

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of)	
Application No. 2009-01)	Public Comment Meeting
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY, LLC.)	On Draft EIS
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT)	Pages 1 - 74
_____)	

A Public Meeting in the above matter was held on Thursday, June 17, 2010, at the Skamania County Fairgrounds, 710 S.W. Rock Creek Drive, Stevenson, Washington at 6:30 p.m., before the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Members.

* * * * *

CHAIR LUCE: Good evening. Today is June 17, 2010. This is the Rock Creek Center in Stevenson, Washington, and we are here to take public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared in connection with the Whistling Ridge Energy Project. Everyone can hear me? Everyone can hear me.

My name is Jim Luce and I'm Chair of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, and on behalf of the Council I want to thank you for taking the time to come tonight and participate in the meeting. I apologize, but I do have a script here that I have been instructed to read by my lawyers, and I'm sure you all appreciate that. I'll try and ad lib to get a little humor along the way, but we'll

1 see.

2 We have EFSEC Energy Siting Council Members here
3 tonight, and we'll start down at the left with Dennis Moss.
4 If each one of you can stand and say what agency you
5 represent, that would be helpful.

6 MR. MOSS: My name is Dennis Moss, and I represent
7 Utilities and Transportation Commission.

8 MS. McDONALD: My name is Mary McDonald and I
9 represent the Department of Natural Resources.

10 MR. FRYHLING: My name is Dick Fryhling and I
11 represent the Department of Commerce.

12 CHAIR LUCE: I am Jim Luce, and to my immediate
13 right is --

14 MR. TAYER: Jeff Tayer. I'm with Washington Fish
15 and Wildlife.

16 MS. WILSON: Judy Wilson. I represent Skamania
17 County.

18 CHAIR LUCE: We also have EFSEC Energy Siting
19 Council staff here this evening. We'll begin with
20 Mr. Posner.

21 MR. POSNER: Stephen Posner.

22 MR. WRIGHT: I'm Al.

23 MR. WALLIS: Bob Wallis, Administrative Law Judge.

24 MR. CREWS: Kyle Crews from the Attorney General's
25 Office.

1 CHAIR LUCE: Most importantly over there behind
2 the table Kayce and our good and trusted assistants.

3 You control the lists. Right?

4 MS. TALBURT: I do.

5 CHAIR LUCE: Tammy Talburt controls the lists.
6 She's very important. If you want a copy of the
7 Environmental Impact Statement other than that which is on
8 the website, which it is, you may request a copy, and we
9 will provide a hard copy. So please don't think that you
10 have to burn up your computer and go through all sorts of
11 ribbons to get a copy. So please do that.

12 I also want to introduce on my immediate left
13 Andrew Montano from the Bonneville Power Administration.
14 This is a joint EIS prepared by Bonneville and the Energy
15 Siting Council.

16 Andrew, do you have some people with you tonight?

17 MR. MONTANO: I do. Good evening. Thanks for
18 joining us. I'm Andrew Montano, the Environmental Project
19 Manager for this project. With me tonight I have Susan
20 Offerdahl, the Environmental Protection Specialist, and John
21 Tyler in the back of the room our Public Affairs Specialist.
22 It was brought to my attention tonight that certain people
23 from the meeting last night didn't know that they could ask
24 us questions, ask the Bonneville folks questions. Please if
25 you want to, you can pull myself, Susan, or John aside later

1 after this meeting and ask us any questions you may have.
2 You may also pull Stephen or Al Wright aside, and they can
3 also answer your questions. Thank you.

4 CHAIR LUCE: Just to clarify, the Energy Council
5 Members such as myself and my colleagues are participating
6 in an adjudicatory proceeding that's parallel to this. For
7 that reason we do not talk to members of the public as much
8 as we might like to. So it's something that we've adopted
9 as a policy and as I think as a legal practice is probably
10 pretty sound.

11 By way of preface, the comments tonight are on the
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and its issues, not
13 general views. Everybody has particular views about energy
14 policy or alternative energy resources or other issues, and
15 we respect those views, but that's not the purpose of
16 tonight's meeting.

17 The following is a short summary of the project:
18 On March 10, 2009, Whistling Ridge Energy, LLC, a Washington
19 limited liability company, submitted an application for site
20 certification to the Energy Siting Council to construct and
21 operate the Whistling Ridge Energy Project, a 75-megawatt
22 electrical wind generation facility. The proposed project
23 would be located about seven miles north of the City of
24 White Salmon in Skamania County, Washington. The proposed
25 project site is privately owned land currently used for

1 commercial timber parts. Up to 50 wind turbines ranging in
2 size from 1.2 to 2.5 megawatts and up to 426 feet tall would
3 be installed for the project. The project would include an
4 operation and maintenance facility, electrical substation --
5 that's Bonneville -- underground collector lines and
6 systems, access roads and other ancillary facilities.

7 The revised application was submitted on
8 October 12, 2009, which changed site access by removing the
9 use of a forest service road located within the Columbia
10 Gorge National Scenic Area. Last month the Draft
11 Environmental Impact Statement was issued jointly by
12 Bonneville and EFSEC. It has been prepared consistent with
13 the requirements of SEPA and NEPA. Because the State of
14 Washington has a primary role in the siting of this proposed
15 project, the impact statement generally follows the format
16 contained in WAC 197-11 as adopted by EFSEC through WAC
17 463-47.

18 We will be accepting written comments tonight.
19 Also very important, written comments may be sent to us and
20 must be postmarked by July 19. So if you have written
21 comments, please Tammy over here on the right and Kayce will
22 take those comments, and we'll make sure that they get in
23 the official record of proceedings. If you have any
24 questions about EFSEC's application process, Al Wright and
25 Stephen Posner can answer those questions, and you can also

1 contact Bruce Marvin. Bruce, are you here? Bruce, is the
2 Counsel for the Environment.

3 Bruce is a State Assistant Attorney General
4 appointed to represent the public in its interest in
5 protecting the quality of the environment. Bruce, can you
6 stand up? And you stood up. People have recognized you.
7 And would you like to comment in any way this evening?

8 MR. MARVIN: Just that I will be observing and
9 taking notes on the statements that are made today. I will
10 review the written comments that are submitted to EFSEC, and
11 if you have additional information or you'd like to direct
12 comments to me directly, that's fine. I can't promise you
13 one way or the other I'll react to those promises or whether
14 I'll react to them. I'll certainly acknowledge receiving
15 them, but please note that EFSEC is ultimately the people
16 that are going to be making the decision on this. So if you
17 choose to communicate with me, you might also want to copy
18 them and make sure that they get information from you as
19 well. Thank you.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Thanks, Bruce.

21 Members of the Public, while you're making
22 comments tonight please be as specific as possible regarding
23 the section of the Environmental Impact Statement that
24 you're addressing. If you inadvertently start drifting away
25 from the subject of tonight's meeting, which I recognize can

1 happen occasionally, I am going to ask you to refocus your
2 comments specifically on the Draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement.

4 Now, some basic ground rules that I think we all
5 would agree to. Cell phones in the air. Turn it off,
6 please. Check them. We all love ring tones, but I'll show
7 you mine later if you really want to hear it.

8 Be respectful. No applause, no negative comments.
9 Everybody here deserves respect. Please limit your comments
10 to three minutes or less. We have a timekeeper over here,
11 Mr. Stephen Posner. He will be giving a one minute time
12 frame for you. He'll have a little sign he will hold up.

13 If you spoke at last night's meeting, you're at
14 the end of the bus. So that's okay if there's time left
15 over and you want to speak again, you can feel free to do
16 so. I would really, really think if you have new comments
17 as opposed to what you said last night. We got it down with
18 the court reporter so you don't have to repeat yourself.

19 If you have written comments, please don't read
20 them into the record. We do read everything that's sent to
21 us. That's our job, but standing at the microphone and
22 reading long statements really is not helpful to the Council
23 nor you. We will read those statements.

24 If you agree with somebody who has just testified
25 before you, either I like the project or I don't like the

1 project because fill in the blank, just say I agree with the
2 previous speaker or I agree with the speaker that previously
3 spoke on this subject. If there are a number of you
4 supporting a common position and you can agree among
5 yourselves as to one spokesman instead of several, you
6 should feel free to consolidate your time and designate one
7 spokesperson. So hypothetically if there were some
8 advocates for the project and they wanted to get together
9 and say, "There's six of us, we'd like 18 minutes", that
10 would be fine. As converse if there were opponents that
11 felt that way.

12 So we're going to call three speakers at a time.
13 I'm going to have one person at the mic with two on the
14 ready. When you come forward please give us your comments,
15 state your full name, spell it, give us your address, and if
16 you have brought written materials please again provide them
17 to Tammy and Kayce.

18 We will now hear oral comments from those present
19 in the order which people signed up, and our first speaker
20 is Paul Pearce followed by Ann Leuders, and Dave L'Hommedieu
21 I believe, and I apologize for pronunciation. My
22 handwriting is in some cases as the handwriting on these
23 sheets and my ability to read what is on them is likewise
24 handicapped.

25 So yes, sir, Mr. Pearce.

1 there's a very clear delineation between the scenic area
2 boundaries. So when you talk about SEPA review on the
3 scenic level, and then you get a letter from the Forest
4 Service or the Parks Service saying you should look at key
5 viewing areas which are in fact managed under the Scenic Act
6 at things outside of the scenic area, I would just repeat
7 what's been repeated a number of times, and that the fact
8 that activities or uses inconsistent with management
9 directives for the scenic area or special management areas
10 which can be seen or heard these areas shall not of itself
11 preclude such activities or uses up to the boundaries of the
12 Gorge. Our argument would clearly be that that was an
13 intent that was clear on Congress's part, and we would
14 appreciate that you would take that into consideration.

15 I also have a letter from Congressman Brian Baird
16 to the Forest Service, May 20, 2009, and I will give it to
17 your capable staff. But in that letter he calls forth the
18 fact that the Forest Service in his opinion is reaching
19 outside of their area of responsibility, and I also have a
20 letter from both Congressman Hastings and Congressman Baird
21 to the National Parks Service where they say nothing in this
22 section of this title allows you to or allows effects
23 outside the scenic area to be taken into account by these
24 agencies. And as I explained to the Forest Service in
25 meeting just two days ago when you comment as the Forest

1 Service as a federal agency you carry a big pail of water,
2 and I think that it's important for the board to recognize
3 that when they're commenting they're commenting outside of
4 their jurisdiction and I appreciate that.

