



ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions
Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

Transcript of Proceedings

January 31, 2024

WA State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council v.

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lef, mdb
accessed via *paperclip* icon



WASHINGTON STATE

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

MONTHLY MEETING

January 31, 2024

Lacey, Washington

Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR

1 APPEARANCES

2
3 STATE AGENCY MEMBERS:

4 Kathleen Drew, Chair

5 Elizabeth Osborne, Department of Commerce (*)

6 Eli Levitt, Department of Ecology (*)

7 Mike Livingston, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (*)

8 Lenny Young, Department of Natural Resources (*)

9 Stacey Brewster,
10 Utilities & Transportation Commission (*)

11 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OPTIONAL STATE AGENCIES:

12 Horse Heaven:

13 Ed Brost, Benton County (*)

14 Badger Mountain:

15 Jordyn Guilio, Douglas County (*)

16 Wautoma Solar:

17 Paul Gonseth, WA Dept. of Transportation (*)

18 Hop Hill Solar:

19 Paul Krupin, Benton County (*)

20 Carriger Solar:

21 Matt Chiles, Klickitat County (*)

22 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:

23 Jon Thompson (*)

24 Zack Packer (*)

25

1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)

2
3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

4 Adam Torem (*)

5
6 COUNCIL STAFF:

7 Sonia Bumpus (*)

John Barnes (*)

8 Ami Hafkemeyer (*)

Joanne Snarski (*)

9 Amy Moon (*)

Alex Shiley (*)

10 Stew Henderson (*)

Ali Smith (*)

11 Joan Owens (*)

Karl Holappa

12 Andrea Grantham

Zia Ahmed (*)

13 Dave Walker (*)

Maria Belkina (*)

14 Sonja Skavland (*)

Lisa McLean (*)

15 Sean Greene (*)

Adrienne Barker (*)

16 Lance Caputo (*)

17
18 OPERATIONAL UPDATES:

19 Eric Melbardis (*)

Kittitas Valley Wind, EDP Renewables

20 Jennifer Galbraith (*)

Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Puget Sound Energy

21 Jeremy Smith (*)

Chehalis Generation Facility, PacifiCorp

22 Amy Moon (*)

23 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4, Energy
24 Northwest
25

1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)

2
3 OPERATIONAL UPDATES (Continuing):

4 Thomas Cushing (*)
Columbia Solar, Tuusso Energy

5
6 Jacob Crist (*)
Goose Prairie Solar, Brookfield Renewable

7
8 COUNSEL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:

9 Sarah Reyneveld (*)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 (*) indicates remote attendee

MEETING INDEX	
EVENT:	PAGE NO.
Call to order	7
Roll call	7
Proposed agenda	12
Minutes	
11/29/2023 Horse Heaven Special Meeting	12
12/20/2023 Monthly Council Meeting	13
Projects	
Kittitas Valley Wind Project	14
Wild Horse Wind Power Project	16
Chehalis Generation Facility	17
Grays Harbor Energy Center	17
Columbia Solar	17
Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4	17
Goose Prairie Solar	18
High Top and Ostrea	19
Whistling Ridge	19
Badger Mountain	19
Wautoma Solar	20
Hop Hill Solar	21
Carriger Solar	22
Horse Heaven Wind Farm	23
Cascade Renewable Transmission	104
Third-quarter cost allocation	107

MEETING INDEX (Continuing)

EVENT :	PAGE NO.
Employee updates	
New-employee introduction of Lisa McLean	108
New-employee introduction of Zia Ahmed	109
New-employee introduction of Maria Belkina	110
New-employee introduction of Adrienne Barker	111
Adjournment	112

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday,
2 January 31, 2024, at 621 Woodland Square Loop
3 Southeast, Lacey, Washington, at 3:00 p.m., the
4 following Monthly Meeting of the Washington State
5 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was held, to
6 wit:

7
8 <<<<<< >>>>>>

9
10 CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This
11 is Kathleen Drew, Chair of the Energy Facility Site
12 Evaluation Council, calling our January meeting to
13 order.

14 Ms. Grantham, will you call the roll.

15 MS. GRANTHAM: Certainly.

16 Department of Commerce.

17 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,
18 present.

19 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of
20 Ecology.

21 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt, present.

22 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Fish
23 and Wildlife.

24 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston,
25 present.

1 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Natural
2 Resources.

3 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

4 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities and
5 Transportation Commission.

6 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster,
7 present.

8 MS. GRANTHAM: For local government
9 and optional State agencies:

10 For the Horse Heaven project: For Benton County,
11 Ed Brost.

12 For the Badger Mountain project: For Douglas
13 County, Jordyn Guilio.

14 MS. GUILIO: Present.

15 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Wautoma Solar
16 Project: For Benton County, Dave Sharp.

17 The Washington State Department of Transportation,
18 Paul Gonseth.

19 MR. GONSETH: Paul Gonseth, present.

20 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Hop Hill
21 Solar Project: For Benton County, Paul Krupin.

22 MR. KRUPIN: Paul Krupin, present.

23 MS. GRANTHAM: For the Carriger
24 Solar project: For Klickitat County, Matt Chiles.

25 Assistant attorney generals: Jon Thompson.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Present.
2 MS. GRANTHAM: Jenna Slocum.
3 Zack Packer.
4 MR. PACKER: Present.
5 MS. GRANTHAM: Administrative law
6 judges: Adam Torem.
7 Laura Bradley.
8 Dan Gerard.
9 And Joni Derifield.
10 For the Council staff: Sonia Bumpus.
11 MS. BUMPUS: Present.
12 MS. GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer.
13 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Present.
14 MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon.
15 MS. MOON: Amy Moon, present.
16 MS. GRANTHAM: Stew Henderson.
17 Joan Owens.
18 MS. OWENS: Present.
19 MS. GRANTHAM: Dave Walker.
20 MR. WALKER: Present.
21 MS. GRANTHAM: Sonja Skavland.
22 MS. SKAVLAND: Present.
23 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa Masengale.
24 Sara Randolph.
25 Sean Greene.

1 MR. GREENE: Present.

2 MS. GRANTHAM: Lance Caputo.

3 John Barnes.

4 MR. CAPUTO: Lance Caputo, present.

5 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you, Lance.

6 John Barnes.

7 MR. BARNES: Present.

8 MS. GRANTHAM: Joanne Snarski.

9 MS. SNARSKI: Present.

10 MS. GRANTHAM: Alex Shiley.

11 MS. SHILEY: Present.

12 MS. GRANTHAM: Ali Smith.

13 MS. SMITH: Ali Smith, present.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Karl Holappa.

15 MR. HOLAPPA: Karl Holappa, present.

16 MS. GRANTHAM: Audra Allen.

17 Zia Ahmed.

18 MR. AHMED: Present.

19 MS. GRANTHAM: Maria Belkina.

20 MS. BELKINA: "Belkina." Present.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa McLean.

22 MS. McLEAN: Present.

23 MS. GRANTHAM: Adrienne Barker.

24 MS. BARKER: Present.

25 MS. GRANTHAM: For operational

1 updates: For the Kittitas Valley wind project, Eric
2 Melbardis.

3 Wild Horse Wind Power Proj- -- oh.

4 MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis,
5 present.

6 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you,
7 Mr. Melbardis.

8 For the Wild Horse Wind Power Project.

9 MS. GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith,
10 present.

11 MS. GRANTHAM: Grays Harbor Energy
12 Center.

13 Chehalis Generation Facility.

14 MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.

15 MS. GRANTHAM: Columbia Generating
16 Station.

17 Columbia Solar.

18 MR. CUSHING: Thomas Cushing,
19 present.

20 MS. GRANTHAM: And the Goose Prairie
21 Solar.

22 MR. CRIST: Jacob Crist, present.

23 MS. GRANTHAM: And do we have anyone
24 present for the counsel for the environment?

25 MS. REYNEVELD: Yes. Sarah

1 Reyneveld, present. I'm also joined by Yuriy Korol, a
2 newly assigned counsel for the environment, who's also
3 present.

4 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you,
5 Ms. Reyneveld.

6 Chair, we have a quorum for all of the councils.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

9 On to our approving the meeting minutes.

10 First of all, let's approve the proposed agenda.
11 The proposed agenda is in front of you.

12 Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

13 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young --

14 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt --

15 MR. YOUNG: Go ahead, Eli.

16 MR. LEVITT: Motion to approve.

17 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. Second.

18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

19 All those in favor, please say "aye."

20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

21 CHAIR DREW: Those opposed?

22 The agenda is approved.

23 Moving on to the meeting minutes. For November
24 29th, 2023, meeting: The Horse Heaven special meeting
25 minutes.

1 Is there a motion to approve the special meeting
2 minutes?

3 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne. So
4 moved.

5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
6 Second?

7 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.
8 Second.

9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

10 The comments I have on those meeting minutes:

11 Page 30, Line 18: The word "iterate,"
12 i-t-e-r-a-t-e, should be "iterative," i-t-e-r-a-t-i-v-e.

13 Page 32, Line 13: "Tax," t-a-x, should be TACs,
14 capital T, capital A, capital C, s.

15 Those are the two corrections that I have. Are
16 there any other corrections?

17 Hearing none.

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

20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

21 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

22 The minutes are approved.

23 Moving on to our December 20th monthly Council
24 meeting minutes.

25 Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

1 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. So moved.

2 CHAIR DREW: Second?

3 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston.

4 Second.

5 CHAIR DREW: Okay. The comments I
6 have, the corrections I have for the December 20th
7 minutes are:

8 Page 12, Line 12: "Ms.," M-s, should be "Mr.,"
9 M-r.

10 Page 15, Line 6: So this one, strike from the
11 comma after "Archaeology" through "preservation," and
12 this should say "Archaeology and Historic
13 Preservation."

14 Page 48, Line 6, the word "let," l-e-t, should be
15 "less," l-e-s-s.

16 Are there any other corrections?

17 Hearing none.

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

20 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

22 We'll move now to the operational update.

23 Mr. Melbardis. Sorry. That would be Kittitas Valley
24 wind project.

25 MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon,

1 Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and staff. For the record,
2 this is Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables giving my
3 final report for the Kittitas Valley wind power
4 project.

5 Firstly, we have nothing nonroutine to report for
6 the period. However, I did e-mail EFSEC staff
7 earlier -- I think it was last week -- that I have
8 accepted a promotion, so there will be a management
9 change at Kittitas Valley after 14 years.

10 I've been here since we -- since we put the
11 turbines in the ground, and I will be moving on to an
12 area manager role for the company, where I will have --
13 be responsible for just over a couple of gigawatts of
14 solar in Nevada, California, and Arizona.

15 So I will -- was going to introduce the new
16 manager for Kittitas Valley, Jarred Caseday. However,
17 when -- when we rescheduled the meeting, he wasn't able
18 to make it today. So I will fill him in, and he will
19 be giving the -- the KV report next month.

20 That's all I have.

21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. My
22 microphone was not responding adequately. Thank you,
23 Eric. You have been a great partner, and we look
24 forward to working with you in another capacity. And
25 congratulations to you.

1 MR. MELBARDIS: Thank you.

2 CHAIR DREW: Wild Horse operat- --
3 wind power project. Ms. Galbraith.

4 MS. GALBRAITH: Yes. Thank you,
5 Chair Drew, Council members, and staff. This is
6 Jennifer Galbraith with Puget Sound Energy representing
7 the Wild Horse wind facility.

8 And for the month of December, I have a couple of
9 environmental compliance updates.

10 The Wild Horse Technical Advisory Committee met
11 via conference call on December 5th for the annual
12 meeting. This was an informational meeting only.
13 There were no items that required formal actions or
14 recommendations from the TAC for the Council's
15 consideration.

16 And then the second item. In accordance with the
17 site certification agreement, the Operation Spill
18 Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan was
19 updated and submitted to EFSEC staff on December 18th,
20 and there were only minor administrative updates to
21 that plan.

22 And that's all I have. Thank you.

23 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. And thank
24 you for including the minutes from the TAC meeting. I
25 appreciated reading them and keeping up with the good

1 work that you're doing.

2 MS. GALBRAITH: Great. Thank you.

3 CHAIR DREW: Chehalis Generation
4 Facility. Mr. Smith.

5 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair
6 Drew, Council members, and staff. This is Jeremy
7 Smith, the operations manager representing Chehalis
8 Generation Facility.

9 I have nothing nonroutine to note for the month of
10 December.

11 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

12 Grays Harbor Energy Center. Mr. Sherin.

13 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Chair Drew, if I
14 may chime in. This is Ami Hafkemeyer, for the record.

15 The update is provided by the facility in your
16 Council packets. There were no nonroutine items to
17 report.

18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

19 Columbia Solar. Mr. Cushing.

20 MR. CUSHING: Good afternoon, Chair
21 Drew, Council members, EFSEC staff. This is Thomas
22 Cushing speaking on behalf of Columbia Solar.

23 There are no nonroutine updates.

24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

25 Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1 and -4.

1 MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Chair
2 Drew. This is Amy Moon, EFSEC staff. Energy Northwest
3 asked if I could give the update.

4 There are no nonroutine items to report, as
5 demonstrated in the Council packet. Thank you.

6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

7 Goose Prairie Solar project update. Mr. Crist.

8 MR. CRIST: Good afternoon, Chair
9 Drew, EFSEC Council, and staff. This is Jacob Crist,
10 senior project manager, on behalf of Brookfield
11 Renewable.

