



AGENDA

MONTHLY MEETING

Wednesday July 16, 2025
1:30 PM

HYBRID MEETING

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Conference number: 564-999-2000 ID: 141231937#

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1. Call to Order |Kurt Beckett, EFSEC Chair |
| 2. Roll Call |Adrienne Barker, EFSEC Staff |
| 3. Proposed Agenda |Kurt Beckett, EFSEC Chair |
| 4. Minutes | Meeting MinutesKurt Beckett, EFSEC Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 25, 2025 Monthly Meeting Minutes |
| 5. Projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Kittitas Valley Wind Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Jarred Caseday, EDP Renewables b. Wild Horse Wind Power Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Jennifer Galbraith, Puget Sound Energy c. Chehalis Generation Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Jeremy Smith, Chehalis Generation d. Grays Harbor Energy Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor Energy e. Columbia Solar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Elizabeth Drachenberg, Greenbacker Capital f. Columbia Generating Station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Josh LaPorte, Energy Northwest g. WNP – 1/4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Operational Updates.....Josh LaPorte, Energy Northwest h. Goose Prairie Solar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Updates.....Nelson Jia, Brookfield Renewable i. Ostrea Solar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Jon Voltz, Cypress Creek Renewables j. Carriger Solar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff k. Horse Heaven Wind Farm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff l. Hop Hill Solar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....John Barnes, EFSEC Staff m. Goldeneye BESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff n. Transmission PEIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Sean Greene, EFSEC Staff o. Badger Mountain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Updates.....Joanne Snarski, EFSEC Staff |

Notes: The following projects are not on the agenda due to lack of project activity: Wautoma Solar, High Top Solar, and Wallula Gap.

"FINAL ACTION" means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.020 This is not the final action on this application review, and there will be additional opportunities for public comment on this project.

p. **Small Modular Reactor**

- Pre-Application Update.....Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff

6. Other

- Council Delegation of Authority to EFSEC Director.....Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff
The Council may take FINAL ACTION on delegating authority to the EFSEC Director
- Cost Allocation.....Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff
- New Staff Introduction - Nabila Gomes.....Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff

7. Adjourn.....Kurt Beckett, EFSEC Chair

Notes: The following projects are not on the agenda due to lack of project activity:Wautoma Solar, High Top Solar, and Wallula Gap.

"**FINAL ACTION**" means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.020 This is not the final action on this application review, and there will be additional opportunities for public comment on this project.

