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Bonanza Energy Facility – Notice of Intent Informational Meeting

October 13, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

Oregon Department of Energy Presentation: Presentation by Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. Introductions; overview of facility siting process highlighting opportunities for public participation.

Applicant Presentation: Presentation by Hecate Energy Bonanza LLC. Overview of proposed facility and location, site selection.

Q&A and Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Ashbach</td>
<td>6201 Teare Ln. Bonanza, OR</td>
<td>Described opposition to the project because his property would be in the middle of the island, and would be impacted by the project; questioned timeline for comments – 30 days does not seem fair given applicant’s timeframe; questioned the location of the proposed facility in EFU rather than industrial zoned land; described that proposed facility fence would be too high for wildlife movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed concerns regarding potential impacts to natural habitat and wildlife within proposed facility site – land is zoned EFU/CG – no idea where project fits; concerned about proposed facility impacts to well water supply. Questioned whether the entire Council has to agree in order to approve project - believes Council should have to vote unanimously in favor for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg &amp; Maureen Thomas</td>
<td>6516 Teare Ln. Bonanza, OR</td>
<td>Expressed concern about taking prime agricultural land, used for cattle and hay, for industrial use; concerned about wildlife impacts (Winter Range Deer); requested clarification on impacts of proposed facility to domestic wells/groundwater. Questioned the site selection process and locations where energy would be sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hermantrout</td>
<td>PO Box 295 Bonanza, OR</td>
<td>Questioned the location of the proposed facility given the lack of disturbance and beauty of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Cox, Klamath County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioned the estimated investment of the proposed project in the local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Connor</td>
<td>6919 Teare Ln. Bonanza, OR</td>
<td>Expressed concerns regarding impacts from potential battery leakage to groundwater/natural springs/aquifers; impacts to Native American artifacts; questioned the overall impact of solar development given technology (panel) development process; questioned battery disposal process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Pinckney</td>
<td>37150 Johns Rd., Bonanza, OR</td>
<td>Opposed to project because area is zoned for agricultural use; Proposed location is a gateway to Gerber Reservoir and should be preserved; government land available near Bryant, out of site, and should be considered as proposed site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Katie,

I am writing in regard to the Bonanza Energy Facility, in Bonanza, Oregon. I hope that the Oregon Energy Department will consider not going ahead with this facility. The proposed location is beautiful and prime agricultural land. The lifestyle of the residents will be affected by this facility. The wildlife will be affected by the facility. As you know, the U.S. is losing agricultural land every year. Please let the Bonanza area, the Langell Valley remain as it is, agricultural.

Thank you,
Sharon Allen
Klamath Basin Resident and Sheepgrower.
Dear Ms Clifford,

As someone who frequently travels to Modoc County and up towards Klamath Falls, I have been saddened and alarmed to hear of the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility. Although statements have been made claiming it would not harm the aesthetic value of the area, because it is not visible from public parks or public wildlife viewing areas, that is not the point.

The point is that this solar facility would take away viable farming land in an area where a good farm land is at a premium. Furthermore, as the attached photo shows, it will impact habitats, flyways, nesting areas, water usage and all the native flora and fauna that live here. As well as the farmers who would live next door to this thing.

The amount of water that has been quoted as being used for the building, maintenance and possible increase of this area is astounding, especially in a region prone to drought. Farmers down in Tulelake are battling to keep water to irrigate their fields at all, and yet this facility talks about using tens of thousands of gallons a week.

This photo was taken by a friend this morning, on East Langell Valley Road. She and the other neighboring agricultural families are dealing with this issue nose-to-nose. Look at this picture and tell me that it is barren wasteland, or that it would not be missed when clad in hundreds of acres of glass.

Please, I asked you and the powers-that-be to reconsider this project, not just for aesthetic reasons, but for the lives and livelihoods of both farmers and wild creatures who call this area home.

Sincerely,

Gloria Atwater
Gardnerville, NV
Good afternoon,

My name is Anna Aylett and I am issuing my public comment regarding the Bonanza Energy Facility. I was raised in Bonanza and have returned to my hometown to continue my career. I am writing to express concerns I have with the installation of this facility.

There are issues with this project that have not been addressed by anyone other than the developer and the contractor hired to draft the notice of intent. Biological information was gathered by Jacobs and not biologists from ODFW or USFWS. They state in the notice that they did not see ungulates using that ground, but the Jacobs biologists only came out in the summer. This time of year, mule deer are seen regularly traveling the areas that would be used by the solar panels. The notice also states that the entire facility would be fenced, effectively cutting off that habitat for mule deer.

Next, the fact that the power is largely being distributed in California is an issue. If we are going to give up that much land in Langell Valley, we should benefit from the panels being installed. The notice also states that the land is uncultivated. While the land that is not on the hillside may be uncultivated, that does not mean it is not good soil that is used for agricultural production. Much of that land off the hillside is used for pasture and some irrigated alfalfa.

Next, Oregon is known for its strong land use laws. How can land that has been zoned Exclusive Farm Use be taken out of production solely for an energy facility?

Last, but not least, we do not want to see thousands of acres of solar panels, battery storage buildings, more transmission lines, and possibly a natural gas peaker in our valley. As far as I am concerned, there has to be a better place that is less desirable land that would serve the same purpose. Land that is not on valuable soil and not near our community, waterways and wetlands.

Thank you,
Anna Aylett
18419 W Langell Valley Rd
Bonanza, OR 97623
541-545-3211
Hello Katie

My name is Robert Bacon and I have been the owner and broker of a real estate office in Bonanza, Or. for 20 years. I live here, serve on the Town Council, my 4 children all went to school 1st. through 12th grade at Bonanza. The main portion of my business is farm, ranch and rural properties. I am writing to offer my opinion on the proposed Hecate Energy Facility to be built at 6201 Teare Lane. I have marketed this property twice and concluded sales in both cases. It is good productive agricultural land that produces excellent pasture and hay. It is in the middle of a large agricultural valley made up of similar properties large and small. This is one of the better, more productive ones in the area. Allowing this to be built and take that land out of the food producing category is a mistake. I recognize the need for alternative energy, the need to rely less on fossil fuels, to reduce our carbon foot print and support those decisions. However to place such a huge facility in the middle of large agricultural valley/community is simply not the appropriate place for this. This is a good producing ranch of 1800 acres that is mostly all irrigated from district water and a private well. Then the power line that has to be built to e this facility into the substaon near Malin many miles to the south will impact another enormous swath of land private and public. There are many other very reasonable objecons to this location for such a facility. It is not an allowable use under the current zoning, it is in a wildlife overlay area, it will (with the proposed fencing) interfere with deer and other wild life annual migration patterns and I can certainly say with some authority have a very negative impact on property values in a very large area. Property values will be affected in a negative way not just those that are contiguos but even those some distance away. This will have a negative impact on property values in our area and thus the owner’s chances to get new financing, operating loans, construction loans etc. Agriculture in this area of Oregon is and has been under duress due to the water issues that have been an ongoing battle for years. There may be and hopefully is a solution at some point in the future to our water problems but it is not clear at this point what that is and when it will go into effect. Therefore to add to that a huge facility such as this that will further reduce property values and therefore the ability of our farmers and ranchers to obtain operating funds is a mistake. How much this will impact property values is at this point not easy to quantify. However adjacent property owners will have to disclose to lenders and potential buyers that this facility may be built. I can tell you clearly in my experience that almost any buyer’s interest once they are made aware of the potential for this facility to be built will dwindle and I would expect to then be asked what else I have to show them that is in a much different location.

There are many locations that are more remote, closer to the substation in Malin, not good producing farm ground, with very minimal effect on neighboring property owners and property values, and not zoned EFU-CG that would be much better choices for this facility. Rural America is often over looked and left out of the political process. We are
one of the greatest assets this country has so please consider the negative impact this would have on our ability to continue as an important, prosperous, farming community. Thank you for considering my thoughts on this.

Sincerely

Robert R. Bacon

for more information on our area and all of our properties click on the link below

www.oregonranchland.com
Ms. Clifford,
Here is the full submission. I didn't attach the second letter properly in the first email.
Thank you,

Linda Barrett  
barrettlinn@gmail.com  
541.545.6370
RE: Bonanza Energy Facility siting request

Dear Ms. Clifford,

Please admit the following comments and attachments to be heard/read by the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council in their review of the application for site certificate for the Hecate Energy NAF LLC proposed solar and storage project, and potential gas-powered peaker generating facility.

