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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This is Kathleen Drew. I Chair the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council meeting, and I will be -- I am calling this meeting to order today.

Before we begin with roll call, I thought I would make a couple of introductory comments since we do have two projects that have filed applications with us in the past since our last meeting, and we will be establishing the site councils for those according to our state law and have letters out to those who, under our state law, have an ability to participate but they have not yet been formed.

Secondly, although we have just introductory information to be presented today, we will have opportunities for public comment within the 60 days of when those applications have been filed. So although we aren't taking public comments today, we will be providing that opportunity to everyone who is interested, and we look forward to your participation in this process.

We will be discussing when those will be held. At this point, given our COVID situation, we do expect those to be virtual. If you want to sign up to receive project information, you can do so on our website or by calling our general information number.

So with that, again, I am asking for the -- the clerk to first call the roll of the EFSEC Council and then the Staff members and then the representatives of the facilities and the projects who are on the agenda for today.

Ms. Mastro, will you please call the roll?

MS. MASTRO: Good afternoon, Chair Drew.

Good afternoon, Councilmembers. This is Tammy Mastro for the record.

Department of Commerce?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, present.

MS. MASTRO: Department of Ecology?

MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, present.

MS. MASTRO: Department of Fish and Wildlife?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston, present.

MS. MASTRO: The Natural Resources position is vacant.

Utilities and Transportation Commission?

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.
MS. MASTRO: Local jurisdictions and optional state agencies for the Goose Prairie Project, Department of Transportation?

MR. SAURIOL: Bill Sauriol, present.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you.

The assistant attorney general for EFSEC?

MR. THOMPSON: Jon Thompson is present.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you.

EFSEC Staff, Sonia Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus is present.

Amy Moon?

MS. MOON: Present. Thank you, Tammy.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, Amy.

Kyle Overton?

MR. OVERTON: Here.

Joan Owens?

MS. OWENS: Present.

Patty Betts?

MS. BETTS: Present.

Stew Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: Present.

Stephen Posner?

MR. POSNER: Stephen Posner, present.

Representatives for the operational updates, Kittitas Valley Wind?

Wild Horse Wind Power Project?

Jennifer Diaz, present.

MS. DIAZ: Grays Harbor Energy Center?

MR. SHERIN: Chris Sherin is present.

MS. MASTRO: Columbia Generating Station?

MS. RAMOS: Mary Ramos, present.

Chehalis Generation Facility?

MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.

Mark Miller, also present.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Counsel for The Environment for the Goose Prairie Project, would you like to introduce yourself?

The court reporter please introduce yourself?

THE COURT REPORTER: This is Tayler Garlinghouse.

Ms. Garlinghouse.

Chair Drew, there is a quorum for the regular EFSEC Council as well as the Goose Prairie Council. Thank you.

Chair Drew: Thank you, Ms. Mastro.

Also, if there's anyone on the line who would like to introduce themselves at this point, please do so. Go ahead.

MR. SHERMAN: This is -- this is Bill Sherman as counsel for The Environment. I'm afraid that was mute when I introduced myself a moment ago.

Sorry about that.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MR. KOBUS: This is Dave Kobs with Scout Clean Energy for Horse Heaven Wind Farm.

Mr. Hurd: This is Owen Hurd, TUUSSO Energy with the Columbia Solar Projects.

Mr. Melbardi: Eric Melbardi, EDP Renewables, Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

Mr. Bjornson: This is Blake Bjornson with OneEnergy for the Goose Prairie Solar Project.

Chair Drew: Thank you. And I believe that was Eric Melbardi before that with Kittitas Valley; is that correct?

Mr. Melbardi: That was correct.

MS. SIQVELAND: This is Ann Siqveland with OneEnergy Renewables for the Goose Prairie Solar Project.

Noelle Madera with Yakima County Planning.

CHAIR DREW: I'm sorry, I'm not sure we heard your name. Could you please state it again?

Thank you.

Noelle Madera, N-o-e-l-l-e, last name is M-a-d-e-r-a, and I'm with Yakima County Planning.

Jason Earls with Yakima County Planning.

Tim McMahan with Stoel Rives law firm on behalf of the Scout Horse Heaven Project and OneEnergy Goose Prairie.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

At this point, we will move on to our proposed agenda, which is before you.

Councilmembers, is there a motion to adopt the proposed agenda?

Kate Kelly, move to adopt the agenda as written.

Rob Dengel, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MR. EARLS: Jason Earls with Yakima County Planning.

Mr. McMahan: Tim McMahan with Stoel Rives law firm on behalf of the Scout Horse Heaven Project and OneEnergy Goose Prairie.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

At this point, we will move on to our proposed agenda, which is before you.

Councilmembers, is there a motion to adopt the proposed agenda?

Kate Kelly, move to adopt the agenda as written.

Rob Dengel, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

All those in favor, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: All those opposed?

Motion to adopt the agenda is approved.

Moving on to minutes. We have two sets of minutes from January. The first we will take up is the January 19th, 2021 Council meeting minutes. Is there a motion to approve the minutes from January 19th, 2021, the regular Council meeting?
CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

I'll move that we approve the minutes from the public comment hearing on January 19th, 2021.

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

Moving on to the public comment hearing of January 19th, 2021. For those minutes, is there a motion to approve the minutes?

