



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

AGENDA

POTENTIAL ACTION ITEM

MONTHLY MEETING
Wednesday February 21, 2024
1:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING ONLY
[Click here to join the meeting](#)
Conference number: 564-999-2000 ID: 699286814#

- 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
 - January 31, 2024 Monthly Council Meeting Minutes
- 5. Projects
 - a. Kittitas Valley Wind Project
 - Operational Updates Jarred Caseday, 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 Crist, Brookfield Renewable
 - i. High Top & Ostrea
 - Project Updates Sara Randolph, EFSEC Staff
 - j. Whistling Ridge
 - Project Updates Lance Caputo, EFSEC Staff
 - k. Badger Mountain
 - Project Updates Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff
 - l. Wautoma Solar
 - Project Updates Lance Caputo, EFSEC Staff
 - m. Hop Hill Solar
 - Project Updates John Barnes, EFSEC Staff
 - n. Carriger Solar
 - Extension Request Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff

The Council may consider and take FINAL ACTION on the extension request for the Carriger Solar project.
 - o. Horse Heaven Wind Farm
 - Project Updates Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
 - p. Cascade Renewable Transmission
 - Project Updates Maria Belkina, EFSEC Staff
- 6. Other
 - Employee Updates
 - New Employee – Catherine Taliaferro Dave Walker, EFSEC Staff
 - Farewell to Lisa Masengale Dave Walker, 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

WA State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
January, Monthly Meeting - January 31, 2024

WASHINGTON STATE

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

MONTHLY MEETING

January 31, 2024

Lacey, Washington

Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 STATE AGENCY MEMBERS:</p> <p>4 Kathleen Drew, Chair</p> <p>5 Elizabeth Osborne, Department of Commerce (*)</p> <p>6 Eli Levitt, Department of Ecology (*)</p> <p>7 Mike Livingston, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (*)</p> <p>8 Lenny Young, Department of Natural Resources (*)</p> <p>9 Stacey Brewster,</p> <p>10 Utilities & Transportation Commission (*)</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OPTIONAL STATE AGENCIES:</p> <p>13 Horse Heaven:</p> <p>14 Ed Brost, Benton County (*)</p> <p>15 Badger Mountain:</p> <p>16 Jordyn Guilio, Douglas County (*)</p> <p>17 Wautoma Solar:</p> <p>18 Paul Gonseth, WA Dept. of Transportation (*)</p> <p>19 Hop Hill Solar:</p> <p>20 Paul Krupin, Benton County (*)</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:</p> <p>23 Jon Thompson (*)</p> <p>24 Zack Packer (*)</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 OPERATIONAL UPDATES (Continuing):</p> <p>4 Thomas Cushing (*)</p> <p>5 Columbia Solar, Tuusso Energy</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 Jacob Crist (*)</p> <p>8 Goose Prairie Solar, Brookfield Renewable</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 COUNSEL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:</p> <p>11 Sarah Reyneveld (*)</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 (*) indicates remote attendee</p>																																																
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:</p> <p>4 Adam Torem (*)</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 COUNCIL STAFF:</p> <p>7 Sonia Bumpus (*) John Barnes (*)</p> <p>8 Ami Hafkemeyer (*) Joanne Snarski (*)</p> <p>9 Amy Moon (*) Alex Shiley (*)</p> <p>10 Stew Henderson (*) Ali Smith (*)</p> <p>11 Joan Owens (*) Karl Holappa</p> <p>12 Andrea Grantham Zia Ahmed (*)</p> <p>13 Dave Walker (*) Maria Belkina (*)</p> <p>14 Sonja Skavland (*) Lisa McLean (*)</p> <p>15 Sean Greene (*) Adrienne Barker (*)</p> <p>16 Lance Caputo (*)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 OPERATIONAL UPDATES:</p> <p>19 Eric Melbardis (*)</p> <p>20 Kittitas Valley Wind, EDP Renewables</p> <p>21 Jennifer Galbraith (*)</p> <p>22 Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Puget Sound Energy</p> <p>23 Jeremy Smith (*)</p> <p>24 Chehalis Generation Facility, PacifiCorp</p> <p>25</p> <p>26 Amy Moon (*)</p> <p>27 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4, Energy Northwest</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 MEETING INDEX</p> <p>2</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">EVENT:</th> <th style="text-align: right;">PAGE NO.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3 Call to order</td> <td style="text-align: right;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Roll call</td> <td style="text-align: right;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 Proposed agenda</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 Minutes</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 11/29/2023 Horse Heaven Special Meeting</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 12/20/2023 Monthly Council Meeting</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9 Projects</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10 Kittitas Valley Wind Project</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 Wild Horse Wind Power Project</td> <td style="text-align: right;">16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 Chehalis Generation Facility</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13 Grays Harbor Energy Center</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14 Columbia Solar</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 Goose Prairie Solar</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 High Top and Ostrea</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18 Whistling Ridge</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19 Badger Mountain</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 Wautoma Solar</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 Hop Hill Solar</td> <td style="text-align: right;">21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22 Carriger Solar</td> <td style="text-align: right;">22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 Horse Heaven Wind Farm</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24 Cascade Renewable Transmission</td> <td style="text-align: right;">104</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 Third-quarter cost allocation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">107</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	EVENT:	PAGE NO.	3 Call to order	7	4 Roll call	7	5 Proposed agenda	12	6 Minutes		7 11/29/2023 Horse Heaven Special Meeting	12	8 12/20/2023 Monthly Council Meeting	13	9 Projects		10 Kittitas Valley Wind Project	14	11 Wild Horse Wind Power Project	16	12 Chehalis Generation Facility	17	13 Grays Harbor Energy Center	17	14 Columbia Solar	17	15 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4	17	16 Goose Prairie Solar	18	17 High Top and Ostrea	19	18 Whistling Ridge	19	19 Badger Mountain	19	20 Wautoma Solar	20	21 Hop Hill Solar	21	22 Carriger Solar	22	23 Horse Heaven Wind Farm	23	24 Cascade Renewable Transmission	104	25 Third-quarter cost allocation	107
EVENT:	PAGE NO.																																																
3 Call to order	7																																																
4 Roll call	7																																																
5 Proposed agenda	12																																																
6 Minutes																																																	
7 11/29/2023 Horse Heaven Special Meeting	12																																																
8 12/20/2023 Monthly Council Meeting	13																																																
9 Projects																																																	
10 Kittitas Valley Wind Project	14																																																
11 Wild Horse Wind Power Project	16																																																
12 Chehalis Generation Facility	17																																																
13 Grays Harbor Energy Center	17																																																
14 Columbia Solar	17																																																
15 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4	17																																																
16 Goose Prairie Solar	18																																																
17 High Top and Ostrea	19																																																
18 Whistling Ridge	19																																																
19 Badger Mountain	19																																																
20 Wautoma Solar	20																																																
21 Hop Hill Solar	21																																																
22 Carriger Solar	22																																																
23 Horse Heaven Wind Farm	23																																																
24 Cascade Renewable Transmission	104																																																
25 Third-quarter cost allocation	107																																																

Page 6

1	MEETING INDEX (Continuing)	
2	EVENT:	PAGE NO.
3	Employee updates	
4	New-employee introduction of Lisa McLean	108
5	New-employee introduction of Zia Ahmed	109
6	New-employee introduction of Maria Belkina	110
7	New-employee introduction of Adrienne Barker	111
8		
9	Adjournment	112
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 8

1 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural
2 Resources.
3 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.
4 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities and
5 Transportation Commission.
6 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster,
7 present.
8 MS. GRANTHAM: For local government
9 and optional State agencies:
10 For the Horse Heaven project: For Benton County,
11 Ed Brost.
12 For the Badger Mountain project: For Douglas
13 County, Jordyn Guilio.
14 MS. GUILIO: Present.
15 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Wautoma Solar
16 Project: For Benton County, Dave Sharp.
17 The Washington State Department of Transportation,
18 Paul Gonseth.
19 MR. GONSETH: Paul Gonseth, present.
20 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Hop Hill
21 Solar Project: For Benton County, Paul Krupin.
22 MR. KRUPIN: Paul Krupin, present.
23 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Carriger
24 Solar project: For Klickitat County, Matt Chiles.
25 Assistant attorney generals: Jon Thompson.

Page 7

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday,
2 January 31, 2024, at 621 Woodland Square Loop
3 Southeast, Lacey, Washington, at 3:00 p.m., the
4 following Monthly Meeting of the Washington State
5 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was held, to
6 wit:
7
8 <<<<<< >>>>>>
9
10 CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This
11 is Kathleen Drew, Chair of the Energy Facility Site
12 Evaluation Council, calling our January meeting to
13 order.
14 Ms. Grantham, will you call the roll.
15 MS. GRANTHAM: Certainly.
16 Department of Commerce.
17 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,
18 present.
19 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of
20 Ecology.
21 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt, present.
22 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Fish
23 and Wildlife.
24 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston,
25 present.

Page 9

1 MR. THOMPSON: Present.
2 MS. GRANTHAM: Jenna Slocum.
3 Zack Packer.
4 MR. PACKER: Present.
5 MS. GRANTHAM: Administrative law
6 judges: Adam Torem.
7 Laura Bradley.
8 Dan Gerard.
9 And Joni Derifield.
10 For the Council staff: Sonia Bumpus.
11 MS. BUMPUS: Present.
12 MS. GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer.
13 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Present.
14 MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon.
15 MS. MOON: Amy Moon, present.
16 MS. GRANTHAM: Stew Henderson.
17 Joan Owens.
18 MS. OWENS: Present.
19 MS. GRANTHAM: Dave Walker.
20 MR. WALKER: Present.
21 MS. GRANTHAM: Sonja Skavland.
22 MS. SKAVLAND: Present.
23 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa Masengale.
24 Sara Randolph.
25 Sean Greene.

Page 10

1 MR. GREENE: Present.
 2 MS. GRANTHAM: Lance Caputo.
 3 John Barnes.
 4 MR. CAPUTO: Lance Caputo, present.
 5 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you, Lance.
 6 John Barnes.
 7 MR. BARNES: Present.
 8 MS. GRANTHAM: Joanne Snarski.
 9 MS. SNARSKI: Present.
 10 MS. GRANTHAM: Alex Shiley.
 11 MS. SHILEY: Present.
 12 MS. GRANTHAM: Ali Smith.
 13 MS. SMITH: Ali Smith, present.
 14 MS. GRANTHAM: Karl Holappa.
 15 MR. HOLAPPA: Karl Holappa, present.
 16 MS. GRANTHAM: Audra Allen.
 17 Zia Ahmed.
 18 MR. AHMED: Present.
 19 MS. GRANTHAM: Maria Belkina.
 20 MS. BELKINA: "Belkina." Present.
 21 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa McLean.
 22 MS. McLEAN: Present.
 23 MS. GRANTHAM: Adrienne Barker.
 24 MS. BARKER: Present.
 25 MS. GRANTHAM: For operational

Page 11

1 updates: For the Kittitas Valley wind project, Eric
 2 Melbardis.
 3 Wild Horse Wind Power Proj- -- oh.
 4 MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis,
 5 present.
 6 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you,
 7 Mr. Melbardis.
 8 For the Wild Horse Wind Power Project.
 9 MS. GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith,
 10 present.
 11 MS. GRANTHAM: Grays Harbor Energy
 12 Center.
 13 Chehalis Generation Facility.
 14 MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.
 15 MS. GRANTHAM: Columbia Generating
 16 Station.
 17 Columbia Solar.
 18 MR. CUSHING: Thomas Cushing,
 19 present.
 20 MS. GRANTHAM: And the Goose Prairie
 21 Solar.
 22 MR. CRIST: Jacob Crist, present.
 23 MS. GRANTHAM: And do we have anyone
 24 present for the counsel for the environment?
 25 MS. REYNEVELD: Yes. Sarah

Page 12

1 Reyneveld, present. I'm also joined by Yuriy Korol, a
 2 newly assigned counsel for the environment, who's also
 3 present.
 4 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you,
 5 Ms. Reyneveld.
 6 Chair, we have a quorum for all of the councils.
 7 Thank you.
 8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 9 On to our approving the meeting minutes.
 10 First of all, let's approve the proposed agenda.
 11 The proposed agenda is in front of you.
 12 Is there a motion to approve the agenda?
 13 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young --
 14 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt --
 15 MR. YOUNG: Go ahead, Eli.
 16 MR. LEVITT: Motion to approve.
 17 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. Second.
 18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 19 All those in favor, please say "aye."
 20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Those opposed?
 22 The agenda is approved.
 23 Moving on to the meeting minutes. For November
 24 29th, 2023, meeting: The Horse Heaven special meeting
 25 minutes.

Page 13

1 Is there a motion to approve the special meeting
 2 minutes?
 3 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne. So
 4 moved.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 6 Second?
 7 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.
 8 Second.
 9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 10 The comments I have on those meeting minutes:
 11 Page 30, Line 18: The word "iterate,"
 12 i-t-e-r-a-t-e, should be "iterative," i-t-e-r-a-t-i-v-e.
 13 Page 32, Line 13: "Tax," t-a-x, should be TACs,
 14 capital T, capital A, capital C, s.
 15 Those are the two corrections that I have. Are
 16 there any other corrections?
 17 Hearing none.
 18 All those in favor of the meeting minutes as
 19 amended, please say "aye."
 20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?
 22 The minutes are approved.
 23 Moving on to our December 20th monthly Council
 24 meeting minutes.
 25 Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

Page 14

1 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. So moved.
 2 CHAIR DREW: Second?
 3 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston.
 4 Second.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Okay. The comments I
 6 have, the corrections I have for the December 20th
 7 minutes are:
 8 Page 12, Line 12: "Ms.," M-s, should be "Mr.,"
 9 M-r.
 10 Page 15, Line 6: So this one, strike from the
 11 comma after "Archaeology" through "preservation," and
 12 this should say "Archaeology and Historic
 13 Preservation."
 14 Page 48, Line 6, the word "let," l-e-t, should be
 15 "less," l-e-s-s.
 16 Are there any other corrections?
 17 Hearing none.
 18 All those in favor of the meeting minutes as
 19 amended, please say "aye."
 20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 22 We'll move now to the operational update.
 23 Mr. Melbardis. Sorry. That would be Kittitas Valley
 24 wind project.
 25 MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon,

Page 15

1 Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and staff. For the record,
 2 this is Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables giving my
 3 final report for the Kittitas Valley wind power
 4 project.
 5 Firstly, we have nothing nonroutine to report for
 6 the period. However, I did e-mail EFSEC staff
 7 earlier -- I think it was last week -- that I have
 8 accepted a promotion, so there will be a management
 9 change at Kittitas Valley after 14 years.
 10 I've been here since we -- since we put the
 11 turbines in the ground, and I will be moving on to an
 12 area manager role for the company, where I will have --
 13 be responsible for just over a couple of gigawatts of
 14 solar in Nevada, California, and Arizona.
 15 So I will -- was going to introduce the new
 16 manager for Kittitas Valley, Jarred Caseday. However,
 17 when -- when we rescheduled the meeting, he wasn't able
 18 to make it today. So I will fill him in, and he will
 19 be giving the -- the KV report next month.
 20 That's all I have.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. My
 22 microphone was not responding adequately. Thank you,
 23 Eric. You have been a great partner, and we look
 24 forward to working with you in another capacity. And
 25 congratulations to you.