5 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Thank you very much,
6 appreciate your comments, Mr. Pearce.

7 Ann.

8 COMMENTS BY ANN LEUDERS

9 Leuders. I'm at 11271 Wind River Road, Carson
10 Washington.

11 CHAIR LUCE: Spelling?

12 MS. LEUDERS: The last name?

13 CHAIR LUCE: Yes, please.

14 MS. LEUDERS: L-e-u-d as in David -e-r-s as in
15 Sam.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

17 MS. LEUDERS: I would like to comment on the
18 visual impacts section of the Draft Environmental Impact
19 Statement, and I came prepared with some written notes
20 because I oftentimes forget my train of thought.

21 Basically at this point opponents to this project
22 are asking your Council to sacrifice the economic stability
23 of Skamania for their view. They are opposing it as it's
24 going to be detrimental to tourism which I do not believe to
25 be true, and further they cannot ask Skamania County, I

1 don't feel they can ask Skamania County to survive on
2 tourism alone.

3 Further, they would note that it's a detriment to
4 wildlife. I do not find that the Environmental Impact
5 Statement is clear on that. I think it says maybe. So at
6 this point I would just like to inform the support of this
7 project. SDS has been a great steward of the land. They
8 will continue to be a great steward of the land and
9 furthermore continue to be good for this community.

10 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Appreciate your comments.

11 Dave L'Hommedieu and after Dave we'll have Matt
12 Mega and Mr. Truitt.

13 COMMENTS BY DAVE L'HOMMEDIEU

14 My name is Dave L'Hommedieu. I live at 2121 Loop
15 Road here in Skamania County. Previous to retiring I worked
16 for 34 years --

17 CHAIR LUCE: Spelling on the last name if you
18 could.

19 MR. L'HOMMEDIEU: Oh, L--H-o-m-m-e-d-i-e-u.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. L'HOMMEDIEU: That's why you couldn't
22 pronounce it.

23 CHAIR LUCE: You Should see what they do with
24 Luce.

25 MR. L'HOMMEDIEU: Previous to Retiring I worked

1 for 34 years for both the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau
2 of Indian Affairs as a ranger in Glenwood, Washington. My
3 main duties were timber sale administration, and I can tell
4 you I have reviewed more EIS's than I ever would like to do
5 again, but I'm here and I've done it again. And what I have
6 seen in this project that this EIS it's a fine job. The
7 only thing that I could find that was really wrong or way
8 out of the picture was the complaint about the visuals. Now
9 the visuals that I see and I drove up there, and I can see
10 from I-84 is what I would consider those windmills are way
11 in the background and not much of an impact of anybody
12 coming down I-84.

13 We need this project because it will generate
14 money for the county to run. It will put money into our
15 schools which we need very badly, and we hope that this
16 project goes ahead as proposed. I totally support the
17 project and hopefully we'll use this project to generate
18 electricity for the local area or wherever they send it
19 under the wire until something better comes along. Thank
20 you.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir. Appreciate your
22 comments. Mr. Truitt.

23 MR. TRUITT: You're next.

24 COMMENTS BY MATT MEGA

25 Good evening. My name is Matt Mega. I'm the

1 director of conservation out of Seattle Audubon. Last name
2 is M-e-g-a.

3 Our organization is in the process of reviewing
4 the DEIS. Our board of directors has not made a final
5 decision so these are preliminary comments. We'll have
6 written comments by the 18th. We're also official
7 intervenors in the EFSEC process and we've met with SDS on
8 one occasion to do a site visit.

9 Our primary goal is to ensure a balance between
10 our growing concerns over green energy and not impacting our
11 local bird and wildlife populations. This is not an easy
12 task. As we know birds do get killed by wind turbines. A
13 recent Seattle Times article said about 6,500 birds get
14 killed annually by wind turbines in Washington and Oregon
15 together.

16 So this is hard for a bird organization, but we're
17 looking at the bigger picture. We're looking at green
18 power. We're trying to weigh it and look at those balance
19 issues. So our preliminary comments on the EIS as we know
20 this is the first wind power project in forested landscape.
21 That causes some uncertainties for you. We need to make
22 sure the bird surveys, the collision risk models, all those
23 things address forested landscapes. Currently the
24 guidelines for Washington State that you guys often used for
25 siting and mitigation are really focused on Eastern

1 Washington Habitats so we may need to look at those
2 guidelines and see what needs to be updated and what kind of
3 new things you need to put in.

4 So our concern is really looking at mitigation.
5 The 30-year life of this project and the mitigation impacts
6 we'll be commenting specifically on some of those. We know
7 there's a tech advisory committee that's suppose to be put
8 together. It does not mention Audubon. We would like to
9 see an Audubon representative and other NGOs on there. We
10 also feel that post-mortality studies for two years is not
11 adequate for this new kind of project in a forested
12 landscape so we're looking for longer post-mortality studies
13 and maybe some changes to those.

14 So essentially I'm here to raise, you know,
15 there's some uncertainties. This is a new project in a
16 forested landscape, and your job is tough and we're going to
17 hopefully help out with some comments and make them as
18 constructive as possible.

19 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Matt.

20 Mr. Truitt.

21 COMMENTS BY W.D TRUITT

22 Thank you. My name is W.D. Truitt. Last name is
23 T-r-u-i-t-t. I am District 2 Port Commissioner representing
24 the Port of Skamania County, and I've lived in the county
25 more than 50 years.

1 The Port and myself support this project. We're
2 looking at 143 average jobs generated during construction,
3 \$13 million in local purchase during construction,
4 \$1.5 million in annual wind farm payroll, annual new
5 property tax revenue which is very important to the county
6 at \$731,000, \$150,000 annually to the White Salmon School
7 District, and 8 or 9 permanent jobs which is very important
8 to the county.

9 As the gentleman that spoke previous to me
10 mentioned, I've been studying your EIS and some new
11 technology from wind turbines, and there was a lady who
12 spoke last night in Underwood that talked about bats, and
13 they supposedly have developed new technology that takes the
14 vacuum off the back side of the blade or whatever it does.
15 So anyway it doesn't harm bats anymore. Just I learned this
16 in the last couple days. Anyway we're in support of this
17 thing.

18 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much, Mr. Truitt.

19 Mr. Canon, Mike Canon Cannon followed by Aaron
20 Leonard followed Tom D-r-a-c-h.

21 Good evening, Mr. Canon.

22 COMMENTS BY MIKE CANON

23 Good evening. My name is Mike Canon and I'm a
24 foreigner. I'm from Klickitat County, and I'm the Director
25 of the Economic Development Department for Klickitat County.

1 The address is 127 West Court Street in Goldendale and we
2 very much support this Whistling Ridge Energy Project.

3 I felt the thing I could do that would be the most
4 helpful is to explain some of the Klickitat experience.

5 Because of the income that our wind farms are producing for
6 our schools, our hospitals, our library districts, our red
7 funds, and our fire districts, and numbers in cases as much
8 as hundreds of thousands of dollars, in the smaller
9 subdistricts tens of thousands, this is making a difference.

10 Right now we have just a few wind farms that are
11 actually on the tax rolls. The Ebidrolla Wind Farm which is
12 the PTM and the Big Horn 1 and 2 farms. That particular
13 wind farm paid over a million dollars in property tax this
14 year. The Summit Power which is the White Creek Wind Farm
15 paid \$1,011,000. There are others that are going to be on
16 the tax rolls in 2011. Those are the Tuolumne Wind Project
17 known as Windy Point and then there's Windy Flats. And
18 Windy Point these two together represent the largest wind
19 farm in the United States. Then there's another wind farm
20 from PacifiCorp.

21 We have a thousand megawatts in production. That
22 provides household electricity for 500,000 households per
23 year. That's a tremendous amount of energy. We have
24 another 700 megawatts that are permitted and scheduled for
25 construction.

1 What we see as positive about this type of effort
2 for Skamania is that generally benefits these junior taxing
3 districts. It will benefit your county and through all of
4 that revenue it directly benefits your citizens. We found
5 that there was some concern over view shed. Our view shed
6 where these wind farms are not well near as intense as where
7 yours is, but the benefits to people has energized Klickitat
8 County residents in many, many different ways very
9 positively. And they have better schools, they will have
10 better hospitals, and much better fire protection. These
11 are things that we see as positive in the effort to have
12 this green energy, this wind energy in your county. We very
13 much support this project. Thank you.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir.

15 Mr. Leonard.

16 COMMENTS BY AARON LEONARD

17 Aaron Leonard. I'm actually going to choose not
18 to speak in regards to the DEIS at this time because I have
19 not had the opportunity to thoroughly review the document.
20 I would like to say that I'm a long-time Skamania County
21 resident and I'm in full support of this project.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir, appreciate that.

23 Written comments will be accepted until July 19.

24 Dr. Drach.

25 ///

1 COMMENTS BY TOM DRACH

2 Yes, Drach. Before I begin a point of order.
3 Last night you were accepting people to waive their time and
4 allocate it to others. Is that the policy tonight as well?

5 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

6 MR. DRACH: If so, Vicky Price has indicated that
7 she's willing to advocate her time.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. I'm checking off Vicky and
9 you're up and you've got six minutes.

10 MR. DRACH: Thank You. Good evening, Councilors.
11 My name is Tom Drach, spelled D-r-a-c-h. I'm here
12 representing a nonprofit organization called Save our Scenic
13 Area. Our mailing address is P.O. Box 41, Underwood,
14 Washington 98651.

15 SOSA as we have been known to be called is a
16 nonprofit that's been formed to have a voice for concerned
17 local citizens regarding this project.

