



## ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions  
Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

### Transcript of Proceedings

*June 25, 2025*

### EFSEC 2025 Monthly Meetings

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

**Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR**  
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™  
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lef, mdb  
accessed via *paperclip* icon

WASHINGTON STATE  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL  
MONTHLY MEETING  
June 25, 2025  
Lacey, Washington  
Reporter: Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR

APPEARANCES

STATE AGENCY MEMBERS:

Kurt Beckett, Chair  
Elizabeth Osborne, Commerce  
Eli Levitt, Ecology  
Nate Pamplin, Fish and Wildlife  
Lenny Young, Natural Resources  
Stacy Brewster, Utilities & Transportation  
Commission

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OPTIONAL STATE AGENCIES:

Carriger Solar:  
Matt Chiles, Klickitat County

Goldeneyer BESS:  
Robby Eckroth, Skagit County

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:

Jon Thompson  
Zack Packer

COUNCIL STAFF:

Sonia Bumpus	Lisa McLean
Ami Hafkemeyer	Adrienne Barker
Amy Moon	Trevin Taylor
Joan Owens	Patty Betts
Andrea Grantham	Dave Walker
Sean Greene	
Lance Caputo	
Joanne Snarski	
Alex Shiley	
Karl Holappy	
Maria Belkina	

APPEARANCES (Continued)

OPERATIONAL UPDATES:

Jarred Caseday,  
Kittitas Valley Wind, EDP Renewables

Jennifer Galbraith,  
Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Puget Sound Energy

Chris Sherin,  
Grays Harbor Energy Center, Grays Harbor Energy

Jeremy Smith,  
Chehalis Generation Facility, PacifiCorp

Josh LaPorte,  
Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4, Energy  
Northwest

Elizabeth Drachenberg,  
Columbia Solar, Tuusso Energy

Nelson Jia,  
Goose Prairie Solar, Brookfield Renewable

John Voltz,  
Ostrea Solar, Cypress Creek Renewables

COUNSEL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:

Sarah Reyneveld  
Yuriy Korol

1	MEETING INDEX	
2	EVENT:	PAGE NO.
3	Call to order	6
4	Roll Call	7
5	Proposed Agenda	10
6	Minutes	
7	May 5, 2025 Carriger Solar Special Meeting Minutes	11
8	May 21, 2025 Monthly Meeting Minutes	12
9	Projects	
10	Kittitas Valley Wind Project	13
11	Wild Horse Wind Power Project	13
12	Chehalis Generation Facility	14
13	Grays Harbor Energy Center	14
14	Columbia Solar	14
15	Columbia Generating Station	14
16	Washington Nuclear Projects 1 and 4	14
17	Goose Prairie Solar	15
18	Ostrea Solar	16
19	Carriger Solar	17
20	Recommendation to Governor	32
21	Horse Heaven Wind Farm	62
22	Hop Hill Solar	63
23	Wallula Gap	63
24	Goldeneye BESS	64
25	Transmission PEIS	64
	Desert Claim	66
	Final Action on Desert Claim	67

MEETING INDEX (Continued)		
EVENT:		PAGE NO.
Other		
Council Delegation of Authority to EFSEC Director		68
Website Update		72
Adjournment		76

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Good afternoon. This  
2 is Kurt Beckett, Chair of the Energy Facility Site  
3 Evaluation Council calling our June 25th meeting to  
4 order.

5 And before we have the roll call I did want to  
6 announce for the benefit of the public, or if you have  
7 friends that can use this information in case they are  
8 not already online EFSEC has launched a new website today  
9 and Dave Walker will be giving a briefing on that here at  
10 the end of the meeting, lots of good work that you will  
11 hear more about.

12 Most importantly, for today's meeting, you do find  
13 the meeting button right on the front page of the website  
14 where you can click directly into this meeting. You will  
15 also find access to our agenda which has a hyperlink as  
16 we have traditionally used. If you have any challenges  
17 today or questions about the website you can email the  
18 EFSEC staff which is [websitehelp@efsec.wa.gov](mailto:websitehelp@efsec.wa.gov) and folks  
19 will be monitoring that mailbox if anyone has any access  
20 issues for this meeting you are certainly welcome to use  
21 those tools.

22 And I would also just acknowledge that today's  
23 launch was originally not at the same time as the EFSEC  
24 council meeting. Those have been moved and appreciate  
25 the public and our participants in the meeting as well as

1 staff accommodating the schedule change and members of  
2 the Council as well.

3 So with that if you could call the roll, please.

4 MS. BARKER: Certainly. Department of  
5 Commerce?

6 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,  
7 present.

8 MS. BARKER: Department of Ecology?

9 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt, present.

10 MS. BARKER: Department of Fish and  
11 Wildlife?

12 MR. PAMPLIN: Nate Pamplin, present.

13 MS. BARKER: Department of Natural  
14 Resources?

15 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

16 MS. BARKER: Utilities &  
17 Transportation Commission?

18 MS. BREWSTER: Stacy Brewster,  
19 present.

20 MS. BARKER: For Local Government and  
21 Optional State Agencies for the For Hop Hill Project,  
22 Benton County, Paul Krupin?

23 For the Carriger Solar project, Klickitat County,  
24 Matt Chiles?

25 For the Wallula Gap project, Benton County, Adam

1 Fyall?

2 For the Goldeneye BESS for Skagit County Robby  
3 Eckroth?

4 MR. ECKROTH: Robby Eckroth, present.

5 MS. BARKER: Assistant Attorney  
6 General, Jon Thompson?

7 MR. THOMPSON: Present.

8 MS. BARKER: Zack Packer?

9 MR. PACKER: Present.

10 MS. BARKER: And Talia Thuet?

11 For EFSEC staff, I will call those anticipated to  
12 speak today. Sonia Bumpus?

13 MS. BUMPUS: Present.

14 MS. BARKER: Ami Hafkemeyer?

15 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Present.

16 MS. BARKER: Amy Moon?

17 MS. MOON: Amy Moon, present.

18 MS. BARKER: Sean Greene?

19 MR. GREENE: Sean Greene, present.

20 MS. BARKER: Lance Caputo.

21 MR. CAPUTO: Present.

22 MS. BARKER: Joanne Snarski.

23 MS. SNARSKI: Present.

24 MS. BARKER: Trevin Taylor?

25 MR. TAYLOR: Present.

1 MS. BARKER: Dave Walker?  
2 MR. WALKER: Present.  
3 MS. BARKER: For Operational Updates,  
4 Kittitas Valley Wind project?  
5 MR. CASEDAY: Jarred Caseday, present.  
6 MS. BARKER: Wild Horse Wind Power  
7 project?  
8 MS GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith,  
9 present.  
10 MS. BARKER: Grays Harbor Energy  
11 Center?  
12 MR. SHERIN: Chris Sherin, present.  
13 MS. BARKER: Chehalis Generation  
14 Facility?  
15 MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.  
16 MS. BARKER: Columbia Generating  
17 Station?  
18 MR. LAPORTE: Josh LaPorte, present.  
19 MS. BARKER: Columbia Solar?  
20 MS. DRACHENBERG: Elizabeth  
21 Drachenberg, present.  
22 MS. BARKER: Goose Prairie Solar?  
23 MR. JIA: Nelson Jia, present.  
24 MS. BARKER: Ostrea Solar?  
25 MR. VOLTZ: Jon Voltz, present.

1 MS. BARKER: Is there anyone online  
2 present for the Counsel for the Environment?

3 MR. KOROL: Yuriy Korol, present, and  
4 my colleague, Sarah Reyneveld, will be joining in a  
5 little bit.

6 MS. BARKER: Thank you. Chair, there  
7 is a quorum for all councils.

8 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Ms. Barker.  
9 Next item up is the proposed agenda and let me please  
10 note at the outset that there's an intent on our other  
11 items for the delegation of authority too. Welcome Mr.  
12 Chiles. You are right on time. Thanks for being with us  
13 here today.

14 So back on the agenda, I wanted to note that the  
15 delegation of authority item in the other section, No. 6,  
16 intend to have that briefing and counsel questions or  
17 discussion today but not intent to act. I wanted to note  
18 that for the benefit of the public at the outset.

19 And fellow Council, with that I would entertain a  
20 motion to approve the proposed agenda.

21 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, so moved.

22 CHAIR BECKETT: Is there a second.

23 MR. PAMPLIN: Second.

24 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Councilman  
25 Pamplin. All in favor of adopting the agenda as

1 proposed, please say aye.

2 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

3 CHAIR BECKETT: Opposed. Agenda is  
4 adopted.

5 Next step, we have actually two minutes for  
6 adoption, and any discussions, so we will put each into  
7 motion and on the table and open up for any discussion.  
8 So I would entertain a motion for the May 5th Carriger  
9 Solar special meeting minutes. Is there a motion?

10 MR. CHILES: I so move.

11 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Mr. Chiles.

12 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,  
13 second.

14 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Any  
15 discussion or edits to the minutes?

16 MR. CHILES: I have two small items.

17 CHAIR BECKETT: Please.

18 MR. CHILES: Line No. 7, Page 46, it  
19 should read smoke, not spoke.

20 MS. GRANTHAM: I apologize. This is  
21 Andrea Grantham. We are having a little bit of technical  
22 difficulties. We are going to switch from Ms. Barker's  
23 laptop to my laptop really quick so there's going to be a  
24 quick switch online so give us like two minutes and I  
25 should be able to get this --

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. We will pause  
2 for the benefit of the public.

3 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you.

4 (Pause in the proceedings.)

5 CHAIR BECKETT: Of course. We have a  
6 adoption of the minutes on the table and Councilman  
7 Chiles had two changes to the Carriger Solar minutes.

8 MR. CHILES: I am going to withdraw my  
9 changes because I cannot find them in the document after  
10 all. My notes are in error.

11 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. I'm sure if  
12 there's other clarifications needed we can capture that.  
13 Okay. Are there other discussion or comments to the  
14 Carriger Solar meeting minutes?

15 Okay. Hearing none, all in favor please say aye?

16 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

17 CHAIR BECKETT: Opposed. Okay. The  
18 minutes are adopted.

19 The next item up, May 21st, 2025 monthly meeting  
20 minutes from our regular council meeting. Do I have a  
21 motion to adopt the minutes?

22 MR. PAMPLIN: I move that we approve  
23 the May 21st, 2025 monthly meeting minutes.

24 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Is there a  
25 second?

MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, second.

CHAIR BECKETT: Any discussion or changes to the monthly regular meeting on the 21st of May? Okay. Hearing none, all in favor say aye?

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

CHAIR BECKETT: Opposed? Minutes are adopted. Next up we have our project updates and we will move to Kittitas Valley Wind project, Mr. Caseday.

MR. CASEDAY: Good afternoon, Chair Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff. This is Jarred Caseday of the EDP Renewables for the Kittitas Valley Wind power project and we had nothing nonroutine to report for the period.

CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Mr. Caseday. Next up, Wild Horse Wind Power project, Jennifer Galbraith.

MS. GALBRAITH: Can you hear me?

CHAIR BECKETT: We can.

MS. GALBRAITH: Okay. Great. Thank you Chair Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff, this is Jennifer Galbraith with Puget Sound Energy representing the Wild Horse Wind facility, and I have nothing nonroutine to report for the month of May.

CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up, Chehalis Generation Facility.

1 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair  
2 Beckett, Council members and EFSEC staff, this is Jeremy  
3 Smith, the operations manager representing the Chehalis  
4 Generation Facility. There are no nonroutine items to  
5 report for this period.

6 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up  
7 Grays Harbor Energy Center.

8 MS. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair  
9 Beckett, Council members and staff, Grays Harbor Energy  
10 also has nothing nonroutine to report for the month of  
11 May.

12 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you very much.  
13 Next up, Columbia Solar, Ms. Drachenberg.

14 MS. DRACHENBERG: Good afternoon,  
15 Chair, Council and staff, this is Elizabeth Drachenberg  
16 with Columbia Solar, and no nonroutine updates to report.

17 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up  
18 Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4, Josh LaPorte.

19 MR. LAPORTE: Good afternoon, Chair  
20 Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff, this is Josh LaPorte,  
21 representing Columbia Generating Station and Washington  
22 Nuclear Projects 1/4. The facility update is included in  
23 your packet for both sites. There's no nonroutine  
24 updates to report for the month of May.

25 I would just point out that I think that the

1 facility updates on the screen are actually for the month  
2 of April. However, I will also just bring up for the  
3 Council's awareness the Columbia Generating Station was  
4 recently brought back online from our refueling outage  
5 27, and during system checks a vibration in the turbine  
6 was observed that require the plant be taken back offline  
7 to address that issue safely. This is a planned  
8 maintenance procedure and similar to those performed in  
9 December 2021. That's all I have for Columbia Generating  
10 Station and WNP 1/4.

11 CHAIR BECKETT: Appreciate the update  
12 as well as certainly the extra wave of activity that goes  
13 with Energy Northwest, so congratulations on that  
14 process.

15 Next up Goose Prairie Solar, Nelson Jia.

16 MR. JIA: Good afternoon everybody.  
17 For the month of April we had about 19 -- almost 2001  
18 hours generation. We did some fan power supply  
19 replacements that occurred on the inverter units that  
20 ultimately failed. Many inverter units continue to  
21 experience similar faults or errors, so we are continuing  
22 to work with Sun Grow to kind of fix those issues.

23 Otherwise, no other major comments from an  
24 environmental or safety compliance perspective.

25 CHAIR BECKETT: Very well. Thank you.

1 Next up Ostrea Solar, Jon Voltz.

2 MR. VOLTZ: Good afternoon, this is  
3 Jon Voltz with Cypress Creek Renewables representing  
4 Ostrea Solar. I would also like to comment that I  
5 believe these updates are from the previous month  
6 representing the period for April. I had the report for  
7 May identified or pulled up on my end and can provide  
8 those updates. We are continuing a construction road.  
9 Construction is 95 percent complete. Inverter and array  
10 pile installation is ongoing throughout the facility.  
11 Racking installation has begun. Fencing is up 90 percent  
12 of the east portion, about 40 percent in the west. AC  
13 cable installs looking at about 80 percent complete.  
14 Substation construction is underway. Foundations are  
15 being poured, and we have started to receive modules that  
16 are being prepped for installation.

17 There was one incident that occurred in the month of  
18 May on the 27th. There was a diesel fuel spill that was  
19 caused due to incorrect process being followed during  
20 fueling the tank of an employee vehicle that we have  
21 remediated the incident. The cleanup has been performed.  
22 We are waiting to receive the final report from Patriot.  
23 That has been mitigated. Those are all the updates for  
24 Ostrea Solar for the period of May.

25 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you very much.

1 Both projects have highlighted the April versus later  
2 update. I believe I read a correct version this morning  
3 but if we could make sure the website record has the  
4 current report it would be great.

5 Next up we have Carriger Solar and Joanne Snarski  
6 and Sean Greene will be presenting.

7 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair  
8 Beckett, staff and Council members. My name is Joanne  
9 Snarski, the siting specialist for EFSEC. And I will be  
10 giving the presentation today alongside Sean Greene, our  
11 state environmental ecology specialist assigned to  
12 Carriger.

13 The purpose of this presentation is to describe to  
14 Council the developments that went into the draft Site  
15 Certification Agreement or SCA. As a result of  
16 discussions with the Yakama Nation, explained the  
17 development of the revised mitigated determination of  
18 nonsignificance, or RMDNS. Summarized, the comments  
19 received during these public comment campaigns for these  
20 documents, and finally to explain the minor changes that  
21 staff plan on including in the final versions of these  
22 documents as a result of comments.

23 As a brief recap of the project, Carriger Solar is a  
24 proposed 160 megawatt solar only generation facility with  
25 the 63 megawatt battery energy storage system, that is to

1 be located on 2,108 acres of privately owned land  
2 approximately two miles west and northwest of the city of  
3 Goldendale in unincorporated Klickitat County.

4 The project itself will occupy no more than 1,326  
5 acres that would contain all the project components.

6 Since the last council meeting several important  
7 events have occurred in relation to the certification  
8 process for the Carriger project. First, the EFSEC Chair  
9 had a confidential meeting with the Yakama Nation Tribal  
10 Council on June 4th. This meeting provided the Yakama  
11 Nation an opportunity to directly discuss concerns  
12 related to environmental and cultural impacts that would  
13 result from the development of the Carriger project in a  
14 venue where sensitive tribal information could be  
15 discussed without risk of public disclosure.

16 Chair Beckett prepared a confidential memo covering  
17 the topics discussed and how EFSEC had responded. This  
18 memo has been provided to all the Council members. At  
19 the previous council meeting on May 21st, 2025 staff were  
20 directed to develop a draft recommendation for approval  
21 of the Carriger project that could be sent to the  
22 Governor for consideration.

23 That direction required us to include all mitigation  
24 that was proposed in the MDNS and the then projected  
25 RMDNS and any mitigation that may arise from the June 4th

1 meeting with the Yakama Nation Tribal Council.

2 Following the EFSEC Council meeting staff began to  
3 draft the site certification agreement and a report to  
4 the Governor that goes along with the draft SCA. The  
5 report describes important details of the application  
6 process and how the Council has come to request approval  
7 of the project.

8 The draft SCA was also refined to address several of  
9 the Yakama Nation's concerns following the June 4th  
10 meeting. Both the draft SCA and the draft recommendation  
11 report were published for public comment on June 12th.  
12 Additionally, the revised mitigated determination of  
13 significance reflecting the edits covered in the last  
14 council meeting along with a few others that will be  
15 covered later in this presentation was published for  
16 public comment on June 16th.

17 I am going to pass it over to Sean to give you more  
18 detail.

19 MR. GREENE: Thank you. EFSEC staff  
20 determined that many of the concerns raised by the Yakama  
21 Nation Tribal Council at the June 4th meeting were  
22 addressed in the RMDNS, or the draft site certification  
23 agreement. There were, however, two specific concerns as  
24 staff subsequently addressed by adding measures to the  
25 draft SCA prior to its publication.

1           The first was a request by the Yakama Nation Tribal  
2 Council that they be provided the opportunity to review  
3 the site restoration plan for the project prior to its  
4 implementation to ensure that any impacted resources of  
5 tribal concern would be effectively addressed and  
6 restored. Staff added language to the SCA committing  
7 EFSEC to coordinating with the Yakama Nation on both the  
8 initial site restoration, which would be produced prior  
9 to start of construction, and the detailed site  
10 restoration plan, which will be produced prior to the  
11 start of decommissioning.

12           The second issue staff addressed following the  
13 meeting was a request by the Yakama Nation Tribal Council  
14 that the project may result in the loss of existing legal  
15 land access by tribal members. In Washington, tribes  
16 have reserve treaty rights, including access rights on  
17 many public lands and can also develop access agreements  
18 with private landowners.

19           While this project is exclusively located on  
20 privately owned land with no existing tribal access  
21 agreement, EFSEC has included language within the draft  
22 SCA that would require the applicant to ensure tribal  
23 access to public lands be retained throughout  
24 construction. While no loss of legal land access to  
25 tribal members as a result of this project is

1 anticipated, this condition would prevent any such  
2 scenario from occurring unexpectedly. All of this  
3 language was included in the version of the draft SCA  
4 that was published for public comments.

5 The revised mitigated determination of  
6 nonsignificance published on June 16th included five  
7 changes from the original MDNS. The first of these  
8 changes was one that we covered in the last council  
9 meeting regarding the battery chemistry used for the  
10 project BESS.

11 This mitigation language requires that the applicant  
12 assess all viably commercially available battery  
13 chemistry available for BESSs when the project BESS is  
14 proposed for replacement and submit their comparative  
15 report and recommendation to EFSEC for approval.

16 Staff determined that this was the most effective  
17 mitigation available to address the concerns associated  
18 with adverse environmental public health impacts  
19 (inaudible) given the alternative that the chemistry  
20 technologies are not sufficient at the time.

21 The second revision between the MDNS and the RMDNS  
22 focused on the mitigation associated with laydown yard  
23 setbacks. In the MDNS NSRs or noise sensitive receptor  
24 sites, were provided with a 2500 foot setback from all  
25 laydown yards, which are temporary yards holding

1 construction equipment during the construction phase of  
2 the project.

3 The applicant provided figures to EFSEC showing that  
4 due to the dispersed nature of the project such  
5 mitigation measure would prohibit the siting of a laydown  
6 yard in the majority of the lease boundary and challenge  
7 the feasibility of construction of the project.