Page 16

1 MR. MELBARDIS: Thank you.
 2 CHAIR DREW: Wild Horse operat- --
 3 wind power project. Ms. Galbraith.
 4 MS. GALBRAITH: Yes. Thank you,
 5 Chair Drew, Council members, and staff. This is
 6 Jennifer Galbraith with Puget Sound Energy representing
 7 the Wild Horse wind facility.
 8 And for the month of December, I have a couple of
 9 environmental compliance updates.
 10 The Wild Horse Technical Advisory Committee met
 11 via conference call on December 5th for the annual
 12 meeting. This was an informational meeting only.
 13 There were no items that required formal actions or
 14 recommendations from the TAC for the Council's
 15 consideration.
 16 And then the second item. In accordance with the
 17 site certification agreement, the Operation Spill
 18 Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan was
 19 updated and submitted to EFSEC staff on December 18th,
 20 and there were only minor administrative updates to
 21 that plan.
 22 And that's all I have. Thank you.
 23 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And thank
 24 you for including the minutes from the TAC meeting. I
 25 appreciated reading them and keeping up with the good

Page 17

1 work that you're doing.
 2 MS. GALBRAITH: Great. Thank you.
 3 CHAIR DREW: Chehalis Generation
 4 Facility. Mr. Smith.
 5 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair
 6 Drew, Council members, and staff. This is Jeremy
 7 Smith, the operations manager representing Chehalis
 8 Generation Facility.
 9 I have nothing nonroutine to note for the month of
 10 December.
 11 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 12 Grays Harbor Energy Center. Mr. Sherin.
 13 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Chair Drew, if I
 14 may chime in. This is Ami Hafkemeyer, for the record.
 15 The update is provided by the facility in your
 16 Council packets. There were no nonroutine items to
 17 report.
 18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 19 Columbia Solar. Mr. Cushing.
 20 MR. CUSHING: Good afternoon, Chair
 21 Drew, Council members, EFSEC staff. This is Thomas
 22 Cushing speaking on behalf of Columbia Solar.
 23 There are no nonroutine updates.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 25 Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1 and -4.

Page 18

1 MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Chair
 2 Drew. This is Amy Moon, EFSEC staff. Energy Northwest
 3 asked if I could give the update.
 4 There are no nonroutine items to report, as
 5 demonstrated in the Council packet. Thank you.
 6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 7 Goose Prairie Solar project update. Mr. Crist.
 8 MR. CRIST: Good afternoon, Chair
 9 Drew, EFSEC Council, and staff. This is Jacob Crist,
 10 senior project manager, on behalf of Brookfield
 11 Renewable.
 12 So for construction updates: Starting with the
 13 substation. So the construction is progressing. The
 14 substation completion is expected in -- sometime in mid
 15 to late March. Remaining equipment and material
 16 deliveries are still being planned. Everything is
 17 still on schedule here. Predrilling is complete, along
 18 with our medium-voltage cable install. Pile-driving
 19 perimeter fence continue along with the racking and
 20 module install.
 21 So the last two weeks' work's been slowed pretty
 22 significantly with weather delays due to snow, snow
 23 melt, and rain. So it's really all hands on deck for
 24 maintaining B&Ps right now throughout this period. And
 25 then we do have, as recent as today, ongoing

Page 19

1 environmental inspections by WSP also.
 2 And that's -- that's my update.
 3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 4 Council members, are there any questions?
 5 Thank you for the update.
 6 Moving on to High Top and Ostrea project update.
 7 Ms. Hafkemeyer.
 8 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
 9 Drew. Good afternoon, Chair and Council. Again, this
 10 is Ami Hafkemeyer, for the record.
 11 Staff are continuing to work on preconstruction
 12 plan review with the certificate holder. There are no
 13 further updates at this time.
 14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 15 Whistling Ridge. Ms. Hafkemeyer.
 16 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you.
 17 Staff continue to coordinate to work towards
 18 scheduling a public informational meeting for the
 19 requests for this project. Details will be announced
 20 once they are available.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 22 Badger Mountain, project update. Ms. Snarski.
 23 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair Drew.
 24 And good afternoon, Council members. For the record,
 25 this is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist for

Page 20

1 Badger Mountain solar.
 2 Efforts continue on the development of the
 3 supplemental cultural resources survey. We have
 4 received Department of Archaeology and Historic
 5 Preservation concurrence on a work plan for the initial
 6 pedestrian survey.
 7 Additionally, we recently began working with the
 8 Department of Natural Resources to obtain an access
 9 agreement for our subcontractors to the state lands for
 10 cultural resources survey. Due to the current winter
 11 conditions at the proposed site, we are not able to
 12 begin work until snow thaws.
 13 Finally, the findings of this survey will inform
 14 the cultural resources section of the draft
 15 environmental impact statement.
 16 Any questions?
 17 CHAIR DREW: Any questions for
 18 Ms. Snarski?
 19 Thank you.
 20 Wautoma Solar Project. Mr. Caputo.
 21 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Chair Drew, I will
 22 also be giving the update --
 23 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.
 24 MS. HAFKEMEYER: -- for Wautoma
 25 Solar.

Page 21

1 CHAIR DREW: I didn't know. I
 2 heard --
 3 MS. HAFKEMEYER: This is Ami
 4 Hafkemeyer.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Yeah. Go ahead.
 6 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Yes.
 7 Sorry. I just minimized my update. I apologize.
 8 Again, for the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer.
 9 Staff are continuing coordination with our contracted
 10 agencies, tribal staff, and the applicant to refine
 11 identified mitigation for the Wautoma proposal.
 12 Staff are also working in coordination with the
 13 Office of Administrative Hearings and our attorney
 14 general support in preparation for logistics associated
 15 with the adjudicative proceedings for this project.
 16 Are there any questions?
 17 CHAIR DREW: Are there any
 18 questions?
 19 Thank you.
 20 Hop Hill Solar Project. Mr. Barnes.
 21 MR. BARNES: Thank you, Chair Drew
 22 and Council members. For the record, this is John
 23 Barnes, EFSEC staff, for the Hop Hill application.
 24 Work continues with the applicant to complete
 25 studies and reports needed to make a SEPA

Page 22

1 determination. We are continuing to coordinate and
 2 review the application with our contractor, contracted
 3 agencies, and tribal governments.
 4 Are there any questions?
 5 CHAIR DREW: Are there any
 6 questions?
 7 Thank you, Mr. Barnes.
 8 Carriger Solar. Ms. Snarski.
 9 MS. SNARSKI: Yes. Thank you, Chair
 10 Drew.
 11 For the record, this is Joanne Snarski, the siting
 12 special -- specialist for Carriger Solar.
 13 In early January, we received feedback from the
 14 Klickitat County Public Works Department on the draft
 15 traffic impact assessment. We will continue to work
 16 with the County to refine the assessment to ensure all
 17 impacts can be appropriately mitigated.
 18 Staff also received a third revision to the
 19 cultural resources survey from the applicant. It is
 20 currently being reviewed by the Department of
 21 Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Yakama
 22 Nation.
 23 On a final note, the interagency agreement for the
 24 completion of the Traditional Cultural Property Study
 25 by the Yakama Nation for this site has been fully

Page 23

1 executed. The work is underway. The work is scheduled
 2 to be completed in December 2024.
 3 Any questions?
 4 CHAIR DREW: Any questions for
 5 Ms. Snarski?
 6 Thank you.
 7 We are now moving on to the Horse Heaven Wind
 8 Farm. We're going to have an update from Ms. Moon. I
 9 am actually going to take the mitigation discussion
 10 first, unless there are any objections from Council.
 11 Ms. Moon, why don't you go ahead with the update,
 12 and then we'll move to the presentation by Mr. Greene.
 13 MS. MOON: Okay. So I -- maybe you
 14 can clarify, Council Chair Drew. I -- I had an update
 15 on the information on firefighting from DNR and the
 16 Benton County fire chief. Do you want me to go ahead
 17 with that first?
 18 CHAIR DREW: Yes, please.
 19 MS. MOON: Okay. Thank you.
 20 For the record, this is Amy Moon reporting on the
 21 Horse Heaven wind project.
 22 At the December 20th Council meeting, I presented
 23 information regarding firefighting and fire suppression
 24 that led to the Council's request for additional
 25 information regarding the roles of the Washington

Page 24

1 Department of Natural Resources, referred to here
 2 further as "DNR," and the local fire district on fire
 3 protection and firefighting in the proposed Horse
 4 Heaven wind project area.
 5 EFSEC staff worked with DNR and the Benton County
 6 Fire District No. 1 to answer the Council's questions.
 7 Russ Lane, the DNR division manager in the Wildland
 8 Fire Management Division, and the Benton County Fire
 9 District fire chief, Lonnie Click, provided responses
 10 to the Council's questions.
 11 Both the original questions and responses from the
 12 December Council meeting and the follow-up questions
 13 and responses are included in the January 24th Council
 14 packet for your review. But I do have some additional
 15 updates on that.
 16 So I wanted to start off with clarifications to
 17 information I presented at the December Council meeting
 18 regarding aerial firefighting, specifically if the
 19 project area would be a no-fly zone.
 20 According to Mr. Lane, the height of the vertical
 21 obstacles or turbines is what would prevent aerial fire
 22 response in the interior of the proposed project.
 23 Mr. Lane further stated that he doesn't see any way to
 24 mitigate for the aerial response of turbine heights up
 25 to 657 feet or aerial mitigation for the proposed

Page 25

1 turbine spacing.
 2 The aerial firefighting questions and responses I
 3 submitted to DNR are included in your Council packet.
 4 However, in further follow-up, EFSEC received
 5 additional information from Mr. Lane on January 26,
 6 which was too late for the Council packet, clarifying
 7 DNR aerial firefighting efforts, which I will go over
 8 now.
 9 At the December meeting, the Council asked if DNR
 10 had any recommended mitigation measures that may
 11 address aerial firefighting activities in association
 12 with those turbine heights up to 657 feet. DNR
 13 indicated mitigating conflict with tactical aerial
 14 operations to provide safety and maneuvering space may
 15 not be possible due to density and height of the
 16 proposed turbines that would need an additional safety
 17 buffer of one to two tower heights around the project
 18 to, quote, ensure safe operation for aircraft
 19 operations, end quote.
 20 Mr. Lane also expressed concern over the long
 21 lines and bucket that extend up to 150 feet below the
 22 helicopter airframe. In further communication, he
 23 clarified that the DNR's owned and contracted fleet
 24 includes light, medium, and heavy Type 3, 2, and 1
 25 helicopters as well as single-engine and twin-engine

Page 26

1 turboprop aircraft.

2 He stated that the DNR fixed-wing tankers operate

3 in both retardant and scooping configurations, which

4 would be like scooping water from a river. And he is

5 comfortable that they can safely operate the three

6 types of helicopters and light tankers, which are

7 AT-820 models, at a standoff distance of approximately

8 one-quarter mile and that he is reasonably certain DNR

9 would hear the same for the twin-engine scoopers, which

10 are the CL-145 models, and twin tankers, which are the

11 Q400 models, but can verify that with his vendor, if

12 needed. If the Council wants that, we can get that

13 verification.

14 Mr. Lane also noted that DNR infrequently borrow

15 the large and very large jet engine transport-type

16 aircraft present in the federal fleet, which are

17 DC-10s, and these are referred to as very large air

18 tankers. But these fly on less than 1 percent of DNR

19 incidents.

20 In the information included in the Council packet,

21 Mr. Lane expressed his high concern about damage to the

22 wind farm that could likely occur from bucket or

23 retardant drops in the wind farm area, as these drops

24 come down with the force of gravity and many thousands

25 of pounds of water or retardant that could easily snap

Page 27

1 off blades and can do other damage to towers.

2 Mr. Lane further stated that DNR takes great care

3 to avoid damage to high-value infrastructure when

4 firefighting and could easily do more damage conducting

5 aerial drops within a wind project than the fire,

6 itself, might do. And that potential would also likely

7 lead to DNR to make a "no go" call for aerial

8 operations within the perimeter of the wind farm.

9 Mr. Lane wanted to remind EFSEC that the "go" or

10 "no go" call for safe operations near obstacles will be

11 made by the pilot in command at the time of the mission

12 and that DNR remain concerned that operations interior

13 to a large-scale wind project would pose unacceptable

14 risks to air crews. However, he further stated that he

15 believes they have multiple effective tools to do

16 aerial firefighting around the perimeter of wind

17 projects from a safe standoff distance.

18 I conferred with the Benton County Fire District

19 No. 1 fire chief, Lonnie Click. He reviewed the DNR

20 information and stated that his fire district responses

21 would be nearly exact and that the vertical obstruction

22 of the turbine tower is the ultimate hazard to

23 firefighting aircraft; in turn, requiring the aircraft

24 to fly a considerable distance from the towers.

25 Chief Click also stated he agrees with what DNR

Page 28

1 stated and that the -- about the pilot discretion and

2 working outside the proposed project perimeter are key

3 factors in fire response.

4 I know that was a lot of information. Does the

5 Council have any questions?

6 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions

7 from Council members?

8 MS. MOON: It looks like Council

9 Member Young may have.

10 CHAIR DREW: I don't know why I'm

11 not seeing that on my screen. We're going to pause for

12 just a moment while I make sure I can have -- Andrea,

13 can you come help?

14 Just a second.

15 (Discussion off the record.)

16

17 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young, is your hand

18 up?

19 MR. YOUNG: Yes, it is.

20 (Discussion off the record.)

21

22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. I'm going to

23 have to ask you to let me know when you raise your

24 hands.

25 Mr. Young.

Page 29

1 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

2 Amy, would it be fair to summarize what you

3 recounted that aerial fire suppression would not be

4 feasible within the wind farm perimeter or within a

5 one-quarter-mile buffer of the perimeter which was

6 being referred to as the standoff distance? Is that a

7 correct summary interpretation?

8 MS. MOON: Yes. Based on what

9 Mr. Lane provided to EFSEC, that -- that is correct.

10 MR. YOUNG: And I understand that

11 Chief Click concurs with Mr. Lane?

12 MS. MOON: Yes. Yes, Chief Click

13 did concur.

14 Any further questions? I see another hand. But

15 I'm not sure that we can take Paul Krupin's question.

16 CHAIR DREW: That's correct. We're

17 only taking members from Horse Heaven Council members.

18 MS. MOON: Okay. If there are no

19 further questions, I have -- I would like to -- to

20 continue with my update.

