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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: EFSEC Staff, Sonia Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus is present.

MS. MASTRO: Amy Moon?

MS. MOON: Present. Thank you, Tammy.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, Amy.

Kyle Overton?

MR. OVERTON: Here.

MS. MASTRO: Joan Owens?

MS. OWENS: Present.

MS. MASTRO: Patty Betts?

MS. BETTS: Present.

MS. MASTRO: Stew Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: Present.

MS. MASTRO: Stephen Posner?

MR. POSNER: Stephen Posner, present.

MS. MASTRO: Representatives for the operational updates, Kittitas Valley Wind?

Wild Horse Wind Power Project?
MS. DIAZ: Jennifer Diaz, present.

MS. MASTRO: Grays Harbor Energy Center?

MR. SHERIN: Chris Sherin is present.

MS. MASTRO: Columbia Generating Station?

MS. RAMOS: Mary Ramos, present.

MS. MASTRO: Chehalis Generation Facility?

MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.

MR. MILLER: 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?

Will the court reporter please introduce yourself?

THE COURT REPORTER: This is Tayler Garlinghouse.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, 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
I was muted when I introduced myself a moment ago.

Sorry about that.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MR. KOBUS: This is Dave Kobus with Scout

Clean Energy for Horse Heaven Wind Farm.

MR. HURD: This is Owen Hurd, TUUSSO Energy

with the Columbia Solar Projects.

MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis, 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 Melbardis before that with Kittitas Valley; is

that correct?

MR. MELBARDIS: That was correct.

MS. SIQVELAND: This is Ann Siqveland with

OneEnergy Renewables for the Goose Prairie Solar

Project.

MS. MADERA: 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.

MS. MADERA: Noelle Madera, N-o-e-l-l-e,

last name is M-a-d-e-r-a, and I'm with Yakima County
Planning.

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?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, move to adopt the agenda as written.

MR. DENGEL: 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?
MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, motion to approve minutes.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston will second that motion.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Is there any discussion or comments on the minutes?

Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the minutes from the regular meeting on January 19th, 2021, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Those opposed?

Motion carries.

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

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. Melbardis?

MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Staff, and Council. For the record, this is Eric Melbardis 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.

Any questions?

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
the Council for their consideration.

Is there any questions?

CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions from Councilmembers?

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster. Kyle, do you have an idea of when we could expect that report?

MR. OVERTON: I don't have the really firm date of it. We're still coordinating with the facilities to get some initial information to complete their plan.

MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: And as I understand it, there will be additional plans. Specific plans are required to go to the Council for approval, but some of the Staff will coordinate and respond to between them and the facility operator and owner. But we will keep -- give you an update as to when you can expect it and certainly provide you with adequate time for review. Thank you.

Moving on to the Invenergy...

MR. SHERIN: Chair Drew?

CHAIR DREW: Sorry, I lost my -- my focus on the agenda there for a quick minute. Mr. Sherin.

MR. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Chris Sherin, plant
manager at Grays Harbor Energy Center. Grays Harbor Energy Center doesn't have any nonroutine items to report for the month of January.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And we did complete the public hearing in the amendment on Title 5, so that's in effect now I understand?

MR. SHERIN: Yes, that is correct, the PSD Amendment 5.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And we look forward to hearing more about your technology upgrade as you get further into the spring here, so thank you.

MR. SHERIN: Welcome.

CHAIR DREW: Goose Prairie Solar Project. Again, for those of you who may have joined since my opening statement, Goose Prairie Solar Project has applied to us for review of the project. We will have a public comment meeting within the 60 days from the time the application is received. So for today's presentation, we won't be taking public comments and questions, but we will have an ability for Councilmembers to ask questions after the presentation.

With that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Overton.

I am not hearing Mr. Overton. Is there -- is there -- do we have --

MR. OVERTON: Is this working now?
CHAIR DREW: Yes, there you are.

MR. OVERTON: Sorry about that.

CHAIR DREW: No problem.

MR. OVERTON: So this is Kyle Overton, the site specialist for Goose Prairie. I don't know if you heard, but I did want to provide some more info for the Grays Harbor update. Their -- their PSD was -- their amended PSD was issued on January 28th.

And -- and for Goose Prairie, EFSEC received an application for site certification and an application for expedited processing on January 19th for the Goose Prairie Solar Project, which was submitted by OneEnergy Renewables.

The ASC proposes the construction of an 80-megawatt solar facility with optional battery storage to be located in Yakima County.

At this time, Staff is coordinating with State agencies and third-party contractors to review the application for completeness and compliance with that regulation, primarily WAC 463-60 and 463-43.