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

schedule@balitigation.com

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>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 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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>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.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>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.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>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?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>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 --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, second. 2 CHAIR BECKETT: Any discussion or 3 changes to the monthly regular meeting on the 21st of 4 May? Okay. Hearing none, all in favor say aye? 5 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye. 6 CHAIR BECKETT: Opposed? Minutes are 7 adopted. Next up we have our project updates and we will 8 move to Kittitas Valley Wind project, Mr. Caseday. 9 MR. CASEDAY: Good afternoon, Chair 10 Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff. This is Jarred Caseday 11 of the EDP Renewables for the Kittitas Valley Wind power 12 project and we had nothing nonroutine to report for the 13 period. 14 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Mr. 15 Caseday. Next up, Wild Horse Wind Power project, 16 Jennifer Galbraith. 17 MS. GALBRAITH: Can you hear me? 18 CHAIR BECKETT: We can. 19 MS. GALBRAITH: Okay. Great. Thank 20 you Chair Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff, this is 21 Jennifer Galbraith with Puget Sound Energy representing 22 the Wild Horse Wind facility, and I have nothing 23 nonroutine to report for the month of May. 24 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up, 25 Chehalis Generation Facility.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair</p> <p>2 Beckett, Council members and EFSEC staff, this is Jeremy</p> <p>3 Smith, the operations manager representing the Chehalis</p> <p>4 Generation Facility. There are no nonroutine items to</p> <p>5 report for this period.</p> <p>6 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up</p> <p>7 Grays Harbor Energy Center.</p> <p>8 MS. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair</p> <p>9 Beckett, Council members and staff, Grays Harbor Energy</p> <p>10 also has nothing nonroutine to report for the month of</p> <p>11 May.</p> <p>12 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you very much.</p> <p>13 Next up, Columbia Solar, Ms. Drachenberg.</p> <p>14 MS. DRACHENBERG: Good afternoon,</p> <p>15 Chair, Council and staff, this is Elizabeth Drachenberg</p> <p>16 with Columbia Solar, and no nonroutine updates to report.</p> <p>17 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you. Next up</p> <p>18 Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4, Josh LaPorte.</p> <p>19 MR. LAPORTE: Good afternoon, Chair</p> <p>20 Beckett, EFSEC Council and staff, this is Josh LaPorte,</p> <p>21 representing Columbia Generating Station and Washington</p> <p>22 Nuclear Projects 1/4. The facility update is included in</p> <p>23 your packet for both sites. There's no nonroutine</p> <p>24 updates to report for the month of May.</p> <p>25 I would just point out that I think that the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 Next up Ostrea Solar, Jon Voltz.</p> <p>2 MR. VOLTZ: Good afternoon, this is</p> <p>3 Jon Voltz with Cypress Creek Renewables representing</p> <p>4 Ostrea Solar. I would also like to comment that I</p> <p>5 believe these updates are from the previous month</p> <p>6 representing the period for April. I had the report for</p> <p>7 May identified or pulled up on my end and can provide</p> <p>8 those updates. We are continuing a construction road.</p> <p>9 Construction is 95 percent complete. Inverter and array</p> <p>10 pile installation is ongoing throughout the facility.</p> <p>11 Racking installation has begun. Fencing is up 90 percent</p> <p>12 of the east portion, about 40 percent in the west. AC</p> <p>13 cable installs looking at about 80 percent complete.</p> <p>14 Substation construction is underway. Foundations are</p> <p>15 being poured, and we have started to receive modules that</p> <p>16 are being prepped for installation.</p> <p>17 There was one incident that occurred in the month of</p> <p>18 May on the 27th. There was a diesel fuel spill that was</p> <p>19 caused due to incorrect process being followed during</p> <p>20 fueling the tank of an employee vehicle that we have</p> <p>21 remediated the incident. The cleanup has been performed.</p> <p>22 We are waiting to receive the final report from Patriot.</p> <p>23 That has been mitigated. Those are all the updates for</p> <p>24 Ostrea Solar for the period of May.</p> <p>25 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you very much.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 facility updates on the screen are actually for the month</p> <p>2 of April. However, I will also just bring up for the</p> <p>3 Council's awareness the Columbia Generating Station was</p> <p>4 recently brought back online from our refueling outage</p> <p>5 27, and during system checks a vibration in the turbine</p> <p>6 was observed that require the plant be taken back offline</p> <p>7 to address that issue safely. This is a planned</p> <p>8 maintenance procedure and similar to those performed in</p> <p>9 December 2021. That's all I have for Columbia Generating</p> <p>10 Station and WNP 1/4.</p> <p>11 CHAIR BECKETT: Appreciate the update</p> <p>12 as well as certainly the extra wave of activity that goes</p> <p>13 with Energy Northwest, so congratulations on that</p> <p>14 process.</p> <p>15 Next up Goose Prairie Solar, Nelson Jia.</p> <p>16 MR. JIA: Good afternoon everybody.</p> <p>17 For the month of April we had about 19 -- almost 2001</p> <p>18 hours generation. We did some fan power supply</p> <p>19 replacements that occurred on the inverter units that</p> <p>20 ultimately failed. Many inverter units continue to</p> <p>21 experience similar faults or errors, so we are continuing</p> <p>22 to work with Sun Grow to kind of fix those issues.</p> <p>23 Otherwise, no other major comments from an</p> <p>24 environmental or safety compliance perspective.</p> <p>25 CHAIR BECKETT: Very well. Thank you.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 Both projects have highlighted the April versus later</p> <p>2 update. I believe I read a correct version this morning</p> <p>3 but if we could make sure the website record has the</p> <p>4 current report it would be great.</p> <p>5 Next up we have Carriger Solar and Joanne Snarski</p> <p>6 and Sean Greene will be presenting.</p> <p>7 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair</p> <p>8 Beckett, staff and Council members. My name is Joanne</p> <p>9 Snarski, the siting specialist for EFSEC. And I will be</p> <p>10 giving the presentation today alongside Sean Greene, our</p> <p>11 state environmental ecology specialist assigned to</p> <p>12 Carriger.</p> <p>13 The purpose of this presentation is to describe to</p> <p>14 Council the developments that went into the draft Site</p> <p>15 Certification Agreement or SCA. As a result of</p> <p>16 discussions with the Yakama Nation, explained the</p> <p>17 development of the revised mitigated determination of</p> <p>18 nonsignificance, or RMDNS. Summarized, the comments</p> <p>19 received during these public comment campaigns for these</p> <p>20 documents, and finally to explain the minor changes that</p> <p>21 staff plan on including in the final versions of these</p> <p>22 documents as a result of comments.</p> <p>23 As a brief recap of the project, Carriger Solar is a</p> <p>24 proposed 160 megawatt solar only generation facility with</p> <p>25 the 63 megawatt battery energy storage system, that is to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 construction equipment during the construction phase of 2 the project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>24 Staff developed additions to the mitigation measure 25 that will provide nonparticipating noise sensitive</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6 The fourth revision is primarily administrative, and 7 reflects draft language that was inadvertently left in 8 the published version of the RMDNS. The portion of this 9 mitigation measure that was removed in the RMDNS was 10 determined by staff prior to the publication of the RMDNS 11 as leaving the measure too open ended and making it 12 impractical and unenforceable.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>24 In response to those concerns, staff added language 25 requiring that the cistern be opaque and enclosed to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 avoid the potential for algal growth and be kept 2 maintained in good working order.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>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.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>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 so thank you. So we have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 project.</p> <p>2 MS. BUMPUS: Councilman Chiles,</p> <p>3 question just for clarification. Is this a rule that</p> <p>4 applies to potable water for drinking water for onsite</p> <p>5 employees?</p> <p>6 MR. CHILES: From my understanding,</p> <p>7 it's any time that water needs to be used for a public</p> <p>8 service, which would include onsite employees for potable</p> <p>9 water. For an example, a small garage in the middle of</p> <p>10 nowhere that might service automobiles needs to have a</p> <p>11 class B water system, which is a level of water system</p> <p>12 just for its own employees and any guests that might</p> <p>13 come. They are not allowed to truck in water. You can</p> <p>14 truck in water on an emergency basis if your regular</p> <p>15 system is down due to whatever issue then obviously</p> <p>16 trucked in water is allowable, but as a permanent</p> <p>17 longterm plan, from my understanding and working with the</p> <p>18 state health department agencies, it's not allowed.