AGENDA

MONTHLY MEETING
Tuesday May 17, 2022
1:30 PM

1. Call to Order
   .................................................................Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair

2. Roll Call
   .................................................................Joan Owens, EFSEC Staff

3. Proposed Agenda
   Meeting Minutes..................................................Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair
   • April 19, 2022 Monthly Meeting Minutes

4. Minutes
   • April 19, 2022 Monthly Meeting Minutes

5. Projects
   a. Kittitas Valley Wind Project
      • Operational Updates....................................Eric Melbardis, EDP Renewables
   b. Wild Horse Wind Power Project
      • Operational Updates....................................Jennifer Galbraith, Puget Sound Energy
   c. Chehalis Generation Facility
      • Operational Updates....................................Stefano Schnitger, Chehalis Generation
   d. Grays Harbor Energy Center
      • Operational Updates....................................Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor Energy
   e. Columbia Generating Station
      • Operational Updates....................................Marshall Schmitt, Energy Northwest
   f. WNP – 1/4
      • Non-Operational Updates................................Marshall Schmitt, Energy Northwest
   g. Columbia Solar
      • Project Updates............................................Owen Hurd, Tuusso Energy
   h. Desert Claim
      • Project Updates............................................Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
   i. Horse Heaven Wind Farm
      • SEPA update.............................................Amy Moon, EFSEC Staff
      • Land Use Order review and deliberation...........Adam Torem, ALJ
      The Council may consider and take FINAL ACTION to review and vote on the Horse Heaven Land Use Order.
   j. Goose Prairie Solar
      • Project Updates............................................Joe Wood EFSEC Staff
   k. Badger Mountain
      • Project Updates............................................Ami Hafkemeyer, EFSEC Staff
   l. Whistling Ridge
      • Project Updates............................................Ami Hafkemeyer, EFSEC Staff
   m. High Top & Ostrea
      • Project Updates............................................Ami Hafkemeyer, EFSEC Staff
   n. Wautoma Solar
      • New Application.............................................Ami Hafkemeyer, EFSEC Staff
      • Applicant presentation.....................................Laura O’Neil, Innergex

6. Other
   • Legislative update............................................Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Staff

7. Adjourn.............................................................Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair


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

CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This is Kathleen Drew, the Chair of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, calling our April 19th meeting to order.

Ms. Grantham, will you call the roll.

MS. GRANTHAM: Yes.

Department of Commerce?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Ecology?

MR. LEVITT: Sorry, for Ecology, this is Eli Levitt.

MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you.

Department of Fish and Wildlife?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston is present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural Resources?

MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities and Transportation Commission?

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you.

Local Government and Optional State Agencies for the Horse Heaven Project, Department of Agriculture?

MR. SANDISON: Derek Sandison, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Benton County?

MR. BROST: Ed Brost, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: For the Badger Mountain Project, Douglas County?

MS. GIULIO: Jordyn Giulio, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: The Assistant Attorney General?

MR. THOMPSON: This is Jon Thompson, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Administrative Law Judges, Adam Torem?

JUDGE TOREM: This is Judge Torem. I am on the line.

MS. GRANTHAM: Laura Bradley?

JUDGE BRADLEY: This is Judge Bradley. I'm here with you.

MS. GRANTHAM: For EFSEC Council Staff, Sonia Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer?
MS. HAFKEMEYER: Ami Hafkemeyer, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon?

MS. MOON: Amy Moon, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Joe Wood?

MR. WOOD: Joe Wood, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Patty Betts?

Stew Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: Here.

MS. GRANTHAM: Joe Wood?

MR. WOOD: Joe Wood, present.

MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon?

For the operational updates --

MS. BUMPUS: Joan Owens is excused.

MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you.

For the operational updates, Kittitas Valley Wind Project?

MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis, present.

Wild Horse Wind Power Project?

MS. GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith, present.

Grays Harbor Energy Center?

MR. SHERIN: Chris Sherin is present.

Chehalis Generation Facility?

MR. SCHNITGER: Stefano Schnitger is present.

Columbia Generating Station?

MR. MEHINAGIC: This is Denis Mehinagic, present.

Columbia Solar?

MR. HURD: Owen Hurd, present.

Counsel for the Environment, Bill Sherman?

MR. SHERMAN: Present.

And Megan Sallomi?

MR. SALLOMI: Present.

Chair, there is a quorum for the regular Council and for the Horse Heaven and Badger Mountain Councils. Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

This is Bill Sherman as Counsel for the Environment. Let me also emphasize that Sarah Reyneveld, who is Counsel for the Environment on the Horse Heaven Wind Farm, is also on the line.

MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you, noted.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Moving on to our proposed agenda, Councilmembers, you see the agenda before you -- I think I froze there for a minute.

The agenda is before you. Is there a motion to approve -- adopt the proposed agenda?

MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, so moved.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston, and I'll second that.

CHAIR DREW: I think that was Mike Livingston. Thank you.

All those in favor, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Motion is adopted.

Moving on to the meeting minutes. We have two sets of minutes this month. First is the March 15th monthly meeting minutes, which are in your packets and on the screen appearing before you.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Second?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, second.

CHAIR DREW: Are there any edits or changes?

MR. LEVITT: This is Eli. I think on the March 15th one, instead of "siting" with a T, it spells "siding" with a D. But I might be mixing it up with the other set of minutes we're approving.

CHAIR DREW: Fair enough. I don't see it on this one.

MR. LEVITT: Maybe it's the other set of notes. Sorry.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Let me quickly -- I'll just skip forward and see on my own screen here.

So let's see that we will correct the word "siding," from "siding" with a D to "siting" with a T, if we find it in this document.

All those in favor of the minutes as amended, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Okay. Motion carries.

Moving on to the meeting minutes for the Goose Prairie Site Certification Agreement Amendment Hearing.

CHAIR DREW: Fair enough. I don't see it on this one.

MR. LEVITT: Maybe it's the other set of notes. Sorry.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Let me quickly -- I'll just skip forward and see on my own screen here.

So let's see that we will correct the word "siding," from "siding" with a D to "siting" with a T, if we find it in this document.

All those in favor of the minutes as amended, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Okay. Motion carries.

Moving on to the meeting minutes for the Goose Prairie Site Certification Agreement Amendment Hearing.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Okay. Motion carries.

CHAIR DREW: Fair enough. I don't see it on this one.

MR. LEVITT: Maybe it's the other set of notes. Sorry.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Let me quickly -- I'll just skip forward and see on my own screen here.

So let's see that we will correct the word "siding," from "siding" with a D to "siting" with a T, if we find it in this document.

All those in favor of the minutes as amended, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Okay. Motion carries.

Moving on to the meeting minutes for the Goose Prairie Site Certification Agreement Amendment Hearing.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

Okay. Motion carries.

CHAIR DREW: Fair enough. I don't see it on this one.
EFSEC Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Jennifer Galbraith.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and Staff. For the record, Eric Melbardis from EDP Renewables for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. We have nothing nonroutine to report during the period.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHNITGER: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Stefano Schnitger, operations manager reporting from the Chehalis Generation Facility. For the reporting period of March 2022, the Chehalis Generation Facility conducted its annual RATA test, its Relative Accuracy Test Audit on the continuous emissions monitoring system. For the RATA, the preliminary results were within compliance requirements. They were reported to EFSEC Staff. During the RATA, Sean Chisholm with EFSEC visited the land site, and also Clint Lamoreaux with SWCAA visited the land site. They requested to review several documents which were provided to them, and there were no corrective actions required from the documents provided.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Grays Harbor Energy, Mr. Sherin?

MR. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Chris Sherin, the plant manager at Grays Harbor Energy Center. For the month of March, the only nonroutine item we have to report is that we submitted our stack emissions retesting results of our sulfuric acid and sulfur dioxide tests. The results, though much improved, were getting problematic and unrealistic. And Grays Harbor Energy Center -- we did have a meeting with EFSEC Staff. We proposed corrective action and submitted those proposed actions to the EFSEC Staff.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster. I'm wondering if you can give us a quick idea of what you'll be doing next for corrective action.

MR. SHERIN: The high level is we're going to use CTM-013 instead of EPA's Method 8. And CTM, I think, is just -- if I remember right, it's Conditional Test Method 013. It's the same method we used in the prior stack testing that we did here at Grays Harbor successfully, and it's supposed to be less susceptible to moisture and particulate in the exhaust gas.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Ms. Hafkemeyer?

MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair Drew. For the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer with EFSEC Staff. I just wanted to let the Council know that EFSEC Staff and SWCAA and Ecology are all discussing the Facility's proposal to make sure that that will address the issue and determine whether or not any other follow-up action is needed, and we're still coordinating with each other and with the Facility on this.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Any other questions or comments from Councilmembers? Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to Columbia Generating Station and Washington Nuclear Project 1 and 4.

MR. MEHINAGIC: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and Staff. This is Denis Mehinagic reporting for Energy Northwest. For the month of March, I have no updates.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Let's see. Next on our agenda is Columbia Solar Projects. The update on Penstemon is that Puget Sound Energy was up there last week resolving final issues with Puget Sound Energy and the contractor. That's all I have to report for the Chehalis Generation Facility.

CHAIR DREW: Aye.

MR. HURD: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Councilmembers, and EFSEC Staff. This is Owen Hurd from TUUSSO Energy reporting on the Columbia Solar Projects. The update on Penstemon is that Puget Sound Energy was up there last week resolving final issues with Puget Sound Energy and the contractor. That's all I have to report for the Chehalis Generation Facility.

CHAIR DREW: Aye.
<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>communication issues on the interconnection. I believe that work is now complete. I will have confirmation of that in the next day or two. But if so, then Penstemon is complete. Camas is mechanically complete. We’re expecting mechanical or substantial completion in early May. I think the notes that I submitted said April 22nd, but I think it’s looking more like May 10th. But that all seems on track. Urtica, we’re continuing to deal with issues around power remediation. We’ll be installing some concrete collars around some of the twisted piles. I think we’re looking at late June or early July for completion of that project. And then beyond that, the site restoration assurance -- as you may recall, that was going to be replaced by Greenbacker, and that was a condition for the indirect change of control of that permit. I believe that security has now been posted, and so I think we’ll be revisiting that in a future Council meeting to kind of complete the indirect transfer of control. So nothing else to report. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. Any questions from Councilmembers? Okay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing none. Moving on to the next item on our agenda, which is the Desert Claim Wind Power Project, Ms. Moon. MOON: Good afternoon, Council Chair Drew and members of the Council. For the record, this is Amy Moon providing the Desert Claim update. EFSEC Staff continue to coordinate with Desert Claim; however, currently there are no project updates. CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And while I have you, moving on to Horse Heaven Wind Farm, SEPA update, Ms. Moon. MOON: Yes. Again, good afternoon, Council Chair Drew and Councilmembers. This is Amy Moon, once again, with the update for the Horse Heaven Wind Project. In March, EFSEC Staff continued to work on the preparation of the draft environmental impact statement, otherwise known as the DEIS. This includes the review of our contractor Golder’s work drafting the DEIS as well as coordinating the draft and final impact statement chapter reviews with Washington State agencies. EFSEC staff continued to work on wildlife and habitat, including impact analysis and opportunities for avoidance and minimization of impacts. The work continues to support the applicant in refining an updated mitigation plan. The preparation of the draft environmental impact statement has involved several data requests, supplemental report review, and significant work on the format for presenting impact analysis. As a result, EFSEC Staff would like to provide a draft EIS schedule update. At this time, we anticipate the draft EIS will be issued for public comment no earlier than June of 2022 rather than May, which is what we had reported earlier this year. EFSEC Staff continued to anticipate a minimum 30-day public comment period. The working schedule was developed with several assumptions, and updates to the schedule are not unusual as the draft EIS process evolves. In addition to working on the draft EIS in close collaboration with our contractor, EFSEC is working with the Washington Attorney General’s Office planning the adjudication process, which is part of the site certification application review process. Does the Council have any questions? CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions for Ms. Moon? Thank you. Moving on to our adjudication update, Ms. Hafkemeyer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair Drew. Good afternoon, Chair and Council. For the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer. I have a brief update for you today on the Horse Heaven adjudication process. Staff have been coordinating with Judge Torem to begin planning the logistics of the adjudication and are still working to finalize details as we approach the initial stages of the process. This information includes timing of noticing, prehearing conferences, and public participation. And EFSEC will bring that information to the Council and the public as we finalize these details. At this time, EFSEC Staff would like to request that the Council direct Staff to coordinate with Judge Torem to prepare a land use consistency order to then be brought to the Council for deliberation and potentially for Council action at the May Council meeting. This order would include the information brought forward at the land use hearing at which Judge Torem presided on March 30th, 2021, and Staff and Judge Torem’s recommendation on consistency. Are there any questions? CHAIR DREW: Are there questions from Councilmembers? If not, is there a motion to direct Staff to bring to the May Council meeting a draft land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Verbatim Transcript of Monthly Council Meeting - 4/19/2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 17</th>
<th>Page 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. use consistency order for our consideration?  
  MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster.  
  I'll move that the Council direct Staff to prepare a  
  land use consistency order to bring to the Council  
  meeting in May for our consideration.  
  CHAIR DREW: Thank you.  
  Is there a second?  
  MR. LEVITT: This is Eli Levitt. I'll  
  second.  
  CHAIR DREW: Thank you.  
  Is there a discussion?  
  We will certainly work to have that draft for  
  you to review in a timely manner before the May meeting  
  so that you will have time to review that before our  
  discussion.  
  All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."  
  COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.  
  CHAIR DREW: Opposed?  
  The motion carries. Thank you.  
  Moving on to Goose Prairie Solar Project  
  update, Mr. Wood.  
  MR. WOOD: Good afternoon, Chair Drew,  
  Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Joe Wood, EFSEC site  
  specialist, providing a quick update on the status of  
  the Goose Prairie Solar Project.  
  The only update I have on this project today is  
  that EFSEC Staff is coordinating with the applicant on  
  preconstruction plans and activities. I'll be updating  
  the Council and Staff regarding these plans and  
  activities and any other significant developments as we  
  progress.  
  And that's all I have for today. Thanks.  
  CHAIR DREW: Thank you.  
  And then we also have action to potentially  
  take here on the site certification agreement transfer.  
  We had that hearing and reviewed those minutes on -- I  
  think it was -- well, we reviewed them earlier today,  
  but the meeting was on March 15th.  
  Ms. Bumpus, do you have an update for us?  
  MS. BUMPUS: Yes. Thank you, Chair Drew.  
  Good afternoon, Chair Drew and Councilmembers.  
  For the record, this is Sonia Bumpus.  
  As you were saying, Chair Drew -- so a public  
  comment hearing was held on the Goose Prairie request to  
  transfer the SCA on May 15th -- or excuse me, March  
  15th.  
  And then based off direction from the Council  
  from the March Council meeting, the Staff have prepared  
  a draft order that would allow the transfer of the site  
  certification agreement from OneEnergy Renewables to  
  Goose Prairie Solar, LLC. A draft of this order was  
  sent to the Council on April 5th. Some additional  
  comments were received by EFSEC on the draft order, and  
  those were sent to the Council, I believe, by e-mail  
  yesterday.  
  Staff have reviewed the changes that were  
  proposed by the certificate holder, and we did not have  
  any concerns with those. And with that, we are  
  recommending that the Council approve the order, which  
  would allow the transfer of the SCA from One Renewable  
  Energy (sic) to Goose Prairie Solar, LLC.  
  CHAIR DREW: So the order that we received  
  yesterday has these track changes in them and is also in  
  your packets, Councilmembers. And there are just a  
  couple of minor changes from what I can see.  
  Is there a motion to approve the order on the  
  Goose Prairie Solar Project on the transfer of site  
  certification from OneEnergy Renewables to Brookfield?  
  MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, so moved.  
  CHAIR DREW: Thank you.  
  Is there a second?  
  MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, second.  
  CHAIR DREW: Is there a discussion?  
  I think this is fairly straightforward. We  
  certainly had a lot of information about the resources  
  of Brookfield -- that will be the new owner -- and  
  certainly significant experience in constructing and  
  operating solar facilities of this scale. So I don't  
  think there are -- we did not have testimony and had a  
  good opportunity to have questions answered during the  
  public hearing.  
  So all those in favor of approving this  
  transfer, please say "aye."  
  COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.  
  CHAIR DREW: Opposed?  
  The order is adopted. Thank you. And we will  
  get you a finalized copy, certainly, with all of these  
  corrections, these couple of corrections included.  
  And then the next step, as I understand it, is  
  we will also send you a link to the amended site  
  certification agreement. We're not asking you, the  
  Council as a whole, to review that since really what  
  we're doing is a name change in ownership. So it's  
  fairly straightforward in terms of finalizing that  
  amendment. But we will send it to you when the work is  
  completed.  
  Is there anything else you'd like to say,  
  Ms. Bumpus?  
  MS. BUMPUS: No, that actually was all I was  
  going to add, was that we would be updating this and  

---
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1. assigning an order number and distributing to the Council and posting to the website.
2. CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
3. MS. HAFKEMEYER: We are working with the applicant on some studies that were previously identified by EFSEC Staff and our contracted agencies.
4. What we anticipate identifying in the review of the scoping comments are what resources should be covered in depth in the environmental impact statement.
5. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Okay. So the studies were already ones that we needed for additional information, and in addition to that, we have then what the EIS will include.