Our first step as mentioned is to determine if there's any additional information needed to conduct a full review of the ASC. If any are identified, Staff will prepare a data request, which will be submitted to the applicant for their response, which will then get
attached to their initial application.

In conjunction with the overall ASC review, Staff are working on addressing expedited processing request. To determine if the project is eligible for expedited processing, two questions must be answered per WAC 463-43-030, the first being if the environmental impact as a proposed project is not significant or have to be mitigated to a nonsignificant level under SEPA.

The second is if the project is consistent with -- and in compliance with local land use regulation.

Prior to making these determinations, WAC 463-43 requires EFSEC to conduct a public information meeting and a land use consistency hearing within 60 days of receipt of the expedited processing application, and that deadline would be March 20th, 2021.

At this time, Staff's proposing a tentative date of March 16th to hold these meetings, which is the date of the regularly scheduled March Council -- Council meeting. Staff anticipates scheduling the public information meeting and land use hearing later in the day of the 16th and holding these virtually to accommodate COVID-19 restrictions.

Does anybody have any questions before I turn it over to the representative of One -- OneEnergy
Renewables who has prepared a presentation to introduce their project?

CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions from Councilmembers?

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,
please. So 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
the appropriate fence. And then we'll have roads for
access into the facility and within the facility for
operations and maintenance.

Next slide, please. I wanted to talk a
little bit about why solar is a great Washington
product. So I actually want to start on the second
bullet there. The Clean Energy Transformation Act,
CETA, has certainly increased the demand for solar
projects in the state. And as the Department of
Commerce in its recently released 2021 energy strategy
talks specifically about the significant quantities of
new clean generation that will be required to -- to meet
the future energy requirements of Washington, and this
project will be a great contributor to that goal.

Solar also correlates well with peak demand,
especially in the summer. We can site it close to
existing infrastructure, no use of water, and then sun's
going to be shining, so there's no fuel price risk
associated with it.

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 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, 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 that you will see in the application. Meacham is shown here in green and Martinez is in orange. The -- the properties are used in CRP and grazing right now, CRP, the Conservation Reserve Program from USDA, and both -- both landowners have provided letters of support, which are Attachment C to the application.

As I mentioned earlier, the yellow line shows the existing BPA transmission line that we -- the project will be interconnected to. And you can see the point of interconnection identified by the P. And additionally south of that, you can see the access off of State Route 24, and the project will not require any additional roads to access the site.

Just real quickly, the turquoise lines here you see are the facility parcel boundaries, and the shaded areas, the orange and green shaded areas, are the
sole extent of landowner site control, for which we had all our biological and cultural studies completed. We call that the survey area in the application. And then within that, you can see it's a little bit harder to see in this, but there's a red outline, which is within that survey area, and that's the facility area extent, which I will discuss a little bit more in detail in the next side.

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 avoids 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 -- and just to make sure, these are laid out also in our application in Section 2.A.2.D, 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,
and I guess I will leave it at that and let -- let you discuss further from there.

So with that, if you'd go to the last slide, please. I just wanted to make a couple final notes. One is kind of an administrative note. I took great pains in the application to use bookmarks quite a bit, so in both the PDF version and Word version, there are bookmarks to all the different sections. So I really encourage you to use those to jump around in the document when you need to.

And then I also wanted to give my sincere thanks to EFSEC Staff for their assistance for the last many months. The whole crew, including Chair Drew, Sonia, Kyle, Patty, Stephen, and Tammy, have all been really great to work with. Really appreciate that and looking forward to going down this process with you all.

With that, I will open up to any questions.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you, Blake.

Are there any questions from Councilmembers?

MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengel. I have a question regarding the operation. So looking through your application, it looks like you have a maintenance and operation facility that you're going to put on site, but I think it was in your notes you also mentioned that you wouldn't be having a full-time person working at the
site. So I was just wondering, what do operations look like from a long-term staffing perspective just to get a better understanding of the nature of this solar project?

MR. BJORNSON: Yeah, thank you. So in terms of operation maintenance, you're correct that there will be a building on site or we're -- we're asking to permit for a building. Each owner and the, you know, whether they have a building on site that holds things like extra panels or electrical equipment that needs to be 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 servicing 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.

MR. BJORNSON: Great. Thank you so much.