</p> <p>19 MS. BUMPUS: I believe we received</p> <p>20 comments similar to this on another solar project, and I</p> <p>21 think that we had responded that there are no -- there</p> <p>22 are no onsite employees. I think they had to deal with</p> <p>23 potable water availability and it might have been in that</p> <p>24 case a local government requirement. I forget, but there</p> <p>25 are no onsite employees for this facility. So I think in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 a new water right, additional analysis of that would be</p> <p>2 required.</p> <p>3 MR. CHILES: My next concern, and it</p> <p>4 didn't really address anywhere that I have seen, and this</p> <p>5 is my biggest concern over the whole project is emergency</p> <p>6 response and firefighting, especially in the event of a</p> <p>7 BESS fire. County emergency services has stated to me</p> <p>8 repeatedly that they do not have the manpower, they do</p> <p>9 not have the funding, they do not have the equipment,</p> <p>10 they do not have the know how to even begin to fight a</p> <p>11 BESS fire. They are concerned that would there be a BESS</p> <p>12 fire they would have a hard time even finding volunteers</p> <p>13 to be willing to go and attack it without the skills and</p> <p>14 know how in the situation.</p> <p>15 How -- is the applicant proposing anything at all to</p> <p>16 help with this situation because should there be a</p> <p>17 disaster the county is really unprepared to address it.</p> <p>18 It's beyond the scope of anything in the county.</p> <p>19 MR. GREENE: I can say that the BESS,</p> <p>20 the applicant has committed the providing the BESS with a</p> <p>21 fire containment system the meets all existing</p> <p>22 regulations and best response practices from the</p> <p>23 organization the National Fire Safety Organization.</p> <p>24 The SCA also requires the applicant prepare a fire</p> <p>25 response and emergency management plan in concert and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 that case I think at any rate that was not applicable to</p> <p>2 that project and so I think that would be the case here.</p> <p>3 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If I could add one of</p> <p>4 the additional requirements, so the requirement that Mr.</p> <p>5 Greene spoke to earlier was the requirement for water</p> <p>6 availability prior to the start of construction. There</p> <p>7 is another requirement in Article 7G that speaks about</p> <p>8 confirming water availability for operational use, like</p> <p>9 potable water for site operations for staff, confirming</p> <p>10 that's available prior to being allowed to start</p> <p>11 operations for some of the solar facilities that have</p> <p>12 (inaudible) areas. There have been instances of new</p> <p>13 connections to potable water sources also, and I think</p> <p>14 this is in some way distinct, although, I hope you will</p> <p>15 forgive me for not knowing the exact language but like</p> <p>16 water supply service is not the same as trucking in</p> <p>17 water, but the water coolers and stuff like that, things</p> <p>18 like that are available are permissible for potable</p> <p>19 onsite water for the these intermittent staff sites and</p> <p>20 that's what some facilities have done as well.</p> <p>21 MR. CHILES: Follow up on my question,</p> <p>22 should it be determined during their search for water</p> <p>23 that a well is necessary, is that going to require a</p> <p>24 whole lot of extra hoops from EFSEC's perspective?</p> <p>25 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If they are proposing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 cooperation with the county and the local fire protection</p> <p>2 district that will include training for their staff on</p> <p>3 how to respond to a BESS fire, and as I understand best</p> <p>4 current practice is to simply let the fire burn itself</p> <p>5 out as it keeps -- the heat of the fire denatures some of</p> <p>6 the more toxic chemicals that could otherwise spread in</p> <p>7 the air.</p> <p>8 That plan will be required to be revisited on an</p> <p>9 annual basis. The applicant has already begun the</p> <p>10 process of working with the fire chief and local fire</p> <p>11 protection district on things like access to project, it</p> <p>12 will be provided with user codes to unlock the padlock</p> <p>13 gates on the perimeter fencing, and ensuring that there</p> <p>14 is sufficient spacing between panels to allow their</p> <p>15 emergency equipment to pass through, and planning for</p> <p>16 contact procedures ins the event of a fire to ensure that</p> <p>17 the applicant will have the facility monitored on a 24/7</p> <p>18 basis so they would be able to respond immediately if</p> <p>19 there is a fire reported by the fire protection district</p> <p>20 or by the monitoring equipment.</p> <p>21 Additionally, there is a 10,000 gallon cistern that</p> <p>22 is being imposed. While that won't be necessarily useful</p> <p>23 for putting out a BESS fire because like I say the</p> <p>24 current best practice is to let it burn itself out, that</p> <p>25 water can be used for smoke containment, which results in</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>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.</p> <p>15 MR. CHILES: Thank you. I will give 16 someone else a chance.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>20 MR. CHILES: They will need a handicap 21 parking area at the maintenance facility but that would 22 be one spot.</p> <p>23 MS. HAFKEMEYER: If I may, Councilman 24 Chiles, the language in the current SCA does mention 25 minimizing -- (inaudible) the secure requirements and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>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 to 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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>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 meting, and the report recommending the Governor 24 approve the Carriger Solar project located in Klickitat 25 County.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>25 We can also incorporate the language regarding</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 and then the opposition from -- is the county government 2 opposed to an energy project within their energy overlay 3 zone?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>10 MS. BUMPUS: The answer is no.</p> <p>11 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>14 That is the motion. Any further discussion before I 15 call the question? Okay. Hearing none. All those in 16 favor --</p> <p>17 MR. CHILES: Mr. Chair, can I request 18 a roll call vote?</p> <p>19 CHAIR BECKETT: Happy to do so. 20 Prepared to call the Carriger Project, Council.</p> <p>21 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair Beckett, this 22 Andrea Grantham and I can call the role for the votes.</p> <p>23 CHAIR BECKETT: For the Carriger 24 project. Thank you. Please do so.</p> <p>25 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair Kurt Beckett?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4 MR. LEVITT: Yes, I said aye.</p> <p>5 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Council.</p> <p>6 MS. GRANTHAM: So there six ayes and 7 one nay.</p> <p>8 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Ms. 9 Grantham. So thank you, Council. The motion passes.</p> <p>10 The Carriger Solar project will advance to the Governor.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>25 MR. CHILES: I do want to thank the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 CHAIR BECKETT: Chair votes aye.</p> <p>2 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Commerce, 3 Elizabeth Osborne?</p> <p>4 MS. OSBORNE: Aye.</p> <p>5 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Ecology, 6 Eli Levitt? No response.</p> <p>7 Department of Fish & Wildlife, Nate Pamplin?</p> <p>8 MR. PAMPLIN: Aye.</p> <p>9 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural 10 Resources, Lenny Young?</p> <p>11 MR. YOUNG: Aye</p> <p>12 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities & 13 Transportation Commission, Stacey Brewster?</p> <p>14 MS. BREWSTER: Aye.</p> <p>15 MS. GRANTHAM: And then for Carriger 16 Solar Klickitat County, Matt Chiles?</p> <p>17 MR. CHILES: Nay.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>24 MR. LEVITT: Can you hear me now?</p> <p>25 CHAIR BECKETT: Yes, we can.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>25 MR. CHILES: Thank you.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>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.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>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?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>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?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>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.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>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 think 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</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>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</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>Byers & Anderson, Inc. - our Reporters & Video 1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR, 2) ss a certified court reporter 3 County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do 4 hereby certify: 5 6 That the foregoing Monthly Meeting of the Washington 7 State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was conducted 8 in my presence and adjourned on June 25, 2025, and 9 thereafter was transcribed under my direction; that the 10 transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the 11 said meeting, transcribed to the best of my ability; 12 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or 13 counsel of any party to this matter or relative or employee 14 of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not 15 financially interested in the said matter or the outcome 16 thereof; 17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on 18 April 2nd, 2025. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 _____ /s/Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR Certified Court Reporter No. 1932 (Certification expires 05/06/26.)</p>