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster. I'll move that we approve the minutes from the public comment hearing on January 19th, 2021.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Discussion? I do have one correction to make on page 4. Pull this up here. Line 2 it says, Determination to improve the PSD Amendment 5 Permit, and it should be Determination to approve the PSD Amendment 5 Permit.

So with that change, are there any other proposed changes?

Hearing none, all those in favor as -- of approving the minutes as amended, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: All those opposed?

I heard a couple of you, so I'm assuming we have a majority in favor to be approved.

Moving on to our first operational update, Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, Mr. Melbards?

MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Staff, and Council. For the record, this is Eric Melbards with EDP Renewables speaking on behalf of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. We had nothing nonroutine to report during the period. We are just enjoying winter wonderland over here today.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. We even got to experience a little bit of that in Western Washington, although it's sunny right now and the snow seems to have disappeared at my home anyway.

Moving on to Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Jennifer Diaz.

MS. DIAZ: Yes, thank you, Chair Drew and Councilmembers. This is Jennifer Diaz with the Wild Horse Wind Project, and I have no nonroutine updates for the month of January.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Chehalis Generation Facility, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and Staff. This is Jeremy Smith, the environmental analyst representing Chehalis Generation Facility. The facility has no nonroutine updates for the month of January.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4, Ms. Ramos?

MS. RAMOS: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Staff, and Councilmembers. This is Mary Ramos reporting for Energy Northwest. For the month of January 2021, Energy Northwest requested and received an extension for annual air emissions source registration for Columbia Generating Station. We're continuing to discuss with Department of Ecology the -- the scope of emissions source report.

And then also, regarding the Industrial Development Complex Inert Waste Landfill, we are working to address comments we received from EFSEC and Department of Ecology. That's all I have.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Okay. Thank you very much.

Moving on to Desert Claim Wind Power Project, Ms. Moon.

MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Council Chair Drew and Councilmembers. For the record, this is Amy Moon providing an update on the Desert Claim Project.

EFSEC Staff continue to coordinate with Desert Claim; however, there are no other project updates at this time.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Next on our agenda is Columbia Solar Project, Mr. Overton.

MR. OVERTON: Yes, this is Kyle Overton, the site specialist for Columbia Solar. This past month, EFSEC Staff received a preliminary draft of the Initial Site Restoration Plan, or ISRP, from Columbia solar. Staff in the process of our initial review in consultation with our independent contractor determined that the plan complies with facility's SCA in regulation primarily WAC 463-72.

The ISRP is required to be approved by the Council per WAC 463-72-030. Once the review is complete, EFSEC Staff will prepare a recommendation to...
CHAIR DREW: And as I understand it, there...
Renewables who has prepared a presentation to introduce their project?

CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions from Council members?

MR. OVERTON: So I think Blake Bjornson is going to do the presentation here. I'll hand it over to him.

MR. BJORNSON: Great. Thank you, Kyle. Can everybody hear me okay?

CHAIR DREW: Yes.

MR. BJORNSON: Thank you. All right. Yes, thank you. My name is Blake Bjornson. I'm the manager of product development in OneEnergy, and we are happy to be here to introduce the project and our project team and excited to get going in this process with EFSEC.

So next slide, please. Just a quick agenda of what I'm going to be touching on today. Like I say, going to introduce our team a little bit. I know we've got some new members of the EFSEC Council, so I wanted to just quickly cover some solar basics and then get into an overview of the project including the location and kind of where we're at with development and then open up to questions.

So next slide. And go ahead, next slide.

### Project Overview

- **Location**: Washington in Seattle.
- **Employees**: OneEnergy is headquartered in the state of Washington in Seattle. We have had success developing projects here in the West with multiple operational projects in both Oregon and Montana and a number of other projects in our development pipeline including here in Washington. The -- we're really excited about having a project that's -- that's close to home, and we look forward to being able to hopefully one day take folks out to Yakima County directly from Olympia here.

As far as who is going to be working on this project, like I said, my name is Blake Bjornson. We've also got on the call today Ann Siqveland. Ann is a director of development and going on seven years with OneEnergy. She will be leading development -- or she is leading development of the project in the West. And she's been in the renewable energy industry since 2007 with previous solar and wind development experience at EDP Renewables and EDF Renewable Energy.

We also have on the call today as he mentioned Tim McMahan supporting us from Stoel Rives. Go ahead to the next slide, please. So like I said, I know some folks are new to the Council since Columbia Solar, so I just wanted to touch quickly on some of the major components.

First and foremost, as you guessed, we're going to have some solar panels out there. Same type of panel that you see on a -- on a residential or commercial facility. And one cool thing is the antireflective coating, which really enhances the amount of power -- or the amount of solar energy that's not lost to reflection and turned into electricity.

Also got the racking. Those hold the panels, and we are proposing a single axis tracking technology that would rotate throughout the day to track the sun. And then that's held up by minimally invasive steel posts that are driven into the ground.

Next slide, please. So we've got a couple of electrical components to get that electricity into a usable form to get it onto the grid. There are the inverters that change the power into a useable type of power, and then there's the interconnection infrastructure, which has safety equipment and -- and different controls to actually put it onto the grid.

And we work closely with the interconnecting utility or provider, which in this case is Bonneville Power Administration.

Next slide. Wanted to touch on the -- the optional battery energy storage system. I guess, first of all, just to say it is optional. The commercial discussions and -- and what exactly the buyer of the power wants will -- will ultimately decide whether we -- whether set storage is included with the project or not.

