



То:	Joanne Snarski / Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Amí Hafkemeyer / Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
From:	Jess Taylor / Tetra Tech, Inc. Paul Hicks / Tetra Tech, Inc.
Cc:	Mike DeRuyter / Aurora Solar, LLC Alicia Schulz / Washington Department of Ecology
Date:	March 14, 2023
Subject:	Badger Mountain Solar Energy Project: Response to Washington Department of Ecology Letter

This memorandum provides responses to Washington Department of Ecology's (Ecology) July 14, 2022 letter to the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) regarding the Badger Mountain Solar Energy Project (Project). The responses below follow the organization of Ecology's letter.

The Project is a 200-megawatt solar photovoltaic generation facility with an optional 200-megawatt battery energy storage system and associated 3.7-mile-long, 230-kilovolt overhead generation-tie transmission line corridor in unincorporated Douglas County, Washington. Wetland and other water surveys were conducted in April 19 to 22, 2021, and June 23 and 24, 2021, within the 2,390-acre Survey Area. Surveys results were provided in the Applicant's Wetland Delineation Report, which was submitted to EFSEC for review on October 7, 2021 in Attachment I to the Application for Site Certification.

RESPONSE TO WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY LETTER

Review of Wetlands Datasheets

Wetlands in the Arid West are required to meet at least two of the three hydric criteria (hydrology, vegetation, and soils), a single indicator such as hydrophytic vegetation without hydric soils and hydrology will not meet wetland criteria (USACE 2008). Site 227 only had reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), which is designated as Facultative Wetland (FACW) vegetation, not Obligate Wetland (OBL) vegetation in the Arid West; soils and hydrology did not meet wetland criteria even under the difficult situations criteria (USACE 2020):

"If indicators of either hydric soil or wetland hydrology are absent, the area is likely non-wetland sunless soil and/or hydrology are also disturbed or problematic." (USACE 2008:86).

Site 227 is within a homestead area that has not been lived in for several decades and therefore was considered undisturbed. It appears that the reed canarygrass was planted as a lawn grass in the past as it is bordered by a hedgerow of upland roses and located on the sunny side of an abandoned house. Several soil pits were dug at least 16 inches deep across Site 227 and down the gradient slope to determine if there were hydric soils present. An excerpt from Section I – Procedures for Digging a Soil Pit and Examining for Hydric Soil

Page 2

Indicators in the 1987 *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (USACE 1987) is provided below to verify the use of 16-inch pit depth:

Apply the following procedure: Circumscribe a 1-ft-diam area, preferably with a tile spade (sharpshooter). Extend the blade vertically downward, cut all roots to the depth of the blade, and lift the soil from the hole. This should provide approximately 16 inches of the soil profile for examination. NOTE: Observations are usually made immediately below the A-horizon or 10 in. (whichever is shallower). In many cases, a soil auger or probe can be used instead of a spade. If so, remove successive cores until 16 inches of the soil profile have been removed. Place successive cores in the same sequence as removed from the hole. NOTE: An auger or probe cannot be effectively used when the soil profile is loose, rocky, or contains a large volume of water (e.g., peraquic moisture regime).

No soils meeting hydric conditions were found. In addition, no signs of hydrology were observed despite recent snow melt on site. The site is not in a landscape position that is likely to concentrate water, it slopes towards the southeast at a 3 percent angle. It does not meet landscape position for difficult wetland situations in the Arid West.

Tetra Tech has included the sample site data sheet for WT-332 as an attachment to this memorandum (Attachment A). It was not included with Attachment I to the Application for Site Certification originally because while hydric vegetation was present, the area was not shown on the NWI and also did not meet hydric soils or hydrology criteria.