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update Format

Facility Name: Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project

Operator: EDP Renewables

Report Date: July 07, 2025

Reporting Period: June 2025

Site Contact: Jarred Caseday, Operations Manager

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- Power generated: 44,351,63 MWH.
 - Wind speed: 10.10 m/s.
 - Capacity Factor: 56.34%.
-

Environmental Compliance

- No incidents

Safety Compliance

- Nothing to report

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Nothing to report

Other

- No sound complaints
- No shadow flicker complaints

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Wild Horse Wind Facility
Operator: Puget Sound Energy
Report Date: July 7, 2025
Report Period: June 2025
Site Contact: Jennifer Galbraith
SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

June generation totaled 60,314 MWh for an average capacity factor of 30.73%.

Environmental Compliance

Nothing to report.

Safety Compliance

Nothing to report.

Current or Upcoming Projects

Nothing to report.

Other

Nothing to report.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Chehalis Generation Facility
Operator: PacifiCorp
Report Date: July 1, 2025
Reporting Period: June 2025
Site Contact: Jeremy Smith, Operations Manager
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

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

- 192,921 net MWhrs generated in the reporting period for a capacity factor of 55.95%
-

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

Environmental Compliance

-Monthly Water Usage: 3,92,232 gallons

- No changes

-Monthly Wastewater Returned: 1,142,563 gallons

-Permit status if any changes.

- No changes.

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

- Nothing to report

-Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

- Nothing to report.

-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

- Nothing to report

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

- Nothing to report

Safety Compliance

-Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions.

- Zero injuries this reporting period for a total of 3,621 days without a Lost Time Accident.

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Planned site improvements.

- No planned changes.

-Upcoming permit renewals.

- Nothing to report.

-Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.

- Nothing to report.

Other

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

- Nothing to report.

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

- Nothing to report.

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

- Nothing to report.

Respectfully,



Jeremy Smith
Gas Plant Operations Manager
Chehalis Generation Facility

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center

Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC

Report Date July 16, 2025

Reporting Period: June 2025

Site Contact: Chris Sherin

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

-GHEC generated 285,267MWh during the month and 1,710,472MWh YTD.

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

Environmental Compliance

- There were no outfall, or storm water deviations, during the month.
- Routine monthly, quarterly, and annual reporting submissions to EFSEC Staff.
 - Monthly Discharge Monitor Report (DMR).
 - Quarterly Discharge Monitor Report (DMR).
- Annual RATA Test Plan was submitted to EFSEC staff.
- Gas Turbine startup reclassification was submitted to EFSEC staff.

