



# Washington State

## Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

### AGENDA

**MONTHLY MEETING**  
**Tuesday, June 20, 2017**  
**1:30 PM**

**1300 S Evergreen Park Drive SW**  
**Olympia, WA 98504**  
**Hearing Room 206**

- 1. Call to Order ..... Bill Lynch, EFSEC Chair
- 2. Roll Call ..... Tammy Mastro, EFSEC Staff
- 3. Proposed Agenda ..... Bill Lynch, EFSEC Chair
- 4. Minutes **Meeting Minutes**..... Bill Lynch, EFSEC Chair
  - May 16, 2017
- 5. Projects
  - a. **Kittitas Valley Wind Project**
    - Operational Update..... Eric Melbardis, EDP Renewables
  - b. **Wild Horse Wind Power Project**
    - Operational Update..... Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound Energy
  - c. **Columbia Generating Station**
    - Operational Update..... Shannon Khounnala, Energy Northwest
  - d. **WNP – 1/4**
    - Non-Operational Update..... Shannon Khounnala, Energy Northwest
  - e. **Chehalis Generation Facility**
    - Operational Update..... Mark Miller, Chehalis Generation Staff
  - f. **Grays Harbor Energy Center**
    - Operational Update..... Rich Downen, Grays Harbor Energy
  - g. **Tesoro/Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal**
    - Project Update..... Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff
    - Extension of Application Processing Time ..... Stephen Posner, EFSEC Staff

*The Council may consider and take **FINAL ACTION** on the Tesoro/Savage request to extend the time to process Application 2013-01.*
- 5. Other
  - Executive Session..... Bill Lynch, EFSEC Chair
  - Executive Session, **not open to the public** to discuss potential agency litigation as allowed under RCW 42.30.110 (1) (i).*
- 6. Adjourn..... Bill Lynch, EFSEC Chair

**Note: "FINAL ACTION"** means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.02

Verbatim Transcript of Monthly Council Meeting  
Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation  
Council

May 16, 2017



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

**206.287.9066**

[www.buellrealtime.com](http://www.buellrealtime.com)

Olympia | 360.534.9066 Spokane | 509.624.3261 National | 800.846.6989

email: [info@buellrealtime.com](mailto:info@buellrealtime.com)



|   |  |
|---|--|
| Page 1  | Page 3   |
| <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <hr/> <p>6 WASHINGTON STATE</p> <p>7 ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL</p> <p>8 Richard Hemstad Building</p> <p>9 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest</p> <p>10 Conference Room 206</p> <p>11 Olympia, Washington</p> <p>12 May 16, 2017</p> <p>13 1:30 p.m.</p> <hr/> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 MONTHLY COUNCIL MEETING</p> <p>18 Verbatim Transcript of Proceeding</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 REPORTED BY: ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032</p> <p>21 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC.</p> <p>22 1325 Fourth Avenue</p> <p>23 Suite 1840</p> <p>24 Seattle, Washington 98101</p> <p>25 206.287.9066   Seattle</p> <p>360.534.9066   Olympia</p> <p>800.846.6989   National</p> <p>www.buellrealtime.com</p>  | <p>1 APPEARANCES (continued)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Guests in Attendance via Phone:</p> <p>4 Shannon Khounnala, Columbia Generating &amp; WNP 1/4</p> <p>5 Kristen Boyles, Earthjustice</p> <p>6 Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie</p> <p>7 Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound Energy</p> <p>8 Eric Melbardis, EDP Renewables</p> <p>9 Tadas Kisielius, Vancouver Energy</p> <p>10 Jared Larrabee, Tesoro</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 *****</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>  |
| Page 2  | Page 4   |
| <p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Councilmembers Present:</p> <p>3 Bill Lynch, Chair</p> <p>4 Jaime Rossman, Department of Commerce</p> <p>5 Cullen Stephenson, Department of Ecology</p> <p>6 Joe Stohr, Department of Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>7 Dennis Moss, Utilities and Transportation Commission</p> <p>8 Dan Siemann, Department of Natural Resources (via phone)</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 Local Government and Optional State Agencies:</p> <p>11 Ken Stone, Department of Transportation</p> <p>12 Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver</p> <p>13 Greg Shafer, Clark County (via phone)</p> <p>14 Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver (via phone)</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 Assistant Attorney General:</p> <p>17 Ann Essko, Senior Counsel</p> <p>18 Phyllis Bamey</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 Staff in Attendance:</p> <p>21 Stephen Posner</p> <p>22 Jim LaSpina</p> <p>23 Tammy Mastro</p> <p>24 Sonia Bumpus</p> <p>25 Joan Aitken</p> <p>Ami Kidder</p> <p>Guests in Attendance:</p> <p>Rich Downen, Grays Harbor Energy</p> <p>Mark A. Miller, PacifiCorp Chehalis Generation Facility</p> <p>Gary Lee, Ecology</p> <p>Connie Sue Martin, Port of Vancouver</p> | <p>1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; MAY 16, 2017</p> <p>2 1:30 p.m.</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 CHAIR LYNCH: Good afternoon. Today is</p> <p>7 Tuesday, May 16th, the monthly meeting for the Energy</p> <p>8 Facility Site Evaluation Council.</p> <p>9 If we could please have the clerk call the</p> <p>10 roll.</p> <p>11 MS. MASTRO: Department of Commerce?</p> <p>12 MR. ROSSMAN: Jaime Rossman is here.</p> <p>13 MS. MASTRO: Department of Ecology?</p> <p>14 MR. STEPHENSON: Cullen Stephenson, here.</p> <p>15 MS. MASTRO: Fish and Wildlife?</p> <p>16 MR. STOHR: Joe Stohr is here.</p> <p>17 MS. MASTRO: Department of Natural</p> <p>18 Resources?</p> <p>19 MR. SIEMANN (via phone): Dan Siemann is on</p> <p>20 the phone.</p> <p>21 MS. MASTRO: Utilities and Transportation</p> <p>22 Commission?</p> <p>23 MR. MOSS: Dennis Moss is here.</p> <p>24 MS. MASTRO: Local governments and optional</p> <p>25 State agencies; for the Tesoro project, Department of</p> |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| Page 5   | Page 7  |
| <p>1 Transportation?</p> <p>2 MR. STONE: Ken Stone is here.</p> <p>3 MS. MASTRO: City of Vancouver?</p> <p>4 CHAIR LYNCH: He'll be joining us by phone</p> <p>5 later.</p> <p>6 MS. MASTRO: Clark County?</p> <p>7 MR. SHAFER (via phone): Greg Shafer is on</p> <p>8 the phone.</p> <p>9 MS. MASTRO: Port of Vancouver?</p> <p>10 MR. PAULSON (via phone): Larry Paulson's on</p> <p>11 the phone.</p> <p>12 MS. MASTRO: Chair, there is a quorum for</p> <p>13 the regular Council and for the Tesoro Project Council.</p> <p>14 CHAIR LYNCH: Thank you.</p> <p>15 And if I could please have the Council take</p> <p>16 a look at the proposed agenda today, you will see that</p> <p>17 there is one proposed action item at the bottom</p> <p>18 regarding the proposed NPDES Industrial Stormwater</p> <p>19 Permit that we're proposing to public notice today for</p> <p>20 the Tesoro project. And that's the only action item we</p> <p>21 have proposed. Are there any suggested changes to the</p> <p>22 agenda?</p> <p>23 Hearing none, let's move on to the -- before</p> <p>24 we get to the minutes, let's have people who are on the</p> <p>25 phone introduce themselves. And let's start first with</p> | <p>1 entertain a motion for their adoption.</p> <p>2 MR. MOSS: Chair Lynch, I'd move the</p> <p>3 adoption of the April 18th, 2017, minutes as</p> <p>4 transcribed.</p> <p>5 CHAIR LYNCH: Do we have a second?</p> <p>6 MR. STOHR: I'll second.</p> <p>7 CHAIR LYNCH: It's been moved and seconded</p> <p>8 that the Council approve the April 18th, 2017, minutes</p> <p>9 as submitted. All those in favor, say "Aye."</p> <p>10 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.</p> <p>11 CHAIR LYNCH: Opposed? Motion carries.</p> <p>12 And now we've got the May 2nd, 2017, special</p> <p>13 meeting minutes in front of us. Are there any proposed</p> <p>14 edits?</p> <p>15 Councilmember Rossman.</p> <p>16 MR. ROSSMAN: Yes, Mr. Chair, two small</p> <p>17 edits. I was on the phone, and I think it was probably</p> <p>18 hard to hear, but on page 6, line 24, I think that</p> <p>19 should read "guidance document from Texas 'that' was</p> <p>20 recently released in September," not 'but.' That's page</p> <p>21 6, line 24.</p> <p>22 And then on page 8, lines 23 and 24, I</p> <p>23 believe what I said there was, "To clarify, we're just</p> <p>24 issuing for public comment," not the text that's there.</p> <p>25 So with those two changes, those were the</p>         |
| Page 6   | Page 8  |
| <p>1 those people who are representing various projects.</p> <p>2 MS. KHOUNNALA (via phone): Shannon</p> <p>3 Khounnala, Energy Northwest.</p> <p>4 MS. DIAZ (via phone): Jennifer Diaz, Puget</p> <p>5 Sound Energy.</p> <p>6 MR. LARRABEE (via phone): Jared Larrabee,</p> <p>7 Vancouver Energy.</p> <p>8 MR. KISIELIUS (via phone): Tadas Kisielius</p> <p>9 with Van Ness Feldman on behalf of Vancouver Energy.</p> <p>10 CHAIR LYNCH: And anybody also who wishes to</p> <p>11 identify themselves, though you're not required to?</p> <p>12 MR. MELBARDIS (via phone): Eric Melbardis,</p> <p>13 EDP Renewables.</p> <p>14 MS. MCGAFFEY (via phone): Karen McGaffey,</p> <p>15 Perkins Coie.</p> <p>16 MS. BOYLES (via phone): Kristin Boyles,</p> <p>17 Earthjustice.</p> <p>18 MS. MARTIN: Connie Sue Martin, Port of</p> <p>19 Vancouver.</p> <p>20 CHAIR LYNCH: Anybody else?</p> <p>21 Okay. At this time I will ask the</p> <p>22 councilmembers to take a look at the minutes, and we'll</p> <p>23 start first with the April 18th minutes.</p> <p>24 Are there any suggested edits to the</p> <p>25 April 18th minutes? If no suggested edits, I'd</p>   | <p>1 only ones I saw.</p> <p>2 CHAIR LYNCH: Any other proposed edits? So</p> <p>3 at this point in time, I will take a motion to approve</p> <p>4 the May 2nd, 2017, minutes with the proposed amendments.</p> <p>5 MR. ROSSMAN: So moved.</p> <p>6 CHAIR LYNCH: And do we have a second?</p> <p>7 MR. MOSS: I'll second that.</p> <p>8 CHAIR LYNCH: Moved and seconded that we</p> <p>9 approve the May 2nd, 2017, special meeting amendments --</p> <p>10 excuse me -- minutes as modified.</p> <p>11 All those in favor say, "Aye."</p> <p>12 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.</p> <p>13 CHAIR LYNCH: Opposed? Motion carries.</p> <p>14 So at this point in time, let's go ahead</p> <p>15 with our updates -- our operational updates from our</p> <p>16 facilities. And we'll start with Mr. Melbardis for the</p> <p>17 Kittitas Valley Wind Project.</p> <p>18 MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Lynch,</p> <p>19 EFSEC Council and Staff. This is Eric Melbardis with</p> <p>20 EDP Renewables representing the Kittitas Valley Wind</p> <p>21 Power Project.</p> <p>22 For the reporting period of April, we have</p> <p>23 nothing nonroutine to report.</p> <p>24 CHAIR LYNCH: As Mr. Melbardis indicated,</p> <p>25 there's nothing nonroutine to report. There's no</p> |