8 Washington Administrative Code or WAC  
9 197-11-66E(1)(c) states that when developing mitigation  
10 under SEPA substantial authority mitigation shall be,  
11 quote, reasonable and capable of being accomplished.  
12 EFSEC staff determined that the implementation of this  
13 measure as written did not meet either of those  
14 requirements.

15 In contrast to other projects that EFSEC has  
16 reviewed for one or two large laydown yards of the type  
17 that have been proposed that would be in operation  
18 throughout the entire construction phase, the Carriger  
19 project proposed a single primary laydown yard and  
20 several smaller ancillary laydown yards that would each  
21 contain a small portion of the project's construction  
22 material and will only be in use for a portion of  
23 construction days.

24 Staff developed additions to the mitigation measure  
25 that will provide nonparticipating noise sensitive

1 receptor sites with a 1200 foot setback for primary  
2 laydown yards, which is consistent with the setbacks that  
3 EFSEC has previously imposed on projects similar in scale  
4 and type as the Carriger project.

5 Ancillary laydown yards, meaning those that contain  
6 less than 20 percent of the project's equipment and  
7 materials would be set back by 800 feet in recognition  
8 that they will have less activity over a shorter period  
9 of time when compared to primary laydown yards.

10 The third revision is another one that we covered in  
11 the last council meeting, though the language has changed  
12 some between then and the publication of the RMDNS. To  
13 address concerns that have been raised to the visual  
14 aesthetic impacts from the project would use the northern  
15 boundary of the adjacent DNR-owned parcel. Mitigation  
16 has been developed requiring the installation of natural  
17 screening infrastructure along the half mile shared  
18 border.

19 In the previous council meeting, we had presented  
20 this measure after requiring intermittent earthen berms  
21 along this boundary. In further discussions with the  
22 applicant and Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife,  
23 staff determined that a combination of natural screening  
24 measures, such as earthen berms, rock piles, and native  
25 vegetation will be more cost effective, less impactful to

1 other resources, such as wildlife and water runoff and  
2 will be more effective at blending the screening into the  
3 existing view shed. The final design of this natural  
4 screening structure will be submitted to EFSEC for  
5 approval prior to the start of construction.

6 The fourth revision is primarily administrative, and  
7 reflects draft language that was inadvertently left in  
8 the published version of the MDNS. The portion of this  
9 mitigation measure that was removed in the RMDNS was  
10 determined by staff prior to the publication of the MDNS  
11 as leaving the measure too open ended and making it  
12 impractical and unenforceable.

13 The final revision is another one that we discussed  
14 at the last council meeting. This measure is new for the  
15 RMDNS and will require the installation of the 10,000  
16 water<sup>gallon</sup> cistern to assist in potential fire suppression.  
17 Following the Chair's meeting with the Yakama Nation,  
18 this measure was further developed prior to its  
19 publication to address concerns raised by the Yakama  
20 Nation that the cistern would serve as a source -- could  
21 serve as a source of contamination from nearby ground and  
22 water resources if the cistern were to experience algal  
23 growth and/or be improperly maintained.

24 In response to those concerns, staff added language  
25 requiring that the cistern be opaque and enclosed to

1 avoid the potential for algal growth and be kept  
2 maintained in good working order.

3 The RMDNS was published for public comments and a  
4 total of 16 comments were received, one from the Yakama  
5 Nation, one from the applicant, and 14 from members of  
6 the public. Six of these comments were statements of  
7 general opposition for the project, one was a statement  
8 of general support for the project, and the remaining  
9 nine were substantive comments addressing impact and  
10 mitigation described in the RMDNS.

11 These substantive comments generally expressed  
12 concerns about the RMDNS mitigations for a variety of  
13 environmental resource impacts (inaudible) fire hazard,  
14 visual aesthetics, and loss of farm land being the most  
15 common resource areas mentioned.

16 Staff received one comment from the applicant  
17 regarding minor clarification edit for a mitigation  
18 measure that staff proposed to include in the final  
19 version of the RMDNS.

20 The applicant comment came in regards to the natural  
21 screening mitigation that had been added to the original  
22 RMDNS. The original version of this mitigation had  
23 required intermittent earthen berms, and the final  
24 version concedes that the proposed variety of natural  
25 screening implements along the 25 mile buffer boundary

1 between the project and the northern border of the DNR  
2 parcel. The applicant requested that the word periodic  
3 be added to this mitigation measure to clarify that the  
4 structure will be visual screening not a full visual  
5 barrier so as to better blend in.

6 As this changes in keeping with how this mitigation  
7 was envisioned and appropriately reflected the intended  
8 application, that change was incorporated in the final  
9 version of this text.

10 Staff also published the draft SCA and  
11 recommendation report for public comment with a total of  
12 seven comments received. One comment was received from  
13 the Yakama Nation, one received from the applicant, and  
14 the remaining five originated from the public. Of these  
15 seven comments, two were general statements in opposition  
16 to the project, and the remaining five were substantive  
17 in addressing the document in question.

18 After reviewing all of the comments, staff  
19 determined that no substantial edits were needed to  
20 either the SCA or the recommendation report to address  
21 the comments received, apart from minor grammatical edits  
22 and typo corrections.

23 While the visual screening mitigation comments is  
24 the only to which staff proposed revision there were  
25 several other substantive comments received that staff

1 believe should be shared with the Council to verify why  
2 staff did not proposed revisions.

3 The first of these is a comment received from the  
4 Yakama Nation. That is summarizes here as the  
5 (inaudible) of content of the town of Puyallup and  
6 Council should have the aforementioned full letter in  
7 their packets to see the comments in their entirety.

8 In essence, however, the Yakama Nation argues that  
9 EFSEC's environmental analysis of water resource impact  
10 from water use is incomplete and cannot be complete until  
11 the applicant has an effective contract with the specific  
12 purveyor.

13 EFSEC generally requires that a project legally  
14 secure sufficient water for project needs prior to start  
15 of construction, not as a condition for initial project  
16 approval. Water leases are typically turn based and  
17 requiring an applicant to secure a water lease months or  
18 years prior to its anticipated use is seen as  
19 impractical. The applicant has stated that sufficient  
20 water to supply the project has been identified from  
21 local vendors, and confirmed that they plan on purchasing  
22 the water for the project from one of these providers.

23 As these vendors have existing executed water rights  
24 and the project will not involve and withdrawal,  
25 diversion, or retention of water, there is no anticipated

1 increase to the total of consumptive water be used within  
2 the regional aquifer.

3 The draft SCA does require that the applicant secure  
4 legal water use prior to start of construction and prior  
5 to any use during operations. If the project is, for  
6 whatever reason, unable to secure legal water use they  
7 would not be allowed to start construction and would be  
8 out of compliance with the SCA and would be subject to  
9 additional mitigation.

10 For these reasons, staff have determined that the  
11 environmental analysis of water resource impacts with the  
12 RMDNS is complete.

13 The second substantive comment we are discussing  
14 also came from the Yakama Nation. In summation, the  
15 Yakama Nation argued that EFSEC's TCP mitigation, that is  
16 traditional cultural property, is insufficient to address  
17 significant impacts, that EFSEC's determination is based  
18 on personal opinion rather than the Yakama Nation's  
19 professional finding, and that some of the TCP mitigation  
20 was prepared without the Yakama Nation's input.

21 As to the statement that EFSEC substituted the  
22 personal opinions of its staff in place of the  
23 professional findings of the Yakama Nation in determining  
24 the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation, this is  
25 fundamentally incorrect.

1 EFSEC used the Bureau of Land Management's visual  
2 contrast rating process, which is one of the most  
3 conventional, widely used systems for assessing visual  
4 impact to make its determination of both impact rating  
5 and mitigation effectiveness.

6 Staff also worked with technical experts in this  
7 field through all phases of our environmental analysis.  
8 As we developed and refined the mitigation, the applicant  
9 provided multiple series of digital visual stimulations  
10 at EFSEC's direction showing how the project would look  
11 when viewed from multiple key observation points at a  
12 variety of setback and configurations.

13 With all of that said, visual impact determinations  
14 are necessarily qualitative in nature, meaning there is  
15 no numerical way to fully capture the analysis. This, as  
16 a result, makes the project inherently subjective at its  
17 core, meaning that some elements of personal opinion for  
18 any person making the determination is unavoidable.

19 EFSEC may use some of the most widely visual  
20 mitigation practices when developing the measures used  
21 within the RMDNS and draft SCA, including methods such as  
22 setback and additional screening.

23 Some of these measures, in fact, were, in fact,  
24 developed without input from the Yakama Nation. While  
25 many of these measures were developed in concert with the

1 Yakama Nations's input, some were developed independently  
2 by EFSEC in a meeting in February of this year, EFSEC  
3 staff met with the Yakama Nation staff to discuss  
4 potential mitigation strategies for TCPs on this project.  
5 In that meeting, the Yakama Nation staff indicated that  
6 their perspective was that the mitigation strategy  
7 proposed by them in their TCP survey summary provided in  
8 December of 2024 was the minimum amount of mitigation  
9 necessary to mitigate for TCP impacts.

10 As EFSEC was unable to impose some of the measures  
11 proposed by the Yakama Nation EFSEC staff proposed  
12 alternative mitigation strategies for which the Yakama  
13 Nation staff indicated any strategy that did not  
14 incorporate all their recommendations would be  
15 insufficient for TCP impacts.

16 EFSEC staff maintains their determination that the  
17 mitigation and absolute commitment that have been  
18 included in the RMDNS and draft SCA are sufficient to  
19 reduce TCP impacts to a level below significant as  
20 defined by SEPA.

21 The final substantial comment received during the  
22 comment period comes from the applicant and addresses the  
23 section of the draft SCA dealing with financial  
24 assurances for eventual site restoration.

25 One of EFSEC's requirements is that an applicant

1 secure enough funds to fully cover the cost associated  
2 with project decommissioning and site restoration, and  
3 maintain these funds in a bond letter of credit or other  
4 mechanism throughout the life of the project.

5 The applicant notes that the financial assurance  
6 language in the draft SCA does not provide an allowance  
7 to credit the salvage value of project components in  
8 determining the size of the financial assurance and  
9 requested that this value be incorporated.