Safety Compliance

- None.

Current or Upcoming Projects

- Submitted the application to renew the Air Operating Permit (AOP) for Grays Harbor Energy Center (GHEC) that is currently authorized to operate under PSD Permit EFSEC/2001-01, Amendment 5 and Federal Operating Permit EFSEC/94-1 AOP Modification 1.
- Submitted the Acid Rain Permit Application for permit renewal in accordance with Permit Requirements 1(i) of Acid Rain Permit No. EFSEC/10-01-AR.
- NPDES permit renewal application submitted to EFSEC in December 2023 in accordance with Section S6.A of NPDES Permit No. WA0024961.

Other

-None.

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting Facility Update

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

Operator: Tuusso Energy, LLC

Report Date: July 11, 2025

Reporting Period: 30 Days ending June 30, 2025

Site Contact: Liz Drachenberg & Brendan Clemente

Facility SCA Status: Operation

Construction Status

- Penstemon
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of June was 1,568 Megawatt hours
 - Camas
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of June was 1,492 Megawatt hours
 - Urtica
 - Currently operational
 - Total Generation during the month of June was 1,475 Megawatt hours
-

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting

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

Operator: **Energy Northwest**

Report Date: **July 7th, 2025**

Reporting Period: **June 2025**

Site Contact: **Josh LaPorte**

Facility SCA Status: **Operational**

CGS Net Electrical Generation for June 2025: **103,162.32 Mega Watt-Hours.**

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

Environmental Compliance:

No update.

Safety Compliance

No update.

Current or Upcoming Projects

The Industrial Development Complex Landfill Closure Construction is largely complete, and the site is now preparing for Post Closure monitoring of the closed portion of the landfill. During Closure Construction, additional buried material was found outside the scope of the original Closure Plan. EN is actively delineating and characterizing this material to develop a management plan which will be shared with EFSEC as Phase 2 of the IDC Landfill Closure/Post Closure Plan.

Other

Columbia Generating Station began Refueling Outage 27 on April 11, 2025 and came fully back online June 29th, 2025

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update Format

Facility Name: Goose Prairie Solar

Operator: Brookfield Renewable US

Report Date: 7/11/2025

Reporting Period: 6/1/2025 to 6/30/2025

Asset Manager: Nelson Jia

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Construction Status

- N/A

Operations & Maintenance

- Total generation for the month of June-2025 was approximately 24,599 MWh
 - AC Breaker replacements for inverters – ongoing effort till Sungrow fixes the issue
-

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

Environmental Compliance

Permit status if any changes.

- None

Update on progress or completion of any mitigation measures identified.

- No Discharge on the site reported

Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

- WSP inspections are re-occurring on behalf of EFSEC

Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

- None

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

- None

Safety Compliance

- There were no non-routine events to report during this period.

Current or Upcoming Projects

- None

Other

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

- None

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

- None

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

- None

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Ostrea Solar
Operator: Cypress Creek Renewables
Report Date: 7/2/2025
Reporting Period: 6/1/2025-6/30/2025
Site Contact: Fred Hageman
Facility SCA Status: Construction

Construction Status (only applicable for projects under construction)

- Road construction 93% complete. Remaining percent to be completed at end of project.
- Array Piles and Inverter Pile Installation complete in Phase 1 and 2. The beginning of Array Piles in the West Parcel (Phase 3 & 4) are underway.
- Array racking nearing completion in the East Parcel.
- Solar module installation commenced in the East Parcel.
- Security Fence installation is complete in East portion of property with the West portion of the property at 80% pending final quality walk.
- AC Cable trenching and installation is complete for the project, only termination pending.
- Overhead AC lines from West to East are complete with only minimal punch list work.
- Substation construction underway, all foundations complete and structural steel installation ongoing.

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- Not yet operational.

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

Environmental Compliance

-Permit status if any changes.

- N/A

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

- WSP weekly SWPPP inspections performed.
- BMP installations per Exhibits continue.
- On 5/27 during a vehicle refueling operation, a fuel tank was overfilled spilled approximately 5 gallons of diesel fuel
 - Upon reporting of the incident on 5/28, contractor performed initial cleanup and containment
 - Patriot Environmental arrived on 5/29 to perform a full cleanup of the affected area
 - Pending to receive final report from Patriot

-Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

- Site inspection performed by Lynn Bell on a weekly basis without any non-compliant elements being discovered

-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

- Nothing in the month of June

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

- Nothing in the month of June

Safety Compliance

- Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions
- Occasional high winds caused dust to impact work area, dust mitigation and safety measures reinforced
- No issues to note for June

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Planned site improvements

- Current:
 - Fence Installation completion
 - Array Pile, Racking, and Module deliveries
 - Array Pile and Racking installation
 - Basin wrap up and completion
- Upcoming Projects
 - DC cable installation
 - Substation MPT delivery and installation
 - Substation control house delivery and installation.
 - Module stringing and combiner box termination

-Upcoming permit renewals.

- None.

-Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.

- West property Basin and Swells

Other

-Current events of note.

