



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

POTENTIAL ACTION ITEM

REVISED AGENDA

MONTHLY MEETING
Wednesday December 20, 2023
1:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING ONLY
[Click here to join the meeting](#)
Conference number: (253) 372-2181 ID: 56502492#

- 1. Call to Order Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
- 2. Roll Call Andrea Grantham, EFSEC Staff
- 3. Proposed Agenda Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
- 4. Minutes
 - Meeting Minutes..... Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
 - November 15, 2023 Monthly Meeting Minutes
- 5. Projects
 - a. Kittitas Valley Wind Project
 - Operational Updates..... Eric Melbardis, EDP Renewables
 - b. Wild Horse Wind Power Project
 - Operational Updates..... Jennifer Galbraith, Puget Sound Energy
 - c. Chehalis Generation Facility
 - Operational Updates..... Jeremy Smith, Chehalis Generation
 - d. Grays Harbor Energy Center
 - Operational Updates..... Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor Energy
 - e. Columbia Solar
 - Operational Updates..... Thomas Cushing, Greenbacker Capital
 - f. Columbia Generating Station
 - Operational Updates..... Felicia Najera-Paxton, Energy Northwest
 - g. WNP – 1/4
 - Non-Operational Updates..... Felicia Najera-Paxton, Energy Northwest
 - h. Goose Prairie Solar
 - Project Updates..... Jacob Christ, Brookfield Renewable
 - i. High Top & Ostrea
 - Project Updates..... Sara Randolph, EFSEC Staff
 - j. Whistling Ridge
 - Project Updates..... Lance Caputo, EFSEC Staff
 - k. Desert Claim
 - Project Updates..... Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
 - l. Badger Mountain
 - Project Updates..... Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff
 - m. Wautoma Solar
 - Project Updates..... Lance Caputo, EFSEC Staff
 - n. Hop Hill Solar
 - Project Updates..... John Barnes, EFSEC Staff
 - Extension Request..... John Barnes, EFSEC Staff

The Council may consider and take FINAL ACTION on the extension request for the Hop Hill Solar Project.
 - o. Carriger Solar
 - Project Updates..... Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff
 - p. Horse Heaven Wind Farm
 - Project Updates..... Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
 - Mitigation Discussion..... Sean Greene, EFSEC Staff

The Council may take action on whether to direct staff to prepare documents to support their recommendation to the governor.

Note: "FINAL ACTION" means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.020

6. Other

Employee Updates

- New employee introduction – Audra Allen.....Lisa Masengale, EFSEC Staff

7. Adjourn.....Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair

Note: "FINAL ACTION" means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.020

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Monthly Council Meeting, - November 15, 2023

WASHINGTON STATE

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

MONTHLY MEETING

November 15, 2023

Lacey, Washington

Reporter: Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
 Monthly Council Meeting, - November 15, 2023

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 COUNCIL MEMBERS:</p> <p>4 Chair, Kathleen Drew</p> <p>5 Elizabeth Osborne</p> <p>6 Eli Levitt</p> <p>7 Lenny Young</p> <p>8 Stacey Brewster</p> <p>9 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OPTIONAL STATE AGENCIES:</p> <p>10 Ed Brost, Horse Heaven, Benton County</p> <p>11 Dave Sharp, Wautoma Solar, Benton County</p> <p>12 Paul Gonseth, WSDOT</p> <p>13 Paul Krupin, Hop Hill Solar, Benton County</p> <p>14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:</p> <p>15 Adam Torem</p> <p>16 Dan Gerard</p> <p>17 COUNCIL STAFF:</p> <p>18 Ami Hafkemeyer</p> <p>19 Amy Moon</p> <p>20 Joan Owens</p> <p>21 Andrea Grantham</p> <p>22 Sonja Skaland</p> <p>23 Sara Randolph</p> <p>24 Sean Greene</p> <p>25 Lance Caputo</p> <p>26 John Barnes</p> <p>27 Joanne Snarski</p> <p>28 Alex Shiley</p> <p>29 Ali Smith</p> <p>30 Karl Holappa</p> <p>31 COUNCIL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:</p> <p>32 Sarah Reyneveld</p> <p>33</p> <p>34</p> <p>35</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 MS. GRANTHAM: Hop Hill Solar Project</p> <p>2 for Benton County, Paul Krupin?</p> <p>3 For the Carriger Solar Project for Klickitat County?</p> <p>4 Chair Drew, would you like me to go back to Mr.</p> <p>5 Krupin and Stacey Brewster at the end of the roll call to</p> <p>6 make sure they are here for a quorum?</p> <p>7 CHAIR DREW: Yes.</p> <p>8 MS. GRANTHAM: Okay. Assistant</p> <p>9 Attorney General Jon Thompson? Jenna Slocum? Zack</p> <p>10 Packer?</p> <p>11 Administrative Law Judges, Adam Torem?</p> <p>12 JUDGE TOREM: I'm actually on the</p> <p>13 line.</p> <p>14 MS. GRANTHAM: Laura Bradley? Dan</p> <p>15 Gerard.</p> <p>16 MR. GERARD: Present.</p> <p>17 MS. GRANTHAM: Joni Derfield?</p> <p>18 For Council Staff, Sonia Bumpus? Ami Hafkemeyer?</p> <p>19 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Present.</p> <p>20 MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon?</p> <p>21 MS. MOON: Present.</p> <p>22 MS. GRANTHAM: Stew Henderson? Joan</p> <p>23 Owens?</p> <p>24 MS. OWENS: Present.</p> <p>25 MS. GRANTHAM: Dave Walker? Sonja</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 CHAIR DREW: We will start our</p> <p>2 November meeting with the roll call.</p> <p>3 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Commerce?</p> <p>4 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,</p> <p>5 Department of Commerce.</p> <p>6 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Ecology?</p> <p>7 Department of Fish and Wildlife?</p> <p>8 CHAIR DREW: Excused.</p> <p>9 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural</p> <p>10 Resources?</p> <p>11 MS. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.</p> <p>12 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities &</p> <p>13 Transportation Commission?</p> <p>14 I note that Stacey Brewster told me she might be a</p> <p>15 little tardy but she does plan to attend.</p> <p>16 Local Government and Optional State Agencies. For</p> <p>17 Horse Heaven do we have Benton County, Ed Brost.</p> <p>18 MR. BROST: Here.</p> <p>19 MS. GRANTHAM: Badger Mountain,</p> <p>20 Douglas County?</p> <p>21 Wautoma Solar, Benton County, do we have Dave Sharp?</p> <p>22 MR. SHARP: Present.</p> <p>23 MS. GRANTHAM: Washington State</p> <p>24 Department of Transportation?</p> <p>25 MR. GONSETH: Paul Gonseth present.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 Skaland?</p> <p>2 MS. SKALAND: Present.</p> <p>3 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa Masengale? Sara</p> <p>4 Randolph?</p> <p>5 MS. RANDOLPH: Present.</p> <p>6 MS. GRANTHAM: Sean Greene?</p> <p>7 MR. GREENE: Present.</p> <p>8 MS. GRANTHAM: Lance Caputo?</p> <p>9 MR. CAPUTO: Present.</p> <p>10 MS. GRANTHAM: John Barnes?</p> <p>11 MR. BARNES: Present.</p> <p>12 MS. GRANTHAM: Ossa Davis? Oh, Ossa</p> <p>13 is no longer with us. My apologies.</p> <p>14 Joanne Snarski?</p> <p>15 MS. SNARSKI: Present.</p> <p>16 MS. GRANTHAM: Alex Shiley?</p> <p>17 MS. SHILEY: Present.</p> <p>18 MS. GRANTHAM: Ali Smith?</p> <p>19 MS. SMITH: Ali Smith, present.</p> <p>20 MS. GRANTHAM: Karl Holappa?</p> <p>21 MR. HOLAPPA: Present.</p> <p>22 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Operational</p> <p>23 Updates, Kittitas Valley Wind Project?</p> <p>24 MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis,</p> <p>25 present.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 MS. GRANTHAM: Wild Horse Wind Power 2 Project? 3 MS. GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith, 4 present. 5 MS. GRANTHAM: Grays Harbor Energy 6 Center? Chehalis Generation Facility? Columbia 7 Generating Station? 8 MS. NAJERA-PAXTON: Alicia 9 Najera-Paxton, present. 10 MS. GRANTHAM: Columbia Solar? 11 MR. CUSHING: Thomas Cushing, present. 12 MS. GRANTHAM: Goose Prairie Solar? 13 MR. CHRIST: Jacob Christ, present. 14 MS. GRANTHAM: And do we have anyone 15 present for the Counsel for the Environment? 16 MS. REYNEVELD: Sarah Reyneveld, 17 present. 18 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you. And I will 19 circle back to Council members quickly. Do we have 20 Department of Ecology, Eli Levitt present? 21 MR. LEVITT: Yes, this is Eli. 22 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you. And do we 23 have Utilities & Transportation Commission, Stacey 24 Brewster present? 25 And one last call Hop Hill Solar Project for Benton</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 approving the meeting minutes please say aye. 2 Opposed? Minutes are approved. 3 Moving on to our operational updates, Kittitas 4 Valley Wind Project, Mr. Melbardis. 5 MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair 6 Drew, EFSEC Council and Staff, this is Eric Melbardis for 7 the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project on behalf of EDP 8 Renewables, we had nothing nonroutine to report for the 9 period. 10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Wild Horse 11 Wind Power Project, Ms. Galbraith. 12 MS. GALBRAITH: Yes, thank you, Chair 13 Drew, Council members and Staff, this is Jennifer 14 Galbraith with Puget Sound Energy providing updates for 15 the Wild Horse Wind Facility. 16 I have a couple of updates for the Council this 17 month. The general elk hunting season began on October 18 28th and ran through November 5th. In accordance with 19 the Wild Horse Hunting plan, additional security measures 20 were implemented during that time to ensure the safety 21 and security of the hunters, the general public, and the 22 wind project personnel and facilities. 23 The Kittitas County Fire Marshal's Office conducted 24 the annual fire, life, and safety inspection on October 25 16th, and we remain in compliance with the requirements.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 County, Paul Krupin? 2 MR. KRUPIN: Paul Krupin is present. 3 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair Drew, we do have 4 a quorum for Hop Hill Solar and as well for the regular 5 Council. 6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 7 Now we have our agenda, our proposed agenda in front 8 of us. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? 9 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, so moved. 10 CHAIR DREW: Second? 11 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne, 12 second. 13 CHAIR DREW: Comments or questions? 14 All those in favor of adopting the proposed agenda say 15 aye. Agenda is adopted. 16 Moving on to the meeting minutes from October 18, 17 2023, our monthly meeting minutes, is there a motion to 18 approve the minutes? Ms. Osborne? 19 MS. OSBORNE: I move that the minutes 20 are adopted. 21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 22 MR. YOUNG: This is Lenny, second. 23 CHAIR DREW: I did not find any edits 24 or changes. Anybody else have any comments or 25 amendments? Hearing none, all those in favor of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 That's all I have. 2 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Moving on to 3 the Chehalis Generation Facility, Mr. Smith? 4 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair 5 Drew, Council members and Staff, this is Jeremy Smith, 6 maintenance manager representing the Chehalis Generation 7 Facility, I have nothing nonroutine to note for the month 8 of October. 9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Any 10 questions? Thanks. 11 Grays Harbor Energy Center, Mr. Sherin or Ms. 12 Randolph? 13 MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you, Chair Drew, 14 Council members and Staff. For the record, this is Sara 15 Randolph, site specialist for Grays Harbor. There were 16 no nonroutine updates to report. 17 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Columbia 18 Solar, Mr. Cushing. 19 MR. CUSHING: Good afternoon, Chair 20 Drew, Council members and Staff, this is Thomas Cushing 21 speaking on behalf Columbia Solar, and there are no 22 nonroutine updates to report. 23 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Columbia 24 Generating Station and WNP-1/4, Ms. Najera-Paxton. 25 MS. NAJERA-PAXTON: Good afternoon,</p>