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

MS. MOON: Thank you, Chair Drew. On 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
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
1   Ms. Moon?
2
3       Okay. Hearing none.
4
5   MS. MOON: Okay. We will now have a brief
6   project overview presentation by the Horse Heaven Wind
7   Farm Project applicant.
8
9   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not hearing anything.
10
11  CHAIR DREW: Yes, we can't hear the
12   presenter yet.
13
14  MR. LANDESS: Hello. Can you all hear me
15   now?
16
17  CHAIR DREW: Yes, we can. Go ahead.
18
19  MR. LANDESS: Okay. Apologies for the
20   technical difficulties. Okay. Want to -- want to
21   discuss -- introduce Scout Clean Energy, give an
22   overview of our project team as well as the Horse Heaven
23   Project. We will also touch on components of the
24   environmental protections and reviews that you will find
25   in our application materials. I will close with a
26   summary of the community engagement that has been
27   conducted over the past year, and -- and also allow some
28   time for questions from Council or Staff at the end of
29   our presentation.
30
31       So Scout Clean Energy is a leading renewable
32   energy developer, owner, and operator. We have -- we
33   are headquartered in Boulder, Colorado, and have a local
office here in the Tri-Cities. Scout was founded in 2016 but made up of a long-standing management team with an extensive track record of developing utility scale wind projects.

Scout currently has a -- over a 3,000-megawatt portfolio that includes wind, solar, and energy storage projects across 12 states. The most recent Scout project to come online is our Bitter Ridge Wind Farm, which is located in Jay County, Indiana. That site began operations in October 2020.

I'd also like to introduce the broader -- broader project team and consultants that helped prepare our application for site certification. Tetra Tech was responsible for the environmental review analysis in preparation of the application.

West is our avian and bat study and statistical analysis consultant.

Westwood helped or assisted with our preliminary engineering design and survey work.

And HRA, or Historical Research Associates, is our archaeological and cultural study consultant for the project.

Here's our presentation team. They're -- I am Pat Landess and also Dave Kobus is the lead project manager for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm. His experience
includes leading development of the Nine Canyon Wind Farm, which is currently operating in Benton County, Washington. Dave is a resident of Richland, Washington, which is just a few miles from the proposed Horse Heaven project site.

Now, I would like to let Dave talk a little bit and discuss more of the details about the Horse Heaven project that is proposed for Benton County.

MR. KOBUS: Thank you, Pat, and good afternoon, everyone. I hope folks can hear me. As can be seen on the slide, the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project will be located just south of the Tri-Cities. At its closest point, it's approximately four miles south/southwest of the city of Kennewick and as you can see as well on the larger Tri-Cities urban area.

To date, the company has substantial site control in the area. We've got just over 70,000 acres with wind energy lease and easement agreements with the participating landowners. So the project area consists primarily of private agricultural land what -- where each turbine and associate access roads on average affects only about a half acre from agricultural production.

There's also a few parcels of state school trust land, which we have hopes to support up to ten
wind turbines plus a portion of the solar project.

And then we're fortunate we have two planned interconnections with the electrical grid. There is one on the eastern side of the project near Interstate 82, which runs north-south through the project area. And then on the -- the west site control boundary, there's also a planned interconnection there, both are on the Bonneville system.

Scout Clean Energy's been working to develop a wind project 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 megawatts 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
will be placed will -- will cause a change in the -- the
use of the land as the solar panels will take it out of
any agricultural production. And the intention is to
reseed the areas where there's -- the solar panels will
be with native grasses.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And so do you see
some ongoing participation outside of the project exact
footprint in terms of the lease land for that dry land
agriculture? That's kind of the question I was after.

MR. KOBUS: Yeah, wherever the wind turbines
are placed, there will be a, you know, small impact,
approximately a half acre per wind turbine. And so
those agricultural activities will continue. In fact,
the farmers generally appreciate the additional roads as
that helps them in their farming operations as well.

In -- in the solar areas, they will be
fenced as you've heard previously, but we'll work with
the services to make sure that that fencing is, you
know, adequate for safety of the project, but, you know,
minimizes the impact environmentally.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Are there other questions from
Councilmembers?

MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengel with
Ecology. I have a couple of questions I would like to
ask.

So a couple questions on the project, nature of the project, one thing I couldn't find in any of the materials is whether or not you already had leases to cover the 35-year -- -year useful life of all the equipment or how the ownership -- because my understanding is that there are multiple landowners involved in this project. If you can speak to that, please.

MR. KOBUS: Yes, appreciate the question. This is Dave Kobus with Scout. We have almost all of the leases executed. We certainly have commitments from all of the landowners within that site control, you know, at least verbally committed. The one area where we may have to rely on letters of consent is with the State lands where the Department of Natural Resources, you know, will depend on the -- the SEPA evaluation as part of our application to conclude their efforts in their leasing activities.

But they have indicated that they are supporting our wind development parcels as well as the solar as well as the associated right-of-way that will be needed.

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 offtakers.