- N/A

-Personnel changes as they may relate to EFSEC facility contacts:

- None

-Public outreach of interest

- Nothing to note

Carriger Solar Project

General Description:

A proposed 160 megawatts (MW) solar photovoltaic (PV) electric generating facility. Includes a proposed 63 MW of battery energy storage system (BESS). Project area: 2,108- acres of privately owned land.

Location:

Unincorporated Klickitat County. Approximately 2 miles west of Goldendale.

Applicant:



Cypress Creek Renewables, LLC.

Milestone Dates:

- February 10, 2023, Original ASC Submitted
- September 25, 2023, Council issues Order No. 889 Granting a Finding of Land Use Consistency.
- April 7, 2025, SEPA Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance published.
- May 5, 2025, Council granted Expedited Process.
- June 25, 2025, Recommendation to the Governor submitted.

Status:

Location Map:



Horse Heaven Wind Project

General Description:

Proposed construction of a renewable energy facility that would have a nameplate energy generating capacity of up to 1,150 megawatts (MWs) for a combination of wind and solar facilities as well as battery energy storage systems (BESS). Meteorological Towers (MET), overhead transmission lines, and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Facilities are also proposed.

Project area: 72,428 acres, privately owned land in which five DNR parcels are located within.

Location:

Unincorporated Central Benton County south of the Tri-Cities.

Applicant:

Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC.


Milestone Dates:

- February 8, 2021, Original ASC Submitted
- May 17, 2022, Council issues Order No. 883 of Land Use Consistency – Finding Proposed Site Consistent with Land Use Regulations.
- October 31, 2023, Final Environmental Impact Statement Issued.
- April 17, 2024, Adjudicative Order Resolving Contested Issues.
- April 29, 2024, Recommendation to the Governor Submitted.
- May 25, 2024, Governor Remanded the Council's Recommendation.
- September 17, 2024, Final Recommendation to the Governor Submitted.
- October 18, 2024, Received Signed SCA and Final Decision from the Governor.
- November 21, 2024, Applicant Signed the SCA.

Status:

Application Approved
SCA Signed
Pre-Construction
Construction
Prior to Commercial Operations
Operations
Termination, Decommissioning, and Site Restoration

Location Map:



Hop Hill Solar Energy Project

General Description:

HOHI bn, LLC (Applicant), a subsidiary of BNC DEVCO, LLC, which is a joint venture between BrightNight, LLC and Cordelio Power. Hop Hill Solar project is an up to 500-megawatt² (MW) solar photovoltaic (PV) generation facility coupled with an up to 500-MW battery energy storage system (BESS). The Solar Array Siting Area encompasses approximately 11,179 buildable acres and the overhead 230-kV gen-tie line will be developed within a 150-foot-wide corridor and microsituated within the approximately 10,841-acre Transmission Line Corridor Siting Area). The final solar array area anticipated to be approximately 6,000 acres.

Location:

Benton County, Washington.


Applicant:

BrightNight, LLC.


Milestone Dates:

- December 22, 2022, Original ASC Submitted
- February 23, 2023, Public Comment Hearing, Land Use Consistency Hearing
- November 3, 2023, Brightnight requests application review extension (original date:12/22/23 to 12/22/24)
- November 15, 2023, Order finding Project Inconsistent with Land Use (Benton County) Regulations, setting the matter for adjudication.

Status:



Location Map:



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage Project

General Description:

A 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS) project. The Project will not generate electricity, but instead provide a buffer for Skagit County's (County) electrical grid. The Project will accomplish this by receiving energy (charging) from the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) electric transmission system, storing energy on site, and then later delivering energy (discharging) back to the point of interconnection Project area: approximately 16 acres, privately owned land.

Location:

Unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.


Applicant:

GOLDFINCH ENERGY STORAGE, LLC, 412 West 15th Street, 15th Floor. New York, New York 10011

Milestone Dates:

- June 27, 2024, Original ASC Submitted
- August 13, 2024, Public Information Meeting and Land Use Consistency Hearing

Status:



Location Map:



Transmission Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

General Description:

A Programmatic EIS to assess probable significant adverse environmental impacts from electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230 kilovolts (kV) or greater at a broad level and identify avoidance, minimization, and other mitigation measures. EFSEC was directed to conduct this nonproject environmental review under RCW Chapter 43.21C.405.

Location:

Statewide


Originating Legislation:

Senate Bill 5165, Chapter 229, Laws of 2023


Milestone Dates:

- July 23, 2023, Effective Date of Originating Legislation
- June 28, 2024, EIS Scoping Memo Issued
- March 31, 2025, Draft EIS Issued
- April 8, 2025, Public Informational Meeting
- April 22 – 24, 2025, Public Comment Hearings
- May 15, 2025, End of Draft EIS Public Comment Period
- Late September, 2025, Anticipated Final EIS Issuance

Status:



Location Map:



Badger Mountain Solar

General Description:

The project is a proposed 200-megawatt solar photovoltaic generation facility with an optional 200.MW battery energy storage system. The solar array area is approximately 2,274 acres and would include a gen-tie corridor.

Location:

Douglas County, approximately 3.5 miles east of East Wenatchee.

Applicant:



Aurora Solar, LLC.