18 There's a few clarifications I would like to start
19 out with in terms of hearing other people's testimony, and I
20 recall Paul Pearce the first speaker tonight had indicated
21 some letters that were going back and forth between some of
22 our U.S. congressmen and senators and state representatives
23 to the U.S. Forest Service in requesting some out of
24 jurisdiction redaction of sort. And you should be aware
25 that there was a response from the U.S. Forest Service that

1 I'm aware of going back to at least one of those individuals
2 reasserting their belief that it was their duty and
3 responsibility to comment on this project and notify your
4 group of what they felt was a concern to them. And, of
5 course, we'll be filing extensive written comments at the
6 end before the deadline occurs in July for the DEIS.

7 Rex Johnston the Klickitat Commissioner, the first
8 speaker from last night, I think erroneously indicated that
9 EFSEC has no conditioning authority over issues of scenic
10 area concerns, and I think he may have been intending to say
11 that the Gorge Commission has no authority to place
12 restrictions on the project outside of the scenic area. But
13 I'd like to encourage you to consider the fact that your
14 group could have authority to impose conditions which not
15 necessarily impact the scenic area, but the view shed
16 analysis that in fact impacts people and economy, etc. etc.

17 Okay. Getting onto specific comments regarding
18 the DEIS, the transportation plan is unclear about the road
19 transportation component on Cook Underwood Road proper when
20 the large loads are going up and down the hill. It's my
21 understanding that these things are extremely large and
22 would probably require a closure of the opposing direction
23 traffic, and, if so, there should be some indication to the
24 local people what that will mean in terms of emergency
25 services and bypasses and precautions to allow emergency

1 situations to pass, etc.

2 In terms of the soil stability analysis, there is
3 a convenient assertion that the landslide hazards and other
4 slope instabilities as identified by the local governing
5 body is the only requirement to list in terms of the DEIS,
6 and I would like to note that Skamania County has failed to
7 comply with the critical areas ordinance that has been
8 mandated by the state upon this county, and it delayed that
9 process. I can't speak to the exact time frame, but it's at
10 least in excess of two to three years. They're just getting
11 to it now so it's very possible that particular areas of
12 concern are not noted because they haven't been
13 legislatively acted on on a local basis.

14 There is a DNR FPA, Department of Natural
15 Resources Forest Practices Application number which I have
16 which we will be submitting in our comments. That does
17 indicate in the A-1 through 7 portion on the eastern slope
18 unstable slopes, high erosion potential, and a high mass
19 wasting potential, and there's a portion of that area that
20 was not logged intentionally because of concerns about
21 stability. So we just want the Council to be aware that you
22 may not be capturing all the important data just by looking
23 at the actions of the local legislative body.

24 Okay. The issue of alternatives I think is
25 dramatically insufficient in the case of this DEIS. The

1 applicant has for the most part said we need 70 megawatts or
2 we can't do the project, and there is no place else to do it
3 and we have to have absolutely every array that we've
4 proposed. And I think that's disingenuous to the process
5 and contrary to SEPA to allow that to stand. I think there
6 needs to be a really hard look at saying this applicant has
7 70,000 plus acres of land in ownership. I find it hard to
8 believe that they can't come up with at least some viable
9 alternatives to compare this application to.

10 My suggestion including a viable alternative is to
11 say, "Hey, look. The maximum capacity of turbines today is
12 2.5 megawatts. If you did that 70 megawatts, that's 30
13 turbines. You could eliminate the first 11, A-1 through 11
14 on this whole procedure and get this project back far enough
15 from the scenic area that a lot of the public's concerns
16 will be mitigated because of that." It's certainly not
17 going to eliminate all the concerns that people have of this
18 project, but that's a very good start that the applicant has
19 not seemed to be interested in, and there should be a
20 justification why that can't occur since that seemingly on
21 the surface seems viable. What is the time like?

22 MR. POSNER: Time is up.

23 MR. DRACH: Okay. Perfect. I'll finish here.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you so much for your comments.

1 Appreciate the specificity of your comments to the Draft
2 Environmental Impact Statement.

3 Bob Anderson followed by Wilbur Slockish and David
4 Teitzel.

5 COMMENTS BY BOB ANDERSON

6 Hi, my name is Bob Anderson, 751 Old State Road in
7 Skamania County, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n.

8 I would like to go on record as agreeing with
9 speakers one, two, and three -- Mr. Pearce, Ms. Leuders, and
10 Mr. L'Hommedieu -- with the addition of the support of the
11 project as an important puzzle or piece of the puzzle
12 economically to help our families thrive in the county.
13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir.

15 Mr. Slockish.

16 COMMENTS BY WILBUR SLOCKISH

17 First of all, I'd like to say that I support the
18 project because this is the only one that I've ever seen and
19 heard of that doesn't use water. Nuclear power, gas plants,
20 coal fire plants use a lot of water.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Could you give the court reporter the
22 full spelling of your name and your address.

23 MR. SLOCKISH: Okay. Wilbur Slockish,
24 S-l-o-c-k-i-s-h, 89 Main Street, Wishram.

25 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. We'll start over. All right.

1 Go ahead. You don't want to talk about nuclear.

2 MR. SLOCKISH: It's no good.

3 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. Got that down.

4 MR. SLOCKISH: Because the waste that it generates
5 comes from our lands, and they don't clean it up very good.
6 It's a health hazard. So I support this wind because of no
7 water usage.

8 And I have a letter here that I would like to read
9 to Andrew Montano from Harry Smiskin, Chairman of Yakama
10 Nation Tribal Council, June 15, 2010. Subject: Whistling
11 Ridge Energy Project: I, the Chairman of the Yakama Nation
12 Tribal Council, am requesting a continuance of 30 days to
13 review and comment on the Whistling Ridge Energy Project.
14 My staff and I have not had the chance to meet on this
15 important matter, and we would like to provide you with our
16 input.

17 So they want 30 days of consultation with you and
18 I was directed by them, the Tribal Council, to say that any
19 documents that have been submitted by the cultural resource
20 project are unofficial because they have not been reviewed
21 by the entire Tribal Council. And Harry Smiskin and Lavina
22 Washine want a written response from you on this 30-day
23 consultation process.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Mr. Slockish. I
25 appreciate your comments.

1 David Teitzel followed by Chief Johnny Jackson.

2 COMMENTS BY DAVID TEITZEL

3 Hi, I'm David Teitzel, T-e-i-t-z-e-l, Carson,
4 Washington. I'd like to speak in favor of this wind turbine
5 project on Whistling Ridge. I would like to thank this
6 Council for all the time and effort that they're going to
7 take in getting this put together listening to all these
8 comments and all the reading that they're going to have to
9 do going through this environmental study.

10 I'd also like to thank BPA for the comments that
11 they already came up with and looking over the environmental
12 study.

13 The main importance for Skamania, one of the main
14 importance is, of course, the economic advantages of this in
15 this county. Another one, of course, is the company that's
16 doing this. It's not some outside company. It's not some
17 outfit from some foreign county or some other part of the
18 United States. It's a company home grown right here in
19 Skamania.

20 Broughton Lumber Company has been in existence
21 over 90 years in Skamania County being a good steward to the
22 land that we have, and that's one of the reasons you have a
23 scenic area here is because of the stewardship that
24 Broughton and SDS has provided. SDS has been here nearly
25 65 years, long before this ever became a scenic area. If

1 they hadn't been good stewards of this land there wouldn't
2 be the scenic portion that we have like they and other
3 timber companies, private ownership on the Washington side
4 of this river. For some reason they felt the government has
5 stepped in and have done just about everything they can to
6 squash Skamania. Here is a project that can help remedy
7 this situation. It's very important. Thank you.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir, appreciate your
9 comments.

10 Mr. Jackson.

11 COMMENTS BY JOHNNY JACKSON

12 Good afternoon. My name is Chief Johnny Jackson,
13 J-a-c-k-s-o-n. First of all, I want to say that I fully
14 support this wind power project because I think it's highly
15 needed at what I've been looking at and watched, that I
16 watch on the news.

17 One thing that I'd like to say I don't agree with
18 the people going and interfering and telling people what
19 they can do on their property. It's never been done before,
20 but it's starting to. I'm hearing it done now, especially
21 people that don't live along this river here in this area.
22 And I've heard a lot of things said about what happens when
23 these wind towers are up in the air, and I have made a study
24 of my own by traveling up toward Dufur around that area
25 where those wind towers are, and I went up to Goldendale.

1 I've gone down through the area where these wind towers are,
2 and I've parked there and watched and seen these happen that
3 they were talking about.

4 And they said that it is a great harm to the bird
5 life, the bird areas. Well, when I went up in there, I made
6 two trips up there and studied by parking there and watching
7 and see what that is going to happen. When I parked there
8 and watched, I've seen the buzzards circling above the wind
9 towers and they're even turning, and those buzzards never
10 came near them wind towers. They flew over them, they flew
11 around them, and they drifted off. Also, the crows, I've
12 watched the crows fly around there, and they go around the
13 wind towers. They don't go through them, and this here I
14 don't understand why people can make these kind of
15 accusations on something that they're not really sure of.

16 So I'm bringing this out to let you know that I
17 don't think there's anything wrong with these wind towers
18 being up there, and where these wind towers are going to be
19 they're not going to be bothering anybody.

20 No sound. I'm never heard no sound when I was up
21 under these towers, and I never heard nothing or seen
22 anything.

23 So this is my comment to let you guys know what I
24 feel about this wind farm. I'd rather have that than have
25 anything else like coal burning generators or any of these

1 others or the nuclear waste. When they produce this nuclear
2 waste to operate these generators, then the waste they go
3 and they dump it on some poor communities or some people
4 that don't want it, but they put it there anyway. So that's
5 my comments.

6 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your
7 comments.

8 Marfa Scheratski followed by Wally Stevenson.

9 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Wally Stevenson. I'm going to
10 pass.

11 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir.

12 COMMENTS BY MARFA SCHERATSKI

13 Hi, I'm Marfa Scheratski from Bonneville Hot
14 Springs. I'm the general manager.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Could you speak up just a little.

16 MS. SCHERATSKI: S-c-h-e-r-a-t-s-k-i. I just want
17 to --

18 CHAIR LUCE: You're representing?

19 MS. SCHERATSKI: Bonneville Hot Springs, tourism.
20 Address is P.O. Box 356, North Bonneville, Washington. I
21 just wanted to say that we're in support of this. As it
22 turns out there aren't that many other alternatives, and
23 within this county especially there just doesn't seem to be
24 very many other stimulus packages. So I think this would be
25 a great stimulus for the economy. It will give a lot more

1 jobs that people are definitely in need right now, and we're
2 familiar with the different alternatives to energy because
3 our resort is run by geothermal.

