



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council AGENDA

MONTHLY MEETING
Tuesday October 20, 2020
1:30 PM

CONFERENCE CALL ONLY
Conference number: (360) 407-3810 ID: 214817

1. Call to Order Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
2. Roll Call Tammy Mastro, EFSEC Staff
3. Proposed Agenda Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
4. Minutes
Meeting Minutes..... Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
 - September 15, 2020
5. Projects
 - a. Kittitas Valley Wind Project
 - Operational Updates..... Eric Melbardis, EDP Renewables
 - b. Wild Horse Wind Power Project
 - Operational Updates..... Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound Energy
 - c. Chehalis Generation Facility
 - Operational Updates..... Mark Miller, Chehalis Generation
 - d. Desert Claim
 - Project Updates..... Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
 - e. Columbia Solar Project
 - Project Updates..... Ami Kidder, EFSEC Staff
 - f. WNP – 1/4
 - Non-Operational Updates..... Kip Whitehead, Energy Northwest
 - g. Columbia Generating Station
 - Operational Updates..... Kip Whitehead, Energy Northwest
 - h. Grays Harbor Energy Center
 - Operational Updates..... Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor Energy
 - SCA Amendment update..... Kyle Overton, EFSEC Staff
6. Other
 - EFSEC Manager Project Update..... Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff
 - Cost allocation..... Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff
7. Adjourn..... Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair

Note: "FINAL ACTION" means a collective positive or negative decision, or an actual vote by a majority of the members of a governing body when sitting as a body or entity, upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance. RCW 42.30.020

Monthly Council Meeting

EFSEC

September 15, 2020



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

Page 1

WASHINGTON STATE
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
Lacey, Washington
Tuesday, September 15, 2020
1:30 p.m.

Telephonic Monthly Council Meeting
Verbatim Transcript of Proceedings

REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 287-9066 | Seattle
(360) 534-9066 | Olympia
(800) 846-6989 | National
www.buellrealtime.com

Page 2

A P P E A R A N C E S

Councilmembers:
KATHLEEN DREW, Chair
KATE KELLY, Department of Commerce
ROB DENGEL, Department of Ecology
MIKE LIVINGSTON, Department of Fish and Wildlife
STACEY BREWSTER, Utilities and Transportation Commission

EFSEC STAFF:

SONIA BUMPUS
AMI KIDDER
AMY MOON
STEWART HENDERSON
KYLE OVERTON
JOAN OWENS
TAMMY MASTRO

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:
JON THOMPSON

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

CHRIS SHERIN, Grays Harbor Energy
JENNIFER DIAZ, Wild Horse Wind Facility
TIM MCMAHON, Stoel Rives
KIP WHITEHEAD, Energy Northwest
KAREN MCGAFFEY, Perkins Coie
MACKENZIE EVANS, Invenergy
SARAH DE GROOT, Invenergy
FRANK SARDUY, South Shore Environmental
ERIC MELBARDIS, EDP Renewables

Page 3

LACEY, WASHINGTON; SEPTEMBER 15, 2020
1:30 P.M.

--o0o--

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This is Kathleen Drew, Chair of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council for our September meeting.

And will the clerk call the roll,
Ms. Mastro?

MS. MASTRO: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Councilmembers. This -- for the record, this is Tammy Mastro.

Department of Commerce?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, present.

MS. MASTRO: Department of Ecology?

MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, present.

MS. MASTRO: Fish and Wildlife?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston, present.

MS. MASTRO: Department of Natural
Resources?

CHAIR DREW: Excused.

MS. MASTRO: Utilities and Transportation
Commission?

Page 4

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.
MS. MASTRO: EFSEC Staff, Sonia Bumpus?
MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus, present.
MS. MASTRO: Ami Kidder?
MS. KIDDER: Present.
MS. MASTRO: Joan Owens?
MS. OWENS: Present.
MS. MASTRO: Amy Moon?
MS. MOON: Present, Tammy, thanks.
MS. MASTRO: Kyle Overton?
MR. OVERTON: Yeah, this is Kyle Overton,
present.

MS. MASTRO: Stewart Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: Here.

MS. MASTRO: Patty Betts or AAG Jon
Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I am present.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.
Chair Drew is present and there is a quorum
for the regular EFSEC Council. Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Is there anyone else on the line who would
like to introduce themselves?

MR. SHERIN: Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor
Energy Center.

