

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the matter of: )  
Application No. 2003-01 )  
SAGEBRUSH POWER PARTNERS, LLC, ) Prehearing Conference  
KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT ) Pages 1 - 61  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

A prehearing conference in the above matter was held in the presence of a court reporter on September 12, 2004, at 2:45 p.m., at 925 Plum Street S.E., in Olympia, Washington, before Energy Facility Site Evaluation Councilmembers.

\* \* \* \* \*

The parties were present as follows:

SAGEBRUSH POWER PARTNERS, LLC, Darrel Peeples,  
Attorney at Law; Timothy McMahan, Attorney at Law; Erin  
Anderson, Attorney at Law, 325 Washington Street N.E., Suite  
440, Olympia, Washington 98501.

COUNSEL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, John Lane, Assistant  
Attorney General, 1125 Washington Street S.E., P.O. Box  
40100, Olympia, Washington 98504-0100.

KITTITAS COUNTY, James L. Hurson, Kittitas County  
Prosecutor, Kittitas County Courthouse, Room 213,  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926.

Reported by:  
Shaun Linse, CCR

Page 2

1 Appearances (cont'd):  
2 RESIDENTS OPPOSED TO KITTITAS TURBINES (ROKT),  
3 James C. Carmody, Velikanje, Moore & Shore, P.S., 405 East  
4 Lincoln Avenue, P.O. Box 22550, Yakima, Washington 98907.  
5 F. STEVEN LATHROP, Jeff Slothower, Attorney at  
6 Law, Lathrop, Winbauer, Harrel, Slothower & Denison, LLP,  
7 201 West Seventh Avenue, Ellensburg, Washington 98926.  
8 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GROUP, Debbie Strand,  
9 Executive Director, 1000 Prospect Street, P.O. Box 598,  
10 Ellensburg, Washington 98926.  
11 \* \* \* \* \*  
12 CHAIR LUCE: This is a prehearing conference  
13 and I'm not sure what the number is, but the prehearing  
14 conference in the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project,  
15 Application 2003-01 for Tuesday, September 12, 2006 is  
16 called to order. The time is 2:45. Presiding at this  
17 prehearing conference will be Judge Adam Torem.  
18 Judge Torem.  
19 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Chair Luce. Let me  
20 ask the clerk to go through the roll with the Council as  
21 to who's here.  
22 MR. FIKSDAL: Department of Community,  
23 Trade, and Economic Development?  
24 MR. FRYHLING: Dick Fryhling is here.  
25 MR. FIKSDAL: Department of Ecology?

Page 3

1 MS. ADELSMAN: Hedia Adelsman.  
2 MR. FIKSDAL: Department of Fish and  
3 Wildlife?  
4 MS. TOWNE: Chris Towne.  
5 MR. FIKSDAL: Department of Natural  
6 Resources?  
7 MS. WILSON: Judy Wilson.  
8 MR. FIKSDAL: Utilities and Transportation  
9 Commission?  
10 MR. SWEENEY: Tim Sweeney.  
11 MR. FIKSDAL: Kittitas County?  
12 MS. JOHNSON: Patti Johnson.  
13 MR. FIKSDAL: And the Chair.  
14 CHAIR LUCE: The Chair is present.  
15 JUDGE TOREM: Let me take appearances then  
16 from the Applicant.  
17 MR. PEEPLES: Darrel Peeples.  
18 MR. McMAHAN: Tim McMahan.  
19 JUDGE TOREM: Counsel for the Environment?  
20 MR. TRIBBLE: Mike Tribble here.  
21 JUDGE TOREM: And Renewable Northwest?  
22 Not present apparently today.  
23 Kittitas County?  
24 MR. HURSON: Jim Hurson present at the  
25 hearing.

Page 4

1 JUDGE TOREM: Community Trade and Economic  
2 Development?  
3 Not here.  
4 Mr. Lathrop?  
5 MR. SLOTHOWER: Jeff Slothower on behalf of  
6 Steve Lathrop. Mr. Lathrop is not present.  
7 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, sir.  
8 And for ROKT?  
9 MR. GARRETT: Ed Garrett.  
10 JUDGE TOREM: And the Economic Development  
11 Group?  
12 MS. STRAND: Debbie Strand is here.  
13 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Did I miss anybody  
14 from the parties or intervenors?  
15 MS. COMBO: This is Mary Ellen Combo with  
16 the Attorney General's Office, counsel for the EFSEC.  
17 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, ma'am, for joining  
18 us today.  
19 MR. PIERCY: Also Darryl Piercy of Kittitas  
20 County on the phone.  
21 MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  
22 Erin Anderson with Horizon Wind here in Ellensburg on the  
23 phone.  
24 JUDGE TOREM: Any others on the phone?  
25 All right. The next item on the agenda is

Page 5

1 adoption of our proposed agenda. It is a short one today.  
2 Do I have a motion to do so?  
3 MR. FRYHLING: So move.  
4 MS. ADELSMAN: Second.  
5 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Moved by  
6 Mr. Fryhling and seconded by--  
7 MS. ADELSMAN: Adelsman.  
8 JUDGE TOREM: -- Hedia Adelsman. It came  
9 from over there is all I know.  
10 MS. ADELSMAN: I'm one of the three women.  
11 CHAIR LUCE: Question is called for.  
12 All in favor say Aye.  
13 COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.  
14 JUDGE TOREM: All right. The proposed  
15 agenda now includes that we'll talk about the witnesses  
16 and hearings scheduled, see if there are any other  
17 additional questions and issues for the adjudicative  
18 hearings, and there's a separate handout on that, and  
19 finally, the cleanup items as to procedural matters and,  
20 if necessary, another prehearing conference.  
21 Let's look at Item 4. All of you should  
22 have gotten from Mr. Tribble and Mr. Peeples a proposed  
23 schedule, and there were a few more then circulated in  
24 yesterday's late afternoon just juggling the amounts of  
25 time and what dates people would show up. I had talked to

Page 6

1 EFSEC staff, as well as just before today's meeting  
2 Mr. Peeples about how to best ensure what I think is  
3 perhaps an overly optimistic schedule is going to be  
4 achieved.  
5 So let me ask Mr. Peeples first to tell me  
6 and the rest of you what he thinks is the current best  
7 up-to-date schedule and how many days of hearing we're  
8 going to need. Then I'm going to ask Mr. Hurson from the  
9 County if he concurs specifically as to the amount of time  
10 set aside for the preemption matter and other parties I'll  
11 ask if you concur with Mr. Peeples' assessment as to how  
12 many days of hearing we need.  
13 Mr. Peeples.  
14 MR. PEEPLES: First of all, I think the way  
15 Mr. Tribble and I did this, and Mike did the final wrap-up  
16 on this putting it all together and really put a lot of  
17 work into this. The amount of time for cross-examination  
18 of the sum reported by the parties my assessment on that  
19 is I think they're really pretty accurate. I think all  
20 the parties except for ROKT did a thoughtful job, and I  
21 think those are pretty good figures. ROKT looked like  
22 they put a placeholder of .25 hours for every single  
23 witness including their own.  
24 Now, I think probably their attorney was  
25 just too busy that week to get at it. I don't know. But

Page 7

1 that I think skews this and throws it off, and Jim and I,  
2 we were talking about this right before. We really think  
3 that once you make that adjustment, and Jim can speak for  
4 himself, I think we have a chance to get it done in three  
5 days on that, and a lot of those I'm going to make the  
6 other request that we take a look at these witnesses and  
7 perhaps discuss them here.  
8 We've already talked about Clay White.  
9 There's no reason why Clay White has to show up. He's a  
10 county employee. He's up in Ponderay, Stevens County.  
11 ROKT put a .25. If anything, that would be friendly  
12 cross. We'll stipulate to Clay's testimony. It'd be nice  
13 to see him. We haven't seen him for a couple months, but  
14 there's no reason to bring him down. I think we have many  
15 like that.  
16 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Hurson, no outstanding  
17 warrants in the County?  
18 MR. HURSON: No.  
19 JUDGE TOREM: All right then.  
20 MR. PEEPLES: So we have a lot of witnesses  
21 like that which I think we potentially unless the Council  
22 has questions can really to a certain extent totally get  
23 rid of. They're not issues that people have really raised  
24 in this process. The type of people I'm talking about is  
25 Tom Tebb for CFE. He's a DOE employee. There's no reason

Page 8

1 for him to bring Tom over, and we have a lot of other  
2 people. We have people that are going to be  
3 cross-examined for about .25 hours or .35 hours, one of  
4 which is coming from Denmark. We have people coming from  
5 D.C. for .25, .35 hours of cross-examination, and I really  
6 want to take a look at those, especially everybody  
7 starting from George Sterzinger, excluding Barton DeLacy,  
8 Roger Weaver, Tony and Arne and Troy Gagliano. I think we  
9 do those by stipulation or at best by telephone.  
10 And we had problems in the room last time  
11 with the telephone, and I agree that room was not really  
12 set up for it. We're trying to see if maybe we could have  
13 a day hearing or a couple hours of hearing if we need to  
14 do it by telephone someplace over at CWU. They must have  
15 a setup like WSU and UW with a really good audio visual  
16 type of setup where we could do that effectively there.  
17 And I think that's a lot for these  
18 witnesses' convenience. I hate to bring people across the  
19 country, bring state employees in for probably when I say  
20 .25, that's ROKT, and a lot of those are completely out of  
21 their area intervention. So I want to throw that out on  
22 the table now, and I think we can get it done I mean  
23 pretty responsibly within three days.  
24 JUDGE TOREM: I appreciate what you're  
25 suggesting for the witnesses' convenience, but I want to