Page 10

1 Chair Drew, and Council. This is Felicia Najera-Paxton
 2 for Energy Northwest. For our facility, we have just an
 3 update that we are going to have a fire marshal
 4 inspection -- reinspection coming up at the end of this
 5 month, and otherwise it's normal operations.
 6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Goose Prairie
 7 Solar, Mr. Christ.
 8 MR. CHRIST: Good afternoon, Chair
 9 Drew, Council and Staff, this Jacob Christ, for the
 10 record, senior project manager on behalf of Brookfield
 11 Renewables providing the Goose Prairie Solar update
 12 today. For the construction updates, the substation
 13 build out is currently on hold until our second main
 14 power transformer arrives in our main branch. The main
 15 line roads, branch roads, and the site grading is
 16 complete or nearing completion.
 17 We have commenced predrilling, pile driving, and
 18 perimeter fence activities, along with some medium
 19 voltage cable install. And then our typical ongoing
 20 environmental inspections weekly by WSP.
 21 And then just for the public outreach update, we
 22 held -- that we have been reporting on, so November 1st
 23 we held our charitable giving event at the site where we
 24 provided a monetary donation to the City of Moxee, and
 25 our EPC contractor donated the sixth defibrillator unit

Page 11

1 to the Moxee Police Department. We feel that it was a
 2 pretty successful event. We appreciate you, Chair Drew,
 3 attending and all of the others who attended. Any
 4 questions?
 5 CHAIR DREW: I just want to thank you
 6 for hosting the event. I was really pleased to be able
 7 to have a tour of the construction and the work that's
 8 been done on the grading and environmental preparation of
 9 the property as well as the beginning of the
 10 construction. Thank you for all of that, as well as for
 11 your donations to the local community.
 12 MS. CHRIST: Thank you.
 13 CHAIR DREW: Moving on to High Top and
 14 Ostrea, Ms. Randolph.
 15 MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you, Chair Drew.
 16 For the record, this is Sara Randolph, site specialist
 17 for High Top and Ostrea. EFSEC staff are continuing to
 18 work with the developer on preconstruction requirements
 19 and plans. We have no further updates at this time.
 20 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Whistling
 21 Ridge Project update, Ms. Hafkemeyer.
 22 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
 23 Drew. For the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer. Staff are
 24 working to schedule the hearings for the Whistling Ridge
 25 extension request and transfer request. Details of the

Page 12

1 hearings will be announced once they are available. Are
 2 there any questions?
 3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Desert Claim,
 4 Ms. Moon.
 5 MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Chair Drew
 6 and Council members. This is Amy Moon providing a
 7 project update on Desert Claim. At the last Council
 8 meeting on October 18th, the Council approved Resolution
 9 353, Amendment No. 2, to the Desert Claim Wind Power
 10 Project Site Certification Agreement, or SCA. The
 11 approval was to extend the term of the agreement by five
 12 years for substantial completion to November 13th of
 13 2028.
 14 This extension was to allow additional time for the
 15 certificate holder to secure a long term power purchase
 16 commitment. Additional Staff recommendations at that
 17 time in the resolution included were to apply to the
 18 Federal Aviation Administration, known as the FAA, for
 19 approval to install an aircraft detection lighting
 20 system, known as ADLS, as required in the Revised Code of
 21 Washington 70(a).550.020.
 22 And the second Staff recommendation was to amend the
 23 SCA to require the certificate holder to include in its
 24 waste management plan a commitment to recycle project
 25 components during operation and maintenance, and at