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 MS. DIAZ: Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound 2 Energy. 3 MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis, EDP 4 Renewables. 5 MR. MCMAHON: Tim McMahon, Stoel Rives. 6 MR. WHITEHEAD: Kip Whitehead, Energy 7 Northwest. 8 (Multiple speakers.) 9 MS. EVANS: Mackenzie Evans, Invenergy. 10 MS. MCGAFFEY: Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie. 11 MR. SARDUY: Frank Sarduy, South Shore 12 Environmental. 13 CHAIR DREW: There were a couple people from 14 Invenergy that we may not have the correct spelling of 15 your name, so, Mr. Sherin, will you make sure that gets 16 to Ms. Owens and so we can make sure and have the 17 minutes correct? 18 MR. SHERIN: Yes, Chair Drew, I will. 19 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 20 Okay. Moving on to the proposed agenda in 21 front of you. Councilmembers, we have a proposed 22 agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda? 23 MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, move to approve. 24 MR. DENGEL: Second. 25 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. I think that was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, 2 EFSEC Counsel. This Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables 3 for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. We have 4 nothing nonroutine to report during the period. 5 Quick update on the smoke situation by us. 6 We're currently on work stand-downs because our -- our 7 AQI, air quality indexes, are at times above 500. 8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And I know that's 9 also been going on for some manner of days, so difficult 10 time. 11 MR. MELBARDIS: Yes, thank you. 12 CHAIR DREW: Moving on to the Wild Horse 13 Wind Facility, Ms. Diaz? 14 MS. DIAZ: Yes -- yes, thank you, Chair 15 Drew, Councilmembers, and EFSEC Staff. This is Jennifer 16 Diaz with Puget Sound Energy for the Wild Horse Wind 17 Facility, and I have nothing nonroutine to report for 18 the month of August. 19 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 20 MS. OWENS: Looks like I'm having trouble 21 with my documents here. Just one moment, please. 22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. No one is speaking. 23 Thank you for asking that question in the chat. 24 So is -- our next item on the agenda -- 25 there you go -- is the Chehalis Generation Facility.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 Mr. Dengel for a second. 2 MR. DENGEL: Yes. 3 CHAIR DREW: Any discussion? All those in 4 favor, please say aye. 5 COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye. 6 CHAIR DREW: Opposed? Motion carries. 7 Moving on to the meeting minutes from 8 August 18th, 2020. You have received them in your 9 packets and they are presented on the screen. Is there 10 a motion to adopt the minutes from August 18th, 2020? 11 MR. DENGEL: Motion to approve. This is Rob 12 Dengel. 13 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 14 MS. KELLY: Second, Kate Kelly. 15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. It's been 16 moved and seconded. 17 Are there any comments or corrections on 18 this transcript of the meeting? 19 Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting 20 the minutes, say aye. 21 COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye. 22 CHAIR DREW: Opposed? Minutes are adopted. 23 So we will now move on to our -- the rest of 24 our agenda. And first up is Kittitas Valley Wind Power 25 Project, Mr. Melbardis.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 Mr. Miller or Mr. Smith? 2 MR. OVERTON: This is Kyle Overton, the 3 EFSEC site specialist for the Chehalis facility. 4 CHAIR DREW: Yes. 5 MR. OVERTON: For the month of August, the 6 Chehalis facility had no nonroutine items to report. 7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. 8 For the Desert Claim Wind Power Project, 9 Ms. Moon? 10 MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Council Chair 11 Drew and members of the Council. This is Amy Moon 12 providing the update for the Desert Claim project, and 13 EFSEC Staff continue to coordinate with Desert Claim; 14 however, at this time, there are no project updates. 15 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 16 Columbia Solar Project update, is that 17 Mr. Overton or... 18 MS. KIDDER: Chair Drew, this is Ami Kidder. 19 I'll be providing the update for this month's Columbia 20 Solar Project update. 21 Good afternoon, Chair Drew and Council. For 22 this month, the certificate holder continues to update 23 EFSEC Staff on their progress preparing preconstruction 24 plans for submission. Staff will update Council as 25 things progress.</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

Page 9	Page 11
<p>1 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. 2 Okay. Invenergy, Grays Harbor Energy, 3 Mr. Sherin? 4 MR. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair Drew and 5 Councilmembers. For the month of August, I have no 6 nonroutine items to report other than we submitted 7 applications for some permit amendments which we will 8 cover further. Thank you. 9 MS. OWENS: Looks like I have to reopen the 10 document. One moment, please. 11 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Is this the 12 presentation, then? 13 MS. OWENS: Okay. We should be good now. 14 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Are we going to start 15 with the presentation by Mr. Sherin or the Staff 16 presentation? 17 MS. BUMPUS: I believe we're going to... 18 MR. SHERIN: Yes, Chair Drew, I'll start it 19 and then I'll hand it off to -- for the asset managers 20 with Invenergy. 21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Please, go ahead. 22 MR. SHERIN: Okay. Do you have the slides? 23 Again, Chair Drew, Councilmembers, today we 24 just have a brief presentation for the Council. Our 25 application to amend our site certification agreement,</p>	<p>1 construction in 2007. We completed construction in 2008 2 and been operating the facility ever since. 3 Grays Harbor Energy Center is a 650-megawatt 4 rated capacity two-by-one combined cycle natural gas 5 power generation facility located in Elma, Washington, 6 and that combined cycle unit is composed of two General 7 Electric, GE, 7FA.03 combustion turbine generators 8 coupled with Aalborg heat recovery steam generators and 9 a GE D11 steam turbine generator. 10 In 2011, the Council amended the Site 11 Certification Agreement Amendment No. 5 to authorize 12 construction of two more units, Units 3 and 4, to double 13 the size of the facility. This expansion has not yet 14 been built. 15 Grays Harbor Energy Center is one of the 16 most efficient natural gas facilities in the region and 17 as such, we have been operating with greater frequency 18 as peak demand in the region has increased. 19 We've always had a good working relationship 20 with EFSEC and its staff, and we're pleased to be here 21 today to talk about what we think is a pretty simple 22 request, to amend our Site Certification Agreement and 23 modify the PSD Permit so that we can install the latest 24 GE equipment to our facility. 25 At this point, I'll hand off the</p>
Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 SCA Amendment No. 5 and our Prevention of Significant 2 Deterioration, PSD, Amendment 4 facilitate upgrading our 3 combustion turbines. 4 Next slide, please. There is just a brief 5 overview of what we'll cover. 6 Next slide. And then, again, I'm Chris 7 Sherin, the plant manager. Also here at the facility I 8 have Eric Pace, our plant engineer. Also on the call 9 are our asset managers, Sarah de Groot, Mackenzie Evans. 10 We also have Phil Mackey and Frank Sarduy on the call 11 from South Shore Environmental and Karen McGaffey, 12 our -- one of our attorneys with Perkins Coie. 13 Next slide, please. So just I'll provide a 14 brief overview of Grays Harbor for our -- specifically a 15 few of our newer Councilmembers. Grays Harbor Energy, 16 LLC is a subsidiary of Invenergy, which is one of the 17 world's leading privately held stable energy companies. 18 More than a hundred natural gas, wind, and solar and 19 storage facilities. 20 EFSEC first permitted a natural gas power 21 plant at Satsop in 1996, which was Site Certification 22 Agreement Amendment 2. UP Energy North America 23 commenced construction of the facility in 2001 and 24 subsequent -- subsequently ceased construction in 2003. 25 Invenergy acquired the project in 2005 and resumed</p>	<p>1 presentation to Mackenzie Evans, the plant's asset 2 manager, and she'll cover the advanced gas path upgrade 3 and the amendment. 4 MS. EVANS: Thanks, Chris. You can probably 5 go to the next slide. 6 So as Chris mentioned, Grays Harbor Energy 7 Center has been supplying power to the Northwest Power 8 Pool since 2008. So in framing today's conversation, 9 it's -- it's important to understand the changing market 10 dynamics in the Northwest Power Pool. And as you can 11 see here detailed on this side, projected coal and hydro 12 retirements are expected to be over 4.4 gigawatts in the 13 next decade. On top of that, peak demand is expected to 14 increase half a percent annually over the same time 15 period. 16 So together these market forces combine and 17 contribute to the tightening reserve margins and 18 subsequently, a projected increase in Grays Harbor's 19 operating hours as Grays Harbor is already one of the 20 Northwest Power Pool's most efficient, if not the most 21 efficient, gas-fired power plant. 22 And the last thing, you know, kind of to 23 highlight here is just that Grays Harbor Energy does 24 provide flexible gas power that helps with the 25 increasing integration of intermittent renewable</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