4 We've had nothing but good news come from a lot of
5 our guests. So as far as being aesthetically pleasing or
6 not, I think it's in the eye of the beholder. Some people
7 will look at it and say it's the most beautiful thing
8 they've seen, and then there will be others who no matter
9 whatever they look at they will see something wrong with it.

10 On the most part there are pros and cons to
11 everything and we just wanted to put our two cents and say
12 on the most part I think there's a little more good that
13 will come of this than bad, and I agree with a lot of the
14 stuff that the previous speakers have said in terms of need
15 and support. Thank you.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Dan Spatz
17 followed by Adrian Bradford followed by Rick Taylor.

18 COMMENTS BY DAN SPATZ

19 Good evening. My name is Dan Spatz, S-p-a-t-z,
20 and I reside at 2506 Jordan Street, The Dalles. I've lived
21 in the Columbia Gorge since 1967. Although I've held
22 certain official capacities, I'm speaking tonight solely as
23 a private individual. I'm a landowner and taxpayer in The
24 Dalles and also in the Snowden area of Klickitat County
25 where my property looks toward the Whistling Ridge Project

1 location.

2 I'm here to speak in favor of this project for two
3 reasons. First, global climate change is a reality and
4 renewable energy is part of the solution. As a society we
5 seek to reduce our carbon footprint; yet we often oppose new
6 sources of energy necessary to achieve that goal. If we are
7 to maintain our current standard of living, we will need
8 radically different alternatives to fossil fuels on a grand
9 scale, whether this means wind, solar, geothermal, tidal
10 wave or most likely a combination of all the above in
11 concert with energy efficient design.

12 We build out wind energy in more remote locations
13 and we inevitably in fact need to develop wind power closer
14 to places where people already live such as the proposed
15 project location. I submit that these wind turbines, the
16 proposed turbines are far more attractive than strip coal or
17 tar sands or drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. Wind energy is
18 clean energy, renewable energy, and thus we should support
19 it for that reason alone.

20 Second, I object to the contention that proximity
21 to the National Scenic Area should prove a barrier to this
22 project. The project is located outside of the scenic area
23 boundaries as other speakers noted. The intent of Congress
24 was to enhance economic development and protect the
25 environment within the Columbia Gorge.

1 While we still face the need to precisely define
2 certain scenic area boundaries and achieve the necessary
3 mechanism for modifying those boundaries over time, the
4 intent of Congress was not to restrict development within
5 the current boundary. This principle has been demonstrated
6 in Klickitat and Sherman counties where wind farms have been
7 constructed which are visible from within the National
8 Scenic Area. And I think that's a key point for your
9 consideration here. That's a precedent, and I would
10 encourage you to follow that precedent. So I think that
11 probably concludes my key points. Thank you.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, appreciate your comments.
13 Adrian Bradford.

14 MR. BRADFORD: I'm going to pass and submit our
15 support in writing.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, appreciate that.

17 The next speaker is Rick Till.

18 COMMENTS BY RICK TILL

19 Rick Till on behalf of Friends of the Columbia
20 Gorge. Our address is 522 S.W. 5th, Suite 720, Portland,
21 Oregon 97204.

22 I wanted to focus on some aspects of the DEIS
23 relating to the no-action alternative and our regional
24 energy system. Throughout the DEIS the applicant presents a
25 false choice between building Whistling Ridge on the one

1 hand and continued reliance on fossil fuel generation on the
2 other hand. For example, on page 3-21 while analyzing
3 impacts to air quality, the DEIS includes this statement:
4 If the no-action alternative is selected the growing
5 electricity needs of the region would continue to be met
6 through a combination of other renewable energy development
7 and a combination of additional fossil fuels. The last part
8 of that sentence is not supported by any evidence, and in
9 fact, it's patently wrong. If the project isn't built our
10 growing electricity needs will be met through conservation,
11 efficiency, and new clean energy development.

12 The DEIS needs to be revised to reflect this
13 reality. The evidence for that is substantial. Recently
14 the Northwest Power Planning Council adopted its sixth power
15 plan. In that plan it calls for meeting new demand with
16 85 percent of new demand with conservation and efficiency
17 measures. The rest of new demand will be met through new
18 renewables. Whistling Ridge is not critical to meeting that
19 demand. We have evidence of that as well.

20 There's the Bright Future report which I will be
21 submitting for the record. Here's a cover just for you guys
22 to see what the front looks like. But the report is
23 prepared by the Northwest Energy Coalition and it forecasts
24 energy supply and how we're going to meet that energy demand
25 and how we're going to meet that up to 2050. It includes

1 factors in loss of Boardman Power Plant so dropping coal, no
2 new nukes, and taking the measures necessary to protect and
3 resource wild salmon runs. That study projects forecast
4 needs of 25,000 average megawatts by 2050. They also
5 analyze the potential energy supply that we have for clean
6 new renewables, and they forecast that at 80,000 average
7 megawatts. So our projected need is about one foot. Our
8 supply is about four feet. We have plenty of surplus
9 potential to develop. Whistling Ridge doesn't need to be
10 built to meet the forecasted need for renewable energy
11 resources.

12 Since I have a couple seconds left I think I want
13 to point out that the Park Service also responded to the
14 letters from the elected representatives. They also
15 concluded that under NEPA that they're required to consult.
16 It's their obligation as far as the environmental review
17 process to provide some input, and similarly SEPA requires
18 that EFSEC consult with agencies with expertise and the
19 resources that are being affected. You did so. You
20 solicited the Forest Services comment. You need to take
21 that into consideration. Thank you very much.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir. Ben Bliss followed
23 by Paul Smith followed by Steve Jones.

24 COMMENTS BY BEN BLISS

25 Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is

1 Ben Bliss. I am a third generation resident here. My
2 grandfather worked at the dam for the BPA. My father worked
3 in the timber industry on SDS land. I myself am currently
4 enrolled in the Northwest Renewable Energy Institute in
5 Vancouver, Washington pursuing a career in the wind
6 industry. I'm represented here this evening by several of
7 my schoolmates, if you'd like to stand respectively.
8 They're all here in support of this project.

9 Though I could speak endlessly on this topic
10 because I'm very passionate, I will be very brief. I chose
11 to speak tonight on the issue regarding the fatalities of
12 bats and birds. The migratory birds have been historically
13 effective at circumnavigating these wind farms, and we've
14 known that for many generations. What we have now is the
15 issue of bats, and I can tell you extensive research is
16 being carried out now and it's as simple as reducing the
17 times in which we're running these farms.

18 Bats being very small creatures cannot fly in high
19 wind speeds which are favorable to these wind turbines; thus
20 they're going to be operating at different times. Many
21 farms throughout the nation and globally have compromised
22 with the wildlife and the bats especially. In many places
23 these fatalities have been reduced up to 60 percent simply
24 by compromising when these turbines will be operating and
25 when they will not be.

1 Another very effective science that is being
2 researched right now is the use of radar which has reduced
3 fatality from 40 to 60 percent in many locations which will
4 be applied soon in the new future. Thank you, Ladies and
5 Gentlemen.

6 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you so much.

7 Mr. Smith, Paul Smith.

8 COMMENTS BY PAUL SMITH

9 Hello, my name is Paul Smith, and I live at 1482
10 Mabee Mines Road, Washougal, Washington at the west end of
11 the county. Thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight.

12 I am opposed to this project as it is written.
13 It's hard for me to believe that the parties who are
14 responsible for drafting this DEIS can be objective and
15 impartial to this proposal. Nothing personal.

16 EFSEC is an agency known for siting energy
17 facilities, and the BPA is an agency which deals with power
18 generation and the distribution of that power. It is your
19 duty to be objective in this matter.

20 This EIS is insufficient in that an appropriate
21 EIS has a list of alternatives. This one only states one
22 action item and mentions throughout the document that it is
23 one of the alternatives. How can the proposed action also
24 be an alternative? The only alternative stated is the
25 no-action alternative. The applicant states that he cannot

1 go below 70 megawatts and is trying to disguise this
2 unwillingness to minimize this project by saying that public
3 utilities seeking to fulfill their RPS requirements need a
4 minimum of this kind of output "to be attractive".

5 In one area it states that the project has to be
6 defined as an integrated whole to be worthwhile; yet in the
7 design mitigation measure under biological resources it
8 states, "Micro siting of turbines and associated facilities
9 would allow any sensitive resources discovered during
10 construction to be avoided." You can't have it both ways.

11 Page 1-7 states, "No other federal agencies have
12 been identified as cooperating agencies for this EIS at this
13 time." Cooperating, hmmm? Is that because National Parks
14 Service and the Forest Service have made concern negative
15 comments about this proposal as it is now written? Also why
16 have the Yakama Nation not been involved in this DEIS when
17 they as a sovereign nation have legitimate cultural resource
18 concerns? Any EIS is required to ensure that there is no
19 impact to cultural resources.

20 On page 1-8 it states that other federal, state,
21 or local agencies also may have permitting or approval
22 authority for the proposed program. Those agencies may use
23 this EIS in order to fulfill NEPA and SEPA and
24 responsibilities. Those agencies have an obligation to the
25 public to do their own due diligence and evaluations, not

1 the kind of proponents potential bias data.

2 This EIS states that the BPA substation would
3 cover 4.25 acres and be sufficient for future installation
4 of equipment if required for future development. What kind
5 of future development? 50 more wind turbines? I am
6 concerned with scope treaty. With the national and state
7 mandates on going green, I can see how once they are in it
8 would be much easier to expand the number of turbines. I
9 don't want to see this project look like the Klickitat
10 projects. People come from all over the world to enjoy the
11 majestic natural vistas the Columbia River Gorge has to
12 offer, not manmade ones. I don't think very many people
13 would like to see wind turbines at Yosemite, Yellowstone, or
14 the Grand Canyon. Neither should they at the National
15 Scenic Area, one of only two in the whole United States of
16 America?