Page 13

1 decommissioning when recycling opportunities are
 2 reasonably available.
 3 And the third Staff recommendation was to require
 4 the certificate holder to submit for the Council's
 5 review, prior to micrositing, an analysis of the
 6 feasibility of placing all turbines more than 0.5 miles
 7 from nonparticipating residences to avoid dominating
 8 views from the sensitive viewing locations.
 9 As a result, the Site Certification Agreement was
 10 updated to include those changes listed in that
 11 Resolution 353 or 353, Amendment 2. A copy of the draft
 12 site certification changes is included in your Council
 13 packet. And to go over that, the individual requirements
 14 that were made to the SCA are in Article 4, Plans,
 15 Approvals, and Actions required prior to construction to
 16 apply to the FAA to instal ADLS, and submit a feasibility
 17 analysis to the Council to place turbines more than the
 18 0.5 miles from nonparticipating residences, and that's on
 19 pages 20 and 23 respectively.
 20 Updates to the SCA regarding recycling components
 21 were made to Article 5, Project Construction, on Page 28,
 22 Article 7, Project Operation on Page 33, and Article 8,
 23 Project Decommissioning and Site Restoration on Page 34.
 24 The revised SCA was posted for public comment ahead
 25 of today's meeting and no comments were received.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 Does the Council have any questions?</p> <p>2 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions</p> <p>3 from Council members? So this is -- last month we</p> <p>4 directed the Staff to update the site certification,</p> <p>5 which has been done, and that will now be in effect going</p> <p>6 forward. Appreciate the update. There's no further</p> <p>7 action. Thank you, Ms. Moon.</p> <p>8 Moving on to Badger Mountain Project update, Ms.</p> <p>9 Snarski.</p> <p>10 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair Drew,</p> <p>11 and good afternoon Council members. For the record, this</p> <p>12 is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist for Badger</p> <p>13 Mountain Solar. Progress is continuing with the</p> <p>14 development of the draft Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>15 for the proposed Badger Mountain Solar project.</p> <p>16 Efforts are also underway in the development of the</p> <p>17 Supplemental Cultural Resources Survey. A draft work</p> <p>18 plan for the initial ground survey is currently being</p> <p>19 circulated for review among the tribal and agency</p> <p>20 stakeholders. We hope to have their feedback soon so</p> <p>21 that our subcontractor can begin the initial survey work</p> <p>22 and be prepared for the more detailed survey work to be</p> <p>23 done this spring.</p> <p>24 As a reminder, the findings of the survey will</p> <p>25 inform the Cultural Resources Section of the draft</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 update, Mr. Barnes.</p> <p>2 MR. BARNES: Thank you, Chair Drew and</p> <p>3 Council members. For the record, this is John Barnes,</p> <p>4 EFSEC Staff of the Hop Hill application with an update</p> <p>5 for October.</p> <p>6 We are continuing to coordinate and review the</p> <p>7 application with our contractor and contracted agencies</p> <p>8 and tribal governments. A land use order of</p> <p>9 inconsistency has been drafted by our administrative law</p> <p>10 judge and reviewed by our Assistant Attorney Generals.</p> <p>11 Our AAG is available on the call if there are any</p> <p>12 questions.</p> <p>13 The land use order was placed on the EFSEC website</p> <p>14 for public review and comments ahead of this meeting. No</p> <p>15 comments were received. At this time, Staff recommends</p> <p>16 the Council vote to approve the land use order now in</p> <p>17 front of you. Are there any questions?</p> <p>18 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions</p> <p>19 for Mr. Barnes or for Jon Thompson and Judge Gerard is</p> <p>20 also on the line. Council members, you have received the</p> <p>21 information about the recommendation for -- that the</p> <p>22 project is inconsistent with the land use regulation and</p> <p>23 zoning, so is there a motion to support that</p> <p>24 recommendation?</p> <p>25 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, so moved.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>2 Finally, while developing the water resources</p> <p>3 section of the draft EIS, Environmental Impact Statement,</p> <p>4 Department of Ecology staff requested additional wetland</p> <p>5 information be provided by the applicant. We are</p> <p>6 facilitating discussions among the wetlands specialist to</p> <p>7 determine the best path forward. Any questions?</p> <p>8 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions</p> <p>9 for Ms. Snarski?</p> <p>10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you for your</p> <p>11 update. Wautoma Solar, Ms. Hafkemeyer.</p> <p>12 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you. For the</p> <p>13 record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer. The applicants for</p> <p>14 Wautoma Solar Energy Project recently submitted the</p> <p>15 Supplemental Cultural Resource Survey requested by EFSEC</p> <p>16 and the Department of Archeology & Historic Preservation.</p> <p>17 We are presently reviewing the report for compliance.</p> <p>18 The Yakama Nation Cultural Resource Program staff</p> <p>19 requested some additional time to complete their review.</p> <p>20 We expect their comments within the coming weeks. Once</p> <p>21 we have concurrence from DAHP, Department of Archeology &</p> <p>22 Historic Preservation, we will prepare a SEPA threshold</p> <p>23 determination. Are there any questions?</p> <p>24 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions</p> <p>25 for Ms. Hafkemeyer? Thank you. Hop Hill Solar Project</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Is there a</p> <p>2 second?</p> <p>3 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster,</p> <p>4 second.</p> <p>5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Any questions</p> <p>6 or comments? Okay. I think it's a pretty</p> <p>7 straightforward action. All those in favor of finding</p> <p>8 that the land use is inconsistent for the Hop Hill Solar</p> <p>9 Project please say aye.</p> <p>10 All those opposed? Motion is adopted. The order</p> <p>11 has been supported by the Council. We will post that</p> <p>12 following the meeting.</p> <p>13 Okay. Moving on to Carriger Solar.</p> <p>14 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair Drew</p> <p>15 and Council members. For record, this is Joanne Snarski,</p> <p>16 the siting specialist for Carriger Solar. EFSEC Staff</p> <p>17 continue to work with the Carriger Solar applicant to</p> <p>18 address anticipated visual impacts to the proposed</p> <p>19 project. In accordance with RCW 80.50.909(3)(a) the</p> <p>20 applicant is allowed to provide clarification or make</p> <p>21 changes to the proposal to mitigate the anticipated</p> <p>22 environmental impacts.</p> <p>23 We are currently in the process of evaluating the</p> <p>24 needs for supplemental visual simulations to help us</p> <p>25 better understand those potential impacts. These new</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 simulations will lead to further potential mitigation 2 discussions and will result in a formal written response 3 from the applicant to our initial SEPA determination. 4 Staff, with support from our Assistant Attorney 5 General, are nearing completion of an interagency 6 agreement for the completion of a traditional cultural 7 properties study by the Yakama Nation for this site. 8 This is the first time our agency has contracted directly 9 with a Tribe to complete this type of a study. A portion 10 of the study will be funded using funds EFSEC received 11 from the legislature last year, and those funds are 12 intended to specifically assist Tribes with these types 13 of studies. Are there any questions? 14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Are there any 15 questions for Ms. Snarski? Thank you for your report. 16 Horse Heaven Wind Farm, Ms. Moon. 17 MS. MOON: Once again, good afternoon 18 Chair Drew and EFSEC Council members. This is Amy Moon 19 providing an update on the Horse Heaven Wind Project. 20 The Horse Heaven Wind Project's final Environmental Site 21 Assessment, EIS, was issued October 31st, 2023. The EIS 22 was updated to address comments received on the draft EIS 23 issued in December of 2022 on December 19th, as well as 24 to incorporate updated information included in the post 25 adjudication application for site certification received</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 Staff available to answer any questions that might have 2 come up during the Council's initial review. 3 Before we start going through that fairly extensive 4 list of mitigation, however, there are a few relevant 5 topics that I wanted to go through that I think will help 6 the Council understood its authorities and 7 responsibilities and the next steps with regard to the 8 Horse Heaven Project. 9 First, I wanted to explain based -- based on 10 Washington Administrative Code with the purpose of what 11 the EIS is, which is to inform decisionmakers and the 12 public of significant environmental impacts, reasonable 13 alternatives, and mitigation measures that would avoid or 14 minimize adverse impacts. 15 For private projects such as the one before the 16 Council right now, Horse Heaven, the EIS is only required 17 to evaluate reasonable alternatives for achieving the 18 proposal's objective on the same site and the no action 19 alternative. 20 The EIS for Horse Heaven is inclusive of multiple 21 design and construction alternatives to the proposed 22 action, most notably the two turbine options that are 23 outlined within the EIS. Options such as solar only or 24 wind only facilities were not addressed within the EIS as 25 they would not have met the proposal's stated objective</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 from the applicant on September 22nd, 2023. 2 The Council requested to speak with subject matter 3 experts, commonly known as SMEs, to better understand 4 information and mitigation presented in the final EIS, 5 thus a meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 29th 6 at 1:30 p.m. in order to speak with those SMEs. Does the 7 Council have any questions? 8 CHAIR DREW: Are there questions from 9 Council members for Ms. Moon on this update? Okay. 10 Thank you. 11 MS. MOON: No questions. So then I am 12 going to introduce Sean Greene who has a presentation for 13 the Council regarding next steps for the final EIS. 14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Mr. Greene. 15 MR. GREENE: Thank you. Good 16 afternoon, Chair Drew and Council members. For the 17 record, this is Sean Greene, SEPA specialist for EFSEC. 18 I am going to try to share my screen right now for the 19 presentation. Can you confirm you are looking at the 20 presentation now? 21 CHAIR DREW: We are. 22 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you. The 23 purpose of this presentation is to provide the Council an 24 opportunity to discuss mitigation for the Horse Heaven 25 Project that was identified within the EIS, and to have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 in terms of energy production potential. 2 And how the EIS is related to SEPA is that it is not 3 required to evaluate and document all possible effects 4 associated with the project, rather it focuses 5 exclusively on the environmental impacts, and it's 6 intended to be uses in concert with other relevant 7 documents by decisionmakers. SEPA contemplates general 8 welfare, social, and economic and other considerations of 9 State policy, and SEPA actively encourages decisionmakers 10 to seek out other relevant documents to review in concert 11 with the EIS to make a final determination. So any 12 relevant documents from the adjudication process, Council 13 members' independent research or produced by Staff are 14 intended to be treated with equal respective 15 consideration. 16 And on the left of this slide is a flowchart of the 17 EFSEC site certification process with stars currently 18 placed at the relative current steps in the process. And 19 the next step that will happen from here is the Council's 20 review of the EIS and other relevant documents, and the 21 Council is -- will have to make a recommendation to the 22 Governor. That recommendation can either be a 23 recommended approval of the project, along with a draft 24 Site Certification Agreement that would incorporate any 25 conditions and mitigation that the Council deems</p>

Page 22

1 appropriate for that project, or the Council may
 2 recommend rejection of the proposal to the Governor.
 3 Within 60 days of receipt of the Council's
 4 recommendation, the government will take one of three
 5 actions. They will either approve the application and
 6 execute the Site Certification Agreement, reject the
 7 application, or remand that application back to EFSEC and
 8 direct the Council to reconsider certain aspects of the
 9 SCA, the Site Certification Agreement.
 10 In terms of authorities that Council has, the
 11 Council has the authority to deny the proposal in its
 12 entirety based on the finding of significant adverse
 13 environmental impacts within the Environmental Impact
 14 Statement. It should be noted that the Council is not
 15 required to completely eliminate significant impacts
 16 through mitigation for a project as a condition of
 17 approval, so the Council may either deny the proposal as
 18 it stands due to the significant impacts that have been
 19 identified, or approve the proposal with the identified
 20 significant impacts.
 21 The Council may also condition the proposal to
 22 exclude the possibility of specific project elements,
 23 actions, or areas based on the environmental impacts
 24 identified within the EIS, or they can additionally
 25 impose mitigation measures beyond those recommended by

Page 23

1 Staff within the EIS if the Council believes that the
 2 measures are insufficient to address impacts that have
 3 been identified.
 4 When developing mitigation, the Council is
 5 authorized to --
 6 CHAIR DREW: Can we pause for just a
 7 moment. A lot of information is being put forward. Are
 8 there any questions at this point from Council members?
 9 Okay. And feel free as we are going through the
 10 presentation to raise your hand if you do have -- for
 11 Council members to raise your hands if you do have
 12 questions. Okay. Thank you. Please continue.
 13 MS. GREENE: Absolutely. And there's
 14 not much more to this initial part of the presentation,
 15 and the rest of the time allotted for this discussion
 16 will be for Council discussion and Staff answering
 17 questions, so there will be quite a bit of time to answer
 18 any questions.
 19 So when mitigation is being designed, the Council is
 20 authorized to do so through two separate avenues. The
 21 first is SEPA substantive authority, which is WAC
 22 197-11-660, which states that EFSEC, as the agency
 23 performing a SEPA review, can condition or deny a
 24 proposal under SEPA to mitigate for any identified
 25 environmental impacts.