Page 9

1 make sure none of these cross-examination times take into  
2 account that the Councilmembers may have questions they  
3 have, and you and I discussed this before the meeting.  
4 There are a number of questions that have  
5 been filtered to me by the Councilmembers that I do get a  
6 feel of what their questions and issues would be at the  
7 hearing, and some of them we're going to talk about it at  
8 the next agenda item. But there's a lot more that I told  
9 them to hold those for the cross-examination of those  
10 particular witnesses. So we're going to get to the  
11 Councilmembers and their input on it shortly.  
12 I just want to advise them a little bit in  
13 advance if there's any witnesses you see that are say less  
14 than a half an hour of allocated cross-exam time that you  
15 think your questions will lineup there and you do want  
16 them present and you're not willing to risk a bad phone  
17 connection, be prepared to identify those witnesses when  
18 we get done hearing from the County. That way we'll know  
19 if there are going to be witnesses that will only be  
20 called by phone or by stipulation we'll accept their  
21 testimony somehow, we will know if the Council has any  
22 questions or concerns for those particular witnesses.  
23 And I knew that some of you had questions  
24 for the noise and the weather witnesses. So those I can  
25 tell you in advance we may want to have come over to have

Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 them available for perhaps even short Council questioning</p> <p>2 MR. PEEPLES: I haven't marked those off.</p> <p>3 Those are ones there's no problem bringing them.</p> <p>4 JUDGE TOREM: From past practices I know</p> <p>5 we've had witnesses come over and it's a little bit</p> <p>6 embarrassing that no questions actually turn up; none that</p> <p>7 you anticipated and none that the Council may have</p> <p>8 anticipated, and I would like to follow some efficiencies</p> <p>9 for them as well as for the Council and the rest of the</p> <p>10 citizens of Kittitas County that were trying to plan their</p> <p>11 days in attending this.</p> <p>12 So, Mr. Hurson, tell me from the County's</p> <p>13 perspective what you think of Mr. Peeples' comments.</p> <p>14 MR. HURSON: I think scheduling wise we</p> <p>15 probably can get this done in the three-day time frame. A</p> <p>16 lot of the times I think I tried to make an estimate. You</p> <p>17 never know. I'm sure dealing with many hearings or trials</p> <p>18 sometimes the questions what you think is a simple yes or</p> <p>19 no and somebody starts telling their life story and it</p> <p>20 takes a lot longer to actually get the answer out. So</p> <p>21 there's a lot of flexibility.</p> <p>22 But, frankly, I think we're pretty</p> <p>23 realistic. The folks listed for the 18th I think we can</p> <p>24 get those done in a day. It may go over to the morning of</p> <p>25 the 19th would be my guess, but I doubt that we'd get done</p>	<p>1 but the rest of the week was not working well at all. So</p> <p>2 I was hoping we could waive his necessity of appearing. I</p> <p>3 told Mr. White I would be asking this request. He called</p> <p>4 me yesterday actually to find out the schedule, and I</p> <p>5 suggested that perhaps we could just have him submit an</p> <p>6 affidavit because when you submit the prefiled, you don't</p> <p>7 have him sworn in and I know you want sworn-in testimony.</p> <p>8 So I could have him fill out an affidavit that swears</p> <p>9 under penalty of perjury that the testimony that he gave</p> <p>10 previously in the written was true and correct so you get</p> <p>11 the sworn testimony.</p> <p>12 MR. PEEPLES: We would also be willing to</p> <p>13 stipulate to that. I think most parties would.</p> <p>14 JUDGE TOREM: While we're all thinking of</p> <p>15 Mr. White, are there any other parties that have an</p> <p>16 objection to Mr. White's testimony coming into the record?</p> <p>17 That's Exhibit 50 and there's a lot of supporting exhibits</p> <p>18 as to the first preemption request that was later</p> <p>19 withdrawn, but it does I think give a flavor as to what</p> <p>20 the record in this case was and there was some question</p> <p>21 about maybe it would be withdrawn or stricken, but I don't</p> <p>22 think that's something we need to address today. I leave</p> <p>23 that to the County's decision. But they want it to come</p> <p>24 in and submit an affidavit.</p> <p>25 Parties on the phone any objections to that?</p>
Page 11	Page 13
<p>1 earlier. If we do, I wouldn't see that as necessarily a</p> <p>2 major problem. I know I'd appreciate being able to get</p> <p>3 back to my office and check e-mail sooner than later.</p> <p>4 But the one thing I would ask is under Clay</p> <p>5 White's his testimony relates basically to the first</p> <p>6 preemption issue. He's not been an employee for the</p> <p>7 County for a couple of years. He's now in Stevens County.</p> <p>8 He's the planning director, public works director there.</p> <p>9 MR. SLOTHOWER: Judge Torem, I hate to</p> <p>10 interrupt, Mr. Hurson, but it's very hard on the phone</p> <p>11 hearing him.</p> <p>12 MR. HURSON: I'm sorry, Jeff. Is that</p> <p>13 better, Jeff?</p> <p>14 MR. SLOTHOWER: Yes.</p> <p>15 MR. HURSON: We moved the mic next to me.</p> <p>16 Yes, Clay is the Stevens County planning director, public</p> <p>17 works director. He wouldn't have any information</p> <p>18 regarding the last round of hearings and all that other</p> <p>19 information. The only party that indicated an interest in</p> <p>20 cross-examining regarding that I guess you could call it</p> <p>21 the old information is ROKT. I called Mr. Carmody</p> <p>22 yesterday. He said that I could represent to the Council</p> <p>23 that he would waive his right to examine Mr. White because</p> <p>24 I explained the situation, and, frankly, Mr. White's</p> <p>25 schedule is such that Monday he could possibly make it,</p>	<p>1 MR. SLOTHOWER: Jeff Slothower. I don't</p> <p>2 have any objection to that.</p> <p>3 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Tribble, any objections to</p> <p>4 that?</p> <p>5 MR. TRIBBLE: No, I do not.</p> <p>6 JUDGE TOREM: And I don't think the rest of</p> <p>7 the parties had any other items. ROKT is already spoken</p> <p>8 for through Mr. Carmody via Mr. Hurson.</p> <p>9 So, Councilmembers, any concern about not</p> <p>10 having Mr. White available and/or just allowing that</p> <p>11 testimony to come in by affidavit?</p> <p>12 CHAIR LUCE: I think it would be a good idea</p> <p>13 to have him by affidavit.</p> <p>14 JUDGE TOREM: It appears that the Council is</p> <p>15 behind that so we'll go ahead and strike Mr. White from</p> <p>16 the testifying witnesses, and at this time you can relieve</p> <p>17 him from the need to travel back to the old school.</p> <p>18 MR. HURSON: All right. Thank you. It</p> <p>19 would be nice to see him again, but I'll do that and then</p> <p>20 what I'll try to do is I'll try to e-mail him an affidavit</p> <p>21 that he can download, sign it, and then mail it back to me</p> <p>22 and I should have that before Monday morning. Hopefully</p> <p>23 I'll have the signed one. Now if I don't have a signed</p> <p>24 one, I hopefully will have a faxed copy and then get the</p> <p>25 other one to the Council.</p>

Page 14

1 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Very well.  
2 Now, as to the rest of the witness schedule  
3 issues, you feel again you said we can get this done in  
4 that three days.  
5 MR. HURSON: I think we can. I think  
6 there's just some key issues. We can either try to talk  
7 about every small minutia or just the key issues, and I  
8 think our intent is to try to focus more on the big  
9 issues. I assume everybody has looked at the  
10 cross-examination correctly.  
11 My one thing frankly is the 18th. I've only  
12 been through an EFSEC process once before in the Olympic  
13 Pipe Line Project. We were going to start in the morning  
14 and then I think there was motions and all sorts of  
15 things, and I don't think we started our first witness  
16 until 3:00 in the afternoon or something like that. I'm  
17 anticipating that won't happen here, but I didn't realize  
18 that was going to happen on the Olympic Pipe Line Project  
19 either. That's the only thing I think on the slide.  
20 But what I would suggest is you take the  
21 schedule you basically have and like the witnesses for the  
22 19th wouldn't be called until the 19th. So if we're  
23 finished up early, we just go home and everybody can get  
24 ready for the next day. Or if we go over, carry over the  
25 18th to those first and then move to the 19th. It looks

Page 15

1 like most of the witnesses scheduled for the 20th have  
2 very little that needs to be worked through. So if the  
3 18th and the 19th slide a little bit, it looks like on the  
4 20th we will be able to pick that up.  
5 JUDGE TOREM: Councilmembers, in my looking  
6 through the list of witnesses, and other parties on the  
7 phone I'll let you have a shot at this next, but the  
8 witnesses that I see aside from Clay White are Tom Tebb  
9 and then starting down with No. 80 Steven Grover, Michael  
10 Pappalardo, Josh Butler, Randall Krichbaum, and on the  
11 back page Jeffrey Flenniken, Les Polisky, Dan Pitzler,  
12 Henrik Jorgensen, Michael Bernay, and Dan Kammen. Those  
13 ten plus Mr. Tebb are the ones that I didn't see a whole  
14 lot of concern or questions from Councilmembers and what  
15 you've submitted to me. That was ten witnesses off that  
16 list.  
17 MR. PEEPLES: Could you repeat that.  
18 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, I will. So, again, it's  
19 Tebb, No. 90. He's the fifth one down at the top of the  
20 list. Then you'll drop all the way down toward the bottom  
21 of the page, No. 80, Steven Grover. Two witnesses down  
22 from him is No. 23, Michael Pappalardo. 24 is Josh  
23 Butler. The very last witness on that first page is  
24 Randall Krichbaum, No. 30. Then on the next page Jeffrey  
25 Flenniken, No. 28; Les Polisky, No. 31; Dan Pitzler, No.