Also, please find attached comments from Gail Hildreth Whitsett, January 24, 2004, which present material evidence against approval of the proposed site certificate. Conditions noted at that time still apply and do not recommend the use of the proposed site as an energy facility, specifically:

- Hydraulic connection between water bearing zones (Whitsett, p.2)
- Groundwater-surface water hydraulic connection (with the nearby Lost River, with area irrigation and with the Town of Bonanza springs and domestic wells)(Whitsett, p.3)
- The proposed well does not hold senior water rights. Their water rights are junior in an area in which wells are highly conditioned by OWRD, with concern for critical groundwater conditions (Whitsett, 1).
- Availability of alternative site options: with more direct access to transmission lines, existing well (Jan Wright well) and non-irrigated land (Whitsett, p.5)
- Exclusive Farm Use designation on proposed site (Whitsett, p.5, 9).
- Proximity to seismically active faults (particularly Bryant Mountain Fault) (Whitsett, p.7).
- Proximity to natural wetlands supporting migratory and resident waterfowl, including Golden and Bald Eagles (Whitsett, p.9).
- Proximity to Lost River – habitat for threatened Lost River Suckers (the company references a July wildlife study - which does not seem sufficient to account for migratory waterfowl and the wintering populations of Bald Eagles) (Whitsett, p. 9).
The proposed site has **unique and significant features** that would be adversely affected. The natural wetland habitat for migratory waterfowl, the clean air and quiet environment are resources worth conserving. Frequently at night, more than 15 minutes pass without hearing sounds made by man. This kind of solitude and absence of noise pollution is rare and has intrinsic value for residents, wildlife and visitors to the valley. The industrial facility proposed presents a threat to air quality, water resources and wildlife.

Solar plus storage is a booming industry. It is a changing industry. Technology used today can reasonably be expected to be outmoded quickly. Hecate Energy’s proposal for air-cooled battery storage requires nearly 100 acres of large buildings, with potentially noisy cooling systems. It is also reasonable to wonder at the necessity of locating these cooling systems next to a prolific well. Water cooling may be four times as efficient as air cooling. Perhaps this is an unspoken intention. Should this idea be presented, questions about increased impacts on water resources and contamination from wastewater or leakage need to be evaluated (particularly given the proximity to seismic activity). The proposal identifies a gas-fired peaker facility, a process associated with air pollutants. These industrial processes are not compatible with the soils, seismic activity, water and air quality, and wildlife in Langell Valley. Technology is changing too rapidly to settle for a compromise of this magnitude. As a comparison, Oregon State University has developed nuclear energy sources that are safe, quiet and small enough to fit on a semi-truck. It seems irresponsible to swap the attributes of our beautiful valley for technology that risks noise pollution from air cooled storage, excessive water extraction, potential surface water contamination from waste water, or air pollution from a gas-fired peaker. For as special a place as Langell Valley, a wiser, more responsible decision would be to wait for an energy producer who can be a good neighbor, benefitting the community and producing power without harming the environment.

Pursuant to ORS 469.504(4), an applicant must elect to demonstrate compliance with the statewide planning goals by either obtaining local land use approval from the affected local government(s) or through EFSC’s determination of compliance. At this time, Hecate Energy Bonanza LLC intends to satisfy the Council’s Land Use standard (OAR 345-022-0030) by seeking an EFSC determination under ORS 469.504(1)(b). This is an **inappropriate site** for the proposed installation. Please do not circumvent the land use protections put in place for this very purpose. Please do NOT approve a certificate for this site for this project.

Sincerely,

Linda Barrett
9747 E. Langell Valley Rd
Bonanza OR 97623
541.545.6370
Our Klamath Basin Water Crisis
Upholding rural Americans’ rights to grow food,
own property, and caretake our wildlife and natural resources.

Gail Hildreth Whitsett
23131 N. Poe Valley Road
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603
Mr. Michael Grainey, Administrator OOE
Ms Shelly Cimon, Chair OEFSC
625 Marion Street NE, Suite 1
Salem, Oregon 97301-3742
January 24, 2004

Dear Mr. Grainey and Ms. Cimon,

Please admit the following comments to be heard/read by the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council in their final determination of whether to allow a building site permit for People’s Energy Corporation for construction of the California Oregon Border 1160 MW gas fired electrical generating plant in the EFU designated rural area of Langell Valley, Oregon. These are opinions formulated from data in the COB draft proposal (I am not a registered geologist in Oregon). I ask that these written comments replace the public comments I made on January 22, 2004 on the Draft Proposed Order because these comments are more detailed and present additional facts not previously noted.

The Draft Proposed Order for the COB Energy Facility contains

numerous apparent errors of fact. I will refer to the statements in question in order and by page number and line.

Page 10, lines 33-34: COB is not entitled to a new state-administered water use certificate issued before any of the other 32 more senior water use permit applicants in the same water use area receive water right certificates. These senior priority applicants are presently being denied full permanent certification
and permits by the OWRD. COB should only be allowed a new water permit AFTER the other 32 individuals with senior valid claims are granted their full permanent permits. The OOE and ODWR are in apparent violation of the law if they allow the COB plant final permit to move ahead of the other more senior applicants.

Page 10, lines 39-40: An isolated deeper zone aquifer does not exist; state and federal hydrologists have proven that a degree of connectivity exists between the two water bearing units. COB is attempting to say that the water bearing zones constitute an isolated "aquifer" but in fact an isolated aquifer must have certain delineations including geometric and geographic definition, re-charge area definition and discharge area. COB has not identified an isolated separate deeper aquifer by the above normal methods employed by hydrologists. Additional mandatory tests that should be done, include utilization of isotope studies of the water from the Babson Well deeper water bearing unit and comparing them to the results of the isotopes found in the stratigraphically higher water-bearing unit of the same well. It is believed that no hydrologic study of the Babson well can be considered finalized or complete without an isotope study of the water bearing units.

Further references to this "isolated deep aquifer" exist throughout the Draft Proposed Order and its Attachments as well as through out the EIS. This is a very important concept to understand because the "isolated deep aquifer" stance is being falsely promulgated by COB to achieve compliance with other Oregon statutes, and goals mentioned in the Draft Order.

In fact, the OWRD and the USGS directly deny that the deeper water bearing zone found in the Babson Well is isolated. Marshall Gannett of the USGS stated in a letter to the USF&WS that

"As you requested, I took a look at the report by CH2M Hill entitled Water Supply Supplemental Data Report- Deep Aquifer Testing at the COB Energy Facility Water Supply Well. You asked specifically if I could provide an opinion on the adequacy of the report to say there would be no measurable or significant effect on surface water. In my opinion, the report is not adequate to make that conclusion." Page 1, paragraph 1.

And further on page 2 of the same letter, paragraph 1 "This strongly indicates there is some degree of hydraulic connection between the deep zone and the developed shallow zone from which irrigation pumping occurs." Also P. 2 last paragraph: "To summarize, the test and data presented in the report do not, in my opinion, support the idea that the deep water-bearing zone is hydraulically isolated from the shallow zone which is generally accepted to be in hydraulic connection with springs feeding the Lost River."

A response in the shallow ground water system connected to Bonanza Big Springs was unexpected and makes doubtful the complete isolation of deep ground water from shallow ground water in the area.

The (1994, CH 2 M Hill) report notes deep ground water level trends before and after the interference test. It states the "...water level trends likely reflect seasonal recharge and pumping/irrigation patterns. This statement in the report runs counter to the conclusion that the deep ground water is isolated from the shallow ground water. No seasonal pumping/irrigation or recharge influence should be seen if the deep ground water is truly isolated."

These higher static water levels occur at a time when shallow ground water pumping for irrigation is decreasing and ceasing. This recovery (higher static water levels) in both shallow and deep ground water suggest the shallow and deep ground water are hydraulically connected.

In the draft document (not yet finalized) *Ground Water in the Eastern Lost River Sub-Basin, Langell, Yonna, Swan Lake and Poe Ground Valleys of Southeastern Klamath County, Oregon* by the Oregon Water Resources Department, there are implied suggestions that are in direct contradiction to the COB statements referring to an isolated deep basalt aquifer.

It suggests that under current Lost River management conditions, the calculated total basalt ground water drawdown by pro-rated pumping the Bonanza sub-area 5-year permit wells alone is sufficient to terminate Bonanza Big Springs flow in most years. This situation becomes even more problematic given that the exercise of the 5-year permits will occur in addition to the regular exercise of more senior ground water rights. From 1997 through 2002, the basalt ground water level at Bonanza Big Springs nearly met the river stage I in the summer of 1997, and 2000 and dropped below the river stage in the summer of 2001 and 2002. The Babson Well permit being sought by COB is the most junior right presently applied for in the Bonanza sub-basin. It would seem wise to wait to issue the COB site certificate until this OWRD document is finalized, which is supposed to be very soon.

Two other wells with senior established permanent permits already exist on COB controlled land, located within the immediate vicinity the proposed plant site, the Jan Wright well and the Liston well. Both of these senior water right wells could provide the water necessary to run the COB plant (300 gpm), without the drilling of two additional wells or without the use of the Babson well, and without the 2.5 miles of pipeline needed to get the Babson water to the plant site. It is not true that the Babson well is unique and a necessity to provide water for the COB plant. See statements: Draft PO Attachment B, page 291 paragraph 3 "Nevertheless, the Energy Facility will still require some process water; and the applicant has provided evidence that the Babson well is the only source of such water that is available without adversely affecting existing water uses. The existence of the Babson well is one of the major reasons justifying the location of the proposed Energy Facility." With a preexisting water supply, and the need to connect that supply to the proposed Energy Facility, it necessarily follows that
the water supply pipeline connecting the existing well to the proposed Energy Facility is locationally dependent." The Jan Wright well flows enough water (1200 gpm) alone to provide the necessary water and it is already constructed, located on site, and has a senior permit. The Babson well, which is located 2 1/2 miles away, and the two additional wells proposed to be drilled next to it, do not provide a unique or necessary condition.