### Page 22

1. closed the comment period. The Staff is reviewing with our consultant on what studies we will determine that we need to go forward on in the draft EIS.
2. MS. HAFKEMEYER: We are working with the applicant on some studies that were previously identified by EFSEC Staff and our contracted agencies.
3. What we anticipate identifying in the review of the scoping comments are what resources should be covered in depth in the environmental impact statement.
4. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Okay. So the studies were already ones that we needed for additional information, and in addition to that, we have then what the EIS will include.
5. MS. HAFKEMEYER: Correct.
6. CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.
7. Any other questions from Councilmembers? Okay.
8. Moving on to the next item, which is Whistling Ridge Energy Project, Mr. Wood.
9. MR. WOOD: Hello and good afternoon, Chair Drew and Councilmembers and Staff. For the record, again, this is Joe Wood, EFSEC site specialist, providing a brief update on the status of the Whistling Ridge Energy Project.
10. So due to the amount of time that’s passed since this project has seen any action, so to speak,
least in terms of Council activity, EFSEC and Council activity, I would say relatively dormant for several years. I would have to go back and look at our timeline to find out when the last legal activity that involved EFSEC decisions or EFSEC materials were involved. But they did -- I want to say in 2018 -- provide a five-year update.

MS. BUMPUS: Right. That's correct.

MS. HAFKEMEYER: And there's been very little activity since then.

Yes, thank you.

CHAIR DREW: And there were, in addition to appeals -- to the EFSEC action appeals to the transmission activity -- which I believe was a federal appeal as well. So there are more details to the appeals process, but largely, that is what has happened. But then there has not been any further activity, is that correct, Ms. Bumpus? Ms. Hafkemeyer?

MS. BUMPUS: That's our understanding, yes -- this is Sonia Bumpus -- that they went through several years of various appeals, and that was -- our understanding is that's primarily the reason why the project didn't move forward over all these years.

But now, our understanding is that the certificate holder is looking at options and looking at the fate of the project, and we're working with their legal counsel to put together what we think is going to be an SCA amendment request that will include a couple of different types of requests on this SCA.

MR. YOUNG: The whole thing seems a little murky to me. Could I request that Staff provide a little bit more detailed account of the history of the project and the status at the May meeting, our EFSEC May meeting, if that's possible?

MS. BUMPUS: Absolutely. And we also would anticipate that at the meeting where we bring the SCA amendment request -- once we do have it in hand -- to the Council, similar to other SCA amendments, there will be a presentation by the applicant, and they'll be available to answer questions as well.

So I just wanted to mention -- and it's possible that in the May Council meeting, we will have something in hand by then. So just also look forward to that because that will be an opportunity for the Council to ask questions.

MR. YOUNG: It would be great to get a Staff report in addition to whatever type of presentation the applicant might be preparing for the amendment request.

MS. BUMPUS: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: Yes.
Verbatim Transcript of Monthly Council Meeting - 4/19/2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 29</th>
<th>Page 30</th>
<th>Page 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| line crossing. And then most of this site has been farmed. You can kind of see it in the aerial. It is quite weedy. You can see in those pictures there a lot of mustards, kochia, Russian thistle. And if you go back one, this is the Ostrea Project. And this one is located just to the east of High Top. And this one will connect to Bonneville Power Administration Moxee to Midway 115-kilovolt T-line, which runs more on the southern side of this one here, and it's right below that interconnecting line that crosses between the boxes. The projects will not take up all the areas shown on each of these maps. This is the project site control parcel, which is the area that's been leased. But each project will take up a smaller space within there. And the design and layout of those boundaries do take into the consideration the results of cultural and rare plant surveys that were conducted and the resources that were identified with those for avoiding impacts to both of those. The application for site certification was submitted April 7th to EFSEC, and we also submitted ten hard copies and ten USBs. When we started the project in January of 2021, we coordinated with Yakima County, EFSEC, WDFW, and other state agencies to identify what surveys were required. And those are the surveys conducted last summer. We have one more round of rare plant surveys which will hopefully occur next week. I tried last week, and it was snowing out there. We also have some additional cultural surveys to finish up. And if you go back one more slide, that's our note on CCR. And Tai Wallace is on, and I'm going to let him introduce CCR and kind of what their company is. Tai, I'll turn it over to you. MR. WALLACE: Erin, thank you. Madam Chair Drew, EFSEC Councilmembers and Staff, thank you for your time today. My name is Tai Wallace. I'm the director of development for Cypress Creek for our transmission scale projects and markets in the western United States. On my team for this project or these projects, we've got Jess Mosleh. She's an associate project developer. We have Julie Alpert, who's our environmental manager for the western region, and then Seija Stratton, who's our environmental director, among a number of other teams and professionals and verticals that we have supporting the development of this project -- these projects. Cypress, our mission is to power a sustainable future one project at a time. So we take a very intense focus on microsigning, oftentimes putting under lease option more land than we'll ultimately build so that we have the ability to sign around constraints and features as they're discovered during the permitting process. Cypress, as an organization, is a near fully vertically integrated independent power producer. We do everything in-house or in partnership with consultants, with the exception of engineering, procurement, and construction. We do construction management, but we typically outsource our construction to the best local construction firms for our projects. But we -- under the development division, we develop and finance our projects. We also do fleet ownership and asset management for internal projects as well as third-party projects. We have 1.6 gigawatts of solar projects, over 200 projects across the country in 14 states, that we own and operate and also do the O&M for. And we have an additional nearly gigawatt of projects that are third-party projects for, you know, other funds, investment funds, infrastructure funds, that we asset-manage and operate as well. We have an O&M business that is separate from these divisions as well, and we do a first-party O&M for all of our projects as well as third-party O&M for a total of nearly four gigawatts. Wood Mackenzie ranked us as the number four O&M in terms of size in the -- I believe it was the 2020 report. You know, with that, I just wanted to give a little bit of an introduction. You know, we develop quite a few projects of this scale. We have developed quite a few projects of this scale, and we typically retain a majority of those all the way through asset management and contracting, you know, through our various divisions at Cypress. And with that, I just wanted to see if you had any questions about Cypress that I could answer, you know, other than the high level that I just gave. CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Are there any questions from Councilmembers? MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair Drew. I did want to bring to the Council's attention that the applicant has requested expedited process, and so we would like to keep that in mind as we go through our review. Staff are currently working on scheduling the initial public meetings associated with this project to be held within the first 60 days of receipt of...
And so there is some concern from our wildlife area is the connector between those two. And then we have the Hanford Site to habitat that is, you know, home to a lot of native wildlife species. And then we have the Goose Prairie Project. There's another one called Black Rock that's going through Yakima County's permitting process that, to my understanding, is right next to High Top. Then we have Ostrea. And then there's a couple of others that I believe are in the works, too, just to the south and east of these projects in that area.

And one thing that raises our concern is the Yakima Training Center is a large block of shrub-steppe habitat that is, you know, home to a lot of native wildlife species. And then we have the Hanford Site to the south and east of the Yakima Training Center. This area is the connector between those two.

And so there is some concern from our wildlife biologists about impacts to habitat connectivity with the number of projects that we're seeing pop up. And so I don't know if we've done this before, but I think it would be helpful to have some kind of a cumulative impacts analysis related to all of these projects instead of reviewing them individually.

It would be helpful to understand, and for everybody to be fully aware, of the number of projects that are on the docket in this area. Because eventually, we will -- I don't know if the grid can handle it, but we're going to lose this connectivity.
So, yep, again, Sonia Bumpus.

I'm going to just touch on a couple of things about what we're calling the transition. Before I do that, I want to also make note that, as Chair Drew discussed and has talked a little bit about in past Council meetings, there are a number of things that were updated about EFSEC in House Bill 1812.