12 So for construction updates: Starting with the
13 substation. So the construction is progressing. The
14 substation completion is expected in -- sometime in mid
15 to late March. Remaining equipment and material
16 deliveries are still being planned. Everything is
17 still on schedule here. Pre-drilling is complete, along
18 with our medium-voltage cable install. Pile-driving
19 perimeter fence continue along with the racking and
20 module install.

21 So the last two weeks' work's been slowed pretty
22 significantly with weather delays due to snow, snow
23 melt, and rain. So it's really all hands on deck for
24 maintaining B&Ps right now throughout this period. And
25 then we do have, as recent as today, ongoing

1 environmental inspections by WSP also.

2 And that's -- that's my update.

3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

4 Council members, are there any questions?

5 Thank you for the update.

6 Moving on to High Top and Ostrea project update.

7 Ms. Hafkemeyer.

8 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
9 Drew. Good afternoon, Chair and Council. Again, this
10 is Ami Hafkemeyer, for the record.

11 Staff are continuing to work on preconstruction
12 plan review with the certificate holder. There are no
13 further updates at this time.

14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

15 Whistling Ridge. Ms. Hafkemeyer.

16 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you.

17 Staff continue to coordinate to work towards
18 scheduling a public informational meeting for the
19 requests for this project. Details will be announced
20 once they are available.

21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

22 Badger Mountain, project update. Ms. Snarski.

23 MS. SNARSKI: Thank you, Chair Drew.

24 And good afternoon, Council members. For the record,
25 this is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist for

1 Badger Mountain solar.

2 Efforts continue on the development of the
3 supplemental cultural resources survey. We have
4 received Department of Archaeology and Historic
5 Preservation concurrence on a work plan for the initial
6 pedestrian survey.

7 Additionally, we recently began working with the
8 Department of Natural Resources to obtain an access
9 agreement for our subcontractors to the state lands for
10 cultural resources survey. Due to the current winter
11 conditions at the proposed site, we are not able to
12 begin work until snow thaws.

13 Finally, the findings of this survey will inform
14 the cultural resources section of the draft
15 environmental impact statement.

16 Any questions?

17 CHAIR DREW: Any questions for
18 Ms. Snarski?

19 Thank you.

20 Wautoma Solar Project. Mr. Caputo.

21 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Chair Drew, I will
22 also be giving the update --

23 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

24 MS. HAFKEMEYER: -- for Wautoma
25 Solar.

1 CHAIR DREW: I didn't know. I
2 heard --

3 MS. HAFKEMEYER: This is Ami
4 Hafkemeyer.

5 CHAIR DREW: Yeah. Go ahead.

6 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Yes.

7 Sorry. I just minimized my update. I apologize.

8 Again, for the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer.

9 Staff are continuing coordination with our contracted
10 agencies, tribal staff, and the applicant to refine
11 identified mitigation for the Wautoma proposal.

12 Staff are also working in coordination with the
13 Office of Administrative Hearings and our attorney
14 general support in preparation for logistics associated
15 with the adjudicative proceedings for this project.

16 Are there any questions?

17 CHAIR DREW: Are there any
18 questions?

19 Thank you.

20 Hop Hill Solar Project. Mr. Barnes.

21 MR. BARNES: Thank you, Chair Drew
22 and Council members. For the record, this is John
23 Barnes, EFSEC staff, for the Hop Hill application.

24 Work continues with the applicant to complete
25 studies and reports needed to make a SEPA

1 determination. We are continuing to coordinate and
2 review the application with our contractor, contracted
3 agencies, and tribal governments.

4 Are there any questions?

5 CHAIR DREW: Are there any
6 questions?

7 Thank you, Mr. Barnes.

8 Carriger Solar. Ms. Snarski.

9 MS. SNARSKI: Yes. Thank you, Chair
10 Drew.

11 For the record, this is Joanne Snarski, the siting
12 special -- specialist for Carriger Solar.

13 In early January, we received feedback from the
14 Klickitat County Public Works Department on the draft
15 traffic impact assessment. We will continue to work
16 with the County to refine the assessment to ensure all
17 impacts can be appropriately mitigated.

18 Staff also received a third revision to the
19 cultural resources survey from the applicant. It is
20 currently being reviewed by the Department of
21 Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Yakama
22 Nation.

23 On a final note, the interagency agreement for the
24 completion of the Traditional Cultural Property Study
25 by the Yakama Nation for this site has been fully

1 executed. The work is underway. The work is scheduled
2 to be completed in December 2024.

3 Any questions?

4 CHAIR DREW: Any questions for
5 Ms. Snarski?

6 Thank you.

7 We are now moving on to the Horse Heaven Wind
8 Farm. We're going to have an update from Ms. Moon. I
9 am actually going to take the mitigation discussion
10 first, unless there are any objections from Council.

11 Ms. Moon, why don't you go ahead with the update,
12 and then we'll move to the presentation by Mr. Greene.

13 MS. MOON: Okay. So I -- maybe you
14 can clarify, Council Chair Drew. I -- I had an update
15 on the information on firefighting from DNR and the
16 Benton County fire chief. Do you want me to go ahead
17 with that first?

18 CHAIR DREW: Yes, please.

19 MS. MOON: Okay. Thank you.

20 For the record, this is Amy Moon reporting on the
21 Horse Heaven wind project.

22 At the December 20th Council meeting, I presented
23 information regarding firefighting and fire suppression
24 that led to the Council's request for additional
25 information regarding the roles of the Washington

1 Department of Natural Resources, referred to here
2 further as "DNR," and the local fire district on fire
3 protection and firefighting in the proposed Horse
4 Heaven wind project area.

5 EFSEC staff worked with DNR and the Benton County
6 Fire District No. 1 to answer the Council's questions.
7 Russ Lane, the DNR division manager in the Wildland
8 Fire Management Division, and the Benton County Fire
9 District fire chief, Lonnie Click, provided responses
10 to the Council's questions.

11 Both the original questions and responses from the
12 December Council meeting and the follow-up questions
13 and responses are included in the January 24th Council
14 packet for your review. But I do have some additional
15 updates on that.

16 So I wanted to start off with clarifications to
17 information I presented at the December Council meeting
18 regarding aerial firefighting, specifically if the
19 project area would be a no-fly zone.

20 According to Mr. Lane, the height of the vertical
21 obstacles or turbines is what would prevent aerial fire
22 response in the interior of the proposed project.
23 Mr. Lane further stated that he doesn't see any way to
24 mitigate for the aerial response of turbine heights up
25 to 657 feet or aerial mitigation for the proposed

1 turbine spacing.

2 The aerial firefighting questions and responses I
3 submitted to DNR are included in your Council packet.
4 However, in further follow-up, EFSEC received
5 additional information from Mr. Lane on January 26,
6 which was too late for the Council packet, clarifying
7 DNR aerial firefighting efforts, which I will go over
8 now.

9 At the December meeting, the Council asked if DNR
10 had any recommended mitigation measures that may
11 address aerial firefighting activities in association
12 with those turbine heights up to 657 feet. DNR
13 indicated mitigating conflict with tactical aerial
14 operations to provide safety and maneuvering space may
15 not be possible due to density and height of the
16 proposed turbines that would need an additional safety
17 buffer of one to two tower heights around the project
18 to, quote, ensure safe operation for aircraft
19 operations, end quote.

20 Mr. Lane also expressed concern over the long
21 lines and bucket that extend up to 150 feet below the
22 helicopter airframe. In further communication, he
23 clarified that the DNR's owned and contracted fleet
24 includes light, medium, and heavy Type 3, 2, and 1
25 helicopters as well as single-engine and twin-engine

1 turboprop aircraft.

2 He stated that the DNR fixed-wing tankers operate
3 in both retardant and scooping configurations, which
4 would be like scooping water from a river. And he is
5 comfortable that they can safely operate the three
6 types of helicopters and light tankers, which are
7 AT-820 models, at a standoff distance of approximately
8 one-quarter mile and that he is reasonably certain DNR
9 would hear the same for the twin-engine scoopers, which
10 are the CL-145 models, and twin tankers, which are the
11 Q400 models, but can verify that with his vendor, if
12 needed. If the Council wants that, we can get that
13 verification.

14 Mr. Lane also noted that DNR infrequently borrow
15 the large and very large jet engine transport-type
16 aircraft present in the federal fleet, which are
17 DC-10s, and these are referred to as very large air
18 tankers. But these fly on less than 1 percent of DNR
19 incidents.

20 In the information included in the Council packet,
21 Mr. Lane expressed his high concern about damage to the
22 wind farm that could likely occur from bucket or
23 retardant drops in the wind farm area, as these drops
24 come down with the force of gravity and many thousands
25 of pounds of water or retardant that could easily snap

1 off blades and can do other damage to towers.

2 Mr. Lane further stated that DNR takes great care
3 to avoid damage to high-value infrastructure when
4 firefighting and could easily do more damage conducting
5 aerial drops within a wind project than the fire,
6 itself, might do. And that potential would also likely
7 lead to DNR to make a "no go" call for aerial
8 operations within the perimeter of the wind farm.

9 Mr. Lane wanted to remind EFSEC that the "go" or
10 "no go" call for safe operations near obstacles will be
11 made by the pilot in command at the time of the mission
12 and that DNR remain concerned that operations interior
13 to a large-scale wind project would pose unacceptable
14 risks to air crews. However, he further stated that he
15 believes they have multiple effective tools to do
16 aerial firefighting around the perimeter of wind
17 projects from a safe standoff distance.

18 I conferred with the Benton County Fire District
19 No. 1 fire chief, Lonnie Click. He reviewed the DNR
20 information and stated that his fire district responses
21 would be nearly exact and that the vertical obstruction
22 of the turbine tower is the ultimate hazard to
23 firefighting aircraft; in turn, requiring the aircraft
24 to fly a considerable distance from the towers.

25 Chief Click also stated he agrees with what DNR

1 stated and that the -- about the pilot discretion and
2 working outside the proposed project perimeter are key
3 factors in fire response.

4 I know that was a lot of information. Does the
5 Council have any questions?

6 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions
7 from Council members?

8 MS. MOON: It looks like Council
9 Member Young may have.

10 CHAIR DREW: I don't know why I'm
11 not seeing that on my screen. We're going to pause for
12 just a moment while I make sure I can have -- Andrea,
13 can you come help?

14 Just a second.

15 (Discussion off the record.)

16

17 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young, is your hand
18 up?

19 MR. YOUNG: Yes, it is.

20 (Discussion off the record.)

21

22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. I'm going to
23 have to ask you to let me know when you raise your
24 hands.

25 Mr. Young.

1 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

2 Amy, would it be fair to summarize what you
3 recounted that aerial fire suppression would not be
4 feasible within the wind farm perimeter or within a
5 one-quarter-mile buffer of the perimeter which was
6 being referred to as the standoff distance? Is that a
7 correct summary interpretation?

8 MS. MOON: Yes. Based on what
9 Mr. Lane provided to EFSEC, that -- that is correct.

10 MR. YOUNG: And I understand that
11 Chief Click concurs with Mr. Lane?

12 MS. MOON: Yes. Yes, Chief Click
13 did concur.

14 Any further questions? I see another hand. But
15 I'm not sure that we can take Paul Krupin's question.

16 CHAIR DREW: That's correct. We're
17 only taking members from Horse Heaven Council members.

18 MS. MOON: Okay. If there are no
19 further questions, I have -- I would like to -- to
20 continue with my update.

21 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

22 MS. MOON: Okay.

23 As directed by the Council at the December 20th
24 Council meeting, EFSEC staff also made updates to other
25 proposed mitigation measures presented in the final

1 environmental impact statement issued on October 31st
2 of 2023. 62 comments were received during the comment
3 campaign associated with the Council's direction in
4 December to produce figures demonstrating potential
5 project exclusions for their consideration.

6 Our SEPA specialist, Sean Greene, is here to
7 present the proposed updates and to answer any
8 questions.

9 And so if you're ready, Sean, I'll turn it over to
10 you.

11 MR. GREENE: Yes. I believe Chair
12 Drew wanted to lead off before I began.

13 CHAIR DREW: That's right. Thank
14 you, Mr. Greene.

15 So as the Council continues our discussion on our
16 recommendation to the governor or on the Horse Heaven
17 wind and solar project, I'd like to make a few
18 comments.

19 Much of what you have seen in our meetings over
20 the past couple of months has been a discussion of
21 mitigation measures recommended in the final EIS. The
22 Council will consider any changes to these measures,
23 taking into account not just the information we've
24 received through the EIS but the information we've
25 received as a Council through the adjudicative process

1 and the comments we've received from the public
2 throughout our review. We thank everyone for your
3 participation in our process.

4 Mr. Greene, if you would show Figure 2-5 from the
5 final EIS, which we have referred to several times
6 during our conversation over the past couple of months,
7 and please describe to the Council what is represented
8 here.

9 MR. GREENE: Yes. Thank you, Chair
10 Drew and Council members. For the record, this is Sean
11 Greene, SEPA specialist for EFSEC.

12 What this figure represents, there are two roughly
13 equivalent figures in Chapter 2 of the FEIS, each
14 representing one of the two turbine options being
15 proposed.