It is my opinion that COB repeatedly makes the many times, proven false "isolated deep aquifer" statement throughout the Draft PO and throughout the EIS in order to keep the facts from being known and understood regarding the influence of their pumping of the Babson well on the Lost River. With the OWRD and USGS written statements establishing the hydraulic connectivity of the deeper water-bearing basalt unit to the overlying water-bearing units, COB's statements are proved false and without scientific basis.

Isolated means "having no connection to, set apart from and placed alone".

The connectivity of the Babson well and all wells in the Bonanza sub-area to the shallow ground water and consequently to the Lost River underscores the importance of not withdrawing any more water than is already being withdrawn. COB refuses to acknowledge the existence of the hydraulic connection of its wells to the groundwater system, and ultimately to the Lost River, by repeatedly making statements about the "isolation" of the deep aquifer in its Babson well. The reality is that if the COB plant is allowed to be built and use additional water over what is already being withdrawn in the sub-basin, along with drilling the two additional wells requested, it has the potential to interfere with the Lost River. COB persists in the Draft Order and EIS in repeatedly ignoring the many statements of the USGS and OWRD relating the hydraulic connectivity of the deep zone to the shallow zone. COB relentless infer that the Babson well is "unique" and postulates its entire reason for placing the facility at this site on the "isolated aquifer" and lack of interference with the Lost River and the overlying water bearing zones. Just because COB repeats this mantra ad infinitum, does not make it true. Nearly every section of the Draft PO and the EIS are predicated on the "isolated deep aquifer" statement. Numerous violations of the requested Goal 3 exemption are evident. I ask you to review those Draft PO statements which can no longer be considered true when one accepts the scientifically documented fact of hydraulic connectivity throughout the facility site wells and the ground water system that supplies the Lost River.

Recently, two of the highest ranking politicians within the state government of Oregon made comments and pledges to Klamath County regarding the use of agricultural (EFU) lands and agricultural water.

Oregon Department of Agriculture Director Katy Coba was quoted in a lengthy January 12, 2004 Klamath Falls Herald and News interview as stating the following "I think another issue we have to be fairly vigilant about is land use" she said. "The issue of protecting agricultural lands is critically important to our producers and is something we must pay close attention to." Coba also believes water availability remains important.
"The Klamath Basin situation has raised the issue to a national level the past couple of years. It’s ODA’s role to continue to advocate on behalf of agriculture for the use of water. There’s no question, the (agriculture) industry needs access to water throughout the state.....Anything we can do to provide additional quantities of water will be important."

On December 10, 2002, newly elected Governor Kulongoski convened a meeting with Klamath County officials and politicians, as well as the Hatfield Upper Basin Working Committee, of which I am a member. Members of the federally funded Hatfield Committee (founded by Senator Mark O. Hatfield in 1994, to address water issues in the Upper Klamath Basin), have been confirmed by Oregon’s governors and the US Secretary of the Interior. I received my confirmation as a member of the Hatfield Committee by Governor Kulongoski in the spring of 2003.

I will QUOTE from the official minutes of the meeting, "Mr. Kulongoski reported he had just come from a meeting with the Water Users. He indicated that he and his administration are concerned and that this (the water rights issue) is a major issue for them. He will continue to be involved through the Department of Water Resources. He is very familiar with the water rights issues and would like to hear from the group what he can do to help. He added that he has found the Klamath issue to be one of the most complex he has seen- and he has a lot of experience with complex issues as a) Supreme Court justice. He recognizes that the basin is dealing with limited resources with excessive demands. He added that the basin economy

is vital to the State’s economy. He believes that the state is dependent upon the health of agriculture in the state. He is a supporter of land use and noted that the purpose of the land use laws is to keep agriculture functional. If agriculture fails economically, the public can no longer be expected to support land use laws."

It seems apparent that Governor Kulongoski feels quite strongly about keeping EFU agricultural land use designated lands in agriculture, according to his own words. He also stated at that same meeting that he was instrumental in making the present EFU and Forest land use laws in Oregon and he fully expected them to be upheld. the Energy Siting Council should not have the right to usurp, through exemptions, the land use laws that every other citizen and business or industry in Oregon must adhere to. It is a violation of the Klamath County Planning Code to use over 12 EFU acres for an energy facility or 20 acres of forestry designated lands for an energy facility.

Throughout the Draft Proposed Order we are told that the reasons for the exemptions of Goals 3 and 4 of the KC Code, is the "uniqueness" of the conditions present in Langell Valley to site this energy facility. As I stated before, there are no unique conditions at the Langell Valley site. The three conditions listed as unique and favorable to build the plant already exist at an already abandoned industrial site near the present electrical co-generation facilities. This alternate site also includes wells with the appropriate amount of water (300
gpm) necessary to run the plant, a connection into an already existing 500 KV connecting electrical line and access to the same natural gas source as the Langell Valley site would have.

The difference is that a 120 acre special land use exemption WOULD NOT have to be made at this already properly zoned industrial site, 7.2 miles of high voltage transmission lines WOULD NOT have to be constructed over a mountain top, through forested lands, additionally, 4 miles of connecting pressurized gas pipeline and 2 miles of water pumping and piping system WOULD NOT have to be built. But of most importance, this huge facility WOULD NOT have to be built directly over a huge geologic fault. All of the aforementioned situations and conditions exist at the site being proposed by COB and the OOE at the Langell Valley site and must be safely and legally overcome.

**Klamath County has one of the highest ratings for probable seismic activity in the state of Oregon.**

Parts of Klamath County have the highest rating for seismic probability in the continental United States. Klamath County experienced two of the larger earthquakes in the United States in the last decade, 5.9 and a 6.0 magnitudes. The quakes (the 6.0) in Klamath County are listed in the top earthquakes in the entire history of the United States by state in the USGS (on their 2003 data based website for earthquake hazards – see attached pages; it was rated #11 and #15 by state, respectively depending on measurement criteria used). The Klamath quake of 1993 was rated as the largest earthquake in the history of Oregon according to the official government website at [http://neic.usgs.gov/neis/states/oregon](http://neic.usgs.gov/neis/states/oregon). Quakes of similar magnitudes recently killed nearly 50,000 people in Iran. This county and the proposed COB site are definitely capable of having earthquakes now, and in the immediate future, of this and much greater magnitude (up to a 9 magnitude noted from page H-16 of Vol 1). People's Energy employed a consulting firm to model potential earthquake probability and hazards at the site. The siting council is being asked to accept a model to hypothesize the probability of quakes and their magnitudes for the immediate area.

Let me provide some of COB’s own facts in easy to understand terms (COB uses a 0 -1 scale, which refers to a range of from none (0) - to total probability(1) :

There are 8 mapped seismically active major faults within a 50 mile radius of the proposed COB site. Of these, 5 major faults have a (one on their scale) chance of experiencing an earthquake, the remaining 3 active faults have a .5, .6 and .8 of a total 1, probability of experiencing an earthquake. This means, all of the faults have some probability of earthquake activity.

Within a 100 mile radius of the COB site, there are eight additional mapped major active faults, of these four have a 10 of 1 probability of rupture. Two of the four remaining have an .5 probability of an earthquake, one has a .5 chance and one has .3 probability. None of the faults was expected to remain seismically intact. That means that every major mapped fault within a 100 mile radius is expected to have some degree of significant seismic (earthquake) activity during
the time that the COB facility is modeled for (none of the faults listed in COB's application had a zero (0) chance of activity).

The OOE and COB geologic consultants point out in their comments that they only considered mapped faults in their deterministic model. What is most important is that they reference (page H-3, Volume I) "An unmapped normal fault occurs along the base of Bryant Mountain, immediately to the southwest of the Energy Facility site. The inferred trace of the fault is shown in Figure H-1. The fault trends northwest and southeast and is at least 10 miles in length. The bedrock has been uplifted on the southwest side of the fault giving rise to Bryant Mountain, and down-dropped on the northeast side, resulting in the basin where the Energy Facility site is located. The fault likely dips to the northeast, extending beneath the Energy Facility site."

In plain language this means the proposed building site is sitting directly on top of a massive fault. With regard to location in the Lost River sub-basin, the plant would be built directly over one of the largest faults we've ever seen (in this area). The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) does have information on this fault. They estimate this fault has over 2200 feet of visual vertical displacement. Why COB and OOE are proposing to build one of the largest gas fired electrical generating facilities in North America directly over the Bryant Mountain fault is unfathomable.

Registered geologists, with DOGAMI have mapped and noted a fault on Schaup Road (off South Poe Valley Road) less than five miles from the proposed COB site that has about 6 (six) inches of vertical displacement as the result of the 1993 Klamath earthquake that measured 6.0 M. This fault and displacement are located very close to the COB facility site and were not noted at all in the Draft Proposed Final Order. The Department of Energy should wait to site this plant until after DOGAMI's maps and geologic interpretations are published (due out in the near future). There are also numerous references to the "Bryant Mountain Fault" throughout the geologic literature and it will be discussed in the new DOGAMI report and maps. For COB to suggest that this huge fault (ten miles in length and with significant displacement) is "unmapped" appears disingenuous at best. Previous geologic work on this fault (that underlies the proposed site) suggests a vertical displacement of 750 meters (about 2200 feet), not the 1000 feet of vertical displacement estimated by the COB Proposed Order.