Page 9

1 complaints, no incidents. Any questions for  
 2 Mr. Melbardis? Thank you, Mr. Melbardis.  
 3 We'll turn now to Ms. Diaz with Puget Sound  
 4 Energy and the Wild Horse Wind Power Project.  
 5 MS. DIAZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair Lynch and  
 6 Councilmembers. This is Jennifer Diaz, Environmental  
 7 Manager for Puget Sound Energy at the Wild Horse Wind  
 8 Facility.  
 9 I have one minor nonroutine update. At the  
 10 request of EFSEC staff, PSE sent a list of all  
 11 operational plans required by the Site Certification  
 12 Agreement for Wild Horse. All operational plans are  
 13 reviewed annually by PSE and updated as needed, and  
 14 these plans will be shared with EFSEC staff during the  
 15 next compliance inspection, which is scheduled for  
 16 May 31st.  
 17 CHAIR LYNCH: Very good. Any questions for  
 18 Ms. Diaz? Thank you, Ms. Diaz.  
 19 Now we'll turn to Ms. Khounnala.  
 20 MS. KHOUNNALA: Yes. This is Shannon  
 21 Khounnala with Energy Northwest. So in regard to  
 22 Columbia Generating Station, you'll see in your packet  
 23 that we have begun our outage for this year, which is  
 24 our 23rd refueling and maintenance outage. We are in  
 25 our fourth day today. The outage is scheduled for

Page 10

1 40 days.  
 2 In addition to the 1100 people that we have  
 3 on site here at Energy Northwest, we also have an  
 4 additional 1300 supplemental workers here that will help  
 5 support us in this outage, working on approximately  
 6 10,000 scheduled maintenance tasks. So we're in day 4,  
 7 we've got till day 40, and we've got a long way to go,  
 8 but thus far it's going very well.  
 9 We have no other events or incidents or  
 10 regulatory issues to report in regard to Columbia  
 11 Generating Station.  
 12 CHAIR LYNCH: Any questions for  
 13 Ms. Khounnala regarding the Columbia Generating Station?  
 14 Yes, Councilmember Stephenson.  
 15 MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Chair Lynch.  
 16 Ms. Khounnala, there was a widely reported  
 17 tunnel collapse at Hanford recently, and since you  
 18 haven't reported that, I'm assuming that's nothing that  
 19 has impacts on your facility. Are there any other  
 20 things we need to worry about as an EFSEC Council from  
 21 those other facilities close by that would impact you?  
 22 MS. KHOUNNALA: I don't think from an EFSEC  
 23 Council point of view there's considerable worry on your  
 24 part. I'll say that the location of that event was  
 25 approximately three miles from us. It did not impact us