21 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

22 MS. MOON: Okay.

23 As directed by the Council at the December 20th

24 Council meeting, EFSEC staff also made updates to other

25 proposed mitigation measures presented in the final

Page 30

1 environmental impact statement issued on October 31st
 2 of 2023. 62 comments were received during the comment
 3 campaign associated with the Council's direction in
 4 December to produce figures demonstrating potential
 5 project exclusions for their consideration.
 6 Our SEPA specialist, Sean Greene, is here to
 7 present the proposed updates and to answer any
 8 questions.
 9 And so if you're ready, Sean, I'll turn it over to
 10 you.
 11 MR. GREENE: Yes. I believe Chair
 12 Drew wanted to lead off before I began.
 13 CHAIR DREW: That's right. Thank
 14 you, Mr. Greene.
 15 So as the Council continues our discussion on our
 16 recommendation to the governor or on the Horse Heaven
 17 wind and solar project, I'd like to make a few
 18 comments.
 19 Much of what you have seen in our meetings over
 20 the past couple of months has been a discussion of
 21 mitigation measures recommended in the final EIS. The
 22 Council will consider any changes to these measures,
 23 taking into account not just the information we've
 24 received through the EIS but the information we've
 25 received as a Council through the adjudicative process

Page 31

1 and the comments we've received from the public
 2 throughout our review. We thank everyone for your
 3 participation in our process.
 4 Mr. Greene, if you would show Figure 2-5 from the
 5 final EIS, which we have referred to several times
 6 during our conversation over the past couple of months,
 7 and please describe to the Council what is represented
 8 here.
 9 MR. GREENE: Yes. Thank you, Chair
 10 Drew and Council members. For the record, this is Sean
 11 Greene, SEPA specialist for EFSEC.
 12 What this figure represents, there are two roughly
 13 equivalent figures in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, each
 14 representing one of the two turbine options being
 15 proposed.
 16 This is Turbine Option 1. And this figure
 17 represents an assessment of turbine impacts to a number
 18 of resources: Specifically, areas within two miles of
 19 a ferruginous hawk nest; areas with medium or higher
 20 modeled linkage for a wildlife movement corridor; areas
 21 with shrubsteppe habitat; turbines that would create
 22 noise impacts, visual impacts, shadow flicker impacts,
 23 or would have impacts to archaeological and
 24 architectural resources with traditional cultural
 25 property resources shown on the confidential Council

Page 32

1 map that was provided under separate cover to this map.
 2 This also shows turbines that would have impacts
 3 to recreational opportunities.
 4 In terms of the color coding, red-color turbines
 5 on this map are indicative of turbines that were either
 6 assessed as having a high impact on three or more of
 7 those listed resources or having an impact to one or
 8 more particularly vulnerable or sensitive resources,
 9 such as ferruginous hawk nests or archaeological
 10 resources.
 11 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young, you have a
 12 question. Now I don't see you.
 13 MR. YOUNG: Yes. Thank you.
 14 The way you described that, I just want to be
 15 clear: That this map does not take into account
 16 impacts to traditional cultural properties and that
 17 those are identified separately on the confidential
 18 map; is that correct?
 19 MR. GREENE: That is correct.
 20 MR. YOUNG: So TCPs are not -- not
 21 factored into what color the turbines are shaded on
 22 this map, correct?
 23 MR. GREENE: That is correct.
 24 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
 25 MR. GREENE: Were there any further

Page 33

1 questions regarding this map and the meaning of the
 2 color coding or what resources are being assessed as
 3 part of this color coding and the determination of the
 4 class of impact?
 5 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.
 6 So I do want to -- like the Council to start our
 7 conversation by discussing the elimination of the areas
 8 in which the red turbines are located as you've heard
 9 described.
 10 And I will say that although in impact we don't
 11 have specific turbines identified, we do know from the
 12 information that we have received that is confidential
 13 from the Yakama Nation that every turbine -- I'm
 14 sorry -- the entire site impacts traditional cultural
 15 properties. So I want to make that statement, that the
 16 entire project does impact traditional cultural
 17 properties.
 18 But what I would like to do is to ask the Council
 19 to consider eliminating the turbines in -- represented
 20 by the red dots but within those areas, so not just
 21 within the entire areas represented by those red dots.
 22 And that is because the multiple compacting impacts in
 23 this area described.
 24 First of all, we've received information through
 25 the FEIS, again through the adjudication and public

Page 34

1 comments. In my view, taking this action will
 2 eliminate all turbines in two-mile circles around
 3 current and historic ferruginous hawk nests, and it
 4 will reduce the impact on -- of the project on cultural
 5 resources and traditional cultural properties.
 6 It will reduce the impacts to the wildlife
 7 corridors throughout the project.
 8 It will reduce visual impact to communities to the
 9 east of the project and remove turbines from a
 10 prominent ridgeline.
 11 It will reduce potential impact on aerial
 12 firefighting on the slope northeast of the project and
 13 will reduce the impact of the project on some
 14 recreational areas. Not eliminate all impacts, but
 15 there will be a reduction in impacts by taking this
 16 action.
 17 And I'd just like to ask Council members, please
 18 feel free to share your view of this action.
 19 Mr. Greene.
 20 MR. GREENE: Yeah. I just wanted to
 21 make one point. You mentioned that this would reduce
 22 the potential risk to aerial firefighting on the slope
 23 northeast of the project area. It is actually the
 24 northwest of the project area.
 25 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Thank you. Okay.

Page 35

1 My mistake. Thank you.
 2 Council members, I'd like to understand your
 3 views.
 4 Mr. Livingston.
 5 MR. LIVINGSTON: Hello. Thanks,
 6 Chair Drew.
 7 I appreciate, one, the -- the further
 8 clarification about what the green/red/yellow dots are
 9 on the map. I also appreciate the work that's gone
 10 into this. And I -- I agree with you. We've gone
 11 through such a deliberative, intense process of trying
 12 to understand what impacts this size of a project has
 13 posed for us to consider.
 14 And so the approach of eliminating those turbines
 15 that are in red I support for the reasons you
 16 mentioned. They're going to reduce, and not eliminate,
 17 risk to the hawk. They're going to reduce, and not
 18 eliminate, complications to firefighting. There's the
 19 habitat connectivity also is going to be -- the impacts
 20 will be reduced but not eliminated.
 21 So we're working towards a project that could be
 22 permitted, and from my perspective, without having such
 23 a huge size, scope, and scale that would impact all
 24 these important resources.
 25 So those are my -- those are my views and comments

Page 36

1 at the moment. Thank you.
 2 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 3 Mr. Young.
 4 MR. YOUNG: Chair, I support what
 5 you've described, removing all the red turbines. That
 6 is not the full extent of my concerns, and there are
 7 additional turbines that I would like to see
 8 eliminated. I think we'll get to that later in the
 9 discussion. But I support what you've described for
 10 the reasons you -- you gave.
 11 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 12 Other Council members?
 13 Mr. Levitt.
 14 MR. LEVITT: Yeah. Hello. I'm
 15 supportive of the comments you made earlier, Chair
 16 Drew. You know, I guess I do have some questions for
 17 EFSEC staff about how viable some of the strings of
 18 turbines are when a large number are eliminated. For
 19 example, there's some -- some yellow, perhaps some
 20 orange kind of in the middle of the project. And so,
 21 you know, I don't -- I don't know how to answer those
 22 questions. But to make the project viable, you know,
 23 there is infrastructure that connects the rows of
 24 turbines, so I'm concerned about some of those.
 25 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Greene, you want to

Page 37

1 answer that?
 2 MR. GREENE: Yeah. I can -- I can
 3 address that.
 4 So a few of the turbines that you've mentioned,
 5 specifically the ones that identify as Class 1 or
 6 Class 2 impacts here in the yellow and orange dots,
 7 would potentially be excluded by other mitigation
 8 measures that the Council is going to consider as part
 9 of this meeting.
 10 As for the secondary project components, things
 11 like roads and transmission lines, we -- we'll be
 12 presenting the Council with a set of exclusion measures
 13 that they can impose for primary project components --
 14 things like turbines, solar arrays, and BESSes, battery
 15 stations -- and a secondary question about what
 16 exclusions the Council would like to impose on
 17 secondary components, things like those roads and
 18 transmission lines.
 19 So there will be a level of delineation there that
 20 the Council can consider and provide guidance to staff
 21 on how you would like to see those exclusion measures
 22 put into place.
 23 MR. LEVITT: Thank you.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 25 Other comments by Council members?

Page 38

1 Ms. Brewster.

2 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I want to

3 support the notion of eliminating the turbines with the

4 highest impacts on multiple features, so the turbines

5 marked in red. I am supportive of that notion.

6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

7 And, again, because we're not -- we're talking

8 about the areas that those red turbines represent, so I

9 want to say that again. Because it's not moving them a

10 few feet. They would not be in the entire area.

11 You've seen it in different ways in Wild-5 that we will

12 see later as well. But I just want to say that for the

13 record.

14 So hearing that we have strong support for doing

15 that, I wanted to lay the foundation of our

16 conversation and the fact that it doesn't rest on one

17 particular resource but on multiple impacts that we

18 have been concerned about as we have heard throughout

19 this project.

20 So with that, I will ask Sean, then, to move on to

21 the next part of his presentation.

22 MR. GREENE: Thank you, Chair Drew.

23 And I did want to mention that the Council has

24 access to a confidential version of this same figure

25 that actually shows red-shaded areas, which are the

Page 39

1 boundaries of some of those particularly vulnerable or

2 sensitive resources.

3 CHAIR DREW: Right.

4 MR. GREENE: And that shows the

5 approximate outlines of the areas of the micro-siting

6 corridor that would be excluded if these mitigation

7 measures were put into place to exclude those red-color

8 turbines.

9 So moving forward. I wanted to go through the --

10 the various exclusion mitigation measures that the

11 Council was discussing at the previous meeting. In

12 cases where it's -- it's a new measure, such as this

13 Veg-10, I'll show the text as proposed to be included

14 within a draft SCA, were -- were the Council to

15 recommend approval for this project.

16 CHAIR DREW: I want to -- may I

17 interrupt you?

18 MR. GREENE: Yes.

19 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So I asked

20 Mr. Greene to present this. I had presented at the

21 last meeting the idea of eliminating the east solar

22 field. As I looked at comments and discussed this

23 further, I wanted to present a different option to the

24 Council that would eliminate solar arrays in any

25 rabbitbrush shrubland or any of the priority habitat

Page 40

1 areas rather than request the entire solar field be

2 eliminated. So that's where this comes from.

3 Do you have more that you'd like to share on that?

4 MR. GREENE: Yes.

5 So this is just to show the text of that proposed

6 mitigation measure, were it to be incorporated.

7 The next slide here. There we go.

8 So this is a -- a figure showing most of what was

9 originally proposed as that east solar field. Those

10 red polygons are the -- the boundaries of the

11 originally proposed solar arrays.

12 In the final application submitted by the

13 applicant, they significantly reduced -- or I shouldn't

14 say "significant" -- they heavily reduced the footprint

15 of the proposed east solar array to approximately

16 what's encased in that green polygon that I drew. It

17 accounted for a roughly 80 percent reduction in impacts

18 to sensitive habitat types that would be targeted by

19 this mitigation measure, resulting in approximately 140

20 acres of total impacts associated with the east solar

21 array.

22 There are no proposed permanent disturbance

23 impacts to any of these habitat types with the County

24 Well solar array or the Sellards solar array, which are

25 the other two options under consideration. So it's

Page 41

1 just an indication of what the east solar array looks

2 like in the current proposal, and the blue in that

3 central polygon indicates east-side interior

4 grasslands, which is a priority habitat designated by

5 WDFW, and the pink polygon to the bottom left is

6 rabbitbrush shrubland, which would also be excluded as

7 part of this mitigation measure.

8 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

9 MR. YOUNG: Are the three habitat

10 types listed there -- east-side (interior) grassland,

11 rabbitbrush shrubland, and sagebrush shrubsteppe --

12 does that comprise all of the DFW-designated priority

13 habitat types?

14 MR. GREENE: That includes all --

15 that includes rabbitbrush shrubland, which is generally

16 considered an early -- early successional stage of

17 shrubsteppe, and so it -- often incorporated with other

18 priority habitat types. The only two are the only

19 priority habitat types designated by WDFW that have any

20 impacts associated with them as a result of solar

21 arrays --

22 MR. YOUNG: Could -- could you --

23 MR. GREENE: -- for this project.

24 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to

25 the previous slide that had the text?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 MR. GREENE: Yes.</p> <p>2 MR. YOUNG: So where it says "or</p> <p>3 DFW-designated priority habitat types," is it just</p> <p>4 those other two that we've specifically talked about?</p> <p>5 MR. GREENE: It would be -- sorry.</p> <p>6 MR. YOUNG: Or are there other</p> <p>7 DFW-designated priority habitat types that would be</p> <p>8 included here?</p> <p>9 MR. GREENE: It would include all</p> <p>10 designated priority habitat types. There are no others</p> <p>11 within this area.</p> <p>12 MR. YOUNG: Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. GREENE: So -- so essentially --</p> <p>14 MR. YOUNG: Sorry. Cutting you off</p> <p>15 there.</p> <p>16 MR. GREENE: No. I was -- I was</p> <p>17 going to say, effectively it is those other two types,</p> <p>18 the --</p> <p>19 MR. YOUNG: Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. GREENE: The sagebrush</p> <p>21 shrubsteppe and east-side (interior) grassland.</p> <p>22 MR. YOUNG: So in -- on the ground,</p> <p>23 those are the only three types that are involved,</p> <p>24 really, for our conversation?</p> <p>25 MR. GREENE: Correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 Are there any comments?</p> <p>2 Mr. Livingston.</p> <p>3 MR. LIVINGSTON: Can we go back,</p> <p>4 Sean, to the -- I just want to see. How many acres are</p> <p>5 we talking about?</p> <p>6 MR. GREENE: It's approximately 140</p> <p>7 acres.</p> <p>8 MR. LIVINGSTON: And if we go with</p> <p>9 your Proposed Option B, what would be the impacts?</p> <p>10 MR. GREENE: Essentially the -- the</p> <p>11 pink-colored polygon and the blue-colored polygon would</p> <p>12 be excluded, and the -- the color surrounding those</p> <p>13 polygons would also be excluded from the siting of any</p> <p>14 solar arrays. That would give the applicant either the</p> <p>15 option of reducing the footprint of the solar array to</p> <p>16 exclude those -- those plats or restructuring their</p> <p>17 proposed east solar array to cover the same number of</p> <p>18 acres but no longer cover those priority habitat areas</p> <p>19 or rabbitbrush shrubland.</p> <p>20 MR. LIVINGSTON: It would be helpful</p> <p>21 for me if I knew what was the surrou- -- I guess I can</p> <p>22 see some of the surrounding habitat types to the north</p> <p>23 and to the east and to the west. I don't know what's</p> <p>24 to the south, 'cause I guess it's outside of the -- the</p> <p>25 project boundaries.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.</p> <p>2 MR. GREENE: And so the Council</p> <p>3 that -- or pardon me. The question I would like to</p> <p>4 present to the Council for your deliberations and</p> <p>5 discussions, so as to give guidance to staff, is: For</p> <p>6 this proposed mitigation measure, should all solar</p> <p>7 arrays be allowed on rabbitbrush shrubland and priority</p> <p>8 habitats with compensatory mitigation at the</p> <p>9 FEIS-recommended ratios, which is the current version</p> <p>10 incorporated into the FEIS, or excluded from all</p> <p>11 rabbitbrush shrubland and priority habitats, which is</p> <p>12 the proposed version that was shown before?</p> <p>13 And I would like to indicate, these are not the</p> <p>14 only two options. If the Council has further options,</p> <p>15 absolutely provide staff with that direction.</p> <p>16 CHAIR DREW: So from my perspective</p> <p>17 are that there is -- we are trying to reduce impacts on</p> <p>18 ferruginous hawks. There is area that is potential for</p> <p>19 their finding their appropriate sources of food. Then</p> <p>20 I think we should look at keeping those and not</p> <p>21 covering them with solar panels. But I am open to</p> <p>22 conversation by the Council. I did want to recognize</p> <p>23 that some of the east solar field is on areas that are</p> <p>24 currently under agricultural production and less</p> <p>25 valuable for the species of concern.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 Do we know what the habitat looks like to that</p> <p>2 south? 'Cause one of the key components here for</p> <p>3 viable habitat is to have larger acreages. If these</p> <p>4 are isolated pieces, they have less importance than</p> <p>5 they would if they're connected to some other existing</p> <p>6 acres to the south and elsewhere. So I don't have</p> <p>7 that -- a full picture of that.</p> <p>8 So at this point, I would -- without that</p> <p>9 information, I would lean towards supporting B, if we</p> <p>10 were to go forward with supporting the solar fields to</p> <p>11 the east here.</p> <p>12 MR. GREENE: And to address your</p> <p>13 question, I do not know off the top of my head what the</p> <p>14 habitat cover is to the south. That is an area outside</p> <p>15 of project control, so I don't know that we have</p> <p>16 on-the-ground surveys of that vegetation. But the</p> <p>17 surrounding areas to the east, west, and north are</p> <p>18 primarily agricultural.</p> <p>19 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.</p> <p>20 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.</p> <p>21 MR. YOUNG: Chair Drew, I also</p> <p>22 support Option B as you have proposed. But I feel for</p> <p>23 reasons that we'll get to, I think, later in our</p> <p>24 discussion, I propo- -- I favor eliminating the entire</p> <p>25 east solar field. But to the extent of this particular</p>

