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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
   • September 15, 2020
   Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair

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
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---

**PROCEEDINGS**

**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?

**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.
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MS. KELLY:  Kate Kelly, move to approve.

23

agenda.  Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

22

MR. SHERIN:  Yes, Chair Drew, I will.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.  It's been

21

CHAIR DREW:  Moving on to the Wild Horse

20

Wind Facility, Ms. Diaz?

19

MS. DIAZ:  Yes -- yes, thank you, Chair

18

Drew, Councilmembers, and EFSEC Staff.  This is Jennifer

17

Diaz with Puget Sound Energy for the Wild Horse Wind

16

Facility, and I have nothing nonroutine to report for

15

the month of August.

14

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.

13

MS. OWENS:  Looks like I'm having trouble

12

with my documents here.  Just one moment, please.

11

CHAIR DREW:  Okay.  No one is speaking.

10

Thank you for asking that question in the chat.

9

MS. KIDDER:  Chair Drew, this is Ami Kidder.

8

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

7

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

6

EFSEC Counsel.  This Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables

5

for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.  We have

4

nothing nonroutine to report during the period.

3

Quick update on the smoke situation by us.

2

We're currently on work stand-downs because our -- our

1

AQI, air quality indexes, are at times above 500.
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CHAIR DREW:  Please join us.

1

Mr. Dengel for a second.

MR. DENGEL:  Yes.

2

CHAIR DREW:  Any discussion?  All those in

favor, please say aye.

3

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

4

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

5

Moving on to the meeting minutes from

6

August 18th, 2020.  You have received them in your

7

packets and they are presented on the screen.  Is there

8

a motion to adopt the minutes from August 18th, 2020?

9

MR. DENGEL:  Motion to approve.  This is Rob

10

Dengel.

11

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.

12

MS. KELLY:  Second, Kate Kelly.

13

CHAIR DREW:  Okay.  Thank you.  It's been

14

moved and seconded.

15

Are there any comments or corrections on

16

this transcript of the meeting?

17

Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting

18

the minutes, say aye.

19

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

20

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Minutes are adopted.

21

So we will now move on to our -- the rest of

22

our agenda.  And first up is Kittitas Valley Wind Power

23

Project, Mr. Melbardis.

24

25

Mr. Melbardis.

MR. MELBARDIS:  Good afternoon, Chair Drew,

EFSEC Counsel.  This Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables

for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.  We have

nothing nonroutine to report during the period.

Quick update on the smoke situation by us.

We're currently on work stand-downs because our -- our

AQI, air quality indexes, are at times above 500.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.  And I know that's

also been going on for some manner of days, so difficult
time.

MR. MELBARDIS:  Yes, thank you.

CHAIR DREW:  Moving on to the Wild Horse

Wind Facility, Ms. Diaz?

MS. DIAZ:  Yes -- yes, thank you, Chair

Drew, Councilmembers, and EFSEC Staff.  This is Jennifer

Diaz with Puget Sound Energy for the Wild Horse Wind

Facility, and I have nothing nonroutine to report for

the month of August.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.

MS. OWENS:  Looks like I'm having trouble

with my documents here.  Just one moment, please.

CHAIR DREW:  Okay.  No one is speaking.

Thank you for asking that question in the chat.

So is -- our next item on the agenda --

there you go -- is the Chehalis Generation Facility.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.  I think that was

there you go -- is the Chehalis Generation Facility.

CHAIR DREW:  Any discussion?  All those in

favor, please say aye.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.  And I know that's

also been going on for some manner of days, so difficult
time.

MR. MELBARDIS:  Yes, thank you.

CHAIR DREW:  Moving on to the Wild Horse

Wind Facility, Ms. Diaz?

MS. DIAZ:  Yes -- yes, thank you, Chair

Drew, Councilmembers, and EFSEC Staff.  This is Jennifer

Diaz with Puget Sound Energy for the Wild Horse Wind

Facility, and I have nothing nonroutine to report for

the month of August.

CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.

MS. OWENS:  Looks like I'm having trouble

with my documents here.  Just one moment, please.

CHAIR DREW:  Okay.  No one is speaking.

Thank you for asking that question in the chat.

So is -- our next item on the agenda --

there you go -- is the Chehalis Generation Facility.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.

CHAIR DREW:  Opposed?  Motion carries.