16 This is Turbine Option 1. And this figure
17 represents an assessment of turbine impacts to a number
18 of resources: Specifically, areas within two miles of
19 a ferruginous hawk nest; areas with medium or higher
20 modeled linkage for a wildlife movement corridor; areas
21 with shrubsteppe habitat; turbines that would create
22 noise impacts, visual impacts, shadow flicker impacts,
23 or would have impacts to archaeological and
24 architectural resources with traditional cultural
25 property resources shown on the confidential Council

1 map that was provided under separate cover to this map.

2 This also shows turbines that would have impacts
3 to recreational opportunities.

4 In terms of the color coding, red-color turbines
5 on this map are indicative of turbines that were either
6 assessed as having a high impact on three or more of
7 those listed resources or having an impact to one or
8 more particularly vulnerable or sensitive resources,
9 such as ferruginous hawk nests or archaeological
10 resources.

11 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young, you have a
12 question. Now I don't see you.

13 MR. YOUNG: Yes. Thank you.

14 The way you described that, I just want to be
15 clear: That this map does not take into account
16 impacts to traditional cultural properties and that
17 those are identified separately on the confidential
18 map; is that correct?

19 MR. GREENE: That is correct.

20 MR. YOUNG: So TCPs are not -- not
21 factored into what color the turbines are shaded on
22 this map, correct?

23 MR. GREENE: That is correct.

24 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

25 MR. GREENE: Were there any further

1 questions regarding this map and the meaning of the
2 color coding or what resources are being assessed as
3 part of this color coding and the determination of the
4 class of impact?

5 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

6 So I do want to -- like the Council to start our
7 conversation by discussing the elimination of the areas
8 in which the red turbines are located as you've heard
9 described.

10 And I will say that although in impact we don't
11 have specific turbines identified, we do know from the
12 information that we have received that is confidential
13 from the Yakama Nation that every turbine -- I'm
14 sorry -- the entire site impacts traditional cultural
15 properties. So I want to make that statement, that the
16 entire project does impact traditional cultural
17 properties.

18 But what I would like to do is to ask the Council
19 to consider eliminating the turbines in -- represented
20 by the red dots but within those areas, so not just
21 within the entire areas represented by those red dots.
22 And that is because the multiple compacting impacts in
23 this area described.

24 First of all, we've received information through
25 the FEIS, again through the adjudication and public

1 comments. In my view, taking this action will
2 eliminate all turbines in two-mile circles around
3 current and historic ferruginous hawk nests, and it
4 will reduce the impact on -- of the project on cultural
5 resources and traditional cultural properties.

6 It will reduce the impacts to the wildlife
7 corridors throughout the project.

8 It will reduce visual impact to communities to the
9 east of the project and remove turbines from a
10 prominent ridgeline.

11 It will reduce potential impact on aerial
12 firefighting on the slope northeast of the project and
13 will reduce the impact of the project on some
14 recreational areas. Not eliminate all impacts, but
15 there will be a reduction in impacts by taking this
16 action.

17 And I'd just like to ask Council members, please
18 feel free to share your view of this action.

19 Mr. Greene.

20 MR. GREENE: Yeah. I just wanted to
21 make one point. You mentioned that this would reduce
22 the potential risk to aerial firefighting on the slope
23 northeast of the project area. It is actually the
24 northwest of the project area.

25 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Thank you. Okay.

1 My mistake. Thank you.

2 Council members, I'd like to understand your
3 views.

4 Mr. Livingston.

5 MR. LIVINGSTON: Hello. Thanks,
6 Chair Drew.

7 I appreciate, one, the -- the further
8 clarification about what the green/red/yellow dots are
9 on the map. I also appreciate the work that's gone
10 into this. And I -- I agree with you. We've gone
11 through such a deliberative, intense process of trying
12 to understand what impacts this size of a project has
13 posed for us to consider.

14 And so the approach of eliminating those turbines
15 that are in red I support for the reasons you
16 mentioned. They're going to reduce, and not eliminate,
17 risk to the hawk. They're going to reduce, and not
18 eliminate, complications to firefighting. There's the
19 habitat connectivity also is going to be -- the impacts
20 will be reduced but not eliminated.

21 So we're working towards a project that could be
22 permitted, and from my perspective, without having such
23 a huge size, scope, and scale that would impact all
24 these important resources.

25 So those are my -- those are my views and comments

1 at the moment. Thank you.

2 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

3 Mr. Young.

4 MR. YOUNG: Chair, I support what
5 you've described, removing all the red turbines. That
6 is not the full extent of my concerns, and there are
7 additional turbines that I would like to see
8 eliminated. I think we'll get to that later in the
9 discussion. But I support what you've described for
10 the reasons you -- you gave.

11 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

12 Other Council members?

13 Mr. Levitt.

14 MR. LEVITT: Yeah. Hello. I'm
15 supportive of the comments you made earlier, Chair
16 Drew. You know, I guess I do have some questions for
17 EFSEC staff about how viable some of the strings of
18 turbines are when a large number are eliminated. For
19 example, there's some -- some yellow, perhaps some
20 orange kind of in the middle of the project. And so,
21 you know, I don't -- I don't know how to answer those
22 questions. But to make the project viable, you know,
23 there is infrastructure that connects the rows of
24 turbines, so I'm concerned about some of those.

25 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Greene, you want to

1 answer that?

2 MR. GREENE: Yeah. I can -- I can
3 address that.

4 So a few of the turbines that you've mentioned,
5 specifically the ones that identify as Class 1 or
6 Class 2 impacts here in the yellow and orange dots,
7 would potentially be excluded by other mitigation
8 measures that the Council is going to consider as part
9 of this meeting.

10 As for the secondary project components, things
11 like roads and transmission lines, we -- we'll be
12 presenting the Council with a set of exclusion measures
13 that they can impose for primary project components --
14 things like turbines, solar arrays, and BESSes, battery
15 stations -- and a secondary question about what
16 exclusions the Council would like to impose on
17 secondary components, things like those roads and
18 transmission lines.

19 So there will be a level of delineation there that
20 the Council can consider and provide guidance to staff
21 on how you would like to see those exclusion measures
22 put into place.

23 MR. LEVITT: Thank you.

24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

25 Other comments by Council members?

1 Ms. Brewster.

2 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I want to
3 support the notion of eliminating the turbines with the
4 highest impacts on multiple features, so the turbines
5 marked in red. I am supportive of that notion.

6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

7 And, again, because we're not -- we're talking
8 about the areas that those red turbines represent, so I
9 want to say that again. Because it's not moving them a
10 few feet. They would not be in the entire area.
11 You've seen it in different ways in Wild-5 that we will
12 see later as well. But I just want to say that for the
13 record.

14 So hearing that we have strong support for doing
15 that, I wanted to lay the foundation of our
16 conversation and the fact that it doesn't rest on one
17 particular resource but on multiple impacts that we
18 have been concerned about as we have heard throughout
19 this project.

20 So with that, I will ask Sean, then, to move on to
21 the next part of his presentation.

22 MR. GREENE: Thank you, Chair Drew.

23 And I did want to mention that the Council has
24 access to a confidential version of this same figure
25 that actually shows red-shaded areas, which are the

1 boundaries of some of those particularly vulnerable or
2 sensitive resources.

3 CHAIR DREW: Right.

4 MR. GREENE: And that shows the
5 approximate outlines of the areas of the micro-siting
6 corridor that would be excluded if these mitigation
7 measures were put into place to exclude those red-color
8 turbines.

9 So moving forward. I wanted to go through the --
10 the various exclusion mitigation measures that the
11 Council was discussing at the previous meeting. In
12 cases where it's -- it's a new measure, such as this
13 Veg-10, I'll show the text as proposed to be included
14 within a draft SCA, were -- were the Council to
15 recommend approval for this project.

16 CHAIR DREW: I want to -- may I
17 interrupt you?

18 MR. GREENE: Yes.

19 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So I asked
20 Mr. Greene to present this. I had presented at the
21 last meeting the idea of eliminating the east solar
22 field. As I looked at comments and discussed this
23 further, I wanted to present a different option to the
24 Council that would eliminate solar arrays in any
25 rabbitbrush shrubland or any of the priority habitat

1 areas rather than request the entire solar field be
2 eliminated. So that's where this comes from.

3 Do you have more that you'd like to share on that?

4 MR. GREENE: Yes.

5 So this is just to show the text of that proposed
6 mitigation measure, were it to be incorporated.

7 The next slide here. There we go.

8 So this is a -- a figure showing most of what was
9 originally proposed as that east solar field. Those
10 red polygons are the -- the boundaries of the
11 originally proposed solar arrays.

12 In the final application submitted by the
13 applicant, they significantly reduced -- or I shouldn't
14 say "significant" -- they heavily reduced the footprint
15 of the proposed east solar array to approximately
16 what's encased in that green polygon that I drew. It
17 accounted for a roughly 80 percent reduction in impacts
18 to sensitive habitat types that would be targeted by
19 this mitigation measure, resulting in approximately 140
20 acres of total impacts associated with the east solar
21 array.

22 There are no proposed permanent disturbance
23 impacts to any of these habitat types with the County
24 Well solar array or the Sellards solar array, which are
25 the other two options under consideration. So it's

1 just an indication of what the east solar array looks
2 like in the current proposal, and the blue in that
3 central polygon indicates east-side interior
4 grasslands, which is a priority habitat designated by
5 WDFW, and the pink polygon to the bottom left is
6 rabbitbrush shrubland, which would also be excluded as
7 part of this mitigation measure.

8 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

9 MR. YOUNG: Are the three habitat
10 types listed there -- east-side (interior) grassland,
11 rabbitbrush shrubland, and sagebrush shrubsteppe --
12 does that comprise all of the DFW-designated priority
13 habitat types?

14 MR. GREENE: That includes all --
15 that includes rabbitbrush shrubland, which is generally
16 considered an early -- early successional stage of
17 shrubsteppe, and so it -- often incorporated with other
18 priority habitat types. The only two are the only
19 priority habitat types designated by WDFW that have any
20 impacts associated with them as a result of solar
21 arrays --

22 MR. YOUNG: Could -- could you --

23 MR. GREENE: -- for this project.

24 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to
25 the previous slide that had the text?

1 MR. GREENE: Yes.

2 MR. YOUNG: So where it says "or
3 DFW-designated priority habitat types," is it just
4 those other two that we've specifically talked about?

5 MR. GREENE: It would be -- sorry.

6 MR. YOUNG: Or are there other
7 DFW-designated priority habitat types that would be
8 included here?

9 MR. GREENE: It would include all
10 designated priority habitat types. There are no others
11 within this area.

12 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

13 MR. GREENE: So -- so essentially --

14 MR. YOUNG: Sorry. Cutting you off
15 there.

16 MR. GREENE: No. I was -- I was
17 going to say, effectively it is those other two types,
18 the --

19 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

20 MR. GREENE: The sagebrush
21 shrubsteppe and east-side (interior) grassland.

22 MR. YOUNG: So in -- on the ground,
23 those are the only three types that are involved,
24 really, for our conversation?

25 MR. GREENE: Correct.

1 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

2 MR. GREENE: And so the Council
3 that -- or pardon me. The question I would like to
4 present to the Council for your deliberations and
5 discussions, so as to give guidance to staff, is: For
6 this proposed mitigation measure, should all solar
7 arrays be allowed on rabbitbrush shrubland and priority
8 habitats with compensatory mitigation at the
9 FEIS-recommended ratios, which is the current version
10 incorporated into the FEIS, or excluded from all
11 rabbitbrush shrubland and priority habitats, which is
12 the proposed version that was shown before?

13 And I would like to indicate, these are not the
14 only two options. If the Council has further options,
15 absolutely provide staff with that direction.

16 CHAIR DREW: So from my perspective
17 are that there is -- we are trying to reduce impacts on
18 ferruginous hawks. There is area that is potential for
19 their finding their appropriate sources of food. Then
20 I think we should look at keeping those and not
21 covering them with solar panels. But I am open to
22 conversation by the Council. I did want to recognize
23 that some of the east solar field is on areas that are
24 currently under agricultural production and less
25 valuable for the species of concern.

1 Are there any comments?

2 Mr. Livingston.

3 MR. LIVINGSTON: Can we go back,
4 Sean, to the -- I just want to see. How many acres are
5 we talking about?

6 MR. GREENE: It's approximately 140
7 acres.

8 MR. LIVINGSTON: And if we go with
9 your Proposed Option B, what would be the impacts?

10 MR. GREENE: Essentially the -- the
11 pink-colored polygon and the blue-colored polygon would
12 be excluded, and the -- the color surrounding those
13 polygons would also be excluded from the siting of any
14 solar arrays. That would give the applicant either the
15 option of reducing the footprint of the solar array to
16 exclude those -- those plats or restructuring their
17 proposed east solar array to cover the same number of
18 acres but no longer cover those priority habitat areas
19 or rabbitbrush shrubland.

20 MR. LIVINGSTON: It would be helpful
21 for me if I knew what was the surrou- -- I guess I can
22 see some of the surrounding habitat types to the north
23 and to the east and to the west. I don't know what's
24 to the south, 'cause I guess it's outside of the -- the
25 project boundaries.

1 Do we know what the habitat looks like to that
2 south? 'Cause one of the key components here for
3 viable habitat is to have larger acreages. If these
4 are isolated pieces, they have less importance than
5 they would if they're connected to some other existing
6 acres to the south and elsewhere. So I don't have
7 that -- a full picture of that.

8 So at this point, I would -- without that
9 information, I would lean towards supporting B, if we
10 were to go forward with supporting the solar fields to
11 the east here.

