

1 This Petition will refer to three different sets of EFSC rules. First, the “2017 rules” are
2 the permanent, valid rules that were in effect prior to October 2017.

3 Second, the “2018 rules” are the permanent rules adopted in October 2017. On August 1,
4 2019, the Oregon Supreme Court held that the 2018 rules “are invalid.” *Friends of the Columbia*
5 *Gorge v. EFSC* (“*Friends v. EFSC*”), 365 Or 371, 396, 446 P3d 53 (2019).
6

7 Third, the “2019 rules” are the temporary rules adopted by EFSC on August 22, 2019.
8 The 2019 rules are currently being challenged in *Friends of the Columbia Gorge v. EFSC*,
9 Oregon Supreme Court No. S066993. The parties are currently awaiting a decision from the
10 Supreme Court.
11

12 II. GROUNDS FOR RECONSIDERATION OR REHEARING

13 A. Because the 2018 rules are invalid, the Council lacked authority to apply the 2018 14 rules in its Orders.

15 In numerous instances within its Orders and within the Amended Site Certificate, the
16 Council applied the 2018 rules. However, the Oregon Supreme Court has expressly held that the
17 2018 rules “are invalid.” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396. In addition, the Oregon Court of
18 Appeals has held that “[a] rule not promulgated according to the [Oregon Administrative
19 Procedures Act] is not a rule.” *Gooderham v. Adult & Family Servs. Div.*, 64 Or App 104, 110,
20 667 P2d 551 (1983) (emphasis added). Here, the Oregon Supreme Court held that the 2018 rules
21 were not promulgated according to the mandatory rulemaking procedures required by the
22 Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 387–90, 395–96. Thus, the
23 2018 rules were never valid rules. EFSC lacked authority to implement, apply, or enforce the
24 2018 rules, and erred in doing so in this matter.
25
26

27 ///
28

1 For example, EFSC's Order on Requests for Contested Case in this matter is entirely based
2 on the invalid 2018 rules. Furthermore, within this Order, EFSC rejected Petitioners' request to
3 hold a contested case, in pertinent part concluding that "Friends may not . . . challenge the
4 validity of these rules in a contested case proceeding" and that "the Council does not have
5 jurisdiction to grant a contested case to determine the validity of rules adopted by the Council."
6 (Order on Requests for Contested Case at 13.) Even assuming that these conclusions are correct,
7 the fact remains that, after the Council issued this Order, the challenged rules were deemed
8 invalid by the Supreme Court. The Council should reconsider this Order, and should allow a
9 public hearing and contested case to resolve whether it was proper for EFSC to implement the
10 invalid 2018 rules in this and other Orders.

13 In addition, the Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate also
14 purports to apply the invalid 2018 rules as well:

16 While portions of the rules are being challenged in the Oregon Supreme Court, a
17 stay of the rules or any other injunction against using the rules has not been
18 issued. As such, the [2018] rules are valid and are applicable to the amendment
19 request, as well as all other amendment requests pending with EFSC at this time.
The prior rules were repealed in 2017, and are not applicable to the review of the
RFA4.

20 (Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate at 8 n 7.) This statement,
21 adopted more than three weeks *after* the Supreme Court held the 2018 rules "invalid," fails to
22 even acknowledge the Supreme Court's ruling, let alone properly respond to it. The above-
23 quoted statement says that the 2018 rules "are valid" (even though they had been held "invalid"
24 by the Supreme Court by that time) and says that EFSC and ODOE will continue to apply these
25 invalid rules. This statement is in error and should be reversed. Agencies lack authority to
26 implement, enforce, and apply invalid rules, especially after a court has declared them invalid.
27
28

1 The Council should reconsider this Order, and should allow a public hearing and contested case
2 to resolve whether it was proper for EFSC to implement invalid rules in this and other Orders in
3 this matter.

4
5 The Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order also erroneously
6 interprets the validity of the 2018 rules and the effect of the Supreme Court’s decision on this
7 proceeding:

8 The August 1, 2019 Supreme Court decision holds that OAR 345 Division 27
9 rules approved by EFSC through Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017
10 and 5-2017 are invalid due to a procedural error and further holds that provisions
11 regarding judicial review in those rules were beyond Council’s authority to adopt.
12 However, the Supreme Court’s decision is not effective until the issuance of the
appellate judgment, which has not yet occurred.

13 (Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at 6.) EFSC concluded in
14 this statement that it may implement, apply, and enforce invalid rules, and that it may and will
15 continue to do so, even after a court holds that the rules are invalid, until the court issues a
16 judgment. This conclusion is incorrect. As the Court of Appeals held in *Gooderham*, “[a] rule not
17 promulgated according to the APA *is not a rule.*” *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110 (emphasis
18 added). Accordingly, the 2018 rules are not rules, and it was improper for EFSC and ODOE to
19 implement, apply, and enforce the 2018 rules. An agency decision based on invalid rules is
20 subject to reversal. *See Homestyle Direct, LLC v. Dep’t of Human Serv.*, 245 Or App 598, 605,
21 263 P3d 1118 (2011) (state agencies cannot enforce invalid rules), *rev’d on other grounds*, 354
22 Or 253, 311 P3d 487 (2013); *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 107–08 (invalid rule could not be used
23 to reduce or terminate benefits); *Clark v. Pub. Welfare Div.*, 27 Or App 473, 477, 556 P2d 722
24 (1976) (“The decision of the hearings officer having been made pursuant to invalid rules is itself
25 invalid.”); *Kessler v. Or. Corr. Div.*, 26 Or App 271, 274, 552 P2d 589 (1976) (agency decision
26
27
28

1 reversed and remanded because it applied invalid rules), *overruled on other grounds by*
2 *Rutherford v. Or. State Penitentiary*, 39 Or App 431, 439, 592 P2d 1028 (1979). The Council
3 should reconsider this Order, and should allow a public hearing and contested case to resolve
4 whether it was proper for EFSC to implement invalid rules in this and other Orders.
5

6 EFSC also appears to have applied the invalid 2018 rules to support numerous conditions
7 of approval within the Fourth Amended Site Certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm. For
8 example, Conditions 2.10 and 15.0 apply OAR 345-027-0100,¹ Condition 5.7 applies OAR 345-
9 027-0020, Condition 7.10 applies OAR 345-027-0023(4), Condition 7.13.c.vi applies OAR 345-
10 027-0050, Condition 14.4 applies OAR 345-027-0110(5), and Condition 14.5 applies OAR 345-
11 027-0110. All of EFSC's citations within these Conditions are either to the 2018 rules, the 2017
12 rules, or both. EFSC's actions in issuing the Fourth Amended Site Certificate and related rules
13 were inconsistent with EFSC's rules, because EFSC applied the 2019 rules in multiple instances
14 within these decisions, and yet applied the 2018 and/or 2017 rules in other instances. EFSC's
15 actions in applying the 2018 and/or 2017 rules were also inconsistent with EFSC's own officially
16 stated agency positions, because EFSC has also claimed that the 2017 rules are no longer
17 effective or valid, and that the 2018 rules have been superseded by the 2019 rules. The Council
18 should reconsider the Fourth Amended Site Certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm and
19 related Orders, and should allow a public hearing and contested case to resolve which set(s) of
20 rules should be implemented within any Amended Site Certificate and related Orders.
21
22
23

24 ///
25

26 ¹ In Condition 15.0, the citation to OAR 345-027-0100 includes a handwritten note dated September
27 11, 2019 and changing the citation to OAR 345-027-0400. It is unclear who made this handwritten
28 revision and whether it was properly reviewed and approved by the Council in compliance with all
applicable laws.

1 In the Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order, EFSC also
2 erroneously concluded that any issues involving the 2018 rules are “moot” because of the
3 adoption of the 2019 rules:
4

5 [A]ny issue questioning the validity of RFA 4 and Pattern’s site certificate due to
6 the amendment rules adopted in October 2017 having been invalidated is moot
7 because those rules have been suspended and replaced with the temporary rules
8 adopted on August 22, 2019.

9 (Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at 6.) The conclusion that
10 these issues are moot is incorrect, because as Petitioners have shown above, EFSC implemented
11 and applied the 2018 rules on numerous occasions within all three of its Orders, thus forcing the
12 issue as to whether it was proper for EFSC to do so. In addition, in the months leading up to
13 these Orders, EFSC took multiple actions under the 2018 rules that should or would have led to a
14 very different result had the 2017 rules (the only valid set of rules) instead been applied. For
15 example, the 2017 rules required Pattern Energy to submit its application “no later than six
16 months before the date of the applicable deadline.” OAR 345-027-0030(1) (2017). Here, Pattern
17 submitted its application *only three days* prior to the construction start deadline, thus violating
18 this 2017 rule. EFSC has taken the position that the invalid 2018 rules, rather than the valid 2017
19 rules, were properly applied at multiple stages of this proceeding, and that the 2018 rules were
20 properly applied within several of EFSC’s Orders. Because EFSC and ODOE have applied the
21 invalid 2018 rules in numerous instances in this matter, their actions in doing so are not “moot.”
22 The Council should reconsider its Orders and should allow a public hearing and contested case to
23 resolve whether it was proper for EFSC to implement invalid rules, and to resolve which set(s) of
24 rules should be implemented in the Amended Site Certificate and related Orders.
25
26
27
28

1 **B. Because the 2019 rules are invalid, the Council lacked authority to apply the 2019**
2 **rules in its Orders.**

3 On numerous occasions within its Orders and within the Amended Site Certificate, the
4 Council applied the 2019 rules. However, as Petitioners have explained in the pending appeal in
5 the Oregon Supreme Court, the 2019 rules are invalid because they were not promulgated in
6 accordance with the requirements of the APA. In addition, the Council adopted the 2019 rules on
7 August 22, 2019 and used them only one day later to issue the Order on Requests for Contested
8 Case on Amended Proposed Order and to approve the proposed Amendment to the Summit
9 Ridge Site Certificate, without ever giving the public an opportunity to comment on whether it
10 was lawful and proper for the Council to do so. The Council should reconsider the Fourth
11 Amended Site Certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm and related Orders, and should allow
12 a public hearing and contested case to resolve whether it was proper for the Council to, within
13 the Amended Site Certificate and related Orders, retroactively apply the 2019 temporary rules to
14 transactions and occurrences in 2018 and early 2019 (without ever allowing any participation
15 from the public on the Council's decisions to do so).
16
17
18

19 As Petitioners have explained in the pending case *Friends of the Columbia Gorge v. EFSC*,
20 Oregon Supreme Court No. S066993, under the APA, “a rule is not valid unless adopted in
21 substantial compliance with the provisions of [ORS 183.335].” ORS 183.335(11)(a); *see also*
22 ORS 183.400(4)(c) (Agency rules “adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking
23 procedures” are “invalid.”). Here, ODOE and EFSC chose to bypass the APA’s normal
24 rulemaking requirements and instead quickly adopt the 2019 rules as temporary rules, without
25 soliciting comments from the general public and without allowing the public to request an oral
26 hearing. In so doing, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by failing to demonstrate an emergency
27
28

1 via adequate findings “that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public
2 interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of
3 prejudice.” The purpose of this requirement is to allow an abbreviated, expedited rulemaking
4 process only where there is, effectively, an emergency. That purpose was not met here.
5

6 Specifically, ODOE and EFSC contrived a false emergency by adopting the legal fiction
7 that there were (or would be) no rules in place following the Supreme Court’s decision in the
8 prior case. In fact, the 2017 rules were reinstated by the Supreme Court’s decision, and there was
9 no need whatsoever for EFSC “to act promptly” to adopt new temporary rules on an expedited
10 basis without full compliance with the rulemaking requirements of the APA. ORS 183.335(5)(a).
11

12 In addition, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by failing to adopt adequate findings of
13 “serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned.” Instead, EFSC
14 merely adopted findings that energy developers should not have to experience “unnecessary
15 delays and costs” and that adopting the “temporary rules may also improve the prospects for
16 continuity in the processing of applications.” EFSC’s findings were inadequate to demonstrate
17 the need to “act promptly” to avoid “serious prejudice,” as required by the APA for temporary
18 rules. ORS 183.335(5)(a); *see also Vier ex rel. Torry v. State Office for Servs. to Children &*
19 *Families*, 159 Or App 369, 375, 977 P2d 425 (1999) (ORS 183.335(5)(a) requires agencies “to
20 demonstrate an emergency”); *Waterwatch of Or., Inc. v. Or. Water Res. Comm’n*, 97 Or App 1,
21 6, 774 P2d 1118 (1989) (An agency’s findings under ORS 183.335(5)(a) must “provide adequate
22 support for the promulgation of the temporary rule.”); *Van Horn v. Senior Servs. Div.*, 76 Or App
23 15, 16, 707 P2d 1294 (1985) (temporary rules must be supported by “adequate” findings); *Metro.*
24 *Hosps., Inc. v. State Health Planning & Dev. Agency*, 52 Or App 621, 626, 628 P2d 783 (1981)
25
26
27
28

1 (Temporary rules were invalid because agency’s findings that the rules would “provide a more
2 thorough, equitable and less expensive hearing to four applications currently granted their
3 requests for reconsideration” were insufficient to demonstrate the “serious prejudice” required by
4 the APA.).

5
6 Moreover, EFSC readily admitted in its findings that the 2019 rules were adopted to
7 effectively make a policy choice to (temporarily) replace the procedural requirements and criteria
8 of the valid 2017 rules with that of the invalid 2018 rules, so that one preferred set of rules could
9 be used over the other. EFSC failed to establish that this policy choice was an emergency
10 warranting prompt action to adopt a temporary rule under ORS 183.335, thereby bypassing the
11 APA’s procedural requirements for permanent rules. Because the 2019 rules were not adopted in
12 substantial compliance with the requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a), they are invalid pursuant to
13 ORS 183.335(11)(a) and ORS 183.400(4)(c). *See Waterwatch of Or.*, 97 Or App at 6 (Agency’s
14 temporary rule was invalid because it “was clearly a change in the substance of the regulation
15 rather than a mere attempt to clarify for which the need was found,” agency’s “findings and
16 statement of need [did] not provide adequate support for the promulgation of the temporary
17 rule[,] and . . . the rule was therefore adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking
18 procedures.”).

19
20
21
22 In addition, under the APA, a rule that “[e]xceeds the statutory authority of the agency” is
23 “invalid.” ORS 183.400(4)(b). Here, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), which was adopted on
24 August 22, 2019, is invalid because it expressly applies retroactively for a period of more than
25 650 days to “all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or
26 after October 24, 2017.” Furthermore, within the Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the
27
28

1 Site Certificate, EFSC in fact implemented OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) to apply the 2019 rules
2 retroactively to numerous past actions that occurred in 2018 or early 2019. (*See, e.g.*, Final Order
3 on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate at 3 n 1, 8–11, 14, 20.²) This far exceeds the
4 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under the APA. *See* ORS
5 183.335(6)(a) (A temporary rule “may be effective for a period of not longer than 180 days.”).
6 Because this rule exceeds EFSC’s statutory authority, it is invalid pursuant to ORS
7 183.400(4)(b). And because this rule was not adopted in substantial compliance with ORS
8 183.335(6)(a), it is invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a).
9
10

11 In the alternative, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it unlawfully attempts
12 to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules, which this Court has held “are invalid.” *Friends*
13 *v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) exceeds EFSC’s statutory authority, and
14 is therefore invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b).
15

16 Finally, assuming arguendo that the 2018 rules were valid and/or effective until they were
17 readopted by the 2019 rules, then virtually all of the 2019 rules violate ORS 183.335(6)(a)
18 because these rules are a readoption and continuation of rule language identical to that of the
19 2018 permanent rules, which had already been in effect for more than 650 days at the time the
20 2019 rules were adopted. ORS 183.335(6)(a) expressly prohibits the language of temporary rules
21 from being in effect for more than 180 days. Thus, rule language that had previously been in
22

23 ² In many of these examples, the Final Order expressly relies on the 2019 rules and applies them
24 retroactively to events that occurred in 2018 or early 2019. For example, the Final Order states that
25 “[p]ursuant to OAR 345-027-0363(2), on September 28, 2018, the Department determined pRFA4 to be
26 incomplete and issued a request for additional information.” (Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to
27 the Site Certificate at 9.) Yet, OAR 345-027-0363(2) *did not exist* on September 28, 2018, and was not
28 adopted until nearly eleven months later, on August 22, 2019. This and the other cited instances in the
Final Order were either the improper retroactive application of temporary rules in excess of 180 days, or
the improper implementation of rules before they were promulgated (and therefore, before they were
effective).