The benefits of storage include reducing renewable curtailments, being able to provide power when the sun doesn't necessarily shine, and limit price spikes related to evening peak ramping demand, so being able to shift some of that power.

Any battery that would be used would be listed or certified by the Underwriter's laboratory, which is the industry's foremost safety and sustainability third-party standard. And kind of as you can see here, these are modular self-contained units that have all the built-in systems that are required including, as you can see, there's a new standard, NFPA 855, that's been developed for the standard for the installation of stationary energy storage systems. So there's some high-level -- there's some -- there's some requirements that have been created to -- to make sure that these are safe.

Okay. Next slide, please. This will be the final -- final couple components here. There's fencing with the security fence up to eight feet in height that would be installed around the perimeter. And we would work with the County and the landowner and other interested or -- agencies to make sure that we design...
Next slide, please. The other reason we chose this location is the very high solar energy resource. So this is a map produced by the National Renewable Energy Lab, NREL, and shows solar radiation in the state. And as you can see, there's that darker shade here in the south -- southern part of the state. Yakima County has a -- is square in that -- that really high resource, which of course just means that each solar panel can produce more electricity on an annual basis than ones that are in a lower resource area, say, in Seattle.

And finally, the solar is compatible with agriculture. It's -- it does not have any negative impacts on adjacent agricultural uses, and the landowner is provided with supplemental income, which helps a lot for them. And at the end of the project, we can remove the -- remove the project and the land can be returned to either its current use or whatever the landowner wants to do with the -- with the land at that time.

Next slide, please. A few more things that are kind more specific benefits to local communities. One of them, taxes. There will be -- throughout the life of the project, the project will deliver a reliable and sustainable source of revenue to the County, which can, of course, provide funding for schools, roads, police, fire rescue, et cetera.

There's the recurring land expenditures that just talks about the lease payments. Those -- you know, those can really help diversify the landowner's income, which allows for more resilience through volatility of ag markets. And then there's also operation and maintenance to keep the -- to keep the project going, things like vegetation management.

Local spending during the -- especially during the construction will have, you know, up to 300 -- as many as up to 300 jobs during construction, which brings, you know, money into the community for local contractors, hotels, food, things like that. And then, of course, spending on things like electrical. I will give a little bit to the [inaudible] project. This is taken of the sites. Again, this is -- again, this is -- this sort of -- well, we will get to -- the next page I have a map, so we'll jump next to that. Yes, so here's the project location. You can see Yakima sort of in the center of the map. We are about eight miles east of Moxee in the Moxee Valley, and that yellow line you can see there is the BPA line crossing the -- that goes right across the project site.

It's actually the second site for this same project. OneEnergy conducts thorough early due diligence on sites, and that includes rigorous desktop analysis through online mapping and early engagement with agencies. And this instance, we actually had site control and interconnection position on the same line but about 12 miles east and in response to some WDFW feedback, we moved the project to this current location.

Next slide, please. The reason why we chose this location is the very high solar energy resource. So this is a map produced by the National Renewable Energy Lab, NREL, and shows solar radiation in the state. And as you can see, there's that darker shade in the south -- southern part of the state. Yakima County has a -- is square in that -- that really high resource, which of course just means that each solar panel can produce more electricity on an annual basis than ones that are in a lower resource area, say, in Seattle.

And, you know, while the solar resource is better east of the Cascades, there's limited electrical infrastructure, and so a really key component in siting is to look for those existing transmission lines to reduce the impacts of new products.

Next slide, please. Just wanted to zoom in a little bit closer in on the site here. So a little bit of background. The project encompasses two private landowners. There's what we call Meacham and Martinez. Yakima County has a -- is square in that -- that really high resource, which of course just means that each solar panel can produce more electricity on an annual basis than ones that are in a lower resource area, say, in Seattle.

And, you know, while the solar resource is better east of the Cascades, there's limited electrical infrastructure, and so a really key component in siting is to look for those existing transmission lines to reduce the impacts of new products.

Next slide, please. Just wanted to zoom in a little bit closer in on the site here. So a little bit of background. The project encompasses two private landowners. There's what we call Meacham and Martinez. Yakima County has a -- is square in that -- that really high resource, which of course just means that each solar panel can produce more electricity on an annual basis than ones that are in a lower resource area, say, in Seattle.

And, you know, while the solar resource is better east of the Cascades, there's limited electrical infrastructure, and so a really key component in siting is to look for those existing transmission lines to reduce the impacts of new products.
Before we get there, I wanted to point out a couple of additional things. You can see the ephemeral stream -- there are a couple of ephemeral streams that were delineated. Those are in blue. Those are tide five streams, ephemeral streams, and the County did not have any regulations for that type of stream; however, we intend to avoid those as you can see in our layouts with a 50-foot buffer. And then the area in the black is the sage draw that we’ve also committed to avoiding as higher quality habitat.

And if you go to the next slide, please. I just wanted to spend a moment on the area definitions that we use. I just said a few of them. So there’s the facility parcels, and just to make sure, these are laid out also in our application in Section 2.A.2.D. So the facility area is defined as the area within the project sets plus the access roads to connect any distinct areas. That’s the facility area.