Page 46

1 question point here, I do support Option B.
 2 CHAIR DREW: Others?
 3 Ms. Brewster.
 4 MS. BREWSTER: I will weigh in my
 5 support for Option B at this point. Thank you.
 6 MR. LEVITT: Yeah. This is Eli. I
 7 support Option B as well, as long as the applicant has
 8 some flexibility to adjust.
 9 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Let's move on to
 10 the next question, then.
 11 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you.
 12 Next is the modifications to Habitat 1, which is
 13 the mitigation measure addressing wildlife movement
 14 corridors.
 15 As a result of previous Council discussions, it
 16 has been restructured to -- I should say, the original
 17 version allowed siting of all project components within
 18 modeled wildlife movement corridors, so long as the
 19 applicant produced a corridor mitigation plan in
 20 consultation with EFSEC that we felt appropriately
 21 addressed the impacts.
 22 The current version following the previous Council
 23 meeting's discussion would prohibit the siting of
 24 primary project components, such as specifically
 25 turbines, solar arrays, and battery stations, and any

Page 47

1 movement corridors modeled as medium to very high
 2 linkage and would prohibit secondary project
 3 components, such as roads and power lines and
 4 substations, in modeled high to very high linkage
 5 movement corridors.
 6 And in the previous meeting, Council also directed
 7 staff to seek out guidance from WDFW staff on how they
 8 viewed this -- this modification of the original
 9 measure.
 10 First, EFSEC requested from WDFW --- WDFW staff
 11 how primary project components should be defined for
 12 the purposes of mitigation throughout this document.
 13 And WDFW staff believe that primary project components
 14 should be defined as turbines, solar arrays, and
 15 battery stations, consistent with the current version
 16 of this -- this measure that you see on the left.
 17 The second question we asked was whether primary
 18 project components should be excluded from medium to
 19 very high linkage or high to very high linkage
 20 corridors, and WDFW staff believe that primary project
 21 components should not be sited in medium to very high
 22 linkage corridors, again consistent with the current
 23 version of Hab-1.
 24 And the third occas- -- the third question also
 25 resulted in WDFW staff concurring with the current

Page 48

1 version of Hab-1 that secondary -- that's a typo --
 2 secondary project components should not be sited in
 3 high to very high linkage corridors but could be sited
 4 in medium corridors with a corridor mitigation plan as
 5 included in Hab-1.
 6 And just for the purposes of recollection and this
 7 conversation, this is a map of the modeled wildlife
 8 movement corridors throughout the project area. The
 9 locations most of concern are this -- this central
 10 medium and high linkage corridor that bisects the site,
 11 and the second part is this narrow strip of high and
 12 medium movement corridor. That's more of a concern for
 13 the primary -- the current location of the proposed
 14 primary transmission line for the applicant. And we
 15 can come back to this figure during discussion.
 16 CHAIR DREW: Can you go back to
 17 what -- go ahead. You had another -- another view
 18 there.
 19 MR. GREENE: Yeah, so this is going
 20 to continue. This is a -- a figure propo- -- or
 21 produced for the purposes of this discussion. It's not
 22 exact. It's just additional aid.
 23 And it is for Turbine Option 1, which, just as a
 24 reminder, Turbine Option 1 would site a maximum of 222
 25 turbines, with a maximum height of 499 feet.

Page 49

1 Option 2, for which a similar figure has been
 2 produced but is not in this presentation currently,
 3 would site a maximum of 141 turbines, so fewer
 4 turbines, with a maximum height of 671 feet. Fewer
 5 turbines at a taller height.
 6 In terms of what project components are currently
 7 proposed in high or above wildlife linkage corridor,
 8 there is the primary transmission line at three
 9 different points, one within this bigger square and
 10 twice within the smaller rectangle.
 11 22 Option 1 turbines are within high or above
 12 corridors, and six -- or six Option 2 turbines are
 13 within those high or above corridors.
 14 Within medium -- or within just the medium
 15 linkage -- level of linkage corridor is again the
 16 primary transmission line at three different points and
 17 then 11 Option 1 turbines or 16 Option 2 turbines.
 18 There are no solar arrays, battery substations -- or
 19 battery stations or substations that are currently
 20 proposed in medium or higher modeled habitat movement
 21 corridors.
 22 CHAIR DREW: And of those numbers,
 23 some of those turbine numbers you've identified, we've
 24 already talk about -- talked about eliminating some of
 25 those in those areas, so we've reduced that; is that

Page 50

1 correct?

2 MR. GREENE: Yes. Many of the

3 turbines that are within these movement corridors would

4 also potentially be excluded by other mitigation

5 measures that we're going to discuss in today's

6 meeting; specifically, the ferruginous hawk Species 5

7 mitigation.

8 CHAIR DREW: I will say to Council

9 members that I have been thinking quite a bit about, as

10 Mr. Levitt brought up, connectivity, stranded assets,

11 as well as the impact that turbines, once they're

12 constructed, have on wildlife movement. It's not --

13 they don't entirely block the movement, in fact. I

14 know we have seen, some of us who have been here for a

15 while, seen examples of wildlife throughout the Wild

16 Horse wind project, for example.

17 I would like to suggest that we don't eliminate --

18 that we go back to the original FEIS-recommended

19 version. Because I think it's important to maintain an

20 ability to have infrastructure throughout this project.

21 So perhaps, Sean, if you can remind us again what

22 the original mitigation was.

23 MR. GREENE: Yes. So the original

24 request, that the applicant locate all project

25 components outside of medium or above linkage corridors

Page 51

1 to the extent feasible. Then for any components that

2 would be sited within medium or above corridors, there

3 are a series of measures that we would require to be

4 incorporated into a corridor mitigation plan that

5 describes the proposed impacts and identifies effective

6 mitigation and restoration as a result of those

7 impacts, and that plan would be submitted to the

8 pre-tech -- pre-operational technical advisory group

9 prior to construction, approved by EFSEC, and then

10 monitored and enforced by EFSEC with the guidance of

11 the technical advisory committee throughout the life of

12 the project.

13 CHAIR DREW: Any comments from

14 Council members?

15 Again, I think we've reduced the number of

16 turbines in this area.

17 Mr. Young.

18 MR. YOUNG: I disagree with going

19 back to the original language. I favor the way we

20 configured it on December 20th.

21 MR. GREENE: And I have questions

22 with -- with the various options available, if the

23 Council would like to have that up for discussion.

24 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

25 MR. GREENE: So the first would be

Page 52

1 for primary project components, which is turbines,

2 solar arrays, and battery substations: Should they be

3 allowed within these corridors when combined with the

4 corridor mitigation plan, which is the version included

5 within the FEIS; excluded from high to very high

6 linkage corridors -- again, there are no very high

7 modeled linkage corridors within the project area, but

8 from high to very high -- or excluded from medium to

9 very high linkage corridors, which is the current

10 version that was shown as discussed at the previous

11 Council meeting.

12 CHAIR DREW: Are there any other

13 comments from Council members?

14 Mr. Livingston.

15 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I -- I'm in

16 agreement with Lenny. I want to stick with what we

17 agreed to back in December, if possible.

18 CHAIR DREW: So to exclude...

19 MR. GREENE: This question is

20 specific to primary components. There's a

21 subsequent --

22 CHAIR DREW: Primary.

23 MR. GREENE: -- question.

24 CHAIR DREW: Solar arrays, BESS, and

25 turbines from medium to very high linkage corridors.

Page 53

1 MR. GREENE: Yes.

2 CHAIR DREW: Okay. C.

3 Are there any other comments from Council members?

4 Ms. Brewster.

5 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. Sean, can you

6 talk about the transmission components that might be

7 affected by this?

8 MR. GREENE: So there is a

9 subsequent question to this one regarding how the

10 Council would like to incorporate exclusions for

11 secondary components, and transmission lines are part

12 of that.

13 This first question is just regarding turbines,

14 solar arrays, and BESSes, or battery stations. But the

15 primary concern for transmission lines is, as I

16 mentioned, this -- this area, the primary transmission

17 line for the project does run from east to west through

18 this area. So it would have to be resited further

19 north. And then the current proposed line runs through

20 this red rectangle to the left, and at two points it

21 does cross a modeled high linkage movement corridor, so

22 it would not be allowed in those sites and would have

23 to be, again, restructured to a different location.

24 CHAIR DREW: But that's coming next.

25 MR. GREENE: Yes, that is the -- the

Page 54

1 next question. This first question is -- is just --
 2 CHAIR DREW: First one's about --
 3 MR. GREENE: -- dealing with
 4 turbines --
 5 CHAIR DREW: -- turbines --
 6 MR. GREENE: -- solar arrays, and --
 7 CHAIR DREW: -- solar arrays --
 8 MR. GREENE: -- battery stations.
 9 CHAIR DREW: -- and BESS.
 10 MR. GREENE: Yes.
 11 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Levitt.
 12 MR. LEVITT: Well, I guess I just
 13 wanted to ask, so when we say "wildlife corridor," are
 14 we primarily talking about pronghorn or other species
 15 as well?
 16 MR. GREENE: There are other species
 17 that will make use of these corridors: Deer and the
 18 like. It is modeled based on the -- I forget the name
 19 of the organization. It is the -- the Washington
 20 Wildlife Movement Corridor Working Group, I believe.
 21 That -- that is the data set that is being used for
 22 this figure here, and it covers a variety of species.
 23 MR. LEVITT: And is this the figure
 24 that was also used at one point for transportation
 25 planning, or are the purposes broader than -- for this

Page 55

1 data?
 2 MR. GREENE: I don't have the answer
 3 to that question right now.
 4 MR. LEVITT: I guess -- I guess my
 5 concern is that we're primarily looking at a wildlife
 6 corridor for sort of a reintroduced species that -- I'm
 7 not a wildlife expert, but I don't believe the
 8 pronghorn are threatened or endangered. So I'm
 9 concerned that we're making large adjustments to the
 10 project similar to what we're doing for ferruginous
 11 hawk when the species is not threatened or endangered.
 12 I guess I'm -- I'm interested in more compromise
 13 options, if possible.
 14 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Livingston?
 15 MR. LIVINGSTON: I think I might be
 16 able to address some of that. So I haven't looked at
 17 the habitat connectivity study, itself -- other than
 18 these data layers that have been provided to us -- in
 19 some time. It's based on existing habitat, so it'd be
 20 shrubsteppe or interior grassland, shrublands. And
 21 then some of the species that they did modeling for
 22 included Townsend's ground squirrels, badgers. You
 23 know, I can't -- I can't tell you all of them. It
 24 wasn't, in fact -- it was done before or right after
 25 the pronghorn were reintroduced. So it wasn't based on

Page 56

1 pronghorn. It was based on other species that are
 2 dependent upon having habitat connected on the ground
 3 for their -- their movement patterns. So it's not just
 4 pronghorn. This is a number of different species that
 5 they're looking at.
 6 There were a few -- some of the importance of this
 7 corridor habitat is, if you look at everything
 8 surrounding it, all the green is non-habitat. What's
 9 remaining in the Horse Heaven Hill is, along the
 10 ridgeline, you have that red corridor that goes up in
 11 the northwest corner of the map that goes north to
 12 south, and then you have this one band that goes right
 13 through the middle of this project, way out, but then
 14 connects to habitat further south. Ultimately, there's
 15 some connectivity that goes into Oregon.
 16 And so there's this small band of habitat
 17 remaining, connecting wildlife core habitat areas
 18 across this -- this landscape. So that's the -- that's
 19 the importance of these areas for area species that
 20 would -- that would use that.
 21 CHAIR DREW: A question that I have.
 22 And thank you for that. Again, kind of getting back to
 23 the disruptive nature if we're not -- let's say we
 24 don't have solar arrays, we don't have BESS, but
 25 there's temporary -- fewer -- significantly fewer, I

Page 57

1 would say -- turbines in that area, and they have a
 2 wild- -- wildlife corridor plan.
 3 Can you put those options back up again, please?
 4 A, B, and C.
 5 MR. GREENE: Okay.
 6 CHAIR DREW: So --
 7 MR. GREENE: And I would like to --
 8 CHAIR DREW: -- excluded -- maybe B.
 9 If we looked at excluded from the high linkage corridor
 10 area and combined with a corridor mitigation plan, is
 11 that someplace we can get to? Rather than the medium.
 12 But you're looking at, Mike -- sorry. I'm just
 13 asking you again.
 14 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah. Chair, are
 15 you asking for these primary components or secondary?
 16 CHAIR DREW: Well, the primary
 17 components -- you know, we're not -- they're not
 18 planning, but we could say solar arrays and BESS, but
 19 the turbines are the only ones.
 20 MR. LIVINGSTON: Right.
 21 CHAIR DREW: And if -- if so, that's
 22 fine. I just want to confirm, given Eli's question as
 23 well.
 24 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, so it's hard
 25 to track where -- what we agreed to with those red

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 turbine strings in that map at the beginning of the 2 presentation to what we're talking about right now, 3 whether there would be primary components -- turbines, 4 specifically -- in that area or not. I -- I don't 5 recall. It'd be best to keep the turbines out of 6 there. And from medium to the very high linkage 7 corridors. That would be my preference. 8 CHAIR DREW: Okay. 9 MR. LEVITT: And, Mike, when you say 10 best to keep them out, is this based on research that 11 WDFW has done about the porosity of wind turbines in 12 specific species that were -- were considered when 13 making the -- the wildlife corridor map? 14 MR. LIVINGSTON: It's -- it's a 15 combination, Eli, of remaining habitat, the species 16 that might exist there -- Townsend's ground squirrels, 17 for example -- those being a primary prey for 18 ferruginous hawks, and so their -- it -- you know, 19 their interest in foraging in those areas to obtain 20 for -- food for -- for themselves as well as their 21 young as they're raising them, so it's a combination. 22 These -- these habitat linkages are, you know, the 23 remaining habitat in an area that animals can use 24 either to live or to migrate through or to forage, and 25 so I have a concern because there's so little of it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 includes things like roads, substations, transmission 2 lines. So should these secondary components be allowed 3 within corridors with the corridor mitigation plan, 4 which was the FEIS version, excluded from high to very 5 high linkage corridors, which is the current version 6 based on the previous Council meeting, or further 7 excluded from medium to very high linkage corridors as 8 well? 9 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young. 10 MR. YOUNG: Could we go back and 11 look at the language from December 20? Because I think 12 there was a last sentence that was -- that was not read 13 here this afternoon about the applicant could site 14 secondary components in the medium linkage if they 15 produced the rationale that satisfied EFSEC. 16 Is that incorporated into Option C for the 17 secondary components? 18 MR. GREENE: For secondary 19 components, the current version is Option B, which 20 excludes them from high to very high but would allow 21 secondary components within medium modeled corridor 22 linkage with this corridor mitigation plan. That was 23 based on -- pardon me. That was based on the 24 discussion from the previous Council meeting. 25 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 left in that area that it's super important for all of 2 the critters that are dependent upon the shrubsteppe 3 habitat. 4 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you. 5 That's helpful for my understanding. 6 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Levitt, 7 what's your thought at this point? 8 MR. LEVITT: Yeah, I guess I can 9 live with B or C. I'll go with the -- go with the flow 10 of the Council. 11 CHAIR DREW: Any other comments from 12 Council members? 13 Thank you. 14 I think, Ms. Brewster. 15 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I was just 16 going to say Councilman Livingston's comments are very 17 helpful. So for the primary components, I guess I -- I 18 will agree with C. I think if B could be a possible 19 compromise. But I'm going to defer to WDFW's opinion 20 on that. 21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 22 So I will say let's then move on with C. 23 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you. 24 Then the next question is the same question but 25 essentially for secondary project components, which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 the options again? 2 MR. GREENE: Yes. 3 MR. YOUNG: That seems to be like a 4 modified -- a modified B. Because our discussions 5 on -- if I got this right, our discussions on December 6 20th did not take it so far as to completely exclude 7 secondary components from medium. 8 MR. GREENE: Yes. And -- 9 MR. YOUNG: Is that correct? 10 MR. GREENE: That is correct. And 11 this -- this version shown here, the current version is 12 B, which does not exclude secondary components from 13 medium. It just would -- 14 MR. YOUNG: Well, but it puts -- it 15 puts a condition on putting them in medium, as they 16 would have to meet the corridor mitigation plan, and 17 the rationale would have to be presented to EFSEC. 18 It's not just open season on -- on medium areas 19 under -- under what we talked about on the 20th. 20 MR. GREENE: Okay. 21 MR. YOUNG: Correct? 22 MR. GREENE: And -- 23 MR. YOUNG: I want to make sure I'm 24 correct. 25 MR. GREENE: Yes.</p>