1 effect for more than 650 days may only be readopted or continued as permanent rules, not as
2 temporary rules. See ORS 183.335(6)(a). Because the 2019 rules exceed EFSC’s statutory
3 authority, they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b). And because the rules were not
4 adopted in substantial compliance with ORS 183.335(6)(a), they are invalid pursuant to ORS
5 183.335(11)(a).
6

7 Finally, in addition to EFSC exceeding the APA’s 180-day limit for temporary rules, it was
8 also improper for EFSC to adopt and apply retroactive rules, which will harm Petitioners and the
9 public at large as applied to the Summit Ridge project. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is a
10 retroactive rule (and it makes the 2019 rules retroactive), because it expressly states that it
11 applies to “all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or
12 after October 24, 2017” and that “[t]he Department and Council will continue to process all
13 [such] requests . . . , without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat
14 any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.” This was a
15 retroactive legislative action, as defined by the Oregon Supreme Court. “[A]s a general matter, a
16 retroactive legislative action is one that affects existing legal rights or obligations arising out of
17 past transactions or occurrences.” *U.S. Bancorp v. Dept. of Rev.*, 337 Or 625, 636–37, 103 P3d
18 85 (2004) (citing *Fromme v. Fred Meyer, Inc.*, 306 Or 558, 561–62, 761 P2d 515 (1988);
19 *Whipple v. Howser*, 291 Or 475, 488–89, 632 P2d 782 (1981) (Linde, J., concurring)). Here, as
20 described above, OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019) does “affect[] existing legal rights or obligations
21 arising out of past transactions or occurrences,” and has in fact already been implemented in that
22 manner by ODOE and EFSC in the instant matter, and thus is “retroactive legislative action.”
23
24
25
26
27 *U.S. Bancorp*, 337 Or at 636–37.
28

1 The Council adopted the 2019 rules on August 22, 2019, and applied them retroactively in
2 this matter one day later, on August 23, 2019. Both of these dates were well after the February
3 22, 2019 public hearing, and well after the May 2, 2019 deadline for interested persons to request
4 a contested case in this matter. The Council should not have adopted and implemented
5 retroactive rules in this matter, especially not without allowing Petitioners and the public at large
6 to participate on whether it was proper for EFSC to do so, including not allowing Petitioners to
7 be heard regarding the ways their interests would be adversely affected by the retroactive
8 application of the 2019 rules.
9

10
11 Pattern Energy's application to amend the Site Certificate (including extending the
12 construction deadlines for a third time) was submitted pursuant to the invalid 2018 rules, was not
13 submitted in compliance with the valid 2017 rules, and should never have been processed or
14 approved. Upon the Supreme Court ruling that the 2018 rules were invalid, ODOE should have
15 ceased processing Pattern's application (because it was submitted pursuant to the invalid 2018
16 rules), and EFSC should have confirmed that the Summit Ridge Site Certificate is now expired
17 because the construction start deadline passed without the filing of a valid application under
18 valid rules prior to the deadline. Instead, ODOE and EFSC rushed to adopt the 2019 rules and
19 retroactively apply these rules to the Summit Ridge project one day after the rules were adopted,
20 effectively (and unlawfully) reviving an expired project back from the dead. ODOE's and
21 EFSC's actions in adopting and retroactively applying the 2019 rules to this expired project were
22 unreasonable and will result in substantial harm to Petitioners and their members, including harm
23 to scenic, natural, and recreational resources (as detailed in Petitioners' Requests for a Contested
24 Case).
25
26
27
28

1 The Council should reconsider the Amended Site Certificate and related Orders, and
2 should allow a public hearing and contested case to resolve whether it was proper for the Council
3 to unilaterally and retroactively apply the 2019 temporary rules to transactions and occurrences
4 in 2018 and early 2019, without ever allowing any participation from the public on the Council's
5 decisions to adopt and retroactively apply these rules. Ultimately, the Council should reverse its
6 decision to amend the Site Certificate, which expired on August 20, 2018.

8 **C. The Council failed to properly apply the correct standard for determining whether
9 to conduct a contested case proceeding.**

10 Assuming for the sake of argument that OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018) and/or OAR 345-
11 027-0371(9) (2019) are valid and effective rules that apply to this matter, these rules contain the
12 applicable standard that the Council must use in determining whether to conduct a contested case
13 proceeding:
14

15 To determine that an issue justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council must
16 find that the request raises a significant issue of fact or law that *may* affect the
17 Council's determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the
18 amendment, meets the applicable laws and Council standards included in chapter
345 divisions 22, 23 and 24.

19 OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019) (emphasis added).³ Note the use of
20 the word "may" in this standard, as italicized in the quotation above. Given this use of the word
21

22 ³ The rule language referring to "the Council's determination that the facility, with the change
23 proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable laws and Council standards" is unclear, because it
24 appears to presuppose that there already has been such a determination, even though that will be
25 impossible at the time a contested case is requested. This language is likely intended to refer to the
Council's *prior* determination(s) regarding an original or previously amended site certificate (which will,
by definition, not have included "the change proposed by the amendment").

26 In this matter the Council added to the confusion by repeatedly misstating the standard as whether
27 Petitioners and others "identified a significant issue of law or fact that could impact the Council's
28 determination that the certificate holder *has complied with*" the applicable laws and standards. (*See, e.g.*,
Order on Requests for Contested Case at 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 22 (emphasis added)). The operative
question is not whether the certificate holder has previously complied with the law, but rather whether the

1 “may,” the rule does not require persons requesting a contested case to prove, at the time they
2 request a contested case, that the issues they raise *will* in fact affect the Council’s determinations
3 of compliance with applicable laws. In adopting this rule, the Council set a relatively low bar for
4 raising issues to justify a contested case. In this context, the inclusion of the word “may,” versus
5 the word “will,” is similar to the differences between notice pleading and fact pleading. A person
6 requesting a contested case merely need give notice of a significant issue that *may* affect the
7 Council’s evaluations as to compliance with the applicable law. At this early stage, such persons
8 need not *prove*, via the introduction of evidence, detailed factual allegations, or legal arguments,
9 that they are likely to prevail on each issue, nor even that the issues *will* affect the Council’s
10 review. All of that must come later—as part of the contested case.

13 Unfortunately, in its two Orders denying a contested case proceeding in this matter, the
14 Council repeatedly failed to apply the correct standard for determining whether to conduct a
15 contested case, and instead jettisoned the required standard in favor of ad hoc standards that
16 impermissibly imposed unwarranted burdens on persons requesting a contested case to
17 effectively prove their claims with detailed arguments, factual allegations, and/or evidence.
18 Instead of evaluating whether the *issues* raised by Petitioners “may” affect the Council’s
19 evaluations of compliance with the applicable law, the Council required Petitioners to prove that
20 the issues *will* affect the Council’s evaluations—and in some cases, that Petitioners were correct
21 on the merits of the issues. Furthermore, rather than simply evaluate whether a contested case is
22 warranted to address and determine compliance with applicable laws, the Council in many cases
23
24
25

27 energy facility, taking into account the change(s) proposed by the amendment(s), presently meets the
28 applicable laws and standards. *See* OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019). As
Petitioners have explained, a contested case is necessary to resolve numerous issues under this standard.

1 prematurely reached conclusions about compliance with those laws. The Council thus acted
2 inconsistent with, and erroneously interpreted, its own rules.

3 In evaluating Petitioners' request for a contested case, the Council first determined that
4 Petitioners had in fact "identif[ied]" or "raise[d]" numerous "issues of fact" or "issues of fact and
5 law." (*See, e.g.*, Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at 9–14.)
6 But then the Council inexplicably evaluated the *merits* of the examples that Petitioners, for
7 example evaluating whether Petitioners had successfully argued and *proven* that Pattern's
8 application is inadequate to demonstrate compliance with the applicable laws, or that the
9 Proposed Order or Amended Proposed Order was erroneous. (*See, e.g., id.*) Even worse, the
10 Council went on to reach conclusions, within its Orders denying a contested case, about whether
11 Pattern's application, the energy project itself, the Proposed Order, and the Amended Proposed
12 Order in fact comply with the applicable law, instead of allowing such issues to be resolved via a
13 contested case proceeding (and ultimately in the Council's Final Order on the proposed
14 Amendment to the Site Certificate). (*See id.*) Under the Council's rules, in deciding whether to
15 allow a contested case, the Council is only to determine whether persons have raised significant
16 issues that may affect the Council's review—*not* to resolve and decide the merits of the issues,
17 nor to decide the merits of the project's compliance with the applicable law. *See* OAR 345-027-
18 0071 (2018); OAR 345-027-0371 (2019).

19 For example, in Petitioners' Second Request for a Contested Case Proceeding, Petitioners
20 raised numerous significant issues involving compliance with various state statutes, state rules,
21 and Wasco County ordinance provisions involving the protection of wildlife, plants, and habitat
22 that *may* affect the Council's evaluations of compliance with these laws and rules. And although
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 the applicable law does not require Petitioners to do so, they also offered multiple examples to
2 illustrate how the Council’s evaluations of compliance *may* be affected. (Friends of the Columbia
3 Gorge, et al.’s Second Request for a Contested Case Proceeding (“Second Request for Contested
4 Case”) at 14–35.) Petitioners requested a contested case, in part to allow Petitioners “to introduce
5 scientific evidence and legal argument rebutting ODFW’s new comments,⁴ including a
6 demonstration that it is necessary to assess and evaluate *current* conditions involving wildlife
7 habitat and species use and abundance before it can be determined whether the Project complies
8 with applicable law, and ultimately prior to a final Council decision.” (*Id.* at 15–16.) Similarly,
9 Petitioners asserted that “a contested case is needed to allow [Petitioners] to submit new
10 evidence, including sworn expert witness testimony, on [the disputed] issue[s] (including
11 evidence proving that the Applicant’s previously submitted wildlife use and habitat surveys are
12 incomplete, inaccurate, and outdated.” (*Id.* at 19.) And Petitioners asserted that “a contested case
13 is needed to allow [Petitioners] to seek from Pattern discoverable information likely to bear on
14 th[e] issue[s] (including any and all evidence of the Project’s potential impacts not disclosed in
15 [Pattern’s] Request for Amendment, and [that Petitioners] have no other means of obtaining such
16 information and presenting it to the Council.” (*Id.*) Petitioners also offered an example of
17 potentially discoverable evidence: “[I]n August 2018, Pattern stated that it ‘is currently
18 performing eagle use surveys [that] will . . . inform updates to eagle occurrence in the analysis
19 area’”—evidence that “was apparently never disclosed to ODOE and EFSC.” (*Id.* at 19 n 8.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

⁴ The new ODFW comments were submitted after the comment period in this matter closed, pursuant to a Council directive for ODOE to consult with ODFW. (*See* Order on Requests for Contested Case at 5.) Given the late timing of ODFW’s comments after the public process was concluded, Petitioners have had no opportunity to rebut these comments, unless a contested case is held.

1 would unlawfully defer the submission of multiple surveys, plans, and other evidence until
2 unspecified, future points in time *after* the Council makes its final decision, and with little to no
3 specified parameters governing the contents of these future submissions, thus resulting in a
4 decision not based on substantial evidence and improperly shutting Petitioners and the general
5 public out of the decision-making process. (*Id.* at 15–19.) Petitioners also asserted that ODFW’s
6 new comments, which ODOE expressly relied on in drafting the proposed Orders and Amended
7 Site Certificate, and which “purportedly recommend deferring habitat assessments until a later
8 date, ‘a few years’ into the future, . . . are inconsistent with the applicable law,”⁵ and “contradict
9 prior ODFW comments regarding this Project.” (Second Request for Contested Case at 15.)
10 Petitioners also requested an opportunity to rebut ODFW’s comments by introducing scientific
11 evidence, sworn expert witness testimony, and legal argument via a contested case. (*Id.* at 15,
12 19.)

13
14
15
16 Unfortunately, instead of determining whether these issues “*may* affect the Council’s
17 determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable
18 laws and Council standards,” OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019)
19 (emphasis added), the Council simply asserted that the Council and the Department are required
20 to consult with ODFW, that ODFW staff “are considered experts,” and that the “Council
21 considers the comments provided by ODFW to provide a reason, recent wildfire, as the basis for
22 not requiring an updated habitat assessment at this time.” (Order on Requests for Contested Case
23 on Amended Proposed Order at 9.) These findings and conclusions are irrelevant to the actual
24 standard required by the Council’s own rules: whether the significant issues raised by Petitioners
25
26

27
28 ⁵ Petitioners cited the applicable law in great detail. (Second Request for Contested Case at 14–35.)

1 *may* affect the Council’s review of and determinations regarding the project’s compliance with
2 applicable law. In determining whether to conduct a contested case, it does not matter whether
3 ODFW staff are regarded as experts, whether ODFW articulated a reason for its comments, or
4 whether ODOE and EFSC must consult with ODFW. All of that has no bearing on Petitioners’
5 request to conduct a contested case in order to allow Petitioners to demonstrate, through
6 evidence and legal argument, that the applicable laws and standards are not being met (including
7 rebuttal of ODFW’s comments).
8

9
10 The Council essentially concluded that ODFW’s comments must be treated as the ultimate
11 authority on whether the applicable laws are satisfied, without even acknowledging the
12 possibility that ODFW’s new comments might be wrong or incomplete. This ignores the entire
13 point of holding a contested case. The Council’s approach was inconsistent with its own rules
14 and must be reversed. One of the pertinent questions is whether ODFW’s comments *may* be
15 incorrect or not fully responsive to all applicable laws and rules, and if so, whether that “may”
16 affect the Council’s review for compliance with the applicable authorities. OAR 345-027-
17 0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019). The Council failed to properly apply this
18 required standard in determining whether to conduct a contested case.
19

20
21 The Council also ignored Petitioners’ request to submit new evidence and pursue
22 discovery, via a contested case, on the issues they raised. As Petitioners explained, they sought a
23 contested case in part to submit evidence (including sworn expert witness testimony as well as
24 potential evidence that could only be obtained from the Applicant via discovery), and they also
25 explained that updated wildlife surveys are necessary prior to a final Council decision, and that
26 the issues involving the stale and outdated wildlife surveys (or updated surveys, if the Applicant
27
28

1 is finally willing to update them) will absolutely affect the Council’s analysis of compliance with
2 applicable law. (Friends of the Columbia Gorge, et al.’s Request for a Contested Case
3 Proceeding (“First Request for Contested Case”) at 1–3, 11–29; Second Request for Contested
4 Case at 3–5, 14–35; Comments of Friends of the Columbia Gorge, *et al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 6–22;
5 Comments of Shawn Smallwood, PhD (Feb. 21, 2019) at 3, 14–30, 40–41.) Yet, in denying
6 Petitioners’ requests for a contested case, the Council effectively ignored Petitioners’ requests to
7 submit and seek new evidence.
8

9
10 In addition, the Council opined about what it “expected” updated habitat surveys might
11 show. (Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at 9.) With its use of
12 the word “expected,” the Council implicitly acknowledged that updated surveys *might* show
13 something different than what the Council expects. In other words, depending on what the
14 evidence shows, this issue “may” affect the Council’s evaluations under the applicable law,
15 which is the standard required by OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018) and OAR 345-027-0371(9)
16 (2019). A contested case should be held to resolve this disputed issue.
17

18 In rejecting Petitioners’ request for a contested case, the Council also impermissibly
19 focused solely on “habitat quality based on the presence or absence of physical, terrestrial habitat
20 that is important to the species, rather than on air space for example” and asserted that “neither
21 the Council nor ODFW have guidance, rules or requirements that would apply to the evaluation
22 of the habitat quality of air space (i.e. use of air by migratory bird species).” (Order on Requests
23 for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at 9.) In other words, the Council concluded
24 that it need only protect *habitat*, not the actual wildlife and plants that may be affected by energy
25 projects. These statements are patently wrong, in part because they ignore OAR 345-021-
26
27
28

1 0010(1)(p), which requires applicants to provide information about all “fish and wildlife species .
2 . . . that could be affected by the proposed facility” (separate from fish and wildlife habitat); OAR
3 345-021-0010(1)(q), which requires applicants to provide information about all “threatened and
4 endangered plant and animal species that may be affected by the proposed facility” (also separate
5 from habitat); OAR 345-022-0070, which requires the Council to ensure that “the design,
6 construction and operation of the proposed facility, taking into account mitigation, are not likely
7 to cause a significant reduction in the likelihood of survival or recovery of the [threatened or
8 endangered plant or wildlife] species” (regardless of, and broader than, impacts to habitat); OAR
9 345-024-0015(4), which requires the Council to ensure that the applicant will “reduce
10 cumulative adverse environmental effects in the vicinity by practicable measures including, but
11 not limited to . . . [d]esigning the facility to reduce the risk of injury to raptors or other
12 vulnerable wildlife in areas near turbines or electrical equipment” (again, regardless of habitat
13 impacts); and OAR 345-025-0016, which requires applicants to develop, and the Council to
14 approve within any site certificate, “monitoring and mitigation plans” that must “ensure
15 compliance with the standards contained in OAR Chapter 345, Division 22 and Division 24”
16 (again, regardless of, and broader than, habitat impacts).