10 The language excluding salvage credit from financial  
11 assurance in the draft SCA was, however, intentional.  
12 Despite conditional language like that proposed by the  
13 applicant there is still legal risk that another party  
14 with standing could claim the salvage credit funds which  
15 would be an effective barrier in any unfulfilled costs  
16 for decommissioning.

17 Additionally, there is risk that reduced financial  
18 assurance funds would be insufficient to cover the cost  
19 of EFSEC procuring a contractor to complete the  
20 decommission.

21 EFSEC has no authority to invoice these costs to  
22 other facilities under the Revised Code of Washing, RCW  
23 80.50.071. As a result, EFSEC intends to follow EPA  
24 guidance in not allowing for the reduction of financial  
25 assurance to account for salvage credit.

1 That concludes our presentation. Joanne and I are  
2 available to answer any questions that the Council  
3 members may have as far as the RMDNS and draft SCA for  
4 the Carriger project in general. This is also the period  
5 where the Council may deliberate or propose Council  
6 actions. And I would also like to acknowledge that staff  
7 has received comments from council members this week  
8 prior to this meeting about Carriger. Staff believes  
9 that the concerns raised in these comments are addressed  
10 in the application materials, RMDNS or draft SCA, or will  
11 be addressed by plans that are in development and will be  
12 complete prior to start of construction. Thank you.

13 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you both, very  
14 much. So noted. Let me check with the Council as well.  
15 Let's take questions and discussion from the Council on  
16 the presentation and any specific questions you may have  
17 as to changes that have been made or any other underlying  
18 questions, and then we would move to the consideration of  
19 action on recommendation to the Governor and which we  
20 will put that on the table and we can have further  
21 discussion.

22 And also let me -- Sean was just noting, Council  
23 Chiles, thank you for your dedication to feedback  
24 throughout this project, including this week, so that's  
25 accompanied by a ~~dry tear~~ <sup>drive here</sup> so thank you. So we have

1 endeavored to address those through the presentation and  
2 want to acknowledge your direct input and importance of  
3 having a county representative for the project.

4 With that, I would entertain questions from any  
5 Council.

6 MR. CHILES: Yeah, I do have a couple  
7 questions. First off, is a question on water for the  
8 maintenance facility at the site. It's my understanding  
9 that state health department laws prohibit trucked in  
10 water for a longterm permanent basis. In my experience  
11 and personal experience in working with them they require  
12 a permanent onsite source for a facility, so it seems to  
13 me that they need to be required to drill a well or  
14 something like that. Have you guys checked into that at  
15 all?

16 MS. SNARSKI: I haven't personally  
17 been able to identify that specific law or rule that you  
18 are referring to there, but in the application they did  
19 indicate that that was the water sources that were  
20 available to them, meaning they were exploring the  
21 opportunity for existing water rights is what they  
22 originally wanted to do, or review the availability of  
23 municipal or other opportunities for water and they did  
24 indicate that that is what they were going to be using  
25 and that's what we determined to be sufficient for the

1 project.

2 MS. BUMPUS: Councilman Chiles,  
3 question just for clarification. Is this a rule that  
4 applies to potable water for drinking water for onsite  
5 employees?

6 MR. CHILES: From my understanding,  
7 it's any time that water needs to be used for a public  
8 service, which would include onsite employees for potable  
9 water. For an example, a small garage in the middle of  
10 nowhere that might service automobiles needs to have a  
11 class B water system, which is a level of water system  
12 just for its own employees and any guests that might  
13 come. They are not allowed to truck in water. You can  
14 truck in water on an emergency basis if your regular  
15 system is down due to whatever issue then obviously  
16 trucked in water is allowable, but as a permanent  
17 longterm plan, from my understanding and working with the  
18 state health department agencies, it's not allowed.

19 MS. BUMPUS: I believe we received  
20 comments similar to this on another solar project, and I  
21 think that we had responded that there are no -- there  
22 are no onsite employees. I think they had to deal with  
23 potable water availability and it might have been in that  
24 case a local government requirement. I forget, but there  
25 are no onsite employees for this facility. So I think in

1 that case I think at any rate that was not applicable to  
2 that project and so I think that would be the case here.

3 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If I could add one of  
4 the additional requirements, so the requirement that Mr.  
5 Greene spoke to earlier was the requirement for water  
6 availability prior to the start of construction. There  
7 is another requirement in Article 7G that speaks about  
8 confirming water availability for operational use, like  
9 potable water for site operations for staff, confirming  
10 that's available prior to being allowed to start  
11 operations for some of the solar facilities that have  
12 (inaudible) areas. There have been instances of new  
13 connections to potable water sources also, and I think  
14 this is in some way distinct, although, I hope you will  
15 forgive me for not knowing the exact language but like  
16 water supply service is not the same as trucking in  
17 water, but the water coolers and stuff like that, things  
18 like that are available are permissible for potable  
19 onsite water for the these intermittent staff sites and  
20 that's what some facilities have done as well.

21 MR. CHILES: Follow up on my question,  
22 should it be determined during their search for water  
23 that a well is necessary, is that going to require a  
24 whole lot of extra hoops from EFSEC's perspective?

25 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If they are proposing

1 a new water right, additional analysis of that would be  
2 required.

3 MR. CHILES: My next concern, and it  
4 didn't really address anywhere that I have seen, and this  
5 is my biggest concern over the whole project is emergency  
6 response and firefighting, especially in the event of a  
7 BESS fire. County emergency services has stated to me  
8 repeatedly that they do not have the manpower, they do  
9 not have the funding, they do not have the equipment,  
10 they do not have the know how to even begin to fight a  
11 BESS fire. They are concerned that would there be a BESS  
12 fire they would have a hard time even finding volunteers  
13 to be willing to go and attack it without the skills and  
14 know how in the situation.

15 How -- is the applicant proposing anything at all to  
16 help with this situation because should there be a  
17 disaster the county is really unprepared to address it.  
18 It's beyond the scope of anything in the county.

19 MR. GREENE: I can say that the BESS,  
20 the applicant has committed the providing the BESS with a  
21 fire containment system the meets all existing  
22 regulations and best response practices from the  
23 organization the National Fire Safety Organization.

24 The SCA also requires the applicant prepare a fire  
25 response and emergency management plan in concert and

1 cooperation with the county and the local fire protection  
2 district that will include training for their staff on  
3 how to respond to a BESS fire, and as I understand best  
4 current practice is to simply let the fire burn itself  
5 out as it keeps -- the heat of the fire denatures some of  
6 the more toxic chemicals that could otherwise spread in  
7 the air.

8 That plan will be required to be revisited on an  
9 annual basis. The applicant has already begun the  
10 process of working with the fire chief and local fire  
11 protection district on things like access to project, it  
12 will be provided with user codes to unlock the padlock  
13 gates on the perimeter fencing, and ensuring that there  
14 is sufficient spacing between panels to allow their  
15 emergency equipment to pass through, and planning for  
16 contact procedures ins the event of a fire to ensure that  
17 the applicant will have the facility monitored on a 24/7  
18 basis so they would be able to respond immediately if  
19 there is a fire reported by the fire protection district  
20 or by the monitoring equipment.

21 Additionally, there is a 10,000 gallon cistern that  
22 is being imposed. While that won't be necessarily useful  
23 for putting out a BESS fire because like I say the  
24 current best practice is to let it burn itself out, that  
25 water can be used for smoke containment, which results in

1 misting the air around the BESS fire making the smoke  
2 molecules and water molecules don't spread as far. Those  
3 are the primary mitigation measures proposed in the SCA  
4 for the applicant to address the environmental hazards or  
5 public safety hazards associated with a BESS fire.

6 MR. CHILES: Thank you, Mr. Greene.  
7 Also related to the fire, the issue isn't just fire.  
8 It's also disaster communication. If there's a need to  
9 evacuate residents downwind in the event of a BESS fire  
10 or to notify those residents the county doesn't have the  
11 equipment or the ability to do that. Is the applicant  
12 suggesting any help in that department?

13 MR. GREENE: I don't know that  
14 anything is currently proposed in regards to notifying  
15 procedures, but those two plans that I mentioned before,  
16 the fire response and the emergency plan are both subject  
17 to EFSEC approval prior to their implementation and they  
18 are required prior to the start of construction. The  
19 primary purpose of those plans is to lay out a plan of  
20 action for all involved parties in the event of a fire.  
21 Obviously, one of those is coordinating responses and  
22 people getting information, so we will make sure that the  
23 notification be incorporated into the those and be  
24 sufficient to address those concerns.

25 MR. CHILES: One other fire-related

1 concern. Thank you, Mr. Greene. In the event of a fire,  
2 if the panels can be moved to as close to vertical as  
3 possible as quickly as possible, is that being planned as  
4 part of the potential emergency plan because the quicker  
5 they can get to that position the easier it is to not  
6 only fight the fire on the ground but fight the fire from  
7 the air. In our environment, air fighting is, especially  
8 if a fire grows very large, the number one way to quickly  
9 stop the fire.

10 MR. GREENE: The panels can't be made  
11 vertical so they are 90 degrees from the ground because  
12 they do pivot on the top, and I think they can go more  
13 like 78 degrees to vertical. And because the facility  
14 will be monitored 24/7 the applicant should be able to  
15 raise the panels to the maximum vertical height  
16 instantaneously or as soon as they are made aware of the  
17 issue.

18 MR. CHILES: Thank you.

19 CHAIR BECKETT: All right.

20 MR. CHILES: I see also that -- I like  
21 the idea that at the end of like the BESS facility they  
22 are going to look at the best stuff to replace this with.  
23 In the recommendations in the packet, it was listed as  
24 the current recommendation is most environmentally  
25 friendly. I would like to request that we look at that

1 not being the most environmentally friendly, but the  
2 safest and least prone to thermal runaway which at the  
3 same time is going to end up being the most likely  
4 environmentally friendly, but thermal runaway is the  
5 biggest concern. Frankly, the whole BESS thing is what  
6 scared people the most, and there's been way too many  
7 stories of good bulletproof systems going up in flames.  
8 I note that the chemistry being used, the lithium ion,  
9 which is one of safest chemistries, but that doesn't seem  
10 to stop them from going up in flames.