12 MR. GREENE: And to address your
13 question, I do not know off the top of my head what the
14 habitat cover is to the south. That is an area outside
15 of project control, so I don't know that we have
16 on-the-ground surveys of that vegetation. But the
17 surrounding areas to the east, west, and north are
18 primarily agricultural.

19 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.

20 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

21 MR. YOUNG: Chair Drew, I also
22 support Option B as you have proposed. But I feel for
23 reasons that we'll get to, I think, later in our
24 discussion, I propo- -- I favor eliminating the entire
25 east solar field. But to the extent of this particular

1 question point here, I do support Option B.

2 CHAIR DREW: Others?

3 Ms. Brewster.

4 MS. BREWSTER: I will weigh in my
5 support for Option B at this point. Thank you.

6 MR. LEVITT: Yeah. This is Eli. I
7 support Option B as well, as long as the applicant has
8 some flexibility to adjust.

9 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Let's move on to
10 the next question, then.

11 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you.

12 Next is the modifications to Habitat 1, which is
13 the mitigation measure addressing wildlife movement
14 corridors.

15 As a result of previous Council discussions, it
16 has been restructured to -- I should say, the original
17 version allowed siting of all project components within
18 modeled wildlife movement corridors, so long as the
19 applicant produced a corridor mitigation plan in
20 consultation with EFSEC that we felt appropriately
21 addressed the impacts.

22 The current version following the previous Council
23 meeting's discussion would prohibit the siting of
24 primary project components, such as specifically
25 turbines, solar arrays, and battery stations, and any

1 movement corridors modeled as medium to very high
2 linkage and would prohibit secondary project
3 components, such as roads and power lines and
4 substations, in modeled high to very high linkage
5 movement corridors.

6 And in the previous meeting, Council also directed
7 staff to seek out guidance from WDFW staff on how they
8 viewed this -- this modification of the original
9 measure.

10 First, EFSEC requested from WDFW --- WDFW staff
11 how primary project components should be defined for
12 the purposes of mitigation throughout this document.
13 And WDFW staff believe that primary project components
14 should be defined as turbines, solar arrays, and
15 battery stations, consistent with the current version
16 of this -- this measure that you see on the left.

17 The second question we asked was whether primary
18 project components should be excluded from medium to
19 very high linkage or high to very high linkage
20 corridors, and WDFW staff believe that primary project
21 components should not be sited in medium to very high
22 linkage corridors, again consistent with the current
23 version of Hab-1.

24 And the third occas- -- the third question also
25 resulted in WDFW staff concurring with the current

1 version of Hab-1 that secondary -- that's a typo --
2 secondary project components should not be sited in
3 high to very high linkage corridors but could be sited
4 in medium corridors with a corridor mitigation plan as
5 included in Hab-1.

6 And just for the purposes of recollection and this
7 conversation, this is a map of the modeled wildlife
8 movement corridors throughout the project area. The
9 locations most of concern are this -- this central
10 medium and high linkage corridor that bisects the site,
11 and the second part is this narrow strip of high and
12 medium movement corridor. That's more of a concern for
13 the primary -- the current location of the proposed
14 primary transmission line for the applicant. And we
15 can come back to this figure during discussion.

16 CHAIR DREW: Can you go back to
17 what -- go ahead. You had another -- another view
18 there.

19 MR. GREENE: Yeah, so this is going
20 to continue. This is a -- a figure propo- -- or
21 produced for the purposes of this discussion. It's not
22 exact. It's just additional aid.

23 And it is for Turbine Option 1, which, just as a
24 reminder, Turbine Option 1 would site a maximum of 222
25 turbines, with a maximum height of 499 feet.

1 Option 2, for which a similar figure has been
2 produced but is not in this presentation currently,
3 would site a maximum of 141 turbines, so fewer
4 turbines, with a maximum height of 671 feet. Fewer
5 turbines at a taller height.

6 In terms of what project components are currently
7 proposed in high or above wildlife linkage corridor,
8 there is the primary transmission line at three
9 different points, one within this bigger square and
10 twice within the smaller rectangle.

11 22 Option 1 turbines are within high or above
12 corridors, and six -- or six Option 2 turbines are
13 within those high or above corridors.

14 Within medium -- or within just the medium
15 linkage -- level of linkage corridor is again the
16 primary transmission line at three different points and
17 then 11 Option 1 turbines or 16 Option 2 turbines.
18 There are no solar arrays, battery substations -- or
19 battery stations or substations that are currently
20 proposed in medium or higher modeled habitat movement
21 corridors.

22 CHAIR DREW: And of those numbers,
23 some of those turbine numbers you've identified, we've
24 already talk about -- talked about eliminating some of
25 those in those areas, so we've reduced that; is that

1 correct?

2 MR. GREENE: Yes. Many of the
3 turbines that are within these movement corridors would
4 also potentially be excluded by other mitigation
5 measures that we're going to discuss in today's
6 meeting; specifically, the ferruginous hawk Species 5
7 mitigation.

8 CHAIR DREW: I will say to Council
9 members that I have been thinking quite a bit about, as
10 Mr. Levitt brought up, connectivity, stranded assets,
11 as well as the impact that turbines, once they're
12 constructed, have on wildlife movement. It's not --
13 they don't entirely block the movement, in fact. I
14 know we have seen, some of us who have been here for a
15 while, seen examples of wildlife throughout the Wild
16 Horse wind project, for example.

17 I would like to suggest that we don't eliminate --
18 that we go back to the original FEIS-recommended
19 version. Because I think it's important to maintain an
20 ability to have infrastructure throughout this project.

21 So perhaps, Sean, if you can remind us again what
22 the original mitigation was.

23 MR. GREENE: Yes. So the original
24 request, that the applicant locate all project
25 components outside of medium or above linkage corridors

1 to the extent feasible. Then for any components that
2 would be sited within medium or above corridors, there
3 are a series of measures that we would require to be
4 incorporated into a corridor mitigation plan that
5 describes the proposed impacts and identifies effective
6 mitigation and restoration as a result of those
7 impacts, and that plan would be submitted to the
8 pre-tech -- pre-operational technical advisory group
9 prior to construction, approved by EFSEC, and then
10 monitored and enforced by EFSEC with the guidance of
11 the technical advisory committee throughout the life of
12 the project.

13 CHAIR DREW: Any comments from
14 Council members?

15 Again, I think we've reduced the number of
16 turbines in this area.

17 Mr. Young.

18 MR. YOUNG: I disagree with going
19 back to the original language. I favor the way we
20 configured it on December 20th.

21 MR. GREENE: And I have questions
22 with -- with the various options available, if the
23 Council would like to have that up for discussion.

24 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

25 MR. GREENE: So the first would be

1 for primary project components, which is turbines,
2 solar arrays, and battery substations: Should they be
3 allowed within these corridors when combined with the
4 corridor mitigation plan, which is the version included
5 within the FEIS; excluded from high to very high
6 linkage corridors -- again, there are no very high
7 modeled linkage corridors within the project area, but
8 from high to very high -- or excluded from medium to
9 very high linkage corridors, which is the current
10 version that was shown as discussed at the previous
11 Council meeting.

12 CHAIR DREW: Are there any other
13 comments from Council members?

14 Mr. Livingston.

15 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I -- I'm in
16 agreement with Lenny. I want to stick with what we
17 agreed to back in December, if possible.

18 CHAIR DREW: So to exclude...

19 MR. GREENE: This question is
20 specific to primary components. There's a
21 subsequent --

22 CHAIR DREW: Primary.

23 MR. GREENE: -- question.

24 CHAIR DREW: Solar arrays, BESS, and
25 turbines from medium to very high linkage corridors.

1 MR. GREENE: Yes.

2 CHAIR DREW: Okay. C.

3 Are there any other comments from Council members?

4 Ms. Brewster.

5 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. Sean, can you
6 talk about the transmission components that might be
7 affected by this?

8 MR. GREENE: So there is a
9 subsequent question to this one regarding how the
10 Council would like to incorporate exclusions for
11 secondary components, and transmission lines are part
12 of that.

13 This first question is just regarding turbines,
14 solar arrays, and BESSes, or battery stations. But the
15 primary concern for transmission lines is, as I
16 mentioned, this -- this area, the primary transmission
17 line for the project does run from east to west through
18 this area. So it would have to be resited further
19 north. And then the current proposed line runs through
20 this red rectangle to the left, and at two points it
21 does cross a modeled high linkage movement corridor, so
22 it would not be allowed in those sites and would have
23 to be, again, restructured to a different location.

24 CHAIR DREW: But that's coming next.

25 MR. GREENE: Yes, that is the -- the

1 next question. This first question is -- is just --

2 CHAIR DREW: First one's about --

3 MR. GREENE: -- dealing with

4 turbines --

5 CHAIR DREW: -- turbines --

6 MR. GREENE: -- solar arrays, and --

7 CHAIR DREW: -- solar arrays --

8 MR. GREENE: -- battery stations.

9 CHAIR DREW: -- and BESS.

10 MR. GREENE: Yes.

11 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Levitt.

12 MR. LEVITT: Well, I guess I just
13 wanted to ask, so when we say "wildlife corridor," are
14 we primarily talking about pronghorn or other species
15 as well?

16 MR. GREENE: There are other species
17 that will make use of these corridors: Deer and the
18 like. It is modeled based on the -- I forget the name
19 of the organization. It is the -- the Washington
20 Wildlife Movement Corridor Working Group, I believe.
21 That -- that is the data set that is being used for
22 this figure here, and it covers a variety of species.

23 MR. LEVITT: And is this the figure
24 that was also used at one point for transportation
25 planning, or are the purposes broader than -- for this

1 data?

2 MR. GREENE: I don't have the answer
3 to that question right now.

4 MR. LEVITT: I guess -- I guess my
5 concern is that we're primarily looking at a wildlife
6 corridor for sort of a reintroduced species that -- I'm
7 not a wildlife expert, but I don't believe the
8 pronghorn are threatened or endangered. So I'm
9 concerned that we're making large adjustments to the
10 project similar to what we're doing for ferruginous
11 hawk when the species is not threatened or endangered.
12 I guess I'm -- I'm interested in more compromise
13 options, if possible.

14 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Livingston?

15 MR. LIVINGSTON: I think I might be
16 able to address some of that. So I haven't looked at
17 the habitat connectivity study, itself -- other than
18 these data layers that have been provided to us -- in
19 some time. It's based on existing habitat, so it'd be
20 shrubsteppe or interior grassland, shrublands. And
21 then some of the species that they did modeling for
22 included Townsend's ground squirrels, badgers. You
23 know, I can't -- I can't tell you all of them. It
24 wasn't, in fact -- it was done before or right after
25 the pronghorn were reintroduced. So it wasn't based on

1 pronghorn. It was based on other species that are
2 dependent upon having habitat connected on the ground
3 for their -- their movement patterns. So it's not just
4 pronghorn. This is a number of different species that
5 they're looking at.

6 There were a few -- some of the importance of this
7 corridor habitat is, if you look at everything
8 surrounding it, all the green is non-habitat. What's
9 remaining in the Horse Heaven Hill is, along the
10 ridgeline, you have that red corridor that goes up in
11 the northwest corner of the map that goes north to
12 south, and then you have this one band that goes right
13 through the middle of this project, way out, but then
14 connects to habitat further south. Ultimately, there's
15 some connectivity that goes into Oregon.

16 And so there's this small band of habitat
17 remaining, connecting wildlife core habitat areas
18 across this -- this landscape. So that's the -- that's
19 the importance of these areas for area species that
20 would -- that would use that.

21 CHAIR DREW: A question that I have.
22 And thank you for that. Again, kind of getting back to
23 the disruptive nature if we're not -- let's say we
24 don't have solar arrays, we don't have BESS, but
25 there's temporary -- fewer -- significantly fewer, I

1 would say -- turbines in that area, and they have a
2 wild- -- wildlife corridor plan.

3 Can you put those options back up again, please?

4 A, B, and C.

5 MR. GREENE: Okay.

6 CHAIR DREW: So --

7 MR. GREENE: And I would like to --

8 CHAIR DREW: -- excluded -- maybe B.

9 If we looked at excluded from the high linkage corridor
10 area and combined with a corridor mitigation plan, is
11 that someplace we can get to? Rather than the medium.

12 But you're looking at, Mike -- sorry. I'm just
13 asking you again.

14 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah. Chair, are
15 you asking for these primary components or secondary?

16 CHAIR DREW: Well, the primary
17 components -- you know, we're not -- they're not
18 planning, but we could say solar arrays and BESS, but
19 the turbines are the only ones.

20 MR. LIVINGSTON: Right.

21 CHAIR DREW: And if -- if so, that's
22 fine. I just want to confirm, given Eli's question as
23 well.

24 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, so it's hard
25 to track where -- what we agreed to with those red

1 turbine strings in that map at the beginning of the
2 presentation to what we're talking about right now,
3 whether there would be primary components -- turbines,
4 specifically -- in that area or not. I -- I don't
5 recall. It'd be best to keep the turbines out of
6 there. And from medium to the very high linkage
7 corridors. That would be my preference.

8 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

9 MR. LEVITT: And, Mike, when you say
10 best to keep them out, is this based on research that
11 WDFW has done about the porosity of wind turbines in
12 specific species that were -- were considered when
13 making the -- the wildlife corridor map?