Page 62

1 MR. YOUNG: I hope I said that
 2 right.
 3 MR. GREENE: Yes. With the current
 4 version, based on our understanding of the previous
 5 Council discussion, secondary components in medium
 6 linkage areas would still need to be presented to EFSEC
 7 with a corridor mitigation plan included.
 8 If there is a desire to remove that stipulation
 9 and allow secondary components to be sited within
 10 medium corridor linkage without a mitigation plan, that
 11 can be incorporated into this -- this measure, if
 12 that's the Council's desire.
 13 MR. YOUNG: I think that's the way
 14 that B is written right now. And so B does not really
 15 reflect the totality of where we landed on secondary
 16 components on December 20th. B -- B should have
 17 additional language about siting in medium is
 18 predicated upon an approval by EFSEC and a corridor
 19 mitigation plan.
 20 MR. GREENE: Yes.
 21 MR. HENDERSON: I don't think
 22 there's any disagreement about the current ver- -- what
 23 the current version is, just how it's being described
 24 here in B. It's inadequately --
 25 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

Page 63

1 MR. HENDERSON: -- described here in
 2 B.
 3 MR. YOUNG: That's right.
 4 MR. GREENE: Yes.
 5 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
 6 MR. GREENE: I agree with that. I
 7 used abbreviated text just for this question, but
 8 the -- the essence of Option B here is the full text of
 9 that current version based on the 12/20 meeting that --
 10 that was shown earlier. I should have added more
 11 descriptive text to this answer.
 12 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for that
 13 clarification. And with that clarification, I can
 14 support Option B for the secondary components.
 15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Other comments?
 16 So this is the secondary components, the
 17 transmission lines.
 18 Can you show us again -- let's see the map. Which
 19 one?
 20 So -- and then you had another one with open --
 21 MR. GREENE: Yes.
 22 CHAIR DREW: So essentially not --
 23 go ahead and describe what this is again.
 24 MR. GREENE: Sure. So the -- the
 25 empty spaces that you see, the -- the small empty

Page 64

1 spaces in this transmission line here and then the
 2 larger square incorporates all areas of high linkage.
 3 So no components, primary or secondary, would be
 4 allowed in those areas, and that's why in this visual
 5 aid, those areas have been erased of project
 6 components.
 7 As currently designed, the project's primary
 8 transmission line does go through this -- I think it
 9 might be shown on -- yes. The primary transmission
 10 line does go through this high linkage area throughout
 11 much of that -- that central corridor and then patches
 12 through high linkage area twice in this -- this upper
 13 corridor here.
 14 So for secondary components, that would be the --
 15 the primary effect of this mitigation being imposed,
 16 that the primary transmission line would have to be
 17 redesigned to be located, for this main corridor,
 18 farther north, and for this -- this northwestern
 19 corridor, likely farther west.
 20 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Livingston.
 21 MR. LIVINGSTON: Sean, do we -- do
 22 you know what the size of the transmission line will
 23 be, kV?
 24 MR. GREENE: Not off the top of my
 25 head. I want to say 230 kilovolt. I'm not sure if

Page 65

1 that's correct, though.
 2 MR. LIVINGSTON: And there would
 3 likely be a road associated with it, gravel road, or do
 4 we know?
 5 MR. GREENE: I don't know if there
 6 is a road associated with the transmission line
 7 throughout this extent, but there are project roads
 8 that cross much of the project area, so they would be
 9 affected by exclusion from high linkage corridors as
 10 well.
 11 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I just wonder
 12 if there's possibilities of associating these with
 13 existing roads and other lines that are already out
 14 there. We don't -- I don't have a sense of that or if
 15 we're talking about uninterrupted habitat having a
 16 brand-new transmission line and a road going through
 17 it.
 18 CHAIR DREW: Is there a possibility
 19 that, from what you say, we could say that -- let me
 20 think -- that it would be excluded from high -- can you
 21 take the lang- -- bring the language back up for me?
 22 Thank you.
 23 Secondary project components should be excluded
 24 from high and very high linkage corridors unless there
 25 is existing infras- -- then it's following existing

Page 66

1 infrastructure and it's -- comes with the corridor
 2 mitigation plan and through the staff? I'm trying to
 3 figure out a pathway where that can be considered.
 4 Ms. Brewster.
 5 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I just want to
 6 voice my support for preserving the corridor areas and
 7 then voice a concern with the reality of moving
 8 transmission corridors. I -- I don't know how easy
 9 that is to redesign and if that is the type of thing
 10 that makes a project like this infeasible. So I don't
 11 know if staff could provide more information on that or
 12 could be acquired.
 13 MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is
 14 Sonia Bumpus, if I may.
 15 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.
 16 MS. BUMPUS: I was just going to
 17 mention as I was listening to the deliberation that the
 18 FEIS did consider the impacts to these corridors and
 19 the wildlife and the habitat, and -- and so I think
 20 that the corridor mitigation plan, that mitigation that
 21 came in through the FEIS is good mitigation here. So I
 22 just wanted to -- to make that comment.
 23 And part of that too is just to say that, for the
 24 secondary components, I think that there -- there would
 25 be some -- some very -- very real consequences to the

Page 67

1 project design if it goes -- if we start to go outside
 2 of the proposed mitigation measure in the FEIS, such --
 3 such that we may even see just the -- the totality of
 4 the project amended.
 5 And so I just wanted to -- to make that comment,
 6 just hearing that some of the Council members were --
 7 were wondering about that.
 8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 9 Other comments?
 10 I think we're -- I have a view that we may -- and
 11 maybe that's not correct -- we may be a bit conflicted
 12 on an absolute exclusion even in the high linkage
 13 corridors for the secondary movement.
 14 Can we -- I guess I'm going to have to ask for a
 15 vote on this.
 16 MR. LEVITT: Before a vote, may I
 17 ask a clarification question?
 18 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 19 MR. LEVITT: I'm sorry if I missed
 20 this. Is it possible that some of these are a little
 21 hybrid, like you could do B and there would be a
 22 corridor mitigation plan?
 23 CHAIR DREW: I think the problem
 24 comes from it be- -- the exclusion being in the high
 25 linkage corridor according to this map. Because we've

Page 68

1 heard that the current design has transmission lines
 2 that go through the area identified on the map as a
 3 high linkage corridor.
 4 Again, I would say that it is disturbance. It may
 5 already be disturbed. We don't know that from looking
 6 at the map that we have in front of us. So I think
 7 that presents us with a -- a challenge.
 8 Go ahead. Somebody else.
 9 Mr. Livingston.
 10 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.
 11 Even though we don't know what's underneath these
 12 colors on the ground and the ability to colocate some
 13 of this infrastructure with existing infrastructure,
 14 which is a best management practice if you can do that,
 15 can we stall on this one -- hate to say that, but give
 16 us a little bit of time, give us some information so
 17 that we know what this looks like on the ground?
 18 Otherwise, with the information I have, I'm going to be
 19 conservative in my vote.
 20 CHAIR DREW: So can we say perhaps
 21 that if it's colocated with existing roads and
 22 infrastructure, then it would be a conversation in a
 23 mitigation plan?
 24 MR. LIVINGSTON: And if that's not
 25 possible, what do we do then?

Page 69

1 MS. BUMPUS: Yeah, I would propose
 2 that, you know -- this is Sonia Bumpus. I propose at
 3 that point, you still have your corridor mitigation
 4 plan, which -- which was proposed in the FEIS.
 5 CHAIR DREW: I hear -- I hear
 6 concern. I don't know that we -- I mean, I don't know
 7 how much more information we could get on this going
 8 forward. We are deep into the details, so I am going
 9 to go ahead and ask for a vote of -- Mr. Greene, go
 10 ahead.
 11 MR. GREENE: Yes. I just wanted to
 12 say that if it is the Council's desire to see a version
 13 of B, so excluding from high to very high linkage
 14 corridors for secondary components but allowing them
 15 within medium or, and then the modification would be,
 16 when colocated with existing infrastructure, that is a
 17 version of this mitigation that we could write up.
 18 CHAIR DREW: How does that sound to
 19 Council members?
 20 MR. LEVITT: I'm interested in that.
 21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Young.
 22 MR. YOUNG: I'd -- I'd like to have
 23 that clarified once more and repeated.
 24 MR. GREENE: Sure. So secondary
 25 components would be allowed in medium or below habitat

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 linkage corridors with the habitat mitiga- -- or 2 sorry -- corridor mitigation plan and then only allowed 3 in high to very high linkage corridors when colocated 4 with existing infrastructure and, again, accompanied by 5 a corridor mitigation plan. 6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for the 7 clarification, but I do not support that. 8 CHAIR DREW: Okay. I will call for 9 a vote on the version just described by Mr. Greene: 10 Secondary project components allowed in medium to high 11 linkage -- and I might -- 12 MR. GREENE: Sorry. It's medium -- 13 CHAIR DREW: Say it again, please. 14 MR. GREENE: Yes. Of course. 15 Secondary components would be allowed in medium 16 and below when accompanied by a corridor mitigation 17 plan, and then excluded from high to very high unless 18 colocated with existing infrastructure and, again, 19 accompanied by a corridor mitigation plan. 20 CHAIR DREW: Okay. All those in 21 favor, please say "aye," or raise your hands. 22 Okay. 23 All those opposed. 24 Okay. 25 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young votes "no."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 prove to EFSEC and the -- PTAG that the nest was not 2 active, that there was no viable habitat in the area, 3 and they had produced a species-specific mitigation and 4 monitoring plan. 5 As a result of previous Council deliberations, 6 this measure has been amended to exclude all primary 7 project components from that two-mile radius of any 8 identified nest but potentially allow for secondary 9 components based on those initial restrictions: Again, 10 proving that the nest is not active, there is no viable 11 habitat, and they have produced a species-specific 12 mitigation and monitoring plan. 13 And that is the text throughout. Essentially just 14 reflect that change. And also based on Council 15 direction, staff -- EFSEC staff reached out to WDFW 16 staff on whether there was an indica- -- or a belief 17 that there were any project components that could be 18 sited within two miles of a documented nest that would 19 not have adverse effects on the ferruginous hawk, and 20 WDFW staff indicated that there are no project 21 components that could be sited within that two-mile 22 radius without having adverse impacts. So all project 23 components would have an adverse impact. 24 And this is, again, the visual aid figure. The 25 areas with the red-shaded corridors are the existing</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Voted for it. 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, you did. 4 I just didn't see -- 5 MR. YOUNG: No, I -- 6 CHAIR DREW: So we will -- 7 MR. YOUNG: I did not -- did not 8 vote for it. The hand -- the hands from -- 9 CHAIR DREW: Right. 10 MR. YOUNG: -- the first vote were 11 not taken down when I raised my hand. 12 CHAIR DREW: Yes, I saw that. 13 Mr. Young voted "no." 14 It is approved. Thank you, everybody. 15 Let's move on to the next question. 16 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you. 17 The next is Species 5, which is the 18 species-specific mitigation for the ferruginous hawk. 19 There are several slides of this. The original text is 20 on the left from the FEIS. The amended text is on the 21 right, current to the previous Council meeting. 22 The original version would only -- only allow 23 project components to be sited within two miles -- a 24 two-mile radius of an existing -- or a documented 25 ferruginous hawk nest, if the applicant were able to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 proposed micro-siting corridors that, with the current 2 version of Species 5, would not be allowed to site any 3 turbines or other project -- primary project 4 components, such as solar arrays and battery substa- -- 5 battery stations. 6 The clear-colored corridors are areas outside of 7 those two-mile radii and would be allowed to site 8 project components normally. So the areas that would 9 be included within this exclusion area, so the two-mile 10 radius of all identified nests, would include 116 11 Option 1 turbines or 73 Option 2 turbines. It would 12 include the entirety of the east solar siting area. It 13 would include three proposed substation locations and 14 significant portions of the primary transmission line. 15 So the question for the Council. Again, this is a 16 two-part question. The first is regarding just primary 17 project components, so turbines, solar arrays, and 18 battery substations. Should those primary project 19 components be allowed within two miles of a documented 20 ferruginous hawk nest only when the applicant can 21 demonstrate that the nest is inactive, no viable 22 foraging habitat is present, and the applicant produces 23 a mitigation and management plan specific to that 24 species, which was the version of this measure included 25 in the FEIS.</p>

Page 74

1 Option B would exclude all primary project
 2 components within a half mile of documented nests,
 3 which is the existing WDFW seasonal buffer, and which
 4 essentially make that permanent for all project
 5 components. And then for any primary project
 6 components within a half mile to two miles of a nest,
 7 the original Species 5 would again apply, so project
 8 components would be allowed if the applicant can meet
 9 those -- those requirements.

10 And then the third version here is what was
 11 proposed at the last Council meeting, which is that all
 12 primary project components are excluded from areas
 13 within two miles of a documented ferruginous hawk nest.

14 CHAIR DREW: Question for you: Are
 15 all -- based on our earlier map of the areas identified
 16 by red turbines and the multiple compounding impacts
 17 that those turbines have that we discussed earlier,
 18 removing those turbines in those areas, does that
 19 remove all turbines within the two miles of a
 20 documented ferruginous hawk nest?

21 MR. GREENE: I -- I would say every
 22 red-colored turbine in that first figure is not only
 23 red because it was in -- it is within two miles of a
 24 nest, but all red turbines on that figure are within a
 25 two -- two-mile radius --

Page 75

1 CHAIR DREW: And there --
 2 MR. GREENE: -- of a nest.
 3 CHAIR DREW: -- are no others...
 4 MR. GREENE: There are no other red
 5 turbines that are outside of --
 6 CHAIR DREW: There are no --
 7 MR. GREENE: -- a two-mile radius --
 8 CHAIR DREW: -- turbines that are --
 9 MR. GREENE: -- of a nest.
 10 CHAIR DREW: Yeah. Okay.