17 This EIS is globally insufficient in the
18 evaluations of wildlife. It does a poor job of covering bat
19 evaluations, lacks significant bird-bat dispersal data, and
20 has no mention of large animal. It is so bold as to state,
21 "For potential impacts of big game species, deer and elk,
22 coordination with WDFW will occur if appropriate. It is a
23 no warning ground for elk."

24 Also what about cougar, bobcat, and coyotes and
25 other game? It states that it will convene a technical

1 advisory committee to evaluate mitigation and monitoring
2 programs for the impact to wildlife and habitat. Why is
3 that not already in place? So this project is proposed at
4 the right time in our local and national energy needs, but
5 it's placed in the wrong place. The Space Needle is around
6 605 feet tall. These turbines could be 426 feet tall.
7 There is no way this project could be defined visually
8 subordinate. If I want to see the Space Needle which also
9 has a blinking red light on top I will go to Seattle. I
10 don't want to see 50 Space Needles from key viewing areas in
11 the Columbia River Gorge. Thank you.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Can you provide those
13 written comments you just gave us to our staff, to Tammy.

14 MR. SMITH: Sure. It's a little bit marked up.

15 CHAIR LUCE: All right. That's fine. Thank you,
16 Mr. Smith.

17 Sallie.

18 COMMENTS BY SALLIE T. JONES

19 Sallie T. Jones, 882 Tuwa-Narrow, Washougal,
20 Washington, west end of Skamania County. Regardless of the
21 opinions regarding this proposed project, there must be
22 unbiased objective documents that permit public access to
23 information and divide decision makers to their tasks as
24 well. I don't really think this document is satisfactory in
25 that respect. I think -- that's all I'll say for now.

1 Item 1, I wanted to mention during a brief review
2 of the document, I was startled the appearance throughout a
3 distinct bias that had to do with the business needs of the
4 applicant. Right off the bat in Section 1.2.33 a discourse
5 of almost a few pages of text dealt with the business needs.
6 I don't think that's an appropriate discussion to have in
7 any EIS document, and the only information in that section
8 that I thought was relevant was the portion that mentioned
9 the amount of construction jobs. It didn't say temporary
10 construction jobs that would be provided by the project, and
11 the small amount of permanent jobs generated. I guess
12 that's about all on that subject.

13 I had Item 2. In view of the fact that no studies
14 have been conducted in the United States that determine what
15 effect wind turbines have on forest dwelling species of
16 wildlife, it seems somewhat inappropriate and misleading to
17 simply state over and over again as it does in some of the
18 concluding statements that no impacts are anticipated. Some
19 of the comments to that were stacked are nebulous,
20 inaccurate, or contradictory information included in the
21 appendices or in the text proceeding it, and that's part of
22 why I was disappointed in this document. It seems though
23 the attention to detail is not very good, nor very thorough.

24 Page 377 confidently states that operation of the
25 project would result in no further impacts to habitat on the

1 project site despite a statement on page 381 that quote,
2 "Because impact to big game as a result of the wind project
3 operation is limited it is difficult to predict the impacts
4 of the proposed project on wildlife using priority habitat
5 on the proposed project site."

6 More research data on human health in connection
7 with wind turbines is more available than it has ever been
8 before, and another person has made a good study in
9 compilation of that which I think you heard yesterday
10 evening in Underwood so I won't make anymore comment on
11 that.

12 Geologic and soils information is troubling for
13 anyone who has seen the proposed project site which is
14 pretty steep, and this project proposes to disturb a great
15 deal of that. Construction would require blasting, removal
16 of soil. And blasting can disturb fragile habitats not
17 necessarily at the time, but in future times and in long
18 periods of time as well. The soil types present are
19 unstable and probably even the plan mitigation -- am I done?
20 Oh, okay. Thank you. I will submit the rest of my
21 comments.

22 CHAIR LUCE: Please. Thank you very much.

23 Mr. Kahn.

24 COMMENTS BY GARY KAHN

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and Members of the Council.

1 My name is Gary Kahn. My address is P.O. Box 86100,
2 Portland, 97286. Kahn is spelled K-a-h-n, and I represent
3 Friends of the Columbia Gorge.

4 Initially I'd like to say that we support
5 Mr. Slockish's request for additional time to review the
6 EIS. The document is very thick. We've had three weeks
7 between its issuance and today. It's simply not enough time
8 for people to review it and offer public comments. We also
9 request there be an additional public hearing later on in
10 the process after people have had a full opportunity to
11 review the EIS.

12 Although we've had only three weeks, we've already
13 noted a number of major flaws in the EIS, and I would like
14 to talk about two of them today. At page 3-194 the DEIS
15 says, "During scoping some commenters expressed concern that
16 project operation would impact the scenic area adversely
17 since turbines would be visible from some key viewing areas
18 inside the scenic area. Analysis of the key viewing areas
19 and viewpoints within the scenic area were sought and
20 analyzed. The presence of the project would cause low to
21 moderate visual impact to viewpoints within the scenic
22 area."

23 There's several problems with this. First, the
24 reference to some commenters is simply unfair and wrong.
25 Hundreds of commenters raised the concerns about the scenic

1 impacts. During scoping 92 percent of the written comments
2 were opposed or had concerns about scenic impacts. Most of
3 them raised this issue. We searched the entire DEIS
4 electronically and this is the only instance where the
5 phrase some commenters is used. The EIS should be very
6 accurate and make it clear that it is most commenters that
7 have raised this concern.

8 Secondly, there have been no analysis of the
9 impacts from a number of the key viewing areas and
10 viewpoints within the scenic area. These include Mitchell
11 Point along the Historic Columbia River Highway which is an
12 important recreational trailhead. There's a process ongoing
13 to restore the scenic highway in that area and create
14 windows in the walls like there is outside of the Hood
15 River. The views from the restored tunnel along this trail
16 would look directly at this project.

17 There is no analysis of the impacts from the
18 Columbia River, another key viewing area. No analysis of
19 the impacts of State Routes 141 and 14 in Washington or
20 Oregon Highway 35 or Tom McCaw Point or Panorama Point in
21 Oregon which was noted in a letter of May 6, 2009 by Daniel
22 Harkenrider, the scenic area manager of the Forest Service.

23 In addition, there should be analysis of the
24 impacts visible from the Buck Creek Trail to Nestor Peak
25 which is due north of the project area. Although this is

1 outside the scenic area it's an important viewpoint and the
2 impacts to this view should be considered. The view of
3 Mount Hood from this area would be blocked by wind turbines.

4 The second issue I'd like to address is the
5 reasonable range of alternatives. NEPA and SEPA require two
6 major points with respect to alternatives. One, there be a
7 reasonable range of alternatives considered; two, that each
8 reasonable alternative be rigorously explored and
9 objectively evaluated. In this DEIS we have two
10 alternatives: one the project, one no action. This flies in
11 the face of NEPA and SEPA requirements, and we believe
12 additional alternatives must be analyzed in either a
13 supplemental DEIS or a new DEIS. It's the only way you can
14 comply with these two laws. Thank you for the opportunity
15 to comment.

16 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Mr. Kahn, appreciate your
17 comments.

18 MR. SLOCKISH: Mr. Luce, I want to clarify. I did
19 not say that. I said consultation. I did not say extend
20 the comment period for everybody, just the Tribal Government
21 with respect to him.

22 CHAIR LUCE: You're talking about government to
23 government.

24 MR. SLOCKISH: Yes.

25 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Thank you.

1 MR. KAHN: If I mischaracterized his comments, I
2 apologize.

3 CHAIR LUCE: I'm sure that no harm no foul.
4 Loreley Brach followed by David Bennett followed
5 Harold Gailey.

6 COMMENTS BY LORELEY BRACH

7 Thank you very much. My name is Loreley Brach,
8 and I live in Underwood, Washington. My address is P.O.
9 Box 67. I am here today to speak about something a little
10 different. Thank you again for letting me speak up.

11 I'm here today to speak about the data collection
12 in here. You allowed the applicant to hire their own
13 consultants and collect this data, and I'm going to relay a
14 little story to you about some experience I had when I
15 worked for the government, and I worked for a number of
16 different agencies, state, federal doing research. And I
17 was involved in a project.

18 It was a two-year project, and before I left to
19 start a family I completed the whole results, the analysis,
20 everything, turned it in, and never got -- I was the primary
21 author and never got another chance to look at it
22 afterwards. And after some time I went on line and found
23 this document and it was very interesting. A two-year study
24 a large portion of it was missing out of the first year. So
25 I called up the people and I said, "What was wrong? Was

1 there something wrong with my analysis that would cause
2 this?" And the answer was, "We did not agree with the
3 results." That's with the government.

4 Now what do you think a private consultant whose
5 bread and butter is to produce some product for these
6 companies, what do you think they would do to keep their
7 business, their jobs? I really have to question this.
8 These people shouldn't be doing this study for the people to
9 come up with the answers the right ones, ones we can trust.
10 So please I don't agree with this. I'm not even sure if
11 this is allowed by NEPA. If it is, please put it in the
12 document what laws allow this. I would really like to see
13 this. I would like the justification for this. If I'm
14 confused, I'm sure there's a lot of other people.

15 As far as new bat technology, we've been trying to
16 send man to outer space and find other planets to live on.
17 Wind turbines are basically like an airplane blade. You've
18 got to lift, you've got a low pressure zone. I don't see
19 how the technology mentioned really exists or would function
20 in that capacity, and I would like to see the research on
21 that.

22 As far as the economics of this county, you
23 probably noticed that there has been a lot of construction
24 going on. I personally and along with a lot of other people
25 do not believe that this once very wealthy county is really

1 struggling that hard. I think it's a spending problem. It
2 is not a financial problem. We're going to have to come
3 back to what all the other counties have been dealing with
4 more for many years, and that's trying to juggle and find
5 priorities. Skamania County was very wealthy. We have to
6 enter this new reality. Thank you.