As currently designed, facility occupies approximately 595 acres. We are asking -- and we are asking for a maximum size of 625 acres. That would be the facility area. Facility area’s fully within what we call the facility area extent, which is a micrositing boundary within which that facility area will be placed. So that totals 789 acres, and that’s what you see as in the red in this map. So the purp-- and the purple is what is the currently designed facility area.

And like I said, the facility area extent is wholly located within the survey area, which was for our biological and cultural surveys. So just wanted to touch base on kind of an important part of understanding some of the terminology in our -- in our applications. Next slide, please. And this will be the last side. Just wanted to touch on the project status a bit. So kind of the macro level, we think about project development needing to satisfy these five components.

So with land, we’ve got site control secured for adequate lands. We’ve got interested private landowners that are seeking endeavors by their income streams. We’ve got interconnection. We’ve received our facility study, which is the final study from BPA, which shows that we can interconnect to this location easily, both in terms of minimal new facilities and feasible costs. And the project is sited immediately adjacent to the existing infrastructure, which limits impacts. And this limited scope lower cost interconnection ultimately means cheaper electricity for the consumer.

For strong resource, as I mentioned earlier, this is one of the best spots in the state for solar. This project is anticipated to produce about 180 gigawatt hours in the first year, which is equivalent to the annual electricity consumption of over 14,500 hours, so a pretty great spot to have solar.

So the two you can see there in gray are of course the permit, here we are. And I will talk about next steps in a moment, but -- and then the energy sales, which, again, CETA’s creating high demands for renewables in the state, we’re actively engaged in state proposals and negotiations with a number of entities and targeting a commercial operation date as soon as November of 2022.

And I guess maybe I’ll just focus here -- stay here on the permit for a second and talk about next steps. Kyle mentioned the -- we’ve got the land use consistency meeting and the public information meeting on March 16th that we look forward to participating in,
With that company as
And then there's also, you know, annual
come up, they can be called on -- to go and fix
solar project itself does not require a full-time staff.
servicing a number of projects in an area so that the
-- what's the right word -- consultants, that are
serviced, you know, that -- that might be up to --
that's different depending on who's operating the
project.
But we have -- you know, typically solar
projects are serviced by operations and maintenance sort
of -- what's the right word -- consultants, that are
serving a number of projects in an area so that the
solar project itself does not require a full-time staff.
A solar project of this size does not require a
full-time staff on site. But when there are issues that
come up, they can be called on to -- to go and fix
things.
And then there's also, you know, annual
maintenance that's scheduled, and so those -- those
would be scheduled with that -- with that company as
well. That's typically how it's -- how it's done.
MR. DENGEL: Thank you.
CHAIR DREW: Any other questions from
Councilmembers?
MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, Chair, this is Mike
Livingston.
CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.
MR. LIVINGSTON: So first I just wanted to
thank Blake and the team for the -- the consideration of
moving the site from that wet farther eastern location
to this one. From a Fish and Wildlife standpoint,
siting is the key for these projects. The more we can
get them away from impact wildlife habitat the better,
so appreciate that.
I wanted to also acknowledge the preliminary
work that is done on the rare plants and big game
habitat corridors. I'm curious if there's any
additional survey work intended to be done. Though the
likelihood is low, there's still a possibility given the
proximity of the site to the Yakima Training Center
where we do have one of our remaining sage grouse
populations left, there's some possibility that they're
occurring in the general area. So I'm curious if you're
planning on doing any more wildlife surveys. Ground
squirrels are another potential species of concern, jack
rabbits, burrowing owls.
And then I -- one other question would be,
are you guys -- you know, one of the things that we've
grappled with for the solar project in particular is
that these large eight-foot fences can be barriers to
wildlife movements, and they can also be potential
collision sites for, in particular, birds. And so I
don't know if you're looking at best management practice
for how to minimize those types of collisions. Thanks.
MR. BJORNSON: Yeah, thank you for the
questions. So on the survey work, we conducted surveys
at the site over the course of two years, 2019 and 2020
spring surveys, and conducted outreach to the local WDFW
folks who provided feedback on our survey protocol and
made sure that we were doing the appropriate work out
there.
In terms of sage grouse in particular, no
sage grouse were identified on the site during either
survey. And I don't think we anticipate -- we do not
anticipate at this time doing additional survey work,
and I encourage you to -- you know, all the survey -- or
the survey reports are included of course in the permit
as an attachment, I believe it's Attachment F.
And I would say -- do I want to say any more
on the surveys? Yeah, you know, different ground
squirrels, there were -- all the findings can be found
in that Attachment F.
In terms of the fence, yes, we also did
the -- we've discussed the fence design with WDFW as
well and have committed to raising the bottom by four
inches off the ground and also committed to not using
razor wire on the top.
And we do have some ongoing conversation
with WDFW in terms of rounding out the -- the mitigation
and making sure that the project minimizes impacts to be
least as possible. So we continue to look forward to
continue discussing those impacts and -- as we go
forward.
And I would also encourage, the habitat
mitigation memo is Attachment R to the application, and
that -- that has a kind of our assessment of where we're
at with mitigation at -- at this present time and
provides some of the other things that we've done for
mitigation tactics.
MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you for those
responses. I appreciate that.
MR. BJORNSON: Thank you.
CHAIR DREW: Blake, I do have a question
too. In terms of the agricultural lands, do you know if
any of them are designated of long-term significance?
MR. BJORNSON: I believe in Yakima County, all agricultural lands -- when they did the land use planning, all agricultural lands have that designation. They do not distinguish within the agricultural zoning district.