Staff are internally working on something like a report that will summarize what these changes are for EFSEC. So this has to do with things that were changed in our statute, our jurisdictional authority procedural changes. So there is going to be a document that will sort of summarize all of that that will be made available.

But today, I'm just going to talk about the transition piece, which has to do with just a few of the things that are changes to EFSEC because of House Bill 1812. So for instance, four of EFSEC's positions are funded -- four of our highest-paid positions are funded through general fund.

And then, of course, as Chair Drew mentioned, EFSEC is given its own account, and we're also going to be stood up as our own independent agency, which is an excellent segue into what this transition is all about.

So EFSEC, as the Council knows, currently relies on the UTC for agency support services, which are, you know, very significant and important for our operations. These include finance support, the records center at UTC supports us for records management, activities, human resources support. We also get support from their media folks.

So there are a number of things that UTC...
for your participation, and please let Ms. Bumpus know if you have questions or, of course, you can reach out to me. Thanks.
The meeting is adjourned.
(Meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.)
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Facility Name: Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project
Operator: EDP Renewables
Report Date: May 2, 2022
Reporting Period: April 2022
Site Contact: Eric Melbardi, Sr Operations Manager
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)
- Power generated: 21,603 MWh
- Wind speed: 6.6 m/s
- Capacity Factor: 30%

Environmental Compliance
- No incidents

Safety Compliance
- Nothing to report

Current or Upcoming Projects
- Nothing to report

Other
- No sound complaints
- No shadow flicker complaints
Facility Name: Wild Horse Wind Facility
Operator: Puget Sound Energy
Report Date: May 3, 2022
Report Period: April 2022
Site Contact: Jennifer Galbraith
SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance
April generation totaled 62,978 MWh for an average capacity factor of 32.09%.

Environmental Compliance
Nothing to report.

Safety Compliance
Nothing to report.

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: May 6, 2022
Reporting Period: April 2022
Site Contact: Stefano Schnitger, Operations Manager
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.
  • 211,965 net MW-hrs generated in April for a capacity factor of 58.7%.

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

Environmental Compliance
-Monthly Water Usage: 103,972 gallons
-Monthly Wastewater Returned: 217,668 gallons
-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.
  • Nothing to report
-Any EFSEC-related complaints or violations that occurred.
  • No issues or updates.
-Brief list of reports submitted to EFSEC during the monthly reporting period.
  • Nothing to report

Safety Compliance
-Safety training or improvements that relate to SCA conditions.
  • Zero injuries this reporting period for a total of 2,465 days without a Lost Time Accident.
Current or Upcoming Projects
- Planned site improvements.
  - No planned changes.
- Upcoming permit renewals.
  - Nothing to report.
- Additional mitigation improvements or milestones.
  - Nothing to report.

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).
  - Michael Adams was hired as the new plant manager on April 21st.
- Public outreach of interest (e.g., schools, public, facility outreach).
  - Nothing to report.

Respectfully,

Stefano Schnitger

Stefano Schnitger
Operations Manager
Chehalis Generation Facility
EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting – Facility Update

Facility Name: Grays Harbor Energy Center  
Operator: Grays Harbor Energy LLC  
Report Date: May 17, 2022  
Reporting Period: April 2022  
Site Contact: Chris Sherin  
Facility SCA Status: Operational

**Operations & Maintenance**
- GHEC generated 186,956MWh during the month and 929,151MWh YTD.  
- GHEC started the Annual (Maintenance) Outage on April 22nd.  
- Compliance related maintenance planned for 2022 includes:  
  o Routine permit required maintenance.  
  o Preventive maintenance inspections and cleaning Heat Recovery Steam Generator 1’s Selective Catalytic Reduction Catalyst and Ammonia Injection Grid.

---

**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, quarterly, and annual reporting to EFSEC  
  o Monthly Outfall Discharge Monitor Report (DMR).  
  o Quarterly Stormwater Discharge Monitor Report (DMR).  
  o Quarterly Air Emissions Data Reports (EDR).  
  o AOP Annual Compliance Certifications for 2021.

**Safety Compliance**
- EHS Annual Training conducted in April included Hazard Communication and Identification and Electronic SDS refresher training.

**Current or Upcoming Projects**
- Application for a Modification to the Air Operating Permit. GHEC is currently authorized to operate under PSD Permit EFSEC/2001-01, Amendment 5 and Federal Operating Permit EFSEC/94-1 AOP Initial.

**Other**
- None.
EFSEC Monthly Council Meeting

Facility Name: Columbia Generating Station (CGS) and Washington Nuclear Projects 1 and 4 (WNP 1/4)
Operator: Energy Northwest
Report Date: May 5, 2022 (revised May 11, 2022)
Reporting Period: April 2022
Site Contact: Marshall Schmitt
Facility SCA Status: Operational

Operations & Maintenance (only applicable for operating facilities)
CGS Net Electrical Generation April 2022: 827,383 MWh

Environmental Compliance
On April 11, 2022, Energy Northwest (EN) notified EFSEC that a discrepancy was identified in the runtime meters for the Emergency Diesel Generators 1 and 2 that challenges compliance with EFSEC Order 873. Specifically, EN identified that the meters are designed only to record engine runtime once the engines reach rated speed and stop recording when the engine is switched to idle. Energy Northwest met with EFSEC and the Department of Ecology (Ecology) on May 3rd, 2022 to discuss the discrepancy. Despite the discrepancy, the actual engine runtime is well below the EFSEC Order 873 limits. EN has other methods in place to verify the actual engine operational hours, which will be used in the interim while EN works with EFSEC and Ecology to determine the appropriate corrective actions to take.

On April 14, 2022, Energy Northwest notified EFSEC that tritium was detected in the Sanitary Waste Treatment Facility (SWTF) influent composite sampler. The amount of activity detected in two samples, taken approximately a month apart at the composite sampler, was 476 picocuries per liter (pCi/L) and 900 pCi/L which are well below the drinking water limit of 20,000 pCi/L. The source of the tritium is under investigation but correlates with the commissioning of the new Surface Water Treatment Facility (WTF) at the Industrial Development Complex (IDC). There is no evidence to suggest the recent detection of tritium is related to the operation of Columbia Generating Station. The source water to the WTF comes from the Columbia River and Energy Northwest has engaged the United States Department of Energy (USDOE) for insight on the state of known tritium plumes from the adjacent Hanford Site. Energy Northwest is currently developing an Incident Report and Investigation Plan as requested by EFSEC.

Safety Compliance
None.

Current or Upcoming Projects
- Planned site improvements.
The Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) is being expanded to include an additional pad.
- Upcoming permit renewals.
Columbia Generating Station’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit is in the process of being renewed.

Other
None.
EFSEC Council Update: Columbia Solar

Facility Name: Columbia Solar Projects (Penstemon, Camas and Urtica)
Operator: Tuusso Energy, LLC
Report Date: May 6, 2022
Reporting Period: 30-days ending May 6, 2022
Site Contact: Owen Hurd
Facility SCA Status: Construction

Construction Status

- Penstemon
  - PSE still working to resolve final communications issues with the interconnection; plant will remain offline until this is resolved, hopefully shortly

- Camas
  - Achieved Mechanical Completion on March 23rd
  - Substantial Completion expected in late-May/early-June, following resolution of:
    - Inverter malfunction that presented during the initial attempted witness test with PSE
    - Penstemon communication issues (to avoid repeat on Camas)

- Urtica
  - Pile remediation still underway (concrete collars being installed on twisted piles)
  - No change in schedule
    - Mechanical Completion: late June
    - Substantial Completion: late July

Other

- New Site Restoration Financial Assurance has been posted by Greenbacker
- Updating impact calculations based on final layouts, which will be used to update planting plans
Desert Claim Wind Power Project

May 2022 project update
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BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of Application
No. 2021-__ Docket No. EF-210011

Scout Clean Energy, LLC, for Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC, Applicant

ORDER FINDING PROPOSED SITE CONSISTENT WITH LAND USE REGULATIONS

BACKGROUND

Synopsis. Scout Clean Energy, LLC, submitted an application to the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC or Council) on February 8, 2021, for site certification of the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm in Benton County. The applicant demonstrated that the Facility is not a prohibited use within the County’s agricultural zone but requires a conditional use permit (CUP). The County agrees that a CUP is required in order to approve the Facility. The Council determines the proposed Facility site was consistent with Benton County land use and zoning regulations at the time the application was filed. RCW 80.50.090(2). However, the Council has not yet determined whether the proposed Facility site meets the CUP criteria set out in Benton County’s zoning code, or whether it may require a variance from setback requirements. The Council will schedule an adjudicative proceeding to fully consider the Facility site’s suitability for a CUP and if so, whether the proposal qualifies for a setback variance under the local zoning code.