11 So I want to start from that question, because I
 12 want us to seriously consider the solar arrays and BESS
 13 if they are in the same category of creating impacts to
 14 the ferruginous hawk foraging area, which is what I
 15 focused on by the new mitigation measure that we talked
 16 about earlier.

17 In my opinion, I think it is the turbines that are
 18 the most impact, and it's also the elimination of
 19 existing priority habitat. But if what we are doing is
 20 putting solar arrays within those two miles of the
 21 nests on agricultural already disturbed property, I
 22 guess my view is it should be perhaps just the turbines
 23 that are eliminated in the two-mile ferruginous hawk
 24 zone.
 25 So comments on that.

Page 76

1 Mr. Livingston.
 2 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I'm still --
 3 I'm still supporting C, which would exclude all primary
 4 compo- -- project components. And if that would
 5 include solar, then I would -- I would be supporting
 6 that still.

7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Young.
 8 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, I agree with
 9 Mr. Livingston, and I -- I support Option C.

10 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Others?
 11 MR. LEVITT: I think I might need a
 12 review of the map again, because I was a little
 13 confused by that explanation, but I think I do not
 14 support C.

15 CHAIR DREW: Okay.
 16 MR. GREENE: Can you clarify which
 17 map you would like to see again?
 18 MR. LEVITT: Sorry. The one you
 19 went over where you were saying clear -- clear
 20 sections. It was just before --
 21 MR. GREENE: Yes.
 22 MR. LEVITT: -- we got -- yeah.
 23 MR. GREENE: Yeah. So the red-
 24 shaded sections are sections of the micro-si- -- the
 25 wind micro-siting corridor where turbines would no

Page 77

1 longer be allowed under the current form of the
 2 mitigation, so they are within two miles of a
 3 documented nest. The clear are areas outside of that
 4 two-mile buffer. So wind turbines would be allowed to
 5 be sited normally.

6 MR. LEVITT: And green is to be
 7 sited normally?
 8 MR. GREENE: Yes, green are the
 9 actual currently proposed locations of turbines.

10 MR. LEVITT: And solar fields,
 11 like -- there's solar fields on the west, and they're
 12 demarcated by cross lines?
 13 MR. GREENE: Yes, they are. And
 14 they are with -- they are outside of that two-mile
 15 radius of any identified nest. The east solar array,
 16 which is not shown on this map because it -- it was
 17 excluded for a number of mitigation reasons, would be
 18 fully within a two-mile radius of a nest.

19 MR. LEVITT: Do you show it with
 20 your cursor approximately where you --
 21 MR. GREENE: Yes. It's -- it's
 22 right -- well, it's -- it's right here mostly actually.
 23 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Other comments from
 25 Council members?

Page 78

1 MR. LEVITT: Mr. Greene, if we were
2 to go with C, would the applicant have the option of
3 trying to adjust where the -- where that solar station
4 is?
5 MR. GREENE: Likely not for the
6 solar array, just because there's a lot involved with
7 the -- the siting of project components and the only
8 areas where full -- a full complement of surveys had
9 been performed are the current cross-hatched solar
10 arrays or those corridors, the -- the micro-siting
11 corridors. So they could identify a different site and
12 propose that. It would require more collection of data
13 and analysis.
14 CHAIR DREW: Probably an amendment.
15 MR. GREENE: Yes.
16 MR. LEVITT: And the reason they
17 probably have two sets is one is connected to one side
18 of the project, and another is connected to different
19 parts of the project; is that correct?
20 Infrastructure-wise?
21 MR. GREENE: The primary
22 transmission line does connect the eastern part of the
23 project to the western part, but there are substations
24 located on both sides. So I would imagine that each
25 solar array connects to different substations as

Page 79

1 currently proposed.
2 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.
3 CHAIR DREW: Any other comments?
4 We will take a vote. The vote will be whether or
5 not the primary project components, all of them --
6 turbines, solar arrays, and BESS -- should be excluded
7 from all areas within two miles of a documented
8 ferruginous hawk nest.
9 So we're voting on C. And all those in favor,
10 raise hands.
11 All those opposed.
12 Put your hands down.
13 All those opposed.
14 So we will be -- okay. So what are we moving
15 forward with, then?
16 Ms. Brewster.
17 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah, I guess maybe a
18 bit more discussion about a compromise like B. I'm in
19 favor of excluding -- I guess my concern is maybe the
20 east solar array and its -- how it's affected,
21 considering the discussion we had earlier about the
22 east solar array and the habitat types.
23 So I guess I am in favor of the two-mile hard
24 boundary for most things, but I think I have a question
25 about that east solar array.

Page 80

1 CHAIR DREW: Okay. And your
2 question on the east solar array is...?
3 MS. BREWSTER: Well, I guess not so
4 much a question as not -- I guess I am just not a -- I
5 haven't had a chance to think about that east solar
6 array and its effects and how it is affected by the
7 two-mile boundaries and especially around the historic
8 nests that may be demonstrated as not viable.
9 CHAIR DREW: Okay.
10 MS. BREWSTER: So that's where --
11 why I'm waffling a little bit.
12 CHAIR DREW: Okay.
13 Mr. Levitt.
14 MR. LEVITT: Yeah, I guess I have a
15 question for Mr. Greene, Mr. Livingston, or other EFSEC
16 staff with expertise. But I guess I'm curious if there
17 is a best management practice that has been in place in
18 Washington or more widely in Western states for -- for
19 these specific questions, half mile or two miles.
20 Like, do most states do B? Do most states do C? Et
21 cetera.
22 MR. GREENE: I would say, in most
23 existing cases, ferruginous hawk nests are not
24 necessarily provided a buffer from development. This
25 was proposed in this case because this species is --

Page 81

1 their population levels are very fragile in this area,
2 and there's a -- a significant threat to their
3 continued existence in the area both as a result of
4 direct mortality and loss of foraging habitat.
5 The two-mile buffer was arrived at through
6 discussions with WDFW staff as an indication of the
7 general home range of ferruginous hawks from their
8 nests, and that was their guidance on the desired
9 buffer that WDFW staff would like to see implemented
10 for all project components.
11 The -- the Option B here that EFSEC staff
12 developed as a potential option for discussion was
13 arrived at by using the existing WDFW seasonal buffers
14 for project -- for work activities for active
15 ferruginous hawk nests, which is half a mile, and
16 considering a case where that half-mile seasonal buffer
17 is made permanent for all project components and no
18 siting would be done in that area with the remaining
19 1.5-mile radius of the home range being covered by the
20 existing restrictions within the FEIS version of this
21 measure, which is, again, the inactive nest, nonviable
22 habitat, and a mitigation and monitoring and management
23 plan.
24 CHAIR DREW: So would an option be
25 that we would not allow -- which I think we've already

Page 82

1 done, but just to be sure -- turbines to be constructed
 2 within the two-mile documented ferruginous hawk nest
 3 but would allow solar arrays or BESS -- I don't even
 4 know that I want to go to the demonstrating that a nest
 5 is inactive, I guess.
 6 MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is --
 7 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 8 MS. BUMPUS: -- Sonia Bumpus.
 9 I was just going to mention, you know, as I'm
 10 listening here, that the Council talked about
 11 eliminating the red turbines, which are also turbines
 12 within this two-mile --
 13 CHAIR DREW: Right.
 14 MS. BUMPUS: -- buffer. So I wonder
 15 if maybe it makes more sense to look at this question
 16 as just about solar arrays and BESS.
 17 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 18 MS. BUMPUS: And then the other
 19 thing I was just going to mention is that I think that
 20 the removal of the red turbines that is being
 21 contemplated, it was noted that this was about
 22 compounding impacts, getting at reducing but not able
 23 to eliminate multiple different kinds of impacts:
 24 Visual, so on; avian impacts, these kinds of things.
 25 So I don't know. I think maybe removing turbines from

Page 83

1 this and just thinking about it in terms of solar
 2 arrays and BESS, particularly if the Council's leaning
 3 towards removal of the red turbines.
 4 CHAIR DREW: I think that's what
 5 I'm -- exactly what I'm trying to get to here.
 6 And what would we -- what --
 7 MR. GREENE: So I -- I guess --
 8 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.
 9 MR. GREENE: -- the -- the version
 10 that I think you're discussing would exclude wind
 11 turbines from within a two-mile buffer of any
 12 documented nest. And for solar arrays and BESSes, the
 13 question is whether you would like to see the existing
 14 restrictions from the FEIS version of this measure
 15 required for siting those components or allow those
 16 components to be sited free of those restrictions.
 17 CHAIR DREW: I guess my preference
 18 would be to allow the -- those -- that
 19 infrastructure -- or that -- those primary project
 20 components to be included or allowed and not -- I guess
 21 the -- that would be my preference. With the exclusion
 22 we've already done for the solar arrays on the priority
 23 habitat areas.
 24 MR. GREENE: Yes. In either of
 25 those versions I just mentioned, the mitigation

Page 84

1 management plan, I assume, would stay. That's --
 2 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 3 MR. GREENE: That's pretty standard
 4 for all of our species mitigation.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 6 What are views of Council members?
 7 Mr. Levitt?
 8 MR. LEVITT: I guess I think that
 9 can be persuaded. But B, to me, still sounds more
 10 appealing than A or C.
 11 CHAIR DREW: Say that again. It
 12 sounds more...?
 13 MR. LEVITT: Appealing.
 14 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Okay.
 15 I -- again, I come back to: Requiring the work to
 16 be done for solar or BESS, I think, is -- is not the
 17 same as looking at the nests in the context of the
 18 impact from a turbine. So I would not have the
 19 mitigation on those two project components.
 20 That's what I'll propose: That the Species 5, we
 21 still want a mitigation plan, but the solar arrays and
 22 the BESS can be included with the species management
 23 plan.
 24 Does that make sense?
 25 Ms. Brewster.

Page 85

1 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah, just -- so to
 2 clarify, you're leaning towards the Option A, so there
 3 would be no restriction such as the half-mile seasonal
 4 buffer around a nest site; is that correct?
 5 CHAIR DREW: Yes. Already -- I
 6 mean, we can keep the exclusion of the turbines within
 7 that area, which we are also looking at another way,
 8 but I think we should also keep it in here.
 9 So it would be that the turbines would not be --
 10 would be excluded from all areas, but solar and BESS
 11 would be allowed.
 12 Any discussion?
 13 MS. BREWSTER: I think I would be
 14 inclined to lean towards B. That still leaves some
 15 buffer around an area that, as was discussed by the
 16 Fish and Wildlife expert, that the nests are
 17 generally -- nest sites can be close together and used,
 18 so I feel like that would leave a little leeway without
 19 entirely excluding --
 20 CHAIR DREW: Okay.
 21 MS. BREWSTER: -- infrastructure
 22 there.
 23 CHAIR DREW: I could do that.
 24 Let's -- my -- okay. If the applicant would want to
 25 build in that area, then they would need to demonstrate

Page 86

1 that the nest is inactive or that no viable foraging
 2 habitat is present and produce a mitigation and
 3 management plan.
 4 Okay? More discussion on that?
 5 MR. LEVITT: This is Eli,
 6 Mr. Greene. So we -- we have a threshold for the
 7 applicant to be able to prove whether a nest is active
 8 or inactive, right? If it's not used for, like, two or
 9 three years or something, it's inactive; is that
 10 correct? Or maybe it is --
 11 MR. GREENE: Yeah, the -- the exact
 12 methodology for determining whether a nest is active
 13 and whether the habitat is viable is something that
 14 would be developed through conversations with us, the
 15 applicant, WDFW, through the PTAG.
 16 The applicant has proposed a number of measures
 17 for how to -- to reach those determinations, but we
 18 haven't really considered them at this point, because
 19 we are waiting for final determination on this measure
 20 and the incorporation of the PTAG.
 21 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.
 22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So this vote is
 23 on excluding turbines from all areas within two miles
 24 and allowing solar arrays and BESS on B.
 25 Ms. Osborne.

Page 87

1 MS. OSBORNE: Sorry, Chair Drew. I
 2 just was being a little bit ahead.
 3 CHAIR DREW: Ahead of the question.
 4 MS. OSBORNE: Yep. Sorry about
 5 that.
 6 CHAIR DREW: That's okay.
 7 So is that clear? We would exclude turbines in
 8 the two-mile, and the solar arrays and BESS would be
 9 excluded from all areas within a half mile of a
 10 documented nest, but allow the half mile to two miles
 11 of a documented hawk nest for solar arrays and BESS if
 12 the applicant can demonstrate that the nest is
 13 inactive, no viable foraging habitat is present,
 14 produces a mitigation plan.
 15 Okay. All those in favor, raise your hands.
 16 All those opposed.
 17 Okay. It is four to two. So that is moving
 18 forward.
 19 MR. LEVITT: Chair Drew, clarifying
 20 question for that vote.
 21 I thought at one point --
 22 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 23 MR. LEVITT: -- Director Bumpus
 24 suggested we not think about the turbines in this vote.
 25 So you did include the turbines, correct?

Page 88

1 CHAIR DREW: I did, because it's,
 2 for me, a double safety, if you will, to say here
 3 they're excluded, so there's no question about that
 4 they would be excluded in the two-mile area. But
 5 they're also ones we're planning to exclude anyway.
 6 MR. LEVITT: Okay.
 7 MR. GREENE: I would also say, in
 8 the interest of staff actually implementing these
 9 measures, having that two-mile buffer defined here is
 10 very helpful because we are excluding not just
 11 individual turbine locations; we are excluding sections
 12 of the micro-siting corridor so that turbines aren't
 13 just moved the two feet and suddenly are allowed again.
 14 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you,
 15 everybody. We'll move on to the next one.
 16 MR. GREENE: And the next question
 17 is this same topic again but for secondary components.
 18 I'm sorry. That's -- whoops. That's a typo. Option 3
 19 is not the current version for this.
 20 For secondary components, the version in the FEIS
 21 is also the version that Council was considering at the
 22 previous meeting, which is that secondary components,
 23 such as roads, substations, and transmission lines,
 24 would be allowed within two miles of a documented nest
 25 only when the applicant can demonstrate that the nest

Page 89

1 is inactive, no viable foraging habitat is present, and
 2 produces a mitigation and management plan.
 3 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 4 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to
 5 the notes from our December 20 meeting as far as the
 6 secondary components?
 7 MR. GREENE: Did you mean, like, the
 8 actual text of it?
 9 MR. YOUNG: Yes.
 10 Thank you.
 11 MR. GREENE: What the edit
 12 essentially did was change the beginning of this
 13 measure to fully exclude primary components within that
 14 two-mile buffer, which will now change as a result of
 15 the previous vote, and then make the rest of Species 5
 16 as written only apply to secondary components.
 17 So the rest of the text is essentially the same as
 18 the FEIS version of Species 5.
 19 CHAIR DREW: And that's the original
 20 that's on the left, is the FEIS version, which would --
 21 so maybe to make this easy for everyone, it is the same
 22 as the FEIS version.
 23 All those in favor of maintaining that as we
 24 described on 12/20/23, raise your hand.
 25 I'll ask for discussion.