14 MR. LIVINGSTON: It's -- it's a
15 combination, Eli, of remaining habitat, the species
16 that might exist there -- Townsend's ground squirrels,
17 for example -- those being a primary prey for
18 ferruginous hawks, and so their -- it -- you know,
19 their interest in foraging in those areas to obtain
20 for -- food for -- for themselves as well as their
21 young as they're raising them, so it's a combination.

22 These -- these habitat linkages are, you know, the
23 remaining habitat in an area that animals can use
24 either to live or to migrate through or to forage, and
25 so I have a concern because there's so little of it

1 left in that area that it's super important for all of
2 the critters that are dependent upon the shrubsteppe
3 habitat.

4 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.
5 That's helpful for my understanding.

6 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Levitt,
7 what's your thought at this point?

8 MR. LEVITT: Yeah, I guess I can
9 live with B or C. I'll go with the -- go with the flow
10 of the Council.

11 CHAIR DREW: Any other comments from
12 Council members?

13 Thank you.

14 I think, Ms. Brewster.

15 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I was just
16 going to say Councilman Livingston's comments are very
17 helpful. So for the primary components, I guess I -- I
18 will agree with C. I think if B could be a possible
19 compromise. But I'm going to defer to WDFW's opinion
20 on that.

21 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

22 So I will say let's then move on with C.

23 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you.

24 Then the next question is the same question but
25 essentially for secondary project components, which

1 includes things like roads, substations, transmission
2 lines. So should these secondary components be allowed
3 within corridors with the corridor mitigation plan,
4 which was the FEIS version, excluded from high to very
5 high linkage corridors, which is the current version
6 based on the previous Council meeting, or further
7 excluded from medium to very high linkage corridors as
8 well?

9 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

10 MR. YOUNG: Could we go back and
11 look at the language from December 20? Because I think
12 there was a last sentence that was -- that was not read
13 here this afternoon about the applicant could site
14 secondary components in the medium linkage if they
15 produced the rationale that satisfied EFSEC.

16 Is that incorporated into Option C for the
17 secondary components?

18 MR. GREENE: For secondary
19 components, the current version is Option B, which
20 excludes them from high to very high but would allow
21 secondary components within medium modeled corridor
22 linkage with this corridor mitigation plan. That was
23 based on -- pardon me. That was based on the
24 discussion from the previous Council meeting.

25 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to

1 the options again?

2 MR. GREENE: Yes.

3 MR. YOUNG: That seems to be like a
4 modified -- a modified B. Because our discussions
5 on -- if I got this right, our discussions on December
6 20th did not take it so far as to completely exclude
7 secondary components from medium.

8 MR. GREENE: Yes. And --

9 MR. YOUNG: Is that correct?

10 MR. GREENE: That is correct. And
11 this -- this version shown here, the current version is
12 B, which does not exclude secondary components from
13 medium. It just would --

14 MR. YOUNG: Well, but it puts -- it
15 puts a condition on putting them in medium, as they
16 would have to meet the corridor mitigation plan, and
17 the rationale would have to be presented to EFSEC.
18 It's not just open season on -- on medium areas
19 under -- under what we talked about on the 20th.

20 MR. GREENE: Okay.

21 MR. YOUNG: Correct?

22 MR. GREENE: And --

23 MR. YOUNG: I want to make sure I'm
24 correct.

25 MR. GREENE: Yes.

1 MR. YOUNG: I hope I said that
2 right.

3 MR. GREENE: Yes. With the current
4 version, based on our understanding of the previous
5 Council discussion, secondary components in medium
6 linkage areas would still need to be presented to EFSEC
7 with a corridor mitigation plan included.

8 If there is a desire to remove that stipulation
9 and allow secondary components to be sited within
10 medium corridor linkage without a mitigation plan, that
11 can be incorporated into this -- this measure, if
12 that's the Council's desire.

13 MR. YOUNG: I think that's the way
14 that B is written right now. And so B does not really
15 reflect the totality of where we landed on secondary
16 components on December 20th. B -- B should have
17 additional language about siting in medium is
18 predicated upon an approval by EFSEC and a corridor
19 mitigation plan.

20 MR. GREENE: Yes.

21 MR. HENDERSON: I don't think
22 there's any disagreement about the current ver- -- what
23 the current version is, just how it's being described
24 here in B. It's inadequately --

25 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

1 MR. HENDERSON: -- described here in
2 B.

3 MR. YOUNG: That's right.

4 MR. GREENE: Yes.

5 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

6 MR. GREENE: I agree with that. I
7 used abbreviated text just for this question, but
8 the -- the essence of Option B here is the full text of
9 that current version based on the 12/20 meeting that --
10 that was shown earlier. I should have added more
11 descriptive text to this answer.

12 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for that
13 clarification. And with that clarification, I can
14 support Option B for the secondary components.

15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Other comments?

16 So this is the secondary components, the
17 transmission lines.

18 Can you show us again -- let's see the map. Which
19 one?

20 So -- and then you had another one with open --

21 MR. GREENE: Yes.

22 CHAIR DREW: So essentially not --
23 go ahead and describe what this is again.

24 MR. GREENE: Sure. So the -- the
25 empty spaces that you see, the -- the small empty

1 spaces in this transmission line here and then the
2 larger square incorporates all areas of high linkage.
3 So no components, primary or secondary, would be
4 allowed in those areas, and that's why in this visual
5 aid, those areas have been erased of project
6 components.

7 As currently designed, the project's primary
8 transmission line does go through this -- I think it
9 might be shown on -- yes. The primary transmission
10 line does go through this high linkage area throughout
11 much of that -- that central corridor and then patches
12 through high linkage area twice in this -- this upper
13 corridor here.

14 So for secondary components, that would be the --
15 the primary effect of this mitigation being imposed,
16 that the primary transmission line would have to be
17 redesigned to be located, for this main corridor,
18 farther north, and for this -- this northwestern
19 corridor, likely farther west.

20 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Livingston.

21 MR. LIVINGSTON: Sean, do we -- do
22 you know what the size of the transmission line will
23 be, kV?

24 MR. GREENE: Not off the top of my
25 head. I want to say 230 kilovolt. I'm not sure if

1 that's correct, though.

2 MR. LIVINGSTON: And there would
3 likely be a road associated with it, gravel road, or do
4 we know?

5 MR. GREENE: I don't know if there
6 is a road associated with the transmission line
7 throughout this extent, but there are project roads
8 that cross much of the project area, so they would be
9 affected by exclusion from high linkage corridors as
10 well.

11 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I just wonder
12 if there's possibilities of associating these with
13 existing roads and other lines that are already out
14 there. We don't -- I don't have a sense of that or if
15 we're talking about uninterrupted habitat having a
16 brand-new transmission line and a road going through
17 it.

18 CHAIR DREW: Is there a possibility
19 that, from what you say, we could say that -- let me
20 think -- that it would be excluded from high -- can you
21 take the lang- -- bring the language back up for me?

22 Thank you.

23 Secondary project components should be excluded
24 from high and very high linkage corridors unless there
25 is existing infras- -- then it's following existing

1 infrastructure and it's -- comes with the corridor
2 mitigation plan and through the staff? I'm trying to
3 figure out a pathway where that can be considered.

4 Ms. Brewster.

5 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah. I just want to
6 voice my support for preserving the corridor areas and
7 then voice a concern with the reality of moving
8 transmission corridors. I -- I don't know how easy
9 that is to redesign and if that is the type of thing
10 that makes a project like this infeasible. So I don't
11 know if staff could provide more information on that or
12 could be acquired.

13 MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is
14 Sonia Bumpus, if I may.

15 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

16 MS. BUMPUS: I was just going to
17 mention as I was listening to the deliberation that the
18 FEIS did consider the impacts to these corridors and
19 the wildlife and the habitat, and -- and so I think
20 that the corridor mitigation plan, that mitigation that
21 came in through the FEIS is good mitigation here. So I
22 just wanted to -- to make that comment.

23 And part of that too is just to say that, for the
24 secondary components, I think that there -- there would
25 be some -- some very -- very real consequences to the

1 project design if it goes -- if we start to go outside
2 of the proposed mitigation measure in the FEIS, such --
3 such that we may even see just the -- the totality of
4 the project amended.

5 And so I just wanted to -- to make that comment,
6 just hearing that some of the Council members were --
7 were wondering about that.

8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

9 Other comments?

10 I think we're -- I have a view that we may -- and
11 maybe that's not correct -- we may be a bit conflicted
12 on an absolute exclusion even in the high linkage
13 corridors for the secondary movement.

14 Can we -- I guess I'm going to have to ask for a
15 vote on this.

16 MR. LEVITT: Before a vote, may I
17 ask a clarification question?

18 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

19 MR. LEVITT: I'm sorry if I missed
20 this. Is it possible that some of these are a little
21 hybrid, like you could do B and there would be a
22 corridor mitigation plan?

23 CHAIR DREW: I think the problem
24 comes from it be- -- the exclusion being in the high
25 linkage corridor according to this map. Because we've

1 heard that the current design has transmission lines
2 that go through the area identified on the map as a
3 high linkage corridor.

4 Again, I would say that it is disturbance. It may
5 already be disturbed. We don't know that from looking
6 at the map that we have in front of us. So I think
7 that presents us with a -- a challenge.

8 Go ahead. Somebody else.

9 Mr. Livingston.

10 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.

11 Even though we don't know what's underneath these
12 colors on the ground and the ability to colocate some
13 of this infrastructure with existing infrastructure,
14 which is a best management practice if you can do that,
15 can we stall on this one -- hate to say that, but give
16 us a little bit of time, give us some information so
17 that we know what this looks like on the ground?
18 Otherwise, with the information I have, I'm going to be
19 conservative in my vote.

20 CHAIR DREW: So can we say perhaps
21 that if it's colocated with existing roads and
22 infrastructure, then it would be a conversation in a
23 mitigation plan?

24 MR. LIVINGSTON: And if that's not
25 possible, what do we do then?

1 MS. BUMPUS: Yeah, I would propose
2 that, you know -- this is Sonia Bumpus. I propose at
3 that point, you still have your corridor mitigation
4 plan, which -- which was proposed in the FEIS.

5 CHAIR DREW: I hear -- I hear
6 concern. I don't know that we -- I mean, I don't know
7 how much more information we could get on this going
8 forward. We are deep into the details, so I am going
9 to go ahead and ask for a vote of -- Mr. Greene, go
10 ahead.

11 MR. GREENE: Yes. I just wanted to
12 say that if it is the Council's desire to see a version
13 of B, so excluding from high to very high linkage
14 corridors for secondary components but allowing them
15 within medium or, and then the modification would be,
16 when colocated with existing infrastructure, that is a
17 version of this mitigation that we could write up.

18 CHAIR DREW: How does that sound to
19 Council members?

20 MR. LEVITT: I'm interested in that.

21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Young.

22 MR. YOUNG: I'd -- I'd like to have
23 that clarified once more and repeated.

24 MR. GREENE: Sure. So secondary
25 components would be allowed in medium or below habitat

1 linkage corridors with the habitat mitiga- -- or
2 sorry -- corridor mitigation plan and then only allowed
3 in high to very high linkage corridors when colocated
4 with existing infrastructure and, again, accompanied by
5 a corridor mitigation plan.

6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for the
7 clarification, but I do not support that.

8 CHAIR DREW: Okay. I will call for
9 a vote on the version just described by Mr. Greene:
10 Secondary project components allowed in medium to high
11 linkage -- and I might --

12 MR. GREENE: Sorry. It's medium --

13 CHAIR DREW: Say it again, please.

14 MR. GREENE: Yes. Of course.

15 Secondary components would be allowed in medium
16 and below when accompanied by a corridor mitigation
17 plan, and then excluded from high to very high unless
18 colocated with existing infrastructure and, again,
19 accompanied by a corridor mitigation plan.

20 CHAIR DREW: Okay. All those in
21 favor, please say "aye," or raise your hands.

22 Okay.

23 All those opposed.

24 Okay.

25 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young votes "no."

1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Voted for it.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, you did.

4 I just didn't see --

5 MR. YOUNG: No, I --

6 CHAIR DREW: So we will --

7 MR. YOUNG: I did not -- did not

8 vote for it. The hand -- the hands from --

9 CHAIR DREW: Right.

10 MR. YOUNG: -- the first vote were

11 not taken down when I raised my hand.

12 CHAIR DREW: Yes, I saw that.

13 Mr. Young voted "no."

14 It is approved. Thank you, everybody.

15 Let's move on to the next question.

16 MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you.

17 The next is Species 5, which is the

18 species-specific mitigation for the ferruginous hawk.

19 There are several slides of this. The original text is

20 on the left from the FEIS. The amended text is on the

21 right, current to the previous Council meeting.

22 The original version would only -- only allow

23 project components to be sited within two miles -- a

24 two-mile radius of an existing -- or a documented

25 ferruginous hawk nest, if the applicant were able to

1 prove to EFSEC and the -- PTAG that the nest was not
2 active, that there was no viable habitat in the area,
3 and they had produced a species-specific mitigation and
4 monitoring plan.

5 As a result of previous Council deliberations,
6 this measure has been amended to exclude all primary
7 project components from that two-mile radius of any
8 identified nest but potentially allow for secondary
9 components based on those initial restrictions: Again,
10 proving that the nest is not active, there is no viable
11 habitat, and they have produced a species-specific
12 mitigation and monitoring plan.