In many peoples' estimation these are extremely important and critical points to be resolved prior to citing the facility. If the COB preliminary geologic work is off by an order of 100% (as by stating the vertical displacement is 1000 feet instead of the true 2200 feet of vertical displacement) then we can infer that other "work" they have done has the potential to be off by a similar magnitude. Failing to note a very recent (1993) earthquake rent less than five miles away from the site (on the George Rajnus Jr. property), and stating that the closest recent displacement (rent) is over 60 miles away is dangerously careless and clearly violates Oregon law about presenting ALL of the pertinent facts known. This is not reassuring and constitutes a clear and present danger to the safety of the local community, ground water system and the Lost River water supply. The OOE and Draft Proposed Order appears to be in clear violation of state of Oregon and Klamath County public safety statutes, laws and rules, by providing false and incomplete information upon which to base this siting ruling.
With nearly 25 acres of multi-storied buildings, 200 foot high towers, and multiple million gallon containers of waste water, this plant built directly on top of a fault with extensive known visual fractured and brecciated bedrock displacement, may be a disaster waiting to happen.

If the fault moves again, as it obviously has in the geologic past, the potential for rupture of the waste water tanks, the toppling of the massive towers, the resulting gas explosions and electrical fires, and the release of hazardous chemical containment systems including aqueous ammonia exists. If either of the maximum potential magnitude quakes that could occur in the region, actually did occur, the results could be an accident of historical proportions. Any liquids could spill directly into the drainage of the Lost River where the federally listed endangered Lost River Sucker fish exist and where a known hydrologic connection to the surface and subsurface exists. This connection may have the potential to contaminate all of the subsurface waters of the entire Lost River Sub-basin.

Additional data from section H-3 paragraph 4, of Volume I, states regarding COB"S gas pipeline easement, that "The extension of the fault along the base of Bryant Mountain ridge crosses the natural gas pipeline along Harpold Road" and on page H-3 paragraph 8, Volume I, "The electric transmission line easement traverses several faults. The fault along the base of Bryant Mountain ridge crosses the easement on the far north end near the Energy Facility. A mapped fault crosses the easement's southern end. This is a normal fault that is down-dropped to the northeast similar to the Bryant Mountain ridge fault. It runs subparallel to the easement for a short distance. These faults are shown in Figure H-1. There are undoubtedly other unmapped normal faults crossing the easement that have less obvious topographic expression."

The Oregon Office of Energy proposes to place mitigating conditions on the site that require development of the necessary scientific data to determine if this site is geologically suitable on which to build the facility AFTER it issues the site certificate. This is backward. The geologic studies necessary to determine suitability should be completed BEFORE the site certificate is issued.

Some of the pertinent Oregon Administrative Rules regarding these issues include, but are not totally inclusive of: OAR 345-022-0020, OAR 345-022-0030; Klamath County Code LDC 44.030 A,B, and C; Klamath County Code LDC 54.040 and 57.060 B,C,D, and E and Klamath County and State of Oregon Goals 3, 4 and 5. Klamath County Goal 7, Policy 1, Article 59 V.A.3

Also, additional information that must be put in writing is the Confederated Klamath Tribe's written approval of the archeological processes involved in the siting process. On page 1, line 36 and Page 2, line 16 of the Draft PO the OOE has stated that they have "talked" with the tribes involved with the COB plant archeological sites, but have not received written and signed paperwork from the tribal council regarding actual approval for the COB project. The state of Oregon should require written and readily confirmable proof that the tribes have indeed given their approval to the project. Catherine Van Horn has indicated to me that because she is of "native American" descent, she has a special relationship with
the tribes and that her conversation(s) with them are sufficient to constitute their approval. She told me she has "noted" in her records that they have given her verbal approval, but that the tribes are reluctant to put anything in writing. Surely it is not sufficient under Oregon law, to have notations of only "verbal" acknowledgement in your file, without further written documentation. Please reference the Oregon law that states where a verbal acceptance notation is acceptable for a siting council decision. Oregon law dictates that the state has only powers vested in it by rule or statute. Oregon departments (such as OOE) do not have the power to make their own rules, if a rule does not already exist (ie: to exempt the tribe’s from making a written declaration in this matter). If the state allows sole verbal acquiescence as a legal form of communication, they must pass a law allowing for verbal acceptance instead of written acceptance, if this is how they wish to conduct business. Otherwise this is a violation of Oregon law and its constitution. These archeological site evaluations need CRMP and SHPO before being sited and they violate Goal 5, Policy 5 of the Klamath County LDC.

The OOE has in fact made an error with regard to the EFU land designation on Page 8, line 5 of the Draft PO upon which COB wishes to site the plant. Seed potatoes were grown on this land in the past and seed potato production requires the highest quality land and EFU land value determination. Whether this is the fault of the county inadvertently misrepresenting the land value, or the US Soil and Water Conservation District, it is never the less mislabeled and needs to be corrected in the Draft PO. Don Rajnus, a local farmer and current member of the Oregon Groundwater Advisory Board, testified during the final COB hearing on January 22, 2004 that this land is wrongly designated in its EFU determination and requires an upgrading to highest EFU status. This oversight results in a violation of Goal 3 and 4 of the Klamath County Code and Oregon Planning Goals.

OOE has made an additional error in the draft PO and EIS in stating that the nearest endangered species are at least five miles distance from the proposed plant. In fact, the endangered Lost River Sucker habitat in the Lost River is within two miles of the site, in a geographically lower altitude than the plant. Any major amount of water spilled, released or runoff from the plant would travel over the land surface or through the ground water directly into the Lost River with its Federally listed endangered fish. Federally listed as "threatened" bald eagles routinely fly and hunt directly at the site and near the transmission lines. An individual in Klamath County was recently fined several thousand dollars for cutting coniferous trees to within 300 feet of the roosting/nesting site of one of these threatened species. I believe the Draft PO is in error when it states that the bald eagles will get used to the noise and intrusion on their lives. I also believe that People's Energy may be heavily fined by the Federal government if they disturb any timber within 300 feet of a nesting site. The entire 7 miles of transmission lines have not been scouted for bald eagle nests within 300 feet of the proposed right of way.

A further serious concern exists in the Draft PO with regard to the overabundance of the element boron, as a waste water byproduct that will be placed on the ground in the site area. It appears that the amount of added boron particle pollution which will be allowed to be irrigated in the form of COB plant waste water, added to the naturally occurring water and soil boron levels will
create too high a total background level and exceed the federal standards allowable for sensitive plant species of this particular element. Boron levels have been detected at the Babson well and at Big Springs in Bonanza and the first draft for this permit states that the boron levels are exceeded. Pages 2 & 3, Attachment P-3 Amendment #2 states "As indicated in Attachment P-3 Table 2, several wastewater constituents (aluminum, barium, boron, chromium III, copper, fluoride, iron, manganese, molybdenum and nickel) failed to pass the screening evaluation (i.e. Hazard Quotients HQ’s greater than one for any receptor) when total (incremental +background) concentrations were evaluated. However, the exceedances of all but boron and molybdenum were driven by background concentrations." "Estimated maximum incremental boron concentrations in soil were 93 times the screening value of 0.5 mg/kg." On page 1 of this same document it states "This screening assessment was based on highly conservative assumptions such that constituents that passed the screen can be considered to pose no significant risk to ecological receptors. Failure to pass the screen however, cannot be concluded to represent the presence of risk. Rather these results indicate that available data are insufficient to support a conclusion that ecological risks are absent." It appears in this subsequent draft proposed order, COB has tried to finesse the amount of boron allowable in site wastewater by saying that the standards were set too high. The EPA/ODEQ has spent considerable effort on this issue with COB and OOE and I don’t feel the issue has been properly resolved. They (COB) must adhere to the same EPA standards setting maximum allowable amounts for sensitive plant species, without compromising or exceeding the federally regulated element tables used by the ODEQ.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Hildreth Whitsett
I received a desperate email from a friend that lives near the proposed Solar facility near Bonanza. I have a couple of questions about this proposal:
1. Does it meet the "Environmental Impact Rules for the State of Oregon"?
2. Is there not a rule about "Interstate transmission of utility" and its impact on the production State?
3. Has the DEQ of the State of Oregon given its approval on this project?
4. Has the community been given a chance to receive all information about this project and the plans to sell Oregon Power to the State of California?
5. What impact will this have on the Beaver and other possible endangered species in the area?
6. What will be done to compensate the residents that border this project?
7. What EMF protections will be applied to the transmission of power and who will coordinate it?

I expect to get some answers to these very simple and necessary questions before the project starts, that means, before one shovel of dirt is disturbed in the project area. I plan to involve the DLCD (Department of Land Conservation and Development) about this project.

Thank you for your speedy response,
Greg Beckman
Hi Katie

I'm writing you in hopes that we the people in Langell Valley have a voice in if the power plant will go in or not. I have lived in this valley my entire life, literally two miles from where it might go in, and to see part of it turn into solar panels and storage banks breaks my heart. It is hard enough being a rancher and to have fabulous pasture ground turned into that makes it even harder for us to raise livestock. We need pasture to raise beef/ lamb so people can buy it in a store! In my opinion people have forgot where their food comes from! Let alone the impact it will have on wildlife, people out here have hunted deer, quail, ducks etc and if you don't think it will effect them you haven't been out in nature.