Page 13	Page 15
<p>resources.</p> <p>Next slide, please. So now that you have a little bit more background on Grays Harbor and its role in the Northwest Power Pool, we are here today outlining the objectives of our recently submitted SCA and PSD amendments, so our objectives are twofold. First, the installation of GE's advanced gas path package and next, the extension of Units 3 and 4's construction deadline.</p> <p>So specifically we submitted some materials that should be in your packet. Kind of walk through those quickly. First, we have the letter requesting the amendment. This letter discusses the Council's regulations concerning amendments and explains how our request satisfies each of those.</p> <p>Next, we have a SEPA checklist which explains why the requested amendment is not expected to have any significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>Next, is the redline of the SCA that shows the specific parts of the SCA that we have asked the Council to amend.</p> <p>And lastly, the PSD minor modification application.</p> <p>So this is the detailed air permitting material. And we do want to emphasize that we are not asking for any changes in the PSD permit limit; however,</p>	<p>does all the time. Technology has been around for several years. It's one of GE's most common upgrades. In fact, there are other generators in the area who have already upgraded their units to this technology.</p> <p>So the upgrade is entirely interior to the gas turbines. No change in the turbine footprint. And, again, to be clear, we're not requesting any change that limits any existing air water permits. And with that said, we do want to point out that the greenhouse gas -- excuse me, greenhouse gas emission rate actually improves with the increased efficiency from AGP.</p> <p>In terms of timing, installation is planned for spring of 2021 as a part of the facility's regularly scheduled annual maintenance outage. So with the units already on outage, no additional downtime is required for installation. And kind of walking back from there, in order to meet that timeline, we did submit the material in August and we're here talking to the Council today in September so that we can get approval before the end of the year to buy the equipment and be good to go for next spring.</p> <p>Next slide, please. So to close the loop here, the chart on this slide details Grays Harbor's projected operations through 2029. We wanted to show this to be clear that the demand for efficient natural</p>
Page 14	Page 16
<p>but because the equipment would change, we do need a minor modification of the PSD permit. So this application obviously goes through all the regulatory issues in detail and provides the technical information for the EFSEC Staff and Ecology to review.</p> <p>Next slide, please. So the first objective of the amendment is installation of GE's advanced gas path package, or AGP, in both units. So AGP involves an upgrade to turbine software and hardware with more robust parts manufactured from enhanced materials or increased reliability. So if you look at the picture on the slide here, the air comes in on the left side through the inlet, it's compressed in the compressor section, and then the gas is combusted and goes to the turbine section to generate the power.</p> <p>So the parts we're talking about here looking at replacing is what's known as the hot gas path section, which is just after the combustion section, so these parts do see the highest temperatures. So then by swapping them out, swapping the existing turbine parts out with these AGP components, the turbines are able to produce more output at an increased firing temperature, which improves overall efficiency.</p> <p>Next slide, please. So diving in a little bit more about the upgrade. This is an upgrade that GE</p>	<p>gas-fired power is going to increase over the next several years with the retirements discussed earlier. So we expect the plan to run more often even if the equipment is not changed. So the modest increase in capacity from AGP means that Grays Harbor Energy Center can provide a bit more power to meet this increasing demand. And the improvement and efficiency means that the facility may also run a little bit more often because as we know, gas generation in the region is dispatch -- dispatched based on efficiency. So of course, you know, if Grays Harbor is running instead of less efficient generation, it means less gas is consumed and fewer greenhouse gases are emitted overall in order to meet the regional load.</p> <p>Next slide, please. Moving on to the second objective of the amendments, the extension of the construction deadlines for Units 3 and 4. So the Council and the governor have already approved the addition of two more combustion turbine units at the facility as Chris noted. The SCA currently requires construction of these units to begin by 2021. We would like to extend that to 2028, which we think better lines up with the need for generation in the region resulting from the expected retirements.</p> <p>So the SCA already requires us to make</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 detailed filings throughout the environmental 2 requirements in effect at the time we proposed to 3 initiate construction, and it also requires us to get 4 the Council's approval before we begin. So those 5 requirements would of course continue to be in effect, 6 and so the Council would have a chance -- a chance to 7 look at those issues in detail before authorizing 8 construction to proceed.</p> <p>9 Next slide, please. And that brings us to 10 the end of the presentation we had prepared. On behalf 11 of the team, we really do appreciate your time fitting 12 us on the schedule today, and with that said, I'd like 13 to open it up for any questions.</p> <p>14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you very much. 15 Now we will move on to Staff. Ms. Bumpus, 16 do you have questions or would you like to go ahead and 17 make your comments?</p> <p>18 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Drew. Good 19 afternoon, Councilmembers. No questions. I can go 20 ahead and proceed with the presentation if that's okay 21 with the Council?</p> <p>22 CHAIR DREW: Yes, and then we'll come back 23 because I do have a couple of questions about the 24 presentation, but why don't you go ahead because I think 25 you're going to talk about our process here.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 The public hearings, specifically the first 2 public hearing, historically includes a presentation by 3 the certificate holder about the amendment they're 4 requesting, and it also provides an opportunity for 5 public comment on the amendment request before the 6 Council. So you could imagine that once we've had the 7 opportunity of public comment and we've received public 8 input, that helps move the process along particularly 9 with respect to the SEPA process which EFSEC conducts 10 under our promulgation of SEPA WAC in 463-47.</p> <p>11 So EFSEC SEPA-responsible official, which is 12 the EFSEC manager, would review the amendment 13 documentation re- -- which is what we've already begun 14 to do, would request additional information if -- if 15 needed to complete the review, the environmental review, 16 and would then make a SEPA determination with respect to 17 the environmental impact associated with the amendment 18 request and would report that to the Council in a public 19 meeting.</p> <p>20 And at that point, the Council then can 21 proceed with review of the SCA amendment request, which 22 is outlined in WAC 463-66-040, and I've encouraged the 23 Council to take a look at these four provisions, and I'm 24 just going to highlight them really quickly. 25 Number one is the intention of the original</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 MS. BUMPUS: Yes. Okay, great. 2 So, again, for the record, this is Sonia 3 Bumpus, and I am going to talk about EFSEC's SCA 4 amendment process. Going to just kind of provide a high 5 level overview of -- of how the process works, and 6 afterwards, I'd like to make some recommendations for 7 the Council to consider with respect to next steps for 8 this SCA amendment that's been proposed.