Nature of Proceeding. This matter involves an application for site certification (Application or ASC) filed on February 8, 2021, by Scout Clean Energy (the Applicant) to construct and operate Horse Heaven Wind Farm (the Facility), a renewable energy generation facility including wind and solar energy generation with battery energy storage systems and supporting facilities. The Facility would be located in the Horse Heaven Hills area of unincorporated Benton County, Washington, approximately 4 miles south/southwest of the city of Kennewick and the larger Tri-Cities urban area, along the Columbia River (the Site). The Applicant estimates that the Facility would generate up to 1,150 megawatts (MW).
Land Use Consistency Hearing. RCW 80.50.090(2) requires EFSEC to “conduct a public hearing to determine whether or not a proposed site is consistent and in compliance with city, county, or regional land use plans or zoning ordinances.” On March 9, 2021, EFSEC issued a Notice of Informational Public Hearing and Land Use Consistency Hearing and scheduled a virtual hearing by Skype or by telephone participation for 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 30, 2021.¹

On March 30, 2021, the Council conducted a virtual land use consistency hearing to hear testimony regarding whether the Facility was consistent and in compliance with Benton County’s local land use provisions. The following EFSEC members were present at the March 30, 2021, hearing: Robert Dengel (Department of Ecology), Kate Kelly (Department of Commerce), Mike Livingston (Department of Fish and Wildlife), Leonard “Lenny” Young (Department of Natural Resources), Derek Sandison (Department of Agriculture), Stacey Brewster (Utilities and Transportation Commission), and Ed Brost (Benton County). Kathleen Drew, EFSEC Chair, presided over the hearing.

Assistant Attorney General Bill Sherman, Counsel for the Environment, was present for the land use consistency hearing.

Timothy McMahan, Stoel Rives Law Firm, represented the Applicant and spoke on the Applicant’s behalf. Ryan Brown, Benton County Deputy Prosecutor, represented the County and spoke on the County’s behalf. The Council allowed for but did not receive any testimony from members of the public.

Applicant’s Description of Proposed Facility. The proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm is a renewable energy generation facility designed to generate a maximum of 1,150 MW utilizing wind turbines and solar photovoltaic panels to convert energy from the wind and sun into electric power. This power would then be either directly transferred to the electric power grid or stored on up to three battery energy storage systems (BESS) on the Site. The Facility would be located in the Horse Heaven

¹ The Council sent this Notice to all interested persons on the mailing list for the Facility including landowners within one mile and to all subscribers to EFSEC’s general minutes and agenda list. Further, the Council posted this Notice in English and Spanish on its public website, distributed the Notice to local libraries, and purchased advertisement in the Tri-City Herald and the Corvallis Gazette Times, the local daily newspapers of general circulation.
Hills area of unincorporated Benton County, Washington, approximately 4 miles south/southwest of the city of Kennewick and the larger Tri-Cities urban area, along the Columbia River.

According to the Application, the Facility would be located entirely within the county’s Growth Management Act Agricultural (GMA AG) land use designation and entirely within the county’s corresponding Growth Management Act Agriculture District (GMAAD). Application for Site Certification, Sections 2.1.3 and 2.23.3.

The ASC seeks authorization for up to 244 wind turbine locations and three distinct solar arrays with BESS to be located on a maximum footprint of 6,869 acres of leased agricultural land, a figure representing 1.1 percent of County agricultural lands. Scout has executed leases covering all potentially affected parcels within the project lease boundary, a total area encompassing approximately 72,428 acres. Much of this land is privately owned and actively managed for dryland agriculture (primarily wheat farming) and livestock grazing; some parcels are managed by the Department of Natural Resources. Application for Site Certification, Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.23, 3.1.2, 4.2.1, and 4.2.6.2; Tables 2.1-1, 2.3-1, and 4.2.6-4; Figures 2.1-1 and 2.1-2.

The Applicant contends the proposed Site is consistent and in compliance with Benton County’s land use plans and zoning ordinances because the Facility is allowable as a conditional use in the GMAAD. The Applicant emphasizes that after construction and during operation of the Facility, existing agricultural land uses will continue on over 90 percent of the acreage within the project lease boundary. Scout also provided its analysis of how the Facility would meet the County’s criteria for a conditional use permit (CUP).

**Benton County’s Position.** Benton County contends that the Site proposed for the Facility is not consistent with its Comprehensive Plan’s Agricultural zone because it would not preserve and protect prime agricultural land. The County stresses that eliminating over 1 percent of its prime agricultural land from actual or potential agricultural production is significant. Even so, the County concedes that the Facility might be allowed as a conditional use in the GMAAD, but only after an evidentiary hearing or adjudication. The County also objected to the Facility’s proposed layout for security fencing around the solar arrays to span parcels, making compliance with

---

2 The list of landowners within the project lease boundary is set out in Appendix F to the ASC.
existing setback provisions impossible.

**DISCUSSION**

**I. Land Use Consistency Determination**

11 The purpose of the land use hearing is “to determine whether at the time of application the proposed facility was consistent and in compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances.” In this order, the Council will refer to land use plans and zoning ordinances collectively as “land use provisions” and will refer to its decision as pertaining to “land use consistency.”

12 The Council’s evaluation of land use consistency is not dispositive of the Application and a determination of land use consistency is neither an endorsement nor an approval of the Facility. The evaluation pertains only to the general siting of categories of uses, taking into account only the Site and not the Facility’s construction and operational conditions.

13 Whether a particular project will actually create on- or off-site impacts (including impacts to the environment) is considered separately through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process, during the Council’s adjudication, through the environmental permitting processes (if applicable), and through other Council processes (if applicable). The Council’s ultimate recommendation to the Governor will be made after full and thorough consideration of all relevant issues.

14 The Applicant did not obtain certificates from local Benton County authorities attesting to land use consistency. Therefore, the Applicant retains the burden of proving the Site is indeed consistent and compliant with the local jurisdiction’s land use provisions.

---

3 WAC 463-26-050.

4 In re Whistling Ridge Energy Project, Council Order No. 868 at 9 (October 6, 2011) (Whistling Ridge Order). A determination of land use inconsistency simply results in the Council’s further consideration of whether local land use provisions should be preempted. WAC 463-28-060(1), see also RCW 80.50.110(2) and WAC 463-28-020. If they are preempted, the Council will include in any proposed site certification agreement conditions designed to recognize the purpose of the preempted provisions. WAC 463-28-070.

5 RCW 80.50.090(3), RCW 80.50.040(9), (12), WAC 463-30, WAC 463-47, WAC 463-76, WAC 463-78.

6 WAC 463-26-090. In cases where such certificates are obtained, they are regarded as *prima facie* proof of consistency and compliance with local land use plans and zoning ordinances absent contrary demonstration by anyone present at the hearing.
Definitions of “Land Use Plan” and “Zoning Ordinances”. The term “land use plan” is defined by statute as a “comprehensive plan or land use element thereof adopted … pursuant to” one of the listed planning statutes. EFSEC interprets this definition as referring to the portions of a comprehensive plan that outline proposals for an area’s development, typically by assigning general uses (such as housing) to land segments and specifying desired concentrations and design goals. Comprehensive plan elements and provisions that do not meet this definition are outside of the scope of the Council’s present land use consistency analysis. The term “zoning ordinance” is defined by statute as an ordinance “regulating the use of land and adopted pursuant to” one of the listed planning statutes. EFSEC has interpreted this definition as referring to those ordinances that regulate land use by creating districts and restricting uses in the districts (i.e., number, size, location, type of structures, lot size) to promote compatible uses. Ordinances that do not meet this definition are outside of the scope of the Council’s present land use consistency analysis.

EFSEC has defined the phrase “consistent and in compliance” based on settled principles of land use law: “Zoning ordinances require compliance; they are regulatory provisions that mandate performance. Comprehensive plan provisions, however, are guides rather than mandates and seek consistency.”