Milestone Dates:

- September 2021 Application Submitted
- November 17, 2021 Informational public meeting and Land Use Consistency Hearing
- March 13, 2022 Land Use Inconsistency Determination
- March 14, 2022 SEPA Determination of Significance
- June 2024 Applicant requested all work to pause until further notice.
- Remaining application work includes: Cultural Resource Survey and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
- April 16, 2025, Extension request granted.

Status:

Location Map:



Small Modular Reactor

Pre-Application

Placeholder for updates



PO Box 43172 • Olympia, Washington 98503-3172
www.efsec.wa.gov

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC)

Delegating Certain Plan Approvals to the EFSEC [Director](#)

Deleted: Manager

Policy #16-01

[March 25, 2016; Revised July 16, 2025](#)

Deleted: June 25

Deleted: , 2016

POLICY PURPOSE

To establish a consistent and timely review and approval process for energy facility plans [submitted by certificate holders](#) that do not require an amendment to a site certification agreement.

General Discussion

The Legislature intended, as part of the energy facility siting process, for EFSEC to preserve and protect the quality of the environment, assure that sufficient operational safeguards are in place, and avoid costly duplication in the siting process and ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner. See RCW 80.50.010.

A number of specific powers implementing this legislative intent are set forth in both statutes and rules. RCW 80.50.040(2) gives the Council the power "[t]o develop and apply environmental and ecological guidelines in relation to the type, design, location, construction, and operational conditions of certification of energy facilities subject to this chapter." Similarly, RCW 80.50.040 (9) authorizes the Council "[t]o prescribe the means for monitoring of the effects arising from the construction and the operation of energy facilities to assure continued compliance with terms of certification and/or permits issued by the council. . . ." WAC 463-68-050 states: "at least ninety days prior to start of construction . . . a certificate holder shall provide the plans and specifications required by the site certification agreement to the council for approval." WAC 463-70-020 and 463-70-030 address compliance monitoring procedures and compliance determinations as prescribed by the council.

A [certificate holder](#) must submit many types of plans to EFSEC for review and approval to ensure that the appropriate protocols are met. Many of the plans are detailed and contain technical/engineering documents for which EFSEC staff and state and local agencies have expertise. To ensure EFSEC has access to additional expertise when needed, interagency agreements have been developed with appropriate agencies.

Deleted: n energy facility

The Legislature has recognized that some work of the Council will be performed by Council staff. RCW [80.50.360](#). The Council's rules also recognize the propriety and necessity of delegating some tasks to EFSEC staff. WAC 463-10-010 ("Council" means the energy facility site evaluation council ... and, where appropriate to the staff of the council"). [Agency heads are presumed to have the authority to delegate decision making to subordinates unless the agency's enabling statute indicates it is forbidden. See Jackstadt v. Washington State Patrol, 96 Wash.App. 501, 512-13 \(1999\); Kobach v. U.S. Election Assistance Com'n, 772 F.3d 1183, 1190-91 \(10th Cir. 2014\).](#) Approval of this policy implements the legislature's directive by delegating to the EFSEC Council [Director](#) the authority to review and approve technical plans related to facility construction and operation when an amendment to a site certification is not required.

Deleted: 80.50.030(2)(b)

Deleted:).

Implementing this policy will contribute to timely completion of the plan review process and is consistent with EFSEC's past practice of delegating certain review and approval authorities to the EFSEC [Director](#). The adoption of this policy formalizes the delegation of this authority to the EFSEC [Director](#) and specifies the type of plans to which this delegated authority extends.

Deleted: Manager

Deleted: Manager

Approval of plans by the EFSEC [Director](#) may only occur after EFSEC staff and contractors [or subject matter experts](#), which may include state and local agencies [and tribal governments](#), have identified and the certificate holder has addressed areas of concern. As a prerequisite to plan approval, EFSEC staff will obtain written verification from the appropriate agency documenting that review has taken place to ensure plans are compliant with applicable requirements. Deficiencies noted by EFSEC staff or reviewing agencies must be addressed before a plan may be considered for approval. [The Director will also consider advice from a pre- or post-construction technical advisory committee when site certification agreement requires it.](#) EFSEC staff will update the Council of any plans which have been approved by the EFSEC [Director](#).

Deleted: Manager

Deleted: Manager

For plans subject to EFSEC [Director](#) approval, the [Director](#) shall consider whether any individual plan should be forwarded to the Council for review and, at the Council's discretion, Council approval. [Review and approval by the Council may be appropriate where resolution of the plan details involves a high degree of policy discretion and may substantially affect the interests of third parties.](#)

Deleted: Manager

Deleted: Manager

Deleted: The Manager will forward to the Council for Council review any plan for which the EFSEC responsible official issues a SEPA Determination of Significance or a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance.