17
18
19
20
21 The Council’s statement about terrestrial habitat versus airspace also ignores Wasco
22 County Land Use and Development Ordinance (“LUDO”) § 19.030.C.5, which imposes a
23 standard for energy projects that “[t]aking into account mitigation, siting, design, construction
24 and operation the energy facility will not cause significant adverse impact to important or
25 significant natural resources identified in the Wasco County Comprehensive Plan, Wasco County
26 Land Use and Development Ordinance or by any jurisdictional wildlife agency resource
27
28

1 management plan adopted and in effect on the date the application is submitted” (regardless of,
2 and broader than, impacts to habitat); LUDO § 19.030.C.5.a(1), which requires energy project
3 applicants to “[p]rovid[e] information pertaining to the energy facility’s potential impacts and
4 measures to avoid impacts on . . . [w]ildlife (all potential species of reasonable concern)” (which
5 is listed separately from “[w]ildlife [h]abitat” at section 19.030.C.5.a(2)); LUDO §
6 19.030.C.5.b, which requires energy project applicants to “[c]onduct biologically appropriate
7 baseline surveys in the areas affected by the proposed energy facility to determine *natural*
8 *resources present and patterns of habitat use*” (emphasis added); LUDO § 19.030.C.5.h, which
9 requires energy developers to “us[e] appropriate no construction buffers around known [raptor]
10 nest sites” (separate from requirements to protect habitat); and LUDO § 19.030.C.5.k, which
11 requires applicants for energy projects to “[d]evelop a plan for post-construction monitoring of
12 the facility site using appropriate survey protocols to measure the impact of the project on
13 identified natural resources in the area” (separate from, and broader than, impacts to habitat).

14
15
16
17 All of these authorities *require* the protection of wildlife and plants, separate from and/or
18 broader than the requirements to protect habitat. Yet the Council narrowly focused on terrestrial
19 habitat in its conclusions, and used these conclusions to dismiss Petitioners’ request for a
20 contested case, which as Petitioners explained, would allow the Council, with the assistance of a
21 hearings officer, to address and resolve the proper interpretation and application of the applicable
22 laws and standards.

23
24 In addition, if it is indeed true, as the Council asserts, that the Council lacks any “guidance
25 . . . that would apply to the evaluation of the habitat quality of air space (i.e. use of air by
26 migratory bird species” (Order on Requests for Contested Case on Amended Proposed Order at
27
28

1 9), then this situation is tailor-made for a contested case, which would allow the Council to
2 develop and determine, with the assistance of a hearings officer, appropriate guidance on this
3 issue in order to implement the applicable laws and rules that require the protection of wildlife
4 (separate from habitat). As the Oregon Supreme Court has aptly explained in a prior case
5 involving EFSC, the contested case process should be used to resolve issues that involve
6 “judgments about technological feasibility, economic projections, costs, safety, environmental
7 consequences, and similar probabilities that will call for factual information and agency
8 expertise, and judgments about the relative importance of conflicting goals, about values and
9 priorities, in short, policy judgments,” as well as the setting of standards that “call[] for the
10 factual kind of judgment and procedures appropriate thereto” and that can be “made more
11 concrete only in the course of a proceeding focusing on a particular kind of [energy] installation
12 at a particular location”; in such instances, “[t]he procedure for adopting [such] standard[s] to be
13 applied in a few complex, large-scale decisions such as the site certifications entrusted to the
14 council” is via the “‘contested case’ procedure,” which “is to be used in applying statutory or
15 agency policy to specific parties on particular facts.” *Marbet v. PGE*, 277 Or 447, 460–63, 561
16 P2d 154 (1977) (quoting ORS 183.310(2)).

17
18
19
20
21 To provide another example, in requesting a contested case Petitioners asserted (as one
22 example of the problems with the Recommended Amended Conditions) that “Recommended
23 Amended Condition 10.7 is . . . defective because it merely requires future surveys within the
24 narrow ‘micrositing corridor.’” (Second Request for Contested Case at 17.) Rather than evaluate
25 whether Petitioners’ assertions, if ultimately proven correct, “*may* affect the Council’s
26 determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable
27
28

1 laws and Council standards,” OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019)
2 (emphasis added), the Council placed an impermissible burden on Petitioners to “explain or
3 provide reasoning to support a different area [other than the micrositeing corridor] for which to be
4 included in the survey area,” incorrectly determined that “the Council only has authority through
5 the site certificate to impose conditions related to the area within the micrositeing corridor” (and
6 implicitly, therefore the Council cannot require any assessment of environmental conditions
7 outside of that narrow corridor), and impermissibly required Petitioners to name specific wildlife
8 species that may exist in the project vicinity, asserting that Petitioners “do[] not identify the
9 species [they] consider[] necessary to be included in surveys covered by the condition nor
10 identify how, if not included, the omission of specific other species would impact the Council’s
11 evaluation of compliance with an applicable standard.” (Order on Requests for Contested Case
12 on Amended Proposed Order at 12–13.)⁶

13
14
15
16 The Council’s analysis is patently wrong, inconsistent with its own rules and Wasco
17 County rules, and inconsistent with the prior wildlife surveys for this project. First, the
18 applicable law does not limit the analysis of impacts (nor conditions regarding those impacts)
19 only to micrositeing corridors or project areas. Indeed, EFSC’s own rules require analyses of
20 impacts within specified “analysis areas” and “study areas”—terms that are defined by EFSC’s
21 rules—which can extend, for example for threatened and endangered species, as far as five miles
22 from the site boundary. *See* OAR 345-001-0010(2) (definition of “analysis area”) and OAR 345-
23
24

25 ⁶ The Council also apparently overlooked the fact that Petitioners had, in their prior written
26 comments, provided numerous examples of species that need to be surveyed for, and commented
27 specifically on the types of surveys that are needed. (*See, e.g.*, Comments of Friends of the Columbia
28 Gorge, *et al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 6–11, 18–19; Comments of Shawn Smallwood, PhD (Feb. 21, 2019) at
15–30) Petitioners expressly incorporated these comments into their requests for a contested case. (First
Request for Contested Case at 1 n 1; Second Request for Contested Case at 1 n 2.)

1 001-0010(58) (definition of “study area”). Specifically, OAR 345-021-0010(1)(q) requires the
2 applicant to “include in its application . . . [i]nformation about threatened and endangered plant
3 and animal species that may be affected by the proposed facility.” In addition, OAR 345-024-
4 0015(4) requires the applicant to “design and construct the facility to reduce cumulative adverse
5 environmental effects *in the vicinity* by practicable measures including, but not limited to, . . .
6 [d]esigning the facility to reduce the risk of injury to raptors or other vulnerable wildlife in areas
7 near turbines or electrical equipment” (emphasis added). Similarly, among other pertinent
8 requirements, Wasco County’s ordinance requires applicants to “[p]rovid[e] information
9 pertaining to the energy facility’s potential impacts and measures to avoid impacts on . . .
10 [w]ildlife (all potential species of reasonable concern),” to “[c]onduct[] biologically appropriate
11 baseline surveys in the areas affected by the proposed energy facility to determine natural
12 resources present and patterns of habitat use,” and to “[d]evelop a plan for post-construction
13 monitoring of the facility site using appropriate survey protocols to measure the impact of the
14 project on identified natural resources in the area.” Wasco County LUDO §§ 19.030.C.5.a, .b,
15 .k.

16
17
18
19
20 None of these requirements limit the required surveys and analyses only to locations within
21 the micro-siting corridors. Moreover, given these and other requirements, the prior applicant in
22 2009 surveyed an area extending two miles outside the wind turbine micro-siting corridors for all
23 raptor and other large bird nests, including great horned owls, long-eared owls, prairie falcons,
24 and red-tailed hawks. (Summit Ridge Wind Farm – Application for Site Certificate, Ex. P at fig.
25 P-3 (Summit Ridge Wind Project 2009 Raptor and Other Large Bird Nests).) The prior applicant
26 in 2009 also conducted avian use surveys in ten different study plots throughout the project
27
28

1 boundary, several of which were located entirely outside the micro-siting corridors. (Summit
2 Ridge Wind Farm – Application for Site Certificate, Ex. P at attach. P-1, fig. 1 (Avian Study
3 Survey Points and Plots at Summit Ridge Wind Power Project). Despite the fact that the new
4 applicant, Pattern Energy, has not updated these surveys, nor multiple other surveys, at any time
5 over the past decade, ODOE and the Council are now willing to give Pattern a free pass, merely
6 requiring a *future* species survey, *after* the Council issues an Amended Site Certificate, only
7 within the micro-siting corridors, and only surveying for state-listed species (rather than
8 surveying for all raptors and large birds up to two miles from the micro-siting corridors, or
9 surveying for bats and other potentially affected species, as was previously surveyed).

12 As Petitioners explained in their prior written comments, if new surveys (consistent with
13 the geographic scope of the 2009 surveys) are performed now, such new surveys might produce
14 very different results than the 2009 surveys, and either way, this issue may affect the Council’s
15 evaluations of compliance with applicable laws. (Comments of Friends of the Columbia Gorge,
16 *et al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 6–22; Comments of Shawn Smallwood, PhD (Feb. 21, 2019) at 3, 14–
17 30, 40–41.)⁷ But Petitioners are not required to *prove* that outcome at this time. The point is that
18
19

20
21 ⁷ For example, Dr. Smallwood commented specifically regarding the wildfires that burned extensive
22 portions of the project area in 2008 (and Tetra Tech’s conclusions regarding the effects of these
23 wildfires), noting that “Tetra Tech’s conclusions . . . are based on scientifically incorrect characterizations
24 of habitat, an outdated and insufficient analysis from nearly a decade ago that is not likely to reflect
25 current conditions, an unsubstantiated assumption that burned vegetation negatively affects all wildlife,
26 and absence of any consideration of an interaction effect between vegetation changes and the proposed
27 wind project”; that Tetra Tech’s “current claim that habitat was degraded as a result of the 2018
28 wildfires” is “inconsistent with both the scientific definition of habitat and Oregon’s definition in OAR
635-415-0005”; that “[w]ildlife species vary in their responses to changes in the environment, so
vegetation cover changes caused by a wildfire will displace some species while attracting others”; that “I
have seen and quantified such variation in response to fires when I performed a 13-year study of wildlife
responses to mechanical alteration of the environment as well as the use of controlled burns”; and that
“[e]arly successional vegetation following a fire can increase the numbers and availability of some small
mammal species to aerial predators.” (Comments of Shawn Smallwood, PhD (Feb. 21, 2019) at 5–6.) Dr.

1 new surveys *may* change the outcome, and that the absence of updated surveys is a significant
2 issue that may affect the Council’s evaluations of compliance with applicable laws. In their
3 deliberations on whether to allow a contested case, several Council members specifically
4 commented on the inherent problems with making decisions based on stale surveys from a
5 decade prior. By the Council members’ own admissions, this is a significant issue.
6 Unfortunately, the Council in its written Orders erred by requiring Petitioners to demonstrate or
7 prevail on their claims at this early stage, rather than applying the correct standard, which merely
8 requires Petitioners to raise issues that “*may* affect” the Council’s determinations of compliance
9 with applicable law. OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019) (emphasis
10 added).

13 To provide another example, OAR 345-025-0016 requires that “[t]he Council shall
14 incorporate approved monitoring and mitigation plans in applicable site certificate conditions.”
15 Here, despite this requirement for such plans to be incorporated into site certificate conditions,
16 only a *draft* wildlife monitoring and mitigation plan was submitted by Pattern Energy, and this
17 plan has only been approved in that *draft* form. Even worse, as Petitioners noted in their request
18 for a contested case, “Recommended Amended Condition 10.5 requires a *future*, final Wildlife
19 Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (“WMMP”), which will include ‘thresholds of concern’ for
20 avian fatality monitoring, and potentially requires ‘additional mitigation in a form and amount
21 agreed upon by the Department, in consultation with ODFW.’” (Second Request for Contested
22 Case at 18 (emphasis added).) As Petitioners noted, this Condition “is inadequate and erroneous
23
24
25

26 Smallwood also commented extensively on the need to update and correct the flawed and outdated
27 previous surveys, for example noting that “even without a major change in vegetation cover, wildlife
28 typically shift activity areas every generation or so” and that “it is mistaken to regard wildlife
distributions as static or habitat as spatially fixed.” (*Id.* at 7.)

1 because it defers the preparation, submission, review, and approval of the actual Wildlife
2 Monitoring and Mitigation Plan until some unknown point in time after the Request for
3 Amendment has been decided; it will result in a decision not based on substantial evidence
4 (because the evidence does not yet exist); and it will prejudice the substantial rights of
5 [Petitioners] and other interested persons by precluding them from participating in the decision-
6 making processes for this Project.” (*Id.*) Petitioners also noted that the applicable law requires
7 the final plan to be submitted and approved “before final Council action,” not afterwards. (*Id.*)
8 The applicable law simply does not allow the approval of a plan in *draft* form, subject to any
9 change imaginable at a later date.
10
11

12 Rather than determine that Petitioners had raised an issue that may affect the Council’s
13 evaluations of compliance with the applicable law, the Council asserted that “[t]he Habitat
14 Mitigation Plan is approved in draft form” and will be “finalized” later, and that “[t]he core
15 substance of the plan . . . [is] not *expected* to change.” (Order on Requests for Contested Case on
16 Amended Proposed Order at 10 (emphasis added).) With these findings, the Council proves
17 Petitioners’ point: the *draft* Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan *may* change in the future,
18 and therefore *may* affect the Council’s evaluations under the applicable laws. Pursuant to the
19 Council’s rules, Petitioners have the right to a contested case, so that Petitioners may submit
20 expert analysis and legal argument evaluating the *draft* mitigation plan, explaining why the draft
21 plan substantively and procedurally fails to comply with the applicable law and how it should be
22 corrected, and urging that the plan is finalized *prior to* final Council decision, as required by the
23 applicable law. The Council erred in declining to conduct a contested case to address this and the
24 other disputed issues.
25
26
27
28

1 To provide another example, Petitioners requested a contested case in part to address
2 compliance with Wasco County LUDO § 19.030.C.5, which requires in pertinent part the
3 protection of all “important or significant natural resources identified in . . . *any jurisdictional*
4 *wildlife agency* resource management plan adopted and in effect on the date the application is
5 submitted,” and which later refers to “the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, *or other*
6 *jurisdictional wildlife or natural resource agency*” (emphasis added). (First Request for Contested
7 Case at 24–26; Second Request for Contested Case at 15–20, 31–33.) Petitioners also explained
8 that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“UFSWS”) is a jurisdictional wildlife agency, explained
9 that LUDO § 19.030.C.5 requires the protection of wildlife species identified in all USFWS
10 resource management plans adopted and in effect as of the date Pattern Energy submitted its
11 application, provided a list of such plans, and also provided a summary list of the wildlife species
12 identified in those plans (“bald eagles, golden eagles, federally designated migratory birds, and
13 federal birds of conservation concern”). (First Request for Contested Case at 26; Comments of
14 Friends of the Columbia Gorge, *et al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 18–19.) Petitioners noted that “Pattern is
15 required to demonstrate that the project will not cause significant adverse impact” to these bird
16 species, that “Pattern has failed to identify all such bird species in its application, and to the
17 contrary, has removed federal birds of conservation concern that were previously identified in
18 prior applications by Pattern’s predecessor,” and that “Pattern is also failing to demonstrate that
19 it will follow the recommendations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the protection of
20 bald eagles and golden eagles” (recommendations that UFSWS made in its prior comments to
21 EFSC regarding this project). (Comments of Friends of the Columbia Gorge, *et al.* (Feb. 21,
22 2019) at 18–19.)
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 In response, rather than acknowledging that Petitioners had identified an issue that *may*
2 affect the Council’s evaluation of compliance with the applicable laws (under the standard
3 required by the Council’s own rules for determining whether to conduct a contested case), the
4 Council adopted the following statement: “The Council has historically interpreted the reference
5 to ‘jurisdictional wildlife agency’ in WCLUDO Section 19.030(C)(5) to apply to the Oregon
6 Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), as the state wildlife agency, not to federal wildlife
7 agencies.” (Order on Requests for Contested Case at 10.) As will be explained below, this
8 statement not only endorses a patently incorrect interpretation of the Wasco County LUDO
9 section, it is also factually incorrect. But the larger point is that because this statement refers to
10 how the Council *interprets* section 19.030.C.5, the Council is inherently admitting that the code
11 provision may potentially be interpreted in other ways. The possibility that the Council *may* be
12 interpreting the code section incorrectly (and that Petitioners are correct that the UFSWS is in
13 fact a “jurisdictional wildlife agency”) inherently means that this issue *may* affect the Council’s
14 evaluation of compliance with the code provision. Pursuant to OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018);
15 OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019), this necessitates a contested case on this significant issue, so that
16 Petitioners and other parties can research the legislative history of the Wasco County LUDO
17 provision in question, as well as the Council’s historical interpretations of the provision, and so
18 that the Council can ultimately determine, with the assistance of a hearings officer, how the code
19 provision should be interpreted and implemented. To deny a contested case on this issue is to
20 effectively decide that there is only one possible interpretation, which is of course, not true. It is
21 also a premature decision on the merits of how to interpret the Wasco County LUDO provision,
22 which, again, must be resolved via a contested case.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 The Council’s interpretation of the phrase “jurisdictional wildlife agency” in LUDO §
2 19.030.C.5 is patently incorrect. The code provision in question first refers to “*any* jurisdictional
3 wildlife agency” and then refers to “the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, *or other*
4 jurisdictional wildlife or natural resource agency.” LUDO § 19.030.C (emphasis added). The use
5 of the word “any” denotes that there is more than one jurisdictional wildlife agency, and the later
6 express reference to “the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, *or other* jurisdictional . . .
7 wildlife . . . agency” again shows that ODFW is not the only jurisdictional wildlife agency. The
8 Council has failed to address these basic points of statutory construction, and has failed to
9 explain why its “interpretation” is belied by the plain language of the rule in question.
10