Page 11

1 in a way that we had to respond or evacuate in any  
 2 means.  
 3 Our facility personnel here did coordinate  
 4 with Hanford so that we were receiving up-to-date and  
 5 realtime notifications on the events that they were  
 6 experiencing, but there have been no other issues or  
 7 concerns that have affected Columbia in that regard.  
 8 MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.  
 9 MS. KHOUNNALA: Thank you.  
 10 CHAIR LYNCH: Any other questions for  
 11 Ms. Khounnala? Thank you, Ms. Khounnala.  
 12 Go ahead and update us on WNP 1/4.  
 13 MS. KHOUNNALA: Sure. WNP 1/4, we did sign  
 14 a final lease document with the Department of Energy for  
 15 that land that WNP 1/4 sits upon. Those lease documents  
 16 take the lease out another 25 with additional –  
 17 25 years with an additional option for leases beyond  
 18 that.  
 19 So that extension of our lease does allow us  
 20 then to proceed with planning and construction  
 21 opportunities to implement the water rights that were  
 22 granted through the Department of Energy. So that lease  
 23 goes into effect in July, and we will go into our  
 24 planning phase following that lease announcement.  
 25 And with that, I have no additional updates

Page 12

1 for WNP 1/4.  
 2 CHAIR LYNCH: Any questions for  
 3 Ms. Khounnala regarding WNP 1/4? And I think there's a  
 4 few people here in the room, Ms. Khounnala, that can say  
 5 that, once you get a water right, you don't want to sit  
 6 on it.  
 7 MS. KHOUNNALA: That's correct.  
 8 CHAIR LYNCH: Okay. Very good.  
 9 And now we have Mr. Miller. Please go  
 10 ahead.  
 11 MR. MILLER: Thank you.  
 12 Good afternoon, Chair Lynch and  
 13 Councilmembers and Staff. I'm Mark Miller. I'm the  
 14 plant manager at the PacifiCorp Chehalis Generation  
 15 Facility.  
 16 I have one nonroutine comment to provide  
 17 today. Last week I submitted late in the week a letter  
 18 to EFSEC staff requesting consideration to modify one of  
 19 the approved greenhouse gas mitigation projects that  
 20 were deemed in-plant efficiency, and specifically, the  
 21 reverse osmosis treatment project.  
 22 If you recall previously, we had asked that  
 23 we install variable frequency drives to reduce the  
 24 energy consumption. We have since gone out to an  
 25 engineering contractor that assessed that approach and

Page 13

1 came back and believed that -- or has recommended an  
 2 alternative to variable frequency drives for those  
 3 specific horsepower-rated motors in the system to  
 4 actually reduce the horsepower size of the motors that  
 5 are installed, so we would achieve a lower horsepower  
 6 consumption.

7 And it's pretty simple math for that, and we  
 8 hadn't considered that previously, and it was based upon  
 9 what our water requirements were originally designed for  
 10 at that plant. You may not know that our raw water  
 11 supply is actually potable water from the city of  
 12 Chehalis, so it's very clean water and doesn't require a  
 13 lot of water treatment. So in effect, we do not need to  
 14 treat the water quite as aggressively as we have and  
 15 still meet, you know, plant requirements for the boilers  
 16 and whatnot.

17 So in that, I submitted a letter to  
 18 Mr. LaSpina. And also, the other part of that is it's  
 19 taking us a little bit longer because we'd like to  
 20 self-perform it, as far as the engineering design with  
 21 our staff, because it's quite expensive to -- even for  
 22 scope of work where the engineering contractor would  
 23 basically -- to write a small scope of work is asking  
 24 for a little over \$100,000. And given the limited funds  
 25 for this, we thought it would be probably more

Page 14

1 appropriate if we took a little more time and  
 2 self-performed it.

3 And that's the request that we put to Staff  
 4 is just to consider the change from the variable  
 5 frequency drives to these lower horsepower motors.

6 CHAIR LYNCH: And this all relates to the  
 7 greenhouse mitigation policy that this Council  
 8 previously approved?

9 MR. MILLER: Correct. And that was a  
 10 requirement during the acquisition approval for  
 11 PacifiCorp when they purchased the plant from SUEZ  
 12 Energy. And that was one component -- you know, the  
 13 other components were energy -- or carbon offsets that  
 14 were generated by the Linden Farm project, which is a  
 15 dairy cow manure digester, and so we've purchased a  
 16 contract through that.

17 And then we've -- for quite some time we  
 18 tried to work out an agreement with the Confederated  
 19 Tribes of the Chehalis to do treatment, and that didn't  
 20 pan out, so one of the approaches that was recommended  
 21 was that we go back to the greenhouse gas mitigation  
 22 that was put together for the original EFSEC permit, and  
 23 deal with -- implement in-plant efficiency projects.  
 24 Long story short, or short story long.

25 CHAIR LYNCH: And my own sense is that,

Page 15

1 because this Council already previously approved how you  
 2 were going to change the mitigation strategy to one  
 3 where it was in-house improvement for your facilities,  
 4 you gained not only better efficiency, but you also cut  
 5 down -- significantly cut the amount of greenhouse  
 6 gases.

7 The fact that this is a small tweak to that,  
 8 I don't see the need for the Council to revote on that,  
 9 because that's within the spirit of what we -- and this  
 10 is just a slight modification of that.

11 Any questions for Mr. Miller? Thank you,  
 12 Mr. Miller.

13 MR. MILLER: Thank you. Have a good day.

14 CHAIR LYNCH: Grays Harbor Energy Center,  
 15 Mr. Downen.

16 MR. DOWNEN: Good afternoon, Chair Lynch,  
 17 Councilmembers and EFSEC staff. My name's Rich Downen.  
 18 I'm the acting plant manager at Grays Harbor Energy.

19 In the monthly report for the month of  
 20 April, there's only two off-normal things to note and  
 21 talk about.

22 Item 2.3, an April 5th stormwater test  
 23 measured 32 NTU, so that's -- my mind just went blank on  
 24 the -- on the parameter.

25 MR. LASPINA: Turbidity?

Page 16

1 MR. DOWNEN: Turbidity. Thank you. This  
 2 exceeded our 25 NTU benchmark, which triggered us to  
 3 perform a site inspection and to take a look at where we  
 4 thought this was coming from.

5 And the site -- I should have brought a  
 6 picture of the site. So the site is split pretty much  
 7 in half, and half of it is the operating power block  
 8 that is Grays Harbor Units 1 and 2, and the other half  
 9 is kind of a gravel lay-down, or open area where Phase 2  
 10 is going to go. So that side doesn't really get used  
 11 for anything, only in this cooling tower replacement,  
 12 that's where all the new -- all the spare cooling tower  
 13 was put in all its material steps, and then, you know, a  
 14 lot of traffic.

15 So in the middle of that space, there's kind  
 16 of a swale, a stormwater swale in the middle that goes  
 17 into a stormwater drain. So that with all the rain that  
 18 we've had this spring, quite a bit, that swale was full  
 19 of water, and it was -- and it was muddy. It had been  
 20 stirred up by all the traffic in that area.