COUNCILMEMBERS:  Aye.
Invenergy acquired the project in 2005 and resumed subsequent -- subsequently ceased construction in 2003. Commenced construction of the facility in 2001 and Agreement Amendment 2. UP Energy North America plant at Satsop in 1996, which was Site Certification EFSEC first permitted a natural gas power storage facilities. More than a hundred natural gas, wind, and solar and world's leading privately held stable energy companies. LLC is a subsidiary of Invenergy, which is one of the few of our newer Councilmembers. Grays Harbor Energy, and then I'll hand it off to -- for the asset managers with Invenergy. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Is this the presentation, then? MS. OWENS: Okay. We should be good now. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Are we going to start with the presentation by Mr. Sherin or the Staff presentation? MS. BUMPUS: I believe we're going to... MR. SHERIN: Yes, Chair Drew, I'll start it and then I'll hand it off to -- for the asset managers with Invenergy. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Please, go ahead. MR. SHERIN: Okay. Do you have the slides? Again, Chair Drew, Councilmembers, today we just have a brief presentation for the Council. Our application to amend our site certification agreement, construction in 2007. We completed construction in 2008 and been operating the facility ever since. Grays Harbor Energy Center is a 650-megawatt rated capacity two-by-one combined cycle natural gas power generation facility located in Elma, Washington, and that combined cycle unit is composed of two General Electric, GE, 7FA.03 combustion turbine generators coupled with Aalborg heat recovery steam generators and a GE D11 steam turbine generator. In 2011, the Council amended the Site Certification Agreement Amendment No. 5 to authorize construction of two more units, Units 3 and 4, to double the size of the facility. This expansion has not yet been built. Grays Harbor Energy Center is one of the most efficient natural gas facilities in the region and as such, we have been operating with greater frequency as peak demand in the region has increased. We've always had a good working relationship with EFSEC and its staff, and we're pleased to be here today to talk about what we think is a pretty simple request, to amend our Site Certification Agreement and modify the PSD Permit so that we can install the latest GE equipment to our facility. At this point, I'll hand off the presentation to Mackenzie Evans, the plant's asset manager, and she'll cover the advanced gas path upgrade and the amendment. MS. EVANS: Thanks, Chris. You can probably go to the next slide. So as Chris mentioned, Grays Harbor Energy Center has been supplying power to the Northwest Power Pool since 2008. So in framing today's conversation, it's -- it's important to understand the changing market dynamics in the Northwest Power Pool. And as you can see here detailed on this side, projected coal and hydro retirements are expected to be over 4.4 gigawatts in the next decade. On top of that, peak demand is expected to increase half a percent annually over the same time period. So together these market forces combine and contribute to the tightening reserve margins and subsequently, a projected increase in Grays Harbor's operating hours as Grays Harbor is already one of the Northwest Power Pool's most efficient, if not the most efficient, gas-fired power plant. And the last thing, you know, kind of to highlight here is just that Grays Harbor Energy does provide flexible gas power that helps with the increasing integration of intermittent renewable.
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. 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. Next, we have a SEPA checklist which explains why the requested amendment is not expected to have any significant environmental impacts. Next, is the redline of the SCA that shows the specific parts of the SCA that we have asked the Council to amend. And lastly, the PSD minor modification application. 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, 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. 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. 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. Next slide, please. So diving in a little bit more about the upgrade. This is an upgrade that GE 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. 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. 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. 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 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. 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. So the SCA already requires us to make an amendment to turbine software and hardware with more robust parts manufactured from enhanced materials or increased reliability. And lastly, the PSD minor modification of the PSD permit. 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, 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. 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. 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. Next slide, please. So diving in a little bit more about the upgrade. This is an upgrade that GE
So, again, for the record, this is Sonia Bumpus, and I am going to talk about EFSEC's SCA amendment process. Going to just kind of provide a high level overview of -- of how the process works, and afterwards, I'd like to make some recommendations for the Council to consider with respect to next steps for this SCA amendment that's been proposed.

So the procedures concerning an amendment request for a site certification agreement are outlined in EFSEC's WAC, Washington Administrative Code, 463-66. The Council when acting on the site certification agreement amendment request can accept, reject, or reject the request with conditions. This is in 463-66-060.

So now that we have a written request for an SCA amendment, we look to WAC 463-66-030. This requires the Council to hold one or more public hearing sessions at the times and places determined appropriate by the Council. And so this is where Staff at the end of this overview will make a recommendation. But essentially, the Council can decide as they go along if they need additional information and if they want to conduct additional public hearing sessions on the amendment request.