11
12 If Wasco County had intended to only protect species identified in ODFW plans, then it
13 could easily have said exactly that in the rule. Instead, the rule refers to “*any* jurisdictional
14 wildlife agency.” Here, the USFWS is a wildlife agency with jurisdiction over natural resources,
15 *i.e.*, bird species, that could be affected by this project, including bald eagles, golden eagles,
16 federally designated migratory birds, and federal birds of conservation concern. Under the plain
17 language of the code provision in question, these species must be protected from adverse effects
18 that might be caused by this project.
19

20
21 The Council’s statement regarding its interpretation is also factually incorrect, or at the
22 very least, misleading. The statement indicates that “[t]he Council has *historically* interpreted the
23 reference to ‘jurisdictional wildlife agency’ in WCLUDO Section 19.030(C)(5) to apply to the
24 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), as the state wildlife agency, not to federal
25 wildlife agencies.” (Order on Requests for Contested Case at 10 (emphasis added).) The Council
26 cites no prior Council orders documenting this as its historical interpretation. The Summit Ridge
27
28

1 project is the only project that EFSC has previously approved in Wasco County, and the Council
2 has issued four prior final orders regarding the Summit Ridge project (the first for the original
3 site certificate, and the other three for each of the three certificate amendments). Two of those
4 four prior final orders do not address compliance with the regulatory language currently found at
5 Wasco County LUDO section 19.030.C.5 at all, and it appears that this code provision may have
6 been adopted after the Council’s 2011 final order approving the original site certificate, which is
7 one of the two orders that does not address compliance with the current language. (*See Summit*
8 *Ridge Wind Farm Final Order (Aug. 19, 2011) at 51–54 (evaluating compliance with older*
9 *regulatory language that previously appeared at LUDO § 19.030.C.5).)*

12 Of the two prior Council final orders on the Summit Ridge project that *do* address
13 compliance with the current Wasco County regulatory language, these two orders are not
14 necessarily consistent with each other on this issue, and they may even conflict with each other.
15 The first order, issued in 2015, does (somewhat) support the Council’s current interpretation. It
16 states that “[t]he Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) is the wildlife agency with
17 subject matter jurisdiction over other natural areas.” (Summit Ridge Wind Farm Amended Final
18 Order on Amendment #1 (Aug. 7, 2015) at 49.) Although this statement does refer to ODFW as
19 “the wildlife agency,” which supports the Council’s current interpretation, it also refers to
20 jurisdiction over “natural areas,” which undermines the Council’s current interpretation, because
21 the code language in question does not refer to “natural areas,” but rather to “important or
22 significant *natural resources* identified in . . . any jurisdictional wildlife agency resource
23 management plan adopted and in effect on the date the application is submitted.” LUDO §
24 19.030.C.5 (emphasis added). The term used in the code (“natural resources”) is broader than the
25
26
27
28

1 term used in the Council’s 2015 statement (“natural areas”), so this statement is of limited
2 guidance.

3
4 Moreover, the other prior Council final order that addresses compliance with the current
5 Wasco County regulatory language at LUDO § 19.030.C.5 arguably undermines the Council’s
6 current interpretation. That 2016 order simply states that “[t]he Oregon Department of Fish and
7 Wildlife (ODFW) is the *state* wildlife agency.” (Final Order on Request for Contested Case,
8 Amendment #2 and Request for Transfer of the Site Certificate (Nov. 4, 2016) at 76.) By
9 specifically referring to ODFW as simply the “*state* wildlife agency,” and not the *only* wildlife
10 agency with jurisdiction, this statement supports Petitioners’ interpretation that ODFW is the
11 *state* wildlife agency with jurisdiction, while USFWS is the *federal* wildlife agency with
12 jurisdiction.
13

14
15 Thus, it was not accurate for the Council to conclude that it has a “historical interpretation”
16 of LUDO § 19.030.C.5 that ODFW is the only “jurisdictional wildlife agency” referenced in the
17 code. At best, the Council on a single occasion (in 2015) referred to ODFW as the agency with
18 jurisdiction over “natural areas,” and then the following year merely referred to ODFW as the
19 “*state* wildlife agency.” This hardly amounts to a historical interpretation, and there was no prior
20 Council analysis of whether the USFWS is an agency with jurisdiction. Moreover, whether or
21 not this was the Council’s historical interpretation, the fact that the Council may be wrong in this
22 interpretation means that this significant issue may, in turn, affect the Council’s review of this
23 project. A contested case is warranted to address and resolve this significant issue.
24
25

26 Finally, the Council also rejected a contested case on this issue in part by finding that
27 Wasco County “does not have any concerns associated with the request for amendment.” (Order
28

1 on Requests for Contested Case at 10.) This is not a proper basis for denying a contested case.
2 The question is not whether Wasco County supports or opposes the project (and for the record,
3 the County is officially neutral on that question), but rather whether the phrase “*any*
4 jurisdictional wildlife agency” within the Wasco County LUDO section at issue includes the
5 USFWS. Petitioners’ interpretation is consistent with the plain language of the code provision,
6 and if Petitioners are correct, Pattern’s application does not demonstrate compliance with the
7 code provision because it ignores the protection of bald and golden eagles (both of which were
8 detected in the project area in the prior applicant’s avian use surveys more than a decade ago)
9 and the other protected species. Therefore, Petitioners have raised a significant issue that may
10 affect the Council’s evaluation of compliance with this code provision. Under the Council’s own
11 rules at OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018) and OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019), a contested case is
12 required.
13
14
15

16 In conclusion, in denying Petitioners’ requests for a contested case in this matter, the
17 Council made a number of errors. The Council’s own rules require a contested case whenever a
18 requesting person raises a significant issue that “*may* affect the Council’s determination that the
19 facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable laws.” OAR 345-027-
20 0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019) (emphasis added). If such issues are raised, a
21 contested case must be held. Here, Petitioners raised numerous such issues, which should have
22 resulted in a contested case. Instead, with no advance warning, the Council improperly imposed
23 extraordinary (and in some cases, impossible) burdens on Petitioners, evaluating (and in some
24 cases deciding) the merits of Petitioners’ issues and effectively requiring Petitioners to prove
25 their case at this early stage.
26
27
28

1 Petitioners requested a contested case in good faith, believing that the Council would
2 follow its own rules and recognize that the significant issues raised by Petitioners *may* affect the
3 Council’s review of the project for compliance with the applicable laws and standards. If the
4 Council wished to impose some other standard for evaluating whether to conduct a contested
5 case, it should have so specified within its rules. Until the Council does so, it is obligated to
6 follow its current rules. The Council should reconsider its Orders, and should decide to conduct a
7 contested case on the issues raised by Petitioners.
8

9
10 **D. The Council erroneously concluded that Wasco County LUDO sections 5.020 and
11 5.030 are not applicable substantive criteria in this matter.**

12 The Council erroneously concluded that Wasco County LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030
13 do not provide applicable substantive criteria in this matter. Petitioners relied on both these
14 County LUDO provisions in their comments, as well as in their requests for a contested case
15 proceeding. (Comments of Friends of the Columbia Gorge, *et al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 20–22; First
16 Request for Contested Case at 11–13, 26–29; Second Request for Contested Case at 15–20, 33–
17 35.) Both LUDO sections are applicable substantive criteria that must be applied to this project.
18 The Council erred in concluding otherwise, and also erred in not conducting a contested case to
19 determine the proper application of these County LUDO requirements in this matter.
20

21 LUDO section 5.020, in pertinent part, requires the Council to “weigh the proposal’s
22 appropriateness and desirability or the public convenience or necessity to be served against any
23 adverse conditions that would result from authorizing the particular development at the location
24 proposed, and to approve such use, shall find that the following criteria are either met, can be
25 met by observance of such conditions, or are not applicable.” The section requires consideration
26 of a number of expressly designated “criteria,” two of which Petitioners specifically cited, which
27
28

1 require an evaluation of whether “[t]he proposal is consistent with the goals and objectives of the
2 Comprehensive Plan and implementing Ordinances of the County” and whether “[t]he proposed
3 use will not significantly reduce or impair sensitive wildlife habitat, riparian vegetation along
4 streambanks and will not subject areas to excessive soil erosion.” LUDO §§ 5.020.A, 5.020.F.

6 LUDO section 5.030, in pertinent part, requires EFSC to impose “[s]uch reasonable
7 conditions as are necessary to . . . fulfill the general and specific purposes of this Ordinance,”
8 and includes a number of specific conditions, including but not limited to “[l]imiting the manner
9 in which the use is conducted including . . . restraints to minimize . . . environmental effects,”
10 “[l]imiting the height, size, or location of a building or structure,” and “[p]rotecting and
11 preserving . . . existing trees, vegetation, water resources, wildlife habitat, or other significant
12 natural . . . resources.” LUDO §§ 5.030, 5.030.A, .C, .J.

14 In 2011, in its Final Order on the original site certificate, EFSC expressly designated
15 LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030 as “applicable substantive criteria.” (Summit Ridge Wind Farm
16 Final Order (Aug. 19, 2011) at 25.) EFSC went on to evaluate compliance with both sections in
17 its original 2011 order, and to evaluate compliance with section 5.020 in subsequent orders. (*See*,
18 *e.g.*, Summit Ridge Wind Farm Final Order (Aug. 19, 2011) at 40–48; Summit Ridge Wind Farm
19 Amended Final Order on Amendment #1 (Aug. 7, 2015) at 37–41; Final Order on Request for
20 Contested Case, Amendment #2 and Request for Transfer of the Site Certificate (Nov. 4, 2016)
21 at 62–67.) Moreover, in 2019, the Council even specifically listed section 5.020 in Table 1 in the
22 Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate as part of the “Wasco County
23 Applicable Substantive Criteria.” (Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 at 38.)
24
25
26

27 ///
28

1 Despite these Council decisions concluding that sections 5.020 and 5.030 provide
2 applicable substantive criteria for the Summit Ridge project, the Council now concludes that
3 these sections do not apply:
4

5 [LUDO section 5.020] is not applicable to the Council's consideration of the
6 request for an amendment to extend construction deadlines, because the ordinance
7 deals with authorization of conditional uses.

8 * * *

9 [LUDO section 5.030 is] not applicable substantive criteria from the Wasco
10 County comprehensive plan and land use regulations that apply to the subject
11 facility.

12 (Order on Requests for Contested Case at 11–12.) The Council's conclusions regarding these
13 code sections are wrong. LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030 provide applicable substantive criteria
14 for the Summit Ridge project, and it was error to conclude otherwise.

15 Apparently the Council now believes that the conditional use standards in sections 5.020
16 and 5.030 no longer apply, simply because EFSC, rather than Wasco County, is the permitting
17 authority for issuing a site certificate. (*See* Order on Requests for Contested Case at 11–12.) Not
18 only is this the wrong analysis, both ODOE and EFSC previously concluded the opposite.

19 In the 2009 Project Order, which “establish[es] the requirements for a site certificate
20 application for the Summit Ridge Project,” ODOE instructed the original applicant (LotusWorks)
21 to “contact the Wasco County Planning Department to discuss the requirements for conditional
22 use permits.” (Project Order (July 30, 2009) at 2, 11.) In other words, the County's conditional
23 use requirements apply to this project.
24

25 In addition, in its Final Order on the original Site Certificate, the Council determined that
26 “[w]ith the exception of the 230 kV transmission feeder line (permitted subject to standards) and
27
28

1 improvements to existing public roads (permitted without review), *all components of the facility*
2 *are subject to [Wasco County's] conditional use criteria.*" (Summit Ridge Wind Farm Final
3 Order (Aug. 19, 2011) at 40 (emphasis added).) The Council reiterated this point later in the
4 Final Order, determining that, other than the transmission feeder line and improvements to
5 existing public roads, "[t]he remainder of the facility . . . is permitted as a 'Conditional Use'
6 pursuant to Section 19.010(B)." (Summit Ridge Wind Farm Final Order (Aug. 19, 2011) at 49.)
7

8 Thus, there should be no question that the Summit Ridge project can only be permitted as a
9 conditional use, and therefore is subject to Wasco County's conditional use standards and
10 criteria, which constitute "applicable substantive criteria" pursuant to OAR 345-022-0030(3).⁸
11 *See also Save Our Rural Oregon v. EFSC*, 339 Or 353, 380–81, 121 P3d 1141, 1156 (2005)
12 (EFSC properly applied county's conditional use criteria to proposed energy project). Here, the
13 Council erroneously concluded in the Order on Requests for Contested Case that LUDO sections
14 5.020 and 5.030 do not apply to the project, and then failed to apply these sections within its
15 Final Order and within the Amended Site Certificate.
16

17
18 The Council also erred in denying a contested case proceeding, which would have allowed
19 for the proper application of LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030 to this project. As Petitioners
20 explained in their comments, Pattern Energy must "complete current wildlife and habitat
21 surveys, categorizations, and mapping," which will provide the current baseline conditions and
22 allow for appropriate application of the conditional use standards and criteria, which could
23 potentially include minimizing environmental effects; limiting the height, size, or locations of
24
25

26
27 ⁸ OAR 345-022-0030(3) defines "applicable substantive criteria" as "criteria from the affected local
28 government's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use ordinances that are required by the
statewide planning goals and that are in effect on the date the applicant submits the application."

1 individual wind turbines or other project structures; and protecting and preserving existing
2 natural resources such as wildlife and habitat. (Comments of Friends of the Columbia Gorge, *et*
3 *al.* (Feb. 21, 2019) at 20–22.) This is a significant issue that “may affect the Council’s
4 determination that the facility, with the change[s] proposed by the amendment[s], meets the
5 applicable laws.” OAR 345-027-0071(9) (2018); OAR 345-027-0371(9) (2019). Under the
6 Council’s rules, a contested case is necessary to address and resolve these significant issues.
7

8 The Council erred by concluding that LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030 do not apply to this
9 project, erred in failing to evaluate compliance with these LUDO sections within its Final Order
10 on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate, erred in failing to impose any conditions
11 under the standards and criteria of these sections within the Amended Site Certificate, and erred
12 in denying a contested case proceeding on these issues. The Council should reverse its
13 conclusions that LUDO sections 5.020 and 5.030 do not apply, and should conduct a contested
14 case to address and resolve proper application and implementation of these LUDO sections.
15

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 For the reasons stated above, Petitioners Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Oregon Wild,
3 the Oregon Natural Desert Association, Central Oregon LandWatch, and the East Cascades
4 Audubon Society respectfully request that the Energy Facility Siting Council reconsider and
5 reverse its orders in this matter and/or rehear the matter.
6

7 Dated this 29th day of November, 2019.

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 REEVES, KAHN, HENNESSY & ELKINS

10 /s/ Gary K. Kahn
11 Gary K. Kahn, OSB No. 814810
12 Attorney for Petitioners

13 FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

14 /s/ Nathan J. Baker
15 Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980
16 Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

Friends of the Columbia Gorge v. EFSC,
Oregon Supreme Court No. S066993

**Petitioners' Opening Brief
and Excerpt of Record**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON

FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA
GORGE, OREGON WILD,
CENTRAL OREGON
LANDWATCH, WILDLANDS
DEFENSE, THRIVE HOOD RIVER,
GREATER HELLS CANYON
COUNCIL, OREGON NATURAL
DESERT ASSOCIATION, OREGON
COAST ALLIANCE, AUDUBON
SOCIETY OF PORTLAND, and
COLUMBIA RIVERKEEPER,

Petitioners,

v.

ENERGY FACILITY SITING
COUNCIL and OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,

Respondents.