</p> <p>9 So the procedures concerning an amendment 10 request for a site certification agreement are outlined 11 in EFSEC's WAC, Washington Administrative Code, 463-66. 12 The Council when acting on the site certification 13 agreement amendment request can accept, reject, or 14 reject the request with conditions. This is in 15 463-66-060.</p> <p>16 So now that we have a written request for an 17 SCA amendment, we look to WAC 463-66-030. This requires 18 the Council to hold one or more public hearing sessions 19 at the times and places determined appropriate by the 20 Council. And so this is where Staff at the end of this 21 overview will make a recommendation. But essentially, 22 the Council can decide as they go along if they need 23 additional information and if they want to conduct 24 additional public hearing sessions on the amendment 25 request.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 SCA. So you're looking at whether the proposal is 2 consistent with the intent of the original SCA. 3 Two is, is it consistent with applicable 4 laws and rules. 5 Three, consistent with public health safety 6 and welfare. 7 And four, the provisions of Chapter 463-72. 8 And so there's sort of an outline of -- of 9 how the Council approaches the review of -- of the 10 amendment.</p> <p>11 For the Council to approve the SCA amendment 12 request, there are two paths on which the Council can 13 proceed. One is to approve the Council -- or to approve 14 the amendment request by resolution, and this is in 15 463-66-070. There's a second option for approval, but 16 it applies only if certain criteria are met. This is in 17 463-66-080 and this requires approval by the governor.</p> <p>18 So I'm -- and I can answer questions about 19 this. It's a lot of information. So I'm just trying to 20 sort of touch on the highlights, but I wanted to let the 21 Council know that it -- historically what we've done is 22 once public hearings have been conducted, SEPA -- a SEPA 23 determination has been made, the Council is reviewing 24 the SCA amendment request in light of those four 25 provisions, consistency with those four provisions that</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 I just outlined.</p> <p>2 Typically around that time is when Staff</p> <p>3 would make a recommendation to the Council on a path</p> <p>4 forward whether, you know, we would recommend that the</p> <p>5 Council proceed by approval of -- you know, through</p> <p>6 resolution or would it be triggering those criteria in</p> <p>7 463 -- 463-66-080 requiring approval by the governor.</p> <p>8 So I'm not going to make a recommendation</p> <p>9 with respect to that at this time, but I wanted to let</p> <p>10 the Council know about those two paths for approval down</p> <p>11 the road.</p> <p>12 So that's -- that's the overview of our</p> <p>13 process, and I'm going to stop here before I get into</p> <p>14 what I would recommend as next steps to see if the</p> <p>15 Council have any questions about any of these rules that</p> <p>16 I've just gone through.</p> <p>17 CHAIR DREW: So what I'd like to do perhaps</p> <p>18 is to ask questions -- let's see, I -- I think I still</p> <p>19 have some questions on the information and -- that was</p> <p>20 provided to us by Grays Harbor Energy and Invenergy, and</p> <p>21 so why don't we start with those questions. I know this</p> <p>22 is a lot coming at the Council right now and I'm sure</p> <p>23 that, Sonia, you will also share those citations in an</p> <p>24 email so people don't have to write them down. And then</p> <p>25 we'll take questions on the process and then we'll talk</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 so the -- I'll -- I'll skip to a different question I</p> <p>2 have which is along those same lines. So the current</p> <p>3 Amendment 5 allows for construction of two-by-one</p> <p>4 combined cycle turbine and steam turbines the same as is</p> <p>5 currently used in Units 1 and 2; is that correct?</p> <p>6 MR. SHERIN: Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>7 CHAIR DREW: So would you imagine putting in</p> <p>8 those exact same units?</p> <p>9 MR. SHERIN: I wouldn't imagine it would put</p> <p>10 in the exact same units, but I wouldn't rule it out</p> <p>11 either. I think this is what Ms. McGaffey was implying</p> <p>12 is that if we -- when we -- if we were to build Units 3</p> <p>13 and 4, then we would have -- pretty -- we'd pretty much</p> <p>14 have to go through another amendment and the whole</p> <p>15 process for those two units.</p> <p>16 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So that -- that was</p> <p>17 actually the point I was getting to I -- is that, and so</p> <p>18 I think that we should lay that out here that if there</p> <p>19 are changes to what was approved in the Amendment 5 for</p> <p>20 the facility for the Units 3 and 4, then we would have</p> <p>21 to do another amendment, which would have its own SEPA</p> <p>22 checklist with it?</p> <p>23 MR. SHERIN: Yes, that would be correct.</p> <p>24 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So another question I</p> <p>25 have is -- and -- and this may be something that you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 about next steps.</p> <p>2 So I will, if we can, go back to a couple</p> <p>3 questions about the information from Invenergy and Grays</p> <p>4 Harbor Energy. Mr. Sherin, I don't know how you want to</p> <p>5 handle that in terms of responses, but I have -- first</p> <p>6 of all, my question as we went through the items</p> <p>7 provided the SEP- -- SEPA checklist as I reviewed it</p> <p>8 only applies to the advanced gas path and not to the</p> <p>9 construction extension; is that correct?</p> <p>10 MR. SHERIN: Yes, Chair Drew, that's</p> <p>11 correct.</p> <p>12 MS. MCGAFFEY: Excuse me, Chair Drew, this</p> <p>13 is Karen McGaffey. The checklist actually applies to</p> <p>14 both. I think from our view, the actual immediate</p> <p>15 effects of the amendment all relate to the advanced gas</p> <p>16 package. There wouldn't be any environmental effects</p> <p>17 from a -- the extension by itself. The Council's</p> <p>18 subsequent decision when Grays Harbor requests</p> <p>19 authorization to begin construction would clearly</p> <p>20 require some consideration by the council of</p> <p>21 environmental issues at that point. But I think that</p> <p>22 extension by itself does not have additional</p> <p>23 environmental impacts and that's why you don't see a</p> <p>24 bunch of things discussed in the checklist.</p> <p>25 CHAIR DREW: Okay. I understand that. And</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 want to get back to us on. I'm -- followed the chart a</p> <p>2 little bit in terms of, I mean, I saw the lines go up in</p> <p>3 terms of current capacity and with -- and this is with</p> <p>4 the advanced gas path, so let me clarify that. And then</p> <p>5 the additional capacity provided by that but also a</p> <p>6 forecast that's rather substantially increased in terms</p> <p>7 of the actual sold generation power from the facility.</p> <p>8 Excuse me if I'm not using the right term there. And</p> <p>9 that's confusing to me how that forecast was developed</p> <p>10 because it looks very divergent from the history of the</p> <p>11 facility.</p> <p>12 MS. EVANS: I can maybe take a first stab --</p> <p>13 stab at this one. So with the impact of the retirements</p> <p>14 expected in the region as -- as we kind of walked</p> <p>15 through that that creates a larger need for a gas-fired</p> <p>16 power -- power generation. So that was kind of what</p> <p>17 we're seeing in the market is that we expect to be</p> <p>18 operating more than we have historically with that --</p> <p>19 with or without the AGP installation based on changing</p> <p>20 market forces and we foresee a need for more power</p> <p>21 generation.</p> <p>22 CHAIR DREW: So is that an internal, then,</p> <p>23 forecast as opposed to an external forecast?</p> <p>24 MS. EVANS: I believe so, yes. We -- we do</p> <p>25 have a, you know, commercial modeling team.</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