The public hearings, specifically the first public hearing, historically includes a presentation by the certificate holder about the amendment they're requesting, and it also provides an opportunity for public comment on the amendment request before the Council. So you could imagine that once we've had the opportunity of public comment and we've received public input, that helps move the process along particularly with respect to the SEPA process which EFSEC conducts under our promulgation of SEPA WAC in 463-47.

So EFSEC SEPA-responsible official, which is the EFSEC manager, would review the amendment documentation re- -- which is what we've already begun to do, would request additional information if -- if needed to complete the review, the environmental review, and would then make a SEPA determination with respect to the environmental impact associated with the amendment request and would report that to the Council in a public meeting.

And at that point, the Council then can proceed with review of the SCA amendment request, which is outlined in WAC 463-66-040, and I've encouraged the Council to take a look at these four provisions, and I'm just going to highlight them really quickly.

Number one is the intention of the original SCA. So you're looking at whether the proposal is consistent with the intent of the original SCA.

Two is, is it consistent with applicable laws and rules.

Three, consistent with public health safety and welfare.

And four, the provisions of Chapter 463-72. And so there's sort of an outline of -- of how the Council approaches the review of -- of the amendment.

For the Council to approve the SCA amendment request, there are two paths on which the Council can proceed. One is to approve the Council -- or to approve the amendment request by resolution, and this is in 463-66-070. There's a second option for approval, but it applies only if certain criteria are met. This is in 463-66-080 and this requires approval by the governor.

So I'm -- and I can answer questions about this. It's a lot of information. So I'm just trying to sort of touch on the highlights, but I wanted to let the Council know that it -- historically what we've done is once public hearings have been conducted, SEPA -- a SEPA determination has been made, the Council is reviewing the SCA amendment request in light of those four provisions, consistency with those four provisions that
So that's -- that's the overview of our 12
road.

The Council know about those two paths for approval down
11
10
resolution or would it be triggering those criteria in
463 -- 463-66-080 requiring approval by the governor.
8
So I'm not going to make a recommendation
9
with respect to that at this time, but I wanted to let
10
the Council know about those two paths for approval down
11
the road.

So that's -- that's the overview of our
12
process, and I'm going to stop here before I get into
13
what I would recommend as next steps to see if the
14
Council have any questions about any of these rules that
15
I've just gone through.

CHAIR DREW: So what I'd like to do perhaps
16
is to ask questions -- let's see, I -- I think I still
17
have some questions on the information and -- that was
18
provided to us by Grays Harbor Energy and Invenery, and
19
so why don't we start with those questions. I know this
20
is a lot coming at the Council right now and I'm sure
21
why don't we start with those questions. I know this
22
is a lot coming at the Council right now and I'm sure
23
that, Sonia, you will also share those citations in an
24
email so people don't have to write them down. And then
25
we'll take questions on the process and then we'll talk

about next steps.

So I will, if we can, go back to a couple
questions about the information from Invenery and Grays
Harbor Energy. Mr. Sherin, I don't know how you want to
handle that in terms of responses, but I have -- first
of all, my question as we went through the items
provided the SEP- -- SEPA checklist as I reviewed it
only applies to the advanced gas path and not to the
construction extension; is that correct?

MR. SHERIN: Yes, Chair Drew, that's
9
correct.

MS. MCGAFFEY: Excuse me, Chair Drew, this
10
is Karen McGaffey. The checklist actually applies to
11
both. I think from our view, the actual immediate
12
effects of the amendment all relate to the advanced gas
13
package. There wouldn't be any environmental effects
14
from a -- the extension by itself. The Council's
15
subsequent decision when Grays Harbor requests
16
authorization to begin construction would clearly
17
require some consideration by the council of
18
environmental issues at that point. But I think that
19
extension by itself does not have additional
20
environmental impacts and that's why you don't see a
21
bunch of things discussed in the checklist.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. I understand that. And
22
so the -- I'll -- I'll skip to a different question I
23
have which is along those same lines. So the current
24
Amendment 5 allows for construction of two-by-one
25
combined cycle turbine and steam turbines the same as is
currently used in Units 1 and 2; is that correct?

MR. SHERIN: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR DREW: So you imagine putting in
those exact same units?