CHAIR DREW: And can you explain what the different kinds of agriculture that are currently happening on this property are?

MR. BJORNSON: Yes. So the Meacham property, which is the southernmost property, the one that's adjacent to State Route 24, that is in the Conservation Reserve Program, so it's been sitting fallow and does not have any active agricultural practices.

The Martinez property is routinely used for grazing in the winter. As you can see in the -- in the Attachment C, the landowner support letter, it doesn't have very high value for them as a -- as winter habitat, but -- or excuse me, as winter grazing, but it is used. And you can see there's one particular portion that has a bit heavier grazing usage that's in the Martinez property that's south of the transmission line. But otherwise, it's not used a lot, but it is used for grazing.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Other questions?

Okay. Hearing none, thank you very much for your presentation and we will continue to -- the Staff will work with you in terms of the review, and we will also work to set up the informational meeting and the land use consistency meeting in order to gather the input from the public at that time. Thank you. MS. MOON: Great. Thank you so much.

CHAIR DREW: Moving on to Horse Heaven Wind Project, Ms. Moon?

February 8th, 2021, EFSEC received an application for a site certification from Scout Clean Energy proposing the construction and operation of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project. The application for site certification, also known as an ASC, proposes the construction of a renewable energy generation facility that would have a maximum nameplate energy generating capacity of up to 1,150 megawatts for a combination of wind and solar facilities as well as battery energy storage systems, or BESS. The proposed project is located in Benton County, Washington, south of Kennewick.

According to the ASC if approved, the applicant is anticipating commercial operation of the first phase to be built by the end of calendar year 2023.

EFSEC is working to schedule the public information meeting and land use hearing to be held on the same day within 60 days of applicant receipt before April 9th. These are anticipated to be virtual meetings, or virtual meeting and hearing.

EFSEC is sending notification letters this week to local and State agencies who have an opportunity to appoint someone to sit on the Council. EFSEC is also developing a project mailing list. People can sign up for the project mailing list on the Horse Heaven Project specific website. That's -- first go to the EFSEC website and then you can scroll through the facilities to Horse Heaven.

The Horse Heaven Project application included a request for the expedited process, which has a 120-day State Environmental Policy Act, otherwise known as SEPA, review timeline. June 8th will be the 120 days.

As Kyle Overton previously presented, the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project is subject to the same Washington Administrative Codes as the Goose Prairie Solar Project.

Does the Council have any questions?

CHAIR DREW: Any questions at this point for Ms. Moon?

Okay. Hearing none.


CHAIR DREW: Yes, we can't hear the presenter yet.

MR. LANDESS: Hello. Can you all hear me now?

CHAIR DREW: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

MR. LANDESS: Okay. Apologies for the technical difficulties. Okay. Want to -- want to discuss -- introduce Scout Clean Energy, give an overview of our project team as well as the Horse Heaven Project. We will also touch on components of the environmental protections and reviews that you will find in our application materials. I will close with a summary of the community engagement that has been conducted over the past year, and -- and also allow some time for questions from Council or Staff at the end of our presentation.

So Scout Clean Energy is a leading renewable energy developer, owner, and operator. We have -- we are headquartered in Boulder, Colorado, and have a local...
Scout Clean Energy's been working to develop 
wind projects in Benton County since 2016. In the 
process, we've -- we've acquired assets as well as filed 
for additional interconnection capacity that will allow 
the addition of solar and battery storage components. 
This allows us to scale the project up to 1,150 
megwatts of renewable energy.  
The project will permit up to 244 wind 
turbine generator locations with the exact model and -- 
and precise corresponding locations to be determined 
closer to construction, as it will be dependent on 
available manufacturer production schedules and will be 
selected through a competitive process.  
Combining wind, solar, and battery storage 
as a hybrid system helps to mitigate one of the biggest 
disadvantages of renewable power and that's in its 
variability. Building these components at the same 
location can enhance grid reliability by providing 
electrical generation during more hours of the day as 
well as the ability to store power when it's needed the 
most. Also, hybrid renewable energy resources in this 
region have enhanced value due to generation peaks 
coinciding with power demand peaks where one technology 
can contribute during the [sound interference] of 
another. 
So flexibility's key as depending on the 
preferences of the eventual power purchaser of a power 
sales agreement for the facility. The relative wind, 
solar, battery storage ratios may change where 
additional solar, battery storage is constructed with 
correspondingly fewer wind turbines. This flexibility 
also includes the potential for the project to be built 
in phases and even have multiple offtakers.  
So Scout originally intended to pursue local 
permitting throughout our development planning efforts 
as wind, solar, and battery storage are allowable 
conditional uses in Benton County. However, in -- in 
recent months, the project size and scope have expanded 
as well as the evolving challenges associated with 
public meetings due to the pandemic all adding to the 
environmental review complexity.  
We also appreciated that the EFSEC process
ensures robust public involvement opportunities that we believe match or exceed the local permitting process. So the State process ensures that expert resources are available to accomplish review without undue burden on local agencies with limited resources.

We have met with Benton County staff and officials multiple times throughout the course of our development effort, and our team continues dialogue as questions arise. And Benton County has been provided the land use section of the application. Consistency with local land use will be determined through the site certification process.