13 And that is the text throughout. Essentially just
14 reflect that change. And also based on Council
15 direction, staff -- EFSEC staff reached out to WDFW
16 staff on whether there was an indica- -- or a belief
17 that there were any project components that could be
18 sited within two miles of a documented nest that would
19 not have adverse effects on the ferruginous hawk, and
20 WDFW staff indicated that there are no project
21 components that could be sited within that two-mile
22 radius without having adverse impacts. So all project
23 components would have an adverse impact.

24 And this is, again, the visual aid figure. The
25 areas with the red-shaded corridors are the existing

1 proposed micro-siting corridors that, with the current
2 version of Species 5, would not be allowed to site any
3 turbines or other project -- primary project
4 components, such as solar arrays and battery substa- --
5 battery stations.

6 The clear-colored corridors are areas outside of
7 those two-mile radii and would be allowed to site
8 project components normally. So the areas that would
9 be included within this exclusion area, so the two-mile
10 radius of all identified nests, would include 116
11 Option 1 turbines or 73 Option 2 turbines. It would
12 include the entirety of the east solar siting area. It
13 would include three proposed substation locations and
14 significant portions of the primary transmission line.

15 So the question for the Council. Again, this is a
16 two-part question. The first is regarding just primary
17 project components, so turbines, solar arrays, and
18 battery substations. Should those primary project
19 components be allowed within two miles of a documented
20 ferruginous hawk nest only when the applicant can
21 demonstrate that the nest is inactive, no viable
22 foraging habitat is present, and the applicant produces
23 a mitigation and management plan specific to that
24 species, which was the version of this measure included
25 in the FEIS.

1 Option B would exclude all primary project
2 components within a half mile of documented nests,
3 which is the existing WDFW seasonal buffer, and which
4 essentially make that permanent for all project
5 components. And then for any primary project
6 components within a half mile to two miles of a nest,
7 the original Species 5 would again apply, so project
8 components would be allowed if the applicant can meet
9 those -- those requirements.

10 And then the third version here is what was
11 proposed at the last Council meeting, which is that all
12 primary project components are excluded from areas
13 within two miles of a documented ferruginous hawk nest.

14 CHAIR DREW: Question for you: Are
15 all -- based on our earlier map of the areas identified
16 by red turbines and the multiple compounding impacts
17 that those turbines have that we discussed earlier,
18 removing those turbines in those areas, does that
19 remove all turbines within the two miles of a
20 documented ferruginous hawk nest?

21 MR. GREENE: I -- I would say every
22 red-colored turbine in that first figure is not only
23 red because it was in -- it is within two miles of a
24 nest, but all red turbines on that figure are within a
25 two -- two-mile radius --

1 CHAIR DREW: And there --

2 MR. GREENE: -- of a nest.

3 CHAIR DREW: -- are no others...

4 MR. GREENE: There are no other red
5 turbines that are outside of --

6 CHAIR DREW: There are no --

7 MR. GREENE: -- a two-mile radius --

8 CHAIR DREW: -- turbines that are --

9 MR. GREENE: -- of a nest.

10 CHAIR DREW: Yeah. Okay.

11 So I want to start from that question, because I
12 want us to seriously consider the solar arrays and BESS
13 if they are in the same category of creating impacts to
14 the ferruginous hawk foraging area, which is what I
15 focused on by the new mitigation measure that we talked
16 about earlier.

17 In my opinion, I think it is the turbines that are
18 the most impact, and it's also the elimination of
19 existing priority habitat. But if what we are doing is
20 putting solar arrays within those two miles of the
21 nests on agricultural already disturbed property, I
22 guess my view is it should be perhaps just the turbines
23 that are eliminated in the two-mile ferruginous hawk
24 zone.

25 So comments on that.

1 Mr. Livingston.

2 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah, I'm still --
3 I'm still supporting C, which would exclude all primary
4 compo- -- project components. And if that would
5 include solar, then I would -- I would be supporting
6 that still.

7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Mr. Young.

8 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, I agree with
9 Mr. Livingston, and I -- I support Option C.

10 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Others?

11 MR. LEVITT: I think I might need a
12 review of the map again, because I was a little
13 confused by that explanation, but I think I do not
14 support C.

15 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

16 MR. GREENE: Can you clarify which
17 map you would like to see again?

18 MR. LEVITT: Sorry. The one you
19 went over where you were saying clear -- clear
20 sections. It was just before --

21 MR. GREENE: Yes.

22 MR. LEVITT: -- we got -- yeah.

23 MR. GREENE: Yeah. So the red-
24 shaded sections are sections of the micro-si- -- the
25 wind micro-siting corridor where turbines would no

1 longer be allowed under the current form of the
2 mitigation, so they are within two miles of a
3 documented nest. The clear are areas outside of that
4 two-mile buffer. So wind turbines would be allowed to
5 be sited normally.

6 MR. LEVITT: And green is to be
7 sited normally?

8 MR. GREENE: Yes, green are the
9 actual currently proposed locations of turbines.

10 MR. LEVITT: And solar fields,
11 like -- there's solar fields on the west, and they're
12 demarcated by cross lines?

13 MR. GREENE: Yes, they are. And
14 they are with -- they are outside of that two-mile
15 radius of any identified nest. The east solar array,
16 which is not shown on this map because it -- it was
17 excluded for a number of mitigation reasons, would be
18 fully within a two-mile radius of a nest.

19 MR. LEVITT: Do you show it with
20 your cursor approximately where you --

21 MR. GREENE: Yes. It's -- it's
22 right -- well, it's -- it's right here mostly actually.

23 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.

24 CHAIR DREW: Other comments from
25 Council members?

1 MR. LEVITT: Mr. Greene, if we were
2 to go with C, would the applicant have the option of
3 trying to adjust where the -- where that solar station
4 is?

5 MR. GREENE: Likely not for the
6 solar array, just because there's a lot involved with
7 the -- the siting of project components and the only
8 areas where full -- a full complement of surveys had
9 been performed are the current cross-hatched solar
10 arrays or those corridors, the -- the micro-siting
11 corridors. So they could identify a different site and
12 propose that. It would require more collection of data
13 and analysis.

14 CHAIR DREW: Probably an amendment.

15 MR. GREENE: Yes.

16 MR. LEVITT: And the reason they
17 probably have two sets is one is connected to one side
18 of the project, and another is connected to different
19 parts of the project; is that correct?
20 Infrastructure-wise?

21 MR. GREENE: The primary
22 transmission line does connect the eastern part of the
23 project to the western part, but there are substations
24 located on both sides. So I would imagine that each
25 solar array connects to different substations as

1 currently proposed.

2 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIR DREW: Any other comments?

4 We will take a vote. The vote will be whether or
5 not the primary project components, all of them --
6 turbines, solar arrays, and BESS -- should be excluded
7 from all areas within two miles of a documented
8 ferruginous hawk nest.

9 So we're voting on C. And all those in favor,
10 raise hands.

11 All those opposed.

12 Put your hands down.

13 All those opposed.

14 So we will be -- okay. So what are we moving
15 forward with, then?

16 Ms. Brewster.

17 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah, I guess maybe a
18 bit more discussion about a compromise like B. I'm in
19 favor of excluding -- I guess my concern is maybe the
20 east solar array and its -- how it's affected,
21 considering the discussion we had earlier about the
22 east solar array and the habitat types.

23 So I guess I am in favor of the two-mile hard
24 boundary for most things, but I think I have a question
25 about that east solar array.

1 CHAIR DREW: Okay. And your
2 question on the east solar array is...?

3 MS. BREWSTER: Well, I guess not so
4 much a question as not -- I guess I am just not a -- I
5 haven't had a chance to think about that east solar
6 array and its effects and how it is affected by the
7 two-mile boundaries and especially around the historic
8 nests that may be demonstrated as not viable.

9 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

10 MS. BREWSTER: So that's where --
11 why I'm waffling a little bit.

12 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

13 Mr. Levitt.

14 MR. LEVITT: Yeah, I guess I have a
15 question for Mr. Greene, Mr. Livingston, or other EFSEC
16 staff with expertise. But I guess I'm curious if there
17 is a best management practice that has been in place in
18 Washington or more widely in Western states for -- for
19 these specific questions, half mile or two miles.
20 Like, do most states do B? Do most states do C? Et
21 cetera.

22 MR. GREENE: I would say, in most
23 existing cases, ferruginous hawk nests are not
24 necessarily provided a buffer from development. This
25 was proposed in this case because this species is --

1 their population levels are very fragile in this area,
2 and there's a -- a significant threat to their
3 continued existence in the area both as a result of
4 direct mortality and loss of foraging habitat.

5 The two-mile buffer was arrived at through
6 discussions with WDFW staff as an indication of the
7 general home range of ferruginous hawks from their
8 nests, and that was their guidance on the desired
9 buffer that WDFW staff would like to see implemented
10 for all project components.

11 The -- the Option B here that EFSEC staff
12 developed as a potential option for discussion was
13 arrived at by using the existing WDFW seasonal buffers
14 for project -- for work activities for active
15 ferruginous hawk nests, which is half a mile, and
16 considering a case where that half-mile seasonal buffer
17 is made permanent for all project components and no
18 siting would be done in that area with the remaining
19 1.5-mile radius of the home range being covered by the
20 existing restrictions within the FEIS version of this
21 measure, which is, again, the inactive nest, nonviable
22 habitat, and a mitigation and monitoring and management
23 plan.

24 CHAIR DREW: So would an option be
25 that we would not allow -- which I think we've already

1 done, but just to be sure -- turbines to be constructed
2 within the two-mile documented ferruginous hawk nest
3 but would allow solar arrays or BESS -- I don't even
4 know that I want to go to the demonstrating that a nest
5 is inactive, I guess.

6 MS. BUMPUS: Chair Drew, this is --

7 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

8 MS. BUMPUS: -- Sonia Bumpus.

9 I was just going to mention, you know, as I'm
10 listening here, that the Council talked about
11 eliminating the red turbines, which are also turbines
12 within this two-mile --

13 CHAIR DREW: Right.

14 MS. BUMPUS: -- buffer. So I wonder
15 if maybe it makes more sense to look at this question
16 as just about solar arrays and BESS.

17 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

18 MS. BUMPUS: And then the other
19 thing I was just going to mention is that I think that
20 the removal of the red turbines that is being
21 contemplated, it was noted that this was about
22 compounding impacts, getting at reducing but not able
23 to eliminate multiple different kinds of impacts:
24 Visual, so on; avian impacts, these kinds of things.
25 So I don't know. I think maybe removing turbines from

1 this and just thinking about it in terms of solar
2 arrays and BESS, particularly if the Council's leaning
3 towards removal of the red turbines.

4 CHAIR DREW: I think that's what
5 I'm -- exactly what I'm trying to get to here.

6 And what would we -- what --

7 MR. GREENE: So I -- I guess --

8 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

9 MR. GREENE: -- the -- the version
10 that I think you're discussing would exclude wind
11 turbines from within a two-mile buffer of any
12 documented nest. And for solar arrays and BESSes, the
13 question is whether you would like to see the existing
14 restrictions from the FEIS version of this measure
15 required for siting those components or allow those
16 components to be sited free of those restrictions.

17 CHAIR DREW: I guess my preference
18 would be to allow the -- those -- that
19 infrastructure -- or that -- those primary project
20 components to be included or allowed and not -- I guess
21 the -- that would be my preference. With the exclusion
22 we've already done for the solar arrays on the priority
23 habitat areas.

24 MR. GREENE: Yes. In either of
25 those versions I just mentioned, the mitigation

1 management plan, I assume, would stay. That's --

2 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

3 MR. GREENE: That's pretty standard
4 for all of our species mitigation.

5 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

6 What are views of Council members?

7 Mr. Levitt?

8 MR. LEVITT: I guess I think that
9 can be persuaded. But B, to me, still sounds more
10 appealing than A or C.

11 CHAIR DREW: Say that again. It
12 sounds more...?

13 MR. LEVITT: Appealing.

14 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Okay.

15 I -- again, I come back to: Requiring the work to
16 be done for solars or BESS, I think, is -- is not the
17 same as looking at the nests in the context of the
18 impact from a turbine. So I would not have the
19 mitigation on those two project components.

20 That's what I'll propose: That the Species 5, we
21 still want a mitigation plan, but the solar arrays and
22 the BESS can be included with the species management
23 plan.

24 Does that make sense?

25 Ms. Brewster.

1 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah, just -- so to
2 clarify, you're leaning towards the Option A, so there
3 would be no restriction such as the half-mile seasonal
4 buffer around a nest site; is that correct?

5 CHAIR DREW: Yes. Already -- I
6 mean, we can keep the exclusion of the turbines within
7 that area, which we are also looking at another way,
8 but I think we should also keep it in here.

9 So it would be that the turbines would not be --
10 would be excluded from all areas, but solars and BESS
11 would be allowed.

12 Any discussion?

13 MS. BREWSTER: I think I would be
14 inclined to lean towards B. That still leaves some
15 buffer around an area that, as was discussed by the
16 Fish and Wildlife expert, that the nests are
17 generally -- nest sites can be close together and used,
18 so I feel like that would leave a little leeway without
19 entirely excluding --

20 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

21 MS. BREWSTER: -- infrastructure
22 there.

23 CHAIR DREW: I could do that.
24 Let's -- my -- okay. If the applicant would want to
25 build in that area, then they would need to demonstrate

1 that the nest is inactive or that no viable foraging
2 habitat is present and produce a mitigation and
3 management plan.