Deleted: Manager

I. Plans Subject to EFSEC [Director](#) Approval:

- Construction Best Management Practices Plan
- Construction [and Operations](#) Emergency Plans
- Construction Management Plan
- Construction [Phase and Operations](#) Phase Health and Safety Plans
- Construction [Phase and Operations](#) Phase Site Security Plans
- Construction [Phase and Operations Phase](#) Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans
- Construction [Phase and Operations Phase](#) Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plans
- Construction [Phase and Operations Phase](#) Soil Management Plans
- Construction [Phase and Operations Phase](#) Traffic Management Plans
- Habitat [and Movement Corridor Mitigation and](#) Restoration Plans
- Hunting, [Fishing, and Outdoor Recreation Plan](#)
- Livestock [and Agricultural](#) Plan
- [Pre and Post Construction](#) Technical Advisory Committee Rules of Procedure
- [Construction Phase and Operations Phase](#) Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plans
- Cultural and Archeological Resources Plan
- [Construction Phase and Operations Phase](#) Fire Control Plan
- Other Non-Specified Construction Plans
- Noise and Shadow Flicker Modeling, [Monitoring, and Mitigation Plan](#)
- Greenhouse Gases Mitigation Plan
- Environmental Monitoring Stop Work Criteria Plan
- Rare Plant Survey/Plant Conservation Plan
- Forest Practices Application Class [I](#) and II
- Solid Waste Control Plan
- [Pre or Post Construction species-specific monitoring and mitigation plans.](#)

Deleted: Grazing

Deleted: (wind facilities)

Deleted: <#>Operations Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan¶
Operation Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan¶
Operations Emergency Plan¶
Operations Fire Control Plan¶

Deleted: <#>1

Deleted: <#>Traffic Monitoring Plan¶


Deleted: <#>Operations Phase Health and Safety Plan¶
Operations Phase Site Security Plan¶
Facility Operations and Monitoring Plan¶

Deleted: Post Construction Avian Monitoring Plan

Deleted: <#>¶

II. **Plans/Actions Requiring Council Approval**

- Initial Site Restoration Plan
- Forest Practices Application – Class III and IV
- Wetlands Compensation Mitigation Plan
- Post Construction Bald Eagle/Golden Eagle Plan
- Detailed Site Restoration Plan
- Site Preservation Plan



PO Box 43172 • Olympia, Washington 98503-3172
www.efsec.wa.gov

Memorandum

To: Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

From: EFSEC staff

Date: July 10, 2025

RE: Update to EFSEC Policy #16-01

PROPOSAL: Staff propose to update EFSEC Policy #16-01 to reflect changes in the agency since the 2022 amendments to RCW 80.50.

Policy #16-01 is a policy that delegates to the EFSEC Director the authority to approve construction and operations plans identified within facility site certificate agreements (SCA). EFSEC has implemented this policy for several years with the intent of providing certificate holders a more efficient and predictable pre-construction process. There are often several prescriptive SCA requirements related to plans. Furthermore, different types of plans are being required in current SCAs as compared to those required historically. With the increase in project applications under review, multiple recently approved SCAs, and the expanded scope of facility types that may come before EFSEC, updating this policy will allow for the continued efficient and effective review of plans. The delegation of approval to the Director has helped to minimize added time and administrative burden during the pre-construction phase.

EFSEC maintains several interagency agreements to support coordination between the certificate holder, EFSEC staff, and identified parties with expertise during the development and review of required plans. The Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Department of Ecology, and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation are regular participants in the review of multiple standard construction and operation phase plans. Input is also regularly provided by local fire response districts, interested tribes, and local governments.

This policy update was proposed initially for the June 25, 2025 Council meeting. Highlights of the proposed edits on the June 25, 2025 agenda include:

1. replacing "Manager" with "Director", to reflect the change in EFSEC's staffing structure when EFSEC became an independent agency in June 2022;

2. combining construction and operation plans into 1-line item, instead of calling each plan out individually by phase;
3. combining and broadening species-specific plans into one line item that will capture any species-specific monitoring and mitigation plans that might apply to a project;
4. modifying the line item for noise and shadow flicker modeling to include additional energy generation types, beyond only wind facilities; and
5. modifying the line item for Habitat Restoration Plan to include movement corridors and mitigation plans.

Because the policy update was on the June Council agenda as a potential final action item, the draft policy was posted for public comment. In response to the comments received, staff is proposing some additional edits.

These additional edits are primarily to provide clarity around questions raised by commenters and to correct a citation to a statute that was amended in 2022. One sentence was removed as irrelevant, because any additional State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review is not pertinent to the delegation of authority to the EFSEC Director to approve plans. Any additional state environmental policy act (SEPA) review would be conducted by the Director pursuant to her designation as EFSEC's SEPA responsible official in WAC 463-47-050.

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council


Non-Direct Cost Allocation for 1st Quarter FY 2026

July 1, 2025 – Sept 30, 2025

The EFSEC Cost Allocation Plan (Plan) was approved by the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council in September 2004. The Plan directed review of the past quarter's percentage of EFSEC technical staff's average FTE's, charged to EFSEC projects. This along with anticipated work for the quarter is used as the basis for determining the non-direct cost percentage charge, for each EFSEC project.

Using the procedures for developing cost allocation, and allowance for new projects, the following percentages shall be used to allocate EFSEC's non direct costs for the 1st quarter of FY 2026.

Columbia Generating Station	20%
Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project	15%
Chehalis Generation Project	6%
Grays Harbor 1&2	6%
Carriger Solar	6%
Goldeneye	5%
Hop Hill	5%
Wallula Gap	5%
Wautoma Solar Project	5%
Columbia Solar	4%
CCR Ostrea	4%
Goose Prairie Solar Project	4%
Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project	4%
Wild Horse Wind Power Project	4%
WNP-1	3%
Badger Mountain	2%
CCR High Top	2%



Sonia E. Bumpus, EFSEC Manager

Date: 7/14/2025