    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
in -- in modular-type units, you know, similar to what you saw earlier relative to inverters for the solar 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.
It's currently a State-threatened species, and we are under current public review for a potential recommendation to our Commission to uplift endangered -- State-endangered, so that species is really kind of imperilled. And Benton and Franklin Counties are like the, if you will, the stronghold for the species. So there's -- there's some real concern there that we want to make sure that siting is done properly for that particular species.

So I wanted to know -- and I've got some other questions, but I want to know, are there additional update surveys planned, because ferruginous hawk in particular will move around from different territories, and so it will be important to note where they are when you are making these decisions.

MR. KOBUS: Appreciate the question, Mike. At this point, we do not plan any additional surveys. The -- you know, we had the two-year baseline survey, you know, relative to standard protocols. And then as we expanded the site, we did an additional one-year of large bird surveys on the eastern side of the project. But, you know, we do have a bird and bat conversation strategy that -- that will be a living document and, you know, we will work with services and adapt as necessary.
MR. LIVINGSTON: Okay. Thank you. And then one other wildlife-centered question, and you're probably aware of this, the snow geese numbers in -- particularly in the wintertime have just been really increasing in that area. They spend a lot of time on the wheat fields and then further down onto the Columbia River. And so that's something to keep in mind. They're not an imperilled species and in some -- some situations they can be at a nuisance level on the breeding grounds, but they are economically important both from a hunting as well as a wildlife watching perspective. So I think that'll be an important species to keep in mind as you're doing your siting decisions as well.

And then finally, and I'm going to geek out for a second, and just note that in the West report, there were five observations of Washington ground squirrels, which to my knowledge don't occur in Benton County. That would be Townsend's. So I think that would be an important thing for you guys for your records to make sure that you get that -- that corrected.

And with that, Chair, I'm done with my questions and comments.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
Any other questions from Councilmembers?

MS. KELLY: Chair, this is Kate Kelly again. They -- at the end of their presentation, there was talk about additional documents that were being produced. Does -- does that mean the application isn't complete right now or -- until we receive those or are those just part of the ongoing process?

CHAIR DREW: I will ask Staff to answer that. Ms. Moon or Ms. Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Hi, Chair Drew. This is Sonia Bumpus. So the application is being reviewed for completeness, and those reports are items that we would need to complete the reviews. So we do see those as pieces of information that are needed to make the application complete, but we're also reviewing everything else we have so that we can develop a comprehensive list of questions and things that we might need just clarified to put together to send to Scout Clean Energy.

CHAIR DREW: And that's --

MS. BUMPUS: Does that help answer the question?

CHAIR DREW: The -- just a second. And that's common in terms of even though we've received the application, we already start that 60-day period in
order to have the first comment -- public comment period
and the land use consistency hearing, so we're -- we're
on that timeline, but that doesn't mean we won't be
asking for additional information. And I'll take
whoever it is that wanted to comment on it as well. Was
that someone from Scout?

MS. KELLY: Chair, this is Kate. That --
that answered my question. So thank you both very much.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Are there additional questions from
Councilmembers?

Thank you very much for your presentation,
and we look forward to getting additional information as
we move forward.

Again, for those of you who are
participating on this call in terms of listening or
viewing it, this will be -- the applications are posted
on our site, and there are opportunities for you to sign
up on mailing lists, which are electronic as well, and
to continue to get information on the project. And we
look forward to hearing from you in our future meetings
for public comment. So appreciate that.

We're moving on now to the revised third
quarter cost allocation, Ms. Bumpus.

MS. BUMPUS: Yes, thank you. Good
afternoon, Chair Drew and Councilmembers. This is Sonia Bumpus for the record. We have done our third quarter cost allocation, but with the two new projects that we've received, Goose Prairie in January and Horse Heaven Wind Farm in February, we've needed to update our cost allocation. So this cost allocation that you're seeing in your packets here is for January 19th, that's when it begins, incorporates the Goose Prairie Solar Project into the cost allocations. So I will just very quickly go through these.

For Kittitas Valley Wind Farm, 8 percent; Wild Horse, 8 percent; Columbia Generating Station is 24 percent; Columbia Solar, 8 percent; WNP-1, 3 percent; Whistling Ridge, 3 percent; Grays Harbor 1&2, 13 percent; Chehalis, 12 percent; Desert Claim Wind Power Project, 8 percent; Grays Harbor 3&4, 4 percent; and Goose Prairie, 9 percent.

So this cost allocation became effective January 19th when the new application was received by Goose Prairie. In February we received the -- February 8th to be precise -- the application for site certification for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm.

We also have another change, as of February 18th, two days from now, the Grays Harbor Energy Site Certification Agreement for Units 3 and 4 will be
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.)
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