The County’s Comprehensive Plan. The portions of the Benton County Comprehensive Plan that meet the statutory definition are within Chapter 3 (Land Use Element), Chapter 4 (Natural Resource Land Elements), Chapter 5 (Economics Element), Chapter 8 (Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Historic Preservation Element), and Chapter 10 (Utilities Element). Chapter 3 identifies the land use designations assigned in the Comprehensive Plan, along with corresponding zone classifications present in each land use designation. Lands designated for “Growth Management Act Agriculture” (GMA AG) are considered agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. Chapter 4 sets out policies to conserve GMA AG

7 RCW 80.50.020(14).
8 In re Northern Tier Pipeline, Council Order No. 579 (Northern Tier Pipeline Order) at 9 (November 26, 1979).
9 RCW 80.50.020(22).
10 Whistling Ridge Order at 10 n 15.
areas “for a broad range of agricultural uses to the maximum extent possible and protect these areas from the encroachment of incompatible uses,” but also to “recognize that only uses related or ancillary to, supportive of, complimentary to, and/or not in conflict with agricultural activities are appropriate in areas designated GMA Agriculture.”

18 The County’s Zoning Ordinances. The portions of the County’s zoning ordinances that meet the statutory definition are the County’s zoning map, Title 11 of the Benton County Code (Zoning), specifically BCC 11.17 GMAAD, and associated definitions. The entirety of the Facility is zoned Growth Management Act Agriculture District (GMAAD). BCC 11.17.010 describes the purpose of the GMAAD as “protection of agricultural lands of long term commercial significance” in the district “by limiting non-agricultural uses to those compatible with agriculture and by establishing minimum lot sizes in areas where soils, water, and climate are suitable for agricultural purposes.” In addition to farming, the following uses are among those allowed by BCC 11.17.040 in the GMAAD: single family dwellings, adult family homes, wineries/breweries/distilleries, airstrips (personal), schools and churches, kennels (commercial and private), single wind turbines less than sixty feet in height, and meteorological towers.

19 Under the Benton County Code, the Facility would meet the definitions of a “Solar Power Energy Facility, Major”11 and of a “Wind Turbine Farm.”12 Both of these uses may be permitted as a “conditional use” in Benton County’s GMAAD zoning district after notice and public hearing if they satisfy the conditional use criteria.13

20 Under Benton County Code Section 11.50.040(d), a conditional use is permitted when it:

(a) Is compatible with other uses in the surrounding area or is no more incompatible than are any other outright permitted uses in the applicable zoning district;

(b) Will not materially endanger the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community to an extent greater than that associated with any other permitted uses in the applicable zoning district;

11 BCC 11.03.010(167).
12 BCC 11.03.010(190) and (191).
13 BCC 11.17.070(t) and (cc).
(c) Would not cause the pedestrian and vehicular traffic associated with the use to conflict with existing and anticipated traffic in the neighborhood to an extent greater than that associated with any other permitted uses in the applicable zoning district;

(d) Will be supported by adequate service facilities and would not adversely affect public services to the surrounding area; and

(e) Would not hinder or discourage the development of permitted uses on neighboring properties in the applicable zoning district as a result of the location, size or height of the buildings, structures, walls, or required fences or screening vegetation to a greater extent than other permitted uses in the applicable zoning district.

21 The Test for Consistency and Compliance. Under the test for land use consistency previously established by the Council, EFSEC considers whether the pertinent local land use provisions “prohibit” the site “expressly or by operation clearly, convincingly and unequivocally.” If a site can be permitted either outright or conditionally, it is consistent and in compliance with the local land use provisions.14

22 Applying the facts to the test established, we conclude the Site is consistent with the pertinent portions of the land use provisions because neither the pertinent portions of the Plan nor the pertinent portions of the zoning ordinances clearly, convincingly, and unequivocally prohibit the Facility. The Plan does not provide guidance on the siting of renewable energy facilities. The zoning ordinances specifically allow the proposed use to be authorized in the GMAAD zone as a conditional use. We note that the County previously permitted the Nine Canyon Wind Project (25 turbines) in this zoning district. Therefore, we conclude the pertinent land use provisions do not clearly, convincingly or unequivocally prohibit the Facility. Under the established precedent for a minimal threshold for determining land use consistency, the Facility is consistent and in compliance with Benton County’s land use provisions.

23 The Council’s land use consistency determination does not prejudge whether the Facility has met or can meet Benton County’s conditional use criteria. Additionally, the Council’s land use consistency determination also does not address the question raised by the County regarding specific parcel setback requirements for solar arrays.

These are questions for later EFSEC proceedings, after which EFSEC may recommend and impose conditions of approval to address Benton County’s CUP and variance criteria in a Site Certification Agreement (SCA).

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

24 (1) On February 8, 2021, Scout Clean Energy submitted an application for site certification to construct and operate Horse Heaven Wind Farm (the Facility), a renewable energy generation facility, including wind and solar energy generation with battery energy storage systems and supporting facilities to be located in Benton County, Washington.

25 (2) On March 30, 2021, the Council convened a virtual land use consistency hearing, pursuant to due and proper notice. The Council received presentations from the Applicant’s attorney and the County’s attorney. No testimony was presented.

26 (3) The Site is located in unincorporated Benton County, Washington. The Site is located entirely within the Growth Management Act Agricultural (GMA AG) land use designation and entirely within the county’s corresponding Growth Management Act Agriculture District (GMAAD).

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

27 (1) The Council has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and the parties to it pursuant to RCW 80.50.090 and WAC chapter 463-26.

28 (2) The Council provided adequate notice to interested parties, and the Council has adequate information to render a land use consistency decision.

29 (3) Under the Benton County Code, the Facility meets the definitions of a “solar power generation facility, major” and a “wind turbine farm.”

30 (4) The Facility Site is on land zoned GMAAD, an area of Benton County primarily dedicated for agricultural uses. However, major solar power generation facilities and wind turbine farms are conditionally permitted in the GMAAD.

15 Id., ¶ 36.

16 See BCC 11.50.030.
(5) A site is consistent and in compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances if it is permitted absolutely or conditionally. To be inconsistent and noncompliant, the plan or ordinances must expressly, or by operation, clearly convincingly, and unequivocally prohibit the facility site.

(7) The Applicant has met its burden of proof of demonstrating that the site is consistent and in compliance with Benton County’s Comprehensive Plan and applicable zoning ordinances in effect as of the date of the application as required by RCW 80.50.090(2).

(8) The matter will be scheduled for an adjudication to consider whether the Council should recommend approval of the Application and, if so, to determine specific conditions to include in a draft site certification agreement that address the County’s criteria for issuance of a conditional use permit.

ORDER

THE COUNCIL ORDERS:

(1) Scout Clean Energy’s application is consistent and in compliance with local land use plans and zoning regulations.

(2) Scout Clean Energy’s application would require a conditional use permit under local zoning regulations.

(3) The matter shall be set for an adjudication to consider any conditions which might be required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Facility in the GMAAD, consistent with Benton County’s conditional use criteria in effect at the time the application for site certification was filed with EFSEC. The adjudication may be held concurrent with, or separate from the adjudication related to the application for site certification under RCW 80.50.090(3).

DATED at Olympia, Washington, and effective [insert date].

WASHINGTON STATE ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

KATHLEEN DREW, Chair
Goose Prairie Solar Project
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[Place holder]
Badger Mountain Solar Energy Project
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Whistling Ridge Energy Project
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[Place holder]
October 25, 2018

Kathleen Drew, Chair
Washington Energy Facility Siting Council
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.
PO box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Dear Chair Drew and Councilmembers:

I am the President of SDS Lumber Company and Whistling Ridge Energy LLC, the owner of the Whistling Ridge Energy Project (“Whistling Ridge” or “Project”). I am submitting a status report for the Whistling Ridge project, in accordance with RCW 463-68-060. Attached to this report is a “Project History” timeline that helps in understanding the status of this Project.

The “Effective Date” of the Site Certificate Agreement (“SCA”) is November 18, 2013 -- the date when I executed the SCA (after conclusion of the Supreme Court appeal). Further opposition litigation followed the execution of the SCA, with 9th Circuit Court of Appeals challenges fully exhausted in July of this year. Due to the uncertainties associated with these appeals, thus far it has not been possible to move the Project forward.

We provide the following information, pursuant to RCW 463-68-060.

WAC 463-68-060

Review and reporting changes in the project status or site conditions.

(1) The nature and degree of any changes to the following since the effective date of the site certification agreement:

(a) Project design;
(b) Statements and information in the application;
(c) Statements and information in project-related environmental documents;

and

(d) Project-related environmental conditions.

(2) Whether any new information or changed conditions indicate the existence of probable significant adverse environmental impacts that were not covered in any project-related environmental documents, including, but not limited to, those prepared under chapter 43.21C RCW.
(3) Suggested changes, modification, or amendments to the site certification agreement and/or any regulatory permits.