Page 16

1 32; and then these next three in a row 37, 38, and 39,  
2 Jorgensen, Bernay, and Kammen they are mostly about the  
3 risk and the turbine safety and those sorts of issues.  
4 I've believe we heard from those three in the Wild Horse  
5 Project, but that doesn't make a record for us here.  
6 Their testimony would have to come in essentially without  
7 cross-examination or a telephone adoption of it and  
8 telephone cross-examination, if necessary.  
9 There were some questions Councilmembers had  
10 at the last hearing on those, but no one submitted to me  
11 that those were big issues for them. It may be that your  
12 minds have already been set at ease from your prior  
13 experience, but, again, remember the record in this case  
14 still has to be made. So if there are cross-examination  
15 type questions, I'm suggesting for these witnesses they  
16 might be appropriate for telephone, assuming we have the  
17 facilities to do that.  
18 MR. PEEPLES: I've been informed there's  
19 facilities available at CWU.  
20 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Ms. Adelsman.  
21 MS. ADELSMAN: No. 28 the cultural resources  
22 did you include him on the list?  
23 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, I did.  
24 MS. ADELSMAN: What was the reason?  
25 JUDGE TOREM: The logic that I gave you for

Page 17

1 the names I included to have them only come by telephone  
2 is that, again, we're showing that these are only reserved  
3 for cross-examination by ROKT, and to the best of my  
4 recollection there was no questions from Council submitted  
5 to me in advance demonstrating a got-to-have-them-there  
6 interest for further cross-examination.  
7 MS. JOHNSON: But they will be available by  
8 phone for us at least to ask some questions?  
9 JUDGE TOREM: I'm not suggesting that all of  
10 these be given Mr. White's accommodation; that they just  
11 have their testimony in by affidavit; but that they might  
12 be quick telephone calls and not have to travel.  
13 MR. PEEPLES: May I also inquire about some  
14 of CFE's people. Ken Bevis, he just has ROKT. Would the  
15 people want to talk to Bevis? And Ted Clausing.  
16 JUDGE TOREM: The reason I left the CFE  
17 witnesses alone for this first round of trimming was I  
18 wanted to hear from Mr. Tribble if he wanted those people  
19 left off.  
20 Second, there were some issues last time as  
21 to which witnesses were having the Department's position  
22 for Ecology and Fish and Wildlife, and I think those might  
23 be better hashed out in person than by telephone. So  
24 that's why I left them off my first list and that was the  
25 logic there. It may be that I'm remembering issues from

Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 Wild Horse that don't apply here, but I just thought some</p> <p>2 of these same names came up in both cases and the same</p> <p>3 confusion might still apply.</p> <p>4 MR. PEEPLES: I can speak to my</p> <p>5 understanding is specifically with WDFW we gave them a</p> <p>6 witness that was not the agency's position and they kept</p> <p>7 somewhat of a wall between them.</p> <p>8 MR. TRIBBLE: This is Mike Tribble. I can</p> <p>9 speak to that issue if now is the right time.</p> <p>10 JUDGE TOREM: Go ahead, Mr. Tribble.</p> <p>11 MR. TRIBBLE: We can stipulate as Counsel</p> <p>12 for the Environment that these witnesses are based on--the</p> <p>13 witness testimony is offered based on their specific</p> <p>14 personal knowledge and expertise in the field, but they do</p> <p>15 not speak on behalf of their representative agency.</p> <p>16 JUDGE TOREM: I think that may be covered in</p> <p>17 their testimony making that clear.</p> <p>18 MR. PEEPLES: I believe it is.</p> <p>19 JUDGE TOREM: When you were referring to</p> <p>20 those witnesses again, Mr. Tribble, is just Mr. Bevis?</p> <p>21 MR. TRIBBLE: Ken Bevis and Tom Tebb.</p> <p>22 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Tebb was already on my</p> <p>23 initial screen list simply because, again, storm water and</p> <p>24 wetlands weren't coming up as key issues. It had already</p> <p>25 been mentioned by Mr. Peeples today.</p>	<p>1 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. If you're willing to do</p> <p>2 that then Mr. Tribble and Mr. Hurson are the other ones</p> <p>3 listed.</p> <p>4 Mr. Hurson, any trouble with Mr. Hardy by</p> <p>5 phone?</p> <p>6 MR. HURSON: Off the top of my head I can't</p> <p>7 remember exactly what questions I was going to ask him.</p> <p>8 MR. PEEPLES: I think that's a .1.</p> <p>9 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Tribble, any questions for</p> <p>10 Mr. Hardy that you couldn't ask by phone?</p> <p>11 MR. TRIBBLE: No, and that goes for every</p> <p>12 single witness that I have listed I can ask questions by</p> <p>13 telephone.</p> <p>14 JUDGE TOREM: We'll put you and a telephone</p> <p>15 in another room, Mr. Tribble, and arrange for that.</p> <p>16 All right. So then Mr. Hardy has been added</p> <p>17 to the potential first trimming of witnesses that may not</p> <p>18 appear in person and it would be simply minimal</p> <p>19 cross-examination by telephone.</p> <p>20 MR. SLOTHOWER: Judge Torem, this is Jeff</p> <p>21 Slothower.</p> <p>22 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, Mr. Slothower, if you</p> <p>23 could speak up just a little bit.</p> <p>24 MR. SLOTHOWER: I'm sorry. Is that better?</p> <p>25 JUDGE TOREM: Slightly. Go ahead.</p>
Page 19	Page 21
<p>1 Councilmembers, from that list is there</p> <p>2 anyone you want to hold back from that initial screen that</p> <p>3 might go to a telephone only appearance?</p> <p>4 CHAIR LUCE: I would like to add one to a</p> <p>5 telephone appearance.</p> <p>6 JUDGE TOREM: Okay.</p> <p>7 CHAIR LUCE: Possibly and that's Randy</p> <p>8 Hardy.</p> <p>9 JUDGE TOREM: He's No. 43 on the front page.</p> <p>10 CHAIR LUCE: No. 43. I don't know how the</p> <p>11 parties feel about Randy Hardy. I sort of feel about</p> <p>12 Randy Hardy the same way that Mr. Hurson feels about his</p> <p>13 former planning director. I would love to see Randy. I</p> <p>14 think I know--I just don't know whether it's necessary to</p> <p>15 have him here present.</p> <p>16 JUDGE TOREM: Well, he's being presented by</p> <p>17 the Applicant and Mr. Lathrop appears to be the key to</p> <p>18 cross-examine. Mr. Slothower, are you still there?</p> <p>19 MR. SLOTHOWER: Yes, I am.</p> <p>20 JUDGE TOREM: Tell me what your feeling is</p> <p>21 about having Mr. Hardy actually make an appearance for the</p> <p>22 personal cross-examination or if you would be comfortable</p> <p>23 doing it by phone?</p> <p>24 MR. SLOTHOWER: I would be comfortable doing</p> <p>25 it by phone.</p>	<p>1 MR. SLOTHOWER: Is this better?</p> <p>2 JUDGE TOREM: Very much so.</p> <p>3 MR. SLOTHOWER: Okay. The individuals that</p> <p>4 will testify by telephone will they have--I suppose it</p> <p>5 depends upon whose witness they are, but it would be</p> <p>6 helpful if they had in front of them their testimony with</p> <p>7 attached exhibits and things of that nature.</p> <p>8 JUDGE TOREM: I expect at the minimum they</p> <p>9 would have that, and if there additional supplemental</p> <p>10 exhibits that were presented say the day of the scheduled</p> <p>11 cross-examination, we would work hard to get them to them</p> <p>12 by fax. But if you know you're going to have additional</p> <p>13 witness exhibits for these people that might be by</p> <p>14 telephone, if that's formally approved today, it would be</p> <p>15 wise to bring those exhibits as soon as possible,</p> <p>16 hopefully on Monday, and get those faxed to them well in</p> <p>17 advance so they have time to digest them before they have</p> <p>18 to answer any questions. I know we have in our original</p> <p>19 ground rule order the possibility of that sort of exhibit</p> <p>20 coming in, but with these additional telephone</p> <p>21 considerations we want to add the extra courtesy so that</p> <p>22 you can ask appropriate questions if something is kind of</p> <p>23 late breaking.</p> <p>24 MR. SLOTHOWER: Understood. That answered</p> <p>25 my question.</p>