21 So we identified that that was where it was  
 22 coming from, and we took some steps immediately. We got  
 23 some fabric and some -- quite a few straw bales and set  
 24 up a -- just some improvements there in the swale, and  
 25 we brought in 60 yards of one-inch wash gravel and kind



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 of replaced the gravel and kind of built up the gravel<br/>                 2 there in that lay-down area.<br/>                 3 Subsequent samples have -- have been taken<br/>                 4 with other -- other rain events, and we've had readings<br/>                 5 well below the tolerance of the 25 NTUs, so we're --<br/>                 6 we're pretty certain that we understand the mechanism of<br/>                 7 why it happened with the unusual traffic over there.<br/>                 8 That yard is empty again now that the<br/>                 9 cooling tower project is done. And then with all the<br/>                 10 steps that we took to improve it, we're pretty confident<br/>                 11 that we're -- we're in a good state once again.<br/>                 12 And then item 2.4 is just kind of a -- it's<br/>                 13 not the complete project close-out. There's a little<br/>                 14 bit of paperwork to be finished on the project, but the<br/>                 15 cooling tower replacement project, the replacement of<br/>                 16 all nine cooling tower cells stick by stick to FRP is<br/>                 17 complete, not -- not any injuries incurred in the<br/>                 18 performance of that, and the cooling tower is performing<br/>                 19 well.<br/>                 20 The ongoing testing that now will take place<br/>                 21 is, once the plant comes up and starts running on a<br/>                 22 regular basis, which prices are pretty soft, there's a<br/>                 23 lot of hydro runoff right now, so we think that may be a<br/>                 24 little bit before we start running on a regular basis,<br/>                 25 but once that happens and we start cooling tower</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 Eckhardt -- obtaining the Eckhardt standard.<br/>                 2 And as Rich said, this should facilitate the<br/>                 3 expeditious completion of the engineering report, and<br/>                 4 we're looking at reissuance of the permit probably late<br/>                 5 this year, early next year. So that will be a good<br/>                 6 milestone for the facility and for EFSEC.<br/>                 7 CHAIR LYNCH: Very good. And Mr. LaSpina,<br/>                 8 if you'd just refresh my memory, I believe I'm right on<br/>                 9 this, but when there is an incident of a BMP -- you<br/>                 10 know, here we had a -- the amount of turbidity was<br/>                 11 exceeded for a particular test period, if you go back,<br/>                 12 you're allowed to actually average those over a period<br/>                 13 of time. And if there's no further exceedances, you are<br/>                 14 not in violation of the permit is my understanding.<br/>                 15 MR. LASPINA: Yes, sir. The industrial<br/>                 16 stormwater permit is designed so that exceedance of a<br/>                 17 benchmark is not, in and of itself, a permit violation.<br/>                 18 What it does is it triggers actions, review actions,<br/>                 19 beefing up of BMPs. And you are correct, the permit<br/>                 20 allows averaging of samples over a quarter to get back<br/>                 21 into compliance with the benchmark.<br/>                 22 CHAIR LYNCH: Thank you.<br/>                 23 Any questions for Mr. LaSpina or Mr. Downen?<br/>                 24 Thank you.<br/>                 25 MR. DOWNEN: All right. Thank you.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 blow-down once again, and that's our outfall stream,<br/>                 2 then we'll start that -- restart that testing protocol<br/>                 3 of about two samples a week for ten weeks to get a good<br/>                 4 characterization of that outfall, which then completes<br/>                 5 the engineering report, which then feeds the process to<br/>                 6 get the NPDES permit finalized.<br/>                 7 So that's the -- that's the end game. But<br/>                 8 that project is complete, we're happy to say.<br/>                 9 CHAIR LYNCH: I'm happy to hear that as<br/>                 10 well. Just hearing you say the characterization of the<br/>                 11 effluent in an engineering report, that's -- those are<br/>                 12 all good things that we were looking forward to having.<br/>                 13 MR. DOWNEN: We waited a long time to say<br/>                 14 that, and I -- knock on wood -- we've got a little ways<br/>                 15 to go yet.<br/>                 16 CHAIR LYNCH: I hope I didn't jinx you at<br/>                 17 all.<br/>                 18 MR. DOWNEN: Me too.<br/>                 19 CHAIR LYNCH: Any questions for Mr. Downen?<br/>                 20 Mr. LaSpina, did you have anything to add?<br/>                 21 MR. LASPINA: No, not if there's no<br/>                 22 questions. We -- EFSEC does want to -- the Staff want<br/>                 23 to point out that they stepped up to the plate and<br/>                 24 voluntarily replaced their cooling tower, which was a<br/>                 25 good thing. They're well on their way to the</p>   | <p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 CHAIR LYNCH: Now, if we could have<br/>                 2 Ms. Bumpus provide us the project update for the<br/>                 3 Tesoro/Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.<br/>                 4 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you.<br/>                 5 Good afternoon, Chair Lynch and<br/>                 6 Councilmembers. I'll start with the SEPA update.<br/>                 7 EFSEC staff are continuing to work with our<br/>                 8 consultants to address the issues that were identified<br/>                 9 in the preliminary draft FEIS we received from our<br/>                 10 consultant. And since last council meeting, this effort<br/>                 11 has progressed to final chapters of the document with a<br/>                 12 few exceptions in early sections that we still need to<br/>                 13 work on.<br/>                 14 I'll just note that there are a lot of<br/>                 15 moving parts that we're still working out and dealing<br/>                 16 with as we finish up the document, and we'll keep the<br/>                 17 Council informed as we get closer to preparation of the<br/>                 18 document we can share with the Council.<br/>                 19 And that's all I have for SEPA. Are there<br/>                 20 any questions?<br/>                 21 CHAIR LYNCH: Just one quick one from me. I<br/>                 22 don't know -- I know that you were waiting for some air<br/>                 23 information before you could help finalize that portion<br/>                 24 of the EIS. Did you get that?<br/>                 25 MS. BUMPUS: Correct. Yeah. We had</p>   |



Page 21

1 requested on March 24th that the applicant update their  
 2 air quality analysis information that they had provided  
 3 that was used in the draft EIS, and we received that  
 4 today.  
 5 CHAIR LYNCH: Good. Good.  
 6 Any questions for Ms. Bumpus regarding the  
 7 EIS? Okay. Go ahead and proceed.  
 8 MS. BUMPUS: Okay. For permits, for the  
 9 NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit, there's no new  
 10 updates there. We're continuing to review comments  
 11 where we can and coordinate with the applicant for new  
 12 information, if needed, and the Ecology contractors to  
 13 develop responses to the comments we received during the  
 14 public comment period.  
 15 For the Notice of Construction Air Permit  
 16 application, the public comment on the Notice of  
 17 Construction permit began on May 3rd, it will end on  
 18 June 7th, for a total of 36 days of public comment.  
 19 Since the beginning of the public comment  
 20 period, EFSEC has received approximately 40 public  
 21 comments on the permit, and currently we're planning to  
 22 hold a public hearing on June 7th in Vancouver at the  
 23 Clark College Gaiser Hall. This is the same venue we  
 24 used for the Construction NPDES Stormwater Permit. And  
 25 doors will open at 1:00 p.m. as planned now, and we'll

Page 22

1 notify the public if any of those details change.  
 2 CHAIR LYNCH: Any questions regarding  
 3 permits?  
 4 MS. BUMPUS: All right. So if there's no  
 5 questions on those, I'll go ahead and move forward with  
 6 the permit that Staff is going to ask the Council to  
 7 take action on today. This is the NPDES Industrial  
 8 Stormwater Permit Update.  
 9 As councilmembers are aware, part five of  
 10 the application for site certification included  
 11 application materials for an NPDES Industrial Stormwater  
 12 Permit to cover stormwater discharges for the proposed  
 13 Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal project.  
 14 Gary Lee is here to answer technical  
 15 questions about the draft permit documents, which  
 16 included the permit and a fact sheet that were provided  
 17 to the Council for review on May 9th. Phyllis Barney is  
 18 also here from the AG's office. She's been involved in  
 19 reviewing the draft permit documents that were provided  
 20 to you on May 9th as well.  
 21 And I wanted to just go over a couple of the  
 22 highlights of the permit. It's not everything that's  
 23 detailed in the permit, but just a few things about what  
 24 it addresses.  
 25 There are two outfall locations that will