Ecology's letter states that a number of rare plant species were noted for their presence on site. This statement is incorrect and clarification is provided below. Tetra Tech conducted rare plant surveys within the Survey Area May 3 to May 7, 2021. As identified in Attachment F to the Application for Site Certification, no rare plant species were identified during the surveys. Although habitat for sticky phacelia (*Phacelia viscida*) was present within the Survey Area and surveys were conducted during the recommended survey period, no individuals of this species were observed. Habitat for later-blooming rare plant species with **potential** (emphasis added) to occur in the Survey Area (i.e., those listed with a low, moderate, or high likelihood of occurrence in Appendix A whose recommended survey period occurs later than May) includes vernal pools, moist meadows, wet openings in in hardwood or coniferous forests, bogs, springs, seeps, riparian areas, and dry rocky washes. No suitable habitat for later blooming rare species with potential to occur in the Survey Area, including Wenatchee larkspur (*Delphinium viridescens*), was observed during surveys.

No wetlands were found within the Survey Area; therefore, no Wetland of High Conservation Value or wetlandspecific Element Occurrences occur within this Survey Area.

Tetra Tech is available to give a tour of any site that Ecology would like to see in the field. No ponded water was observed during the three site visits where snow was not on the ground. Additionally, no wetland vegetation was observed in low lying areas in the landscape. The wetland curve data values of 80-89 align with the Hydrologic Soils Group D in the shallow soils at the cliff edge and in two of the drainages (ST-260 and ST-249) that were delineated. Photos of these areas are included in the photolog in Attachment I to the Application for Site Certification (Appendix C of the Wetland Delineation Report) as photopoints 139, 140, 147, 160, 161, 162, 213, 214, 215, 249, 250, 251, 260, and 356.

TETRA TECH

Page 3

Prior to survey efforts, a call with Ecology was made on March 26, 2022, to inform Ecology of the delineations that would occur and determine if anything out of the ordinary would be required at this site. Lori White agreed that the timing of our field surveys would accurately capture potential vernal pools on site. Site visits and surveys were made in March, April, May, and June of 2021. When surveyors arrived in March there was 6 inches of snow on the ground making wetland delineations impossible. Surveyors revisited the site two weeks after the snow melt in April to capture any vernal pools that might be present. No vernal pools (or any areas of standing water that might develop vernal pool vegetation) were observed in the shallow soils or in the larger Survey Area. Plant surveys were completed in early May and botanists surveyed for any vernal pool or wetland vegetation at that time. No wetland or vernal pool vegetation was found in May. Subsequent visits in June were made to observe vegetation after it had matured and recovered from late spring snowfall. No wetland or vernal pool vegetations at that time either.

No hydric soils are indicated by Natural Resources Conservation Service soil surveys (NRCS 2021) or were observed in the field within the Project Survey Area.

Tetra Tech surveyors delineate ephemeral waterways at any location where water may drain off a site regardless of whether or not the bed or banks are defined for the entirety of the flow path. This is done to help projects avoid stormwater issues during construction as well as to meet Washington's Waters of the State criteria for defining ephemeral waterways. Ecology noted an interest in reviewing select drainages for presence of wetland characteristics, such as those in photopoints 508, 513, and 329a and 329b. Tetra Tech provides additional notes on these photopoints below:

- Photopoint 508 shows actively growing wheat. No bed or banks or wetland vegetation was observed.
- Vegetation in ST-513, which is shown in photopoint 513, is primarily downy brome (*Bromus tectorum*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), and volunteer winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) from the neighboring crop field. No bed or banks or wetland vegetation was observed.
- Photopoint 329 shows a short segment of ST-329 before it loses all bed and banks in a wheat field downslope. No bed or banks or wetland vegetation was observed. In addition, Section 4.3.C.1 of the Application for Site Certification states that the segment of ST-329 within the Survey Area is disconnected from its downstream channel by active farming of the drainage and is unlikely to contain fish in this reach.

Tetra Tech is available as needed to give a tour of the locations that Ecology would like to see in the field.