7 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

8 Mr. Bennett.

9 COMMENTS BY DAVID BENNETT

10 Good evening. My name is David Bennett,
11 B-e-n-n-e-t-t, 401 Smith Beckon Road, Carson, Washington. I
12 think I'm coming from an advocate's position on this matter,
13 but I think everybody is right in the fact that everybody is
14 going to be impacted. If we do nothing, we're impacted
15 economically, socially, jobs, whatever. If the project goes
16 in, there's going to be some impact on the environment to
17 some degree. Your job is find to that balance and hopefully
18 make sure that the data and the science is such that the
19 risks are minimal.

20 But we do need to make some changes. We have to
21 have power or we have to change our ways entirely. We do
22 need jobs. We do need tax bases or we have to start
23 floating bond levies. The job is to find some kind of
24 balance, and I'm not exactly sure how you're going to do
25 that because everybody comes from a very emotional position

1 on this matter. Pro or con, that's it.

2 So I am an advocate for the project. I would like
3 to see it go in for a lot of reasons. It would help balance
4 out a lot of economic things, social things, jobs, and
5 somewhere along the line we're going to have to figure out
6 how to get along because the Gorge belongs to all of us.
7 It's where we live. It's where we make our living, and I'm
8 glad that people on the outside are wanting to defend the
9 beauty of what we have. Again, we've got to find that
10 balance. Thanks.

11 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, appreciate your comments.

12 Harold Gailey followed by Peter Cornelison.

13 COMMENTS BY HAROLD GAILEY

14 Yes, my name is Harold Gailey. I came prepared to
15 support the project, but in view of time I think I'll just
16 submit written comments.

17 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, appreciate that.

18 Mr. Cornelison.

19 COMMENTS BY PETER CORNELISON

20 I'm going to start by giving you something to look
21 at.

22 Hello again. My name is Peter Cornelison. I live
23 at 1003 5th Street, Hood River, Oregon 97031. I am going to
24 repeat myself on one point tonight. That is please give us
25 another chance at this time. Three weeks to review

1 1,500 pages of technical material is totally inadequate.

2 Please give us another hearing.

3 Point 2, this is something that locals, it sort of
4 takes local knowledge to know this, but in Hood River and in
5 Washington there's typically when there's storming from the
6 coast they stop kind of on the ridge line here as you can
7 see and forms a pretty substantial cloud layer. Now
8 oftentimes that cloud layer is right behind Underwood
9 Mountain where these turbines are proposed. My question is
10 what would the impact be on birds and aviation if you don't
11 see these things taller than the tallest building in
12 Portland? That to my knowledge is not covered in the EIS.

13 Point 3, it was stated earlier that a precedent
14 has been set. Turbines can be seen from inside the National
15 Scenic Area area. True on the extreme eastern end from a
16 great distance away. The fact that I talked to you about
17 last night was that turbines, a turbine project that was
18 going to be right on the boundary of the scenic area has
19 been stopped, defeated. This was the one at 7 Mile Hill
20 between The Dalles and Mosier.

21 This will be the first turbine project just
22 outside the boundary of the scenic area and essentially it
23 flouts the intention of the drafters of the Scenic Act. It
24 also would have a major impact on Hood River which derives
25 at least one-third of its business from tourist economy.

1 If you've driven to Goldendale and seen the impact
2 of those turbines up close, the blades spinning, they draw
3 your eye. That's not what people come to Hood River and
4 Washington to experience. If they want that, they can drive
5 another hour to Goldendale. I know you probably don't have
6 to consider Hood River in your impact, it's Oregon, but I
7 ask out of fairness that you do. Thank you.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, appreciate your comments.

9 Jill Barker followed by Charles Pace and Rob
10 Gilchrist.

11 COMMENTS BY JILL BARKER

12 Good evening. I'm Jill Barker and I live in
13 Mosier, Oregon, and I'm speaking for the Columbia Gorge
14 Audubon Society tonight.

15 Whistling Ridge is not so much about renewable
16 energy development. We all support renewable energy future
17 for our nation, but this simply is the wrong project at the
18 wrong place at the wrong time. The Condit Dam on the White
19 Salmon is going to be removed. Day after day the Condit Dam
20 churns out 8 to 10 megawatts of power, almost of the firm
21 power Whistling Ridge would produce. Should we rethink a
22 facility's removal? No, because it's been determined that
23 salmon recovery is a higher priority than renewable energy
24 from the White Salmon River.

25 So it is with the Columbia Gorge. The Gorge was

1 set aside by Congress as a special place to be preserved and
2 protected for all future generations. No one anticipated
3 the abomination of 500-foot gleaming white towers with
4 rotating blades being located on ridges just outside the
5 National Scenic Area boundaries; otherwise, the lines would
6 have been drawn up differently.

7 If this proposal is permitted along with other
8 proposals in the east Gorge, the iconic landscapes the
9 Scenic Act purports to protect will become subordinate by
10 day to giant towers with rolling blades and by night to
11 flashing red lights. If the Whistling Ridge project is
12 permitted, then it will be time to ask Congress to redraw
13 the boundaries of the scenic area. The incongruity of
14 industrial wind energy projects up and down the Gorge on
15 ridge tops just beyond the scenic area boundary scene flies
16 in the face of the very intent of the Scenic Act itself.

17 A cheerleading flyer sent out by the project
18 proponent asserts that in a single year Whistling Ridge will
19 displace X barrels of oil, X tons of CO₂, and X numbers of
20 cars on the road. This is a cruel hoax. Where is the
21 evidence for such an assertion? In fact, for every megawatt
22 of wind energy developed an offset of fossil fuel fired
23 megawatts has to be developed as wind energy's
24 unpredictability fee stabilizes the electrical grid, and
25 this comes from the Northwest Power Planning Council's own

1 words.

2 With a verging population, negative consumerism,
3 and Wall Street driven cowboy economy, we'll need every
4 barrel of oil, every ton of coal, every cubic foot of gas to
5 keep the economy humming. The best evidence we have for
6 this is the Gulf Oil volcano. Even though the Gulf Coast is
7 a wash of oil threatening their very way of life elected
8 officials have lined up to demand that the moratorium on
9 deep water oil drilling be lifted so that business can go on
10 as usual. Moreover Whistling Ridge developer SDS and its
11 partners were paid 20 million dollars in public money by BPA
12 to not develop a gas fired plant project in Bingen. Where
13 is the concern by SDS for CO2 emissions then? The flyer
14 further asserts there will be no harm to wildlife
15 populations. Can I continue?

16 CHAIR LUCE: Wrap it up, but go ahead.

17 MS. BARKER: There will be no harm to wildlife
18 population. This is also a hoax. The raptor mortality from
19 wind energy projects developed in Klickitat County is ten
20 times what the EIS predicted, and there's an article by
21 Kathy Durbin in the Columbia minutes states that. What went
22 so terribly wrong? Columbia Gorge Audubon releases the cozy
23 relationship between the project proponents and the EIS
24 preparers is what went wrong. Getting a permit opens the
25 spickets to fat state and federal subsidies without which

1 projects like Whistling Ridge would be unprofitable to
2 develop.

3 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you so much. You will leave
4 comments hopefully with staff?

5 MS. BARKER: My husband was going to speak and
6 he'd defer his time to me to finish this.

7 CHAIR LUCE: Your husband is listed as a speaker?

8 MS. BARKER: You signed in?

9 I think he signed in.

10 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Go ahead.

11 MS. BARKER: By comparison wind energy industry
12 makes much of birds killed by plate glass windows, cats, and
13 vehicle grills. But how many eagles or falcons or hawks are
14 killed by these objects? Wind energy is very selective in
15 its bird mortality, and raptors are some of the most
16 threatened bird populations. I would not want to be a
17 raptor trying to negotiate the mid Columbia landscape these
18 days, would you? The U.S. Fish and Wildlife service wants
19 to reintroduce the California Condor to its former range in
20 the Gorge. What a joke.

21 At an initial hearing before EFSEC on Whistling
22 Ridge Wally Stevenson the owner of SDS states that his
23 company has always tried to do the right thing. Columbia
24 Gorge Audubon assumes that this was said to help persuade
25 EFSEC to render a decision favorable to Whistling Ridge. We

1 would like to balance the record with this.

2 Concurrent with establishing a National Scenic
3 Area, Congress designated the lower White Salmon River under
4 the National Wild Scenic River Act. The management area
5 boundary included some SDS property, including lands along
6 Spring Creek and critical areas of salmon spawning once they
7 are reintroduced. The Forest Service offered SDS a land
8 exchange so these lands would not be logged and the values
9 for which the river was designated could be preserved.
10 Apparently SDS was unable to get above the appraised values
11 for their land so the company cut the forest down to include
12 Spring Creek and other areas where hiking trails and picnic
13 areas were planned. Now we ask you was that the right thing
14 to do?

15 Lastly, the Northwest is not short, not short on
16 renewable energy. It's conveniently overlooked by the
17 industrial wind energy proponents, but 10,000 megawatts of
18 high quality renewable energy is churned out daily by the
19 Columbia River Hydro System, and it's come at a high price.
20 Saliva Falls once the Northwest cultural and natural history
21 icon is gone, and the world's greatest natural salmon
22 fishery has been driven to near extinction. The sprawling
23 industrial swathe of wind turbines now stretches along both
24 sides of the Columbia from Maryhill to Walla Walla. These
25 Columbia River landscapes of Lewis and Clark and the Oregon

1 Trail have been disfigured and no longer available to those
2 who aspire to capture the spirit of those storied places.

3 It would seem that the Northwest are selling our
4 souls, our incomparable landscapes to satisfy California's
5 insatiable need for so-called green energy. So SDS and your
6 sidekick Wind Works! Northwest don't tell us that now we
7 need to deface the Columbia Gorge to chase a few more green
8 megawatts. The region has paid its dues. The wind energy
9 industry just like the dam builders will hound out every
10 wind resource to erect their turbines because a pot of money
11 in state and federal subsidies awaits a secured permit. It
12 is up to thoughtful citizens to ensure that some areas are
13 off limits. Prides of NIMBYism can be heard, but let us not
14 be made to feel guilty by renewable energy wants and the
15 wind energy industry and county commissioners who do their
16 bidding for standing up to protect the last best places.
17 We'll comment further on the DEIS.

18 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much, appreciate your
19 comments.