4 Okay? More discussion on that?

5 MR. LEVITT: This is Eli,
6 Mr. Greene. So we -- we have a threshold for the
7 applicant to be able to prove whether a nest is active
8 or inactive, right? If it's not used for, like, two or
9 three years or something, it's inactive; is that
10 correct? Or maybe it is --

11 MR. GREENE: Yeah, the -- the exact
12 methodology for determining whether a nest is active
13 and whether the habitat is viable is something that
14 would be developed through conversations with us, the
15 applicant, WDFW, through the PTAG.

16 The applicant has proposed a number of measures
17 for how to -- to reach those determinations, but we
18 haven't really considered them at this point, because
19 we are waiting for final determination on this measure
20 and the incorporation of the PTAG.

21 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.

22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So this vote is
23 on excluding turbines from all areas within two miles
24 and allowing solar arrays and BESS on B.

25 Ms. Osborne.

1 MS. OSBORNE: Sorry, Chair Drew. I
2 just was being a little bit ahead.

3 CHAIR DREW: Ahead of the question.

4 MS. OSBORNE: Yep. Sorry about
5 that.

6 CHAIR DREW: That's okay.

7 So is that clear? We would exclude turbines in
8 the two-mile, and the solar arrays and BESS would be
9 excluded from all areas within a half mile of a
10 documented nest, but allow the half mile to two miles
11 of a documented hawk nest for solar arrays and BESS if
12 the applicant can demonstrate that the nest is
13 inactive, no viable foraging habitat is present,
14 produces a mitigation plan.

15 Okay. All those in favor, raise your hands.

16 All those opposed.

17 Okay. It is four to two. So that is moving
18 forward.

19 MR. LEVITT: Chair Drew, clarifying
20 question for that vote.

21 I thought at one point --

22 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

23 MR. LEVITT: -- Director Bumpus
24 suggested we not think about the turbines in this vote.
25 So you did include the turbines, correct?

1 CHAIR DREW: I did, because it's,
2 for me, a double safety, if you will, to say here
3 they're excluded, so there's no question about that
4 they would be excluded in the two-mile area. But
5 they're also ones we're planning to exclude anyway.

6 MR. LEVITT: Okay.

7 MR. GREENE: I would also say, in
8 the interest of staff actually implementing these
9 measures, having that two-mile buffer defined here is
10 very helpful because we are excluding not just
11 individual turbine locations; we are excluding sections
12 of the micro-siting corridor so that turbines aren't
13 just moved the two feet and suddenly are allowed again.

14 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you,
15 everybody. We'll move on to the next one.

16 MR. GREENE: And the next question
17 is this same topic again but for secondary components.
18 I'm sorry. That's -- whoops. That's a typo. Option 3
19 is not the current version for this.

20 For secondary components, the version in the FEIS
21 is also the version that Council was considering at the
22 previous meeting, which is that secondary components,
23 such as roads, substations, and transmission lines,
24 would be allowed within two miles of a documented nest
25 only when the applicant can demonstrate that the nest

1 is inactive, no viable foraging habitat is present, and
2 produces a mitigation and management plan.

3 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

4 MR. YOUNG: Could you flip back to
5 the notes from our December 20 meeting as far as the
6 secondary components?

7 MR. GREENE: Did you mean, like, the
8 actual text of it?

9 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. GREENE: What the edit
12 essentially did was change the beginning of this
13 measure to fully exclude primary components within that
14 two-mile buffer, which will now change as a result of
15 the previous vote, and then make the rest of Species 5
16 as written only apply to secondary components.

17 So the rest of the text is essentially the same as
18 the FEIS version of Species 5.

19 CHAIR DREW: And that's the original
20 that's on the left, is the FEIS version, which would --
21 so maybe to make this easy for everyone, it is the same
22 as the FEIS version.

23 All those in favor of maintaining that as we
24 described on 12/20/23, raise your hand.

25 I'll ask for discussion.

1 Is there any other discussion?

2 MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Could we --

3 CHAIR DREW: I should --

4 MR. YOUNG: Could we flip back to
5 the questions? I'm still trying to cross-reference the
6 questions back --

7 CHAIR DREW: Yeah.

8 MR. YOUNG: -- to the -- the notes.

9 CHAIR DREW: My apologies.

10 MR. YOUNG: So this is for secondary
11 components.

12 MR. GREENE: Correct.

13 MR. YOUNG: And is it that Option A
14 is -- is what is consistent with both the FEIS and
15 December 20?

16 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

17 MR. GREENE: Correct.

18 MR. YOUNG: And that's what the --
19 the vote is being called for, is who supports A.

20 CHAIR DREW: Yes. Yes.

21 MR. YOUNG: Because of that
22 consistency?

23 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

24 MR. YOUNG: Is that correct?

25 Thanks for the clarification.

1 CHAIR DREW: Yeah.

2 So we're going to vote on A.

3 All those in favor of A. Unless there's further
4 discussion.

5 Sorry. Okay.

6 All those in favor of A, raise your hand.

7 Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. GREENE: Okay. The next and, I
9 believe, final exclusion measure for today's meeting is
10 a new measure that we entitled Cultural Resources 3,
11 which is a desire that was discussed by the Council at
12 the previous meeting to eliminate -- or exclude all
13 project components from areas east of the boundaries of
14 Straub Canyon to reduce the project impacts to identify
15 TCPs.

16 And this is what the project would look like
17 with -- Straub Canyon doesn't fully bisect the project
18 area, so staff drew a line in the -- the direction of
19 travel of the canyon from it -- its final extent and
20 kind of extended that through the project area so that
21 we would have a line of demarcation. But this is what
22 the project would look like with the incorporation of
23 that measure.

24 And then the question is fairly straightforward,
25 is just: Should all project components be allowed east

1 of Straub Canyon, which is the FEIS version, or
2 excluded from the areas east of Straub Canyon, which is
3 the proposed version.

4 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Young.

5 MR. YOUNG: So could you flip back
6 to the map? I had a question about the -- down at the
7 extreme southeast tip of -- of the project area here,
8 there's, like, a red-shaded corridor. Is that --
9 that's -- is that an area where we've already for other
10 reasons excluded turbines?

11 MR. GREENE: You mean this area
12 here?

13 MR. YOUNG: No. Up near, like, what
14 the new project area would be. Yeah, right up there.

15 MR. GREENE: Yeah. Okay. Yes. I'm
16 sorry. The -- just the way that we develop these
17 figures, these red-shaded corridors are areas that are
18 within two miles of a ferruginous hawk nest, so they
19 would be excluded by Species 5 for primary project
20 components.

21 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

22 And I do advocate for this option. I -- I think
23 we would eliminate a large portion of the unmitigable
24 high, high impacts to traditional cultural properties.
25 And so much of what is in the area that would be

1 eliminated under this option would also resolve
2 multiple other concerns that we've had with ferruginous
3 hawk, with wildlife movement corridors, with visual
4 impacts from the more developed areas off to the east,
5 with connectivity. So many things. But the dominant
6 driver for this for me is to address the significant
7 unmitigable impacts to traditional cultural properties,
8 and I do support this.

9 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

10 Other comments?

11 MR. LEVITT: This is Eli. I guess I
12 would offer up that, you know, we've done our best as a
13 Council to mitigate environmental impacts, especially
14 wildlife. And the cultural impacts are challenging, to
15 say the least. But because we've had such a strong
16 focus on wildlife, I think that actually ends up
17 helping with -- just saying at a very high level,
18 helping with TCP issues presented by some interested
19 parties.

20 So I don't know. The demarcation of Straub
21 Canyon, to me, seems arbitrary and pulled out -- pulled
22 out of our pocket, so I guess I just -- I can't support
23 the proposal as is.

24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

25 Other comments?

1 I will say that I respect and understand,
2 Mr. Young, your reason for putting this forward. I
3 would say that there are project components in
4 different -- in areas to the east that don't have the
5 same multiple compounding impacts as the ones we talked
6 about earlier. And those would be eliminated in this
7 proposal.

8 And I do know and understand that the entire
9 project does impact traditional cultural properties,
10 and we are considering that information along with the
11 environmental, but we also have to consider our
12 responsibility to support clean energy development as
13 well, and it's a difficult balancing to do. But in
14 order to maintain ability for more of the project to
15 move forward for that clean energy, I would not support
16 eliminating all of the project to the east.

17 Mr. Livingston.

18 MR. LIVINGSTON: I always end up
19 having more questions than I have answers. But, you
20 know, it would be -- it would be helpful for me to know
21 what the -- what would the project's ability -- how
22 much megawatts can they produce with this, this
23 proposal; how many turbines are we talking that would
24 be built; what's the -- what does that look like. I
25 mean, it is a very different project than what was

1 originally proposed, and we also have the other -- all
2 the other mitigation and avoidance measures that we've
3 taken have changed the project significantly anyway.

4 I -- I want to support this, this effort, because
5 it -- it's a large project with two solar arrays and a
6 number of turbines in the string. I also know that the
7 company designed it to include that giant 25-mile-long
8 corridor, which there's multiple issues with that, of
9 course.

10 But seeing what this -- the output of this, and
11 truly is it not viable? Yeah, it's not viable to what
12 they built or originally designed for, but it -- could
13 this be a project in itself? I believe it could. So
14 I'm -- I'm supportive of it.

15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

16 Other --

17 MR. YOUNG: I would -- I would --

18 CHAIR DREW: -- Council members?

19 MR. YOUNG: Sorry, Chair Drew. I
20 didn't raise my hand. But I -- I would refer my fellow
21 Council members to the confidential mapping of the
22 project's impacts on traditional cultural properties.

23 Again, everything we've been looking at so far has
24 been based on the maps where TCP impacts did not
25 feature into the green/yellow/red categorization of the

1 turbines. And you get a different take on the
2 project's impacts when you look at that confidential
3 information of the project's impacts on TCPs.

4 And I'd also put forth that I don't think the
5 selection of Straub Canyon was a completely arbitrary
6 thing. If we start looking at maps that represent our
7 other concerns that we've talked about and that we're
8 mitigating, particularly where that major north-south
9 wildlife movement corridor runs through the project,
10 Straub Canyon and what's east of that, it is a logical
11 break point to eliminate a lot of impacts associated
12 with the eastern part of the project. So I'd just put
13 forth that it was not an arbitrary selection.

14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

15 Thank you for also mentioning the confidential
16 maps. I, myself, personally have spent a great deal of
17 time looking at those maps, so I appreciate you
18 referencing those. I have considered that. I have
19 looked at the multiple impacts and the balance that we
20 are trying to -- I am trying to make with this project.
21 And we will not eliminate all the impacts and all the
22 impacts to traditional cultural properties unless we
23 deny the project.

24 So I will not be supporting this. I think there
25 are still elements that can be constructed with a lot

1 of the mitigation that we brought forward for many
2 impacts that we have seen in each of our processes,
3 again with the FEIS, with the adjudication, and with
4 public comments.

5 I think we will need to take a vote.

6 All those in favor of supporting this proposal to
7 eliminate all project elements from east of Straub
8 Canyon, please raise your hand.

9 Thank you.

10 All those opposed.

11 Okay. It fails. Thank you.

12 Are there other measures for us to consider?

13 MR. GREENE: No. That is the
14 entirety.

15 CHAIR DREW: Okay. So Mr. Young.

16 MR. YOUNG: I -- I would -- I don't
17 know how it would fit exactly into the force of our
18 discussion this afternoon, but I think what was
19 summarized for us at the beginning of the meeting, the
20 additional input around impacts on aerial firefighting
21 capabilities that came in for Mr. Lane and chief, the
22 local fire chief, I think that that might point to some
23 things that we would want to require of the applicant
24 to -- if the project moves ahead, that the -- knowing
25 that aerial firefighting will not be able to be used

1 inside the perimeter or within a quarter mile of the
2 perimeter, it suggests that really serious
3 consideration is giving -- given to the alternative and
4 some type of really well-thought-out plan on how fires
5 can be fought from the ground in those areas that are
6 not open to aircraft.

7 CHAIR DREW: I think it is -- I
8 think that's a good idea. I think we already have a
9 measure on that, don't we?

10 MR. GREENE: We don't have a
11 mitigation measure, but one of the applicant
12 commitments is to develop a fire management plan in
13 coordination with EFSEC and local fire response
14 agencies.

15 MR. YOUNG: But perhaps what could
16 be included in there is that the applicant needs to
17 specifically address how it's going to make up for the
18 lack of ability to fight fire from the air, which is an
19 extreme -- probably the single most important initial
20 attack to what we have. And so I think there's an
21 added -- added responsibility on the applicant to make
22 sure that that plan addresses how they're going to make
23 up for the inability to call for aircraft when aircraft
24 would otherwise be deployed.

25 CHAIR DREW: It's my

1 understanding -- and maybe the staff can help me
2 here -- that there isn't a wind farm -- there's not an
3 expectation that there will be firefighting -- aerial
4 firefighting over any wind farm in the state. So my
5 concern has always been about the periphery.

6 I think if you look even at the Wild Horse wind
7 project and their experience with fire and how they
8 fought it there, which is in their TAC minutes, which
9 was just provided to us.

10 So I hear what you're saying. My concern has
11 always been on the aerial firefighting is the area
12 outside the perimeter of the project, itself.