Page 23

1 receive stormwater from the proposed facility. These  
 2 are Terminal 4 outfall and Terminal 5 outfall at the  
 3 Port of Vancouver. Terminal 4 outfall receives treated  
 4 stormwater from Area 300. This is the storage tank farm  
 5 area.  
 6 The stormwater treatment, prior to this  
 7 discharge, includes an oil/water separator and water  
 8 quality vaults that contain media filters and activated  
 9 carbon filtration units. After treatment process, the  
 10 stormwater from Area 400 -- sorry, excuse me -- Area 300  
 11 would be discharged to the T-4 outfall.  
 12 For the Terminal 5 outfall, this is where  
 13 stormwater from around the Area 200 buildings would go.  
 14 Area 200 includes the area outside of the rail and  
 15 loading building and the administration building. And  
 16 again, stormwater treatment includes media filter and  
 17 activated carbon filtration units before discharge into  
 18 the Port's T-5 stormwater pond.  
 19 For Area 400, this is the marine terminal,  
 20 stormwater is collected and treated prior to discharge  
 21 to a grassy swale that's located on Port property that  
 22 would then infiltrate that water to ground.  
 23 So those are just some of the highlights of  
 24 what this permit would address. There's no industrial  
 25 wastewater that's included in this permit.

Page 24

1 CHAIR LYNCH: And so all three outfalls are  
 2 existing outfalls; is that correct?  
 3 MS. BUMPUS: Right. The outfalls that were  
 4 described are existing.  
 5 CHAIR LYNCH: And so any questions for  
 6 Ms. Bumpus? Then we will, I think, turn it over to  
 7 Mr. Lee to see if he has anything to add.  
 8 Mr. Lee, welcome.  
 9 MR. LEE: Yeah, thank you.  
 10 CHAIR LYNCH: I've certainly seen your work  
 11 before. It's good to put a face together with a name.  
 12 MR. LEE: Yeah, thanks. So -- well, I guess  
 13 the -- this permit's basically just strictly for the  
 14 stormwater treatment -- stormwater permit. And a little  
 15 complication is because the outfall, they're using the  
 16 treated stormwater from -- it's proposed that it will be  
 17 discharged into the port stormwater system and then  
 18 discharged through the Columbia River via the existing  
 19 stormwater outfall as you've just mentioned.  
 20 And also the Terminal 4, Area 400, which is  
 21 a dock area, that will be discharged -- will be the  
 22 infiltrated into the ground. The treated stormwater  
 23 from the dock area will be treated and then discharged  
 24 into the ground through the existing swale.  
 25 So pretty much straightforward stormwater

|         |  |         |  |
|---------|--|---------|--|
| Page 25 | <p>1 disposal alternatives. I guess the -- in this case,</p> <p>2 they -- they -- I said for this particular facility that</p> <p>3 the turbine (phonetic) more stringent than the -- than</p> <p>4 what the typical -- what used to be 4 terminal, because</p> <p>5 I think the facility's much -- the -- scale-wise is much</p> <p>6 bigger than the normal bulk storage that we deal with.</p> <p>7 CHAIR LYNCH: I'm sorry. You said than the</p> <p>8 normal --</p> <p>9 MR. LEE: Bulk, the bulk storage tank.</p> <p>10 CHAIR LYNCH: Thank you.</p> <p>11 MR. LEE: And so I think it's a little --</p> <p>12 the requirement is a little bit more comprehensive than</p> <p>13 the typical -- the small storage terminals so --</p> <p>14 CHAIR LYNCH: Any questions for Mr. Lee?</p> <p>15 Yes, Mr. Stone. Councilmember Stone.</p> <p>16 MR. STONE: Thank you, Chair Lynch. I have</p> <p>17 some comments to make. And first of all, I'd like to</p> <p>18 note that, despite the Staff report, I did not receive</p> <p>19 the permit documents until late yesterday afternoon.</p> <p>20 There must have been some sort of technical difficulty</p> <p>21 in the email transmission, but I didn't get them until</p> <p>22 late yesterday afternoon. As such, I only had a chance</p> <p>23 to review the fact sheet, so the comments I have are</p> <p>24 restricted to the fact sheet itself.</p> <p>25 I don't think it's ready to go out for</p> | Page 27 | <p>1 MR. STONE: Okay. I'll find that.</p> <p>2 MR. ROSSMAN: Page 13, maybe, of the fact</p> <p>3 sheet?</p> <p>4 MR. STONE: Yes, page 13 in Section C,</p> <p>5 Wastewater Characterization.</p> <p>6 CHAIR LYNCH: Okay.</p> <p>7 MR. STONE: So the Tesoro Anacortes Refinery</p> <p>8 is used as a surrogate for the expected pollutant</p> <p>9 concentrations to be generated at the Vancouver Energy</p> <p>10 Distribution Terminal, yet there's no description of the</p> <p>11 Tesoro Anacortes refinery to make the case that that is</p> <p>12 an equitable or equivalent surrogate for using in this</p> <p>13 application or in this permit.</p> <p>14 Lastly, there is a fair bit of extraneous</p> <p>15 information in the fact sheet that's not helpful. For</p> <p>16 example, there's a fairly long description of what a</p> <p>17 mixing zone is, despite the fact that the permit -- the</p> <p>18 draft permit does not authorize a mixing zone, so it</p> <p>19 doesn't need to be in there.</p> <p>20 I mean, this fact sheet, as I understand it,</p> <p>21 is used to explain to a lay audience what the permit is</p> <p>22 all about, and it doesn't really help people understand</p> <p>23 if there's information in there that doesn't really need</p> <p>24 to be in there.</p> <p>25 So those are my comments.</p> |
| Page 26 | <p>1 public comment. The fact sheet needs the eyes of a</p> <p>2 technical editor. There are several typos, grammatical</p> <p>3 errors and undefined acronyms that are used. The terms</p> <p>4 "stormwater," "wastewater" and "processed water" are</p> <p>5 used interchangeably as if they are the same thing,</p> <p>6 which they are not. So the document need to be combed</p> <p>7 to make sure you're using the right term for the right</p> <p>8 thing.</p> <p>9 Some of the graphics, for example, Figures 3</p> <p>10 and 4, are illegible, you cannot read them, so they're</p> <p>11 not very helpful at all.</p> <p>12 Number 4, the Tesoro Anacortes Refinery is</p> <p>13 used as a surrogate for the expected pollutant</p> <p>14 concentrations generated at the Vancouver Energy</p> <p>15 Distribution Terminal, yet there's no description of</p> <p>16 that refinery in order to allow the reader to make their</p> <p>17 own judgment as to whether that's an adequate surrogate</p> <p>18 or not to use in this application.</p> <p>19 CHAIR LYNCH: I'm sorry. Where are you,</p> <p>20 Mr. Stone, for that last thing you just said?</p> <p>21 MR. STONE: About the Tesoro Refinery?</p> <p>22 CHAIR LYNCH: Yeah. I'm sorry. I missed</p> <p>23 what you just said --</p> <p>24 MR. STONE: Okay.</p> <p>25 CHAIR LYNCH: -- that was in the document.</p>   | Page 28 | <p>1 CHAIR LYNCH: Any other comments?</p> <p>2 Yes, Mr. Rossman.</p> <p>3 MR. ROSSMAN: Yeah, I have a question for</p> <p>4 Mr. Lee, and I'm wondering, in terms of some of the</p> <p>5 other potential pollutants that aren't -- that there are</p> <p>6 no limits set for here, it looks like we're recommending</p> <p>7 testing for those just once a year.</p> <p>8 MR. LEE: Yes.</p> <p>9 MR. ROSSMAN: And I'm wondering if it would</p> <p>10 be wise for some beginning period to test those more</p> <p>11 frequently just until we have a better sense of the</p> <p>12 outflow of the facility.</p> <p>13 MR. LEE: Okay. I think that the -- that</p> <p>14 annual testing is called Priority Pollutant Scan.</p> <p>15 Basically we try to identify if there are any other</p> <p>16 additional pollutants which --</p> <p>17 CHAIR LYNCH: I'm sorry, Mr. Lee. You're</p> <p>18 speaking very quickly and it's hard to understand.</p> <p>19 MR. LEE: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. So --</p> <p>20 CHAIR LYNCH: Thank you.</p> <p>21 MR. LEE: Okay. Let me settle down a little</p> <p>22 bit.</p> <p>23 Okay. Those annual testings of the items,</p> <p>24 the parameters are called Priority Pollutant --</p> <p>25 (Court reporter clarification.)</p>  |