I’d like to touch on components of the environmental reviews that you will find in our application materials. To give you a sense of the natural environment within the project boundary area, approximately 74 percent is agricultural land, primarily dry land wheat farming, 11 percent is grassland, and 8 percent is shrub land.

Now, the shrub land I can further identify that of the -- you know, high value of shrub land, 1 percent is sagebrush shrub-steppe in our micrositing corridors, and very little of it is impacted by solar.

In fact, less than .1 percent.

The list of studies have all been recently concluded and are in the application materials. The wildlife studies were conducted over the past three years.

Now, our review also considered environmental health impacts, which includes such factors as the aesthetics, ambient noise, and shadow flicker, which you can see a bit there shown on the slide. Setbacks are established for statutory criteria as well as industry standards.

Visual simulations have also been developed based at numerous viewpoints in the surrounding area. The view that you see here is -- is from Clodfelter Road looking southeast. So on the inset, you can kind of get oriented how the -- the photo was taken relative to the full layout of -- of the wind turbine site.

For areas with broad vistas such as this, wind energy projects can result in change to the landscape. You know, you're going to see them. But participating landowners will experience a very small impact on the actual use of their land.

So in this region, wind turbines must be placed in the most windy sites, which are higher in elevation so they'll occupy ridge lines like you see often around the area. Consequently, they will be visible to a varying extent depending on your vantage point.

As I mentioned earlier, the majority of the project site is extensively used for agriculture, but regardless of the land use, cultural resource investigations of all areas were completed and detailed reports are available in the application along with their findings.

Now, I will turn the presentation back over to Pat to address community outreach, which certainly has been challenging due to the recent gathering restrictions in the state.

CHAIR DREW: There you are.

MR. LANDESS: Sorry. Thank you. Can you hear me now?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. LANDESS: Thank you.

Thanks, Dave.

It's important for us to conduct meaningful public engagement and certainly while safely weathering the -- the pandemic. We're using a variety of online tools to connect with residents and local stakeholder groups at -- near the Horse Heaven Project.

In December, a public opinion survey was conducted by EMC Research. Their study assessed Benton County voter sentiment on renewable energy development broadly as well as Horse Heaven Project specifically.

The results of that survey are detailed in our application materials.

I also wanted to touch on the supplemental information that we'll be filing as part of our application for site certification with the Council once it's completed. The -- the two main forthcoming documents are the ambient noise monitoring report as well as the habitat mitigation plan.

And to wrap up now, appreciate the -- the time and would like to answer -- answer any questions that Council or Staff may -- may have after our introduction.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you to both of you. My question is about the agricultural use of the property, and I understand agricultural use with wind is somewhat different than solar. You are planning both activities. Are the lands considered to be -- the agricultural lands long-term -- of long-term significance and what is your thought about the continued use for agriculture?

MR. KOBUS: Yes, appreciate the question, Chair Drew. All of the land that's within the area of site control is GMA ag zoned. And so, you know, as I mentioned, the -- the way the -- the land is utilized, it's primarily dry land wheat. Where the solar panels
CHAIR DREW: So if I could follow up on that. So DNR is looking to our SEPA process to inform their decision?

MR. KOBUS: That's correct.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MR. DENGEL: Just a few other quick questions here, and that is, the energy production on the turbines, I couldn't quite find it, but it looks like it's 350 megawatts; is that right? It's kind of the vast majority of the energy production coming from solar at 6,570 megawatts.

MR. KOBUS: You know, I -- I'm not sure the numbers you're referring to, but suffice it to say that the maximum number of turbines that we could construct is -- is 244, and if I recall correctly, that equates to about 650 megawatts production from -- from the wind turbines. So the remaining 500 megawatts would be the -- the potential of solar if we have that balance of wind and solar desired by our oftakers.

But, you know, as I mentioned, the number of wind turbines could be fewer if we desire more solar associated with the project, but our nameplate limit will be 1150 megawatts.

MR. DENGEL: Okay. Thank you. That's useful. Apologize. Looks like the number I cited was the average. So yeah, okay. So all right. So makes a lot more sense.

And then my last question is regarding the bird mitigation. I was looking over the SEPA documents, can you just kind of describe at a high level what's done on the turbine standpoint for mitigation? I had a difficult time finding anything specific.

MR. KOBUS: Well, as -- as I recall related to turbine placement, we will have the standard setbacks that, you know, are associated with -- with the zoning for the property. We will also have setbacks associated with wildlife such as nesting areas. I mean, one that comes to mind is ferruginous hawk nesting areas. There's a standard setback that -- that we would use from those.

So, you know, other than specific identified locations, it's pretty much the -- going to be the standard protocol in the wind industry guidelines.

MR. DENGEL: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Chair -- Chair Drew, this is Kate Kelly.

CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

MS. KELLY: I just had a question about the battery storage. Can you -- can you talk a little bit about what that might look like or how that would work?

MR. KOBUS: Yeah, the -- the best way to describe it is the -- the battery storage would come...
And so each battery storage container for substations would be for the project. But these -- these modular units would be installed on -- on concrete pads and they're -- they're, you know, kind of like a shipping container, and then there would be the -- the cooling systems that would be required would also be on the end of the units and then they would be stacked -- not stacked but side by side on -- on a footprint close to where the collector substations would be for the project.

And so each battery storage container for the technology we're currently looking at is about three megawatts per container. So if you had 150 megawatts, of course there -- you know, there would be 50 containers that would be sited.

