to housing from decommissioning are assessed as negligible. In accordance with WAC 197-11-660, we request that this measure be removed as it is not related to specific adverse environmental impacts, nor is it tied to policies, plans, rules, or regulations formally designated by an agency.	Socioeconomics	As housing market upon decommissioning would be likely very different compared to current market conditions, this mitigation measure is required for fair assessment of impacts at time of decommissioning.	4.16	n/a
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-61	In Table 3.8-1A, PL Goal 4 Policy 1 states "...the Applicant's ASC provides documentation of tribal consultation." However, as described in Section 3.9, consultation between EFSEC and Tribes has not formally been initiated, and Scout and HRA's communication with the Tribes does not constitute consultation. Recommend revising this statement to replace "consultation" with "discussions".	Land and Shoreline Use	Acknowledged, requested revisions will be addressed in FEIS.	Appendix 3.8-1	Replace reference to "consultation" with "discussions" for more clarity.
Scout Clean Energy	1102200-62	Recommend changing various setback distances from property lines and roadways described in the draft EIS to reference the correct version of the BCC to clarify that the Project is in compliance with the standard that was in effect at the time the application was submitted. For example, references to wind turbine setbacks from dwellings in the draft EIS (Appendix 3.8-1 table 3.8-2A) are to a version of the Benton County Code that postdates the date of the application. The version of code in effect at the time the application was submitted (February 2021) states that all wind turbine bases must be set back from all dwellings not located on the same parcel at least one thousand (1,000) feet. Based on EFSEC precedent, a setback of four times the maximum blade tip height should be required. For the wind turbines described in Turbine Option 1, this setback distance is a minimum of 1,984 feet and for the wind turbines described in Turbine Option 2, this setback distance is a minimum of 2,684 feet. Similarly, the analysis references setbacks from exterior property lines and public road ROWs that were not in effect at the time the application was submitted. See Attachment 3 for a copy of the BCC and Comprehensive Plan that was in effect at the time of application.	Land and Shoreline Use	Acknowledged, requested revisions will be addressed in FEIS where applicable.	Appendix 3.8-1 table 3.8-2A	Requested revisions will be addressed in FEIS accordingly.