Ecology stated that they typically require a jurisdictional determination (JD) from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) verifying that waters are non-federally jurisdictional before beginning their Administrative Order permitting process. Recent conversations with USACE concerning JDs has led Tetra Tech to understand that unless project impacts are beyond the threshold for Pre-Construction Notification that the USACE is reluctant to work through the administrative process necessary to issue a JD. Nonetheless, the Applicant submitted an Approved Jurisdictional Determination request to the USACE on July 12, 2022. Following a call with the USACE on December 9, 2022, and at the USACE's recommendation, the Applicant requested a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) for aquatic resources within the Survey Area. If streams cannot

TETRA TECH

Page 4

be avoided at final design, the Applicant would submit a Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application to EFSEC to obtain necessary permitting for jurisdictional streams, if needed.

A site visit can be scheduled for early spring. The site is at higher elevation than Wenatchee and there was snow up on the plateau when it was warm and flowers were blooming down near the river. Please let us know if we can give you any more information up front to help expedite this review process.

SUMMARY

The Applicant provides this supplementary information to demonstrate that field surveys for wetlands and waters were complete. Four separate site visits were made during the growing season, although very little vegetation was visible in the March visit. No vernal pools or standing waters were observed within the Survey Area despite recent snow melt and spring rains. No wetland vegetation was found on site during any of the four site visits spanning from March through June.

REFERENCES

NRCS. 2021. Web Soil Survey. Available online at:

http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed: March 2021.

- USACE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. January 1987. Wetlands Research Program. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180-6199.
- USACE. 2008. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2). ed. J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-3. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- USACE. 2020. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2020. National Wetland Plant List, version 3.5. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Engineer Research and Development Center. Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, NH. Available online at http://wetland-plants.usace.army.mil/

Attachment A: Sample Site Data Sheet

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA SHEET – Arid West Region

See ERDC/EL TR-07-24; the proponent agency is CECW-CO-R

OMB Control #: 0710-xxxx, Exp: Pending Requirement Control Symbol EXEMPT: (Authority: AR 335-15, paragraph 5-2a)

Project/Site: Badger	Mountain So	lar	City/Co	ounty: Doug	las Coun	ty		Sampling Date:	4/20/2	2021
Applicant/Owner:	Avangrid					State:	WA	Sampling Point:	WT-	332
Investigator(s): Jessi	ica Taylor/Ka	tie Pyne/Sara Frank	Sectior	n, Township,	Range:	23N, 21	E, 34			
Landform (hillside, te	errace, etc.):		Local relie	Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>Concave</u>						5
Subregion (LRR):	LRR B	Lat: <u>47.458279</u>	Long: <u>120.197609</u>				Datum: <u>10</u>			
Soil Map Unit Name:	68: Broada	k-Morrow-Spofford C	omplex, 3 to 8 percent sl	opes		N	WI classific	cation: None		
Are climatic / hydrolo	ogic conditior	ns on the site typical	for this time of year?	Yes <u>x</u>	No		(If no, expl	lain in Remarks.)		
Are Vegetation	, Soil	, or Hydrology	significantly disturbed?	Are "Norma	al Circum	stances'	" present?	Yes <u>x</u> No)	
Are Vegetation	, Soil	, or Hydrology	naturally problematic?	(If needed,	explain a	any ansv	vers in Ren	narks.)		
					1				4	- 4 -

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes	No <u>x</u>	Is the Sampled Area		
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes	No <u>x</u>	within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u>x</u>
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes	No <u>x</u>			

Remarks:

Low spot at the edge of the wheat field, near the project area boundary where the ground has not been tilled or planted. Soils are sandy/rocky. The soils are fairly damp due to recent snowmelt but not saturated and no pooling of water was observed.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator		
Tree Stratum (Plot size:)		Species?	Status	Dominance Test worksheet:	
1	_			Number of Dominant Species That	
2				Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A	()
3				Total Number of Dominant Species	
4.				Across All Strata: 1 (B	5)
		=Total Cover		Percent of Dominant Species That	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size:)			Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A	/ В)
1	_				
2	_			Prevalence Index worksheet:	
3				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:	
4				OBL species 0 x 1 = 0	
5				FACW species 0 x 2 = 0	
		=Total Cover		FAC species 0 x 3 = 0	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5)				FACU species 0 x 4 = 0	
1. Agropyron cristatum	25	Yes	UPL	UPL species 30 x 5 = 150	
2. Brassica nigra	5	No	UPL	Column Totals: <u>30</u> (A) <u>150</u> (B	5)
3				Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.00	
4					
5		. <u> </u>		Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6		. <u> </u>		Dominance Test is >50%	
7				Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹	
8				Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting	g
	30	=Total Cover		data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:)			Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
1.				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology mus	st
2.				be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
		=Total Cover		Hydrophytic	
				Vegetation	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum 70 %	Cover of Biot	ic Crust 0		Present? Yes No X	
Remarks:				·	