I hope this touches someone and they have a second thought on how this will impact our valley.

Sincerely Molly Belding
Dear Ms.Clifford:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility. Bonanza is a multi-generational agricultural community. Because of the nature of raising cattle and growing food, families have been able to teach their children the value of working the land. Farmers and ranchers are also able to employ high school kids to work the land, allowing them to appreciate the value of a hard-earned dollar. Working these kids keeps them too busy to become criminals, alcoholics, suicidal or depressed. It gives them a purpose. Farming and ranching has a direct positive impact on community. Farm and ranch families are almost always hard-working, self-supporting, law-abiding members of society who take care of their families, their neighbors, and their communities. Bonanza is a very small town. What we have in agricultural land is it. If that land is converted to a different use, it will have a direct impact on the entire community. Mostly, it will impact our youth. It will rob them of the opportunity to carry on the tradition of working the land. Bonanza is not meant to be an industrial community. This is why there is very little land actually zoned for industrial use. We are an agricultural community and we want to remain an agricultural community. If this project gains approval, it will be the end of Bonanza. It will be the end of multi-generational, hard-working American families. Working at the plant will be just a job, not an investment into land and business to be passed down for generations. Please do not do this to our community, Please do not approve this project.

Danise Brakeman
Bonanza, OR

Virus-free. www.avast.com
It has just come to my attention that there is a plan to put 1200 acres of spectacularly beautiful farm and wild land into a solar power field. Solar power is an excellent idea, but PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE put the collectors on rocky hillsides NOT in farm and wildlife areas. I know it’s more expensive, but we’re doing it because it is the right thing to do, not because it is the cheapest, I pray! This area cannot be replaced, it is that beautiful, really.
I'd like to point out a few things that are very concerning about this facility out in Langell Valley. This will just be so awful for the many families of that area, plus all the other folks who go there. Here are a few points I hope you will take into consideration.

1. The use of water is really being downplayed but in the Notice of Intent to Apply for a Site Certificate they state they will be using 800,000 gallons per week for two months, then 48,700 per week for 10 months. And then an additional 3,150,000 gallons for concrete. Plus water for dust control. PLUS water for a "potential future buildout of Facility may include an air-cooled, natural gas fired peaker generating facility, a related or supporting natural gas pipeline to the existing Malin natural gas compressor station and a related or supporting water supply pipeline." No mention of this in the letter that was sent to neighbors of the project. We are in a drought and the farmers and ranchers absolutely need that water!

2. Wetlands. There is a pond there. Most of it is within the boundaries of the solar proposal. On page J-2 they state, "Most of the water bodies are associated with irrigation practices. This may be true but the pond is still bird habitat and migrating birds often rest here. During drought years when we were not able to irrigate the pond was still there, fed with springs. So it is a NATURAL WETLANDS. The Hecate company mentions "ODFW Habitat Mitigation policy" at the end of the segment. In fact they mention mitigation after almost every paragraph dealing with environmental issues.

3. The document on page J-4 claims the scenic "impact will be negligible" since the site will not be visible from "Goodlow Mountain Research Natural Area, OC&E Woods Line State Trail and Klamath Falls-Lakeview Forest State Scenic Corridor." We have no scenic value unless we can be seen by those sites? Tell that to the many fishermen, birders, bikers, hunters, campers that drive through our valley. Plus those of us that choose to live here.

4. Land Use. On page J-5 they claim that "much of this land is currently uncultivated."

This is an exaggeration BORDERING on a lie.

Much of the ranch is pasture, alfalfa, and grain land. The ranch has supported a family, one full time hired man, and several part time employees. This is a working ranch.

5. There is mention of fire safety during construction, but nothing about fire for the life of the facility. I am pretty sure our local volunteer fire crew is not trained to deal with a fire involving a major power line and 90 some acres of batteries. A fire on this site would easily destroy neighboring homes and spread to Bryant Mountain.

NO to this facility!!!

Barbara Brown
Hi Katie,

Hopefully I’m not too late with this.

I own some land on Bryan Mt. Road near where the power lines would be sited. I just wanted to email my support for the project.

-Dave Brown
971-678-3688
Breanne Buffington  
6105 Teare Ln  
Bonanza, Oregon 97623  

October 28, 2020  

To Whom it May Concern: Bonanza Energy Facility  

This letter is being written in regards to the proposal to put solar panels southeast of Bonanza Oregon. I am devastated that this is a possibility because I live behind where the proposed panels would rest, and I live across from the battery operated power supply. The valley I live in with my children is beautiful, peaceful, serene, full of wildlife, and most importantly, it is full of working farmers and ranchers! I bought my two acres and 3 bedroom, 2 bathroom home in 2016. I am a single mother to 3 children, and this quiet valley is our safety and dream. My children have learned to live outside of a city and appreciate the beauty of the valley, the safety of not having close neighbors, and how to take care of livestock.  

The research that I have conducted since getting my letter of intent has been another reason why I am opposed to this idea. I am an avid bird watcher and animal lover, whether it be domestic animals or wildlife. The solar panels incinerated as they fly through the air, burn their wings, and encourage them to crash into the structures, resulting in death. (Amp.thedesertsun). Deer and other wildlife will be nonexistent, due to the lands being restructured and inhabitable. Our ecosystems that we rely on will be changed or nonexistent. The farmers and ranchers will not be able to continue to generate the food and keep up with the lifestyle that many rely on, especially financially to keep their farms and ranching successful.  

The solar panels have been proven to make people sick, especially people that are sensitive to radio-frequency radiation, and I am one of those people. It makes me, and others, feel dizzy, nauseated, disoriented, and headaches develop. Scientists have also proven that even low levels of exposure can cause significant health problems. (Dr. Mercola). And again, I would like to reiterate that I am a single mother and I need to be healthy to take care of my three children, more importantly, I need my children to remain healthy!  

There is no benefit that anyone will receive from these panels. Our small school might gain a bit of funding, but that is not worth the troubles this proposed solar panel installation will cause. The residents will not get a lower power bill or any financial compensation.  

Research has also proven that the market value for our properties will be driven down and home and property owners will not be able to sell and have enough to move. The well that this company wants to “use” will bleed myself and my neighbors of our water supply and possibly contaminate it. But more importantly, NO ONE WANTS TO MOVE, NO ONE WANTS TO BE SICK, AND THE RESIDENTS ARE OPPOSED TO THIS IDEA.  

Thank your for your time and please help us find another location for the solar panels,  

Breanne Buffington
Good evening Katie,

I have just become aware of the desire to put in a 1600 acre solar field on East Langell Valley Road in Bonanza, OR. I am very opposed to this idea as a nearby resident. This is prime agricultural land with I believe 300 cows on it currently, mating pairs of bald eagles, golden eagles, deer, antelope, and many other wildlife that will lose their land and possibly lives. Many birds are killed by running into these solar fields. My family enjoys watching these animals and actually observe them as part of our science education in school. I do not want to lose these. It will also devalue the agricultural land around it as well as the homes nearby. It is not just an eye sore. I understand the desire to live provide a green power option and fully support this as much as I can. However, when you are taking away the land that is healthy and green and great farmland to turn into waste I cannot support this at all. In 20 years that whole 1600 acres will just be toxic waste. It will destroy the land and where will it all go? I believe that you need to find land that is somewhere else that is not usable for anything. Where you don’t have the potential of killing so many animals, ruining livelihoods of local farmers/ranchers, destroying the land. I chose to move my family to the valley here because I love the views. I love being able to see the cattle, bald eagles, golden eagles, osprey, sandhill crane, antelope, deer, and the green fields. I enjoy the quietness and the open land.

Thank you!

Olivia Carson
Aenon: Kae Clifford,

This is a letter responding to a Proposed Bonanza Energy Facility located SE of Bonanza, Oregon.

My Husband (Hank) and I (Cherie) are deeply concerned about this project and the detrimental effect it will have on the rural life in the Bonanza area.

Hank has farmed Langell Valley all of his teen/adult life, 42 years following his Father, Grandfathers and Great Grandfathers.

We both object to this extensive amount of Agriculture land being taken out of production. Framing and grazing are centuries long undertakings. To take that land out of the cycle by installing solar panels with a life of 10 to 15 years seems very short sighted. Also the wide range of Wildlife Habitat that will be destroyed is appalling.

Living in a small community it is rather difficult to get behind a project that is thrust on us without Project Managers talking to the community, explaining the project, asking for ideas and concerns. Creates quite a hostile environment. We live here, they don’t.

Using local resources to make a profit then exporting the product out of the community doesn’t sit well with anyone. All we get is loss of prime AG ground, loss of wildlife and loss of the natural beauty of the valley.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Hank and Cherie Cheyne
9859 East Langell Valley Rd
Bonanza, OR 97623
From: Virginia Bradford Christian  
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 1:15 PM  
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE  
Subject: Proposed Solar Planning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Completed

October 24, 2020  
I know there is a need for a power resource in the area, I disagree with the proposed Solar energy system being in zoned fields for other purposes, and priorities. Are there any other alternatives to the placement of facility? Even then, how will this facility be owned as recognized owner? The State is vague, too risky in my opinion. State of Oregon has mandates into they, with an informed choice, Would the energy actually help this area? Or are there hidden costs that would bring lasting consequences?