11 I have done a little research with people in the  
12 know, and it seems that a lithium ion or lithium titanium  
13 titanate is better, but simply not quite commercially  
14 scalable level there or seem to be. I'm not sure how  
15 much is involved, but obviously it seems that the lithium  
16 ion titanate is better. None of them have burned up.  
17 And looking 15, 20 years into the future to replace it, I  
18 assume it's going to be upgraded, and 20 years between  
19 now and then that is the scary part. I certainly  
20 wouldn't want to live anywhere downwind of that,  
21 certainly not within three to five miles downwind. The  
22 winds change and that's a 360 degree radius that is  
23 potentially endangered. I'm not personally in that zone,  
24 but I certainly wouldn't want it to be that close to me  
25 and I don't think anyone else would want it that close to

1     them. That's what makes us really worried, especially  
2     about the BESS.

3                     MR. GREENE: I would say the chemistry  
4     they are using for the current BESS is the lithium ion  
5     phosphate, which is considered one of the safer, more  
6     secure chemistries even as to the lithium ion grouping.

7             As to the language, the current language that's  
8     environmentally, I think call for that and make sure that  
9     is required, that the chemistry should be environmentally  
10    safety in that version, or in the replacement BESS.

11                    MR. CHILES: Thank you.

12                    CHAIR BECKETT: Anything further, Mr.  
13    Chiles?

14                    MR. CHILES: The screening measures  
15    along the DNR boundary, I just wanted to clarify on those  
16    it's listed as periodic. To me that is a very open ended  
17    word. Does that mean there's going to be a pile of rocks  
18    every five hundred feet, or does periodic mean that 30  
19    percent or 50 percent of the view shed is screened in  
20    sections? What is the intent there, and does that  
21    properly conveyed to the applicant?

22                    MR. GREENE: So the desire to add the  
23    word periodic is to reflect that this is not intended to  
24    be a visual barrier. It's not meant to be a hundred  
25    percent you cannot see the project from anywhere within

1 the DNR boundary. The final design of the visual  
2 screening will be subject to EFSEC approval. EFSEC's  
3 intent for the mitigation is to reduce visual impacts of  
4 the project within the normal boundary of the DNR parcel  
5 to less significant so that will be the standard to which  
6 the applicant will be held and they have been made aware  
7 of that. As to specific like percentage of how much of  
8 this blocks that's going to be part of the discussion as  
9 we develop the design for this, and it will be dependent  
10 on what type of visual screening is used and in what  
11 combination. We will be in consultation with the WDFW as  
12 well to make sure that the final design does not  
13 negatively impact other resources like the wildlife and  
14 water.

15 MR. CHILES: Thank you. I will give  
16 someone else a chance.

17 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Mr. Chiles.  
18 Other Council members comments or questions for the  
19 briefing that is currently before us? Okay. I don't see  
20 any currently. Do you have others?

21 MR. CHILES: I wanted to talk about  
22 light pollution. The Goldendale area is striving to be a  
23 dark sky community. We lost our status of that about  
24 five years ago and we are trying to get it back, so as  
25 part of that I would like to see a specific

1 recommendation in VI-1 and note that we are seeking  
2 international dark sky status and that all lighting must  
3 strictly comply with shielding requirements, and if you  
4 can see lights not only be avoided but just not be used,  
5 can you strengthen that language?

6 A big problem for dark sky is reflecting stuff off  
7 of parking lots and things like that. I don't think  
8 there's going to be a lot of paved parking areas and  
9 cement, white cement reflects very well so that's  
10 probably not going to be a huge issue, but if we keep the  
11 light low intensity instead of higher intensity that will  
12 also keep them from reflecting and shielded so you can't  
13 see them from the side or top, and like the light is  
14 coming out from the bottom of the unit.

15 MR. GREENE: Yeah, we can check the  
16 language, but I'm pretty sure that the light is the  
17 lights be downward facing. The only cement that will be  
18 used above ground in the project is the base of the BESS.  
19 The parking areas and roads will be gravel.

20 MR. CHILES: They will need a handicap  
21 parking area at the maintenance facility but that would  
22 be one spot.

23 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If I may, Councilman  
24 Chiles, the language in the current SCA does mention  
25 minimizing -- (inaudible) the secure requirements and

1 that the lights would avoid high intensity lights and  
2 would be downward directed lighting in the language.

3 MR. CHILES: Thank you, Ms.  
4 Hafkemeyer. I was concerned about just avoiding  
5 (inaudible.)

6 The other thing that I wanted to talk about was  
7 noise from the BESS units. And I see that the BESS noise  
8 levels are required to meet Washington state standards,  
9 which is good, but those standards, I believe, are  
10 probably designed for urban areas. Rural areas are much  
11 quieter, and anything above 40 decibels is audible in a  
12 rural area. I would like to see it strengthened so that  
13 the noise is below 40 decibels at any adjacent residents  
14 that are not part of the application. 40 decibels seems  
15 very quiet, if you go out at night 40 decibels is the  
16 level of crickets. When there's no freeway and  
17 background noise, 40 decibels is pretty loud. And so it  
18 seems excessive, but for the rural quality of life it's  
19 important that we limit those as well as possible. 40  
20 decibels from the units which are already spaced quite a  
21 distance from the residences should be an achievable and  
22 realistic goal. If the fans can't do that, they are too  
23 loud.

24 One other thing I want to mention although I don't  
25 think it's -- there's anything that can be done about it

1 at this point is --

2 MR. PAMPLIN: Did we get a response on  
3 the --

4 MR. GREENE: I haven't looked at the  
5 noise studies by the applicant, so I don't know -- I  
6 don't know how far off it may be from that, but that's  
7 something we can look into whether that guideline is  
8 already being met or whether it can be done.

9 MS. BUMPUS: I will also add that with  
10 the environmental review that was done we do look at  
11 local standards, whatever the local requirements are for  
12 addressing noise limits. EFSEC also looks at WAC 173-60  
13 which lays out maximum permissible environmental noise  
14 levels, and those are between 55 and 60 decibels. So  
15 this is -- I know we don't have this information right in  
16 front of us to answer the question now, but these would  
17 have certainly been the bar we would have started with,  
18 which isn't very far from the 40 which -- where did the  
19 40 come from?

20 MR. CHILES: The 40 comes from  
21 actually standing outside the BESS at night.

22 MS. BUMPUS: Are there standards that  
23 we can look at?

24 MR. CHILES: I don't know of written  
25 standards, and I think they might be stated being 55 to

1 60 decibel level. The difference is, you know, if your  
2 neighbors have a party and you can hear it at night,  
3 that's fine, but it's not every single night all year  
4 round, and that's where the different comes in.

5 If you are living in an urban area like this and you  
6 go outside at night, the background noise of the highway  
7 is probably 50 to 60 decibels anywhere, even right  
8 outside the building here. However, in a rural area we  
9 don't have those background noises. When we have a  
10 background noise it makes a big difference in the quality  
11 of life.

12 Now if the noise is to 60 decibels at the unit,  
13 that's probably going to meet the standard at houses  
14 farther away because it's setback, and I can't remember  
15 the exact setback of the BESS from the nearest house, but  
16 if it doesn't meet it then I think the units are too  
17 loud. We shouldn't be able to hear them.

18 CHAIR BECKETT: We appreciate that and  
19 good point. We can share that input for sure.  
20 Obviously, if it's a standard from the Washington  
21 standard that's certainly probably going to create a  
22 certain constraint for EFSEC, but I think it's one that's  
23 generally worthy of highlights because BESS units move in  
24 different places and it's something that EFSEC should be  
25 prepared to help elevate to the appropriate authority and

1 give us a broader issue, given we know that the BESS  
2 units have been located with kind of noise in mind in  
3 terms of their location and safety reasons to staff. I  
4 guess I would encourage if there's any additional  
5 discussion with the applicant on how best to achieve what  
6 they already intend to achieve but further confirm that  
7 for the community.

8  
9 MR. CHILES: The other thing in  
10 particular I wanted to mention IS in the county as we  
11 have been -- again, it's probably not applicable to this  
12 project, but I would like to bring it forward into the  
13 record going forward, as we are working on our new solar  
14 and BESS ordinance in the county, one of the things that  
15 we have discovered is that agrivoltaics works, and it is  
16 a shame this project is not including agrivoltaics, which  
17 is mixed agriculture with solar. Really, the only thing  
18 that needs to happen to make it happen is the panels need  
19 the be raised up a little so that either field operations  
20 or animals can go underneath. When you take land, farm  
21 land out of production for solar we are not looking to  
22 our future. I think solar is an important part of the  
23 future of this state, but we have to keep as much  
24 agricultural land in production as possible as we move  
25 forward in solar. And it would certainly be my hope that

1 agrivoltaics is an integral part of all solar projects  
2 moving forward. We plan on it being an integral part of  
3 all solar projects, at least in Klickitat County moving  
4 forward. The fact that the Carriger project is not going  
5 to have any agrivoltaics involved in it as far as I can  
6 see, is going to really hinder the acceptance of solar in  
7 places like Klickitat County because even though the  
8 setbacks are good, and setbacks are doing a pretty good  
9 job with wildlife passages, the fact that it takes land  
10 out of production that could be also coexisting with  
11 agriculture is -- people are going to look at that and  
12 say that is (inaudible). And I believe that solar should  
13 be a part of agriculture. It can be something that can  
14 add income to struggling farms and ranches, and at the  
15 same time the needs of electricity, and it can complement  
16 and coexist. And I'm sad to see that this project was  
17 not proposed with that in mind at the beginning and  
18 unless they have a big change of heart in the next few  
19 months, it seems unlikely that it's going to turn out  
20 that way, but I would encourage any solar project to move  
21 that way.

22 Also, as part of our new solar and BESS ordinance in  
23 the county, we are, are as a way to incentivize  
24 agrivoltaics if your solar product does not involve  
25 agrivoltaics then the actual solar panels fenced off area

1 for your project and impervious surfaces cannot be more  
2 than 20 percent of the project. I haven't run the  
3 figures exactly but the Carriger project is about 50  
4 percent of the area.

5 Now we would allow 60 percent fenced off for solar  
6 if they also had agrivoltaics and there (inaudible) in  
7 the works. These things can be incentivized so that  
8 we -- solar can be a big plus instead of a little plus.  
9 Again, solar is needed, but agriculture is also needed,  
10 and in doing solar without agriculture is unfortunately a  
11 very shortsighted view of the future.