MR. SHERIN: I wouldn't imagine it would put
in the exact same units, but I wouldn't rule it out
either. I think this is what Ms. McGaffey was implying
is that if we -- when we -- if we were to build Units 3
and 4, then we would have -- pretty -- we'd pretty much
have to go through another amendment and the whole
process for those two units.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. So that -- that was
actually the point I was getting to I -- is that, and so
I think that we should lay that out here that if there
are changes to what was approved in the Amendment 5 for
the facility for the Units 3 and 4, then we would have
do another amendment, which would have its own SEPA
checklist with it?

MR. SHERIN: Yes, that would be correct.
CHAIR DREW: Okay. So another question I
have is -- and -- and this may be something that you

want to get back to us on. I'm -- followed the chart a
little bit in terms of, I mean, I saw the lines go up in
terms of current capacity and with -- and this is with
the advanced gas path, so let me clarify that. And then
the additional capacity provided by that but also a
forecast that's rather substantially increased in terms
of the actual sold generation power from the facility.
Excuse me if I'm not using the right term there. And
that's confusing to me how that forecast was developed
because it looks very divergent from the history of the
facility.

MS. EVANS: I can maybe take a first stab --
stab at this one. So with the impact of the retirements
expected in the region as -- as we kind of walked
through that that creates a larger need for a gas-fired
power -- power generation. So that was kind of what
we're seeing in the market is that we expect to be
operating more than we have historically with that --
with or without the AGP installation based on changing
market forces and we foresee a need for more power
generation.

CHAIR DREW: So is that an internal, then,
forecast as opposed to an external forecast?