Page 25

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Yeah, I'd be -- I'd be interested in -- in more detail because it's quite substantially different, and so I'm -- I'm interested in more information along those lines.

MR. SHERIN: Chair Drew, I'll also add that even from 2015 on, basically our total megawatt hours produced in a year has increased. 2018 it dropped off, but that was because of the -- essentially we didn't run for that last month and three-quarters -- we didn't run for a month and three-quarters because of the pipeline explosion up in British Columbia. We were on pace to have a -- potentially have a record-setting year in 2018 for total megawatt hours produced, and then last year in 2019 we did actually have a record-setting year for the plant's total capacity.

CHAIR DREW: And then --

MR. SHERIN: Megawatt hours produced over the course of the year and that -- that trend we expect to continue.

CHAIR DREW: And this year was a little odd too.

MR. SHERIN: Yes, we had a -- this year that will not be the case. This year due to COVID demands down, it's been a challenging year and we also had a forced outage for three and a half months on one of the

Page 27

MR. DENGEL: Yes, I think they may have just answered one of them. So it sounds like you mentioned in the supporting materials that the market conditions then currently support the construction; however, it may support it in 2028. Is that what you're referring to with the -- with the phase-out creating that additional demand, is that the market conditions that would facilitate the need for this construction or are there other factors that would also heavily weigh in and make this more tentative?