12 That is my spiel on agrivoltaics. And I think I  
13 have -- the only last beef that I really need to bring up  
14 is as we have seen, this project has been vehemently  
15 opposed by a lot of local people in the county. I know  
16 there's people in the county who are in favor of solar or  
17 at least a land owner's right to put solar on their  
18 place, but a lot a lot a lot of people in the county have  
19 felt very runover by this process.

20 I am going to say that I really appreciate the  
21 setbacks and the work that you guys have done to try to  
22 minimize things, but the voice of the people is also  
23 important and no one has taken a poll, but it's running  
24 really, really, really against solar in our area and  
25 probably in a lot of other rural areas like us too. And

1 I'm not sure how to change that. I think instead of  
2 having a solar farm, which doesn't have any farm in it,  
3 we need to put some farm in it and that's going to help  
4 in the future. If we don't change this perspective and  
5 somehow -- somehow resell solar, it's going to lose us in  
6 the whole state and even the whole country is going to be  
7 bad off for it. I think solar is a necessary part of our  
8 future, but if we can't get the support of the people  
9 it's not going to happen.

10 The people, including Klickitat County, have spoken  
11 so far and unfortunately pretty much against solar, but I  
12 need to listen to their voice. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 That's all I have for now.

14 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. If something  
15 else comes to mind, please just speak up. Broad comments  
16 first, if I may.

17 MS. HAFKEMEYER: I just wanted to  
18 circle back if I may to Councilman Chiles' comment about  
19 the noise. I just pulled up the acoustic modeling and  
20 the modeling for both participating ordinances that most  
21 readings looks like they would be in the 30s, there's  
22 some in the 40s, but the range is from 20 to 50 but the  
23 vast majority is in the 30s and 40s. I just want to let  
24 you know that information. In.

25 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, very much.

1 And thank you again for your diligence in this. And  
2 while we -- EFSEC is not here to sell solar by any means,  
3 but respond to the applications that come before us. I  
4 would quickly note in deference to other Council, I  
5 certainly believe one of the best answers is what are the  
6 local pathways? What are the other local options other  
7 than EFSEC and the Department of Ecology, because those  
8 are the three choices in Washington. So if there's other  
9 followup when we are allowed to appropriately have those  
10 conversation and happy to make sure and dig in on that  
11 topic. I certainly agree on agrivoltaics as well, but I  
12 do want to acknowledge it is an important element. And  
13 my understanding that in Klickitat County there is  
14 certainly existing a solar project that has subsequently  
15 (inaudible). Certainly welcome the evolution of the  
16 project continues to live in the community, and with that  
17 thank you fellow Council members for indulging me. Any  
18 other questions or comments? Okay. Hearing none and  
19 seeing none on the screen.

20 So with that, I will then move to entertain a  
21 recommendation to the Governor that is the wishes of the  
22 Council.

23 And since this is my first time on a site  
24 certificate recommendation, are we moving this onto or do  
25 we have any further comment from Council on the draft

1 SCA? Do we need it on the table with a motion to  
2 consider and take discussion?

3 MR. THOMPSON: What I would suggest is  
4 Council would do so make a motion -- well, let me ask  
5 this. I think the -- there are two draft site  
6 certification and recommendations. I think those are  
7 being considered as a big package, and so if it were a  
8 motion to approve those recommendations.

9 MS. BUMPUS: Right, the recommendation  
10 report and the site draft certification.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Then you could  
12 entertain comments after that motion.

13 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. I do have some  
14 legal approved language if other Council would like to  
15 have the benefit of that, provide that as far as how we  
16 best have this on the record officially, but is there a  
17 motion to entertain this site certification agreement?  
18 Here's the language of that. That helps put you on the  
19 spot to make sure we get this appropriately read.

20 MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey  
21 Brewster. I move to approve the draft site certification  
22 agreement as amended, including edits discussed during  
23 today's meeting, and the report recommending the Governor  
24 approve the Carriger Solar project located in Klickitat  
25 County.

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Is there a second for  
2 the motion?

3 MR. PAMPLIN: I will second.

4 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Councilman  
5 Pamplin. There is a motion on the table that has been  
6 seconded. Let me note for the record the language is  
7 clear, just to make sure that all our appropriate legal  
8 and public preface measures are taken. The Council is  
9 now going to begin a full discussion as desired on what  
10 is on the table and its amendments by the Council, so  
11 that is part of our process and I want to just  
12 acknowledge that, and we can adapt the motion if need be  
13 accordingly, as much as I think the matters are fairly  
14 clear on the table.

15 Councilman Pamplin, did you have a question?

16 MR. PAMPLIN: Look to Council Member  
17 Brewster if she wants to speak to her motion.

18 CHAIR BECKETT: All right. Council  
19 Young.

20 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. I just want to  
21 make sure we are very clear on what we are voting for as  
22 the motion refers not only to the written documents that  
23 Council received at 12:35 p.m. today but also referenced  
24 changes made during this meeting. Have -- reflecting on  
25 the preceding discussion, did any of that amount to a

1 specific change in the language we received earlier this  
2 afternoon, and if so could that be clearly stated what  
3 those changes were?

4 CHAIR BECKETT: We have not taken any  
5 changes in the meeting today to be clear. I realize you  
6 are asking about the amended document I believe Ms.  
7 Hafkemeyer provided a clarifying comment earlier. And we  
8 can do either. I appreciate you calling which is on the  
9 table today, is on the table as the document entered this  
10 week so that's what's on the table.

11 MS. HAFKEMEYER: So if this is not in  
12 keeping with what the Council prefers we can change  
13 course, but in keeping track of the items discussed so  
14 far some of the items staff have made note to incorporate  
15 their consideration in the fire plan as identified in the  
16 draft SCA, but those items would be addressed in the  
17 draft plan or in the plan prior to approval, not  
18 necessarily the language of the documents today.

19 A suggested change in language regarding battery  
20 chemistry can be made where the language currently  
21 resides, which is in the revised DMNS, and that can be  
22 incorporated as staff makes the other change that Mr.  
23 Greene spoke to earlier when we finalize the document to  
24 incorporate the term periodic.

25 We can also incorporate the language regarding

1 battery chemistry to consider public health and safety as  
2 well. That can be done and the staff can commit to doing  
3 that, but that is not something that we have identified  
4 that needs to be changed in the draft SCA and  
5 recommendation report.

6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. That's what I  
7 was asking whether there have been any changes to the  
8 report or the draft SCA that make it different than what  
9 you the Council was sent earlier today.

10 MS. BUMPUS: The answer is no.

11 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

12 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. No changes from  
13 what was sent earlier today, just to clarify for  
14 everyone's benefit. Other comments or questions?

15 MR. PAMPLIN: We are in the  
16 deliberation phase of this agenda item. Something I  
17 really appreciate your line of questions and your  
18 comments, Mr. Chiles, relative to this project and  
19 particularly calling out the very vocal local opposition  
20 to the project. And one of the things that I am trying  
21 to reconcile, and I would appreciate hearing your  
22 perspective as a resident of the county is a majority of  
23 this project is within the county's energy overlay zone,  
24 and so can you help me reconcile about the local  
25 government has endorsed energy being sited in this area

1 and then the opposition from -- is the county government  
2 opposed to an energy project within their energy overlay  
3 zone?

4 MR. CHILES: I will address that.  
5 Yes, the energy overlay zone when it was first conceived  
6 and put together approximately 20 years ago was mostly  
7 focused on wind, and wind was the big industry coming in  
8 and we wanted to encourage wind at that time. And solar  
9 was seen as something on the horizon, and at that point  
10 no one really envisioned any solar operation greater than  
11 maybe 20 or 40 acres. And that sort of scale is  
12 different than something covering 1600 acres.

13 The site that was chosen it is in the energy overlay  
14 zone, but the main reason it's a beneficial site is  
15 because of its proximity to the substation area on that  
16 road. Other than that, it can be argued and has been  
17 argued that it's not a very good location for something  
18 that's going to be as visually intrusive as a  
19 nonagriculture solar site is. It's very close to town.  
20 It's on the side of a long broad hill that can be seen  
21 from miles around and in probably about a 270 degree  
22 direction, so it's very visible, not just for the people  
23 who are right there but for people who are quite a long  
24 ways away. It's not a hidden site at all. Those are --  
25 so, yeah, the county is opposed to it. Every county

1 commissioner I have ever talked to has been opposed to  
2 this location. The two county commissioners who came up  
3 on record to various meetings and have talked about it.  
4 We only have three county commissioners. Again, they are  
5 not opposed to solar per se and as has already been  
6 mentioned, we have a very large solar project in the east  
7 part of the county, which is very sparsely populated. So  
8 there's areas in the county that are more suitable to  
9 solar than the Goldendale Valley, and there are probably  
10 areas within the Goldendale Valley that are more suitable  
11 to solar. There are areas in the Goldendale Valley which  
12 are isolated subvalleys or are areas that are really not  
13 very developed.

14 The ridge near where I live that only has one road  
15 to get to it and not a lot of people can see it, and  
16 there's probably several thousand acres back there that  
17 could be used for solar. There's other areas around, but  
18 right now the county has kneejerk responded, in my  
19 opinion, and the whole valley is off of solar right now.  
20 We are working on changing that, but even with our solar  
21 ordinance it's likely the whole valley is going to stay  
22 off solar. I would like to see the valley at least in  
23 areas that would meet the criteria of a solar ordinance  
24 be open for that, but I don't foresee that happening in  
25 the near future. So, yeah, and that whole response to

1 county demands solar is unfortunately the result of the  
2 Carriger project being a large solar spot sited very  
3 close to town. I think solar is good, and I think solar  
4 can coexist with agriculture, but this location is not  
5 coexisting with agriculture. It has a lot of people  
6 really upset.

7 CHAIR BECKETT: Okay. Other comments  
8 or questions from the Council? Okay. Well, let me  
9 restate then the motion that's on the table.

10 The motion to approve the draft site certification  
11 of the agreement as amended and the report recommending  
12 that the Governor approve the Carriger Solar project  
13 located in Klickitat County.

14 That is the motion. Any further discussion before I  
15 call the question? Okay. Hearing none. All those in  
16 favor --

17 MR. CHILES: Mr. Chair, can I request  
18 a roll call vote?

19 CHAIR BECKETT: Happy to do so.  
20 Prepared to call the Carriger Project, Council.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair Beckett, this  
22 Andrea Grantham and I can call the roll for the votes.