13 MR. YOUNG: Yeah, I think the -- the
14 conversa- -- I agree with you, Chair Drew. But I think
15 the conversations we've had around aerial firefighting
16 as it pertains to this project have -- have highlighted
17 some things that maybe haven't got the same level of
18 attention in the past. And, in fact, I believe that
19 there's a bill working in the legislature right now
20 that addresses aerial firefighting and wind
21 interactions. And I don't -- don't know what the
22 status of that bill is.

23 But I think what we've done in the context of
24 discussing it in this project, we've highlighted
25 something that maybe, going forward, needs a little

1 more attention than what it's received in the past.

2 But I would agree. The challenges around aerial
3 firefighting and this proposed wind farm exist with
4 other wind farms as well.

5 CHAIR DREW: Yeah, I think -- I
6 think the fire -- I think we should ask -- I think we
7 can certainly ask that the plan consider issues around
8 aerial firefighting.

9 MR. YOUNG: If air -- if air assets
10 were at -- at one's disposal, one might write the plan
11 one way, but knowing going in that air fi- -- aerial
12 firefighting is not an option --

13 CHAIR DREW: Right.

14 MR. YOUNG: -- would cause you to
15 write the plan a different -- a different way.

16 CHAIR DREW: Right. That's fine. I
17 think that's fine. Appreciate that.

18 So the conclusion here is that we need a motion to
19 ask staff to finalize documents. This is to give
20 direction to staff to finalize documents for review by
21 the public and by ourselves that incorporate the
22 decisions we have made today and to provide those
23 documents back to us for review and final consideration
24 at a future meeting.

25 Is there a motion to direct staff?

1 Mr. Young.

2 MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry. Could I ask
3 a question before --

4 CHAIR DREW: Sure.

5 MR. YOUNG: -- before we get to
6 that?

7 So is there still a final vote in front of us as
8 to whether we support this project being built or not?

9 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

10 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIR DREW: So this is directing
12 the staff to move forward with the documents with the
13 decisions we've made today, and prior decisions, to
14 finalize those documents for our review and final vote
15 in a future meeting.

16 May I have a motion?

17 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt. So moved.

18 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

19 Is there a second?

20 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.

21 Second.

22 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Go ahead. Was
23 that somebody from our Council? Okay.

24 Is there any discussion?

25 Okay. All those in favor, let's do the hand --

1 raise hand.

2 Okay. Opposed.

3 We'd better put our hands down. There we go.

4 Motion carries.

5 One more item on -- well, actually, a couple more
6 items on our agenda. One is an action item regarding
7 an extension request.

8 Ms. Moon, are you still here?

9 MS. MOON: Yes. Yes, I am. Thank
10 you, Chair Drew.

11 CHAIR DREW: You are on for the
12 extension request.

13 MS. MOON: Okay. So I wanted to
14 turn the Council's attention to the current agreement
15 between EFSEC and the project proponent to complete the
16 processing of their application for site certification,
17 or ASC, and submit an EFSEC recommendation to the
18 governor by January 31st of this year, 2024.

19 To allow for more Council review, including
20 responding to the Council's request for additional
21 information, EFSEC staff worked with the applicant to
22 establish an updated commitment date to complete the
23 processing of the Horse Heaven application for site
24 certification. The new date, which is referred to as
25 the extension -- which is referred to as the extension

1 date as defined in the Revised Code of Washington
2 80.50.100 -- 80.50.100 -- requires the EFSEC Council to
3 report to the governor its recommendations as to the
4 approval or rejection of an application for
5 certification within 12 months of receipt by the
6 Council of such an application or such later time as is
7 mutually agreed by the Council and the applicant.

8 Three extension requests have been approved by the
9 Council. And the extension request included in the
10 Council packet, which is up on the screen, that's
11 included today would extend the application processing
12 of the proposed Horse Heaven Wind Farm project
13 application for site certification to April 30th, 2024.

14 Five public comments were received on the
15 extension request. The proposed extension request will
16 allev- -- will -- I'm sorry. The proposed extension
17 request will allow the additional time needed for staff
18 to prepare the documentation needed for the
19 recommendation to the governor, followed by Council
20 review and public comment. Staff have coordinated with
21 the applicant on the request time frame to allow for
22 work that may be needed following Council review or
23 public comment.

24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

25 Are there any questions for staff?

1 Is there a motion to approve the extension request
2 till April --

3 Sorry. My eyes can't see.

4 MS. MOON: April 30th, 2024.

5 CHAIR DREW: -- 30th, 2024?

6 Motion to approve the extension request?

7 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster. So
8 moved.

9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

10 Second?

11 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt. Second.

12 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

13 Discussion?

14 My discussion is that I appreciate the time. I
15 expect it will be done sooner than that. But I don't
16 see any point in continuing to ask for extensions, so I
17 appreciate the time frame in this letter.

18 All those in favor, say "aye."

19 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

20 CHAIR DREW: All those opposed?

21 Motion carries. Thank you.

22 We have agenda items remaining. And thank you,
23 everybody, for the discussion, the thoughtful
24 consideration. I very much appreciate it.

25 Cascade Renewable Transmission Project,

1 preapplication announcement. Ms. Hafkemeyer.

2 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you. I'll
3 try and keep it brief.

4 On December 20th, 2023, EFSEC staff received the
5 preapplication materials for the Cascade Renewable
6 Transmission Project. The proposed transmission line
7 would begin at the Big Eddy Substation located near The
8 Dalles, Oregon, and terminate at the Portland General
9 Electric Harborton Substation located in Portland,
10 Oregon. This line would primarily run down the
11 Columbia River, in the riverbed, exiting the river to
12 go around the Bonneville Dam.

13 Per the Revised Code of Washington, or RCW,
14 80.50.330 and the Washington Administrative Code, or
15 WAC, 463-61-050, electrical transmission proposals are
16 required to engage in specific preapplication
17 activities, such as outreach and negotiations with
18 local jurisdictions. While the applicant, Cascade
19 Renewables, LLC, is engaging in those activities, EFSEC
20 staff are preparing to hold public informational
21 meetings in accordance with WAC 463-61-040.

22 Staff are preparing to hold three meetings, one in
23 each county the proposed transmission line passes by,
24 on the evenings of February 6th, 7th, and 8th. At
25 these meetings, staff will present the EFSEC process,

1 and the applicant will present the project. These are
2 not meetings to take public comment, but information on
3 how to contact EFSEC with comment will be provided as
4 part of EFSEC's presentation. Details for the
5 in-person venues of these meetings will be issued once
6 they are finalized.

7 Are there any questions?

8 CHAIR DREW: So this is a
9 preapplication process, which is required in our
10 statute on transmission projects. Before -- when this
11 project -- should this project come to us in an
12 application, not in preapplication, then the Council
13 would be required to hold public informational meetings
14 within 60 days in these same communities; is that
15 correct?

16 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Correct. Once the
17 application is received, the process proceeds as it
18 would for an energy-generating facility. There are
19 specific preapplication facili- -- or preapplication
20 activities that are required of transmission only. But
21 once the application is received, the meetings that are
22 typically required for other projects will also be
23 required of this project.

24 CHAIR DREW: So this is an early
25 meeting at this point in time to inform the public

1 about both the project from the entity that is putting
2 it forward as well as to hear about the EFSEC process,
3 but we will have our usual public informational
4 meetings taking comments after the application is
5 received.

6 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Correct.

7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. Any other
8 questions from Council members?

9 Okay. Thank you.

10 Third-quarter cost allocation. Ms. Bumpus.

11 MS. BUMPUS: Good afternoon, Chair
12 Drew and Council. Thank you. For the record, this is
13 Sonia Bumpus.

14 I'm going to read off EFSEC's third-quarter 2024
15 cost allocations. This covers the period January 1,
16 2024, to March 30th, 2024.

17 For Kittitas Valley wind power, 4 percent.

18 For Wild Horse, 4 percent.

19 For Columbia Generating Station, 20 percent.

20 Columbia Solar, 4 percent.

21 WNP-1, 2 percent.

22 Whistling Ridge, 3 percent.

23 Grays Harbor, 6 percent.

24 Chehalis, 6 percent.

25 Desert Claim, 4 percent.

1 Goose Prairie, 4 percent.

2 Horse Heaven, 15 percent.

3 Badger Mountain, 6 percent.

4 Cypress Creek, 4 percent.

5 Wautoma Solar, 6 percent.

6 Hop Hill, 6 percent.

7 Carriger Solar, also 6 percent.

8 And that concludes my update for the nondirect
9 cost allocation.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

11 And now for the employee updates. We have
12 new-employee introductions.

13 Beautiful picture on the screen. I don't know who
14 that was, Ms. Grantham.

15 Mr. Walker, you have an introduction to make.

16 MR. WALKER: Yes. Thank you, Chair
17 Drew. For the record, Dave Walker, director of
18 administrative services with EFSEC.

19 I would like to introduce our new policy and
20 legislation manager. Lisa McLean just started with us
21 the middle of January as our new legislative manager.
22 Very happy to have her aboard. She joins us from the
23 Gambling Commission.

24 So, Lisa, if you'd like to say a few words.

25 MS. McLEAN: Sorry. I was trying to

1 unmute these things.

2 Hello, everyone. Nice to meet everybody. Nice to
3 participate in this meeting for the first time. I am
4 the legislative and policy manager and did come over
5 from the Gambling Commission where I was also the
6 legislative and policy manager.

7 I've been working for Washington State for State
8 government for five years. Before the Gambling
9 Commission, I was working out with the Redistricting
10 Commission. And before that, I was working with the
11 census and making sure everybody filled out their
12 census form. And for that reason, Washington State was
13 second in the nation in terms of people who
14 self-responded.

15 So I'm happy to be here and look forward to trying
16 to advance the interests of the Council through the
17 legislation and policy efforts that we pursue. So nice
18 to meet everybody.

19 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Welcome
20 aboard.

21 Next, we have Ami Hafkemeyer.

22 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
23 Drew. I would like to introduce two new siting
24 specialists to the Council who have both started this
25 month. We have Zia Ahmed, who is joining us from most

1 recently Missouri. Then we have Maria Belkina, who is
2 also a siting specialist joining us.

3 Maria will be taking the Cascade Renewable
4 Transmission Project that I just introduced. And Zia
5 will be taking at least one, if not more, of the
6 incoming projects that we are projecting to see in the
7 coming weeks.

8 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

9 Welcome aboard. Thank you for being here.

10 MS. BELKINA: Thank you.

11 MR. AHMED: Thank you.

12 CHAIR DREW: Would you like -- I
13 mean, you don't -- would you like to introduce a little
14 bit about yourself? Go ahead. Maria.

15 MR. AHMED: Yeah. Of course.

16 CHAIR DREW: Zia. Zia.

17 MR. AHMED: Thank you, everyone. My
18 name is Zia Ahmed. So I just complete my Ph.D. from
19 Mississippi State University. My concentration was art
20 and atmospheric science. And I just start for EFSEC
21 from January 2nd, 2024. And I'm excited to work
22 further. And nice to meet you, everyone. And thank
23 you.

24 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

25 Ms. Belkina.

1 MS. BELKINA: Hello, everyone. Just
2 started my first EFSEC experience January 2024. I
3 already have some experience as a site specialist. And
4 I'm very pleased to be part of the team. Thank you.

5 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Welcome
6 aboard.

7 Ms. Owens, you also --

8 MS. OWENS: Thank you.

9 CHAIR DREW: -- have a new employee
10 to introduce.

11 MS. OWENS: I do. Thank you.

12 Good afternoon, EFSEC Council and staff. I'd like
13 to introduce another new employee, Adrienne Barker.
14 Adrienne joins the EFSEC team as an administrative
15 assistant. Mostly her work will be focused on
16 assisting the PEIS manager, once we get that position
17 filled, and other office support tasks as needed.

18 Adrienne recently relocated back to Washington
19 from Virginia, where she was an office manager for a
20 financial planning company. As a former Washington
21 State employee, Adrienne's extensive admin experience
22 includes working in event planning as well as private
23 sector and government contracting in the Washington,
24 D.C., area. So welcome to the team, Adrienne.

25 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

1 Go ahead. Welcome.

2 MS. BARKER: Thank you. Thank you.
3 It's nice to meet everybody. I'm looking forward to
4 it.

5 CHAIR DREW: Welcome aboard. And we
6 appreciate -- and welcome home maybe.

7 MS. BARKER: Yes. Thank you.

8 CHAIR DREW: Welcome back. So --

9 MS. BARKER: Yep.

10 CHAIR DREW: -- thank you.

11 MS. BARKER: Thank you.

12 CHAIR DREW: With that, we have no
13 further business. And so thank you, all, for your
14 participation and work throughout.

15 And this meeting is adjourned.

16 (Meeting adjourned at
17 5:27 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR,
2) ss a certified court reporter
3 County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do
4 hereby certify:

5 That the foregoing Monthly Meeting of the Washington
6 State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was conducted
7 in my presence and adjourned on January 31, 2024, and
8 thereafter was transcribed under my direction; that the
9 transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the
10 said meeting, transcribed to the best of my ability;

11 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel
12 of any party to this matter or relative or employee of any
13 such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially
14 interested in the said matter or the outcome thereof;

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
16 this 15th day of February, 2024.

17 _____
18 /s/John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR
19 Certified Court Reporter No. 2976
20 (Certification expires 5/26/2024.)
21
22
23
24
25