SOIL

Profile Deso Depth	cription: (Describe	to the depth		ument tl ox Featur		tor or o	confirm the a	bsence of indicator	5.)	
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Textu	ro	Remarks	
<u> </u>					туре	LUC	sandy lo		Remarks	
0-22	10YR 3/2	100					Sanuy io			
1										
	oncentration, D=Depl					oated S		² Location: PL=Po		
-	Indicators: (Applica	DIE tO AII LR					I	Indicators for Proble	-	: 50115":
Histosol			Sandy Re				-	1 cm Muck (A9) (
	pipedon (A2)		Stripped I		-		-	2 cm Muck (A10)		
	istic (A3)		Loamy M	-			-	Iron-Manganese	•	(LRR D)
· · ·	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy G	-			-	Reduced Vertic (I	,	
	d Layers (A5) (LRR C	;)	Depleted	-	-		-	Red Parent Mate	()	
	uck (A9) (LRR D)		Redox Da		• •		-	Very Shallow Dar		22)
	d Below Dark Surface	e (A11)	Depleted				-	Other (Explain in	Remarks)	
	ark Surface (A12)		Redox De	epression	s (F8)					
	/lucky Mineral (S1)	2								
Sandy C	Gleyed Matrix (S4)	Indicators	of hydrophytic	vegetatio	n and we	tland h	ydrology must	be present, unless d	isturbed or pr	oblematic.
Restrictive	Layer (if observed):									
Type:			_							
Depth (i	nches):						Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes	No x
Remarks:										
HYDROLC	OGY									
-	drology Indicators:									
Primary Indi	<u>cators (minimum of o</u>	ne is required	l; check all that	apply)				Secondary Indicators	<u>(minimum of</u>	two required
Surface	Water (A1)		Salt Crus	t (B11)			_	Water Marks (B1		
High Wa	ater Table (A2)		Biotic Cru	ıst (B12)			_	Sediment Deposi	ts (B2) (Rive	rine)
Saturati	on (A3)		Aquatic Ir	nvertebra	tes (B13)		_	Drift Deposits (B3	8) (Riverine)	
Water M	larks (B1) (Nonriveri	ne)	Hydrogen	Sulfide	Odor (C1)	_	Drainage Pattern	s (B10)	
Sedime	nt Deposits (B2) (Nor	nriverine)	Oxidized	Rhizosph	eres on l	_iving R	Roots (C3)	Dry-Season Wate	er Table (C2)	
Drift De	posits (B3) (Nonriver	ine)	Presence	of Redu	ced Iron ((C4)	_	Crayfish Burrows	(C8)	
Surface	Soil Cracks (B6)		Recent Ire	on Reduc	tion in Ti	lled Soi	ils (C6)	Saturation Visible	on Aerial Im	agery (C9)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Thin Muck Surface (C7)						_	Shallow Aquitard	(D3)		
Water-S	stained Leaves (B9)		Other (Ex	plain in F	Remarks)		_	FAC-Neutral Test	t (D5)	
Field Obser	vations:					-				
Surface Wat	er Present? Ye	S	No X	Depth (i	nches):					
Water Table	Present? Ye	s	No X	Depth (i	nches):		1			
Saturation P	resent? Ye	s	No X	Depth (i			Wetland	Hydrology Present?	Yes	No X
(includes ca	pillary fringe)				_					
Describe Re	corded Data (stream	gauge, monit	oring well, aeria	al photos	, previous	s inspec	ctions), if avail	lable:		
Remarks:										