Sis Bradford 541 80 8171  
Virginia G Bradford Christian  
Bonanza, Or 97623  
virginiabrandonchristian@gmail.com
Katie Clifford
Senior Siting Analyst
Oregon Department of Energy
550 Capital Street NE (1st Floor)
Salem, OR 97301

Subject: Proposed Bonanza Energy Facility – Solar Photovoltaic

Dear Ms Clifford:

I offer my concerns with the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility. I believe that the facility will cause harm to the local area in the following areas:

1. The gas fired generating facility will use ground water and that the use will provide little economic benefit to the local area like its use for agricultural crops on the land to be used by the facility. The landowners in the Langell Valley are concerned about water use. When ground water and surface water are used for agricultural use, it benefits all the residents in the Valley and the Bonanza area. The residents of the area are concerned about water use in the area because of water supply shortages and environmental concerns impacting water supplies.

2. While the facility will provide some jobs, the jobs will not be filled from the area. Farmers and farm workers will not be employed in the facility. They are farmers and field workers, not power plant operators.

3. There will be a loss of income and jobs for the area. While Klamath County may get additional tax revenues from the facility, the revenue will not benefit the local area.

Because of these harms, I believe the facility should be sited in an area that does not have water supply limitations. Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Cone

Copy to: Klamath County Planning Division
Hello my name is Clayton Conner I live at 6919 teare lane. My family’s home is within 500ft. of the proposed solar facility Hectate Energy Corp. is attempting to get the Oregon board of energy to approve.

I have lived in the Klamath basin my entire life. In this small community I have been able to marry the love of my life, have two children, raise them with the integrity and values I was raised with.

Three years ago my wife and I purchased this property from my aunt to build our forever home. The property has been in our family since 1974 when my grandparents came up from Napa California in the hopes to give there children and grand children the opportunity to raise a family in a place that would not be destroyed by big money or the need for expansion of an infastructer.

I am sure at this time the Oregon Board of Energy has read many personal stories of what this area means to the community. I would like to say we all have close to the same story of why we are here. With that being said I will voice my concerns on why this facility should not be placed here.

We are told that we need more renewable energy sources. Solar being a perfect candidate. Yes the sun comes up every morning, we can count on that. So maybe it seems the sun is a renewable source of energy as long as we can harness it’s power? How can we do that? It seems the answer is solar panels and battery storage. But at what cost? The solar panels are not "green technology" they may be able harness the suns energy and after they no longer are efficient they also have a carbon foot print that will affect future generations. The silica that makes up the solar panel must be mined, much like coal or iron oar. The operation of mining anything from the earth is not a green alternative. Now let’s look at the batteries for energy storage. The batteries are made of lithium, also another product that needs to be mined.

This proposed facility is not only going to have an impact on the community I have lived in and loved my entire life but also other communities from around our country and possibly other countries.

My neighbors and I received a letter of intent on Sept. 29th. we had a phone conference on Oct. 13th with Paul Turner project manager with Hectate Energy Corp., Katie Clifford with Oregon Board of Energy and others within both of their parties. Paul Turner and Katie Clifford, at this time have had plenty of time to prepare for this meeting. At this time my neighbors and I have only had fourteen days to try to research what the full extant of what we were dealing with. At that meeting I asked Mr Turner if would like this in his back yard. He responded by saying he lives in the city of Chicago and he is surrounded by industry. Another neighbor asked if he had ever been out to our valley. He responded that he had been here numerous time. I then asked him at that time if this was his back yard would he want a facility like this in it? His response was he would have to weigh the benefits with the cons, and it would come to how the community could benefit. I then asked Mr Turner what the benefits would be? He responded by saying there would be jobs and revenue for the community. I then asked him how much revenue and jobs that would be? He replied by saying he did not know at this time. I had many more questions for him and his response was the same he did not know at this time.

After the meeting on Oct.13 we had scheduled a meeting with our Klamath County commissioners to voice our opposition to this proposal. On October 20th. myself and eight other neighbors and community members voiced our opposition to our county commissioners.

At 1:00 that afternoon the commissioners met with Eric Noble from the county planning department. The commissioners were trying to figure out there role as a special advisory board on proposed facility. Commissioner Donny Boyd asked Eric how Hectate Energy Corp. could build a facility on agriculture land. Eric responded by saying if the Oregon Board of Energy aproved the facility they could change the zoning without county approval.

Now this is a major part of what has consumed the last thirty days of my life. It has been a lot of research, phone calls, emails and sleepless nights.
I would like to ask the Oregon Board of Energy to consider other land to put facilities like this one on. This land has been zoned agricultural for the reason of what has been produced on it for decades and more to come. When we lose agriculture land we can never get it back.

People move to Oregon from all over the country because of our scenery, our diversity, our landscape. I ask you the Oregon Board of Energy to keep our forests as beautiful as they are for us for future generations our lakes as pristine for us as well as future generations our rivers, streams, wet lands, deserts, mountains, beaches, farmlands and ranchlands something to be admired. It should be our duties as Oregonians to preserve all that makes Oregon our Oregon. We should never sacrifice one way of life to push another agenda no matter how validated the outcome may seem to be. We are all Oregon from the city's to the top of the mountains. It is our duties to find a solution we can all walk away from feeling good.

Thank you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>John Conner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Thursday, October 29, 2020 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>I am aposed to Bonanza Energy Facility, this is a agricultural area not an industrial area. There is to much land that's not productive that should be used for a facility of this magnitude!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
To whom it may concern,

My name is Amber Converse and I reside at 6919 Teare Ln. in Bonanza Oregon. I am writing today to voice my concern with the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility that is being proposed to be placed in an active agriculture community by Hecate Energy LLC, an organization out of Chicago IL.

The proposed location is agriculture land that is currently an operating and fully functional ranch raising beef cattle for US consumption as well as alfalfa, a feed for cattle and horses during winter when pasture growing season ends.

This site is surrounded by families of farmers and ranchers that have lived in this valley, some fifty years and longer, some were homesteaded in this valley with land and the way of living passed down and taught for many generations. I, personally, am part of a family who have lived and operated in this valley for 4 generations. This valley has provided a way of life providing “renewable” crops and food for Americans. This valley has provided these renewable crops and beef cattle for hundreds of years, long before other technology or business discovered their idea of “renewable energy” or “Green energy”, and will continue to provide the stated for 100 more years if Energy facilities like Hecate Energy, will leave this land for agriculture production as it is designed for.

This valley, the proposed site, has been able to remain functional throughout time, in part due to the available water. Surrounding areas are receiving government reimbursement /bailout for water shortage/drought as they have been unable to water land crops for production. This valley has been fortunate, in comparison, with the water crises that has been active in Klamath County. Hecate Energy with the Bonanza Energy Facility will threaten this very way of life for this agriculture community.

The proposed site has an existing large well that has been sought out by renewable energy companies in the recent past. COB energy facility made a proposal for the same location in December of 2001. I urge this to not go unnoticed.

Proposed location is a path for many migratory animals as well. Mule deer, antelope, sand hill cranes, a variety of eagles, hawks, and other animals viewed traveling this very location at various times throughout the year. At this exact time, there are multiple herds of mule deer migrating through this property as well as properties surrounding.

There are multiple solar projects in existence in Klamath County occupying land that once grew crops and cattle. Kamath County is desired by energy/green businesses’ as Klamath County has, on average, between 218-300 days of sun. This amount of sun is essential for growing quality agriculture crops. Unfortunately, this large amount of
days of sun is not only desired by farmers and ranchers as it provides large, quality yields, it is now desired by companies/corporations to fill their pockets off of “solar power”, which is essentially not as “green” as it is being proposed (batteries, disposal, mined products for the panels themselves, etc.). This land, once taken from agriculture production, will never return to produce agriculture products that it once had.

Agriculture land and water sources need to remain as they exist and not be transformed out of agriculture, not only for this proposed site, but for agriculture lands throughout the state of Oregon.

Thank you for your time,
Amber Converse
6919 Teare Ln.
Bonanza, Oregon 97623
From: John Culver
Sent: Saturday, November 7, 2020 9:57 AM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: NOI: Bonanza Energy Facility

Katie Clifford,
I would like to express my support for the proposed energy facility near Bonanza. I am a landowner near the facility (the power lines for it are within a few hundred feet of my property). While I understand the concern that some have over siting such a facility on agricultural land, the benefits of solar/battery power to the community, state and country are quite large. There are concerns over the water usage for the project, of around 5 acre-ft a year, but this is insignificant to the amount of water that would have been used on the land anyways. In today’s era of water uncertainty in the basin, this project will allow water usage to be concentrated in other farming areas as well. It also provides a way for farm land that may not have secure access to water rights to still be in ‘production’ albeit in energy production rather than grass/alfalfa. It should also be noted that previously this site was selected for a gas fired power plant, which most certainly would be a more unappealing neighbor then solar panels. Considering the above, as well as the long term economic benefits of low cost renewable energy I support this project.
Thank you for your time,
John Culver
5040 Miller AVE
Klamath Falls, OR 97603
Dear Ms. Clifford and Council Members:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed solar system array currently under review. I know it's not going in the Council's backyard or even close to your neighborhoods. What if this was your community or your neighborhood where you enjoy your farming life, which provides food to our country? Where you are able to enjoy and support the wildlife.