Page 24

1 And the second avenue is the enumerated Council
 2 Powers under RCW 80.50.040, which states that the Council
 3 can develop and apply environmental and ecological
 4 guidelines in relation to type, design, location,
 5 construction, initial operations, conditions of
 6 certification, as part of the review of proposed energy
 7 facility. However, any mitigation that has been designed
 8 by Staff or would be imposed by the Council should meet
 9 the three requirements outlined within Washington
 10 Administrative Code, which is that the mitigation should
 11 be reasonable, be capable of being accomplished, and be
 12 attributable to a specific environmental impact.
 13 And how this mitigation plays in specifically to
 14 EFSEC is that under EFSEC's guiding policy, the Council
 15 is responsible for ensuring through available and
 16 reasonable methods that proposed energy facilities will
 17 produce minimal adverse impact on the environment. And
 18 this policy is why the EIS has produced, has identified
 19 significant unavoidable adverse impacts. These were
 20 environmental impacts where effective mitigation was
 21 either unavailable or unreasonable. In all other cases,
 22 where mitigation was available and reasonable, it has
 23 been recommended through the EIS.
 24 And per Washington Administrative Code, mitigation
 25 can take one of several forms. With the options that are

Page 25

1 listed here, generally in order from most effective to
 2 least effective in terms of mitigation potential can be
 3 summarized by avoidance, minimization, restoration,
 4 reduction, compensation, or monitoring.
 5 (Noise interference.)
 6 CHAIR DREW: Is there somebody --
 7 okay. Go ahead.
 8 MR. GREENE: Sure. With that we can
 9 move into the discussion of mitigation. I did want to
 10 note that for four resource areas, wildlife and habitat,
 11 historic and cultural, visual aspects, light glare, and
 12 public health and safety, we are holding off on that
 13 discussion of mitigation for now until the November 29th
 14 Council meeting when subject matter experts will be
 15 available to address Council's questions directly.
 16 And in terms of how we want to structure this
 17 discussion, I don't want to read these walls of texts to
 18 all of you. I don't think that benefits anybody, so
 19 these slides are intended to serve as a backdrop for
 20 Council's discussion. And I can kind of generally
 21 summarize that the mitigation measures do and what they
 22 are intended to address. And if the Council wants to
 23 discuss amongst its members, that's entirely welcome to,
 24 or if they have questions for Staff we can make our best
 25 effort to answer them.

Page 26

1 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Go ahead.
 2 MR. GREENE: Thank you. So the first
 3 resource area is earth resources. There was only one
 4 mitigation measure that we felt was necessary to
 5 implement that as all the other impacts were
 6 appropriately addressed by the applicant commitments.
 7 This mitigation measure is essentially a requirement to
 8 avoid construction during wet periods, and that's to
 9 avoid soil impacts, erosion disturbance, primarily during
 10 the construction and decommissioning phases of the
 11 project.
 12 And you can see at the bottom of the slide it's
 13 additionally -- those are mitigation measures designed to
 14 primarily for other resources that we feel are applicable
 15 to earth resource concerns as well, and in the general
 16 sense those are limiting traffic speeds to avoid erosion,
 17 minimizing work in heavy rain to avoid erosion, and the
 18 rest, I think, are primarily dealing with restoration or
 19 vegetation, and other resources that will also have an
 20 impact on restoration of soil composition. This is for
 21 the Council to discuss or ask any questions they have
 22 about earth resources or mitigation efforts identified in
 23 the EIS.
 24 CHAIR DREW: So I will say it this
 25 time -- oh, there we have Mr. Young. Go ahead.

Page 27

1 MR. YOUNG: Question for Staff. Were
 2 any areas identified, considered, or discussed where
 3 topographic relief was such that landsliding during wet
 4 conditions was possible?
 5 MR. GREENE: Not that I'm aware of.
 6 If there were any, it would be spelled out within the
 7 EIS, but I can't recall any areas where that was a
 8 significant concern.
 9 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
 10 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you for
 11 demonstrating what we want Council members to do now. If
 12 you don't have a question, that's fine. We will wait a
 13 few seconds and then move on. Go ahead to the next one.
 14 MR. GREENE: Okay. The next resource
 15 area is air. These two mitigation measures are --
 16 generally the first limits traffic speeds by public
 17 vehicles to 15 miles per hour instead of the 25 miles per
 18 hour that was initially proposed by the applicant. And
 19 the second is a requirement to address future dust
 20 emissions as a potential issue for -- essentially a
 21 notification to EFSEC prior to the start of construction.
 22 Are there any -- is there any discussion or
 23 questions?
 24 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 25 MR. YOUNG: Could you talk a little

Page 28

1 bit more about the magnitude of a dust reduction dropping
 2 from 25 to 15, what's that based on, and what positive
 3 effects it's reasonably expected to achieve.
 4 MR. GREENE: Yeah. So the data behind
 5 it is spelled out more in that resource section, which is
 6 Chapters 3.3 and 4.3 within the EIS, but the general
 7 understanding is that the primary method through which
 8 future dust emissions would come from construction
 9 operations is the movement of vehicles. And as those --
 10 if those vehicles are moving at a slower rate of speed
 11 there is less dust emission that is created from them.
 12 MR. YOUNG: Is that just sort of a
 13 general commonsense idea that less dust at 15 than 25, or
 14 is it really based on some type of experiments or
 15 documentation as to a quantitative reduction in dust?
 16 MR. GREENE: I don't know that we
 17 actually did emissions for 25 miles per hour and 15 miles
 18 per hour, but the 15 miles per hour rate is standard in
 19 other states within the area. I know that California is
 20 one. And it's a measure that we implemented in other
 21 EFSEC projects with the same goal. It is, I think, more
 22 of a commonsense mitigation measure rather than one that
 23 has the actual data analysis produced.
 24 MR. YOUNG: Understood. Thanks.
 25 CHAIR DREW: The follow-up to that is,

Page 29

1 if it's a particularly dry time of year and there are
 2 complaints or problems with it, is there the
 3 contemplation that we would ask for it to be reduced to
 4 ten miles per hour or some other type of measure if there
 5 seems to be a significant problem?
 6 MR. GREENE: So there are emission
 7 limits associated with fugitive dust. I don't think that
 8 the project is likely to exceed those limits, which would
 9 necessarily trigger further recommendation at either of
 10 these speeds. So I guess the concern would come about
 11 through members of the public, and I don't -- the
 12 mitigation as written doesn't allow for a further
 13 reduction, but there are several mitigation measures that
 14 do require constant communication with the applicant and
 15 in negotiation with EFSEC where I think that could be
 16 applied if we believed that was necessary.
 17 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Okay. I would like
 18 to jump in and add lowering to 15 is also in
 19 consideration, but it's a relatively dry area.
 20 Alternatively, during times where it's not as dry is
 21 where we would be cautious of having road traffic
 22 contributing to erosion. So part of the reducing to 15
 23 is in consideration that it's generally a dry area.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Okay. And then, Mr.
 25 Young and then Ms. Brewster.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 MR. YOUNG: Are there any places where 2 accumulated road dust would possibly enter fish bearing 3 waters during rain storms in the form of runoff, or just 4 directly enter into such waters through other means? 5 MR. GREENE: Yes. So we do have a 6 number of plans under the water resource mitigation 7 section that deal with runoff and best management 8 practices for wetlands and road runoff, including the 9 requirements to minimize work in wet periods when there 10 is rain. 11 In terms of fugitive dust specifically from vehicle 12 traffic, I don't know that that's addressed individually. 13 I think it was incorporated with the rest of the 14 stormwater runoff plans. 15 CHAIR DREW: Ms. Brewster. 16 MS. BREWSTER: I'm curious, is there a 17 mechanism for validating compliance for these speeds on 18 roads? I know with large construction crews that might 19 be hard to actually monitor or enforce. 20 MR. GREENE: Yeah, I understand the 21 question. Obviously, we are not going to be in a 22 position where we have people out there with radar guns 23 looking at every project vehicle. EFSEC is involved 24 throughout the operations of -- the construction and 25 operations of these projects, so any case where this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 under that erosion and sediment control plan and 2 oversight during construction. Dust can not only come 3 into the air from driving, but also from some rain 4 falling and then from mud coming off of the equipment and 5 tires, you know, from the construction site onto a road 6 and those are all in that purview of the erosion and 7 sediment control plans and oversight. 8 And then to follow on the landslides, I did look, 9 and within the project area no project components would 10 be located in areas susceptible to landslides or ground 11 instability. 12 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Any other 13 questions on this measure? 14 MR. BROST: This is Ed Brost. If the 15 County has any regulations or land use planning 16 guidelines or anything like that, that impact this 17 location where the project is, do the surveys and the 18 work that the EFSEC do -- well, it's not EFSEC or maybe 19 it is, but is any of that tied together in to this too as 20 to how compatibility aligns with these things we are 21 talking about, if there are some requirements from the 22 County, which I don't know if there is or not, is that 23 part of this review, consistency with the Benton County 24 plans? 25 CHAIR DREW: Just for clarification,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 speed limit is being exceeded by project traffic they 2 would be in violation of the Site Certification 3 Agreement. No, there is not a method through which we 4 are regularly monitoring speed of project vehicles. 5 CHAIR DREW: We will have monitoring 6 on site on a regular basis, and not like you said looking 7 specifically at speed, but perhaps would notice if it was 8 excessive. 9 MR. GREENE: Yes. 10 MS. BREWSTER: Is there an opportunity 11 for say residents if they were noticing it to report it 12 to EFSEC? 13 MR. GREENE: Yes. There's a hotline 14 that is part of the mitigation specifically to other 15 resources of concern, but if members of the public or 16 residents in the area were to contact EFSEC and make us 17 aware of any violation of this mitigation measure, we 18 would certainly make an effort to validate those concerns 19 and address them with the applicant. 20 MS. MOON: This is Amy Moon. Also, 21 with the temporary erosion sediment control plan and the 22 monitoring that's done for that, there's the requirement 23 that you post a phone number or contact information, and 24 fugitive dust is also handled -- I think that Sean talked 25 about that a few minutes ago, but it is also handled</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 are you talking about like construction requirements that 2 are identified outside of the land use review that the 3 Council has already -- 4 MR. BROST: Yes. Yes. Is that part 5 of the requirements that we are trying to assess whether 6 Benton County by themselves if they have some? Is this 7 process consistent with the County's or is that a 8 separate thing and it's not part of our deliberation that 9 we do and make our decision? 10 CHAIR DREW: It's part of the review. 11 If you look at the sections within the EIS that cover the 12 existing regulatory requirements, facilities applying 13 through EFSEC are required to demonstrate consistency and 14 compliance with local requirements, as well as federal 15 and state, and so those local requirements for these 16 topics are also reviewed in our analysis of what we would 17 require for mitigation on top of -- or what we would 18 recommend for mitigation on top of what is already 19 required, and that includes the County requirements. 20 MR. BROST: Okay. Thank you. You 21 clarified that question a lot better than I did. 22 CHAIR DREW: And we are still in the 23 stage where we are considering all the information in 24 front of us. If a project is approved, recommended by 25 the Council and approved by the governor and moves</p>

Page 34

1 forward to construction as we recently have had, there
 2 will be opportunities for the County to be involved in
 3 the construction plans, and to review the plans, and to
 4 participate in monitoring through contract with us if
 5 they so desire. Sometimes the counties want to and
 6 sometimes the counties don't want to, but they should --
 7 should this project move forward like others have, that
 8 would be a place where it would be an opportunity for the
 9 County to participate in that as well.