Page 22

1 MR. PEEPLES: I think for Mr. Lathrop I  
2 think the only person is Randy Hardy. I tried to make  
3 sure that I had everybody there that Mr. Lathrop's  
4 attorney was going to cross. So I think that really just  
5 only relates to Randy Hardy.  
6 JUDGE TOREM: Councilmembers, any other  
7 additions or concerns?  
8 MR. CARMODY: Your Honor, this is Jamie  
9 Carmody. I think I can--  
10 JUDGE TOREM: Hold on just one second,  
11 Mr. Carmody. I just want to see if my Councilmembers have  
12 anything further and then I'm going to go down the list of  
13 parties.  
14 MR. CARMODY: Okay.  
15 JUDGE TOREM: Councilmembers, any other  
16 concerns?  
17 MS. TOWNE: Mr. Torem, I did have one  
18 question. Should we assume that the exhibits of  
19 particular focus for the Council will be those  
20 accompanying the names that remain standing after this  
21 exercise?  
22 JUDGE TOREM: As far as the exhibits and the  
23 issues that they represent?  
24 MS. TOWNE: Yes.  
25 JUDGE TOREM: I think we're trying to make

Page 23

1 sure that the key issues that are in debate, there may be  
2 key findings that we need to make for the recommendation,  
3 if it's thumbs or thumbs down, to the Governor. Some of  
4 those may not be at issue. They may just be a given that  
5 they have to make a finding one way or the other. But,  
6 yes, as to the key issues in contention that's who I think  
7 you'll find in person unless there's a darn good reason  
8 that they can't make it.  
9 MS. TOWNE: With their accompanying  
10 exhibits.  
11 JUDGE TOREM: Correct. Correct.  
12 MS. ADELSMAN: Let me see if I understand  
13 right. I don't think you took any names out of the list.  
14 We actually said by phone or Clay, Clay White, excuse me.  
15 But I think the rest we didn't say take them out.  
16 JUDGE TOREM: No. No.  
17 MS. ADELSMAN: So we still have the--  
18 JUDGE TOREM: The reason, the distinction is  
19 even with Mr. White no one has any questions for him  
20 because of the original preemption request being  
21 withdrawn. That's no longer on the table.  
22 MS. ADELSMAN: His material is still there.  
23 JUDGE TOREM: His material is still there.  
24 It becomes part of the record but only after he swears it  
25 in. So that affidavit allows us then to accept that into

Page 24

1 the record, and Mr. Hurson will make a motion at the  
2 appropriate time when he presents it, and it will become  
3 part of the official record. All the rest of the exhibits  
4 are proposed, and if you recall from previous practice,  
5 the witness comes, is sworn to tell the truth, then adopts  
6 their testimony, and then it's entered into the record.  
7 Each of these witnesses will do that by  
8 phone. It's anticipated based on the cross examination  
9 time desired by the parties and what I've seen in the  
10 questions you've circulated to me in advance there will be  
11 very little, if any, questions for these people, and from  
12 our experience in other hearings having a person travel  
13 all the way to the site just to look at our shining faces  
14 may not be worth the time.  
15 So we're just trying to create a convenience  
16 issue. All these witnesses are still witnesses before the  
17 Council and subject to cross-examination, but it's the  
18 scope and extent that's so minimal we think we could do  
19 them by phone and be that much more efficient.  
20 If there's nothing further for the  
21 Councilmembers comments, Mr. Carmody, since you expressed  
22 an interest, tell me what your thoughts are.  
23 MR. CARMODY: In reviewing the list, and I  
24 spoke with Mr. Hurson yesterday about Mr. White, we would  
25 waive our cross-examination on a number of witnesses if it

Page 25

1 helps to accommodate those parties.  
2 JUDGE TOREM: All right. If you have a list  
3 of those that you want to waive, that will help with the  
4 final scheduling idea. So if you want to go down that  
5 list now, that's fine.  
6 MR. CARMODY: I do and I'll work off the  
7 list that you had gone through. The first would be Thomas  
8 Tebb.  
9 JUDGE TOREM: All right.  
10 MR. CARMODY: The second would be Michael  
11 Pappalardo.  
12 JUDGE TOREM: All right. He's Witness No.  
13 23.  
14 MR. CARMODY: Witness 23, Witness 24, Josh  
15 Butler.  
16 JUDGE TOREM: All right.  
17 MR. CARMODY: Witness 30, Randall Krichbaum.  
18 JUDGE TOREM: All right.  
19 MR. CARMODY: Witness 28, Jeffrey Flenniken.  
20 JUDGE TOREM: All right.  
21 MR. CARMODY: Witness 31, Les Polisky;  
22 Witness 32, Dan Pitzler; Witness 33, Jeanne Acutanza. I  
23 think that's the list.  
24 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Did you want to  
25 reserve your right then as to 37, 38, and 39 as well?

Page 26

1 MR. CARMODY: Yes.  
2 JUDGE TOREM: I anticipated those would  
3 be--and are you comfortable with the three of them being  
4 by telephone?  
5 MR. CARMODY: That would be fine.  
6 JUDGE TOREM: I believe that Mr. Jorgensen  
7 we may have to make some specific time change and  
8 adaptation items if he's not going to travel from Denmark.  
9 MR. PEEPLES: Right.  
10 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Acutanza wasn't on the  
11 list. That was because of Counsel for the Environment.  
12 If we want to add her at this time, Mr. Tribble, would she  
13 be someone that would also be for transportation issues  
14 someone you would be comfortable cross-examining by  
15 telephone?  
16 MR. TRIBBLE: For the transportation issue?  
17 JUDGE TOREM: Yes.  
18 MR. TRIBBLE: I can also waive that as well.  
19 If we want to treat--if Council doesn't have any specific  
20 questions for these people, I suggest that we treat them  
21 the same way as Mr. White.  
22 JUDGE TOREM: The Council may have some  
23 questions and I think these folks probably--Mr. White's a  
24 separate issue in a special class I think. Unless the  
25 Council were come to me and say we know we don't have any

Page 27

1 questions for this person, we absolutely positively won't,  
2 I want to leave open the possibility for them to at least  
3 appear by telephone. But if you're waiving that, then  
4 we'll add Ms. Acutanza to the list of folks that could be  
5 made into telephone witnesses.  
6 Now, the other issue that's going to come up  
7 for staff is to make sure that on the date that the  
8 Central Washington University facility is available that  
9 all of these witnesses are available for the telephone  
10 that we have to do and we would have to schedule which  
11 sessions might be at Central Washington. So it certainly  
12 won't be Monday, the 18th, but one of the days. It looks  
13 like it would be Wednesday, the 20th, if that's when the  
14 facility is available that all these witnesses would be  
15 accommodated on that date. So that's the other issue.  
16 Other parties on the phone are there any  
17 other concerns?  
18 Debbie, I took your witness, Mr. Grover, and  
19 put him on the list for telephone. Ms. Strand, any  
20 concerns from your perspective?  
21 MS. STRAND: No.  
22 JUDGE TOREM: Is he local? Remind me.  
23 MS. STRAND: No, he is from Portland.  
24 JUDGE TOREM: So would he be appreciative  
25 then not having to drive up?

Page 28

1 MS. STRAND: Correct.  
2 JUDGE TOREM: Any other parties whose  
3 witnesses I've just blankly added to the list of telephone  
4 folks and any concerns?  
5 MR. SLOTHOWER: Your Honor, this is Jeff  
6 Slothower. Couple of points. One, the time that we  
7 estimated we were trying to ensure that we had enough  
8 time. I anticipate, for instance, with witness 20, Chris  
9 Taylor there after Kittitas County is done cross-examining  
10 Mr. Taylor our cross-examining may be very brief. It's  
11 just we were unsure as to what areas others would be  
12 covering; therefore, we left time to cover the issues we  
13 wanted to make sure got covered, but those times may very  
14 well slip back and be significantly shorter depending upon  
15 who cross-examines ahead of us.  
16 Also I have one witness, Witness 101, David  
17 Taylor who I learned today in talking with him again that  
18 he cannot be there on the 19th and would prefer to testify  
19 on the 20th if that is acceptable.  
20 JUDGE TOREM: Any concerns about the 20th,  
21 Mr. Peeples, moving that one witness?  
22 MR. PEEPLES: No, I have no--just let me  
23 see. It was CFE .1, us .5, County .1. No, I have no  
24 problem with him of moving him, and he's also one  
25 depending on what comes up we may not even ask him

Page 29

1 questions too. So we'll clarify that. We'll talk to--I  
2 think attorneys need to talk between ourselves as to when  
3 we put placers down whether we're going to use them. So  
4 we need some communication on that.  
5 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Any other parties  
6 on the phone have any other input as to telephone witness  
7 appearances?  
8 Nothing from the parties then.  
9 Ms. Adelsman.  
10 MS. ADELSMAN: Just clarification. When  
11 you're talking about waiving, are we talking by phone or  
12 just waiving?  
13 JUDGE TOREM: Right now the only the witness  
14 who is not going to for sure get any cross-examine  
15 questions is Clay White.  
16 MS. ADELSMAN: So waiving meaning not to be  
17 inclusive but to be by phone.  
18 JUDGE TOREM: Correct. Nothing is being  
19 waived. It's just now the convenience issue of who  
20 travels and who doesn't next week.  
21 MS. ADELSMAN: I understand. Just the use  
22 of the word waive that kind of got me.  
23 JUDGE TOREM: So at this time then I'm going  
24 to ask the Council for an acclamation vote that the  
25 following witnesses need not travel.