Energy Facility Siting
Council No. EFSC 9-2019

SC No. S066993

PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF AND EXCERPT OF RECORD

Gary K. Kahn, OSB No. 814810
Reeves, Kahn, Hennessy & Elkins
P.O. Box 86100
Portland, OR 97286-0100
Phone: (503) 777-5473
gkahn@rke-law.com
Attorney for all Petitioners

*Additional counsel listed on
inside cover*

Ellen F. Rosenblum, OSB No. 753239
Denise G. Fjordbeck, OSB No. 822578
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301
Phone: (503) 378-6002
ellen.f.rosenblum@doj.state.or.us
denise.fjordbeck@doj.state.or.us
Attorneys for Respondents

Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980
Steven D. McCoy, OSB No. 074643
Friends of the Columbia Gorge
333 SW 5th Ave., Suite 300
Portland, OR 97204-1717
Phone: (503) 241-3762
nathan@gorgefriends.org
steve@gorgefriends.org
Attorneys for Petitioner Friends of
the Columbia Gorge

Peter M. Lacy, OSB No. 013223
Oregon Natural Desert Association
2009 NE Alberta Street, Suite 207
Portland, OR 97211
Phone: (503) 525-0193
lacy@onda.org
Attorney for Petitioner Oregon
Natural Desert Association

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
A.	Nature of the Proceeding and Relief Sought.....	1
B.	Nature of the Decision Sought to be Reviewed	3
C.	Statutory Basis for Original Appellate Jurisdiction	3
D.	Timeliness of Appeal	3
E.	Nature and Jurisdictional Basis of the Agency Action	4
F.	Questions Presented on Appeal	4
G.	Summary of the Arguments	5
	First Assignment of Error	5
	Second Assignment of Error	7
	Third Assignment of Error.....	8
H.	Statement of Facts.....	9
	1. Statutory Background.....	9
	2. Rulemaking Background	11
	3. The 2019 rules contain numerous procedural and substantive changes as compared to the 2017 rules.....	19
I.	Preservation of Errors	23
II.	ARGUMENT	24

A. FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: The 2019 rules are invalid because EFSC failed to demonstrate an emergency via adequate “findings that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice,” as required by ORS 183.335(5)(a) 24

1. Standard of Review: Whether the challenged Rules were adopted without substantial compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures. 24

2. Respondents failed to adopt adequate findings demonstrating an emergency to justify the adoption of temporary rules..... 24

B. SECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it exceeds EFSC’s statutory authority and was not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 34

1. Standards of Review: Whether the challenged rule exceeds Respondents’ statutory authority and whether the rule was not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 34

2. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it exceeds the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a) 36

3. In the alternative, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it unlawfully attempts to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules..... 41

C. THIRD ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: The 2019 rules are invalid because they exceed EFSC’s authority for temporary rules and were not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 43

1. Standards of Review: Whether the challenged rules exceed Respondents’ statutory authority and whether the rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 43

2. The 2019 rules are invalid because they are a readoption and continuation of language identical to rules that had already been in effect for more than 650 days, thus exceeding the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a) 44

D. Petitioners intend to seek attorney fees and costs pursuant to ORS 183.497..... 48

III. CONCLUSION..... 49

APPENDIX

ORS 183.335 App-1

OAR 345-027-0311 (2019) App-6

OAR ch. 345, div. 15 (select provisions) (Sept. 2017)
OAR ch. 345, div. 27 (Sept. 2017) App-7

EFSC Meeting Notice and Agenda (Aug. 22–23, 2019)..... App-38

EFSC Meeting Minutes (Aug. 22–23, 2019)..... App-42

EFSC Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site
Certificate for the Montague Wind Power Facility (excerpts) App-52

EFSC Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site
Certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm (excerpts) App-55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Back in Action Physical Therapy v. Liberty Nw. Ins. Corp.</i> , 259 Or App 743, 316 P3d 324 (2013).....	2, 12, 24, 28, 29
<i>Blachana, LLC v. Bureau of Labor & Indus.</i> , 354 Or 676, 687, 318 P3d 735 (2014).....	35
<i>Clark v. Pub. Welfare Div.</i> , 27 Or App 473, 556 P2d 722 (1976).....	14, 27
<i>Coast Sec. Mortg. Corp. v. Real Estate Agency</i> , 331 Or 348, 15 P3d 29 (2000).....	35
<i>Edmunson v. Dep’t of Ins. & Fin.</i> , 314 Or 291, 838 P2d 589 (1992).....	24
<i>Fremont Lumber Co. v. Energy Facility Siting Council</i> , 325 Or 256, 936 P2d 968 (1997)	24, 25
<i>Friends of the Columbia Gorge v. EFSC</i> , 365 Or 371, 446 P3d 53 (2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Fromme v. Fred Meyer, Inc.</i> , 306 Or 558, 761 P2d 515 (1988).....	39, 40
<i>Gooderham v. Adult & Family Servs. Div.</i> , 64 Or App 104, 667 P2d 551 (1983).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Gray Panthers v. Pub. Welfare Div.</i> , 28 Or App 841, 561 P2d 674 (1977).....	25
<i>Harsh Inv. Corp. v. State ex rel. State Hous. Div.</i> , 88 Or App 151, 744 P2d 588 (1987).....	24
<i>Homestyle Direct, LLC v. Dep’t of Human Serv.</i> , 245 Or App 598, 263 P3d 1118 (2011), <i>rev’d on other grounds</i> , 354 Or 253, 311 P3d 487 (2013).....	14, 27

<i>Kids Against the Cut v. Or. Wage & Hour Comm'n,</i> 41 Or App 179, 597 P2d 1264 (1979).....	25
<i>Kessler v. Or. Corr. Div.,</i> 26 Or App 271, 552 P2d 589 (1976).....	14, 27, 41
<i>Marbet v. PGE,</i> 277 Or 447, 561 P2d 154 (1977).....	9
<i>Metro. Hosps., Inc. v. State Health Planning & Dev. Agency,</i> 52 Or App 621, 628 P2d 783 (1981).....	25, 29
<i>Planned Parenthood Ass'n v. Dep't of Human Res.,</i> 297 Or 562, 687 P3d 785 (1984).....	34, 35, 43, 47, 48
<i>Rutherford v. Or. State Penitentiary,</i> 39 Or App 431, 592 P2d 1028 (1979).....	14
<i>Springfield Educ. Ass'n v. Springfield Sch. Dist. No. 19,</i> 290 Or 217, 621 P2d 547 (1980).....	35
<i>U.S. Bancorp v. Dept. of Rev.,</i> 337 Or 625, 103 P3d 85 (2004).....	39, 40
<i>Van Horn v. Senior Servs. Div.,</i> 76 Or App 15, 707 P2d 1294 (1985).....	25, 26
<i>Vier ex rel. Torry v. State Office for Servs. to Children & Families,</i> 159 Or App 369, 977 P2d 425 (1999).....	24, 25
<i>Vill. at Main St. Phase II, LLC v. Dep't of Rev.,</i> 356 Or 164, 339 P3d 428 (2014).....	39
<i>Waterwatch of Or., Inc. v. Or. Water Res. Comm'n,</i> 97 Or App 1, 774 P2d 1118 (1989).....	26, 32, 34
<i>Whipple v. Howser,</i> 291 Or 475, 632 P2d 782 (1981).....	39

STATUTES

ORS ch. 183.....	5, 35
ORS 183.310(9).....	28
ORS 183.335	<i>passim</i>
ORS 183.335(1)–(4).....	46, 47
ORS 183.335(2)(b)(E).....	24
ORS 183.335(5).....	24
ORS 183.335(5)(a)	<i>passim</i>
ORS 183.335(6)(a)	<i>passim</i>
ORS 183.335(11).....	24
ORS 183.335(11)(a)	<i>passim</i>
ORS 183.355	3
ORS 183.355(3).....	3
ORS 183.400	1
ORS 183.400(4).....	3
ORS 183.400(4)(b)	7, 8, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43
ORS 183.400(4)(c)	5, 7, 24, 45
ORS 183.497	47, 48
ORS 183.497(1)(a)	48
ORS 183.497(1)(b)	48
ORS 469.300–.619	2, 9, 35

ORS 469.300(1).....	10
ORS 469.300(12).....	10
ORS 469.320(1).....	10
ORS 469.040(1).....	9
ORS 469.401(1).....	10
ORS 469.405(1).....	10
ORS 469.410(1).....	17
ORS 469.450(1).....	9
ORS 469.450(6).....	9
ORS 469.470	4
ORS 469.470(2).....	4, 10
ORS 469.490	3, 34, 43
ORS 469.501	10
ORS 469.501(1)	10

COURT RULES

ORAP 14.05(2)(c)	2, 49
------------------------	-------

OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

OAR ch. 345, div. 15.....	2
OAR ch. 345, div. 25.....	2

OAR ch. 345, div. 27	2, 9, 11, 16, 36
OAR 345-027-0011 (2017)	16
OAR 345-027-0011 (2018)	17
OAR 345-027-0030(1) (2017)	22
OAR 345-027-0030(4) (2017)	21
OAR 345-027-0050–0100 (2017)	17
OAR 345-027-0068(3)(e)(E) (2018)	16
OAR 345-027-0070 (2017)	27, 28
OAR 345-027-0070(1)(a) (2017)	19
OAR 345-027-0070(6) (2017).....	19, 20
OAR 345-027-0070(10)(a) (2017)	22
OAR 345-027-0072(3)(d) (2018).....	16
OAR 345-027-0072(5) (2018).....	16, 17
OAR 345-027-0311–0400 (2019)	11
OAR 345-027-0311 (2019)	8, 17, 46
OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019).....	<i>passim</i>
OAR 345-027-0311(2) (2019).....	17
OAR 345-027-0357(7) (2019).....	20
OAR 345-027-0359 (2019)	20
OAR 345-027-0360 (2019)	20

OTHER AUTHORITIES

David B. Frohnmayer, *The Oregon Administrative Procedure Act:
An Essay on State Administrative Rulemaking Procedure Reform*,
58 Or. L. Rev. (1980)..... 25

Oregon Attorney General’s Administrative Law Manual (2014)..... 47

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Nature of the Proceeding and Relief Sought

This proceeding is a rulemaking appeal, brought pursuant to ORS 469.490 and 183.400, and involving temporary rules adopted by Respondent Energy Facility Siting Council (“EFSC” or “Council”), upon the recommendation of Respondent Oregon Department of Energy (“ODOE”). The challenged rules were adopted via Energy Facility Siting Council Temporary Administrative Order No. EFSC 9-2019 (“Order EFSC 9-2019”) (ER-1–ER-70).

The language of the challenged rules will be familiar to this Court, because this language is almost entirely identical to that of a prior set of rules that was recently held invalid by this Court in *Friends of the Columbia Gorge v. Energy Facility Siting Council* (“*Friends v. EFSC*”), 365 Or 371, 446 P3d 53 (2019). That prior case involved rules adopted by EFSC in an October 2017 rulemaking, via Energy Facility Siting Council Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017.

This Brief will refer to three different sets of rules: (1) the permanent, valid rules in effect prior to October 2017 (which will be referred to herein as the “2017 rules”),¹ (2) the permanent rules adopted in October 2017 and later held invalid by the Supreme Court in *Friends v. EFSC* (which will be referred to as the “2018 rules”), and (3) the temporary rules adopted in August 2019 that are the subject of

¹ The 2017 rules are in Petitioners’ Appendix at App-7–App-37.

the instant appeal (which will be referred to as the “2019 rules”).² All three sets of rules involve the same subject matter: the procedural requirements and criteria that EFSC and ODOE use to accept, review, process, and decide proposals to amend previously issued energy site certificates for large energy projects throughout the State of Oregon pursuant to the Energy Facility Siting Act (“Siting Act”), ORS 469.300–.619. Most of the rules in question are at OAR Chapter 345, Division 27, while a small number of the rules are at Divisions 15 and 25.³

Under the First Assignment of Error, Petitioners respectfully request that this Court declare the 2019 rules invalid. Under the Second Assignment of Error, Petitioners request that this Court declare OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) invalid. Under the Third Assignment of Error, Petitioners request that this Court declare invalid the majority of the 2019 rules (all rule language from the 2018 rules that Respondents readopted as identical 2019 rules).

If this Court declares any of the 2019 rules invalid, the Court should also clarify that the corresponding 2017 rules are reinstated. *See Back in Action Physical Therapy v. Liberty Nw. Ins. Corp.*, 259 Or App 743, 752, 316 P3d 324 (2013) (“There is no question that the former permanent rule would be controlling if the temporary rule were determined to be inapplicable or invalid.”). The Court should also specify that its decision is effective immediately. *See* ORAP 14.05(2)(c).

² The 2019 rules are in Petitioners’ Excerpt of Record at ER-8–ER-70.

³ The relevant rules in OAR Chapter 345, Division 25 within the 2019 rules were previously found in OAR Chapter 345, Division 27 within the 2017 rules.

B. Nature of the Decision Sought to be Reviewed

The decision sought to be reviewed is EFSC’s decision to adopt the 2019 rules. Judicial review of an agency rulemaking is governed in part by ORS 183.400(4). That section directs courts to declare rules invalid if they (a) violate constitutional provisions, (b) exceed the statutory authority of the agency, or (c) were adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures. ORS 183.400(4). In addition, ORS 183.335(11)(a) directs that “a rule is not valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of [ORS 183.335].”

C. Statutory Basis for Original Appellate Jurisdiction

This Court has original appellate jurisdiction of this matter pursuant to ORS 469.490, which provides that “[t]he validity of any rule adopted by [EFSC] may be determined only upon a petition by any person to the Supreme Court.”

D. Timeliness of Appeal

A petition for judicial review of a rule adopted by EFSC “must be filed within 60 days after the date the rule becomes effective under ORS 183.355.” ORS 469.490. Here, the 2019 rules became effective on August 22, 2019, the same day they were adopted. (ER-1.)⁴ Petitioners timely filed the Petition for Judicial Review with this Court on August 30, 2019, well within the sixty days required by ORS 469.490. Petitioners later filed an Amended Petition for Judicial Review (to add

⁴ See also ORS 183.355(3) (“Each rule is effective upon filing . . .”).

two parties as Petitioners) on September 13, 2019, which was also within the sixty days required by ORS 469.490.

E. Nature and Jurisdictional Basis of the Agency Action

The agency action at issue in this matter is a rulemaking action. EFSC purported to adopt the Rules under the statutory authority of ORS 469.470. (*See* ER-8–ER-70.) EFSC has authority to “adopt standards and rules to perform the functions vested by law in the council.” ORS 469.470(2). Petitioners do not dispute EFSC’s general authority to promulgate rules, but rather the sufficiency of EFSC’s rulemaking procedures in adopting the 2019 rules, as well as EFSC’s statutory authority to adopt these rules.

F. Questions Presented on Appeal

1. Are the 2019 rules invalid because EFSC failed to substantially comply with applicable rulemaking procedures in that it failed to demonstrate an emergency via adequate findings “that [EFSC’s] failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice,” as required for temporary rules by ORS 183.335(5)(a)?

2. Is OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) invalid because it applies retroactively for a period of more than 650 days to “all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017,” thus

violating the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a)?

3. In the alternative, is OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) invalid because it unlawfully attempts to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules?

4. Assuming *arguendo* that the 2018 rules were valid and/or effective until they were readopted by the 2019 rules, then are the 2019 rules invalid because they are a readoption and continuation of rule language identical to that of the 2018 permanent rules, which had already been in effect for more than 650 days at the time the 2019 rules were adopted, thus violating the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a)?

G. Summary of the Arguments

First Assignment of Error: Under the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, ORS ch. 183, “a rule is not valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of [ORS 183.335].” ORS 183.335(11)(a); *see also* ORS 183.400(4)(c) (Agency rules “adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures” are “invalid.”). Here, Respondents chose to bypass the APA’s normal rulemaking requirements and instead quickly adopt the 2019 rules as temporary rules, without soliciting comments from the general public and without allowing the public to request an oral hearing. In so doing, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by failing to demonstrate an emergency via adequate findings “that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the

interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice.” The purpose of this requirement is to allow an abbreviated, expedited rulemaking process only where there is, effectively, an emergency. That purpose has not been met here.

Specifically, Respondents contrived a false emergency by adopting the legal fiction that there were (or would be) no rules in place following the Supreme Court’s decision in the prior case. In fact, the 2017 rules were reinstated by the Supreme Court’s decision, and there was no need whatsoever for EFSC “to act promptly” to adopt new temporary rules on an expedited basis without full compliance with the rulemaking requirements of the APA. ORS 183.335(5)(a).

In addition, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by failing to adopt adequate findings of “serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned.” Instead, EFSC merely adopted findings that energy developers should not have to experience “unnecessary delays and costs” and that adopting the “temporary rules may also improve the prospects for continuity in the processing of applications.” (ER-7.) EFSC’s findings are inadequate to demonstrate the “serious prejudice” required by the APA for temporary rules. ORS 183.335(5)(a).

Moreover, EFSC readily admitted in its findings that the 2019 rules were adopted to effectively make a policy choice to (temporarily) replace the procedural requirements and criteria of the valid 2017 rules with that of the invalid 2018 rules, so that one preferred set of rules could be used over the other. (*See* ER-3, ER-7.)