MS. EVANS: I believe so, yes. We -- we do
have a, you know, commercial modeling team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 25</th>
<th>Page 26</th>
<th>Page 27</th>
<th>Page 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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 increase, decrease or is it -- is it tough to tell; 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;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. SHERIN: Megawatt hours produced over the plant’s total capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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| 1 does that make sense?  
2 MR. SARDUY: I -- I gotcha. The -- I -- I don't have that -- that information with me. I know that there are some coal retirements, so obviously there's -- there's going to be a great improvement there when -- when those units are retired. But I -- I don't have a percentage number that I could give you on -- on what the net change would be.  
3 MR. DENGEL: Thank you. That's all the questions that I had. Appreciate it.  
4 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.  
5 Are there other questions from Councilmembers?  
6 Okay. Hearing none, are there questions about the process as you heard outlined by EFSEC manager, Sonia Bumpus?  
7 MS. KELLY: Chair Drew, this is Kate Kelly.  
8 CHAIR DREW: Yes, go ahead.  
9 MS. KELLY: I -- I guess that -- to understand the process going forward, the -- the application materials that we have are a little thin on the extension of time for the 3 and 4, and there's just not a lot of substance in there. Are -- so I'm -- I'm just trying to understand are we going to receive more material about it so that we can better understand the implications of what's being asked and what happens if this doesn't get approved?  
10 And to tack onto that, I -- I got a -- particularly reading the existing site certificate, it was a little confusing about what the current requirements are and there was five years and there was ten years and just understanding what the implications are for -- for the site amendment permits that are on it.  
11 CHAIR DREW: I think that what we will do as Councilmembers is share some of the questions that we want for additional information with our Staff, and they will then provide that in a data request to the Grays Harbor Energy for additional information. And we can also ask additional questions at the public hearing coming up. So I think those are both two methods where we can make sure that we understand the specific information and the context. And I agree with you, it is quite thin on the construction timeline extension in terms of information.  
12 MS. KELLY: Thank you.  
13 CHAIR DREW: Are there questions about the process from Councilmembers?  
14 MR. DENGEL: So just one clarification on the -- on the time extension and the engines. So my -- |
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| 1 implications of what's being asked and what happens if this doesn't get approved?  
2 And to tack onto that, I -- I got a -- particularly reading the existing site certificate, it was a little confusing about what the current requirements are and there was five years and there was ten years and just understanding what the implications are for -- for the site amendment permits that are on it.  
3 CHAIR DREW: I think that what we will do as Councilmembers is share some of the questions that we want for additional information with our Staff, and they will then provide that in a data request to the Grays Harbor Energy for additional information. And we can also ask additional questions at the public hearing coming up. So I think those are both two methods where we can make sure that we understand the specific information and the context. And I agree with you, it is quite thin on the construction timeline extension in terms of information.  
4 MS. KELLY: Thank you.  
5 CHAIR DREW: Are there questions about the process from Councilmembers?  
6 MR. DENGEL: So just one clarification on the -- on the time extension and the engines. So my -- |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 my take -- my understanding is that if you were to grant this permit extension, if there was to be any change in the proposed -- because there was a prior EFSEC decision for the engines themselves, if there was any change as far as what those engines look like outside of the current proposal, it would have to come back for a later amendment; is -- is that correct?  
2 CHAIR DREW: That's correct.  
3 MR. DENGEL: Okay. Thank you.  
4 CHAIR DREW: So, Ms. Bumpus, if you want to proceed with the next steps.  
5 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Drew. Yes, so as I was saying, there are -- there's a first public hearing that the Council is required to hold and of course additional public hearing sessions can be held. So to start, Staff would like to recommend that the Council conduct a public hearing session on Invenergy's SCA Amendment request on October 6th and that that public hearing session be conducted virtually as we've been holding our Council meetings, our monthly Council meetings, and we provide a presentation, or rather the certificate holder would provide a presentation. We could, of course, provide some additional information to the Council and public. And another portion of the meeting would be for public comment, and we would do this virtually.  
6 The -- the time for the meeting that we are thinking would be best is to start the meeting at 4:00 p.m. and go to 6:00 p.m. We also have a public comment database that we would activate on EFSEC's website during that day so that those who could not call into the meeting or attend on the platform in which we're hosting it would -- would be able to submit -- they could also mail it in, but submit an electronic comment to EFSEC.  
7 CHAIR DREW: So just to --  
8 MS. BUMPUS: There are --  
9 CHAIR DREW: I'm -- I'm sorry, on that point can we clarify? I heard you say that we would activate the comment database on that day, but we would give people more than that day to comment I would assume?  
10 MS. BUMPUS: Well, we will notice the -- the public hearing session to the public if the Council's agreeable to what we're proposing, this proposed schedule. We would notice that likely this week, and the public is -- is free to submit, you know, comments to us now. The -- Chair Drew, are you wanting to know if we could activate our comment database for basically from the beginning of the notification until the meeting?  
11 |
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| 1 this virtually.  
2 The -- the time for the meeting that we are thinking would be best is to start the meeting at 4:00 p.m. and go to 6:00 p.m. We also have a public comment database that we would activate on EFSEC's website during that day so that those who could not call into the meeting or attend on the platform in which we're hosting it would -- would be able to submit -- they could also mail it in, but submit an electronic comment to EFSEC.  
3 CHAIR DREW: So just to --  
4 MS. BUMPUS: There are --  
5 CHAIR DREW: I'm -- I'm sorry, on that point can we clarify? I heard you say that we would activate the comment database on that day, but we would give people more than that day to comment I would assume?  
6 MS. BUMPUS: Well, we will notice the -- the public hearing session to the public if the Council's agreeable to what we're proposing, this proposed schedule. We would notice that likely this week, and the public is -- is free to submit, you know, comments to us now. The -- Chair Drew, are you wanting to know if we could activate our comment database for basically from the beginning of the notification until the meeting?  
7  
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| 1. 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 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.  

MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is Sonia. | 1. 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 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 |
up to the governor or not may be different for the two
paths. So it's -- it's -- I'm glad we're keeping our
options open.

MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengl. I would be
supportive of this approach as well knowing that maybe
we could separate.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Any other comments? Thank you all.

We will -- hearing the comments from the Councilmembers,
we'll ask Staff to proceed with noticing the public
hearing on October 6th and opening the comment database.

I think that concludes our discussion on the
amendment.

Okay. Our next item on the agenda is
Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4 for a monthly
report from Mr. Whitehead.

MR. WHITEHEAD: Good afternoon. This is Kip
Whitehead from Energy Northwest. I'll be reporting on
the Washington Nuclear Project 1 and 4 and the Columbia
Generating Station. There are no nonroutine issues to
discuss for the month of August. Are there any
questions?

CHAIR DREW: Any questions?

Thank you. Hearing none, we will move to
our next item. It looks like that is adjournment. So

if there's no other business to come before us, thank
you all for participation today, and this meeting is
adjourned.

(Adjourned at 2:29 p.m.)
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
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.
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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,

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]
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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.
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