The amount of water that will be used by this facility would be another detrimental hit to our farming community.

There must be other non-farming and wildlife areas to place this and other solar panel arrays. How about on top of the buildings in the already concrete cities? Wouldn't the solar panels be better situated on rooftops of milelong huge concrete warehouses? This would place the power closer to the grid that is going to transmit and use that power.

Farming and forest land is there for a reason and the reason should not be changed in order to less expensively moneyline power and energy businesses pockets.

Please make the right decision and send Hecate Energy LLC back to the drawing board to find a better location for their solar panel array in order to protect farming and wildlife.

Respectfully,
Daneen M. Dail
30110 Possum Drive
Bonanza, OR 97623
541-545-1716
From: Rita Dyer
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2020 12:52 PM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: Notice of Intent for Bonanza Facility

Katie Clifford,
I live at 39755 Bunn Way, Bonanza, OR 97623, We are not within 500 feet of the area that is intended for the solar facility. However we did receive a notice from the state. We would be affected by this in a negative way. Please hear me out as I try to explain. There is farming all around us and we first off don't want to look at it. We would drive by this every day.
The Birds that migrate through this area would be deeply affected! We see a huge variety of birds that rest there while migrating. Many hatch their babies near the springs. We all living near this feel a duty to protect the innocents of nature surrounding us. We teach our children and grandchildren to honor and respect these innocents of nature.
The deer that live there and birth their young, would not be allowed to freely roam as before. There is also antelope that shy away from humans, which is a rare sighting. They could possibly just disappear from all this unnatural activity.

Some other wildlife that live freely around us are, Wolves, Coyotes, Fox, Rockchucks, Lynxes, Mountain Lions and Elk. Of course there are many more, my concern is that this proposed project would permanently disrupt all of our natural environment, it simply isn't productive for nature, which is not productive for mankind! If we that live here don't speak up, soon there will not be any natural places for our wild life to live and thrive. Those of us that have had the privilege to live here have learned how to make a living side by side with nature. We respect and at times help them and they return a favor to us by helping to balance our world that we all have to live in. Please don't destroy our small community by moving any more of these projects into Bonanza!

Sincerely,
Rita E. Dyer
Dear Katie Clifford, I'm writing this letter in opposition to the proposed solar project in the Bonanza, OR, area. I have a home & 12 Ac. of land on West Langell Valley Rd. & I'm concerned about the destruction of farm land & the Exe Sore that it will be. I'm also concerned about the disposal of the batteries & old solar panels in the future. My land is Ag land also & I cannot build houses or anything on it, so why can somebody come in to our homeland & destroy our community for monetary gain? We prefer beauty & quite over monetary gain any day.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Philip Stanton
I am writing in regards to the proposed energy facility. I am completely against this and as a native Oregonian I hope you will stop this facility from being built on this beautiful land for the sake of the wildlife and people living in this area.

I also feel that hydroelectric is the most reliable and environmentally friendly way to get electricity. Dams help farmers, can let out water in the summer, slow flooding in the winter and water in rivers is year round. The sun and wind are not.

Please consider what will happen to all of Oregon. Save our farmers and wildlife.

Connie Filipek

Sent from my iPhone
From: Deborah Fite - Hart
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2020 11:01 AM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: BONANZA ENERGY FACILITY -LANGELL VALLEY- BONANZA OREGON

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Completed

Good Morning Ms. Clifford,

Where do you begin to describe how important it is to keep the very few beautiful and peaceful valleys we have left on this earth?

Not only does Langell Valley provide a source of income for its residents and sustainability for their livestock, but it also provides crops and products sold outside of that beautiful little valley to people like us in the Rogue Valley. If it weren’t for the Klamath hay industry we would not be able to feed our livestock. Most of our agriculture fields have gone to hemp.

Not far from our home on Hwy 234 in Eagle Point there is a solar energy field. When they put that in everyone thought ok, this could be good. This field is nothing but rocks and weeds with no animal habitat. At least someone will keep it up and keep the weeds down and it will be fire safe. WRONG! They came in and put in the panels and did some landscaping with fences. Then it just got left to grow up with weeds again and be a fire hazard. No maintenance at all. Now it is a horrible eye sore. Worse than just the rocks and weeds.

I have gone to Langell Valley for years just to drive through and view the open pastures and look at the animals. The birds are amazing! This area truly is heaven on earth. Not only is it green in the spring and summer but beautiful when the snow flies. If you haven’t been there please go. Some of these people bought their land generations ago. This is where they chose to live, make their living, raise their kids and enjoy a place away from the pollution of town.

Putting in a solar energy facility would be so detrimental to that area for so many reasons. The beauty, the wildlife, property values, toxic waste to the soil and so much more. And what happens when someone says, " this isn’t functional anymore, it’s outdated. We won’t be
using this shut it down. " Will that land be restored to its original state or will the solar panels just be abandoned to leak and rot to the ground., causing toxic pollution and multiple other hazards.

I have friends that have a ranch next to your proposed site and one over the hill from the site. They have had ranches in this area for generations. My heart aches for them. They will have to get up everyday and look out their window to that ugly picture of solar panels. Instead of the beauty and wildlife they once enjoyed. The reason they settled there in the first place. How would you like it if they built one of these next to your home so when you went out on your deck that's all you saw or a cell tower just over your fence so you had to look at it instead of the mountains.

This is so WRONG. Pick somewhere else that doesn't have such a huge impact on so many things. Please!

Thank you for your time reading my letter. I hope to hear you have changed your mind.

Sincerely,

Debbie Hart
Eagle Point, Or.
From: Fairisine Fore
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2020 12:24 PM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: Bonanza energy facility - proposed

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
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Miss Clifford:
I am writing concerning the proposed facility to be constructed in Langell Valley. I have lived here for 44 years and love the wild life, and rural sitting. We have bald Eagles, deer, antelope, coyotes that reside in the valley. Then we have so many varieties of birds that use this area as a migration route and nesting area. Just to mention a few, ducks, snow geese, Canadian geese, sand hill cranes.

To put the solar array in the proposed area would endanger our wild life.

Also on the proposed property is a natural wet land, which has water year round. These ponds provide nesting for above-mentioned wild life, and for the migrating birds.

At this time we are in a drought and have been in one, off and on, since we moved here, to take that much ground water from the well on the property, could prove to be a harmful to the ground water level in the Valley

As I have told you, we moved here 44 years ago to get to a more rural way of life, raising Cattle and hay on our small ranch, and we have enjoyed this way of living, now with this proposed facility, you will be forcing us to live in an Industrialized Area in our rural sitting.

I am against the proposed facility in Langell Valley.

Fairisine Fore
From: Rhodadeen Gibson
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 3:44 PM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: Bonanza Energy Facility
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Katie,
I think it’s important to know the impact the Oregon Siting Counsel has on the decision it makes regarding small communities such as Bonanza. We are a rural community who choose a life providing agricultural goods to people all over the world.

My husband and I have lived and worked here for 45 years, living by the laws and regulations of the Farm-Use Land laws. Solar is important, but not at the expense of depleting farm ground to build this facility. Having come from the California Bay Area, some of the most productive agriculture farm ground in the world (Silicon Valley, Santa Clara, Alameda, Santa Rosa and others) are paved over with highways, homes, industrial; are no more and will never return.

My home where I grew up is now a Walmart, so I know personally what happens for the sake of progress.
The Trans Canada Gas Pipeline and electric lines run from Canada through California to Mexico. If this is the energy source to be used, run your solar along those established lines rather than out here.
The water use in our community is a constant battle with all the demands put on it. Your proposed well could put additional restrictions on the current wells already in use.

If these solar plants are so lucrative, then why does California not allow them in their own state? Instead you choose small communities with the least resistance.
As you know, we currently already have a solar plant in Bonanza that we see everyday, as it sits across the valley from our house on a mountain side. By allowing another one to come to Bonanza, you’re opening the door for others to follow. Its not fair to ask farm communities that depend on the forests and farm ground to abide by those who live in the cities.

Farm Use Land laws were put in place years ago to protect farm and forest lands from being changed for other uses other than what they were meant for.

1) Your site is in the path of interstate deer herd migration.
2) Stress to those who have to deal with the traffic, noise, construction equipment and an eyesore to look at.
3) Decrease in property value to our farms.
4) Our beautiful aesthetics will change and so will all the habitat that live there.

I think with the worries people have for the environment, these issues would be a major concern.

With so much going on in our world today, we certainly don’t need any more stress and worry on our plate. I think there are more important issues to focus on, than this energy facility.

Please consider our OBJECTION to the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility.

Thank You,
Carl and Rhodadeen Gibson
October 21, 2020

To: Oregon Dept. of Energy.

Katie Cifford:

I strongly oppose the Bonanza Energy Facility placed on 2,733 acres of agriculture land.

The impact to the wildlife will change the eco-system with the surrounding acres, as well as the site itself.