EFSC failed to establish that this policy choice was an emergency warranting prompt action to adopt a temporary rule under ORS 183.335, thereby bypassing the APA's procedural requirements for permanent rules.

Because the 2019 rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with the requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a), they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a) and ORS 183.400(4)(c).

Second Assignment of Error: Under the APA, a rule that “[e]xceeds the statutory authority of the agency” is “invalid.” ORS 183.400(4)(b). Here, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), which was adopted on August 22, 2019, is invalid because it expressly applies retroactively for a period of more than 650 days to “all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017.” Furthermore, Respondents have in fact implemented this rule to apply the 2019 rules retroactively to past actions that occurred as long ago as one year and seven months prior to the adoption of the temporary rules. This far exceeds the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under the APA. *See* ORS 183.335(6)(a) (A temporary rule “may be effective for a period of not longer than 180 days.”). Because this rule exceeds Respondents’ statutory authority, it is invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b). And because this rule was not adopted in substantial compliance with ORS 183.335(6)(a), it is invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a).

In the alternative, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it unlawfully attempts to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules, which this Court has held “are invalid.” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) exceeds Respondents’ statutory authority, and is therefore invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b).

Third Assignment of Error: Assuming *arguendo* that the 2018 rules were valid and/or effective until they were readopted by the 2019 rules, then virtually all of the 2019 rules⁵ violate ORS 183.335(6)(a) because these rules are a readoption and continuation of rule language identical to that of the 2018 permanent rules, which had already been in effect for more than 650 days at the time the 2019 rules were adopted. ORS 183.335(6)(a) expressly prohibits the language of temporary rules from being in effect for more than 180 days. Thus, rule language that had previously been in effect for more than 650 days may only be readopted or continued as permanent rules, not as temporary rules. *See* ORS 183.335(6)(a). Because the 2019 rules exceed Respondents’ statutory authority, they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b). And because the rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with ORS 183.335(6)(a), they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a).

///

⁵ All of the 2019 rules except for OAR 345-027-0311 (2019) and the three rule subsections modified by EFSC in response to this Court’s decision, which were OAR 345-027-0368(3)(e)(E), 345-027-0372(3)(d), and 345-027-0372(5) (2019).

H. Statement of Facts

This matter concerns judicial review of an agency rulemaking that adopted temporary rules. The challenged rules, adopted by EFSC with assistance from ODOE, substantially revised the procedures and criteria by which previously approved large energy projects throughout the State of Oregon (and the permits approving these projects) may be modified after receiving EFSC approval. The majority of the rules in question are found at OAR Chapter 345, Division 27.

Petitioners are nonprofit public interest organizations, with more than 60,000 collective members and supporters, with a strong interest in responsible energy generation and the proper implementation of state law governing the approval, construction, and modification of large energy facilities in Oregon. (*See Decl. of Doug Heiken in Supp. of Pet’rs’ Mot. for Prelim. Inj.* (“Heiken Decl.”) at ¶¶ 4, 8.)

1. Statutory Background

Respondent EFSC is a subsidiary agency of Respondent ODOE,⁶ and ODOE provides staff support to EFSC.⁷ For purposes of this appeal, the organic statute for these agencies’ authority is the Siting Act, found at ORS 469.300 through 469.619. *See Marbet v. PGE*, 277 Or 447, 449, 561 P2d 154 (1977).

⁶ ORS 469.450(1) (“There is established in the State Department of Energy an Energy Facility Siting Council . . .”).

⁷ ORS 469.450(6) (“The State Department of Energy shall provide clerical and staff support to the council”); 469.040(1) (“[ODOE] shall be under the supervision of the Director of [ODOE], who shall . . . [s]upervise and facilitate the work and research on energy facility siting applications at the direction of [EFSC].”).

EFSC is responsible for reviewing and deciding whether to approve proposals for large energy facilities in Oregon, such as coal and natural gas plants, wind facilities, and high-capacity transmission lines. *See* ORS 469.300(11) (types of facilities under EFSC’s jurisdiction). When EFSC decides to approve such a facility, it issues a “site certificate,” which is a “binding agreement between the State of Oregon and the applicant, authorizing the applicant to construct and operate a facility on an approved site, incorporating all conditions imposed by the council on the applicant.” ORS 469.300(12). With limited exceptions, “no facility shall be constructed or expanded unless a site certificate has been issued for the site thereof.” ORS 469.320(1). “[A site] certificate or any amended site certificate with any conditions . . . shall authorize the applicant to construct, operate and retire the facility subject to the conditions set forth in the site certificate or amended site certificate.” ORS 469.401(1). “A site certificate may be amended with the approval of [EFSC].” ORS 469.405(1).

In the rulemaking context, EFSC is authorized to “adopt standards for the siting, construction, operation and retirement of [energy] facilities.” ORS 469.501(1); *see also* ORS 469.470(2) (authorizing EFSC to “adopt standards and rules to perform the functions vested by law in the council including the adoption of standards and rules for the siting of energy facilities pursuant to ORS 469.501.”).

///

///

2. Rulemaking Background

EFSC's rules for amending previously issued site certificates are primarily found at OAR Chapter 345, Division 27. Both the 2018 and 2019 rules substantially changed the procedural and substantive provisions of these rules. As described by Respondents themselves, the 2018 rules were a "wholesale re-write" of the 2017 rules. *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 374.⁸

The language of the 2019 temporary rules, in turn, is virtually identical to that of the 2018 rules (which, again, were held invalid by this Court), with only two substantive differences, which will be discussed below. Finally, the 2019 rules have been relocated and assigned new section numbers within the Oregon Administrative Rules, as compared to the 2018 rules.⁹

In the prior case, the Supreme Court held on August 1, 2019 that EFSC had failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the APA in purporting to adopt the 2018 rules, and as a result, the entire rulemaking package was invalid: "The rules approved by the Energy Siting Council through Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017 *are invalid.*" *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396 (emphasis added). Notably, the Supreme Court held that the challenged rules "are invalid," carefully using the same present-tense language as in the APA: "[A] rule *is not valid* unless adopted in substantial compliance with the

⁸ As will be discussed below, *infra* § I.H.3, there are numerous meaningful differences in the 2018 and 2019 rules, as compared to the 2017 rules.

⁹ The new OAR sections are at OAR 345-27-0311 through 345-27-400 (2019).

provisions of [ORS 183.335].” ORS 183.335(11)(a) (emphasis added); *see also Gooderham v. Adult & Family Servs. Div.*, 64 Or App 104, 110, 667 P2d 551 (1983) (“A rule not promulgated according to the APA *is not a rule.*”) (emphasis added).

In other words, the Supreme Court did not state that it was “invalidating” the 2018 rules, nor that the rules would be invalid (or invalidated) at a future date. Rather, the Court held, consistent with the language of the APA, that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” thus confirming that the 2018 rules were never valid in the first place because they were not promulgated in compliance with mandatory rulemaking procedures required by the APA. *See Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110.

As a result of the Supreme Court’s ruling that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” the obvious result should have been that the 2017 rules were automatically back in effect. *See Back in Action Physical Therapy*, 259 Or App at 752.

Respondents, however, did not see it that way. Following the Supreme Court’s opinion, Respondents adopted the position that the 2018 rules were still in effect and would, only later, be “invalidated” when the Supreme Court issues its final judgment in the case. (Heiken Decl. at ¶ 19; *see also* ER-1, ER-7.) Thus, Respondents stated that they believed they could continue implementing and enforcing the 2018 rules while awaiting the Court’s judgment, and they in fact continued to do so, over the objections of Petitioners. (Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 19, 23, 25; *see also* App-57 n 7.)

The disagreements between Petitioners and Respondents did not end there. Rather than concede that the entire rulemaking package (the entire set of 2018 rules) is invalid and that the entire set of 2017 rules was back in effect, Respondents took the novel position that any 2017 rules that had been *repealed* by the 2018 rules *were still repealed* (or, to be more exact, that these 2017 rules would still be repealed upon issuance of the Court’s judgment). (ER-1–ER-2, ER-7; *see also* Heiken Decl. at ¶ 20.) Respondents reached this unprecedented interpretation by parsing the following sentence at the end of the Court’s opinion:

The rules approved by the Energy Facility Siting Council through Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017 are invalid.

Friends v. EFSC, 365 Or at 396 (emphasis added). Respondents argued that because the Court referred to “[t]he rules approved by” these rulemaking orders, the Court’s intent was to only hold invalid the rules that *adopted new or modified* rule language, while not holding invalid any of the 2018 rules that *repealed* specific 2017 rule sections. (ER-1–ER-2, ER-7; *see also* Heiken Decl. at ¶ 20.) Thus, under Respondents’ interpretation, there would be administrative chaos, because core provisions of the 2017 rules had been repealed and would remain repealed even after the Supreme Court’s decision, and thus there would be no rules in effect at all and Respondents “may be unable to process requests for amendment until permanent rules are adopted.” (ER-2, *see also* ER-1, ER-7; Heiken Decl. at ¶ 20.)

Finally, at the time of the Supreme Court’s August 1, 2019 decision, there were at least six applications for site certificate amendments pending before Respondents. (ER-2.) These applications were expressly filed under, and tailored to, the 2018 rules, and were at various stages of the review process under the 2018 rules at the time of the Court’s decision. (ER-2–ER-6.) Immediately following the Supreme Court’s ruling that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” Petitioners asked Respondents to stop processing and to reject these applications, and to not accept any new applications under the 2018 rules (Heiken Decl. at ¶ 18), because agencies cannot implement or enforce invalid rules.¹⁰ In addition, Petitioners asked Respondents to confirm that new applications could be filed and reviewed under the 2017 rules, which were now back in effect as a result of the Supreme Court’s decision. (Heiken Decl. at ¶ 18.)

In response, Respondents once again disagreed with Petitioners. Respondents took the position that they could continue processing and reviewing the pending applications under the 2018 rules, given Respondents’ earlier interpretations that

¹⁰ See *Homestyle Direct, LLC v. Dep’t of Human Serv.*, 245 Or App 598, 605, 263 P3d 1118 (2011) (state agencies cannot enforce invalid rules), *rev’d on other grounds*, 354 Or 253, 311 P3d 487 (2013); *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 107–08 (invalid rule could not be used to reduce or terminate benefits); *Clark v. Pub. Welfare Div.*, 27 Or App 473, 477, 556 P2d 722 (1976) (“The decision of the hearings officer having been made pursuant to invalid rules is itself invalid.”); *Kessler v. Or. Corr. Div.*, 26 Or App 271, 274, 552 P2d 589 (1976) (agency decision reversed and remanded because it applied invalid rules), *overruled on other grounds by Rutherford v. Or. State Penitentiary*, 39 Or App 431, 439, 592 P2d 1028 (1979).

the 2018 rules were still valid and in effect and could still be implemented until the Supreme Court’s judgment, and that any repealed 2017 rules would still be repealed even after the Court’s judgment. (Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 19, 20.)

From there, Respondents advanced their novel interpretations of the Supreme Court’s decision one step further. Relying on the false emergency that there would soon be no rules in effect at all, ODOE argued that this warranted the immediate adoption of temporary rules in order to “improve the prospects for continuity in the processing of applications for site certificate amendments,” and that “failure to promptly adopt [the 2019] temporary rules . . . would impose unnecessary delays and costs to certificate holders seeking site certificate amendments.” (ER-7; *see also* Heiken Decl. at ¶ 20.) ODOE then scheduled the consideration of a temporary rulemaking at EFSC’s August 22–23, 2019 regular meeting (with no public hearing), and chose not to solicit comments on the proposed rules from the public at large, but instead only solicited written statements from energy site certificate holders alleging the “serious prejudice” that they believed they might endure as a result of the Supreme Court’s decision. (*See* ER-3–ER-7; Rulemaking Record (“RR”) Ex A3–A7; Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 20, 21.)

On the first day of the August 22–23, 2019 meeting, EFSC acted on ODOE’s recommendation and adopted the proposed temporary rules. (ER-1; Heiken Decl. at ¶ 21.) At this meeting, shortly before the 2019 rules were adopted, EFSC’s Rules

Coordinator stated that the 2019 rules were designed to “readopt” the 2018 rules “in substantially the same form that they were then.” (ER-91, lines 8–12.)

The temporary rules (*i.e.*, the 2019 rules) temporarily suspend the 2018 rules for 180 days, while also temporarily readopting, verbatim, virtually all of the same language from the 2018 rules but at new OAR sections, with only two substantive differences as compared to the 2018 rules.¹¹ Those two substantive differences are as follows.

First, EFSC modified the language of three specific rule subsections involving judicial review of EFSC final orders.¹² EFSC made these changes in response to the Supreme Court’s holding that the 2018 rule language in these three subsections exceeded EFSC’s statutory authority, *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 394–95. (ER-2; *see also* ER-109; Heiken Decl. at ¶ 21.)

Second, EFSC made substantial changes to a specific section of OAR Chapter 345, Division 27 that governs the applicability of that Division. This section read as follows in the 2017 rules:

The rules in this division do not apply to facilities covered by ORS 469.410(1), including the Trojan energy facility.

OAR 345-027-0011 (2017).

///

¹¹ The two substantive differences are shown in a memo by the EFSC Rules Coordinator, at ER-109–ER-110.

¹² *Compare* OAR 345-027-0368(3)(e)(E), 345-027-0372(3)(d), 345-027-0372(5) (2019) *with* OAR 345-027-0068(3)(e)(E), 345-027-0072(3)(d), 345-027-

The same section read as follows in the 2018 rules:

The rules in this division apply to all facilities under the Council's jurisdiction except those facilities described in ORS 469.410(1), including the Trojan energy facility, *and except that rules OAR 345-027-0050 through 345-027-0100 that were in effect prior to October 24, 2017 apply to requests for amendments to site certificates and change requests that have been received by the Department prior to October 24, 2017.*

OAR 345-027-0011 (2018) (emphasis added). In other words, under the 2018 rules, applications filed prior to October 24, 2017 were to be processed under the 2017 rules, while applications filed after that date were to be processed under the 2018 rules.

And finally, that rule language was substantially revised to read as follows in the 2019 rules:

(1) The rules in this division apply to all requests for amendment to a site certificate and amendment determination requests for facilities under the Council's jurisdiction that are submitted to, or were already under review by, the Council on or after the effective date of the rules. The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

(2) Notwithstanding section (1) of this rule, these rules do not apply to facilities described in ORS 469.410(1).

345-027-0311 (2019); *see also* ER-110.

///

0072(5) (2018). *See also* ER-110 (showing these rule revisions).

The primary intent behind temporary subsection (1), combined with the readoption of the vast majority of the 2018 rule language, was to resurrect the invalid 2018 rules as temporary 2019 rules and to retroactively apply these rules to the then-pending site certificate amendment applications (which were already being processed under the 2018 rules), going all the way back to October 24, 2017.¹³ Respondents made this intent clear in the meeting agenda for EFSC's August 22–23, 2019 meeting (at which the 2019 rules were adopted):

[The 2019 rules] would . . . [e]stablish that the Department and Council will apply the temporary rules to requests for amendments and other review processes submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council or the Department has not yet made a final decision, without requiring certificate holders to resubmit a new request for amendment or amendment determination request.

(App-39.) In addition, a secondary intent behind this rule language was to also apply the same set of rules to all future applications submitted while the 2019 rules are in effect.¹⁴

Within the order adopting the 2019 rules, EFSC announced that the 2019 rules will be effective through February 17, 2020. (ER-1.) Respondents have also decided to initiate a new rulemaking process to adopt permanent rules that will supersede the 2019 temporary rules. (ER-106–ER-107; App-45.)

///

¹³ See ER-2, ER-7, ER-84, ER-90, ER-91–ER-93; Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 22; App. 52–62.

¹⁴ ER-7; *see also* ER-84, ER-90–ER-91; Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 22, 27.

3. The 2019 rules contain numerous procedural and substantive changes as compared to the 2017 rules.

There are numerous differences between the 2017 and 2019 rules.¹⁵ Most of these differences are procedural, but some are substantive. Generally speaking, the 2019 rules eliminate or reduce public participation rights and opportunities that had been available in the 2017 rules, while also creating new hurdles and barriers to public participation that had not existed in the 2017 rules. (Heiken Decl. at ¶ 13.)

For example, under the 2017 rules, the public had an early right to comment on proposed applications to amend site certificates—thus informing the agencies, site certificate holders, and other stakeholders of any specific concerns, and thereby potentially influencing the substantive review of the application—*before* the ODOE staff prepared a draft proposed order on the proposed amendment. *See* OAR 345-027-0070(1)(a) (2017). But this right to provide comments early in the process has been stripped from the 2019 rules, and instead under these new rules the ODOE staff must prepare the entire draft proposed order with no input from the public. OAR 345-027-0365(1)(b)(C) (2019).