Page 90

1 Is there any other discussion?
 2 MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Could we --
 3 CHAIR DREW: I should --
 4 MR. YOUNG: Could we flip back to
 5 the questions? I'm still trying to cross-reference the
 6 questions back --
 7 CHAIR DREW: Yeah.
 8 MR. YOUNG: -- to the -- the notes.
 9 CHAIR DREW: My apologies.
 10 MR. YOUNG: So this is for secondary
 11 components.
 12 MR. GREENE: Correct.
 13 MR. YOUNG: And is it that Option A
 14 is -- is what is consistent with both the FEIS and
 15 December 20?
 16 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 17 MR. GREENE: Correct.
 18 MR. YOUNG: And that's what the --
 19 the vote is being called for, is who supports A.
 20 CHAIR DREW: Yes. Yes.
 21 MR. YOUNG: Because of that
 22 consistency?
 23 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 24 MR. YOUNG: Is that correct?
 25 Thanks for the clarification.

Page 91

1 CHAIR DREW: Yeah.
 2 So we're going to vote on A.
 3 All those in favor of A. Unless there's further
 4 discussion.
 5 Sorry. Okay.
 6 All those in favor of A, raise your hand.
 7 Okay. Thank you.
 8 MR. GREENE: Okay. The next and, I
 9 believe, final exclusion measure for today's meeting is
 10 a new measure that we entitled Cultural Resources 3,
 11 which is a desire that was discussed by the Council at
 12 the previous meeting to eliminate -- or exclude all
 13 project components from areas east of the boundaries of
 14 Straub Canyon to reduce the project impacts to identify
 15 TCPs.
 16 And this is what the project would look like
 17 with -- Straub Canyon doesn't fully bisect the project
 18 area, so staff drew a line in the -- the direction of
 19 travel of the canyon from it -- its final extent and
 20 kind of extended that through the project area so that
 21 we would have a line of demarcation. But this is what
 22 the project would look like with the incorporation of
 23 that measure.
 24 And then the question is fairly straightforward,
 25 is just: Should all project components be allowed east

Page 92

1 of Straub Canyon, which is the FEIS version, or
 2 excluded from the areas east of Straub Canyon, which is
 3 the proposed version.
 4 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.
 5 MR. YOUNG: So could you flip back
 6 to the map? I had a question about the -- down at the
 7 extreme southeast tip of -- of the project area here,
 8 there's, like, a red-shaded corridor. Is that --
 9 that's -- is that an area where we've already for other
 10 reasons excluded turbines?
 11 MR. GREENE: You mean this area
 12 here?
 13 MR. YOUNG: No. Up near, like, what
 14 the new project area would be. Yeah, right up there.
 15 MR. GREENE: Yeah. Okay. Yes. I'm
 16 sorry. The -- just the way that we develop these
 17 figures, these red-shaded corridors are areas that are
 18 within two miles of a ferruginous hawk nest, so they
 19 would be excluded by Species 5 for primary project
 20 components.
 21 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
 22 And I do advocate for this option. I -- I think
 23 we would eliminate a large portion of the unmitigable
 24 high, high impacts to traditional cultural properties.
 25 And so much of what is in the area that would be

Page 93

1 eliminated under this option would also resolve
 2 multiple other concerns that we've had with ferruginous
 3 hawk, with wildlife movement corridors, with visual
 4 impacts from the more developed areas off to the east,
 5 with connectivity. So many things. But the dominant
 6 driver for this for me is to address the significant
 7 unmitigable impacts to traditional cultural properties,
 8 and I do support this.
 9 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.
 10 Other comments?
 11 MR. LEVITT: This is Eli. I guess I
 12 would offer up that, you know, we've done our best as a
 13 Council to mitigate environmental impacts, especially
 14 wildlife. And the cultural impacts are challenging, to
 15 say the least. But because we've had such a strong
 16 focus on wildlife, I think that actually ends up
 17 helping with -- just saying at a very high level,
 18 helping with TCP issues presented by some interested
 19 parties.
 20 So I don't know. The demarcation of Straub
 21 Canyon, to me, seems arbitrary and pulled out -- pulled
 22 out of our pocket, so I guess I just -- I can't support
 23 the proposal as is.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 25 Other comments?

Page 94

1 I will say that I respect and understand,
 2 Mr. Young, your reason for putting this forward. I
 3 would say that there are project components in
 4 different -- in areas to the east that don't have the
 5 same multiple compounding impacts as the ones we talked
 6 about earlier. And those would be eliminated in this
 7 proposal.
 8 And I do know and understand that the entire
 9 project does impact traditional cultural properties,
 10 and we are considering that information along with the
 11 environmental, but we also have to consider our
 12 responsibility to support clean energy development as
 13 well, and it's a difficult balancing to do. But in
 14 order to maintain ability for more of the project to
 15 move forward for that clean energy, I would not support
 16 eliminating all of the project to the east.
 17 Mr. Livingston.
 18 MR. LIVINGSTON: I always end up
 19 having more questions than I have answers. But, you
 20 know, it would be -- it would be helpful for me to know
 21 what the -- what would the project's ability -- how
 22 much megawatts can they produce with this, this
 23 proposal; how many turbines are we talking that would
 24 be built; what's the -- what does that look like. I
 25 mean, it is a very different project than what was

Page 95

1 originally proposed, and we also have the other -- all
 2 the other mitigation and avoidance measures that we've
 3 taken have changed the project significantly anyway.
 4 I -- I want to support this, this effort, because
 5 it -- it's a large project with two solar arrays and a
 6 number of turbines in the string. I also know that the
 7 company designed it to include that giant 25-mile-long
 8 corridor, which there's multiple issues with that, of
 9 course.
 10 But seeing what this -- the output of this, and
 11 truly is it not viable? Yeah, it's not viable to what
 12 they built or originally designed for, but it -- could
 13 this be a project in itself? I believe it could. So
 14 I'm -- I'm supportive of it.
 15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.
 16 Other --
 17 MR. YOUNG: I would -- I would --
 18 CHAIR DREW: -- Council members?
 19 MR. YOUNG: Sorry, Chair Drew. I
 20 didn't raise my hand. But I -- I would refer my fellow
 21 Council members to the confidential mapping of the
 22 project's impacts on traditional cultural properties.
 23 Again, everything we've been looking at so far has
 24 been based on the maps where TCP impacts did not
 25 feature into the green/yellow/red categorization of the

Page 96

1 turbines. And you get a different take on the
 2 project's impacts when you look at that confidential
 3 information of the project's impacts on TCPs.
 4 And I'd also put forth that I don't think the
 5 selection of Straub Canyon was a completely arbitrary
 6 thing. If we start looking at maps that represent our
 7 other concerns that we've talked about and that we're
 8 mitigating, particularly where that major north-south
 9 wildlife movement corridor runs through the project,
 10 Straub Canyon and what's east of that, it is a logical
 11 break point to eliminate a lot of impacts associated
 12 with the eastern part of the project. So I'd just put
 13 forth that it was not an arbitrary selection.
 14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 15 Thank you for also mentioning the confidential
 16 maps. I, myself, personally have spent a great deal of
 17 time looking at those maps, so I appreciate you
 18 referencing those. I have considered that. I have
 19 looked at the multiple impacts and the balance that we
 20 are trying to -- I am trying to make with this project.
 21 And we will not eliminate all the impacts and all the
 22 impacts to traditional cultural properties unless we
 23 deny the project.
 24 So I will not be supporting this. I think there
 25 are still elements that can be constructed with a lot

Page 97

1 of the mitigation that we brought forward for many
 2 impacts that we have seen in each of our processes,
 3 again with the FEIS, with the adjudication, and with
 4 public comments.
 5 I think we will need to take a vote.
 6 All those in favor of supporting this proposal to
 7 eliminate all project elements from east of Straub
 8 Canyon, please raise your hand.
 9 Thank you.
 10 All those opposed.
 11 Okay. It fails. Thank you.
 12 Are there other measures for us to consider?
 13 MR. GREENE: No. That is the
 14 entirety.
 15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So Mr. Young.
 16 MR. YOUNG: I -- I would -- I don't
 17 know how it would fit exactly into the force of our
 18 discussion this afternoon, but I think what was
 19 summarized for us at the beginning of the meeting, the
 20 additional input around impacts on aerial firefighting
 21 capabilities that came in for Mr. Lane and chief, the
 22 local fire chief, I think that that might point to some
 23 things that we would want to require of the applicant
 24 to -- if the project moves ahead, that the -- knowing
 25 that aerial firefighting will not be able to be used

Page 98

1 inside the perimeter or within a quarter mile of the
 2 perimeter, it suggests that really serious
 3 consideration is giving -- given to the alternative and
 4 some type of really well-thought-out plan on how fires
 5 can be fought from the ground in those areas that are
 6 not open to aircraft.
 7 CHAIR DREW: I think it is -- I
 8 think that's a good idea. I think we already have a
 9 measure on that, don't we?
 10 MR. GREENE: We don't have a
 11 mitigation measure, but one of the applicant
 12 commitments is to develop a fire management plan in
 13 coordination with EFSEC and local fire response
 14 agencies.
 15 MR. YOUNG: But perhaps what could
 16 be included in there is that the applicant needs to
 17 specifically address how it's going to make up for the
 18 lack of ability to fight fire from the air, which is an
 19 extreme -- probably the single most important initial
 20 attack to what we have. And so I think there's an
 21 added -- added responsibility on the applicant to make
 22 sure that that plan addresses how they're going to make
 23 up for the inability to call for aircraft when aircraft
 24 would otherwise be deployed.
 25 CHAIR DREW: It's my

Page 99

1 understanding -- and maybe the staff can help me
 2 here -- that there isn't a wind farm -- there's not an
 3 expectation that there will be firefighting -- aerial
 4 firefighting over any wind farm in the state. So my
 5 concern has always been about the periphery.
 6 I think if you look even at the Wild Horse wind
 7 project and their experience with fire and how they
 8 fought it there, which is in their TAC minutes, which
 9 was just provided to us.
 10 So I hear what you're saying. My concern has
 11 always been on the aerial firefighting is the area
 12 outside the perimeter of the project, itself.
 13 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, I think the -- the
 14 conversa- -- I agree with you, Chair Drew. But I think
 15 the conversations we've had around aerial firefighting
 16 as it pertains to this project have -- have highlighted
 17 some things that maybe haven't got the same level of
 18 attention in the past. And, in fact, I believe that
 19 there's a bill working in the legislature right now
 20 that addresses aerial firefighting and wind
 21 interactions. And I don't -- don't know what the
 22 status of that bill is.
 23 But I think what we've done in the context of
 24 discussing it in this project, we've highlighted
 25 something that maybe, going forward, needs a little

Page 100

1 more attention than what it's received in the past.
 2 But I would agree. The challenges around aerial
 3 firefighting and this proposed wind farm exist with
 4 other wind farms as well.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Yeah, I think -- I
 6 think the fire -- I think we should ask -- I think we
 7 can certainly ask that the plan consider issues around
 8 aerial firefighting.
 9 MR. YOUNG: If air -- if air assets
 10 were at -- at one's disposal, one might write the plan
 11 one way, but knowing going in that air fi- -- aerial
 12 firefighting is not an option --
 13 CHAIR DREW: Right.
 14 MR. YOUNG: -- would cause you to
 15 write the plan a different -- a different way.
 16 CHAIR DREW: Right. That's fine. I
 17 think that's fine. Appreciate that.
 18 So the conclusion here is that we need a motion to
 19 ask staff to finalize documents. This is to give
 20 direction to staff to finalize documents for review by
 21 the public and by ourselves that incorporate the
 22 decisions we have made today and to provide those
 23 documents back to us for review and final consideration
 24 at a future meeting.
 25 Is there a motion to direct staff?

Page 101

1 Mr. Young.
 2 MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry. Could I ask
 3 a question before --
 4 CHAIR DREW: Sure.
 5 MR. YOUNG: -- before we get to
 6 that?
 7 So is there still a final vote in front of us as
 8 to whether we support this project being built or not?
 9 CHAIR DREW: Yes.
 10 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
 11 CHAIR DREW: So this is directing
 12 the staff to move forward with the documents with the
 13 decisions we've made today, and prior decisions, to
 14 finalize those documents for our review and final vote
 15 in a future meeting.
 16 May I have a motion?
 17 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt. So moved.
 18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 19 Is there a second?
 20 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.
 21 Second.
 22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Go ahead. Was
 23 that somebody from our Council? Okay.
 24 Is there any discussion?
 25 Okay. All those in favor, let's do the hand --

Page 102

1 raise hand.
 2 Okay. Opposed.
 3 We'd better put our hands down. There we go.
 4 Motion carries.
 5 One more item on -- well, actually, a couple more
 6 items on our agenda. One is an action item regarding
 7 an extension request.
 8 Ms. Moon, are you still here?
 9 MS. MOON: Yes. Yes, I am. Thank
 10 you, Chair Drew.
 11 CHAIR DREW: You are on for the
 12 extension request.
 13 MS. MOON: Okay. So I wanted to
 14 turn the Council's attention to the current agreement
 15 between EFSEC and the project proponent to complete the
 16 processing of their application for site certification,
 17 or ASC, and submit an EFSEC recommendation to the
 18 governor by January 31st of this year, 2024.
 19 To allow for more Council review, including
 20 responding to the Council's request for additional
 21 information, EFSEC staff worked with the applicant to
 22 establish an updated commitment date to complete the
 23 processing of the Horse Heaven application for site
 24 certification. The new date, which is referred to as
 25 the extension -- which is referred to as the extension

Page 103

1 date as defined in the Revised Code of Washington
 2 80.50.100 -- 80.50.100 -- requires the EFSEC Council to
 3 report to the governor its recommendations as to the
 4 approval or rejection of an application for
 5 certification within 12 months of receipt by the
 6 Council of such an application or such later time as is
 7 mutually agreed by the Council and the applicant.
 8 Three extension requests have been approved by the
 9 Council. And the extension request included in the
 10 Council packet, which is up on the screen, that's
 11 included today would extend the application processing
 12 of the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm project
 13 application for site certification to April 30th, 2024.
 14 Five public comments were received on the
 15 extension request. The proposed extension request will
 16 allev- -- will -- I'm sorry. The proposed extension
 17 request will allow the additional time needed for staff
 18 to prepare the documentation needed for the
 19 recommendation to the governor, followed by Council
 20 review and public comment. Staff have coordinated with
 21 the applicant on the request time frame to allow for
 22 work that may be needed following Council review or
 23 public comment.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 25 Are there any questions for staff?