RESPONSE:

Section 1: At this time, the Project is not proposing any changes as described in Section 1 of the statute.

Section 2: There is no new information or changed conditions known at this time that might indicate the existence of any probable significant adverse environmental impacts not previously addressed in the EFSEC FEIS.

Section 3: Finally, at this time, Whistling Ridge is not proposing any changes, modifications or amendments to the Site Certificate Agreement of any regulatory permits. It is possible that such changes will be proposed in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation. We will appreciate the opportunity to address any questions.

Jason S. Spadaro
President
SDS Lumber Company
Whistling Ridge Energy Project History

3/10/09 Application for Site Certification filed; history of adjudication can be found on EFSEC’s Project web page.

1/5/12 EFSEC’s Site Certificate Agreement and Recommendation submitted to Governor Gregoire.

3/5/12 Governor Gregoire approves the Final Order and signs the Site Certificate Agreement.

8/20/13 After appeal by project opponents, the Washington Supreme Court issues a unanimous decision denying appeal.

11/18/13 Jason Spadaro, Whistling Ridge Energy, signs the Site Certificate Agreement (“Effective Date” of Site Certificate Agreement)

2013-15 During this period, BPA worked on the FEIS and its Supplement to the FEIS, addressing further comments submitted post-FEIS by project opponents.

9/9/15 Project opponents file an appeal with the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, challenging BPA’s NEPA FEIS, supporting BPA’s decision to grant the Whistling Ridge Energy Project an interconnection to the Federal Columbia River Transmission System.

3/27/18 The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals issues a Memorandum Decision denying the appeal.

7/11/18 Following a petition by project opponents for a rehearing (en banc), the full US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals denied rehearing. This denial concluded all opposition litigation.
BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of the Application No. 2009-01:
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY LLC:
WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT

WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY LLC’S REQUEST TO EXTEND TERM OF SITE CERTIFICATE AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO WAC 463-68-080

A. Introduction

The Applicant, Whistling Ridge Energy, LLC (Whistling Ridge or Applicant), requests that the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC or “Council”) grant a three-year extension to the term of the Site Certification Agreement (effective November 18, 2013)\(^1\) to November 2025. This request is based on the Council’s discretionary authority to grant an extension pursuant to WAC 463-68-080(3).

If the Council grants this request, the Applicant will first fully review the financial and environmental feasibility of constructing the facility prior to commencing any studies. Only then would the Applicant move forward with studies, some of which are specific to certain times of the year.

As discussed below, EFSEC’s rules and the terms of Site Certificate Agreement (SCA) approved by EFSEC set permissive timeframes for the commencement of construction. Whistling Ridge believes that the intent behind the permissive “shelf life” of SCAs acknowledges that EFSEC jurisdictional projects which typically fulfill important statewide policy objectives often face multi-year litigation aimed at delaying applications and undermining the commercial viability of projects through costs and delays. As is the case here, once a Site Certification Application has undergone often multi-year evaluation and scrutiny, including extensive review through Washington’s State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA, RCW 43.21C), such appeals are rarely successful, but they exact a significant cost for the Applicant. Here, litigation filed by project opponents commenced with a failed appeal before the Washington Supreme Court, followed by failed litigation and appeals before the Ninth Circuit Court of appeals. The appeals were concluded in July 2018.

\(^1\) WAC 463-64-040(3) provides that the certification agreement “shall be binding upon execution by the governor and the applicant.” [Emphasis added].
B. **Whistling Ridge Project History and Timeline**

3/10/09 Application for Site Certification filed; history of adjudication can be found on EFSEC’s Project web page.

1/5/12 EFSEC’s Site Certificate Agreement and Recommendation submitted to Governor Gregoire.

3/5/12 Governor Gregoire approves the Final Order and signs the Site Certificate Agreement.

8/20/13 After appeal by project opponents, the Washington Supreme Court issues a unanimous decision denying appeal.

11/18/13 Jason Spadaro, Whistling Ridge Energy, signs the Site Certificate Agreement (“Effective Date” of Site Certificate Agreement)

2013-15 During this period, BPA worked on the FEIS and its Supplement to the FEIS, addressing further comments submitted post-FEIS by project opponents.

9/9/15 Project opponents file an appeal with the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, challenging BPA’s NEPA FEIS, supporting BPA’s decision to grant the Whistling Ridge Energy Project an interconnection to the Federal Columbia River Transmission System.

3/27/18 The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals issues a Memorandum Decision denying the appeal.

7/11/18 Following a petition by project opponents for a rehearing (*en banc*), the full US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals denied rehearing. This denial concluded all opposition litigation.

10/25/18 Whistling Ridge files and presents its “Five Year Report” to EFSEC (WAC 463-68-060), confirming the following:

*Section 1:* At this time, the Project is not proposing any changes as described in Section 1 of the statute.

*Section 2:* There is no new information or changed conditions known at this time that might indicate the existence of any probable significant adverse environmental impacts not previously addressed in the EFSEC FEIS.

*Section 3:* Finally, at this time, Whistling Ridge is not proposing any changes, modifications or amendments to the Site Certificate Agreement of any regulatory permits. It is possible that such changes will be proposed in the future.

2018 – 2021 SDS Lumber Co. (parent company to Whistling Ridge Energy LLC) undergoes protracted internal discussions among the owners, ultimately resulting in the
decision to sell SDS Lumber Co. and related entities. A sale process was begun in 2021 and in November of 2021 all company assets were sold to multiple buyers. COVID complicates efforts to proceed with Whistling Ridge Energy construction.

2021 - 2022 Twin Creeks Timber, LLC (TCT) acquired a substantial portion of the SDS timberland assets, including Whistling Ridge Energy LLC and the property on which the project would be built, in November of 2021. The assets of TCT are managed by Green Diamond Management Company, a Washington corporation and subsidiary of Green Diamond Resource Company, a fifth-generation timberland owner in the State of Washington.

C. Effective Date of Site Certificate

Whistling Ridge executed the SCA only after completion of the Supreme Court appeal, where the Court issued a unanimous decision denying the appeal. Whistling Ridge believed that it would be unjust for the Project to lose any time established in the SCA on account of what proved to be a failed appeal filed to stop the project. *Friends of Columbia Gorge, Inc. v. State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council*, 178 Wn.2d 320, 310 P.3d 780 (2013). RCW 80.50.100 confirms that the SCA is binding upon execution of both the Governor and the Applicant:

**RCW 80.50.100 Recommendations to governor—Expedited processing—Approval or rejection of certification—Reconsideration.**

* * *

(3)(a) Within sixty days of receipt of the council's report the governor shall take one of the following actions:

(i) Approve the application and execute the draft certification agreement; or
(ii) Reject the application; or
(iii) Direct the council to reconsider certain aspects of the draft certification agreement.

(b) The council shall reconsider such aspects of the draft certification agreement by reviewing the existing record of the application or, as necessary, by reopening the adjudicative proceeding for the purposes of receiving additional evidence. Such reconsideration shall be conducted expeditiously. The council shall resubmit the draft certification to the governor incorporating any amendments deemed necessary upon reconsideration. Within sixty days of receipt of such draft certification agreement, the governor shall either approve the application and execute the certification agreement or reject the application. The certification agreement shall be binding upon execution *by the governor and the applicant.* * * *

Whistling Ridge chose to defer executing the Site Certificate Agreement until the Supreme Court appeal was resolved. The “effective date” of the Site Certification Agreement occurred at the time the two parties (the Governor and the Applicant) had executed the Site
Certificate Agreement. The “term” for start of construction commences within ten years of the “effective date” of the Site Certificate Agreement:

**WAC 463-68-030 Term for start of construction.** Subject to conditions in the site certification agreement and this chapter, construction may start any time within ten years of the effective date of the site certification agreement.

Furthermore, the Site Certificate Agreement allows construction deadlines to be extended to such time as when “all final state and federal permits necessary to construct an operate the Project are obtained and associated appeals have been exhausted:

**Site Certification Agreement, Article I.B:** “This Site Certification agreement authorizes the Certificate Holder to construct the Project such that Substantial Completion is achieved no later than ten (10) years from the date that all final state and federal permits necessary to construct and operation the Project are obtained and associated appeals have been exhausted.” (Page 8 of 42).

As noted in the Project History summary above, opposition appeals to the Bonneville Power Administration interconnection and related NEPA process were not concluded until July 2018. In summary, it was not until 2018 that appeals of all state and federal permits were “exhausted.”