In addition, under the 2017 rules, the public had the right to request a contested case hearing for each proposal to amend a site certificate. OAR 345-027-

¹⁵ Because the relevant language of the 2019 rules is identical to that of the 2018 rules, all changes in the 2019 rules discussed in this section were also previously found in the 2018 rules. However, for brevity, this section will not cite the 2018 rules.

0070(6) (2017). But under the 2019 rules, that right has been removed from the rules and replaced with a completely different framework involving the newly created “Type A,” “Type B,” and “Type C” review paths, and the ODOE staff have been given unilateral authority to decide which applications will be processed as “Type B” matters, for which there is no public hearing and no opportunity for the public to even request a contested case. *See* OAR 345-027-0359, -0360, -0363, -0365, -0367, -0368, -0371, -0372, -0375, -0380 (2019). Under the 2019 rules, only the site certificate holder—and not interested members of the public, nor even the Council itself—is allowed to request Council review of ODOE staff determinations of which applications will be subject to the more truncated “Type B” process. OAR 345-027-0357(7) (2019). In these ways, Petitioners have lost important rights they once had under the 2017 rules, and are now subject to the whims of ODOE staff, with no recourse within the administrative review process itself if and when those whims are arbitrarily exercised.

The 2019 rules also impose new burdensome requirements on persons seeking contested cases on requests for amendments to site certificates by requiring them to submit a variety of information, including “[a] detailed description of the person’s interest in the proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding,” “[a] statement of whether the person’s request to participate in a contested case is as a party or a limited party, and if as a limited party, the precise area or areas in which participation is sought,” “[i]f the person

seeks to protect a personal interest in the outcome of the proceeding, a detailed statement of the person's interest, economic or otherwise, and how such interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding," "[i]f the person seeks to represent a public interest in the results of the proceeding, a detailed statement of such public interest, the manner in which such public interest will be affected by the results of the proceeding, and the person's qualifications to represent such public interest," and "[a] statement of the reasons why others who commented on the record of the public hearing cannot adequately represent the interest identified in [prior rule subsections]." OAR 345-027-0371(6)(e), (h), (i), (j) (2019). None of these requirements applied under the 2017 rules.

There are substantive differences as well. For example, under the 2017 rules, when a site certificate holder requested an amendment to extend a deadline for beginning or completing construction of a project, the Council retained discretion to approve extensions for any period of time up to two years, and thereby protect the public by preventing reviews of approved but not-yet-built projects from becoming stale in the face of changing circumstances. OAR 345-027-0030(4) (2017). But for extension applications under the 2019 rules, it is an all-or-nothing proposition: any extension granted must be *exactly three* years; no time period less than three years may be approved. OAR 345-027-0385(3)(a) (2019).

Also for applications to extend construction deadlines, the 2017 rules required such applications to be submitted at least six months prior to the deadline

in question. OAR 345-027-0030(1) (2017). But under the 2019 rules, such applications may be submitted as late as *one day prior* to the applicable deadline. OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019).

For proposals to expand project site boundaries, the 2017 rules required an analysis of whether “the facility” (*i.e.*, the entire facility, including any new portions within expanded site boundaries) would comply with the applicable rules. OAR 345-027-0070(10)(a) (2017). But under the 2019 rules, only “the portion of the facility within the area added to the site by the amendment” need be evaluated for compliance. OAR 345-027-0375(2)(a) (2019). By narrowing the scope in this way, the newer rules weaken the substance of the rules. For example, if a developer proposes to expand the size of an approved wind energy facility, the Council is no longer required to evaluate whether the facility as a whole, taking into account both previously approved components and new proposed components, complies with applicable noise, scenic, wildlife, and other standards.

In addition, the 2019 rules purport to add temporal limitations on which set of rules applies to the agencies’ review of proposed site certificate amendments. Specifically, the 2019 rules require an analysis of whether a proposed amendment “complies with all laws and Council standards applicable to an original site certificate application.” 345-027-0375(2)(a), (b) (2019). This new rule language appears to only require an analysis of laws and rules that were in effect on the date the site certificate was originally issued, rather than current laws and rules in effect

when a proposed amendment to the site certificate is under review. This limitation was not found in the 2017 rules.

These are just a few of the numerous procedural and substantive changes made in the 2019 rules, as compared to the 2017 rules. Again, Respondents themselves have characterized the 2018 rules as a “wholesale re-write” of the 2017 rules, *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 374, and with only two substantive exceptions, discussed *supra* § I.H.2, the 2019 rules are identical to the 2018 rules (but placed at new section numbers within the Oregon Administrative Rules).

I. Preservation of Errors

Because this appeal challenges a rulemaking action and because this Court has original jurisdiction, there was no court below and no requirement for Petitioners to raise and preserve errors below. Moreover, there was no *opportunity* for Petitioners to have raised the errors, because Respondents chose to not hold a public hearing nor solicit comments from the general public prior to adopting the challenged rules.

///

///

///

///

///

///

II. ARGUMENT

A. FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: The 2019 rules are invalid because EFSC failed to demonstrate an emergency via adequate “findings that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice,” as required by ORS 183.335(5)(a).

1. Standard of Review: Whether the challenged Rules were adopted without substantial compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures.

Under the APA, “a rule is not valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of [ORS 183.335].” ORS 183.335(11)(a); *see also* ORS 183.400(4)(c) (Agency rules “adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures” are “invalid.”) Accordingly, “noncompliance with [applicable provisions of ORS 183.335] will result in invalidation.” *Fremont Lumber Co. v. Energy Facility Siting Council*, 325 Or 256, 263, 936 P2d 968 (1997) (citing ORS 183.335(2)(b)(E), 183.335(11)).

2. Respondents failed to adopt adequate findings demonstrating an emergency to justify the adoption of temporary rules.

The APA authorizes state agencies to adopt “temporary rules,”¹⁶ also commonly called “emergency rules.”¹⁷ However, such rules may be adopted “only

¹⁶ ORS 18.335(6)(a) (“A rule adopted, amended or suspended under [ORS 183.335(5)] is temporary”); *see also* *Edmunson v. Dep’t of Ins. & Fin.*, 314 Or 291, 293, 838 P2d 589 (1992) (“temporary rules”); *Back in Action Physical Therapy*, 259 Or App at 748–50, 752 (“temporary rule”); *Harsh Inv. Corp. v. State ex rel. State Hous. Div.*, 88 Or App 151, 153 & n 2, 744 P2d 588 (1987) (“temporary rule”).

¹⁷ *See, e.g.,* *Edmunson*, 314 Or at 293 (“emergency [rule] provisions”); *Vier ex rel. Torry v. State Office for Servs. to Children & Families*, 159 Or App 369, 375,

under limited circumstances.” *Metro. Hosps., Inc. v. State Health Planning & Dev. Agency*, 52 Or App 621, 625, 628 P2d 783 (1981) (citing ORS 183.335). Here, EFSC failed to demonstrate an emergency via adequate “findings that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice,” as required by ORS 183.335(5)(a). Because Respondents failed to comply with the procedural requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a), “[i]t follows that the challenged rules are invalid.” *Fremont Lumber*, 325 Or 256 at 267–68.

ORS 183.335(5)(a) allows temporary rules only if the agency first “prepare[s] [a] statement of its findings that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice.” ORS 183.335(5)(a) thus effectively requires an agency, before adopting a temporary rule, “to demonstrate an emergency.” *Vier ex rel. Torry*, 159 Or App at 375. The legislature deliberately set the bar high for the required findings, expressly requiring agencies to find not mere “prejudice,” but

977 P2d 425 (1999) (ORS 183.335(5)(a) requires agencies “to demonstrate an emergency”); *Van Horn v. Senior Servs. Div.*, 76 Or App 15, 16, 707 P2d 1294 (1985) (“emergency rule”); *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 111 (“emergency rule”); *Kids Against the Cut v. Or. Wage & Hour Comm’n*, 41 Or App 179, 183, 597 P2d 1264 (1979) (rule amended “on an emergency basis”); *Gray Panthers v. Pub. Welfare Div.*, 28 Or App 841, 845 n 3, 561 P2d 674 (1977) (“the emergency rule making procedure set forth in ORS 183.335(5)”); David B. Frohnmayer, *The Oregon Administrative Procedure Act: An Essay on State Administrative Rulemaking Procedure Reform*, 58 Or. L. Rev. 411, 439 (1980) (“[t]he provisions for temporary emergency rulemaking in ORS 183.335(5)”).

rather “serious prejudice.” ORS 183.335(5)(a).¹⁸ An agency’s findings under ORS 183.335(5)(a) must “provide adequate support for the promulgation of the temporary rule.” *Waterwatch of Or., Inc. v. Or. Water Res. Comm’n*, 97 Or App 1, 6, 774 P2d 1118 (1989); *see also Van Horn*, 76 Or App at 16 (temporary rules must be supported by “adequate” findings).

In adopting the 2019 rules, Respondents chose to bypass the APA’s normal rulemaking requirements, and instead rush the adoption of the rules as temporary rules, without soliciting comments from the general public and without allowing the public to request an oral hearing. In so doing, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by failing to demonstrate an emergency via adequate findings “that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice.” The purpose of this requirement is to allow an abbreviated, expedited rulemaking process only in emergency situations, where “prompt action” is necessary to prevent “serious prejudice.” ORS 183.335(5)(a). That purpose has not

¹⁸ The legislative history supports this reading. Before the Legislature adopted the requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a), the House Judiciary Committee removed the word “serious” from the bill, but later the Senate Judiciary Committee added it back in, and the bill ultimately became law requiring findings of “serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned.” ORS 183.335(5)(a); *see also* Bill File, HB 1213 (1971) (House Committee on Judiciary, Exhibit D (removing “serious” from p. 4, line 17); Senate Committee on Judiciary, Exhibit D (adding “serious” back to p. 5, line 1)).

been met here. Respondents have violated both the letter and spirit of the requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a).

Specifically, Respondents contrived a false emergency by adopting the legal fiction that, following the Supreme Court’s decision in the prior case that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396, there were (or would be¹⁹) no rules in place:

[W]hen Council adopted the [2018] rules in October 2017, it also repealed OAR 345-027-0070 [(2017)] (the rule that had previously governed the process for site certificate amendments) in Order EFSC 5-2017. Given the Council’s prior repeal of the pre-October 2017 amendment rule, if the Council does not take any action now, upon the Supreme Court’s entry of the appellate judgment, it is possible that there will be no rules in place governing site certificate amendments whatsoever. Therefore, certificate holders have questions and significant concerns regarding how the Council will proceed with pending requests for amendment, and ODOE is uncertain how to process any new requests that it may receive.

* * *

¹⁹ Despite this Court’s holding that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” Respondents took the position that they could nevertheless keep implementing the invalid 2018 rules until the Court issues its final judgment in the prior appeal. (Heiken Decl. at ¶ 19; *see also* ER-1, ER-7.) Respondents’ position ignores the plain language of this Court’s decision, which confirmed, in present-tense language, that the 2018 rules “are invalid.” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396; *see also* ORS 183.335(11)(a) (“[A] rule *is not valid* unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of [ORS 183.335].”) (emphasis added); *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110 (“A rule not promulgated according to the APA *is not a rule*.”) (emphasis added). In addition, agencies may not implement or enforce invalid rules. *See Homestyle Direct*, 245 Or App at 601; *Clark v. Pub. Welfare Div.*, 27 Or App at 477; *Kessler*, 26 Or App at 275.

If a certificate holder were to apply for an amendment to a site certificate at this time, it is not clear what, if any, rules would govern the Department and Council's review of that request.

The Supreme Court's decision concludes "The rules approved by the Energy Facility Siting Council through Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017 are invalid." It does not state, for example, that "all actions taken" by EFSC under those Administrative Orders are invalid. Therefore, given that [Order] EFSC 5-2017 repealed OAR 345-027-0070 [(2017)] (the rule that had previously governed the process for site certificate amendments) if Council does not take action, upon the Court's issuing an appellate judgment it is possible that there will be no rules in place governing site certificate amendments.

(ER-1–ER-2, ER-6–ER-7; *see also* ER-83–ER-84, ER-90.)

Respondents' interpretation, of course, quickly falls apart when the definition of "rule" in the APA is consulted. In pertinent part, that definition states that "[t]he term ["rule"] includes the . . . repeal of a prior rule." ORS 183.310(9). Thus, any 2018 rule within EFSC Orders 4-2017 and 5-2017 that purported to repeal a 2017 rule is, in and of itself, a "rule." And when the Supreme Court held that "[t]he rules approved by" these two orders "are invalid," *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396, that necessarily included *all* rules within these orders, including rules that purported to repeal prior rules. Thus, the attempted repeals in the 2018 rules are invalid as well, and the 2017 rules were never repealed. *See Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110 (because rule was "not promulgated according to the APA, [it] was not effective to repeal the previous rule.") The entire set of 2017 rules was automatically back in effect following the Supreme Court's decision. *See Back in Action Physical Therapy*, 259 Or App at 752 ("There is no question that the former permanent rule

would be controlling if the temporary rule were determined to be inapplicable or invalid.”).

Thus, contrary to EFSC findings, the 2017 rules were reinstated in their entirety by the Supreme Court’s decision. But rather than recognize that outcome, Respondents fabricated the false premise that “if the Council does not take any action now, . . . it is possible that there will be no rules in place governing site certificate amendments whatsoever.” (ER-2). By expressly basing the 2019 rules on this false premise (which Respondents themselves were apparently not even sure about, given their inclusion of the equivocal language “it is possible that”), Respondents failed to establish an emergency via adequate findings that EFSC’s “failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned,” and thereby violated ORS 183.335(5)(a).

EFSC also violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) by merely adopting findings that energy developers should not have to experience “unnecessary delays and costs” and that adopting the “temporary rules may also improve the prospects for continuity in the processing of applications.” (ER-7.) EFSC’s findings are inadequate to demonstrate the “serious prejudice” required by the APA for temporary rules. ORS 183.335(5)(a); *see also Metro. Hosps., Inc.*, 52 Or App at 626 (temporary rules were invalid because agency’s findings that the rules would “provide a more thorough, equitable and less expensive hearing to four applications

currently granted their requests for reconsideration” were insufficient to demonstrate the “serious prejudice” required by the APA).

EFSC also adopted findings for five specific pending applications (all of which had been submitted under the 2018 rules), and found that it would be “unfair and substantially prejudicial to require [these] certificate holders . . . to resubmit their requests for amendment under the pre-October 2017 rules and restart the entire amendment process.” (ER-2–ER-7.) These findings completely fail to address, however, why the permanent rulemaking process (rather than the temporary rulemaking process) could not be utilized to address these projects. Instead, the findings focus on whether these applicants should be required to refile new applications under the 2017 rules, which is an entirely different question than whether a solution might be provided through permanent rulemaking. Respondents failed to demonstrate that an emergency required “prompt action” via temporary rulemaking. ORS 183.335(5)(a).

EFSC’s findings also fail to recognize that the site certificates for two of the five projects, the Summit Ridge Wind Farm (“Summit Ridge”) and the Perennial Wind Chaser Station (“Perennial”), have already expired,²⁰ and cannot be revived

²⁰ The Summit Ridge site certificate, originally issued on August 19, 2011, expired on August 20, 2018. The Perennial site certificate, originally issued on September 18, 2015, expired on September 19, 2018. These certificates expired when the certificate holders failed to either begin construction by the construction start deadlines or file valid applications under valid rules to extend those deadlines. (See Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 23, 25.)

through any amount of rulemaking—whether temporary or permanent. For these two projects, the developers’ remedy is to file new applications for site certificates. This is hardly an unfair result given that their prior site certificates were applied for many years ago and the developers are single-handedly responsible for taking the risk of allowing the certificates to expire without ever beginning construction. In any event, the temporary 2019 rules do not, and cannot, revive these two expired certificates, and thus the findings of “serious prejudice” for these projects do not justify the temporary rulemaking.

In addition, EFSC readily admitted within its findings that it effectively made a policy choice to temporarily replace the procedural requirements and criteria of the valid 2017 rules with that of the invalid 2018 rules, so that one preferred set of rules could be (temporarily) used over the other, particularly for new site certificate amendment applications:

Additionally, if it does not adopt temporary rules, as new amendment requests are submitted, Council would also have to process them under the [2017] rules (the legality of which is uncertain) or refuse to process such requests until it has an opportunity to adopt new permanent amendment rules. Were Council to begin processing new amendment applications under the . . . 2017 rules, Council would have to determine how to handle those applications once new permanent amendment rules are adopted.

* * *

At best, [in the absence of temporary rules] the amendment rules would revert to the [2017 rules]. It is necessary to take immediate action to resolve this situation, not only to avoid serious prejudice to

certificate holders with pending requests for amendments, but also to provide regulatory certainty to certificate holders seeking new site certificate amendments regarding what rules apply. Adopting the temporary rules will provide certainty that the temporary rules govern the amendment process until the Council can adopt new permanent rules. Further, adopting the temporary rules may also improve the prospects for continuity in the processing of applications for site certificate amendments once the permanent rules are adopted, as the new permanent rules are likely to be more similar to the temporary rules than the . . . 2017 amendment rules.