Page 29

1 MR. LEE: Priority Pollutant Scan. And so  
 2 the purpose of that is trying to identify if there are  
 3 any other additional pollutants than what's identified  
 4 in the -- as the permit limits itself. So basically  
 5 it's kind of additional to the permit requirement, I  
 6 guess.  
 7 And I'll try to answer part of your  
 8 question -- one of your questions about this -- the  
 9 wastewater characteristics, if it's suitable to be used  
 10 at the influent for this proposed facility.  
 11 It's -- as you know, a lot of the facility,  
 12 which -- right now, since this is a brand new facility,  
 13 so the reason why we pick this Tesoro Anacortes  
 14 Refinery, because it has a bulk storage terminal, the  
 15 tank farm. So in a way, it's kind of a similar  
 16 operation, similar type of operation, although the crude  
 17 oil we deal with might not be quite the same, because  
 18 this is Alaska North Slope crude oil versus --  
 19 (Court reporter clarification.)  
 20 MR. LEE: Alaska North Slope crude oil.  
 21 Okay? And then -- and then the Tesoro, the proposed  
 22 facility will be the -- that's --  
 23 MS. BUMPUS: Bakken.  
 24 MR. LEE: Yeah, the Bakken oil. So it's  
 25 kind of different -- different crude -- type of crude,

Page 30

1 but a similar operation in this case.  
 2 MR. STONE: Yeah. I understand that, but I  
 3 think the explanation that you just provided needs to be  
 4 in the fact sheet so people reading it can understand  
 5 why you selected that refinery as a surrogate for this  
 6 facility.  
 7 MR. LEE: Okay. I understand that, yes, so  
 8 I can revise that, yes.  
 9 CHAIR LYNCH: Ms. Bumpus.  
 10 MS. BUMPUS: I was just going to say,  
 11 Councilmember Stone, we can -- we can add a discussion  
 12 to the fact sheet, and we can also go through and  
 13 address the typos and grammars that you identified --  
 14 grammar errors that you identified, and acronyms that  
 15 may be missing or misstated.  
 16 I think that we can -- given the comments  
 17 that you made on the fact sheet, we can make some final  
 18 revisions before actually putting this out to notice.  
 19 CHAIR LYNCH: Any other comments by  
 20 councilmembers? I'm just curious, when did other  
 21 councilmembers receive these documents? Did you receive  
 22 them like a week ago?  
 23 MR. ROSSMAN: Something like that.  
 24 MS. BUMPUS: To my knowledge, Chair Lynch,  
 25 Councilmember Stone was the only one that experienced

Page 31

1 that issue. One of the documents attached to the email  
 2 was a macro-enabled Word document, and different  
 3 agencies have different settings concerning these types  
 4 of documents when you transmit them via email.  
 5 And so for some reason, that -- because that  
 6 document was attached, I suppose DOT security settings  
 7 are slightly different. It transmitted the email, but  
 8 not the attachments in the email. And so we were -- I  
 9 was able to find out what had happened and save the  
 10 documents in a format that his Outlook would accept.  
 11 MR. STONE: Correction. I didn't get the  
 12 email either. The only reason I knew the documents were  
 13 distributed is I saw them referred to in another email  
 14 that Chair Lynch sent.  
 15 MS. BUMPUS: Oh, sorry, Councilmember Stone.  
 16 I must have mistaken -- I thought you had gotten the  
 17 email and just not the attachments.  
 18 MR. STONE: No, I didn't get the email at  
 19 all.  
 20 MS. BUMPUS: Okay.  
 21 CHAIR LYNCH: Yeah, I can certainly  
 22 understand Councilmember Stone's unhappiness about not  
 23 getting documents that we're going to be at least taking  
 24 an initial vote on, so let me make sure that that's --  
 25 MR. POSNER: Chair Lynch, can I just --

Page 32

1 CHAIR LYNCH: Yes, Mr. Posner.  
 2 MR. POSNER: -- also add something to the  
 3 conversation?  
 4 Just for the record, we've -- we did send  
 5 out an email to all councilmembers on the -- it would  
 6 have been Monday, the 8th -- I did -- just stating that  
 7 we would be sending all of the permit-related documents  
 8 to the councilmembers on the 9th, which is the day that  
 9 Ms. Bumpus did send them.  
 10 So I apologize if Councilmember Stone did  
 11 not get those documents, but we did give councilmembers  
 12 a heads-up that they would be coming. So just so you  
 13 know, we did provide that information. It was noted on  
 14 the agenda. It would have been helpful if Councilmember  
 15 Stone would have contacted us and let us know that you  
 16 did not receive them [sic].  
 17 MR. STONE: I did. On May 10th, I sent an  
 18 email to Staff stating that I didn't get them.  
 19 CHAIR LYNCH: Well, the impetus is still on  
 20 us to make sure that we support the councilmembers. So  
 21 I apologize to Councilmember Stone and we'll -- the  
 22 thing that we need to do is just make sure that -- that  
 23 this doesn't happen again.  
 24 And Councilmember Stone, if for some reason  
 25 you're not getting something, please -- well, you said



Page 33

1 you flagged it, but we just want to make sure that this  
 2 doesn't reoccur. Thank you.

3 And I still think that it's appropriate for  
 4 us to put this out to notice it. It's a draft permit.  
 5 There are -- the things that have been flagged are  
 6 things that would -- that can be addressed and will be  
 7 addressed between the draft stage and the final stage.  
 8 But time is of the essence for us moving  
 9 forward, for putting things out for notice and  
 10 finalizing them, so I would really urge the  
 11 councilmembers to support putting this out for public  
 12 notice, recognizing that we're going to get comments  
 13 back, and that we would have to finalize any permit that  
 14 we're sending out for notice.

15 So if there's no further comments, I will  
 16 entertain a motion for -- yes, Councilmember Moss.

17 MR. MOSS: One thing I didn't hear you  
 18 address, Ms. Bumpus, you said you could correct certain  
 19 things, typos and things. You didn't address the  
 20 quality of the Figures 2 and 3, for example, or 3 and 4.  
 21 They are really pretty poor. In fact, the legends  
 22 themselves are completely illegible, so anybody looking  
 23 at this document is not going to be able to make any use  
 24 out of the pictures that are over 10,000 words [sic].  
 25 MS. BUMPUS: Yes. That is something that --

Page 34

1 something we can fix. We have the PDFs of those images.  
 2 This was -- those images are, I think, somewhat  
 3 distorted because they're converted to a Word document,  
 4 which tends to happen. So we -- we can address the  
 5 replacement of the figures so that they are clearer.