Page 30

1 MR. PEEPLES: May I ask about Sterzinger  
2 too? He's coming from D.C. and he's down for a .35 on  
3 property values. 35, George Sterzinger we only have ROKT  
4 for .25.  
5 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Carmody, as far as your  
6 cross-examination of Mr. Sterzinger would that be okay for  
7 him to be by telephone and avoid the trip from Washington,  
8 D.C.?  
9 MR. CARMODY: That would be fine.  
10 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Hurson, you've got a tenth  
11 of an hour down for that one.  
12 MR. HURSON: Yes, I'm trying to distinguish  
13 between him and Mr. DeLacy. I can't remember. I'm sure I  
14 can be adaptable.  
15 JUDGE TOREM: Councilmembers, let me have  
16 instead of the pantomime we got, we have the description  
17 as to the difference between Mr. Sterzinger and  
18 Mr. DeLacy. Tim, can you give that to the Council. That  
19 way they can decide if that's okay if he's by telephone.  
20 MR. McMAHAN: Yes. Tim McMahan. Not in any  
21 way to portray the strength or weaknesses of any  
22 testimony, Mr. Sterzinger is the fellow that did the  
23 nationwide analysis of property values with some fairly  
24 broad global concepts. There's controversy in some of the  
25 rebuttal about it.

Page 31

1 Mr. DeLacy was the fellow who's actually  
2 been out in the County, testified before the Board of  
3 County Commissioners, and there's some record in those  
4 transcripts of Mr. DeLacy's testimony. So he's the more  
5 really on-the-ground fellow who we would be offering as a  
6 witness.  
7 JUDGE TOREM: Councilmembers, does that  
8 sound like Mr. Sterzinger for his short cross-examination  
9 as anticipated he could be by telephone as well?  
10 MS. ADELSMAN: Yes.  
11 JUDGE TOREM: So we'll add that. Any other  
12 ones that need to be added to the list before I just recap  
13 it for the record and ask for a quick vote from the  
14 Council?  
15 Seeing no additions, the following  
16 witnesses, Council, a vote of yes would mean the Council  
17 would not physically see these people but would have them  
18 available only by telephone for the adoption of their  
19 testimony and cross-examination: Witness No. 90, Tom  
20 Tebb; Witness No. 43, Randy Hardy; Witness No. 35, George  
21 Sterzinger; Witness No. 80, Steven Grover; Witness No. 23,  
22 Michael Pappalardo; Witness 24, Josh Butler; Witness 30,  
23 Randall Krichbaum; Witness 28, Jeff Flenniken; Witness 31,  
24 Les Polisky; Witness 32, Dan Pitzler; Witness 33, Jeanne  
25 Acutanza; Witness 37, Henrik Jorgensen; Witness 38,

Page 32

1 Michael Bernay; and Witness 39, Dan Kammen.  
2 Those are the witnesses that we have on the  
3 list that need not travel if you vote yes but would still  
4 be available for cross-examination from the parties,  
5 intervenors, and Councilmembers by telephone, and staff  
6 will make sure the arrangements for telephone and the  
7 dates that facility will be available are coordinated with  
8 the attorneys presenting those witnesses.  
9 MS. WILSON: So moved.  
10 CHAIR LUCE: Second.  
11 JUDGE TOREM: There's a movement to do that  
12 from Ms. Wilson and seconded by Chair Luce.  
13 CHAIR LUCE: We all seconded it.  
14 JUDGE TOREM: All right. All those in  
15 favor?  
16 COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.  
17 JUDGE TOREM: So the witnesses that were  
18 listed now will be by telephone unless they choose to  
19 appear on their own volition.  
20 MR. FIKSDAL: Judge Torem, I haven't added  
21 up the number of hours or time that it may take. I don't  
22 know if it's more than a day or half a day or the numbers  
23 of time, but we'll work that out.  
24 JUDGE TOREM: I want to direct Mr. Peeples  
25 to calculate that. He and Mr. McMahan have been putting

Page 33

1 this together with Mr. Tribble and since, Mr. Tribble,  
2 you're not here this afternoon, I hope that before the  
3 departure for Seattle occurs in a half an hour or so that  
4 those numbers can be totalled and a particular time chosen  
5 with attention to Mr. Jorgensen's availability as to the  
6 time in Denmark how we can accommodate that with the rest  
7 of the schedule, if at all possible. My hope is that  
8 we'll have one either a morning or one afternoon session  
9 at that alternate facility, and all of these telephone  
10 witnesses will be processed through at that time. Is that  
11 going to be sufficient, Mr. Fiksdal?  
12 MR. FIKSDAL: We'll do our best.  
13 JUDGE TOREM: All right. We'll hope for the  
14 best. Also on the schedule in discussion with Mr. Peeples  
15 this morning it sounded as those if we assigned particular  
16 times for each witness the inevitable filling of that time  
17 will occur. What I propose then is to give some time  
18 lines for starting and ending, and these will be  
19 identified targets to accommodate things and give then  
20 Mr. Tribble and Mr. Peeples some boundaries as to when to  
21 fill in the witnesses.  
22 Monday we'll start at 8:30 in the morning,  
23 and as Mr. Hurson said hopefully there won't be too many  
24 preliminaries and we can get on the first witness shortly  
25 after 8:30. But we will stop between 12:00 and 1:00 each

Page 34

1 day for lunch and go to as close to five o'clock as we can  
2 either until the witnesses run out, or if a witness is  
3 just going to have a few more minutes, we'll carryover and  
4 be flexible on Monday. So if we go from 8:30 to 12:00 and  
5 1:00 to 5:00, that would 7-1/2 hours. Certainly there  
6 will be breaks between witnesses for comfort, etc., until  
7 the max we'll get in is 7-1/2 hours on the record,  
8 probably closer to 6-1/2 when it's all said and done.  
9 Tuesday we have the same schedule, 8:30 to  
10 12:00 and 1:00 to 5:00. Wednesday and Thursday evening I  
11 want you to remember we have noticed public comment  
12 meetings similar to what we're doing tonight. Those can  
13 probably run anywhere from two to three hours each evening  
14 depending on how many people attend. So, therefore, so  
15 people are a little bit fresher, I want to start a little  
16 bit later on Wednesday and go from 9:00 in the morning  
17 until 12:00 and then only from 1:00 to 4:00 in the  
18 afternoon. So it's 9:00 to 12:00 and 1:00 to 4:00 on  
19 Wednesday. The same schedule for Thursday and Friday  
20 morning if necessary 9:00 to 12:00.  
21 Now, there's been discussion and you'll see  
22 the next bullet point there of a site visit for the  
23 Council to the--there's new members of the Council that  
24 have never made a site visit and it's been years since the  
25 last site visit. So while the Council is in town, we're

Page 35

1 going to announce at some point--I think we'll wait until  
2 we get the weather report on Monday and Tuesday as to what  
3 day. But either Thursday morning, Thursday afternoon, or  
4 Friday morning, somewhere in those blocks of time would be  
5 the most advantageous times to go out to the site, and  
6 certainly that would be part of the hearing. There  
7 wouldn't be any communications really allowed with the  
8 Councilmembers because it's all on-the-record time, but we  
9 would have some sort of staff guided tour and any comments  
10 that were there would be recorded so that they become part  
11 of the record. But it would be really a looky-lou visit.  
12 If there were questions, they would have to  
13 become part of record, and we'll arrange for some way to  
14 take those down out in the field, but we'll try to keep  
15 that communication to a minimum so that anything that's  
16 said in front of the Councilmembers is said in front of  
17 everybody. We'll find a way to do this. It's been done  
18 before. But Thursday morning or afternoon or Friday  
19 morning before the Council leaves town would be the  
20 preferred site visit time.  
21 So those are the other things that we would  
22 be working with as we put this together, and if the  
23 witnesses are done in three days, it gives us plenty of  
24 time on Thursday to get a site visit and still have the  
25 public meeting.

Page 36

1 Councilmembers, that's all I have on Item  
2 No. 4 for the hearing schedule.  
3 Chairman Luce, is there anything else that  
4 you have a concern with?  
5 CHAIR LUCE: No. I think all matters have  
6 been handled expeditiously. I'm comfortable with the  
7 schedule. I appreciate the parties agreeing to take a  
8 number of witnesses by telephone which I think will help  
9 greatly.  
10 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Peeples, you had something  
11 else?  
12 MR. PEEPLES: Yes, I do. There probably are  
13 going to be some objections at least we'll be making with  
14 regard to some of the areas that apparently ROKT are still  
15 trying to cross-examine on. We believe they're outside of  
16 their area of intervention. So do you want to handle that  
17 now or when those witnesses come up?  
18 JUDGE TOREM: I would like to handle that  
19 either first thing Monday, and if you can let Mr. Carmody  
20 know who you will be objecting to sooner rather than  
21 later, that way he can prepare and decide if you need to  
22 make any argument whatsoever or if those are simply  
23 placeholders that he will withdraw. Monday then I'll have  
24 the order on intervention in front of me, and I'll be able  
25 to make a more accurate ruling. I've reviewed that

Page 37

1 recently in anticipation of that procedural movement, but  
2 I'm not ready to do that today, and I'd rather get to  
3 Ellensburg and be ready and have reviewed the testimony as  
4 well.  
5 MR. PEEPLES: Okay. That's fine. There's  
6 not very many.  
7 JUDGE TOREM: Just let Mr. Carmody have some  
8 advanced knowledge so that if he wants to withdraw,  
9 perfect. If he doesn't, he's having a little bit more  
10 time to argue as to why that's within the scope of his  
11 intervention.  
12 MR. CARMODY: This is Jamie Carmody. If  
13 Mr. Peeples will just call me, we can work those things  
14 out.  
15 MR. PEEPLES: Sure. I'll try to give you a  
16 call--I might not be able to get a hold of you, Jamie,  
17 today but I'll try to call you tomorrow.  
18 MR. CARMODY: That would be fine.  
19 MR. PEEPLES: Okay. Thanks.  
20 JUDGE TOREM: Anything else on Item 4?  
21 Hearing none, let's move to Item 5. You should have  
22 gotten a copy of three additional questions or issues  
23 labeled in setbacks, aesthetics, and preemption, a couple  
24 of bullets under each. As I went through the questions  
25 that were circulated from Councilmembers to me and try to

Page 38

1 find common themes, these were the areas where the  
2 Councilmembers had some remaining concerns. And I didn't  
3 mean to elevate those issues as the remaining issues, but  
4 these were areas where I didn't think that the  
5 Councilmembers could simply ask the question on  
6 cross-examination whole to the witness and expect to get  
7 the best possible answer.