23 CHAIR BECKETT: For the Carriger  
24 project. Thank you. Please do so.

25 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair Kurt Beckett?

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Chair votes aye.

2 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Commerce,  
3 Elizabeth Osborne?

4 MS. OSBORNE: Aye.

5 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Ecology,  
6 Eli Levitt? No response.

7 Department of Fish & Wildlife, Nate Pamplin?

8 MR. PAMPLIN: Aye.

9 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural  
10 Resources, Lenny Young?

11 MR. YOUNG: Aye

12 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities &  
13 Transportation Commission, Stacey Brewster?

14 MS. BREWSTER: Aye.

15 MS. GRANTHAM: And then for Carriger  
16 Solar Klickitat County, Matt Chiles?

17 MR. CHILES: Nay.

18 MS. GRANTHAM: And I will go back to  
19 Department of Ecology. I know that Eli Levitt was here  
20 during the original roll call. Are you here right now,  
21 Mr. Levitt? I'm not hearing anything, Chair, but if  
22 Council Member Levitt were to say nay there would still  
23 be a quorum for the ayes.

24 MR. LEVITT: Can you hear me now?

25 CHAIR BECKETT: Yes, we can.

1 CHAIR BECKETT: We are having trouble  
2 hearing you, but I think you said aye. If you could  
3 repeat for record we would appreciate it.

4 MR. LEVITT: Yes, I said aye.

5 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Council.

6 MS. GRANTHAM: So there six ayes and  
7 one nay.

8 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Ms.  
9 Grantham. So thank you, Council. The motion passes.  
10 The Carriger Solar project will advance to the Governor.

11 I do want to acknowledge especially to Council  
12 Chiles, the work is ultimately not over. Very critical  
13 decisions have been reached here, so I want to  
14 acknowledge both those things. One of the benefits of  
15 EFSEC is I would say it's a swaddle to grave place, so  
16 our projects ultimately have a continued accountability,  
17 which we see as a two-way street both with staff and  
18 working with projects, and we certainly would anticipate  
19 exactly that going forward and a lot of important work by  
20 the applicants to proceed should eventually this project  
21 be approved. We are not the final decisionmaker here,  
22 appreciate everyone's time and participation and the  
23 diligent work you do, and the flexibility as mentioned in  
24 various plans as they are adopted.

25 MR. CHILES: I do want to thank the

1 Council for their help in this, and the many adjustments  
2 that have been made to the original plan I think are  
3 going to make this project much better as finally  
4 approved than as originally proposed. I feel like my  
5 voice was heard. And although my involvement with the  
6 Council I think is probably going to be done after today,  
7 or assuming that the Governor signs this, we shall find  
8 out, it has been a pleasure and I have learned a lot and  
9 thank you for the opportunity.

10 CHAIR BECKETT: I appreciate that,  
11 Councilman Chiles. And as I said earlier, when  
12 appropriate we have will have further conversation. I  
13 look forward to that.

14 With that I will find our agenda again and we will  
15 continue to move on with a few other projects. I'm  
16 sorry, Councilman Young, we will not move on until you  
17 have spoken.

18 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. I would just  
19 like to thank very much Council Member Chiles for the  
20 great job he did expressing the county's perspectives. I  
21 learned a lot from everything you said Council Member  
22 Chiles, and really appreciate it. I think you did a very  
23 eloquent and admirable job of representing the county's  
24 perspectives and concerns so thank you.

25 MR. CHILES: Thank you.

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Moving on to the Horse  
2 Heaven Wind project update, Ms. Moon.

3 MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Chair  
4 Beckett and EFSEC Council members. As stated, this is  
5 Amy Moon reporting on the Horse Heaven Wind project.  
6 EFSEC staff continued to work on an addendum to the Horse  
7 Heaven Wind Farm final environmental impact statement, or  
8 final EIS in response to the certificate holder  
9 identifying the Department of Natural Resources, or DNR,  
10 Gould Well as their water source for construction and  
11 operation. As indicated in my May Council update, the  
12 public comment period on the addendum to the Horse Heaven  
13 Wind Project final EES was open May 5th through the 19th.  
14 Due to technical difficulties viewing the comments, I  
15 reported at the May Council meeting that EFSEC received  
16 comments from three individuals expressing general  
17 opposition to the project and concern over the use of  
18 this water source for nonagricultural purposes. However,  
19 in addition to those comments EFSEC received comments  
20 from the DNR, Tri City CARES regarding lease conditions,  
21 procedural processes, and a change from agricultural use  
22 to an access road and parking for Gould Well. No changes  
23 were made to the addendum document other than updating  
24 the document as the final addendum to the final  
25 environmental impact statement to document and conclude

1 the EIS addendum process. EFSEC determined that the new  
2 information and analysis for Gould Well as the water  
3 source does not substantially change the final EIS  
4 analysis of significant impacts and alternatives, and  
5 that an addendum was appropriate for documenting this  
6 under this review under SEPA.

7 Does the Council have any questions?

8 CHAIR BECKETT: Council members,  
9 questions? Comments? Okay. Hearing none we move on to  
10 the Hop Hill Solar project.

11 MR. TAYLOR: This is Trevin Taylor on  
12 behalf of John Barnes EFSEC staff for the Hop Hill  
13 application. Continued to review the application with  
14 the contractor, the contracted agencies, and the Tribal  
15 governments. Are there any questions?

16 CHAIR BECKETT: Questions, Council?  
17 Hearing none. Let's move on to Wallula Gap.

18 MR. TAYLOR: Chair Beckett and Council  
19 members, Trevin Taylor on behalf of John Barnes EFSEC  
20 staff for the Wallula Gap application. EFSEC staff met  
21 with the applicant on May 22nd, 2025 to discuss its  
22 interest in pausing their application with EFSEC for site  
23 certification due to ongoing connectivity difficulties  
24 with Bonneville Power Administration. The option was  
25 proposed by EFSEC to the applicant to continue to keep

1 the application open to allow SEPA work and TCP studies  
2 to be completed. The applicant expressed their interest  
3 in pausing the application after this work has been  
4 completed, likely towards the fall of 2025 time period.  
5 Staff met with Department of Ecology and wetlands  
6 consultant, Jeff Gray, on June 24th, 2025 for the wetland  
7 verification for the site. The site visit completed  
8 ongoing wetland site verification for this application.  
9 Continued to coordinating and review the application with  
10 their contractors, contracted agencies, and Tribal  
11 governments. Are there any questions?

12 CHAIR BECKETT: Council, questions?  
13 Okay. And we will move on to the Goldeneye BESS project.

14 MS. SNARSKI: Good afternoon, Chair  
15 Beckett. Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist assigned  
16 to Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System facility in  
17 Skagit County. Staff are working to continue with our  
18 partner agencies to review and seek information on the  
19 application for site certification. US Solar the  
20 developer for Goldeneye project sent us a response to our  
21 (inaudible) request sent to them back in March 2025. We  
22 are in the process of evaluating that response.

23 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Questions?  
24 Comments? Hearing none, moving on to Transmission PEI.  
25 Mr. Greene.

1 MR. GREENE: Good afternoon, Chair  
2 Beckett and Council members. This is Sean Greene SEPA  
3 specialist for EFSEC. Since the last council meeting  
4 staff have completed a series of feasibility tests for  
5 the programmatic EIS. These test sessions involved EFSEC  
6 staff working with external industry and regulatory staff  
7 to present common and use case scenarios for the  
8 programmatic EIS, and having those external resources  
9 work through the draft of the programmatic EIS in an  
10 attempt to identify the potential points of confusion or  
11 navigation difficulties that could be addressed in the  
12 final programmatic EIS.

13 EFSEC staff continues to work with our consultants  
14 at WFP to make edits, revisions, and refinements to the  
15 draft programmatic EIS in response to comments received  
16 during the public comment period and the usability  
17 testings sessions.

18 EFSEC staff and WFP are also working to prepare  
19 supplemental checklists and manual tools that would  
20 facilitate users from the draft EIS. EFSEC staff has  
21 received a 90-day extension for our contract to complete  
22 work on the final programmatic EIS on this chart of  
23 enterprise services and we currently anticipate  
24 publishing final programmatic EIS in late September of  
25 2025. Are there any questions?

1 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Mr. Greene.  
2 Questions anyone? Okay. So that will take us to Desert  
3 Claim, Ms. Moon.

4 MS. MOON: Again, good afternoon,  
5 Chair Beckett and EFSEC Council members. This is Amy  
6 Moon reporting on the Desert Claim wind power project.  
7 Their May 13th request to terminate the Desert Claim wind  
8 project site certification agreement known as the SCA. I  
9 updated the Council on this termination request from the  
10 project proponent, Desert Claim Wind Power, LLC, in my  
11 May 21st update. Following the May Council meeting and  
12 in coordination with our Assistant Attorney General,  
13 staff prepared Resolution No. 356 as Amendment No. 3 to  
14 the Desert Claim Wind Power project site certification  
15 agreement to terminate the project. To recap Desert  
16 Claim's request, the certificate holder did not commence  
17 facility construction. No longer sees a path to  
18 financing construction, and wishes to terminate the SCA.  
19 The resolution before you today includes the background  
20 procedural status, discussion, and EFSEC staff  
21 recommendation that their request for termination be  
22 granted.

23 I do have a few edits to apply to the draft  
24 resolution that I want to point out to the Council. In  
25 the procedural status section on Page 2 we clarified that

1 the ordinarily applicable criteria for amendment of SCAs  
2 have no practical application to the certificate holder's  
3 request by adding the qualifying word termination.

4 In addition, the resolution was updated to reflect  
5 that one comment was received during the June 16th,  
6 through 22nd public comment period on this resolution.  
7 And finally on Page 3 of the resolution, the duplicate  
8 project name, Desert Claim was removed and we clarified  
9 the resolution grants Desert Claim Wind Power's  
10 termination request.

11 As stated previously, the only comment, the one  
12 comment received on the draft resolution No. 356 during  
13 the public comment period, did not prompt any changes in  
14 the draft resolution other than to propose editing the  
15 draft resolution to reflect that one comment was received  
16 in the procedural status section of the resolution. Any  
17 other staff have anything to add? Does the Council have  
18 any questions?