The essential reason for this latitude for construction is that no project facing fierce, multi-year litigation can secure financing or otherwise proceed if pending appeals jeopardize construction. No prudent developer proceeds with construction and operation of an energy facility during litigation, where there is a risk of an appeal outcome that would require the dismantling of an operating facility and cause monumental contract breaches and power disruptions. In fact, it is unlikely that any utility or private purchaser of energy resources would even consider commitments to purchase a facility or power from an energy facility facing staunch appeal risks. It is that fundamental risk that stops projects during appeals, including appeals that have little or no merit.

D. Request to Extend Term of Site Certificate Agreement; Authority and Process

Whistling Ridge requests that the Council extend the term of the Site Certificate for a reasonable period (three years) to undertake due diligence work for the facility, and to update essential natural resource and other studies. WAC 463-68-080 confers discretion for the Council to grant this request. Whistling Ridge understands that the Council would need to conduct review of this request as an amendment to the Site Certificate Agreement, including one or more “public hearing sessions.” In seeking this request, the Applicant will utilize this time to consider commercial viability and to update environmental information and engage with stakeholders. The extension and amendment process are subject to the following Council Rules:
WAC 463-68-080 Site certification agreement expiration.

(1) If the certificate holder does not start or restart construction within ten years of the effective date of the site certification agreement, or has canceled the project, the site certification agreement shall expire.

(2) If commercial operations have not commenced within ten years of the effective date of the site certification agreement, the site certification agreement expires unless the certificate holder requests, and the council approves, an extension of the term of the site certification agreement.

(3) Upon a request to extend the term of the site certification agreement, the council may conduct a review consistent with the requirements of WAC 463-68-060 and 463-68-070, and other applicable legal requirements.

WAC 463-66-030 Request for amendment.

A request for amendment of a site certification agreement shall be made in writing by a certificate holder to the council. The council will consider the request and determine a schedule for action at the next feasible council meeting. The council may, if appropriate and required for full understanding and review of the proposal, secure the assistance of a consultant or take other action at the expense of the certificate holder. The council shall hold one or more public hearing sessions upon the request for amendment at times and places determined by the council.

WAC 463-66-040 Amendment review.

In reviewing any proposed amendment, the council shall consider whether the proposal is consistent with:

(1) The intention of the original SCA;
(2) Applicable laws and rules;
(3) The public health, safety, and welfare; and
(4) The provisions of chapter 463-72 WAC. [Concerns site restoration]

E. Matters to be Addressed in the Amendment to the ASC

The extension will allow Whistling Ridge Energy, through its new owner TCT, to review and if feasible to propose the installation of fewer but taller wind turbine generators and associated facilities within the designated and approved micrositing corridors. Additionally, Attachment A outlines what the Applicant considers to be related and necessary actions, including studies and reports needed to complete the amendment request. The Applicant would confer with EFSEC staff to ensure that all necessary information is developed. Most importantly, Whistling Ridge proposes to update natural resource studies including season-specific data (e.g. avian nesting surveys) and new visual simulations from key viewing areas (KVAs) within the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area. Commencing these studies, including consultation with WDFW, local Tribes, and other agencies concerning sufficiency of information needed for updated wildlife and other surveys, will be essential.
## Attachment A

**Likely (Tentative) Permitting Tasks and Actions Anticipated to Amend WREP Site Certificate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Likely Timing <em>(tbd)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact wildlife consultants; develop scopes of work; identify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seasonally imperative work and schedule same:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avian baseline updates (including passerines and bats)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bald and Golden Eagle and other raptor nest surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northern Spotted Owl survey update for confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sensitive plants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual simulation updates; develop scope of work for modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTGs and locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated noise analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop schedule to complete all study work needed for Site Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Application and SEPA action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency meetings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ODFW -- Confirm wildlife update work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EFSEC staff -- Discuss timing, cost, needs, process; outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendment process, including SEPA process. Discuss and confirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation parcel or alternative mitigation approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USFWS -- BGEPA; NSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DNR — Consultation as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with Tribal governments and representatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA contacts and confirmations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete all studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft ASC Amendment; filing timing discussion with EFSEC,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including evaluation of expected hearing proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File amendment (public process begins).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete all work on mitigation parcel, including agency (WDFW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concurrence; identify and address any other mitigation plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 16, 2022

Ms. Sonia Bumpus
Siting Manager
Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
621 Woodland Square Loop SE
PO Box 43172
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Ms. Bumpus:

Green Diamond Management Company is the manager and authorized representative for Twin Creeks Timber, LLC (TCT), the new owner of Whistling Ridge Energy LLC (Whistling Ridge). TCT acquired Whistling Ridge as part of a larger acquisition in November of 2021.

As you know, on March 2, 2022, Whistling Ridge filed with the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (Council) a request to extend the Whistling Ridge Energy Project (Project) Site Certificate Agreement (SCA) for a period of three years.

This is the first of two filings. The second will be a request to amend the SCA to account for the change in ownership of Whistling Ridge from the prior owner to TCT. We anticipate filing a request for transfer in the next several weeks, and we anticipate seeking the Council’s review of both the SCA extension request and the transfer request in a single process. We will work with Council staff on the most convenient date to initiate these processes. We ask that the Council not take action on either request until we are prepared to move forward on both.

Very truly yours,

Greg Corbin
Senior Special Counsel
High Top and Ostrea Solar Project

May 2022 project update

[Place holder]
Wautoma Solar Energy Project

May 17, 2022
AGENDA
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- Siting Considerations / Preliminary Layout
- Permitting and Studies
- Benefits
- Schedule
INNERGEX - A SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODEL

It all starts with a shared vision. Integrating sustainable development into our strategic planning, decision-making process, and daily activities has always been part of our Corporate Culture.

People
We are a team of passionate individuals who build strong, long-term partnerships with local communities.

Planet
We believe that renewable energy is part of the solution to reducing the impacts of climate change.

Prosperity
We generate value for our employees, our shareholders, our partners and host communities.
INNERGEX RENEWABLE ENERGY - A GLOBAL LEADER

480 employees

80 facilities in operation

CHILE
Gross 323 MW
Net 304 MW

CANADA
Gross 1,954 MW
Net 1,454 MW

UNITED STATES
Gross 1,251 MW
Net 1,168 MW

FRANCE
Gross 324 MW
Net 226 MW

1,083,528 households supplied with clean, renewable energy in 2021
WAUTOMA SOLAR ENERGY PROJECT

- NW Benton County
- Target of 400MW solar + storage
- 875 GWh; enough to power approx. 70,000 WA households
SITING CONSIDERATIONS
PERMITTING AND STUDIES

- Plant and Wildlife Habitat Surveys
- Delineation of Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.
- Cultural and Archaeological Resources Survey
- Visual Impact Assessment
- Geotechnical & Hydrology Studies
- Glint & Glare Analysis
- Acoustic Assessment
- Traffic and Transportation Analysis
AVOIDING, MINIMIZING, AND MITIGATING IMPACTS

- Traffic Control Plan
- Vegetation Management Plan
- Habitat Mitigation Plan
- Emergency Response / Fire Response Plan
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
- Spill Prevention and Response Plan
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
- Decommissioning Plan
STAKEHOLDERS

- Agencies (EFSEC, WDFW, Ecology, DAHP)
- Tribal Governments
  - Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
  - Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon
  - Samish Indian Nation
  - Wanapum Tribe
  - Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
  - Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Benton County
- Participating Landowners
- Adjacent Landowners
- General Public
JOBS AND SERVICES
PROJECT BENEFITS

Local Tax Revenue
Partnership Agreements
Infrastructure investments
Community investment

Part of being a good neighbor means supporting the causes and efforts that have a broader impact in communities.
## PROJECT STATUS AND ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2020</td>
<td>Participating Landowner Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2021</td>
<td>Commencement of Environmental &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2022</td>
<td>Community Meetings Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2022</td>
<td>Application for Site Certification Submitted to EFSEC (followed by Public Meeting and Land Use Consistency Hearing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2023</td>
<td>Large Generation Interconnection Agreement with BPA (Anticipated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2023</td>
<td>Site Certification Agreement Issuance (Anticipated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2024</td>
<td>Construction Start (Earliest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2025</td>
<td>Phase 1 Commercial Operation Date (Earliest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IS ONGOING THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PROCESS**
Thank you!

Reach us at:

loneill@innergex.com
wautomasolar@innergex.com

Website: www.wautomasolar.com