8 So I wanted to publish a list of themes of  
9 areas that might be out there and might lend themselves to  
10 the attorneys bringing a supplemental exhibit, if one  
11 exists, to help clarify things for the record next week  
12 and get this to you today or I think most of you got it by  
13 yesterday afternoon and at least be on record that the  
14 Councilmembers are thinking in these directions, and it  
15 would be hard for them to focus this into just one or two  
16 or a series of cross-examination questions.

17 These aren't the extent of their  
18 cross-examination questions that I've seen so I don't want  
19 you to think they'll be mute the rest of the time, but  
20 certainly these are the ones that I didn't think would be  
21 fair to your witnesses to just have them sprung on them  
22 next Monday or Tuesday.

23 So if you see anything in there that you can  
24 find a supplemental exhibit and bring it Monday or  
25 Tuesday, please do. If you know that this is going to be

Page 39

1 one of your witnesses that you're presenting, when you  
2 have them adopt their testimony you might say, "It's come  
3 to my attention that the Council has an inquiry in this  
4 area, would you like to explain your position." That will  
5 help us out in cross-examination further. So that's what  
6 the intent of this was.

7 Councilmembers, does that sound like what I  
8 told you I was going to say today?

9 All right. Good.

10 MR. PEEPLES: May I ask a clarification on  
11 the last thing?

12 JUDGE TOREM: Please.

13 MR. PEEPLES: So what you're eliciting is  
14 new testimony from the witnesses on these things?

15 JUDGE TOREM: This is sort of an advanced  
16 hit list to where the Council wants to go on cross. They  
17 may be able to clarify their positions on any of these  
18 issues as to why. It may be obvious to you. It's your  
19 witness and some other thinking you've done, but I'm not  
20 eliciting a long stretch of additional testimony, just a  
21 direct answer to those questions which somehow will be  
22 asked on cross. If you find a way in direct to solve what  
23 you might perceive is confusion here, maybe I've captured  
24 the Councilmembers' themes and I've confused them, you  
25 might be able to set me or the Councilmembers straight as

Page 40

1 to why these answers can be found somewhere else in their  
2 testimony or with an additional sentence or two.

3 MR. PEEPLES: Okay.

4 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, in that regard I do want  
5 additional clarifying testimony but not a long and  
6 certainly nothing prewritten. It will just be verbal  
7 testimony that day.

8 MR. PEEPLES: Okay.

9 MR. McMAHAN: Mr. ToREM, Tim McMahan. If I  
10 might just clarify something on the first area setbacks  
11 without going into matters that are subject to the  
12 hearing. One could bring in a notebook full of  
13 ordinances. I mean I'm just kind of looking to understand  
14 better what the Councilmembers might think is an  
15 appropriate response to that. One could have a witness  
16 just talk about what they know about setbacks from other  
17 places. One could do a big research project on the  
18 internet and bring things in and surprise everyone so that  
19 one--

20 JUDGE TOREM: That one is probably the  
21 widest area, and I'm certainly not looking for someone  
22 like Mr. Sterzinger to go do some research this weekend  
23 and find out how many areas or jurisdictions nation wide  
24 or world wide have rules and laws on this, but there may  
25 be that there's been issue taken with Kittitas County's

Page 41

1 ordinances and why we're going back and forth from 1,320  
2 to 2,500 and what's the setback. Where does that come  
3 from?

4 Mr. Hurson might come in with a binder and  
5 say this is why the Council had 2,500 feet. It's not  
6 otherwise explored in the testimony from Mr. Piercy. This  
7 is where they're getting this idea and show us a model  
8 ordinance from somewhere else. He may not. You might  
9 come in and say here's five other wind farms. I don't  
10 think you want a whole lot more testimony or exhibits to  
11 be three-feet thick. You just want to say here's a basis  
12 where it's worked somewhere else from your perspective and  
13 Mr. Hurson might say 1,300 feet has been proven  
14 ineffective in other jurisdictions. Then the Council will  
15 have to decide what's right for Kittitas County.

16 So I'm not looking for a treatise, but the  
17 Councilmembers want to know if there's somebody else  
18 that's done this successfully from either perspective, put  
19 the wind towers farther away or allow them closer in, and  
20 what's their experience been.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Let me amplify on that. There  
22 was testimony from the Applicant that discussed I believe  
23 1,320 feet is generally acceptable. So, you know,  
24 generally accepted by whom? You know, where did this  
25 number come from? Then the Board of County Commissioners

Page 42

1 discussed at various times, Mr. Hurson, 2,000 or 2,500 I  
 2 think. So where did that come from? Is there anything  
 3 specific that these numbers were drawn from either from  
 4 existing laws or model ordinances or comparable wind  
 5 projects? Where did the numbers come from?  
 6 JUDGE TOREM: So I don't know, Mr. McMahan,  
 7 whether that answers your question, but we're not looking  
 8 for an exhaustive list but something that tells us the  
 9 numbers that have been argued and will be argued about  
 10 next week how can the Council best know a basis for that  
 11 then later on when the Council makes its findings of fact.  
 12 I'm looking for you to help us make that finding of fact  
 13 better and so it doesn't appear to anybody, particularly  
 14 nine justices, an arbitrary capricious decision as we pick  
 15 a number.  
 16 CHAIR LUCE: Maybe hypothetically it's how  
 17 far would a turbine blade be thrown potentially under  
 18 safety conditions. That would be one issue. I mean maybe  
 19 that's the basis for it. Maybe it is relating to what do  
 20 they look like. Maybe it's relating to the property  
 21 value. But there's got to be some standard out there  
 22 somewhere that other people have utilized.  
 23 JUDGE TOREM: You can see where his  
 24 cross-examination is going to go next week.  
 25 MR. McMAHAN: Sure.

Page 43

1 JUDGE TOREM: So I just want you to be aware  
 2 if there's something in documentation that you can bring  
 3 in, that's the sort of thing I want you to know today  
 4 rather than have to come in next week cold and say let me  
 5 get back to you. I'm giving you a week to get back to us  
 6 essentially.  
 7 MR. McMAHAN: I appreciate the notice.  
 8 That's fair and it's helped a great deal to understand  
 9 where that was coming from. The concern I had was  
 10 witnesses, and not the Applicant, of course, but witnesses  
 11 doing a great huge internet research project and bringing  
 12 in a lot of interesting standards, and I think at least I  
 13 as one of the lawyers here understand better sort of where  
 14 this is coming from. So I think we are better prepared to  
 15 deal with it.  
 16 JUDGE TOREM: We may get some large internet  
 17 submissions from comments tonight or next week so I don't  
 18 know. But nevertheless that's the issues and where  
 19 they're coming from.  
 20 Mr. Hurson, does that clarify it for you as  
 21 well?  
 22 MR. HURSON: I can see where this could have  
 23 some real potential problems however. Part of this I mean  
 24 the big thing for the County is there a basis for  
 25 preemption. No such information was supplied to the

Page 44

1 County during the course of the public hearing process for  
 2 the County that my clients would have before them to use  
 3 as a supposed standard.  
 4 JUDGE TOREM: Understood.  
 5 MR. HURSON: So we would be having new  
 6 information that we never saw.  
 7 JUDGE TOREM: If it comes up that there's  
 8 new information, I expect you will make the argument as  
 9 against preemption at that point. But I'm looking to see  
 10 because the Council at your Board of County Commissioners  
 11 may have very well had that same issue and wanted to ask  
 12 it. I've just taken the liberty of doing so in advance.  
 13 MR. HURSON: Well, I think as you go through  
 14 ours where the numbers I believe the transcripts from the  
 15 Commissioners pointed to the environmental analysis for  
 16 the basis for coming up with the setbacks and then that  
 17 their personal visits confirmed to them personally what  
 18 the environmental analysis had already told them.  
 19 JUDGE TOREM: Okay.  
 20 MR. HURSON: You have to read the transcript  
 21 to do it and that was something I was going to point out  
 22 basically in closing argument brief and cite line and  
 23 verse out of transcripts. But if you're looking for some  
 24 point to where that is, that's where you'll find it  
 25 already.