6 MR. MOSS: The point simply being, I  
 7 think -- I'm sympathetic to Chair Lynch's comments  
 8 regarding timeliness and -- but also to Councilmember  
 9 Stone's concerns about putting out a document that is  
 10 less than complete and less than a good representation  
 11 of the fine work that the Council typically does.

12 And so with those things in mind, I think we  
 13 ought to do our best to get this in the tip-top shape we  
 14 can if it's going to be distributed.

15 CHAIR LYNCH: Perhaps those figures could be  
 16 an entire page as opposed to a portion of a page. It  
 17 might be easier to read.

18 MS. BUMPUS: They can be enlarged --  
 19 actually, we talked about doing that in the interim --  
 20 in the interim, trying to enlarge those, because we also  
 21 thought that they could -- but again, being that it's a  
 22 draft permit -- but those should be relatively easy  
 23 fixes for us to do before this goes out.

24 CHAIR LYNCH: And then at the public hearing  
 25 that we have, we'll have -- I know a number of times

Page 35

1 we've got -- what I was going to say is demonstrative  
 2 evidence -- but we'll have exhibits and bigger blowups  
 3 of the site and things that people will be able to look  
 4 at.

5 MS. BUMPUS: That's correct. The permit  
 6 provides images to view of the facility, but the  
 7 application itself is actually in the application for  
 8 site certification. And all of these figures, these  
 9 same figures are available online on EFSEC's website.  
 10 And when we have our hearing, we have very large poster  
 11 boards that we have with us that clearly show the  
 12 different areas of the facility to the public.

13 CHAIR LYNCH: Any other comments by  
 14 councilmembers?

15 Yes, Councilmember Rossman.

16 MR. ROSSMAN: I'm willing to put this out  
 17 for public comment, but I'd like to hear further on  
 18 whether it would be appropriate to have more frequent  
 19 testing of those other pollutants in the first year or  
 20 two after start-up, just so that we get a real clear  
 21 characterization of everything that's --

22 MR. LEE: Okay. I can try to modify the  
 23 schedule.

24 MR. ROSSMAN: Thanks.

25 CHAIR LYNCH: And I guess I will ask

Page 36

1 Ms. Barney, since you're an AG who's looked at many  
 2 thousands of NPDES -- well, maybe not quite that many,  
 3 but many NPDES permits, is it -- just regarding  
 4 Councilmember Rossman's question, do you recall if  
 5 that's -- regarding the yearly testing for certain  
 6 priority pollutants, is that something that would be --  
 7 that you've seen in other permits?

8 MS. BARNEY: Thank you, Chair Lynch.  
 9 To address the question, I would say the  
 10 annual testing is probably the standard, but the Council  
 11 always has the option to go further than the standard  
 12 and be a little more stringent. In a case here where --  
 13 as Councilmember [sic] has already pointed out,  
 14 there's -- there's -- using a surrogate as a -- as a --  
 15 the basis for the characterization might be one aspect  
 16 that would -- would cause the Council to maybe want to  
 17 look a little more closely as the facility comes online,  
 18 that, I think, is certainly within the Council's power  
 19 to do in the NPDES permit.

20 The -- while annual testing by the methods  
 21 that are set out in the permit and in federal regulation  
 22 is the standard, because of -- that this is a brand new  
 23 facility, technically, if the technical decision is  
 24 that's appropriate, you certainly have the legal -- the  
 25 legal ability to do that.

Page 37

1 CHAIR LYNCH: And just looking at the types  
 2 of effluent, the pollutants that are listed for sampling  
 3 once a year, if I'm not mistaken, these are pollutants  
 4 that the operation of the facility doesn't actually  
 5 emit, that these are things that would be more likely to  
 6 just be perhaps on the surface of the site itself,  
 7 that -- and because we're having rain on the -- the  
 8 surface, that because there might be some contaminants  
 9 already on the site, they might be showing up as hits  
 10 when we're doing the stormwater sampling.  
 11 Am I correct on that?  
 12 MR. LEE: I can answer that. I think --  
 13 okay. One of the potential sources for those pollutants  
 14 may be from the site. It was originally a cleanup site.  
 15 So I think there are some pollutants already existing  
 16 that, like you said, is in the ground still. So  
 17 sometimes we have, whatever reason, it may be exposed or  
 18 remobilize the pollutant in the soil itself, so --  
 19 CHAIR LYNCH: But am I correct in saying  
 20 that these particular pollutants, you wouldn't -- oh,  
 21 actually, this is a stormwater permit, so you might not  
 22 be familiar with the operational side, but would you  
 23 expect to see these pollutants generated as part of the  
 24 operation?  
 25 MR. LEE: Not -- usually it's not from the

Page 38

1 typical oil transfer operation, no.  
 2 CHAIR LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.  
 3 Any other questions, Mr. Rossman?  
 4 MR. ROSSMAN: Just a comment on that.  
 5 Looking at the -- at the characteristics of the  
 6 Anacortes facility, it looks like some of those other  
 7 priority pollutants, like arsenic and lead, are being  
 8 generated at levels that at least are higher than the  
 9 ambients in the Columbia. So even if they are from some  
 10 different source, I'd be interested in having them  
 11 better characterized than just once a year sampling  
 12 until we had a clearer sense of how they're different.  
 13 CHAIR LYNCH: Okay.  
 14 Ms. Barney.  
 15 MS. BARNEY: If I may, Chair Lynch, just as  
 16 a reminder, part of Mr. Lee's process is to take the  
 17 pollutants that are part of the initial characterization  
 18 and run them through calculations to determine whether  
 19 or not there's a reasonable potential for these  
 20 particular pollutants to violate water quality standards  
 21 in this stormwater discharge.  
 22 So where you see limits in the permit for  
 23 specific pollutants, like copper, like zinc, that means  
 24 that the calculations have demonstrated that there is a  
 25 reasonable potential. That doesn't mean they're going

Page 39

1 to violate water quality standards, but the potential is  
 2 there, and that's why they have actual specific limits  
 3 on the discharge.  
 4 So for the compounds that are -- the rest of  
 5 what's on the characterization list, as well as the  
 6 priority pollutants, those pollutants have not at this  
 7 stage been deemed to have that reasonable potential.  
 8 So I just wanted to state that, to be clear,  
 9 that this isn't simply looking at this list and picking  
 10 out one or two to have limits. There are calculations  
 11 that go behind that, and that's part of the process of  
 12 the development of the permit in determining which  
 13 particular pollutants are going to have limits.  
 14 So that analysis has been completed based on  
 15 what the applicant provided as part of the  
 16 characterization, just to try to provide a little more  
 17 comfort with regard to the testing regime and where the  
 18 permit itself ended up with the limits.  
 19 CHAIR LYNCH: And one of the things the  
 20 Council could do, as opposed to -- well, let's just say  
 21 the Council is interested in more frequent testing of  
 22 these pollutants, you can authorize the more frequent  
 23 testing for a set period of time, say, like a year or  
 24 two years or something, just so, like, the whole length  
 25 of the permit you're not having somebody go out and test