Page 104

1 Is there a motion to approve the extension request
 2 till April --
 3 Sorry. My eyes can't see.
 4 MS. MOON: April 30th, 2024.
 5 CHAIR DREW: -- 30th, 2024?
 6 Motion to approve the extension request?
 7 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster. So
 8 moved.
 9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 10 Second?
 11 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt. Second.
 12 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 13 Discussion?
 14 My discussion is that I appreciate the time. I
 15 expect it will be done sooner than that. But I don't
 16 see any point in continuing to ask for extensions, so I
 17 appreciate the time frame in this letter.
 18 All those in favor, say "aye."
 19 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
 20 CHAIR DREW: All those opposed?
 21 Motion carries. Thank you.
 22 We have agenda items remaining. And thank you,
 23 everybody, for the discussion, the thoughtful
 24 consideration. I very much appreciate it.
 25 Cascade Renewable Transmission Project,

Page 105

1 preapplication announcement. Ms. Hafkemeyer.
 2 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you. I'll
 3 try and keep it brief.
 4 On December 20th, 2023, EFSEC staff received the
 5 preapplication materials for the Cascade Renewable
 6 Transmission Project. The proposed transmission line
 7 would begin at the Big Eddy Substation located near The
 8 Dalles, Oregon, and terminate at the Portland General
 9 Electric Harborton Substation located in Portland,
 10 Oregon. This line would primarily run down the
 11 Columbia River, in the riverbed, exiting the river to
 12 go around the Bonneville Dam.
 13 Per the Revised Code of Washington, or RCW,
 14 80.50.330 and the Washington Administrative Code, or
 15 WAC, 463-61-050, electrical transmission proposals are
 16 required to engage in specific preapplication
 17 activities, such as outreach and negotiations with
 18 local jurisdictions. While the applicant, Cascade
 19 Renewables, LLC, is engaging in those activities, EFSEC
 20 staff are preparing to hold public informational
 21 meetings in accordance with WAC 463-61-040.
 22 Staff are preparing to hold three meetings, one in
 23 each county the proposed transmission line passes by,
 24 on the evenings of February 6th, 7th, and 8th. At
 25 these meetings, staff will present the EFSEC process,

Page 106

1 and the applicant will present the project. These are
 2 not meetings to take public comment, but information on
 3 how to contact EFSEC with comment will be provided as
 4 part of EFSEC's presentation. Details for the
 5 in-person venues of these meetings will be issued once
 6 they are finalized.
 7 Are there any questions?
 8 CHAIR DREW: So this is a
 9 preapplication process, which is required in our
 10 statute on transmission projects. Before -- when this
 11 project -- should this project come to us in an
 12 application, not in preapplication, then the Council
 13 would be required to hold public informational meetings
 14 within 60 days in these same communities; is that
 15 correct?
 16 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Correct. Once the
 17 application is received, the process proceeds as it
 18 would for an energy-generating facility. There are
 19 specific preapplication facili- -- or preapplication
 20 activities that are required of transmission only. But
 21 once the application is received, the meetings that are
 22 typically required for other projects will also be
 23 required of this project.
 24 CHAIR DREW: So this is an early
 25 meeting at this point in time to inform the public

Page 107

1 about both the project from the entity that is putting
 2 it forward as well as to hear about the EFSEC process,
 3 but we will have our usual public informational
 4 meetings taking comments after the application is
 5 received.
 6 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Correct.
 7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Any other
 8 questions from Council members?
 9 Okay. Thank you.
 10 Third-quarter cost allocation. Ms. Bumpus.
 11 MS. BUMPUS: Good afternoon, Chair
 12 Drew and Council. Thank you. For the record, this is
 13 Sonia Bumpus.
 14 I'm going to read off EFSEC's third-quarter 2024
 15 cost allocations. This covers the period January 1,
 16 2024, to March 30th, 2024.
 17 For Kittitas Valley wind power, 4 percent.
 18 For Wild Horse, 4 percent.
 19 For Columbia Generating Station, 20 percent.
 20 Columbia Solar, 4 percent.
 21 WNP-1, 2 percent.
 22 Whistling Ridge, 3 percent.
 23 Grays Harbor, 6 percent.
 24 Chehalis, 6 percent.
 25 Desert Claim, 4 percent.

Page 108

1 Goose Prairie, 4 percent.
 2 Horse Heaven, 15 percent.
 3 Badger Mountain, 6 percent.
 4 Cypress Creek, 4 percent.
 5 Wautoma Solar, 6 percent.
 6 Hop Hill, 6 percent.
 7 Carriger Solar, also 6 percent.
 8 And that concludes my update for the nondirect
 9 cost allocation.
 10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 11 And now for the employee updates. We have
 12 new-employee introductions.
 13 Beautiful picture on the screen. I don't know who
 14 that was, Ms. Grantham.
 15 Mr. Walker, you have an introduction to make.
 16 MR. WALKER: Yes. Thank you, Chair
 17 Drew. For the record, Dave Walker, director of
 18 administrative services with EFSEC.
 19 I would like to introduce our new policy and
 20 legislation manager. Lisa McLean just started with us
 21 the middle of January as our new legislative manager.
 22 Very happy to have her aboard. She joins us from the
 23 Gambling Commission.
 24 So, Lisa, if you'd like to say a few words.
 25 MS. McLEAN: Sorry. I was trying to

Page 109

1 unmute these things.
 2 Hello, everyone. Nice to meet everybody. Nice to
 3 participate in this meeting for the first time. I am
 4 the legislative and policy manager and did come over
 5 from the Gambling Commission where I was also the
 6 legislative and policy manager.
 7 I've been working for Washington State for State
 8 government for five years. Before the Gambling
 9 Commission, I was working out with the Redistricting
 10 Commission. And before that, I was working with the
 11 census and making sure everybody filled out their
 12 census form. And for that reason, Washington State was
 13 second in the nation in terms of people who
 14 self-responded.
 15 So I'm happy to be here and look forward to trying
 16 to advance the interests of the Council through the
 17 legislation and policy efforts that we pursue. So nice
 18 to meet everybody.
 19 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Welcome
 20 aboard.
 21 Next, we have Ami Hafkemeyer.
 22 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
 23 Drew. I would like to introduce two new siting
 24 specialists to the Council who have both started this
 25 month. We have Zia Ahmed, who is joining us from most

Page 110

1 recently Missouri. Then we have Maria Belkina, who is
 2 also a siting specialist joining us.
 3 Maria will be taking the Cascade Renewable
 4 Transmission Project that I just introduced. And Zia
 5 will be taking at least one, if not more, of the
 6 incoming projects that we are projecting to see in the
 7 coming weeks.
 8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 9 Welcome aboard. Thank you for being here.
 10 MS. BELKINA: Thank you.
 11 MR. AHMED: Thank you.
 12 CHAIR DREW: Would you like -- I
 13 mean, you don't -- would you like to introduce a little
 14 bit about yourself? Go ahead. Maria.
 15 MR. AHMED: Yeah. Of course.
 16 CHAIR DREW: Zia. Zia.
 17 MR. AHMED: Thank you, everyone. My
 18 name is Zia Ahmed. So I just complete my Ph.D. from
 19 Mississippi State University. My concentration was art
 20 and atmospheric science. And I just start for EFSEC
 21 from January 2nd, 2024. And I'm excited to work
 22 further. And nice to meet you, everyone. And thank
 23 you.
 24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
 25 Ms. Belkina.

Page 111

1 MS. BELKINA: Hello, everyone. Just
 2 started my first EFSEC experience January 2024. I
 3 already have some experience as a site specialist. And
 4 I'm very pleased to be part of the team. Thank you.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Welcome
 6 aboard.
 7 Ms. Owens, you also --
 8 MS. OWENS: Thank you.
 9 CHAIR DREW: -- have a new employee
 10 to introduce.
 11 MS. OWENS: I do. Thank you.
 12 Good afternoon, EFSEC Council and staff. I'd like
 13 to introduce another new employee, Adrienne Barker.
 14 Adrienne joins the EFSEC team as an administrative
 15 assistant. Mostly her work will be focused on
 16 assisting the PEIS manager, once we get that position
 17 filled, and other office support tasks as needed.
 18 Adrienne recently relocated back to Washington
 19 from Virginia, where she was an office manager for a
 20 financial planning company. As a former Washington
 21 State employee, Adrienne's extensive admin experience
 22 includes working in event planning as well as private
 23 sector and government contracting in the Washington,
 24 D.C., area. So welcome to the team, Adrienne.
 25 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Page 112

1 Go ahead. Welcome.
 2 MS. BARKER: Thank you. Thank you.
 3 It's nice to meet everybody. I'm looking forward to
 4 it.
 5 CHAIR DREW: Welcome aboard. And we
 6 appreciate -- and welcome home maybe.
 7 MS. BARKER: Yes. Thank you.
 8 CHAIR DREW: Welcome back. So --
 9 MS. BARKER: Yep.
 10 CHAIR DREW: -- thank you.
 11 MS. BARKER: Thank you.
 12 CHAIR DREW: With that, we have no
 13 further business. And so thank you, all, for your
 14 participation and work throughout.
 15 And this meeting is adjourned.
 16 (Meeting adjourned at
 17 5:27 p.m.)
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 113

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, John M.S. Botelho, 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 Monthly Meeting of the Washington
 State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was conducted
 in my presence and adjourned on January 31, 2024, and
 thereafter was transcribed under my direction; that the
 transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the
 said meeting, transcribed to the best of my ability;
 7 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel
 of any party to this matter or relative or employee of any
 such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially
 interested in the said matter or the outcome thereof;
 10
 11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
 this 15th day of February, 2024.
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16 _____
 /s/John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR
 Certified Court Reporter No. 2976
 (Certification expires 5/26/2024.)
 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: February 7, 2024

Reporting Period: January 2024

Site Contact: Jarred Caseday, Operations Manager

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- Power generated: 6,639.97 MWh
 - Wind speed: 3.52 m/s
 - Capacity Factor: 8.71%
-

Environmental Compliance

- No incidents

Safety Compliance

- Nothing to report

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Nothing to report

Other

- No sound complaints
- No shadow flicker complaints

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Wild Horse Wind Facility
Operator: Puget Sound Energy
Report Date: February 9, 2024
Report Period: January 2024
Site Contact: Jennifer Galbraith
SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

January generation totaled 33,083 MWh for an average capacity factor of 16.31%.

Environmental Compliance

Nothing to report.

Safety Compliance

Nothing to report.

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: February 8, 2024
Reporting Period: January 2024
Site Contact: Jeremy Smith, Operations 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.

- 289,358 net MW-hrs. generated in the reporting period for a capacity factor of 76.77%
-

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

Environmental Compliance

-Monthly Water Usage: 2,709,256 gallons

-Monthly Wastewater Returned: 2,039,175 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.

- Nothing to report.

-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 3,106 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 Operations Manager
Chehalis Generation Facility

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center

Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC

Report Date: February 20, 2024

Reporting Period: January 2024

Site Contact: Chris Sherin

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

-GHEC generated 281,853MWh during the month and 281,853MWh 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).
- Quarterly Emissions Data Report (EDR).

-Submitted the Annual Water Withdrawal Base Flow Report.

-Submitted notice to EFSEC staff that a CO emissions exceedance on GT1 which occurred on 1/7/24.

- CTG1 had been down for corrective maintenance due to combustion issues and was started and brought online post-maintenance for testing. The CTG1 CEM System (CEMS) had also undergone maintenance during this outage period.
- Following a Cold Startup, the CO ppm @ 15% O2 one-hour average exceeded the permitted limit of 2 ppm for 11 hours. The hourly average during this period was 2.8 ppm CO @15% O2 with the highest hour reaching 3.4 ppm. The CO lb/hr one-hour average exceeded the permitted limit of 10.6 lb/hr for 9 hours. This parameter's hourly average during the event was 12.7 lb/hr CO with the highest hour reaching 15.17 lb/hr.
- The plant's initial response focused on the CEMS due to the corrective maintenance recently performed on that system. An instrument technician was called out to investigate and determine that the CEMS was operating properly and had been properly calibrated.
- Follow up response looked at CGT1 dynamics to determine the cause. Troubleshooting involved OEM Technical Support for real time diagnostics of the combustion anomaly. The unit was shut down once we were able to sufficiently diagnose the problem to provide a corrective action plan.

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.
- NPDES permit renewal application submitted to EFSEC in December 2023 in accordance with Section S6.A of NPDES Permit No. WA0024961.

Other

- None.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting Facility Update

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

Operator: Tuusso Energy, LLC

Report Date: February 13, 2024

Reporting Period: 31 days ending January 31, 2024

Site Contact: Thomas Cushing

Facility SCA Status: Construction

Construction Status

- Penstemon
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of December was 217 Megawatt hours

 - Camas
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of December was 187 Megawatt hours

 - Urtica
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of December was 142 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: **February 21, 2024**

Reporting Period: **January 2024**

Site Contact: **Felicia Najera-Paxton**

Facility SCA Status: **Operational**

CGS Net Electrical Generation for January 2024: **858,425 Mega Watt-Hours.**

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

Environmental Compliance:

No update.

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: 02/05/24

Reporting Period: 01/06/24 to 02/05/24

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. PV Panel delivery continues at the project ~60MWdc of 105MWdc delivered.

2. Perimeter fence and racking/tracker activities continue.

3. Module installation continues.

4. All 22 inverters were delivered and set in January.

-Other?

1. The project was shutdown from

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.

1. Due to significant rain and snow melt across frozen ground the week of January 22, Basin 02 was overcome with water and draining into a farmer's field west of the project. As a result, our EPC plugged basin 02 and 2 sediment traps and started pumping to basin 03 on the south side of the project which is the largest basin on the site. BMPs continue to be maintained. The weather event and size of Basin 02 are under evaluation to determine how if additional basins are needed onsite to avoid this situation in future construction and operation.

2. On 1/18/2024, a 1000 Gallon double walled diesel tank was noticed to be slowly dripping diesel fuel from the side of the tank. PCLs report and main cause was the tank being filled the previous day, 1/17/24 and freezing conditions that night. Immediate action was taken by the PCL team to remediate the spill. ~2-3 gallons of diesel fuel leaked from the top and dripped to the ground. The leak was contained and a remediation/abatement crew was mobilized to site to remove a small area of contaminated soil on the surface. Soil samples were also taken to confirm diesel did not infiltrate the soil deeper. EFSEC and Ecology were notified of the spill.

-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.

2. Q4, 2023 Construction Report.

3. Revised SPCC Plan

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).

High Top and Ostrea Solar Project

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Whistling Ridge Energy Project

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Badger Mountain Solar Energy Project

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Wautoma Solar

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Hop Hill Solar Project

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Carriger Solar

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

February 13, 2023

Joanne Snarski, Energy Facility Site Specialist
Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
P.O. Box 43172
Olympia, Washington 98504

Subject: Extension Request for Carriger Solar, LLC Application for Site Certification

Dear Ms. Snarski,

Cypress Creek Renewables, LLC (CCR), on behalf of Carriger Solar, LLC, is hereby requesting that the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) extend the processing time of the Carriger Solar, LLC Application for Site Certification (ASC) to April 1, 2025.

The Carriger Solar Project Application for Site Certification (ASC) was filed with EFSEC on February 10, 2023. RCW 80.50.100 requires EFSEC to report its recommendations for approval or rejection of an application for certification “within twelve months of receipt by the council of an application deemed complete by the director, or such later time as is mutually agreed by the council and the applicant.” The ASC included a request that EFSEC conduct its review using the expedited process authorized by RCW 80.50.075 and WAC Chapter 463-43. WAC 463-43-050 provides for expedited processing to occur within 120 days of receipt of an application “or such later time as is mutually agreed by the applicant and the council.”

We understand that EFSEC has engaged The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation to perform a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) study associated with the Carriger Solar Project. We understand that this TCP study is required to assess potential impacts to Cultural Resources and will inform EFSEC’s SEPA threshold determination, and that the study is anticipated to be completed by December 2024.

Accordingly, CCR respectfully requests an extension of the timeframe for EFSEC’s recommendation regarding the Carriger Solar ASC in order to provide adequate time for completion of the TCP study and the review of outstanding SEPA threshold items. CCR also requests that the decision surrounding expedited review be on hold until the TCP study is complete and ensuing discussions are concluded.

CCR appreciates the importance of a thorough review and the continued work of EFSEC and relevant agencies throughout this process. We believe the requested extension will allow adequate time for all parties and agencies to have a robust engagement in the process.

Sincerely,



John Hanks
Associate Director, Development
Cypress Creek Renewables, LLC

cc: Lauren Altick, Project Developer
Julie Alpert, Senior Environmental Manager, Western Region
Melissa Kemp, VP of Development

Horse Heaven Wind Project

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]

Cascade Renewable Transmission

February 2024 project update

[Place holder]