10 MR. BROST: Thank you.

11 CHAIR DREW: I think we can move on
 12 from this one, Mr. Greene.

13 MR. GREENE: Okay. Next resource
 14 area. There's more than just these three mitigation
 15 measures. I tried to indicate in the bottom left how
 16 many slides there are for each resource area where we
 17 exceed one.

18 The first three that are relevant to water are
 19 essentially a requirement that the applicant observe
 20 least risk fish windows in terms of timing construction
 21 in intermittent streams.

22 The second is minimizing work during periods of
 23 heavy rain.

24 And the third is a requirement that if check dams
 25 are required for federal or intermittent streams that

Page 35

1 they be approved by EFSEC in coordination with WDFW and
 2 Ecology prior to use.

3 These all three primarily address potential
 4 construction -- potential water impact associated with
 5 the construction of the project. Are there any questions
 6 regarding these first three?

7 So the next two mitigation measures are the
 8 requirement that the applicant would adhere to culvert
 9 installation, best management practices, as defined by
 10 the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

11 And the fifth mitigation measure is the requirement
 12 for employee training as part of the -- pardon me, I'm
 13 forgetting what the SPCC stands.

14 CHAIR DREW: Stormwater pollution --
 15 Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures.

16 MR. YOUNG: How do the USDA PMPs
 17 compare to the State Department Fish and Wildlife culvert
 18 standards?

19 MR. GREENE: I do not know the answer
 20 to that question, but I can look into that.

21 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

22 MR. GREENE: Any questions associated
 23 with these two mitigation measures?

24 The next three are a requirement for the creation of
 25 a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for work within

Page 36

1 the micrositing corridor adjacent to any identified
 2 wetlands, and that it would be in adherence with the PMPs
 3 from the Stormwater Management Manual for Eastern
 4 Washington.

5 The seventh is a requirement that any transmission
 6 lines avoid temporary disturbance within the 100-year
 7 floodplain so that the transmission towers are sited
 8 outside of the floodplain and the lines actually span the
 9 area.

10 And the eighth is the requirement that spill
 11 response equipment be stored in every vehicle accessing
 12 the site during construction, operation, or
 13 decommissioning of the project to avoid -- or to minimize
 14 the potential impacts associated with accidental spills.
 15 Are there any questions regarding these mitigation
 16 measures?

17 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

18 MR. YOUNG: I'm trying to envision
 19 what type of spill response equipment it would be
 20 feasible to equip in every vehicle. Is the type of spill
 21 response equipment specified? Would that be in the Site
 22 Certification Agreement?

23 MR. GREENE: I can -- I can check to
 24 see whether we actually outlined specific equipment.

25 CHAIR DREW: I think that there is

Page 37

1 like vehicle kits that are available for spill response
 2 equipment. We can look into the specificity that's there
 3 and certainly add specificity.

4 MR. YOUNG: It seems like what's up on
 5 the screen right now it's just my first impression is
 6 that it might be designed to control spills of fluids
 7 from the vehicle itself, but what about any type of spill
 8 response equipment that would need to be on site more
 9 generally for a more major spill response that could
 10 result from a more significant accident?

11 MR. GREENE: That is incorporated
 12 within the EIS. I believe that our finding was that the
 13 applicant's commitment in regards to spill response
 14 equipment and planning and training was sufficient to
 15 address the potential impacts associated with that.

16 MR. YOUNG: Okay. And that was sort
 17 of supplemental with respect to vehicles?

18 MR. GREENE: Yes.

19 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

20 MS. MOON: There's generally within
 21 vehicles and then outside of vehicles in specific
 22 locations there's things to contain a spill, to soak up a
 23 spill, and that can be like absorbant pads, absorbant
 24 booms. There's also like a dry compound you can place on
 25 it and mark the area, and then depending on the spill

Page 38

1 there's an escalation of response to that. And, of
 2 course, the utmost importance is to protect any sort of
 3 waterway and to stop a spill from migrating, and like was
 4 stated earlier, the applicant has some commitments with
 5 that as that's part of basically every construction job.
 6 And Ecology is well versed in the spill equipment that's
 7 required, that's part of the -- a long list of best
 8 management practices as published by Ecology that EFSEC
 9 also adheres to when we are doing project management.
 10 MR. YOUNG: I'm trying to envision,
 11 for example, like say a technical team, contracted
 12 technical team flying into Tri-Cities Airport to do some
 13 type of work on site and picking up a rental car from the
 14 airport and what kind of spill response equipment they
 15 would be required to place in that vehicle before they
 16 entered the site.
 17 MS. MOON: Okay. I see the question.
 18 Yeah, I don't think that's really the scenario that this
 19 was written for was rental cars but more of construction
 20 vehicles.
 21 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, those words like
 22 every, and always, and never can be dangerous in a
 23 document like this.
 24 MS. MOON: Yes. Thank you for
 25 pointing that out.

Page 39

1 MR. GREENE: The intent was for
 2 vehicles that are regularly accessing the site, so work
 3 trucks that are kept on site. That is a good point
 4 regarding the specificity of the language, and that is
 5 something that can be changed if this mitigation is one
 6 that the Council wants to adopt into the SCA.
 7 CHAIR DREW: And having just visited
 8 the Goose Prairie site, and they were doing an excellent
 9 job of having the -- the spill response equipment was
 10 pointed out to me throughout that tour. I drove to the
 11 parking lot with my vehicle and then you don't access the
 12 rest of the site, you go within one of the vehicles that
 13 are on site, so I think that's a best practice as well.
 14 There was a little ways that I drove to access that main
 15 parking lot, and there will be -- so I think some of
 16 those site control practices will come into this as well.
 17 MR. GREENE: Are there any other
 18 questions regarding these three? Okay. And the final
 19 mitigation measures associated with water are to
 20 essentially minimize water use, especially in times of
 21 drought or water shortage, and, again, in scenarios of
 22 drought or water shortages the mitigation would require
 23 rescheduling of regularly scheduled panel washing for the
 24 solar arrays.
 25 And W11 is specific to the proposed concrete batch

Page 40

1 plant that would be used during the construction of the
 2 project, requiring essentially a minimum 100-foot buffer
 3 be applied to all mapped streams and water bodies, and
 4 the batch plant would not be allowed within that 100-foot
 5 buffer.
 6 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 7 MR. YOUNG: With respect to W10, I'm
 8 not familiar with it. Is just plain pure water used for
 9 washing, or are there solvents and detergents that are
 10 mixed in to more effectively wash the panels, and if so,
 11 how would it be consistent with recycling?
 12 MR. GREENE: Solvents can be added,
 13 but the applicant has made a commitment to only use pure
 14 water for the panel washing as part of this project.
 15 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
 16 MR. GREENE: Okay. Any other
 17 questions regarding these mitigation measures? All
 18 right. We will move on to vegetation. The first
 19 mitigation measure is essentially a requirement to avoid
 20 removing or disturbing any trees within the lease
 21 boundary. There aren't that many trees within this area,
 22 but there's also an extension of a mitigation where if
 23 tree disturbance is required for any part of construction
 24 that it not be done prior to approval by EFSEC and we
 25 would develop additional mitigation to accommodate for

Page 41

1 that necessary impact. To my knowledge, at this point, I
 2 don't believe the applicant is proposing any disturbance
 3 to any trees. Questions on this one?
 4 Next is the requirement of pre-disturbance surveys
 5 for special status plant species throughout the lease
 6 boundary or within the lease boundary that would be
 7 potentially impacted by project actions. It goes into
 8 more specificity how those surveys would be designed and
 9 reported, which you can read through if you like. Are
 10 there any questions regarding this measure?
 11 Okay. Veg 3 is in relation to special status plant
 12 species, and it's a requirement to provide environmental
 13 orientation to workers on the site, giving them --
 14 essentially how to identify special status plant species
 15 and informing them of what actions they should take if
 16 one is observed. Are there any questions regarding this
 17 measure?
 18 All right. And Veg 4 is in relation to an as-built
 19 report, and that is the requirement that within 60 days
 20 of completing construction the applicant provide an
 21 as-built report that documents the actual impacts that
 22 came as a result of construction, and this is to account
 23 for any impacts that exceed those that were anticipated
 24 and included within the EIS, and as -- and would require
 25 EFSEC and the applicant to come to terms on mitigation

Page 42

1 measures for any impacts that were unanticipated as part
 2 of construction, including monitoring mitigation under
 3 the existing offset ratios.
 4 CHAIR DREW: So would this measure
 5 then apply to habitat, or do you have an additional one
 6 that habitat -- I'm thinking scrub grass or some of the
 7 rabbit brush habitat, is this a mitigation measure that
 8 would apply to that?
 9 MR. GREENE: So there are mitigation
 10 measures specific to impact on priority habitat. The
 11 purpose of this particular measure is to essentially say
 12 that the applicant anticipated that 60 acres of shrub set
 13 would be impacted by construction of a solar array, and
 14 after construction they do this as-built report resurvey
 15 the area and find that it was actually 62 acres, if they
 16 have mitigation that had been agreed upon prior to
 17 construction, that mitigation would need to be adjusted
 18 for the actual onsite conditions following construction.
 19 So this is to account for potential impacts that exceed
 20 those that were anticipated by the applicant and EFSEC.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
 22 Young.
 23 MR. YOUNG: Can you talk a little bit
 24 more about what the offset ratios are? Are those one to
 25 one, or are those different than one to one for what