Page 40

1 quarterly or whatever for things that aren't even  
 2 showing up. But it makes sense if -- if we want to have  
 3 some more rigorous testing, that we can do that, but we  
 4 then have a more finite time period in the permit.  
 5 Mr. LaSpina.  
 6 MR. LASPINA: Chair Lynch, I've written a  
 7 number of NPDES permits. For a brand new facility, it  
 8 would not be unusual to put in a schedule of compliance  
 9 to allow the facility to demonstrate compliance with the  
 10 water quality standards, and to put -- to require  
 11 perhaps quarterly testing for the first two years. The  
 12 eight samples is generally statistically adequate to --  
 13 to forecast the pollutants in the actual discharge.  
 14 That way you have -- you have a set amount of time, and  
 15 then you get -- you generate plenty of data within two  
 16 years, and you've got a better idea of the facility's  
 17 compliance in a fairly short amount of time.  
 18 CHAIR LYNCH: Right. You've got all four  
 19 seasons --  
 20 MR. LASPINA: Yes, sir.  
 21 CHAIR LYNCH: -- if you're doing it  
 22 quarterly.  
 23 Councilmember Stone.  
 24 MR. STONE: So in your experience,  
 25 Mr. LaSpina, since this is a stormwater permit,



# Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project

## Monthly Project Update

June 20, 2017

### Project Status Update

#### **April Production Summary:**

Power generated: 20,980 MWh  
Wind speed: 7.1 m/s  
Capacity Factor: 28.0%

#### **Safety:**

No incidents

#### **Compliance:**

Project is in compliance as of June 15, 2017. Jim LaSpina performed his annual compliance visit on June 1<sup>st</sup> and we're working on his suggestions for attestation of some of our Operations Phase plans.

#### **Sound:**

No complaints

#### **Shadow Flicker:**

No complaints

#### **Environmental:**

No incidents



## WILD HORSE

### Safety

No lost-time accidents or safety injuries/illnesses.

### Compliance/Environmental

#### ***Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:***

The Wild Horse Technical Advisory Committee met on May 31<sup>st</sup>. Members were provided updates on the following items:

- 2016 Hunting Plan
- 2016 Grazing Plan
  - TAC members unanimously voted to recommend approval of the 2017-2021 Coordinated Resource Management Grazing Plan
- Eagle Conservation Plan and Permit
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Sage-Grouse Habitat Monitoring Results
  - TAC members were offered an optional field tour of the sage-grouse habitat restoration area

#### ***EFSEC Compliance Inspection:***

Jim LaSpina, EFSEC staff, conducted a compliance inspection on May 31<sup>st</sup>. No compliance issues were identified.

### Operations/Maintenance

Nothing to report.

### Wind Production

Generation totaled 33,352 MWh for an average capacity factor of 16.44%.

**Energy Northwest  
EFSEC Council Meeting  
June 20, 2017  
Shannon Khounnala**

**I. Columbia Generating Station Operational Status**

As of June 14 Energy Northwest is in the final stages of the refueling outage. Energy Northwest expects that we will conclude the outage the weekend of June 17-18 and that we will be restored to full power at the beginning of the work week.

There are no other events, safety incidents, or regulatory issues to report.

**II. WNP 1/4 Water Rights**

There is no change from the May 17 update (shown below).

NEPA/Leasing

Energy Northwest has finalized and signed lease agreement with the Department of Energy. Under the new lease Energy Northwest will organize funding strategies to begin work on the water distribution system, which will eventually utilize the Water Rights permit granted by the Department of Ecology.



## **Chehalis Generation Facility----Monthly Plant Report – May 2017**

### **Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council**

06-15-2017

---

#### **Safety:**

- There were no recordable incidents this reporting period and the plant staff has achieved 672 days without a Lost Time Accident.

#### **Environment:**

- There were no air emissions or stormwater deviations or spills during the month of May 2017.
- Wastewater and Stormwater monitoring results were in compliance with the permit limits for the month of May 2017.

#### **Personnel:**

- The Chehalis plant staffing level is currently 19 of 19 approved positions filled.

#### **Operations and Maintenance Activities:**

- The Plant generated 97,844 MW-hours in May for a 2017 YTD generation total of 513,725 MW-hours and a capacity factor of 28.12%.

#### **Regulatory/Compliance:**

- Nothing to report.

#### **Sound monitoring:**

- There were no noise complaints to report.





**Carbon Offset Mitigation:**

- No update to provide this reporting period.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Miller".

Mark A. Miller  
Manager, Gas Plant  
Chehalis Generation Facility



## EFSEC Monthly Operational Report

May, 2017

1. Safety and Training

- 1.1. There were no accidents or injuries during the month of May.
- 1.2. Conducted scheduled and required monthly training.
- 1.3. Conducted the scheduled safety committee meeting.

2. Environmental

- 2.1. Submitted the April Outfall Discharge Monitor Report (DMR) to Ecology.
- 2.2. The DMR-QA 37 proficiency tests for Grays Harbor Energy's site lab (EPA ID: WA01287) were completed and sent to ERA (Customer #: G006123) for evaluation.
- 2.3. A May 2 storm water test measured 6.4 NTU which was considerably lower than April 5's turbidity reading of 32 NTU. As the quarterly average of 19 NTU is below the 25 NTU benchmark for this parameter, there are no storm water exceedances to report.
- 2.4. The Adler tanks that were used to temporarily store wash water from cooling tower basin were removed from site and this wash water was properly disposed of by Certified Cleaning Services. Similarly, Jammies pumped and properly disposed of wash water from each gas turbine's sump.
- 2.5. Two management staff attended 8 hours of HAZWOPER training at Site Response.
- 2.6. A natural gas sample was collected on May 2 and its test results were entered into the continuous emission monitoring system (CEMS) for the month.
- 2.7. The arsenic and mercury levels in a May 19 outfall sample were below the minimum levels documented in Table 3-6 of AECOM's 2015 Engineering Report. The post-AKART testing for arsenic and mercury, that is required to complete an addendum to this report, will begin once overall process conditions appear normal.

3. Operations & Maintenance

- 3.1. Grays Harbor Energy (GHE) operated 12 days and generated 75,549 MWh during the month of May.

4. Noise and/or Odor

- 4.1. There were no complaints made to the site during the month of May.

5. Site Visits

- 5.1. Grays Harbor staff hosted a NACT 299, Air Pollution Control Devices class for a supplementary field trip required in the class curriculum. ORCAA arranged the visit which was attended by air regulators from various agencies throughout the western states.



- 5.2. Grays Harbor staff hosted a group consisting of UTC Commissioner Jay Balasbas and 8 UTC staff personnel. There was a presentation covering Invenergy, the Grays Harbor facility design and operations, and a thorough Q&A period.
- 6. Other
  - 6.1. Grays Harbor is staffed with 21 personnel.





June 16, 2017

Stephen Posner, Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
Utilities & Transportation Commission  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Re: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Project No. 2013-01 – Request to Extend Statutory Deadline

Dear Mr. Posner,

Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC dba Vancouver Energy (“Applicant”) submitted its application for site certification for the referenced terminal facility on August 29, 2013. The latest extension for completion of the EFSEC process and reporting its recommendation to the Governor will expire on June 30, 2017.

Nearly four years into the process, it is unclear to Applicant what remaining timeframe is projected for completion of the EFSEC process. The continued absence of a defined schedule has escalated concern amongst stakeholders and perpetuates uncertainty of the duration of the review process for the Applicant and future applicants. Applicant requests a two-month extension to August 31, 2017. The Applicant additionally requests the opportunity to meet with EFSEC staff and the Chair of the Council at your earliest convenience in advance of the July 18, 2017 Council meeting, to discuss the remaining schedule for completing the EFSEC process.

Thank you for your consideration of this extension and meeting. It is the Applicant’s sincere desire to bring the process to conclusion in a manner consistent with EFSEC regulations, while simultaneously managing the permit process uncertainties faced by critical stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Kelly J. Flint

cc: Jared Larrabee, Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC  
Jay Derr, Van Ness Feldman  
Brian Carrico, BergerABAM