Diana Giordano
11431 West Langell Vly Rd
Bonanza, Oregon 97623
I am against such a plant in this small community.
Dear Sitting Analyst, wanted to let you know that this is a TERRIBLE place to put your energy facility. These acres are prime irrigated pasture and would be a complete eye sore to the many who drive out East Langell Road to get to their ranches or recreation areas. I can't think of any person that would be for this unless of course they have some financial gain. As for the rest of us, it would most certainly make our property values go down. I live quite close, and this would be a financial ruin for us. What is wrong with BLM land, or unusably land? Why take good productive land and make it unusable. We don't get any benefit from this at all. We will boycott this to the end. STAY out of Langell Valley.

Mr and Mrs. Bruce Greenwell
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> From
> John Hancock
> We don’t want this project in are small rural Community!!! I have many concerns Please stop this from going forward
> 
> > Sent from my iPhone
I apologize that somehow I bumped the send button before I could list my name and address.

Christine Hankins
PO Box 98
Bonanza, OR 97623
541-545-6649

On Tue, Oct 27, 2020 at 3:02 PM Christine Hankins <grandmachris36@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Ms. Clifford,

The word Foul does describe the fact that a proposed installation which runs completely opposite of the current county zoning, and that is in fact over twice the size of the nearby town of Bonanza, and that the Department of Energy apparently knew about since August, and that the public was supposed to have 30 days within which to comment, became public local knowledge only 3 days before the end of the public comment period!

Most of the local citizenry received notice of this--as did I--the day AFTER the only local public meeting to discuss the proposed installation was held on Sunday, Oct 25th.

I ask you, is this a fair and democratic way to conduct business? I believe the local citizens, and particularly the farmers and ranchers whose properties would be affected by this installation, deserve better.

Also the deer and the abundant local birdlife deserve better. Bald eagles and golden eagles are only two of the protected species that may be endangered. Perhaps this is a good site to put several thousand acres of potentially bird-killing panels. Perhaps the deer will find new paths.

But don't Langell Valley and Bonanza area citizens have a right to see the result of the studies and to know who did them?

Perhaps there is nothing shady going on here. But for something so huge to be planned so quietly and then then sprung upon the local citizenry with essentially no time to thoughtfully respond certainly seems high-handed. The public is supposed to have 30 days to respond, not just 3.

I respectfully request that your department extend the public comment period so that the local citizens will know that they had at least a fair chance to consider and comment on the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility.

--

Chris Hankins

--

Chris Hankins
Good Morning Katie,

I am writing in opposition of the proposed solar energy facility that is slated for Bonanza Oregon. Not only will this facility be an eye sore for those in the beautiful Langell Valley but it will use an extreme amount of water. Water that is already a huge point of contention in the Klamath Basin Irrigation projects for farmers and ranchers. The proposed site will be using over 800,000 gallons of water just in the first two months. This will undoubtedly have an negative impact on the wetlands that are already in place. These wet lands are already associated with irrigation practices and strike a balance for the community as well as the many birds that use these lands as habitat as well as the migratory birds as a place of rest. In drought years although unable to used for irrigation these wetlands still serve a vital purpose to the birds and wildlife in the area.

My second concern fire. The local voluntary fire crews are not trained on dealing with fires involving high voltage wires and storage of 90 acres of batteries. As seen recently a fire can easily destroy entire communities without proper training and proper equipment to handle such a catastrophic event. The rural voluntary firefighting community cannot support such an event.

I understand that given the current climate of world renewable energy resources are needed but I hope that a balance and consideration could be found. Personally, I do not support or agree with putting this energy plant in the Bonanza area and find it will be catastrophic into the farming and ranching communities. I am always amazed how easy it is to desecrate small communities while the bigger west coast cities who in most cases do not share the same values reap the benefits. We have had enough.

Thank you for your time,

Mandy Stanbro
Proud Oregon Rural Resident
Dear Katie Clifford,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility. I have been a resident of Siskiyou County, California and Jackson County, Oregon for a combined 13 years. My appreciation for this unique region extends to Klamath County where I have spent countless hours birding.

My primary concerns with the Bonanza Energy Facility are with the proposed location in the Langell Valley. It is my understanding that Klamath County lacks quality farmland. Building a solar plant on 1,851 acres of historically farmed and grazed farm land would be negligent. In addition there are wetland habitats within the proposed location that support birds and other wildlife that are already experiencing habitat loss at an accelerated rate due to fire, deforestation and climate change. I am also concerned about the proposed site’s proximity to sensitive riparian zones along the Lost River.

At the very least, I believe this project needs to be reassessed at a different location.

Please take these concerns into consideration before allowing this project to proceed at this site location.

Respectfully,

Leslie Hart

Sent from my iPhone
Good Afternoon Ms. Clifford,

Please find attached my opposition letter to the proposed Bonanza Energy Facility.

Kindest Regards,
Leticia Hill
October 29, 2020

Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst
Oregon Department of Energy
550 Capital Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Ms. Clifford,

My name is Leticia Hill, and I live at 9770 East Langell Valley Road, 6 miles east of the proposed solar field site. I am writing this letter to memorialize my opposition of the construction of the Bonanza Energy Facility.

My husband and I and our two children live on a small ranch and raise angus cattle. My husband has lived in Langell Valley since he was a teenager and now we are raising our family here because of the clean agriculture lifestyle it provides. Bonanza is a small community that prides itself on agriculture, and outdoor recreation which requires everyone who lives in this community to be great stewards to the environment. The proposed energy facility will generate waste, hazard materials, buildings, fences, and will eradicate agriculture ground and wildlife habitat that will never be restored. This proposed energy facility will not benefit the community of Bonanza and will not bring us any benefits. Why Langell Valley? Why is this proposed energy facility not being constructed in California as that state is the direct beneficiary of the energy produced.

The notification process to the community of Bonanza concerning this energy facility was by far the poorest example of transparency to our small community. Notification was only provided to those residents that lived within 500 feet of the proposed site, and they were only give 30 days to respond. Nothing about this process indicates good faith on your behalf, rather disingenuous intent to our small community.

Our community is hard working and honest. and we are the true preservationists as we care for the ground, water, air quality, livestock, wildlife habitat, and those who live here. The Bonanza Energy Facility does not meet the foregoing and will destroy the natural environment.

I sincerely hope that you will consider not building this energy facility in Bonanza and will conduct additional research to find a site that will house the proposed facility. Thank you in advance for reading my letter.

Respectfully,

Leticia Hill
From:  
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 10:19 AM
To: CLIFFORD Katie * ODOE
Subject: Comment on Bonanza Energy proposed project
Attachments: Hbar ant solar project.docx
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OPPOSED

Lela Holland 916-995-6496
Stan Holland 530-908-9298

please see attached.
As Landowners within a half of a mile on two separate properties, we want to notify the Oregon Department of Energy, and Klamath County Land Use and Planning officials that we are extremely OPPOSED to this industrial project.

After over 30 years of migrating north with our cowherd for summer pasture, we have CHOSEN this quiet Ranch & Farming area to complement our Ranching operation. This industrial project will be within EYESIGHT of our pasture ranch at 7824 East Langell Valley Rd.

We heard from a neighbor only yesterday about this project, giving us only one week before the deadline to respond to this important proposal. We find it odd that only neighbors are notified within 500 feet, of a project that encompasses roughly 2000+ acres. This Energy Facility project will affect not only our investment, that we have worked and saved over 40 years for, but the whole flavor of our neighborhood in a grossly negative way.

This project is contrary to Klamath County Agriculture & Forest land use zoning. 91 Acres of proposed Industrial buildings is a very large footprint. 1800 more acres of glaring plastic panels is a HUGE footprint, and in our opinion really unsightly, compared to green pastures, hay fields, and wooded hillsides. Farm & Ranch properties are a Premium and finite asset on this globe. As multi-generational Ranchers, producing food for hungry families, we think it is wrong to use farm & ranch soil for this project.

Once the zone rules are broken, there’s no going back.

This proposed project is on property that drains into the LOST RIVER. It is UPSTREAM from our Langell Valley Rd. property. We make our living off of irrigated pasture that pumps water out of the Lost River. Our concern is for any residue that might leach from the 3.95 million square feet of Battery storage, 1800 acres of solar panels, transformers, and other unknown technical devices, that may affect our water source, and or infringes on the quality or quantity of our water rights.

We purchased our properties and moved into an area that is predominately Cattle & Hay ranches. We make our living growing Cattle and Hay. We also chose this area because it was quiet, rural, and with beautiful vistas, with many species of wildlife that also choose to live here, including Deer, Antelope, Sandhill Cranes, Eagles, Ducks, Geese, and many others. We chose a Neighborhood that we felt we could FIT IN, not move to and Change Dramatically.

Farmers & Ranchers do what they do for the lifestyle, not just money. We did not choose this area, to sit on our porch in our retirement years and look at an industrial facility.

Development needs to be in an area ZONED for INDUSTRY. Not on precious Farm and Ranch property.

Respectfully,
Lela, Stan, Steve & Dan Holland
Holland Ranches
Dear Katie,

I’ve lived in Langell Valley my whole life. The construction of this facility can not happen. The valley has always been an agricultural heaven. By building this will not only ruin the community and the people that live near it. The amount of land it takes from the wild life is unbelievable. I live here to be away from all of this now I might end up with front row view of it. Not acceptable. How is the value of my property going to end up with a 1800+ Acre industrial site in front of it?

Clint