Page 43

1 reasons?
 2 MR. GREENE: So they are outlined
 3 within the EIS. They differ based on the specific
 4 habitat type and the type of impact, whether it is
 5 temporary or altered habit impacts or permanent impacts.
 6 In general, for priority habitats with permanent impacts
 7 the ratio is two to one. Priority habitats for temporary
 8 impacts is about one to one. And for all other habitats
 9 they are below these ratios depending on importance of
 10 that particular type of habitat. And there's a table
 11 within the vegetation section that actually outlines all
 12 the ratios for all the habitat types.
 13 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
 14 MR. GREENE: Any other questions for
 15 this measure? Okay. These next three are all primarily
 16 associated with the decommissioning phase of the project.
 17 We are requiring the completion of the decommissioning
 18 dust control plan, and updating of mitigation measures
 19 that would be applied during decommissioning to ensure
 20 that they are applicable -- they are following the
 21 applicable legislative requirement at that time, which
 22 could be 20 plus years in the future following completion
 23 of construction, and requirement for a detailed site
 24 restoration plan that would be prepared and submitted to
 25 EFSEC for final revegetation prior to project

Page 44

1 decommissioning with the intention of recovering all
 2 habitats to pre-project conditions.
 3 Are there any questions for these measures?
 4 CHAIR DREW: I do have a question.
 5 Veg No. 6, I guess my mind went immediately to what if
 6 the legislative requirements are less than what they are
 7 now? It kind of assumes it would be more.
 8 MR. GREENE: I think that if there was
 9 a reduction in legislative requirements following the
 10 execution of the site certification agreement, then the
 11 site certification agreement requirements would still
 12 take precedence.
 13 CHAIR DREW: Let's make sure.
 14 MR. GREENE: For sure.
 15 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 16 MR. GREENE: And the last two for
 17 vegetation are the requirement for development of the
 18 noxious weed management plan for the decommission phase
 19 specifically, and a requirement that the fencing
 20 surrounding the solar array be maintained to stop the
 21 build up of any vegetative material like tumble weeds or
 22 entwining of vegetation within the fencing.
 23 CHAIR DREW: So 9 is not -- is during
 24 operations?
 25 MR. GREENE: Yes.

Page 45

1 CHAIR DREW: And then on the bottom,
 2 the habitat ones, are we going to see those as well?
 3 MR. GREENE: We will see those on the
 4 meeting -- during the meeting of the 29th. Those are
 5 part of the wildlife section. Those address concerns
 6 that are related to vegetation as well.
 7 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 8 MR. GREENE: Okay. Moving on to
 9 energy and natural resources. The first is the
 10 requirement that the applicant provide an executed
 11 agreement for water sourcing. The applicant has provided
 12 a potential source of water within the EIS that has been
 13 incorporated, but they are not able to execute that
 14 agreement until the project is actually finalized.
 15 The second is a requirement for high efficiency
 16 fixtures, and third is for high efficiency security
 17 lighting. Any questions for these three?
 18 CHAIR DREW: Any questions from
 19 Council members?
 20 MR. GREENE: Okay. The other three
 21 for energy and natural resources are the installation of
 22 low flow -- or low water use flush toilets to reduce
 23 water needs for the project during operation, and that
 24 the applicant would capture recycled wash water do reduce
 25 water needs during operations.

Page 46

1 And Energy 6 is a requirement to essentially recycle
 2 project components that are capable of being recycled as
 3 raw materials or for reuse in other projects. And it
 4 incorporates that as part of the applicant's commitment
 5 they have committed to removing all concrete foundations
 6 to a depth, I believe, of -- the exact depth is outlined
 7 within the EIS. I don't remember the exact number, but
 8 there's a stipulation that if any concrete foundations
 9 are being left then they are to submit it to EFSEC for
 10 approval, and update their decommissioning plan
 11 accordingly to incorporate potential future additional
 12 necessary mitigation.
 13 CHAIR DREW: Ms. Brewster.
 14 MS. BREWSTER: Yes. I'm just curious
 15 about the recycling component.
 16 CHAIR DREW: You are cutting out a
 17 little bit. Did you hear the question, Sean?
 18 MR. GREENE: I heard that it was
 19 referencing the recycling, but I didn't get the content
 20 of the question.
 21 MS. BREWSTER: Sorry. Can you hear me
 22 better now?
 23 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 24 MS. BREWSTER: I was just curious
 25 about the recycling and whether EFSEC monitors and

Page 47

1 determines what is recyclable or is that left up to the
 2 applicant?
 3 MR. GREENE: That is a fair question.
 4 CHAIR DREW: I think that would be
 5 important to have.
 6 MR. GREENE: Yes. Any other questions
 7 for energy and natural resources? All right.
 8 The next resource area is land and shoreline use.
 9 The first is the requirement that the applicant provide a
 10 livestock management plan. The second is a dry land
 11 farming management plan. And the third is a requirement
 12 that the applicant ensure arrangements are made for
 13 removal of all livestock during construction and
 14 decommissioning so that there's no potential collision
 15 with livestock. Any questions regarding these measures?
 16 Okay. The fourth is similar to the site restoration
 17 plan. It's a requirement that all temporary disturbance
 18 areas are restored or -- so this comes immediately
 19 following construction, so temporary disturbances that
 20 occur during construction will be restored to
 21 preconstruction status immediately following
 22 construction.
 23 And LSU-5 is the detailed site restoration plan,
 24 which kind of calls for the restoration of all site areas
 25 to pre-project conditions. Any questions on these

Page 48

1 measures or shoreline use in general? Okay.
 2 The next resource area is noise and vibration. The
 3 first is a requirement that all sensitive noise receptor
 4 areas receive a 2500-foot buffer for lay down yards and
 5 storage parking areas.
 6 Second is that large noise generating equipment is
 7 only to be used during daytime hours defined as seven
 8 a.m. to ten p.m., and that the loudest, most impulsive
 9 piece of construction would need to cease use by six p.m.
 10 Monday through Saturday.
 11 And the third is that all construction activities
 12 that have the potential to impact sensitive noise
 13 receptors during nighttime operations be monitored and
 14 reduced if necessary so that they do not exceed state
 15 noise limits. Any questions on these three?
 16 Okay. The fourth is the requirement for the
 17 development of a noise complaint resolution procedure
 18 that would allow residents in the area to call a
 19 complaint hotline, and it gives specific actions that
 20 need to be taken as a result of any lodged complaints.
 21 And the fifth is essentially that requirement again
 22 but specific to the decommissioning phase. Any questions
 23 on these two?
 24 Okay. The next resource area is recreation. The
 25 first is the requirement that the applicant coordinate

Page 49

1 with the Department of Natural Resources and Benton
 2 County to identify new recreational activities, and/or to
 3 improve existing recreational activities within the lease
 4 boundary.
 5 The second is the requirement for providing a
 6 minimum of five informational boards to -- at viewpoints
 7 within the lease boundary or the surrounding communities
 8 associated with scenic areas of interest. Any questions
 9 regarding these two?
 10 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 11 MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Why is DNR
 12 identified as one of the two coordinating entities for
 13 recreation?
 14 MR. GREENE: I think because the
 15 project is anticipated to impact recreational activities
 16 at DNR properties within the area of the lease boundary,
 17 so there will be some loss of recreational activities
 18 within DNR lands.
 19 MR. YOUNG: What portion of the
 20 project is -- I don't recall this, what proportion of the
 21 project area is DNR managed land?
 22 CHAIR DREW: I believe there are five
 23 parcels that are within the lease boundary, that I
 24 remember.
 25 MR. YOUNG: I guess I have sort of a

Page 50

1 mild reaction that a lot of the recreation within or
 2 adjacent to the project area is not under the auspices of
 3 DNR, and so appreciate the consideration for how that
 4 might affect parcels that are managed by DNR, but there
 5 would seem to be perhaps other state and local agencies
 6 that have a greater responsibility for overall recreation
 7 in the area, so maybe those would need to be called out
 8 or considered in addition to the DNR in Benton County.
 9 MR. GREENE: That's definitely a
 10 change that can be incorporated within the mitigation
 11 measures as part of the SCA.
 12 MR. YOUNG: I think it's along the
 13 lines of the DNR does not manage recreation except on DNR
 14 managed lands.
 15 CHAIR DREW: And that certainly could
 16 be added and coordinated with DNR and DNR land. There
 17 may be, depending on what lands are affected, maybe
 18 checking through that again to see if there are other
 19 entities. I think of Bureau of Land Management for one
 20 might be -- isn't within the lease project boundary, but
 21 adjacent to. Just taking a look at that and think about
 22 that.
 23 MS. MOON: And I just looked up and I
 24 believe that the answer to how many acres, the acreage of
 25 DNR land within the lease boundary is 2,739 acres are in

Page 51

1 state trust system managed by DNR, and of that, I
 2 believe, Chair Drew you said five DNR managed parcels and
 3 that's what's listed in the EIS.
 4 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. So let's be
 5 more specific about the coordination with DNR for DNR
 6 lands.
 7 MR. GREENE: Yes. Okay. And the
 8 final mitigation measure for recreation is the
 9 requirement that the applicant coordinate with local and
 10 regional recreation groups specific to paragliding and
 11 hang gliding and bicycling to ensure that access is
 12 continued to be allowed for those recreation activities
 13 where safe, identifying potential hazards, and including
 14 no fly zones, and providing opportunities in concert with
 15 those recreation groups either within the lease boundary
 16 or within the region to compensate for the loss of safe
 17 use of recreation activities within the lease boundary.
 18 CHAIR DREW: What is our involvement
 19 with ensuring that this particular type of activity is
 20 completed? I guess I see it's a plan.
 21 MR. GREENE: Yes, it would be a plan
 22 that would need to be submitted to EFSEC for approval,
 23 and we would be kept in the loop on any discussions that
 24 they have.
 25 CHAIR DREW: I want to think about as