20 Mr. Pace.

21 COMMENTS BY CHARLES PACE

22 Thank you. My name is Charles Pace. I live in
23 North Bonneville. I'm a landowner.

24 CHAIR LUCE: You want to give us your address?

25 MR. PACE: P.O. Box 70.

1 I was going to focus on the weaknesses in the DEIS
2 that I found, but the point is not to support or oppose but
3 rather to strengthen the document, and it's not my -- Al,
4 it's good to see you. I bet you didn't miss me as much as I
5 missed you.

6 The 30-day extension that was requested is
7 appropriate for government-to-government consultation I
8 don't believe it's necessary or even going to contribute to
9 the process to provide that for everyone. In terms of the
10 socioeconomic impacts, I'm a professional economist by
11 training. I find that the Draft EIS falls far short. You
12 need to look at the two-county area. The benefits are
13 significant, but they can't be assumed. You have to do a
14 serious analysis. It has to have detail. In my opinion
15 this is one of the draft's most significant weaknesses. I
16 think it's been raised by either the City of White Salmon or
17 it might have been Klickitat County they pointed that out,
18 and it might have been in the Gorge proceedings. But anyway
19 I remember reading that.

20 3.1.1 the affected environment needs to describe
21 the social and economic baseline, and then from there look
22 at the impacts in section 3.14. Right now that's on page
23 3-35. That's virtually uninformative. So you need to go in
24 there and look at the benefits, the tax revenues, and also
25 recognize that there are going to be impacts on the

1 community infrastructure, governmental services, and so on,
2 but I think just my gut reaction there is that the benefits
3 are going to be significant.

4 Other issues, public safety, global warming, the
5 environmental compliance process also because you are doing
6 a joint one you don't want to ignore BPA's process for
7 interconnection, and I have a concern there because there
8 are water impacts. There are project impacts below
9 projects, and it has to do with the way that we integrate
10 wind into the system. Those are issues that are larger,
11 much larger than this project. For that reason I suggest
12 that you bifurcate the interconnection aspect from the
13 siting facility aspect so that the project can go forward
14 there and not get hung up in questions about how we're going
15 to integrate wind. I'll submit written comments, and it's
16 good to see you again.

17 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, Mr. Pace.

18 Rob Gilchrist.

19 COMMENTS BY ROB GILCHRIST

20 My name is Rob Gilchrist, G-i-l-c-h-r-i-s-t, and I
21 live at 72 McNichols Road in Cook, and I have got a couple
22 comments for tonight. My first big concern is the
23 precedence that this project will set. You know, the visual
24 impacts have looked at what this set of windmills will
25 provide, but if this project is allowed to go forward, I

1 share the concerns with others tonight that more projects
2 will be allowed and the National Scenic Area will be more
3 heavily impacted than is what currently proposed.

4 I also find that I did not know that there's only
5 two National Scenic Areas in the entire United States, and
6 it seems like some of the comments in this proposal do not
7 take into account that this is such a short resource for a
8 nation. For example, looking at the housing prices the
9 housing impact of windmills on housing prices was taken
10 across the nation as a whole, and my guess is that in most
11 of those locations housing prices are not largely based on
12 the scenery that surrounds them. My other comment is that
13 one of the main drives to do this is the economic impact,
14 and there's no question that there will be a positive
15 economic impact; however, I don't want the current economic
16 state of our entire country to bias the decision today
17 because certainly the impacts, the negative visual impacts
18 will last much, much longer than our current poor economic
19 state. That is it.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir.

21 Last person we have listed is Crumpacker, John
22 Crumpacker.

23 COMMENTS BY JOHN CRUMPACKER

24 Good evening. My name is John Crumpacker. My
25 address is P.O. Box 100, Underwood, Washington, and I'm here

1 tonight on behalf of the Skamania Agri-Tourism Association.
2 We're a group of basically businesses that are directly
3 impacted by the project in Underwood, and our position on
4 the project is that we actually support the project. We
5 support it on the condition that it be reconfigured, and
6 that was rejected in the Draft Environmental Impact
7 Statement as not possible so that's what I wanted to
8 address.

9 We support the project on the condition that the
10 seven southerly most A towers which I think are 1 through 7
11 be moved back into the project, and it seems based on most
12 of what's been done both by the applicant and what we've
13 heard from other folks is that those towers probably
14 represent the most significant visual impact of the entire
15 project. So it's a pretty important issue to consider.

16 We basically feel that the conclusion in the Draft
17 Environmental Impact Statement that it can't be reconfigured
18 because it's not economically viable other than as proposed
19 isn't actually the case, and one of the significant issues
20 that you could address in the Draft and the Final
21 Environmental Impact Statement is whether the number of
22 towers less than 50 could produce whatever this threshold is
23 that's truly economically viable. So that's one thing that
24 could be done, and it's really important that be considered
25 and it's not. It's just rejected.

1 The other relates to whether all 50 towers are
2 really necessary, and if you look at the Draft Environmental
3 Impact Statement on 220 and 221, all the conclusions, all
4 the facts that you have before you right now that it's
5 viable only with the full 50 towers as configured with no
6 micro siting or deletion of towers is from the applicant.
7 So I wanted to read quickly a statement from the applicant,
8 and this was made according to Jesse Burkhardt whose the
9 reporter for the Enterprise Newspaper in White Salmon which
10 is one of our local papers. And this statement was made by
11 the president of SDS who's also the president of the
12 Whistling Ridge project, and it was made actually in the
13 room you were in yesterday in front of several hundred
14 people and to quote, "Spadaro said that there would be a
15 maximum of 44 turbines in the development proposal. Our
16 project is 50 megawatts. That's very small in terms of
17 energy development," Spadaro said. It goes on to say that
18 another citizen learned that the energy project would not
19 stop with only 44 turbines, but Spadaro countered that that
20 was not true. Spadaro explained these 44 turbines were the
21 limits to the project.

22 Well, at that point apparently it was economically
23 viable was 44. Our position is that 7 turbines are at issue
24 here. 50 minus must 44 is 6 turbines. Based on the words
25 of the proponent of this project, you should definitely be

1 asking the Draft Environmental Impact Statement authors to
2 include in the Environmental Impact Statement consideration
3 for the reconfiguration of the project which was rejected.
4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your
6 comments. That concludes the list of people -- well, it
7 does conclude the list of people who signed in. Now if you
8 would like to speak or if we have -- Tammy, do you have
9 other people?

10 MS. TALBURT: I don't, but the lady in the scarf
11 did sign in on the list.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Please come forward and give us your
13 comments. I apologize for having overlooked you.

14 MS. REPAR: Thank you very much. Yes, I do
15 remember signing the purple sheet.

16 CHAIR LUCE: All right.

17 COMMENTS BY MARY REPAR

18 Thank you very much for giving this opportunity to
19 speak. My name is Mary Repar, R-e-p-a-r. I live at 6971
20 East Loop Road, No. 2, Stevenson, Washington 98648.

21 These are my preliminary comments and let me be
22 blunt, Section 314, page 3264, these are about the
23 cumulative impacts. There seems to be a lot of talk about
24 cumulative impacts but no analyses. The basic refrain
25 throughout the DEIS, especially on the cumulative impact

1 analysis section seems to be bad things happened in the
2 past, bad things will happen in the present, and bad things
3 will happen in the future, but there is no analysis of these
4 bad things happening.

5 The NEPA process says you must use critical
6 analysis in federal projects and this qualifies. I'm going
7 to give you the CEQ's Handbook on considering cumulative
8 effects under the National Environmental Policy Act, and in
9 Table 5.3, page 56, for example, there are analyses for
10 analyzing cumulative effects. For example, trend which
11 would give you to assess the status of a resource, ecosystem
12 and human community over time. It usually results in a
13 graphical projection of past and future conditions. I
14 didn't see that anywhere in the DEIS. Also there's no
15 modeling which would address the cause and effect
16 relationships. Where is it? Why aren't we seeing some of
17 these true analyses with quantifying data? There is no
18 environmental baseline data established. Where is the
19 baseline data?

20 If you render cumulative analyses you need
21 baseline. I want to see that baseline data. I did not see
22 it in the cumulative impacts analysis section. This whole
23 document actually I found it quite inadequate in the
24 sections that I read, and cumulative impacts are my heart's
25 thumping, causing my heart to thump when I read cumulative

1 analysis, and my heart wasn't thumping when I read this.

2 On page 3272, for example, the proponent states
3 past and present line development, timber harvest, and
4 agricultural uses have resulted in a cumulative significant
5 change. Then at the end of this paragraph, well, our
6 development of this proposed action would contribute
7 incrementally. Okay. You had significant change. Now
8 you're going to do incremental. Where is the quantifying
9 data that would give you something to look forward to?

10 Also, I have carrying capacity has not been
11 addressed at all. Where is the special economic impact
12 analysis and social impact analysis for these documents?
13 The CEQ's handbook covers all of that.

14 BPA question. Is this thing going to need a gas
15 plant to supplement it? I've got a series of questions
16 here. But how is BPA going to back the real and potential
17 wind energy production from all of these wind farms?

18 And I'm also submitting three articles, newspaper
19 articles, and one of them states that, let's see, 6,500
20 birds and more than 3,000 birds are annually killed by the
21 wind power turbines currently operating in Oregon and
22 Washington. And lastly, Increased Costs Are Blowing in the
23 Wind by Todd Wynn and Eric Lowe, Cascade Commentaries or
24 Cascade Policy Organization. Wind energy on the Pacific
25 Northwest's electricity grid has increased substantially.

1 Often overlooked are the impact of increasing wind
2 generation on the reliability and affordability of
3 electricity that very well might outweigh any of the
4 promised environmental benefits.

5 I will be submitting many, many, many, many, many
6 more comments on this DEIS. Just I didn't have anymore time
7 to do it. Again I would like to submit the handbook too for
8 your consideration.

9 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. I do apologize.
10 I did overlook you and it was my error and submit the
11 handbook. We do have a copy of it which we utilize, but we
12 always can use an extra one.

13 Are there anymore comments this evening?

14 Yes.

15 COMMENTS BY AARON BABCOCK

16 I grew up here my whole life every summer. I live
17 in Vancouver, Washington now. 16420 McGillivary, 103-712 is
18 my number.