19 CHAIR BECKETT: Council, questions?  
20 Okay. Very well. Then we do have this on our agenda,  
21 notice for action, or potential action, so the Chair  
22 would entertain a motion to approve draft resolution 356  
23 as amended to terminate the Desert Claim site certificate  
24 agreement as requested by Desert Claim Wind Power, LLC.  
25 Is there a motion accordingly?

1 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne so  
2 moved.

3 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, second.

4 CHAIR BECKETT: Motion is on the table  
5 and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing and seeing none,  
6 all those in favor of approving the motion please say  
7 aye?

8 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

9 CHAIR BECKETT: Opposed? Hearing none  
10 unanimous approval of Desert Claim. Thank you.

11 So we will next move into our other category and we  
12 will have a Council delegation of authority to the EFSEC  
13 director topic in the case of briefing on the topic. Let  
14 me know as Chair, including if there was a comment  
15 submitted to the record highlighting the belief that the  
16 interdependency between this policy and the Horse Heaven  
17 project, of which I recused myself as Chair, and so I  
18 just want to say for the record that given there may be  
19 different views how related this piece of this policy is  
20 towards that, I certainly believe an abundance of caution  
21 is appropriate here and excuse myself as Chair for any  
22 details of policy, as well as its consideration by the  
23 Council in terms of approval so I will not be a part of  
24 that process. My role here today is to serve as Chair  
25 and facilitate said briefing and discussion by the

1 Council. So I will note that for the Council, the  
2 public, and the record. With that, Director Bumpus.

3 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Beckett,  
4 and good afternoon Council members.

5 So as Chair Beckett mentioned, we had planned to  
6 potentially take action for the Council to consider  
7 today, but today we will just do this briefing and I will  
8 provide some information about the policy and the changes  
9 and what I would propose is that we plan to move this to  
10 the July agenda so we will proceed with it but a couple  
11 of the comments as to why, I would like to do that.

12 So the policy 16-01 is a policy that delegates  
13 authority to the -- it used to say manager of EFSEC to  
14 review and approve facility plans for construction and  
15 operation, and so there's been -- there are a number of  
16 reasons we need to update the plan. And it's actually  
17 sort of overdo really to update this policy.

18 EFSEC became an independent agency in 2022, and as I  
19 mentioned earlier, it refers to the EFSEC manager and now  
20 there's no longer an EFSEC manager but an executive  
21 director so we need to change that.

22 The other thing that we need to address in the  
23 updated policy is the different types of facility plans  
24 that we are seeing implemented for facilities that we  
25 more recently permitted. Historically, EFSEC hasn't had

1 very many projects and so the types of facility plans  
2 that we saw we were relatively limited, but as our  
3 regulatory purview has expanded now we have clean energy  
4 manufacturing facilities, hydrogen. We are seeing  
5 several more applications coming in for alternative  
6 energy facilities. We are seeing different types of  
7 plans, plan requirements that we need to make sure we  
8 address.

9 And so we have put forth those changes that were  
10 sent to you in the draft. We did put this out for public  
11 comment, and in looking at those comments there were some  
12 concerns that we are sensitive to. We had posted the  
13 document, but we had not shown the document and tracked  
14 changes to show how we were revising the policy, updating  
15 the policy. We do see it as mostly housekeeping just to,  
16 you know, update these plans.

17 There is a change in there that has to do with  
18 recommendations that come from an advisory committee or  
19 group, such as like the PTAC or Horse Heaven, or  
20 technical advisory committee for Wild Horse Wind Farm, so  
21 we were trying to also address that and include the  
22 recommendations.

23 As I said before, the document wasn't posted out  
24 there for the comment period that showed what it looks  
25 like before and what it looks like after the changes, so

1 what I would like to do is make sure we take a careful  
2 look at all of the comments, provide the public an  
3 opportunity to see the document in the underline  
4 strikethroughs so they can see what it used to look like  
5 and what we are proposing to change in it. We really  
6 don't see it as being a big shift from the prior policy,  
7 which was approved in 2016 I think was the last time the  
8 policy was updated by the Council. So we see this as  
9 housekeeping.

10 Go ahead and post that and then plan to take it up  
11 at the July meeting. And in the meantime, I spoke with  
12 our legal counsel about this, also take a look at the  
13 comments and provide input to the Council from our AAG if  
14 there's anything substantive there that we need to relate  
15 to the Council before they take up this item.

16 So if that sounds good, I think that that would be a  
17 good way to proceed. And, of course, happy to answer any  
18 questions about this plan or approach. And Jon Thompson  
19 is also here and we discussed this plan. I discussed it  
20 with him and I think he supports this too.

21 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you for the  
22 briefing. Are there comments or questions of Council or  
23 staff? I know several of the Council have been in touch  
24 with the staff and certainly sending questions and  
25 feedback and discussion, so as is appropriate on an

1 individual basis. If there are any of those questions  
2 that need to be raised here for clarification let me just  
3 check that again. EFSEC staff is available from a public  
4 access standpoint as well as Council (inaudible).

5 Last call for any comments or questions.

6 MS. BREWSTER: I appreciate the extra  
7 time for allowing for this process. There was quite a  
8 bit of concern brought by the public, and I appreciate  
9 that we are going to allow it to take it up.

10 CHAIR BECKETT: Appreciate that and I  
11 would agree. Thank you. Okay. Then we will close that  
12 item and move on to our final item, and thank you for the  
13 extra time today given the busy agenda.

14 Next is the website update and Dave Walker will  
15 present on that item. I will just say at the outset I'm  
16 excited this day has arrived. And I'm the official  
17 recipient of the benefit of the leadership that worked on  
18 this, multiple staff, prior Chair and other Council who  
19 may have had some role in this. I think it's a key part  
20 of any organization, but especially one like EFSEC in  
21 terms of public transparency and ease of use. I believe  
22 there are some startup aspects and feedback and I'm sure  
23 Dave will cover some of what we have, or how we  
24 anticipate the launch continuing, and certainly just part  
25 of the effort to make it as accessible as possible.

1 I want to acknowledge too that from a process  
2 standpoint EFSEC does work under, I think, a unique  
3 number of statutes as a result of the kind of unique  
4 authority in the state as a result the public process  
5 that accompanies that is often not intuitive in terms of  
6 when public comments have to happen before an action or  
7 after an action. That's not always retailed very well at  
8 the ground level, and I just want to acknowledge that. I  
9 this those are issues that we are all committed to  
10 working on and improving. I think things like this tool  
11 are hopefully a day to day essential and I think they  
12 will play a role in the larger evolution that makes this  
13 a consistent and transparent and accessible agency for  
14 those who participate in it and for those who are living  
15 with it. Mr. Walker.

16 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Chair Beckett  
17 and Council members. For the record, Dave Walker,  
18 interim director of administrative services. This  
19 morning at 7:00 a.m. we launched our new website. I  
20 would like to point out this was a nine month effort that  
21 literally took hundreds of hours of staff time, and not  
22 only the organization and development, but all of the key  
23 pieces behind the scenes that needed to occur for a large  
24 project such as this.

25 Essentially, we did a complete redesign of the

1 website, making the information, I think, easier to find  
2 and much more clearer for the public and for our  
3 stakeholders that go to the site to find the information.

4 Some of the key pieces, we put the upcoming events  
5 very clearly on the landing page towards the top of the  
6 website to make it very simple to see what the upcoming  
7 events are scheduled say for the next month or two months  
8 out.

9 Project pages, I think, are much more clearer as  
10 well actually showing the phase of where the project is  
11 within the process, as well as the energy types being  
12 drawn out. All of the project specific information is  
13 also housed within those particular areas as well, which  
14 also makes it much easier to navigate the new website and  
15 find the information.

16 As we move forward we are -- we have now entered the  
17 stabilization period which is probably going to take a  
18 good two to three months for us to really get through.  
19 We have a punch list of approximately 45 items that we  
20 need to follow up on at this point that we will be doing  
21 in the background during that stabilization period.

22 There is definitely more to come, not only with the  
23 stabilization piece but as we grow the agency and we grow  
24 the website to meet the needs not only of the agency but  
25 our customers and stakeholders as well.

1        So this is a very, very exciting time and I'm just  
2        very proud of all of our staff that stepped in, rolled up  
3        their sleeves and made this happen in addition to their  
4        regular jobs, so it was quite a lift.

5        And the one thing that I did want to repeat as well  
6        and, Chair, you mentioned this at the beginning of the  
7        meeting, the email address if anyone is having issues  
8        accessing the website is webhelp@efsec.wa.gov. Thank  
9        you.

10                CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you.  
11        Congratulations to all the staff most closely wedded into  
12        this, which is really all the staff I realize, I realize  
13        that there are a few individuals in particular that  
14        perhaps we will find the more formal means to thank you  
15        at another time.

16                MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Beckett,  
17        and Council. You know, just to thank the staff, all the  
18        staff that pulled together to complete the website  
19        project. As Mr. Walker noted, our work is not done. We  
20        have a number of things we need to do, but it's been a  
21        tremendous workload and everybody pulled together and  
22        contributed input into getting this project finished, and  
23        I'm very happy with where we are and very proud of  
24        everyone's contribution even with our very heavy  
25        workload. Lots of appreciation for all of that work and

1 effort.

2 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you.  
3 Congratulations. More work to come, but still a big day.  
4 Are there other Council comments or any closing.

5 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair, this is Andrea  
6 Grantham. I would just make a quick comment that the  
7 email to contact isn't webhelp it's actually  
8 websitehelp@efsec.wa.gov.

9 MR. WALKER: Thank you.

10 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. So again  
11 websitehelp@efsec.wa.gov is the email specific to any  
12 assistance with the website. There's a search function,  
13 I think, to help function on the site anyway, but  
14 specific issues here in the near term you can send it  
15 websitehelp@efsec.wa.gov.

16 Any last Council questions? Comments? Okay. Then  
17 at 3:23 we are adjourned for our meeting.

18  
19 (Proceedings adjourned  
20 at 3:23 p.m.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Byers & Anderson, Inc. - our Court Reporters & Video  
STATE OF WASHINGTON ) I, Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR,  
County of Pierce ) ss a certified court reporter  
in the State of Washington, do  
hereby certify:

That the foregoing Monthly Meeting of the Washington  
State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was conducted  
in my presence and adjourned on June 25, 2025, 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;

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;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on  
April 2nd, 2025.

/s/Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR  
Certified Court Reporter No. 1932  
(Certification expires 05/06/26.)