Page 52

1 recreation is impacted maybe something a little more
 2 specific, but I don't have that on the top of my head
 3 right now.
 4 MR. GREENE: Sure thing.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Just identify that as
 6 something perhaps we want to come back to.
 7 MR. GREENE: Absolutely. Any
 8 questions for recreation? Okay. Next is transportation.
 9 The first is essentially a requirement that the applicant
 10 develop procedures for loads that may be stuck at a
 11 railroad crossing.
 12 The second is that the applicant work with WSDOT and
 13 Operation Lifesaver to provide safety presentations
 14 regarding trains.
 15 And the third is the requirement that the applicant
 16 develop a traffic analysis prior to decommissioning
 17 specific to that phase of the project since the one
 18 provided now is primarily associated with the
 19 construction phase. Any questions on these three?
 20 The next two is associated with the decommissioning
 21 phase, and it's a requirement for a route survey for --
 22 primarily intended to identify railroad crossings and
 23 grade changes and provide that information for -- to
 24 EFSEC and the haulers for the project.
 25 And the fifth is essentially updating, again,

Page 53

1 decommissioning plans to ensure they are consistent with
 2 the laws and regulations at the time of the
 3 decommissioning of the project. Any questions?
 4 CHAIR DREW: So talk to me about TR-4
 5 with the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
 6 staff participating perhaps.
 7 MR. GREENE: Yes. So there are a few
 8 mitigation measures within the EIS that are -- that we do
 9 not consider fully effective because they require actions
 10 from other agencies and we cannot mandate those agencies'
 11 involvement. This is one of them where the
 12 decommissioning route survey would require the Utilities
 13 & Transportation Commission staff to be involved to help
 14 determine whether the traffic control systems at the
 15 crossings are appropriate at that time, or if additional
 16 mitigation is needed for decommissioning truck routes.
 17 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 18 MR. GREENE: Any other questions on
 19 these two?
 20 Okay. The last two transportation mitigation
 21 measures. The first is the stipulation of the actual
 22 routes for -- that have been identified within the
 23 traffic impact analysis, and essentially a requirement
 24 that the applicant may only use those routes that were
 25 analyzed as part of that traffic impact analysis, and if

Page 54

1 other routes are desired for use then supplemental
 2 analysis and approval by EFSEC would be needed.
 3 And then and the seventh is a requirement that the
 4 applicant coordinate with WSDOT, Benton County, and EFSEC
 5 prior to construction and decommissioning to identify
 6 potential safety concerns and develop mitigation
 7 measures. In our discussions with WSDOT they have
 8 identified primarily lower cost mitigation measures like
 9 warning signs, rumble strips to alert motorists of the
 10 potential safety concerns at those intersections. Any
 11 questions on these two?
 12 The next resource area is public service and
 13 utilities. And that is just a requirement that the
 14 applicant use an appropriately licensed waste disposal
 15 facility for non recyclable project components. And you
 16 can look up what DNR 5 and 7 are. DNR 5 and 7 are the
 17 requirements for recycling wash water and recycling
 18 project components, so those cover elements that aren't
 19 covered by PS 1. Any questions here?
 20 And the final resource area that we are covering in
 21 today's presentation is socioeconomics, and the only
 22 mitigation requirement that we believed needed to be
 23 imposed was essentially a housing analysis prior to
 24 decommissioning to account for any potential changes that
 25 have occurred since the construction phase of the

Page 55

1 project. Any questions for socioeconomics?
 2 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 3 MR. YOUNG: Has the recommended
 4 mitigation here been correlated to all applicable
 5 Department of Labor & Industries' requirements for
 6 temporary worker housing?
 7 MR. GREENE: The analysis that they
 8 would perform would be substantially similar to the one
 9 that was performed for the construction phase of the
 10 project, which I believe met the guidelines that you are
 11 discussing.
 12 MR. YOUNG: It might not be a bad idea
 13 to specify in here in terms of what the applicant would
 14 be required to do, that it has to be consistent with and
 15 correlated with L&I requirements.
 16 MR. GREENE: That's certainly
 17 something we can add. Any other questions on
 18 socioeconomics? Okay. Beyond that our staff is
 19 available to answer any questions that the Council comes
 20 up with during its review of the EIS, or development of
 21 mitigation measures that the Council wants to incorporate
 22 within the SCA should the project be recommended for
 23 approval by the Council.
 24 CHAIR DREW: And Council members can
 25 reach out directly to you Sean and Amy Moon and Ami

Page 56

1 Hafkemeyer to talk about any of these measures?
 2 MR. GREENE: Absolutely.
 3 CHAIR DREW: So give a heads up
 4 through phone call, Teams, email if you would like to
 5 talk about any of these measures with any of our staff.
 6 Are there additional questions or comments from Council
 7 members? Ms. Osborne.
 8 MS. OSBORNE: Thanks, Chair Drew. I
 9 just wanted to check, Sean, is this presentation
 10 available for us to look at after we adjourn today?
 11 MR. GREENE: I don't think it was
 12 included with the Council's packet for today, but I
 13 believe we can certainly make it available.
 14 MS. OSBORNE: Thank you. I would
 15 appreciate that.
 16 CHAIR DREW: It should also be posted
 17 following the meeting, I imagine, but we can get it to
 18 you right away.
 19 MS. OSBORNE: No hurry, but I will
 20 want to refer back to it.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Young.
 22 MR. YOUNG: Yeah. I just want to say
 23 thank you to Sean and to EFSEC staff for the presentation
 24 today. For me this was a great preview for really
 25 digging into the EIS in a thorough way, so thank you very

Page 57

1 much.
 2 CHAIR DREW: In terms of the public it
 3 will be posted on our website. That's how you can have
 4 access to it. Thank you.
 5 I do want to thank the Staff too. Certainly, the
 6 entire environmental review process, the publishing of
 7 the FEIS, and all the work that's gone into those
 8 reviewing all the issues, along with your consultants,
 9 and all the mitigation that has already been concluded by
 10 the applicant, plus all of this additional work is
 11 impressive. I really want to thank you for all your
 12 efforts in providing this to us and walking us through
 13 this portion of it today.
 14 And I look forward to our conversation on November
 15 29th, and with that our meeting is adjourned. Thank you
 16 all.
 17 (Meeting adjourned at
 18 3:02 p.m.)
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Monthly Council Meeting, - November 15, 2023

Page 58

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR,
) ss a certified court reporter
2 County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do
 hereby certify:

3
4

5 That the foregoing transcript of the EFSEC Monthly
 Council Meeting was taken before me via Zoom and
 completed on November 15, 2023, and thereafter was
6 transcribed under my direction;

7 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or
 counsel of any party to this action or relative or
8 employee of any such attorney or counsel and that I am
 not financially interested in the said action or the
9 outcome thereof;

10

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature
 on November 30, 2023.

12
13
14
15

/s/Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR
Certified Court Reporter No. 1932
(Certification expires 05/06/24.)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update Format

Facility Name: Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project
Operator: EDP Renewables
Report Date: December 5, 2023
Reporting Period: November 2023
Site Contact: Eric Melbardis, Sr Operations Manager
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- Power generated: 8515 MWh
 - Wind speed: 4.2 m/s
 - Capacity Factor: 11.5%
-

Environmental Compliance

- No incidents

Safety Compliance

- Nothing to report

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Nothing to report

Other

- No sound complaints
- Received a shadow flicker complaint from an affected neighbor. The time change from Daylight time to Standard Time affected one of the controllers which automatically stops and starts these 2 turbines. System was upgraded and tested working again. We continue to closely monitor the systems.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Wild Horse Wind Facility
Operator: Puget Sound Energy
Report Date: December 8, 2023
Report Period: November 2023
Site Contact: Jennifer Galbraith
SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

November generation totaled 39,193 MWh for an average capacity factor of 19.97%.

Environmental Compliance

Nothing to report.

Safety Compliance

In accordance with the Fire Control Plan and the Fire Services Agreement with Kittitas Valley Fire District No. 2 (KVFR), PSE and KVFR met to review and train on the fire safety plan, including site orientation and maps, site access, identification of potential electrical hazards, and lessons learned from the 2022 Vantage Fire.

Current or Upcoming Projects

Nothing to report.

Other

Nothing to report.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Chehalis Generation Facility
Operator: PacifiCorp
Report Date: December 8, 2023
Reporting Period: November 2023
Site Contact: Jeremy Smith, Maintenance Manager
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

-Relevant energy generation information, such as wind speed, number of windy or sunny days, gas line supply updates, etc.

- 132,186 net MW-hrs. generated in the reporting period for a capacity factor of 36.33%

The following information must be reported to the Council if applicable to the facility:

Environmental Compliance

-Monthly Water Usage: 2,022,592 gallons

-Monthly Wastewater Returned: 804,000 gallons

-Permit status if any changes.

- No changes.

-Update on progress or completion of any mitigation measures identified.

- Nothing to report

-Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

- CGF received and signed the re-inspection report from the Office of the State Fire Marshal on November 21, 2023. No further action required.

-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

- Nothing to report

-Brief list of reports submitted to EFSEC during the monthly reporting period.

- Nothing to report

Safety Compliance

-Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions.

- Zero injuries this reporting period for a total of 3044 days without a Lost Time Accident.

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Planned site improvements.
 - No planned changes.
- Upcoming permit renewals.
 - Nothing to report.
- Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.
 - Nothing to report.