MS. KELLY: And so the -- the scope of the how many containers there are and what they look like is conditioned on what kind of deals you reach with folks who need the power?

MR. KOBUS: Yeah, the way, you know, it will work is we will, you know, bid the project into requests for proposal of processes, and we'll identify an offering, you know, that we believe is consistent with what the request for proposals are looking for, and then we'll negotiate with the interested party. They may say that, you know, they -- they don't need battery storage, all they want is wind. They may say that they want the hybrid facility that -- that has wind and storage but no battery. Or they could, you know, identify needing battery and -- and not so much solar. So it will really be a negotiation process to refine at the end of the day what has the greatest value for the interested offtakers.

MR. LANDESS: And if I may just add a couple notes, as it's laid out in our -- our application for all of the different resource analyses, it's -- it's -- we're looking at the maximum, you know, impacts of the build-out. So it's -- it's as if -- the resource analyses are completed as if all or, you know, both 150 megawatt battery storage systems at, you know, either projects collector substation location would be constructed and -- and under operations.

CHAIR DREW: So our -- our process would be to review the application, and then pending the outcome of that process once that's completed, if it's a positive outcome, then the negotiations would be under that overall footprint?

MR. LANDESS: That's correct.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KOBUS: Yes, and just -- just another point of clarification that, yeah, whatever we build would -- would be within the footprint we've identified in the application. So in other words, we've -- we've identified the most impactful case and -- and may end up scaling back from there. Also with -- with the battery storage, it's not considered generation. So, you know, when we speak 1150 megawatts as the nameplate capacity of the project, that's not counting the -- you know, the two 150 megawatt potential battery storage systems. Hope that clears it up.

MS. KELLY: Thank you. That's helpful.

CHAIR DREW: Any other questions from Councilmembers?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, Chair, this is Mike Livingston. I got a -- I got a few.

CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

MR. LIVINGSTON: So one thing that I -- I kind of dove in a little bit into the -- the West Incorporated report, noticed the timeline of the -- the wildlife surveys that had been completed, they're two to three years old. I don't know if there's more continued surveys going on that will lead up to the final decisions for siting of specific turbines.

Dave, you mentioned the ferruginous hawk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 53</th>
<th>Page 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MR. LIVINGSTON: Okay. Thank you. And then 1 order to have the first comment -- public comment period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 one other wildlife-centered question, and you're 2 and the land use consistency hearing, so we're--we're</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 probably aware of this, the snow goose numbers in -- 3 on that timeline, but that doesn't mean we won't be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 particularly in the wintertime have just been really 4 asking for additional information. And I'll take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 increasing in that area. They spend a lot of time on 5 whoever it is that wanted to comment on it as well. Was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 the wheat fields and then further down onto the Columbia 6 that someone from Scout?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 River. And so that's something to keep in mind. 7 MS. KELLY: Chair, this is Kate. That --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 They're not an imperilled species and in some -- some 8 that answered my question. So thank you both very much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 situations they can be at a nuisance level on the 9 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 breeding grounds, but they are economically important 10 Are there additional questions from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 both from a hunting as well as a wildlife watching 11 Councilmembers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 perspective. So I think that'll be an important species 12 Thank you very much for your presentation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to keep in mind as you're doing your siting decisions as 13 and we look forward to getting additional information as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 well. 14 we move forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 And then finally, and I'm going to geek out 15 Again, for those of you who are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 for a second, and just note that in the West report, 16 participating on this call in terms of listening or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 there were five observations of Washington ground 17 viewing it, this will be -- the applications are posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 squirrels, which to my knowledge don't occur in Benton 18 on our site, and there are opportunities for you to sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 County. That would be Townsend's. So I think that 19 up on mailing lists, which are electronic as well, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 would be an important thing for you guys for your 20 to continue to get information on the project. And we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 records to make sure that you get that -- that 21 look forward to hearing from you in our future meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 corrected. 22 for public comment. So appreciate that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 And with that, Chair, I'm done with my 23 We're moving on now to the revised third</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 questions and comments. 24 quarter cost allocation, Ms. Bumpus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. 25 MS. BUMPUS: Yes, thank you. Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 54</th>
<th>Page 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Any other questions from Councilmembers? 1 afternoon, Chair Drew and Councilmembers. This is Sonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MS. KELLY: Chair, this is Kate Kelly again. 2 Bumpus for the record. We have done our third quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 They -- at the end of their presentation, there was talk 3 cost allocation, but with the two new projects that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 about additional documents that were being produced. 4 we've received, Goose Prairie in January and Horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Does -- does that mean the application isn't complete 5 Heaven Wind Farm in February, we've needed to update our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 right now or -- until we receive those or are those just 6 cost allocation. So this cost allocation that you're</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 part of the ongoing process? 7 seeing in your packets here is for January 19th, that's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CHAIR DREW: I will ask Staff to answer 8 when it begins, incorporates the Goose Prairie Solar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 that. Ms. Moon or Ms. Bumpus? 9 Project into the cost allocations. So I will just very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MS. BUMPUS: Hi, Chair Drew. This is Sonia 10 quickly go through these.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Bumpus. So the application is being reviewed for 11 For Kittitas Valley Wind Farm, 8 percent;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 completeness, and those reports are items that we would 12 Wild Horse, 8 percent; Columbia Generating Station is 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 need to complete the reviews. So we do see those as 13 percent; Columbia Solar, 8 percent; WNP-1, 3 percent;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 pieces of information that are needed to make the 14 Whistling Ridge, 3 percent; Grays Harbor 1&amp;2, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 application complete, but we're also reviewing 15 percent; Chehalis, 12 percent; Desert Claim Wind Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 everything else we have so that we can develop a 16 Project, 8 percent; Grays Harbor 3&amp;4, 4 percent; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 comprehensive list of questions and things that we might 17 Goose Prairie, 9 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 need just clarified to put together to send to Scout 18 So this cost allocation became effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Clean Energy. 19 January 19th when the new application was received by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 CHAIR DREW: And that's -- 20 Goose Prairie. In February we received the -- February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MS. BUMPUS: Does that help answer the 21 8th to be precise -- the application for site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 question? 22 certification for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 CHAIR DREW: The -- just a second. And 23 We also have another change, as of February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 that's common in terms of even though we've received the 24 18th, two days from now, the Grays Harbor Energy Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 application, we already start that 60-day period in 25 Certification Agreement for Units 3 and 4 will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expiring. So for the cost allocation that you are looking at now that begins February 8th, it removes the portion that Grays Harbor Energy Units 3 and 4 would typically carry, and it shifts those costs and then it also adds in Horse Heaven Wind Farm. So I'll read these percentages off.

For Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, 7 percent; Wild Horse, 7 percent; Columbia Generating Station, 24 percent; Columbia Solar, 8 percent; WNP-1, 3 percent; Whistling Ridge, 3 percent; Grays Harbor 1&2, 12 percent; Chehalis, 12 percent; Desert Claim Wind Power Project, 6 percent; Grays Harbor Energy 3&4 is reduced to 0 percent; Goose Prairie, 9 percent; and Horse Heaven, 9 percent.

And these are going to be our cost allocation percentages until March 31st, the end of the quarter for fiscal year 2021. Are there any questions for me?

CHAIR DREW: Thank you for that. We have a few changes going on, so appreciate that we're keeping up to date with our cost allocation, and thank you for your presentation.

We are at the end of our meeting for today, our agenda, so thank you all for your participation, for the presentations, for the questions, and we look forward to a busy year. Our meeting is adjourned.

(Adjourned at 2:58 p.m.)
Facility Name: Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project
Operator: EDP Renewables
Report Date: March 1, 2021
Reporting Period: February 2021
Site Contact: Eric Melbardis, Sr Operations Manager
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)
- Power generated: 20,611 MWh
- Wind speed: 4.1 m/s
- Capacity Factor: 30.43%

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:** March 5, 2021  
**Report Period:** February 2021  
**Site Contact:** Jennifer Diaz  
**SCA Status:** Operational

---

**Operations & Maintenance**  
February generation totaled 78,372 MWh for an average capacity factor of 42.78%.

**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: March 1, 2021
Reporting Period: February 2021
Site Contact: Jeremy Smith
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.
- 145,748 MW-hrs generated in January for a year-to-date 323,131 MW-hrs and a capacity factor of 42.71%.

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 2,040 days without a Lost Time Accident.

Current or Upcoming Projects
-Planned site improvements.
  - No planned changes.
-Upcoming permit 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,

Jeremy Smith – P22582
Environmental Analyst
Chehalis Generation Facility
EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center
Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC
Report Date: March 16, 2021
Reporting Period: February 2021
Site Contact: Chris Sherin
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance
- GHEC generated 226,847MWh during the month and 501,683MWh YTD.

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

Environmental Compliance
- There were no emission, outfall, or storm water deviations, during the month.
- Routine monthly and quarterly reporting to EFSEC
  - Monthly Outfall Discharge Monitor Report (DMR)
  - 2020 Annual Emissions Inventory Report
  - 2020 Annual Tier II Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory

Safety Compliance
- None.

Current or Upcoming Projects
- Installation of AGP on GT1 & GT2 spring 2021.

Other
- Ongoing COVID-19 mitigation efforts at the site.
Facility Name: Columbia Generating Station and Washington Nuclear Project 1 and 4 (WNP-1/4)  
Operator: Energy Northwest  
Report Date: March 4, 2021  
Reporting Period: February 2021  
Site Contact: Mary Ramos  
Facility SCA Status: (Pre-construction/Construction/Operational/Decommission): Operational

CGS Net Electrical Generation for February 2021: 768,461 MW-Hrs

Environmental Compliance
On 2/18/2021, Energy Northwest (EN) submitted comments regarding the draft Radioactive Air Emissions License (RAEL) for Columbia Generating Station (CGS). EN is coordinating with EFSEC to discuss the comments with Washington State Department of Health.

During the week of February 22, the Washington State Fire Marshal’s office conducted an inspection of EN’s Industrial Development Complex and non-power block buildings at CGS. The inspection scope included a review of 2019 open actions and the 2020 annual inspection.

Current or Upcoming Projects
No updates.

Other
Columbia Generating Station’s next refueling and maintenance outage is scheduled to begin on May 8, with a target duration of 40 days. The entire site shifts focus on the outage and pre-outage work begins to ramp up starting in mid-March.
Desert Claim Wind Power Project

March 2021 project update
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Columbia Solar Project
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Goose Prairie Solar Project
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Horse Heaven Wind Project

March 2021 project update

[Place holder]