Page 45

1 JUDGE TOREM: So this is again just not an  
 2 invitation for voluminous new information and not an  
 3 invitation for anybody to backdoor anybody else with brand  
 4 new information, but simply that's what the Council was  
 5 thinking and we need some answers if they're out there.  
 6 Other parties on the line any questions  
 7 about these setbacks, aesthetics, or preemptions issues?  
 8 All right. Seeing none, that's all there  
 9 was in Item 5. Are there any other procedural matters  
 10 that we are not going to handle Monday morning? We've  
 11 already indicated questions as to striking  
 12 cross-examination rights if it's outside the scope of  
 13 intervention. We'll take that up next week. Any other  
 14 procedural items?  
 15 Mr. Hurson.  
 16 MR. HURSON: I would just one thing. As you  
 17 recall earlier on, I think it was Mr. Ifie was the DNR  
 18 representative and we filed an appearance of fairness  
 19 challenge. I know that was turned down and you have a new  
 20 representative. It was intended to be basically as to the  
 21 DNR representative in general. It may have said Mr. Ifie.  
 22 So rather than bringing this up on Monday, it just makes  
 23 sense to reiterate and confirm that the County's challenge  
 24 was to the DNR representative.  
 25 JUDGE TOREM: Certainly. I'll make that

Page 46	Page 48
<p>1 part of the record now and accept that the challenge was  2 not against Mr. Ifie personally but his appearance on  3 behalf of the Department and therefore Ms. Wilson's  4 substitution for them that's a continuing objection; and  5 the ruling by the Council will then be a continuing ruling  6 on appeal, if there is one, that will be taken up and can  7 go from there. And I don't remember was yours against  8 also Mr. Fryhling from Community, Trade, and Economic  9 Development or did that come from Mr. Lathrop?  10 MR. HURSON: I think Mr. Lathrop had one for  11 Mr. Fryhling, yes.  12 JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Slothower, if you're still  13 with us, I'll take it that if there's any substitution of  14 folks that continues on that objection goes to the basis  15 of that county or that agency having a seat and also a  16 potential interest.  17 MR. SLOTHOWER: That's correct. We weren't  18 challenging that person as an individual but more because  19 of their capacity as a representative of the agency, and  20 we continued our objections in a brief opening statement  21 that we filed.  22 JUDGE TOREM: Understood. So those remain  23 Any other procedural matters holding over?  24 Mr. McMahan.  25 MR. McMAHAN: Yes, Your Honor. You had</p>	<p>1 Any other procedural matters?  2 MR. HURSON: Maybe if Allen wants to check  3 with our fairgrounds. I know that the phone problem  4 before was something that was brought to their attention.  5 I don't know if they got it fixed, but they may very well  6 have so there isn't a need for moving. But I'd suggest  7 you check in advance to make sure that it's working.  8 MR. FIKSDAL: It appears the Applicant has  9 been working with Central.  10 MR. PEEPLES: The acoustics are really bad  11 in that room for that type of thing. It's okay for what  12 we have. I think they're bad for a telephone.  13 MR. FIKSDAL: We'll work this out in the  14 best venue as possible.  15 JUDGE TOREM: Excellent.  16 MR. TRIBBLE: This is Mike Tribble. I have  17 a point of clarification I would like to ask regarding  18 telephone testimony. Did you identify a specific single  19 day that telephone testimony would be made, and if so, any  20 identifying person from an earlier day would then be moved  21 to a later date?  22 JUDGE TOREM: That's the idea, Mr. Tribble,  23 that they will all be taken in one block in whatever  24 order, and I'll leave that for the individual presenting  25 parties to get with Mr. Peeples to schedule if there's</p>
Page 47	Page 49
<p>1 asked that we do the math on the numbers of hours for  2 cross-examination of telephone testimony, and it appears  3 to be 4.35 hours not taking away the 1.75 hours of ROKT  4 that at least by my account looks like was the area waived  5 within those testimonies are moved over to telephone. So  6 in terms of continuing over to another facility that has a  7 good phone that looks like the number based on what's on  8 the paper here.  9 MR. FIKSDAL: But we have to take into  10 account time dialing, getting the person or having the  11 person call in. We have to work those logistics out  12 whether we dial or they dial in. That's going to take as  13 much time as the testimony itself I think.  14 JUDGE TOREM: Stretch your hands out, Allen,  15 and get ready.  16 MR. CARMODY: This is Jamie Carmody. I  17 don't know if there was a misunderstanding. It was my  18 intent to waive the cross-examination on the one that I  19 identified.  20 JUDGE TOREM: I think that's fine. We've  21 got then probably a block of anywhere between three and  22 five hours depending on how long it takes to swear people  23 in, adopt their testimony, and dial. So we'll work with a  24 three to five hour block. If we need to move lunch back a  25 little bit, we'll do that and move things around.</p>	<p>1 specific times. But we don't even know what date the  2 facility would be there. If they're a Monday witness,  3 right now Mr. Tebb I see that he's unavailable the 19th  4 and the 20th.  5 MR. TRIBBLE: That's the basis of my  6 question.  7 JUDGE TOREM: I was anticipating that. So  8 it may be for him for the one witness that you have if  9 he's not available on the date that the Central Washington  10 University site is available we'll to go with Plan B and  11 as Mr. Hurson suggests try to make the best due we can  12 with his testimony by phone in the fairgrounds room. So  13 there will be some exceptions I'm sure, but we're going to  14 try to get everybody that we can into one block of  15 telephone witnesses so that the Council travels to Central  16 Washington one time, has the hearing session there one  17 time, and as many witnesses as possible are sworn in,  18 adopt their testimony, and if there is any, cross-examined  19 at that time.  20 MR. TRIBBLE: As I have not personally gone  21 through this process before, I just want to make it clear  22 so that I'm not crossed up. Mr. Tebb does not have to  23 make the trip let's say if the 20th or the 19th is the  24 only days we're doing telephonic.  25 JUDGE TOREM: Correct.</p>

Page 50

1 MR. TRIBBLE: He can testify by a separate  
2 less reliable telephone.  
3 JUDGE TOREM: Correct.  
4 MR. TRIBBLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  
5 JUDGE TOREM: If you want Mr. Tebb to  
6 testify on the 18th, HE'LL have to travel because we won't  
7 be having telephone witnesses that day at Central. If you  
8 talk to Ms. Makarow and she's convinced that we could get  
9 telephonic testimony in the room on Monday and do it with  
10 that quasi less reliable telephone we might very well be  
11 able to take Mr. Tebb that day, and there's no parties  
12 that have reserved cross-exam time for him so it would  
13 simply be a question of swearing him in on Monday with the  
14 telephone and having Council cross-exam if there is any.  
15 I'll leave that to you and Ms. Makarow to decide if that's  
16 even a possibility for Monday so that you can keep him on  
17 the schedule and not have to worry about his availability  
18 the rest of the week.  
19 MR. PEEPLES: Can we take him by affidavit?  
20 JUDGE TOREM: I don't know if there's  
21 questions for storm water or wetlands yet. There were  
22 some issues about wetlands discussion. It may be that  
23 there's a movement or a motion on Monday, Mr. Tribble, to  
24 bring in his testimony by affidavit so you may want to get  
25 one prepared before you come over, and then if the Council

Page 51

1 then says we don't have any, it would be a done deal on  
2 Monday morning. You can make that motion at that time.  
3 MR. PEEPLES: It would seem to me that we  
4 could make the motion. As long as the affidavit is in at  
5 the end of the close of the record, that's all that we  
6 would need to do.  
7 JUDGE TOREM: So that's another way. Again,  
8 the list we went through today was the first cut. There  
9 may be that you want to present a motion Monday morning  
10 for those people you see don't have anybody to  
11 cross-examine them. You may want to move for affidavit  
12 and see if the Council has any questions before we call  
13 them, that sort of thing. Okay? But, again, we'll have  
14 to get their testimony in at one point or another.  
15 MR. TRIBBLE: Thank you.  
16 JUDGE TOREM: Anything else?  
17 Mr. Peeples.  
18 MR. PEEPLES: Yes. Mike, are you going to  
19 be in Olympia tomorrow morning?  
20 MR. TRIBBLE: Yes, I will. I'll be in  
21 Olympia all day and we can coordinate all this.  
22 MR. PEEPLES: Rather than trying to get at  
23 it tonight, can Mike and I try to put this all together  
24 maybe with Irina tomorrow over here early in the morning  
25 and get it out? Is that Okay?