MS. DE GROOT: Yeah, great question. That is the primary driver. I think there is an increase in -- we're seeing an increase in peak demand as well, but the -- the main driving factor would be coal retirements.

MR. DENGEL: I have one other question regarding the emissions. I don't know if you have this information available, but looking at the -- kind of your -- your operation as a whole, with the -- with the gas pathway, it does sound like there'll be an increase in emissions to the facility as a whole but a decrease in the -- in the pollution per kilowatt hour.

Overall to your system, because you're phasing out some coal plants but you're also phasing out hydro as well, where does your kind of overall emissions

Page 26

turbines. So we physically -- with that occurring, we physically -- this year we physically couldn't produce more than in the past.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Well, it would be -- it would be, I think, helpful to the Council to have some view of the recent past and -- and the considerations in the forecast in the future. Thank you.

Let's see, then my last question at this point is, so in terms of the construction extension, why 2028, why seven years?

MS. EVANS: Sarah, you want to take that one?

MS. DE GROOT: Sure, I would be happy to. So I -- you know, our thought was to kind of keep this in line with when we're seeing coal retirements and, you know, assuming -- or -- or knowing that it would take a couple years for construction to -- to account for that as well. So that timeline is -- is aligned with -- with the coal retirements in the area.

CHAIR DREW: Okay.

MS. DE GROOT: And when there would be a potential need for additional capacity.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

I saw in the chat that -- that Mr. Dengel has some questions?

Page 28

land as a result of making this change? Is it an -- is it an increase, decrease or is it all negligible?

MR. SARDUY: I can field that one. This is Frank Sarduy with South Shore Environmental. The data that GE has provided has -- has shown that for all of the pollutants that -- for which the facility has permit limits and does not have a control, all of those emissions will stay the same or go down on a pounds per MBtu basis.

The -- there -- as far as knots in CO goes, any -- any increases would be able to be addressed by the plant's emission control systems by the SCR and the oxidation catalyst, so we wouldn't expect to see increases in those. And as part of the application, there were no requests for increased permit limits so they can live with the -- with the -- with the permit as written.

MR. DENGEL: Okay. So I -- I get the immediate facility. I mean -- and I appreciate you providing that additional recap and clarity. I'm just wondering with the retirements going on and the increased capacity, overall looking at what those other emissions were on those retirements and going to this, I'm just wondering emission-wise is it resolving in an increase, decrease, or is it -- is it tough to tell;

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 does that make sense?</p> <p>2 MR. SARDUY: I -- I gotcha. The -- I -- I</p> <p>3 don't have that -- that information with me. I know</p> <p>4 that there are some coal retirements, so obviously</p> <p>5 there's -- there's going to be a great improvement there</p> <p>6 when -- when those units are retired. But I -- I don't</p> <p>7 have a percentage number that I could give you on -- on</p> <p>8 what the net change would be.</p> <p>9 MR. DENGEL: Thank you. That's all the</p> <p>10 questions that I had. Appreciate it.</p> <p>11 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>12 Are there other questions from</p> <p>13 Councilmembers?</p> <p>14 Okay. Hearing none, are there questions</p> <p>15 about the process as you heard outlined by EFSEC</p> <p>16 manager, Sonia Bumpus?</p> <p>17 MS. KELLY: Chair Drew, this is Kate Kelly.</p> <p>18 CHAIR DREW: Yes, go ahead.</p> <p>19 MS. KELLY: I -- I guess that -- to</p> <p>20 understand the process going forward, the -- the</p> <p>21 application materials that we have are a little thin on</p> <p>22 the extension of time for the 3 and 4, and there's just</p> <p>23 not a lot of substance in there. Are -- so I'm -- I'm</p> <p>24 just trying to understand are we going to receive more</p> <p>25 material about it so that we can better understand the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 my take -- my understanding is that if you were to grant</p> <p>2 this permit extension, if there was to be any change in</p> <p>3 the proposed -- because there was a prior EFSEC decision</p> <p>4 for the engines themselves, if there was any change as</p> <p>5 far as what those engines look like outside of the</p> <p>6 current proposal, it would have to come back for a later</p> <p>7 amendment; is -- is that correct?</p> <p>8 CHAIR DREW: That's correct.</p> <p>9 MR. DENGEL: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>10 CHAIR DREW: So, Ms. Bumpus, if you want to</p> <p>11 proceed with the next steps.</p> <p>12 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Drew. Yes, so</p> <p>13 as I was saying, there are -- there's a first public</p> <p>14 hearing that the Council is required to hold and of</p> <p>15 course additional public hearing sessions can be held.</p> <p>16 So to start, Staff would like to recommend that the</p> <p>17 Council conduct a public hearing session on Invenenergy's</p> <p>18 SCA Amendment request on October 6th and that that</p> <p>19 public hearing session be conducted virtually as we've</p> <p>20 been holding our Council meetings, our monthly Council</p> <p>21 meetings, and we provide a presentation, or rather the</p> <p>22 certificate holder would provide a presentation. We</p> <p>23 could, of course, provide some additional information to</p> <p>24 the Council and public. And another portion of the</p> <p>25 meeting would be for public comment, and we would do</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 implications of what's being asked and what happens if</p> <p>2 this doesn't get approved?</p> <p>3 And to tack onto that, I -- I got a --</p> <p>4 particularly reading the existing site certificate, it</p> <p>5 was a little confusing about what the current</p> <p>6 requirements are and there was five years and there was</p> <p>7 ten years and just understanding what the implications</p> <p>8 are for -- for the site amendment permits that are on</p> <p>9 it.</p> <p>10 CHAIR DREW: I think that what we will do as</p> <p>11 Councilmembers is share some of the questions that we</p> <p>12 want for additional information with our Staff, and they</p> <p>13 will then provide that in a data request to the Grays</p> <p>14 Harbor Energy for additional information. And we can</p> <p>15 also ask additional questions at the public hearing</p> <p>16 coming up. So I think those are both two methods where</p> <p>17 we can make sure that we understand the specific</p> <p>18 information and the context. And I agree with you, it</p> <p>19 is quite thin on the construction timeline extension in</p> <p>20 terms of information.</p> <p>21 MS. KELLY: Thank you.</p> <p>22 CHAIR DREW: Are there questions about the</p> <p>23 process from Councilmembers?</p> <p>24 MR. DENGEL: So just one clarification on</p> <p>25 the -- on the time extension and the engines. So my --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 this virtually.</p> <p>2 The -- the time for the meeting that we are</p> <p>3 thinking would be best is to start the meeting at 4:00</p> <p>4 p.m. and go to 6:00 p.m. We also have a public comment</p> <p>5 database that we would activate on EFSEC's website</p> <p>6 during that day so that those who could not call into</p> <p>7 the meeting or attend on the platform in which we're</p> <p>8 hosting it would -- would be able to submit -- they</p> <p>9 could also mail it in, but submit an electronic comment</p> <p>10 to EFSEC.</p> <p>11 CHAIR DREW: So just to --</p> <p>12 MS. BUMPUS: There are --</p> <p>13 CHAIR DREW: I'm -- I'm sorry, on that point</p> <p>14 can we clarify? I heard you say that we would activate</p> <p>15 the comment database on that day, but we would give</p> <p>16 people more than that day to comment I would assume?</p> <p>17 MS. BUMPUS: Well, we will notice the -- the</p> <p>18 public hearing session to the public if the Council's</p> <p>19 agreeable to what we're proposing, this proposed</p> <p>20 schedule. We would notice that likely this week, and</p> <p>21 the public is -- is free to submit, you know, comments</p> <p>22 to us now. The -- Chair Drew, are you wanting to know</p> <p>23 if we could activate our comment database for basically</p> <p>24 from the beginning of the notification until the</p> <p>25 meeting?</p>