19 I support the wind farms. I believe the trees is
20 what the major problem is because I believe in the future
21 there will be wild fires if we don't fix the Ecology of the
22 trees which will create a problem for the windmills.

23 They're not thinned well. They're rotting away. I have
24 hunted all through there, and there's plenty of birds
25 because of all the worms that are laying around. So we

1 don't have to worry about the birds. It's about the jobs we
2 have to worry or no one is going to be able to look at
3 anything. We're all going to be up on the sidewalks. But I
4 do security, I'm employed, but people that haven't been
5 working for two years they need a job.

6 A basic remedy for false accusations about the
7 wind turbines would be a security guard or forest ranger to
8 oversee it. You have daily paperwork, court documents on
9 observations, testing the metal, making sure it's durable,
10 it's not aluminum. And if there's any birds going in, it
11 could document it. It's all there right on site, and they
12 could test it everyday, and it's just another job added to
13 the wind turbines. And we could get some real good facts
14 right from the security guard, court documented, and remedy
15 all the paperwork of computers and all of that. Just hire
16 security just to watch the turbines and check the paperwork
17 over here, and it's all remedied.

18 And if the trees are growing good, you won't see
19 the turbines very much because the trees will be growing
20 again. But right now what I see is they're turning brown
21 and they're falling apart. They don't thin them. They're
22 just -- and animals are going away towards those wind farms
23 because there's nothing to eat up there. It's drying out.
24 They're coming down here by the Columbia River on private
25 land. That's why there's hoards of elk and deer right on

1 the Columbia, you know.

2 They just destroyed the lumber industry because
3 environmentalists came in with all their rules and killed
4 jobs. All we need is some good Ecology, you know. Plant
5 ten trees for one tree. Thin the forest so wind can get
6 through there so they grow tall and that's pretty much all I
7 want to say.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much.

9 Anybody else? We've got another commenter. We've
10 got two commenter.

11 COMMENTS BY BONNIE WHITE

12 Hi, I didn't plan on speaking here tonight, but if
13 I don't I'm not going to be able to face my granddaughter.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Could you state your name, please.

15 MS. WHITE: My name is Bonnie White and I live in
16 White Salmon. I grew up in Goldendale. I went to
17 Goldendale High School. My mother was the county auditor,
18 my father was the chief of police, and my grandmother was
19 married to the grandson of the founder of Goldendale.

20 I have lived on the west end of Klickitat County
21 for the past 34 years. I'm an artist. People pay me to
22 paint images of the Gorge. I think I live in one of the
23 most beautiful places in the world. Being raised in a
24 political family I know how power and money speaks, and I
25 think that's pretty evident here tonight. You know, it's

1 hard to get up when you have someone who is part of your own
2 community and a major employer in the community and has long
3 arms. It's hard to speak against them. You pay a price for
4 it.

5 The issue here to me goes beyond whether wind
6 power kills bats or birds or global warming. It's about
7 defacing one of our national treasures. This isn't a
8 national park. It's a national scenic area.

9 A couple weeks ago my family had a gathering in
10 Goldendale, and I saw a cousin that I hadn't seen in a long
11 time, and I am involved in a land trust and we own 160 acres
12 out near Hawker Road where one of the wind power projects
13 is. I asked her if she'd ride out with me to look at the
14 project and see. Up until now I haven't had the guts to go
15 out and see if you can really hear what it sounds like, what
16 it really looks like, what it's really like to be there.
17 And we drove out Hawker Road to an area called, a little
18 road called Oaks Flat, and it was devastating. It was
19 absolutely devastating.

20 We couldn't go any further because there was so
21 much -- there were big rocks and mud in the road from the
22 trucks coming in and out. The turbines totally own the
23 landscape. It's like being in the twilight zone, and I'm
24 not exaggerating. It's worse than I imagined. It's worse
25 than I could have imagined. The sound is overwhelming.

1 They're huge.

2 I saw one kestrel in an area that I birded in, and
3 I've counted dozens of raptors in that area. I saw one
4 kestrel. I heard one meadowlark and I could barely hear it.
5 At this time of year because of all the rain the landscape
6 itself there were all kinds of wildflowers blooming all
7 over, and around them were these huge metal objects that the
8 sound it sounds like a continual airplane over you. It just
9 sounds like an airplane, and each time the blades went
10 around it sounded like a freeway, like freeway traffic. It
11 didn't sound like a car. It sounds like freeway traffic.
12 Just vroom, vroom. It was unbelievably devastating.

13 It owns the entire landscape, and, you know, all
14 of these people talk about jobs. What about all the people
15 who no longer have a job because of these turbines?

16 I got lost here. My cousin who just retired from
17 a mill was sporting her new watch. She was really proud of
18 it. She is very different than I am and she was just
19 overwhelmed. She said they've destroyed the Gorge. They've
20 destroyed the Gorge. This is, you know, this is the
21 Columbia Gorge. They have destroyed it, and I was really
22 surprised and I thought about that. And I thought about how
23 we have this Columbia Gorge Scenic Area, and we think of the
24 boundary of the Gorge, but the people come here and see it
25 is the Columbia Gorge. We have destroyed most of the

1 Columbia Gorge.

2 And this is -- I'm asking you to have some sense.
3 You know, sure, people are here for jobs. Some people are
4 here because they get benefits by speaking out for this
5 project, and those who speak against it have nothing to gain
6 except possibly the hope of continuing to have a Columbia
7 River Gorge in an area that is so precious to all of us, an
8 area where my granddaughter will be able to paint, where
9 Wally's daughter will be able to paint, you know. I just
10 ask you to consider the Columbia Gorge. Thank you

11 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much for your
12 comments. We have another commenter.

13 COMMENTS BY KELLEY BEAMER

14 Thanks. Good evening. My name is Kelley Beamer.
15 I work with Friends of the Columbia Gorge, 522 S.W. 5th,
16 Suite 720, Portland, Oregon 97204. Thank you for the
17 opportunity to comment this evening.

18 I'll be brief. I work as a conservation organizer
19 for Friends and interact a lot with our membership that
20 exceeds 5,000 in Oregon, Washington, and throughout the
21 entire United States. As soon as we let our members know
22 about the release of the Draft Environmental Impact
23 Statement I started receiving calls, e-mails, and visits to
24 the office with people who were frustrated with the amount
25 of time. Again I'm reiterating something you've heard

1 already. But just based on my interactions with supporters
2 and people who care deeply about getting involved with this
3 process there was a lot of frustration. So I would
4 reiterate the request to (a) extend the comment period and
5 (b) to hold an additional public hearing.

6 I also want to address one part of this visual
7 impact analysis involving the key viewing areas. The Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement looked at specific static
9 points. There are specific key viewing areas such as the
10 Historic Columbia River Highway I-84 that are entire
11 stretches of the key viewing area, and I would ask that the
12 analysis be shifted from just specific points on those to an
13 analysis of what the experience is along that entire key
14 viewing area I-84 or Historic Columbia Highway of Columbia
15 River, for instance.

16 Lastly, I just want you to realize that the
17 project that you are all spending this time reviewing and
18 hearing comments about as you know is unlike any other
19 project that has been proposed because of its proximity to a
20 National Scenic Area. Congress has voted time and time
21 again to recognize this area as an outstanding natural
22 treasure that is valuable to our country. It did it when it
23 voted to pass the National Scenic Area Act, when it passed
24 the Ice Age Pledge National Geologic Trail just in 2008, the
25 Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, The Pacific Crest

1 National Scenic Trail. Those are just a few.

2 So the decision that you pass on to Governor
3 Gregoire will impact future generations as it's been said.
4 We hear time and time again about people's experience
5 visiting the Gorge. This is a very, very special area that
6 should be protected for future generations and a decision
7 will impact future generations. Thank you for the
8 opportunity to comment.

9 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Do we have any other
10 comments? Going once, going twice?

11 All right. I think we've had all the commenters
12 this evening. We do appreciate all of your coming here and
13 the respect that you have shown each other. This is a very
14 controversial issue in this community and in the state of
15 Washington with respect to the siting of this project as
16 many other projects are. We will carefully consider all of
17 the comments we have heard orally. We will read and
18 carefully consider all of the comments in writing. We are
19 cognizant of the fact that some of you have asked for
20 additional time.

21 I want to take this opportunity to thank staff,
22 the Energy Facility Site Evaluation staff for setting up not
23 only this meeting but the meeting last evening. I think it
24 went very well. So kudos to the staff for really a first
25 rate job, and I look forward to reading the comments that

1 you're providing and hearing you at additional meetings that
2 the Council may hold on this matter.

3 Thank you to Bonneville so much, Mr. Montana and
4 Bonneville staff, and the meeting is concluded for this
5 evening. Thank you.

6 * * * * *

7 (Whereupon, the public meeting was adjourned at
8 8:40 p.m.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	PAGE
3	PAUL PEARCE	9
4	ANN LEUDERS	11
5	DAVE L'HOMMEDIEU	12
6	MATT MEGA	13
7	W.D. TRUITT	15
8	MIKE CANON	16
9	AARON LEONARD	18
10	TOM DRACH	19
11	BOB ANDERSON	23
12	WILBUR SLOCKISH	23
13	DAVID TEITZEL	25
14	JOHNNY JACKSON	26
15	MARFA SCHERATSKI	28
16	DAN SPATZ	29
17	RICK TILL	31
18	BEN BLISS	33
19	PAUL SMITH	35
20	SALLIE T. JONES	38
21	GARY KAHN	40
22	LORELEY BRACH	44
23	DAVID BENNETT	46
24	HAROLD GAILEY	47
25	PETER CORNELISON	47

I N D E X (CONT'D)

1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	PAGE
3	JILL BARKER	49
4	CHARLES PACE	54
5	ROB GILCHRIST	56
6	JOHN CRUMPACKER	57
7	MARY REPAR	60
8	AARON BABCOCK	63
9	BONNIE WHITE	65
10	KELLEY BEAMER	68
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 In re: Whistling Ridge Energy Project
2 Application No. 2009-01

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A F F I D A V I T

I, Shaun Linse, CCR, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript prepared under my direction is a full and complete transcript of proceedings held on June 17, 2010, in Stevenson, Washington.

Shaun Linse, CCR 2029