Other

- Current events of note (e.g., Covid response updates, seasonal concerns due to inclement weather, etc.).
 - Nothing to report.
- Personnel changes as they may relate to EFSEC facility contacts (e.g., introducing a new staff member who may provide facility updates to the Council).
 - Nothing to report.
- Public outreach of interest (e.g., schools, public, facility outreach).
 - Nothing to report.

Respectfully,



Jeremy Smith
Gas Plant Maintenance Manager
Chehalis Generation Facility

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center

Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC

Report Date: December 20, 2023

Reporting Period: November 2023

Site Contact: Chris Sherin

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

-GHEC generated 313,152MWh during the month and 3,382,863MWh YTD.

The following information must be reported to the Council if applicable to the facility:

Environmental Compliance

-There were no emissions, outfall, or storm water deviations, during the month.

-Routine monthly, quarterly, and annual reporting to EFSEC Staff.

- Monthly Outfall Discharge Monitor Report (DMR).

-Submitted Operations and Maintenance Manual and Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Procedures Manual as required by the PSD and AOP to EFSEC staff.

-Submitted Wastewater Treatment Operations and Maintenance Manual as required by the NPDES to EFSEC staff.

Safety Compliance

- None.

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Application for a Modification to the Air Operating Permit submitted to EFSEC in April 2022.

GHEC is currently authorized to operate under PSD Permit EFSEC/2001-01, Amendment 5 and Federal Operating Permit EFSEC/94-1 AOP Initial.

Other

-None.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting Facility Update

Facility Name: Columbia Solar Projects (Penstemon, Camas and Urtica)

Operator: Tuusso Energy, LLC

Report Date: December 8, 2023

Reporting Period: 30 days ending November 30, 2023

Site Contact: Thomas Cushing

Facility SCA Status: Construction

Construction Status

- Penstemon
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of August was 342 Megawatt hours

 - Camas
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of August was 316 Megawatt hours

 - Urtica
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of August was 346 Megawatt hours
-

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting

Facility Name: **Columbia Generating Station and Washington Nuclear Project 1 and 4 (WNP-1/4)**

Operator: **Energy Northwest**

Report Date: **December 20, 2023**

Reporting Period: **November 2023**

Site Contact: **Felicia Najera-Paxton**

Facility SCA Status: **Operational**

CGS Net Electrical Generation October 2023: **814,786 Mega Watt-Hours.**

The following information must be reported to the Council if applicable to the facility:

Environmental Compliance:

Energy Northwest submitted the Comprehensive Incident Report for the June 2023 Circulating Water Oil Release, related to the Columbia Generating Station National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. WA002515-1, to EFSEC on November 8, 2023. Additional questions from EFSEC were received on November 20, 2023, and Energy Northwest submitted follow-up information on the incident to EFSEC, as requested, on December 12, 2023.

Safety Compliance

No update.

Current or Upcoming Projects

No update.

Other

No update.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update Format

Facility Name: Goose Prairie Solar

Operator: Brookfield Renewable US

Report Date: 12/11/23

Reporting Period: 11/7/23 to 12/10/23

Site Contact: Jacob Crist

Facility SCA Status: (Pre-construction/**Construction**/Operational/Decommission)

Construction Status (only applicable for projects under construction)

-On schedule or not. If not, provide additional information/explanation.

1. Project is on schedule.

-Phase/Brief update on status/month in review.

1. Laydown yards have been constructed

2. Substation grading and foundations are complete

3. Control house has been delivered to site and BPA work is complete until last mobilization in Q2, 2024

4. PV Array mainline roads are complete and feeder roads are now complete

5. PV Panels are arriving at the project

6. Both MPT's have arrived onsite and installation/buildout ongoing. Work scheduled to be completed by years end.

7. Civil grading is complete. SWPPP basins are complete for construction.

8. Pile Driving, predrilling, MV cable install, perimeter fence and racking/tracker activities have commenced.

-Other?

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

-Energy generated for the reporting period.

-Relevant energy generation information, such as wind speed, number of windy or sunny days, gas line supply updates, etc.

The following information must be reported to the Council if applicable to the facility:

Environmental Compliance

-Permit status if any changes.

-Update on progress or completion of any mitigation measures identified.

-Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

1. Frequent Monitoring is occurring through WSP with no findings reported to date.

-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

-Brief list of reports submitted to EFSEC during the monthly reporting period.

Safety Compliance

-Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions.

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Planned site improvements.

-Upcoming permit renewals.

-Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.

Other

-Current events of note (e.g., Covid response updates, seasonal concerns due to inclement weather, etc.).

-Personnel changes as they may relate to EFSEC facility contacts (e.g., introducing a new staff member who may provide facility updates to the Council).

-Public outreach of interest (e.g., schools, public, facility outreach).

- 1. Project Toy Drive. Collection boxes in the job trailers. You were collected and being delivered to the local toys for tots in the area.**

High Top and Ostrea Solar Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Whistling Ridge Energy Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Desert Claim Wind Power Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Badger Mountain Solar Energy Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Wautoma Solar

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Hop Hill Solar Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]



13123 E Emerald Coast Pkwy
Ste B#158
Inlet Beach, FL 32461
info@brightnightpower.com

To John Barnes
Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
621 Woodland Square Loop SE
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Date: 11/03/23

Dear Mr. Barnes,

HOHI bn, LLC, a subsidiary of BNC DEVCO, LLC, which is a joint venture between BrightNight, LLC and Cordelio Power (Applicant), submitted the streamlined solar Application for Site Certification (ASC) for the Hop Hill Solar and Storage Project (Project) to the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) on December 22, 2022.

This letter requests agreement from EFSEC that the processing time of the Project ASC be extended an additional twelve months, to December 22, 2024. We understand the Revised Code of Washington 80.50.100 requires that: "The council shall report to the governor its recommendations as to the approval or rejection of an application for certification within twelve months of receipt by the council of such an application, or such later time as is mutually agreed by the council and the applicant."

Through discussions with EFSEC staff, we also understand that preparation of the land use consistency determination and draft State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold determination is ongoing to complete additional studies and collect supplemental information needed to make the determinations. At this time, we anticipate the land use consistency determination in late 2023, the draft SEPA threshold determination to be published for public comment in mid-2024, followed by the hearing, and that EFSEC's recommendation and Governor's decision would follow.

We appreciate EFSEC staff's continued efforts to review the Project ASC and respectfully request this extension to allow adequate time for all parties to review and process the ASC and supplemental materials or analysis requested by EFSEC staff.

If you have any questions, or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact us at kevin.martin@brightnightpower.com.

Sincerely,

Kevin Martin
Vice President, Permitting - BrightNight

Carriger Solar

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

Horse Heaven Wind Project

December 2023 project update

[Place holder]

RCW 80.50.010 Legislative finding—Policy—Intent. The legislature finds that the present and predicted growth in energy demands in the state of Washington requires a procedure for the selection and use of sites for energy facilities and the identification of a state position with respect to each proposed site. The legislature recognizes that the selection of sites will have a significant impact upon the welfare of the population, the location and growth of industry and the use of the natural resources of the state.

It is the policy of the state of Washington to reduce dependence on fossil fuels by recognizing the need for clean energy in order to strengthen the state's economy, meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations, and mitigate the significant near-term and long-term impacts from climate change while conducting a public process that is transparent and inclusive to all with particular attention to overburdened communities.

The legislature finds that the in-state manufacture of industrial products that enable a clean energy economy is critical to advancing the state's objectives in providing affordable electricity, promoting renewable energy, strengthening the state's economy, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the legislature intends to provide the council with additional authority regarding the siting of clean energy product manufacturing facilities.

It is the policy of the state of Washington to recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities, and to ensure through available and reasonable methods that the location and operation of all energy facilities and certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities will produce minimal adverse effects on the environment, ecology of the land and its wildlife, and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life.

It is the intent to seek courses of action that will balance the increasing demands for energy facility location and operation in conjunction with the broad interests of the public. In addition, it is the intent of the legislature to streamline application review for energy facilities to meet the state's energy goals and to authorize applications for review of certain clean energy product manufacturing facilities to be considered under the provisions of this chapter.

Such action will be based on these premises:

(1) To assure Washington state citizens that, where applicable, operational safeguards are at least as stringent as the criteria established by the federal government and are technically sufficient for their welfare and protection.

(2) To preserve and protect the quality of the environment; to enhance the public's opportunity to enjoy the esthetic and recreational benefits of the air, water and land resources; to promote air cleanliness; to pursue beneficial changes in the environment; and to promote environmental justice for overburdened communities.

(3) To encourage the development and integration of clean energy sources.

(4) To provide abundant clean energy at reasonable cost.

(5) To avoid costs of complete site restoration and demolition of improvements and infrastructure at unfinished nuclear energy sites, and to use unfinished nuclear energy facilities for public uses, including economic development, under the regulatory and management control of local governments and port districts.

(6) To avoid costly duplication in the siting process and ensure that decisions are made timely and without unnecessary delay while also encouraging meaningful public comment and participation in energy facility decisions. [2022 c 183 § 1; 2001 c 214 § 1; 1996 c 4 § 1; 1975-'76 2nd ex.s. c 108 § 29; 1970 ex.s. c 45 § 1.]

Effective date—2022 c 183: "This act takes effect June 30, 2022." [2022 c 183 § 24.]

Severability—2001 c 214: "If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected." [2001 c 214 § 33.]

Effective date—2001 c 214: "This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect immediately [May 8, 2001]." [2001 c 214 § 34.]

Findings—2001 c 214: See note following RCW 39.35.010.

Severability—Effective date—1975-'76 2nd ex.s. c 108: See notes following RCW 43.21F.010.

Nuclear power facilities, joint operation: Chapter 54.44 RCW.

State energy office: Chapter 43.21F RCW.