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

Page 33

CHAIR DREW: I think that would be helpful, because if we want to have all the comments collected by the meeting date, then that gives people different opportunities of time to comment rather than extending it beyond hearing that date. Because I -- I understand they can send them in writing too, but it's much easier perhaps for a lot of people to enter a comment in a database. So just a question on that.

MS. BUMPUS: Yeah, so I -- I think that that -- that would be fine. We can certainly activate the comment database at the same time as the public notice goes out and then just keep that comment database open and available as an alternative to mailing in a hard copy comment or something like that. And then it can still serve as an alternative should someone be intending to join in on the meeting and then for some reason can't make it, they've got another way of submitting a comment pretty quickly. So yes, we can make sure that that happens.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. That sounds good. Did you have additional information?

MS. BUMPUS: So the only other thing I was going to add is that as I mentioned, we are conducting a SEPA review, and so we are reviewing all of the same materials that the Council has already started to

Page 35

Livingston. It -- it sounds reasonable to me. I would -- with the timing of the public hearing, is there a possibility that this would be coming to us in October for a vote, then, or are we anticipating needing more time before that next meeting?

CHAIR DREW: Honestly, I -- I think we need time to digest this right now before we have an answer. I heard the timing in terms of what the certificate holder is looking for is to have some sort of resolution before the end of the year. We don't have to wait until the last minute, but I think we want to hear what the public has to say and make a determination after that.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Chair Drew, this is Kate Kelly again. Has any consideration been given to separating these into two different decision streams, the two issues that have been combined?

CHAIR DREW: They -- they are -- I guess that's one of the questions I have is they seem to me unrelated, but I think we can have further conversations as we hear some information. And perhaps -- I don't know if Mr. Thompson has an answer to that question or has thought about that, but he may be able to help us with --

MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is Sonia

Page 34

review. We will be compiling a data request, which, of course, can include some of the Councilmembers' questions. Staff will also have a set of questions. We'll send that for additional information, and if we have everything we need, Staff can proceed with preparation of the -- of the SEPA documentation for the SEPA determination.

So there'll be more to follow about that pretty soon, I think. The sooner we get the data request out. And then I think we can go from there. So that was the only other thing I was going to add is that we are working on the SEPA review now.

CHAIR DREW: So, Councilmembers, I would like you to send your availability for a public hearing on October 6th, between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. to Ms. Owens because I very much would appreciate as much participation as we can have from the Council at that time.

And do you have any other questions for Staff?

And are you -- and we don't really have to have a vote on this, but does the approach in terms of the public hearing and the comment database sound reasonable to you?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Chair Drew, this is Mike

Page 36


Bumpus. I -- I wanted to share a little bit of information related to that question. So Staff has discussed internally the possibility of bifurcating these -- these two requests. We also see that they are, you know, basically can stand on their own. And so one -- one approach that we've talked about amongst ourselves internally is that after the initial public hearing session, it might be a good time then to decide if we want to separate these out.

I would imagine that if we hear comments about one versus the other or the comments are perhaps complex in nature, it really would make sense at that point to perhaps separate these out and if -- if the Council were to want to hold additional public hearing sessions to perhaps proceed in holding those additional sessions with those issues separated out and having a dedicated hearing session for -- for each by -- by issue.

So that's sort of what Staff have been thinking should these start to get tangled or one starts to perhaps hold up the other.