Page 52

1 Jim, would you be available on telephone if  
2 we need to call you and go over it? I'm trying to get the  
3 final thing.  
4 MR. HURSON: No, I have a meeting at 9:00 in  
5 the morning.  
6 MR. PEEPLES: Okay. Okay. Well then I  
7 would like to have Mike and I meet with Irina tomorrow  
8 morning and do the final to get it out to everybody.  
9 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Certainly. And I  
10 think--  
11 MR. PEEPLES: Will you be available too if  
12 we need to talk to you as far as you've got your notes  
13 down there too?  
14 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, Irina knows the telephone  
15 numbers to reach me at tomorrow.  
16 MR. PEEPLES: Okay. If that's okay with  
17 everybody.  
18 JUDGE TOREM: So we're done with Item 5  
19 then--or Item 6. Are there other procedural matters?  
20 MR. GARRETT: Ed Garrett with ROKT.  
21 JUDGE TOREM: Sir, how are you?  
22 MR. GARRETT: I'm fine, sir. Your Honor, I  
23 just have a question of clarification on your site visit.  
24 Do you plan on just taking the EFSEC Councilmembers in a  
25 van and driving down Highway 97 looping around Bettas Road

Page 53

1 coming back or do you actually plan on trying to tour the  
2 other private road accesses that actually go up into the  
3 project area such as Cricklewood Lane and Elk Springs  
4 Road?  
5 JUDGE TOREM: My understanding, Mr. Garrett,  
6 is the last time there were site visits they were more  
7 informal along the lines of just driving on the highway  
8 and trying to find points that might have been shown in  
9 the illustrative exhibits and looking and saying, "Here's  
10 what we see now, here's what those pictures showed us,"  
11 that sort of thing. I don't know that we've made any  
12 access arrangements to get onto other private roads in the  
13 past so I'm not certain that we would do this now.  
14 Ms. Makarow, I wasn't there on some of those  
15 site visits back in 2003.  
16 MS. MAKAROW: The only access to private  
17 roads that we had were those through which the Applicant  
18 had keys for gates and issues like that. So we did not  
19 seek out access on other private roads through other  
20 people.  
21 JUDGE TOREM: So I guess we would try to  
22 repeat whatever is available this time, Mr. Garrett, and  
23 the Councilmembers would be in the van, but other parties  
24 would certainly again as this would be part of the hearing  
25 process allowed to accompany and see what the

Page 54

1 Councilmembers are seeing. So we'll have to make sure  
2 that the arrangement for access allowed for a much larger  
3 parade to go along with.  
4 MR. GARRETT: I sent an e-mail to Irina. It  
5 was a couple weeks back. I will volunteer to bring keys  
6 to open up the access gate for at least Cricklewood Lane  
7 and I also have someone who's willing to open the gate for  
8 Elk Springs Road if the Councilmembers would choose to  
9 just take a little trip up those roads, check the maps,  
10 look at the land ownership, and get an idea of what it's  
11 going to look like from the inside.  
12 JUDGE TOREM: Well, I'm leaving that for  
13 staff to accommodate the request from the Councilmembers  
14 for another site visit and figure out the exact itinerary.  
15 I don't know that the Councilmembers would have been so  
16 busy reading that we thought about which roads should be  
17 driven on or not. But if parties have recommendations,  
18 I'd just ask them to forward those to staff and the  
19 Council will go where staff take us.  
20 MS. MAKAROW: Maybe I can coordinate  
21 informally with the parties when we're in Ellensburg prior  
22 to the site visit so that we can work something out.  
23 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, please, Monday as I'm  
24 suggesting this visit wouldn't occur until Thursday at the  
25 earliest weather permitting. So we'll find out from staff

Page 55

1 as the week goes on what folks want us to see, and Council  
2 may have its own questions as to viewpoints.  
3 I've been reminded by talking about those  
4 illustrative exhibits, Mr. Peeples and Mr. McMahan, and  
5 maybe also, Mr. Slothower, this might be relevant to you  
6 if you're still on the line. The pictures that we got I  
7 think in Mr. Priestley's most recent photographs from CH2M  
8 Hill that showed the visualizations if you're planning on  
9 bringing larger portions of those in poster board size  
10 ones or certain ones you think are key for either side,  
11 those might be something that would be helpful for the  
12 Councilmembers to have at a break in the hearing to  
13 actually see a bigger picture of. That is a suggestion  
14 not a direct request, but it's been something we talked  
15 about. Those are always helpful at the public meetings to  
16 show the public what the proposed project might or might  
17 not look like from one perspective. Councilmembers  
18 already have some of these in the attachments to  
19 supporting exhibits and certainly they're going to become  
20 part of the record. But if there's a better illustration  
21 please do it, if it's not too much trouble.  
22 Also when those are identified in the  
23 testimony the sort of additional question might be, "And,  
24 Mr. Priestley, what's the views for the current proposed  
25 project?" so the Councilmembers can really go through it

Page 56

1 if it's not directly in his testimony already to circle  
2 the exhibit numbers that are the current views, not of the  
3 views that's proposed of the old project from years ago.  
4 That's a little bit of a confusion.  
5 That's one issue I didn't raise in the  
6 attached issue sheet, but something to know which exhibits  
7 are the ones that tell us what we're looking at that's the  
8 one that you're asking from the Applicant's perspective to  
9 approve. As long as those are clarified that would be  
10 great.  
11 CHAIR LUCE: This is Jim Luce, Chair.  
12 Earlier, and I'm not sure whether it was in the initial  
13 application, the Draft EIS, or the Supplemental EIS or  
14 just the initial application, there were two maps prepared  
15 by CH2M Hill, one of which showed a model of the local  
16 project visual impacts and it had lots of red all over it.  
17 MR. PEEPLES: What's the number on that?  
18 CHAIR LUCE: I'll leave that up here to  
19 figure out.  
20 JUDGE TOREM: This one doesn't have a figure  
21 number on it.  
22 CHAIR LUCE: Then there was a separate one,  
23 potential project visual impact in the region. There were  
24 maps and they identified particularly simulated views and  
25 views, and I guess what I'd like to do is to have pictures

Page 57

1 that lined up with those, whether it's that particular map  
2 or the revised map. There were a whole series of  
3 photographs I believe again perhaps in the original  
4 application that ran from Photo 1 through 15 or 16 or 18,  
5 something on that order. I'll just leave them here. And  
6 then there were additional, and I believe that that was in  
7 the green sheet, Exhibit 22-4, and I think that was part  
8 of the original application, but I could be in error  
9 there.  
10 JUDGE TOREM: We'll leave those up here for  
11 you to look at so you know what he's asking about.  
12 CHAIR LUCE: Then there were additional  
13 pictures in the EIS and then there are further pictures in  
14 the supplemental, the addendum to the Draft Environmental  
15 Impact Statement, and some of those pictures which was  
16 confusing to me--maybe that's just because it's  
17 me--started out with Viewpoints 1 through 5 and then  
18 seemed to jump to No. 11. So I'm trying to get all of the  
19 pictures as they are today. Today what we're going to  
20 talk about starting on Monday lined out in my mind  
21 together with a map that shows the simulated views and the  
22 actual views. It's just me.  
23 MR. HURSON: I hear you. I hear you.  
24 CHAIR LUCE: I apologize.  
25 JUDGE TOREM: Clearly it's been a long

Page 58

1 process. There's a lot of other exhibits that were out  
 2 there that were changes and I think the opening statements  
 3 helped put a lot of them in context. So I encourage the  
 4 Council again after you review the testimony to go back to  
 5 the opening statements. Each party has done a good job if  
 6 there are updates of telling what's happened since 2004  
 7 and where we are in 2006, two years later. But the  
 8 specific issues of which pictures are no longer relevant  
 9 those might be helpful from the witnesses we go to to say  
 10 old information, current information, and some of that  
 11 will factor into the discussion we have Monday with the  
 12 witnesses in preemption and what the County got or didn't  
 13 decide on.

14 MR. GARRETT: Your Honor?

15 JUDGE TOREM: Yes, sir.

16 MR. GARRETT: Ed Garrett for ROKT. That was  
 17 one reason I was making my question because a lot of the  
 18 visual pictures that were taken and were part of the  
 19 record none were ever taken from Cricklewood Lane. None  
 20 were ever taken from Eburg Ranches Road. They were taken  
 21 basically from the main route from a distance back, and so  
 22 I just think the Councilmembers would like to get a clear,  
 23 up-front view of what it's going to look like from the  
 24 people that had properties within the project area or  
 25 right on that list of the people that have properties 300

Page 59

1 feet right on the outskirts to properties because those  
 2 pictures are not part of the record.

3 JUDGE TOREM: As we indicated with the  
 4 Council's vote to have a public meeting tonight, which I  
 5 think people are getting antsy to get to, more information  
 6 is welcome; and so if the Council is going to view those  
 7 things, Mr. Garrett, just please tell Ms. Makarow how and  
 8 the best way to make those arrangements, and I think  
 9 she'll incorporate that into the proposed itinerary for  
 10 the tour so that the Council has a full view of everything  
 11 that's going to be talked about throughout next week.

12 And, again, all the parties if there's a  
 13 specific road you want us to be on to see views from a  
 14 certain point, just let Ms. Makarow know early in the week  
 15 and she'll get with all the representatives and hopefully  
 16 we can have one proposed itinerary presented; and if there  
 17 are objections for some reason or why we should or  
 18 shouldn't go to certain places, those can be addressed  
 19 before the tour itself is adopted and sent out on and off  
 20 we go.

21 MR. GARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll  
 22 work that out with Ms. Makarow.

23 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. Any other issues?

24 I don't think we need another prehearing  
 25 conference before Monday so I'm going to strike No. 7 from

Page 60

1 the list. But we'll start and find out if there are  
 2 additional procedural matters on Monday morning in  
 3 addition to the discussion that you, Mr. Carmody, and  
 4 Mr. Peebles are going to have about cross-examination and  
 5 if there are any arguments left on that. Then we'll see  
 6 what else comes up Monday morning before we get to  
 7 Mr. Taylor's cross-examination.

8 All right. We are adjourned then at about  
 9 12 minutes until 4:00.

10 \* \* \* \* \*

11 (Whereupon, the prehearing conference was  
 12 concluded at 3:48 p.m.)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 61

1  
2  
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, Certified Court Reporter,  
 do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript  
 prepared under my direction is a true and accurate  
 record of the proceedings taken on September 12, 2006,  
 in Olympia, Washington.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Shaun Linse, CCR  
 CCR NO. 2029