MS. KELLY: So, again, this is Kate Kelly and -- and that seems like a good approach. I'm pleased to keep that option on the table. It seems like the standard for review and the decision whether to send it

Monthly Council Meeting - 9/15/2020

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 up to the governor or not may be different for the two</p> <p>2 paths. So it's -- it's -- I'm glad we're keeping our</p> <p>3 options open.</p> <p>4 MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengel. I would be</p> <p>5 supportive of this approach as well knowing that maybe</p> <p>6 we could separate.</p> <p>7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>8 Any other comments? Thank you all.</p> <p>9 We will -- hearing the comments from the Councilmembers,</p> <p>10 we'll ask Staff to proceed with noticing the public</p> <p>11 hearing on October 6th and opening the comment database.</p> <p>12 I think that concludes our discussion on the</p> <p>13 amendment.</p> <p>14 Okay. Our next item on the agenda is</p> <p>15 Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4 for a monthly</p> <p>16 report from Mr. Whitehead.</p> <p>17 MR. WHITEHEAD: Good afternoon. This is Kip</p> <p>18 Whitehead from Energy Northwest. I'll be reporting on</p> <p>19 the Washington Nuclear Project 1 and 4 and the Columbia</p> <p>20 Generating Station. There are no nonroutine issues to</p> <p>21 discuss for the month of August. Are there any</p> <p>22 questions?</p> <p>23 CHAIR DREW: Any questions?</p> <p>24 Thank you. Hearing none, we will move to</p> <p>25 our next item. It looks like that is adjournment. So</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 STATE OF WASHINGTON</p> <p>4 COUNTY OF THURSTON</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand</p> <p>7 Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby</p> <p>8 certify that the foregoing transcript is true and</p> <p>9 accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11  Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 330</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>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 if there's no other business to come before us, thank</p> <p>2 you all for participation today, and this meeting is</p> <p>3 adjourned.</p> <p>4 (Adjourned at 2:29 p.m.)</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</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>	

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update Format

Facility Name: Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project

Operator: EDP Renewables

Report Date: October 8 2020

Reporting Period: September 2020

Site Contact: Eric Melbardis

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- Power generated: 18,849 MWh
 - Wind speed: 6 m/s
 - Capacity Factor: 25.97%
-

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: October 6, 2020
Report Period: September 2020
Site Contact: Jennifer Diaz
SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance

September generation totaled 38,802 MWh for an average capacity factor of 19.77%.

Environmental Compliance

Nothing to report.

Safety Compliance

No lost-time accidents or safety injuries/illnesses.

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: October 7, 2020
Reporting Period: September 2020
Site Contact: Mark A. Miller
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.

- 264,025 MW-hrs generated in August for a year-to-date 1,792,303 MW-hrs and a capacity factor of 55.7%.

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

Environmental Compliance

-Permit status if any changes.

- No changes.

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

- No issues or updates.

-Any EFSEC-related inspections that occurred.

- None.

-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.

- None.

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

- None.

Safety Compliance

-Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions.

- Zero injuries this reporting period and a total of 1889 days without a Lost Time Accident.

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Planned site improvements.

- No planned changes.

-Upcoming permit renewals.

- No upcoming renewals.

-Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.

- No issues or updates.



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,

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

Mark A. Miller--P75451

Manager, Gas Plant

Chehalis Generation Facility

Desert Claim Wind Power Project

October project update

[Place holder]

Columbia Solar Project

October project update [Place
holder]

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – September 2020

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

Operator: **Energy Northwest**

Report Date: **October 7, 2020**

Reporting Period: **September 2020**

Site Contact: **Kip Whitehead**

Facility SCA Status: (Pre-construction/Construction/Operational/Decommission): **Operational**

CGS Net Electrical Generation for September 2020: 817,086 MW-Hrs

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

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

Environmental Compliance

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

Only routine reports submitted for the month

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Planned site improvements potentially related to SCA conditions, EFSEC-issued permits, or future permitting needs.

- **Energy Northwest recently signed a new lease agreement with the Department of Energy.**
- **The new lease agreement requires the Industrial Development Complex (IDC) located at WNP 1/4 to no longer use groundwater as its water source by July 2022.**
- **The IDC is planning to use surface water from the Columbia River as its water source and will be installing a new water filtration system at the site.**

Other

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

- **Pandemic Response: Benton-Franklin County is currently under a modified phase 1. Energy Northwest began a slow transition of non-essential employees back to the facilities in a reduced capacity to ensure social distancing measures are maintained.**

-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). **Shannon Khounnala is no longer the Environmental Manager at Energy Northwest. The new Environmental Manager is Brad Barfuss.**

EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center

Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC

Report Date: October 20, 2020

Reporting Period: September 2020

Site Contact: Chris Sherin

Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)

- GHEC generated 374,967MWh during the month and 1,757,768MWh YTD.

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

Environmental Compliance

-There were no emissions, outfall or storm water deviations, during the month.

-Monthly Discharge Monitoring Reports were submitted to staff.

-Annual Relative Accuracy Test Audit (RATA) results were submitted to staff.

Safety Compliance

-None.

Current or Upcoming Projects

-Gray Harbor Energy LLC submitted additional information to EFSEC staff in response to follow up requests on the PSD amendment application.

Other

-Ongoing COVID-19 mitigation efforts at the site.

-

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

Non-Direct Cost Allocation for 2nd Quarter FY 2021

October 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020

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 2nd quarter of FY 2021

Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project	9%
Wild Horse Wind Power Project	9%
Columbia Generating Station	24%
Columbia Solar	8%
WNP-1	3%
Whistling Ridge Energy Project	3%
Grays Harbor 1&2	15%
Chehalis Generation Project	12%
Desert Claim Wind Power Project	8%
Grays Harbor Energy 3&4	9%



Sonia E. Bumpus, EFSEC Manager

Date: 10/19/2020