(ER-3, ER-7.) Again, in these findings EFSC readily admitted that it was making a policy choice to readopt nearly the entire set of invalid 2018 rules as temporary rules, rather than keep the valid 2017 rules in place while new, permanent rules could be considered and adopted. This policy choice was not an emergency warranting prompt action to adopt a temporary rule under ORS 183.335, thereby bypassing the APA's procedural requirements for permanent rules. *See Waterwatch of Or.*, 97 Or App at 6 (agency's temporary rule was invalid because it "was clearly a change in the substance of the regulation rather than a mere attempt to clarify for which the need was found," agency's "findings and statement of need [did] not provide adequate support for the promulgation of the temporary rule[,] and . . . the rule was therefore adopted without compliance with applicable rulemaking procedures").

Moreover, EFSC purported to readopt the 2018 rules as temporary rules in order to avoid alleged "serious prejudice" to site certificate holders with pending applications. (ER-2-ER-7.) However, with regard to new site certificate amendment applications submitted in the future, EFSC did not adopt *any* findings

that the 2019 rules were necessary to avoid “serious prejudice,” but instead merely found that the 2019 rules would provide “regulatory certainty” for such future applications. (ER-7.) EFSC admitted as much in this sentence within its findings:

It is necessary to take immediate action to resolve this situation, not only to avoid serious prejudice to certificate holders with pending requests for amendments, *but also to provide regulatory certainty to certificate holders seeking new site certificate amendments regarding what rules apply.*

(ER-7 (emphasis added).) In other words, EFSC freely admitted that *there was no serious prejudice* to developers desiring to file new applications in the future. Yet, despite the absence of such findings, EFSC nevertheless proceeded to readopt the language of the 2018 rules as temporary rules, and make that rule language immediately applicable not only to pending applications, but also to all future applications. (ER-7; *see also* OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019).)

EFSC made these changes despite the fact that at least one site certificate holder, PGE, asked ODOE and EFSC to *not* temporarily readopt or apply the language of the 2018 rules to future applications, and instead apply the language of the 2017 rules (which, if ODOE and EFSC had agreed to do so, would not have required *any* temporary rulemaking for such applications):

PGE recommends that the temporary rulemaking adopted only apply to pending site certificate amendments. Until final rules can be promulgated, future amendments should be processed under the pre-October 24, 2017 rules. PGE looks forward to participating with all concerned stakeholders in a careful evaluation of any new permanent rulemaking to govern future site certificate amendments.

(RR Ex A7 at 1.) The fact that PGE made this explicit request severely undermines EFSC’s findings that the immediate readoption of the 2018 rules was necessary for future amendment applications, given that PGE urged EFSC *not* to do so.

Much like the outcome in *Waterwatch of Oregon*, see 97 Or App at 6, the course of action that EFSC pursued here (readopting the 2018 rules as temporary rules and applying these rules to future site certificate amendment applications) was not supported by adequate findings demonstrating an emergency. Therefore, EFSC violated ORS 183.335(5)(a) and the 2019 rules are invalid.

Because the 2019 rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with the requirements of ORS 183.335(5)(a), they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a) and ORS 183.400(4)(c).

B. SECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it exceeds EFSC’s statutory authority and was not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335.

1. Standards of Review: Whether the challenged rule exceeds Respondents’ statutory authority and whether the rule was not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335.

The Court “shall declare [a] rule invalid” when that rule “[e]xceeds the statutory authority of the agency.” ORS 183.400(4)(b) (made applicable by ORS 469.490). When evaluating an agency’s rules under the APA, “the first question is whether the action fell within the reach of [the agency’s] authority.” *Planned Parenthood Ass’n v. Dep’t of Human Res.*, 297 Or 562, 565, 687 P3d 785 (1984).

“Assuming that proper procedures were followed, the next question is whether the substance of the action, though within the scope of the agency’s . . . general authority, departed from a legal standard expressed or implied in the particular law being administered, or contravened some other applicable statute. These steps are designed to assure that the challenged action . . . in fact was authorized by the state’s . . . politically accountable policy makers.” *Id.*

In making these inquiries, this Court interprets the agency’s organic statute and any other applicable statutes, which is a question of law. *See Springfield Educ. Ass’n v. Springfield Sch. Dist. No. 19*, 290 Or 217, 224, 621 P2d 547 (1980) (“The determination of the meaning of a statute is one of law, ultimately for the court.”); *see also Coast Sec. Mortg. Corp. v. Real Estate Agency*, 331 Or 348, 353, 15 P3d 29 (2000). Save for the limited circumstance—inapplicable here—in which the legislature has delegated broad discretion to an agency to establish policy, the agency’s interpretation of the applicable statute is entitled to no deference. *Blachana, LLC v. Bureau of Labor & Indus.*, 354 Or 676, 687, 318 P3d 735 (2014). In this case, EFSC derives its limited authority from the Energy Facility Siting Act, ORS 469.300–.619, and the Administrative Procedures Act, ORS ch. 183.

In addition, as under the First Assignment of Error, rules not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 are invalid. ORS 183.335(11)(a).

///

2. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it exceeds the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a).

The APA limits the duration of temporary rules to no more than 180 days: “A rule adopted, amended or suspended under [ORS 183.335(5)(a)] is temporary and may be effective for a period of not longer than 180 days.” ORS 183.335(6)(a). Here, Respondents violated this requirement by adopting OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), which expressly applies the 2019 rules retroactively to “all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017.” Respondents themselves described the 2019 rules in exactly that way:

[The 2019 rules] would . . . [e]stablish that the Department and Council will apply the temporary rules to requests for amendments and other review processes submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council or the Department has not yet made a final decision, without requiring certificate holders to resubmit a new request for amendment or amendment determination request.

(App-39.) This retroactive rule far exceeds the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under the APA. Because this rule exceeds Respondents’ statutory authority, it is invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b).

The exact language of the rule in question is as follows:

The rules in this division [OAR Chapter 345, Division 27] apply to all requests for amendment to a site certificate and amendment determination requests for facilities under the Council’s jurisdiction that are submitted to, or were already under review by, the Council on or after the effective date of the rules. The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the

request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019).

This newly adopted rule language reaches back in time—all the way back to October 24, 2017—to expressly apply the 2019 rules to all applications submitted on or after that 2017 date. The rule language further states that any site certificate holders with pending applications submitted as long ago as October 24, 2017 will not be required to “resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of the rules.” *Id.* In other words, the 2019 rules are the operative rules for any such pending applications, going back in time to October 24, 2017.

For example, OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019) expressly authorizes site certificate holders to submit applications to extend construction deadlines as late as one day “before the applicable construction deadline.”²¹ In turn, OAR 345-027-0385(2) (2019) prevents site certificates from expiring so long as applications are timely submitted in accordance with OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019). Under the plain language of OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), these two rules apply retroactively to applications submitted “on or after October 24, 2017.” Thus, for all applications submitted in the last nine weeks of 2017 or in all of 2018, OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019) and OAR 345-027-0385(2) (2019) will be used—retroactively—to resolve

²¹ The 2017 rules imposed a very different deadline: “no later than six months before the date of the applicable deadline.” OAR 345-027-0030(1) (2017).

any questions about whether such applications were timely submitted and whether the lack of a timely application results in expiration of the site certificate.

Respondents' actual implementation of OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) further demonstrates their intent to make this rule applicable retroactively. For example, at the same August 22–23, 2019 meeting at which the 2019 rules were adopted, EFSC went on to use OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019)—and by extension, the 2019 rules—to immediately approve two pending applications that had been submitted long before the 2019 rules were adopted (in one case approximately ten months prior,²² and in the other case approximately twenty months prior²³). (App-48–App-49, App-52–App-62.) Throughout its final orders on these two applications, EFSC relied on OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) to repeatedly cite and apply numerous 2019 rules, including for multiple past actions and events in ODOE's and EFSC's reviews that had occurred as long ago as February 20, 2018—nineteen months prior to the August 22, 2019 adoption of the 2019 rules. (App-52–App-62; *see also* Heiken Decl. at ¶¶ 23, 24.)

This included EFSC's retroactive application of OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019) (adopted on August 22, 2019) to determine whether the Summit Ridge application, which was filed with ODOE on August 17, 2018, was timely submitted, valid, and complete at the time of filing (and, in turn, whether the

²² The Preliminary Request for Amendment 4 to the site certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm was submitted on August 17, 2018. (App-57.)

²³ The Preliminary Request for Amendment 4 to the site certificate for the

August 17, 2018 submittal of that application extended the August 19, 2018 construction start deadline for the project). (*See* App-56 n 1, App-62.) Because the 2017 rules on these and other questions are very different from the 2019 rules (*see supra* § I.H.3), the retroactive application of the 2019 rules to transactions and events that occurred in 2018 led to much different results than would have occurred under the 2017 rules.

Respondents may argue that the rule language is prospective, not retroactive. But as this Court has noted, “[d]etermining what constitutes ‘retroactive’ application of a statute can be a difficult task because of the notoriously slippery nature of the notion of ‘retroactivity.’” *Vill. at Main St. Phase II, LLC v. Dep’t of Rev.*, 356 Or 164, 183, 339 P3d 428 (2014); *see also Whipple v. Howser*, 291 Or 475, 488–89, 632 P2d 782 (1981) (Linde, J., concurring) (“‘Retroactivity’ itself is a deceptively simple word for a complex set of problems. In real time, all laws can operate only prospectively, prescribing legal consequences after their enactment; they cannot change the past. On the other hand, all new laws operate upon a state of affairs formed to some extent by past events.”).

Ultimately, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) meets this Court’s definition of a retroactive legislative action. “[A]s a general matter, a retroactive legislative action is one that affects existing legal rights or obligations arising out of past transactions or occurrences.” *U.S. Bancorp v. Dept. of Rev.*, 337 Or 625, 636–37, 103 P3d 85

Montague Wind Power Facility was submitted on January 9, 2018. (App-53.)

(2004) (citing *Fromme v. Fred Meyer, Inc.*, 306 Or 558, 561–62, 761 P2d 515 (1988); *Whipple v. Howser*, 291 Or at 488–89 (Linde, J., concurring)). Here, as described above, OAR 345-027-0385(1) (2019) does “affect[] existing legal rights or obligations arising out of past transactions or occurrences,” and has in fact already been implemented in that manner by Respondents, and thus is “retroactive legislative action.” *U.S. Bancorp*, 337 Or at 636–37.

If the challenged rule were intended to be only prospective, it would not expressly include the October 24, 2017 date (more than 650 days prior to the adoption of this rule), nor would it specify that the 2019 rules apply to applications submitted on or after that date, nor would it refer to and legitimize past “steps” taken for such applications. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019). Nor would ODOE and EFSC utilize the 2019 rules for evaluating compliance for events that occurred in 2018, as they have now done for multiple projects. (*See, e.g.*, App-52–App-62.) The obvious intent (as well as Respondents’ actual implementation) of OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is to apply the 2019 rules retroactively to such applications.

Because OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) applies retroactively for more than 650 days prior to its adoption, the rule exceeds the maximum 180 days allowed under ORS 183.335(6)(a), and is thus invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b).

///

///

///

3. In the alternative, OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid because it unlawfully attempts to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules.

Respondents have argued,²⁴ and may continue to argue, that the 2019 rules are not retroactive. As explained above, *supra* § II.B.2, that argument is legally incorrect, because OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) expressly states that the 2019 rules apply to all applications submitted on or after October 24, 2017, and that the site certificate holders for such applications are not required to “repeat any steps taken” under those rules (and because Respondents are in fact implementing the 2019 rules retroactively). But if the 2019 rules are *not* intended to be retroactively applied, then the language in OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) that “[t]he Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules” is an unlawful attempt to retroactively legitimize the invalid 2018 rules.

Again, this Court has held that the 2018 rules “are invalid,” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396, and the Court of Appeals has held that “[a] rule not promulgated according to the APA is not a rule.” *Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110 (emphasis added). Thus, the 2018 rules are not valid rules, and cannot be enforced or applied. *See Kessler*, 26 Or App at 274 (state agencies cannot base their decisions on invalid

rules). Yet OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), by its own express language, purports to legitimize past “steps” taken under the 2018 invalid rules:

The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, *without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.*

OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) (emphasis added). The italicized language in the above-quoted sentence is an attempted legitimization of past events that occurred under the invalid 2018 rules.

The instant case is exactly on point with *Gooderham*, in which a retroactivity clause of a 1982 rule was invalid because it “attempted to legitimize the action that had already been taken” under an earlier 1980 rule that was also invalid because it had not been promulgated in compliance with APA rulemaking procedures. 64 Or App at 110–12. Here, we have the exact same fact pattern. First, EFSC purported to adopt the 2018 rules, but in so doing failed to comply with the APA’s mandatory rulemaking procedures, and as a result, the 2018 rules “are invalid.” *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396. Yet, despite the fact that the 2018 rules are invalid, EFSC and ODOE nevertheless proceeded to use these invalid rules to accept, process, review, and even approve applications while the prior appeal was pending (and continued to do so even following this Court’s decision in the prior appeal²⁵), and

²⁴ See Resp’ts’ Resp. to Pet’rs’ Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 13–14.

²⁵ For example, on August 23, 2019, EFSC adopted its Final Order approving a

have now adopted OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019), which expressly states that site certificate holders whose applications were submitted under the 2018 rules are not required to “resubmit” their applications, “[n]or to repeat any steps taken” under the 2018 rules. This is a blatant effort to retroactively legitimize ODOE’s and EFSC’s past actions implementing the invalid 2018 rules. Respondents lack statutory authority to implement, apply, enforce, or retroactively ratify prior rules that were never adopted in compliance with the APA’s procedural requirements. OAR 345-027-0311(1) (2019) is invalid for the same reasons as the rule in *Gooderham*.

C. THIRD ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR: The 2019 rules are invalid because they exceed EFSC’s authority for temporary rules and were not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335.

1. Standards of Review: Whether the challenged rules exceed Respondents’ statutory authority and whether the rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335.

As under the Second Assignment of Error, this Court reviews the challenged rules to determine whether they exceed EFSC’s authority. *See* ORS 183.400(4)(b) (made applicable by ORS 469.490); *Planned Parenthood Ass’n*, 297 Or at 565. In addition, as under the First and Second Assignments of Error, rules not adopted in

proposed amendment to the site certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm, in which EFSC concluded that “[w]hile . . . the [2018] rules are being challenged in the Oregon Supreme Court, a stay of the rules or any other injunction against using the [2018] rules has not been issued. As such, the [2018] rules are valid and are applicable to the amendment request, as well as all other amendment requests pending with EFSC at this time. The [2017] rules were repealed in 2017, and are not applicable to the review of the [request for amendment of the site certificate].” (App-57 n 7.)

substantial compliance with the provisions of ORS 183.335 are invalid. ORS 183.335(11)(a).

2. The 2019 rules are invalid because they are a readoption and continuation of language identical to rules that had already been in effect for more than 650 days, thus exceeding the 180-day maximum allowable duration for temporary rules under ORS 183.335(6)(a).

As discussed above, the 2018 rules were not promulgated consistent with the APA's mandatory rulemaking procedures, and thus "are invalid"—and in fact, were never valid rules to begin with. *Friends v. EFSC*, 365 Or at 396; *see also Gooderham*, 64 Or App at 110. But if Petitioners are incorrect in that assertion, and the 2018 rules were valid and/or effective until they were readopted by the 2019 rules, then most of the 2019 rules (all rules except for OAR 345-027-0311 (2019) and the three rule subsections modified by EFSC in response to the Supreme Court's prior decision²⁶) violate ORS 183.335(6)(a) because these rules are a readoption and continuation of rule language identical to that of the 2018 permanent rules, which had already been in effect for more than 650 days at the time the 2019 rules were adopted, thus violating the APA's 180-day limit for temporary rule language.

ORS 183.335(6)(a) expressly prohibits the language of temporary rules from being in effect for more than 180 days. Thus, the 2018 rule language that had

²⁶ The three rule subsections are OAR 345-027-0368(3)(e)(E), 345-027-0372(3)(d), and 345-027-0372(5) (2019).

previously been in effect for more than 650 days may only be readopted or continued as permanent rules, not as temporary rules. *See* ORS 183.335(6)(a). Because the 2019 rules exceed Respondents’ statutory authority, they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.400(4)(b). And because the rules were not adopted in substantial compliance with ORS 183.335(6)(a), they are invalid pursuant to ORS 183.335(11)(a).

As explained by Respondents themselves, the 2019 rules were designed to “readopt” the 2018 rules “in substantially the same form that they were then,” but at “new numbers” within the Oregon Administrative Rules:

Essentially, these would readopt the rules adopted in 2017 in substantially the same form that they were then. To do that, we would amend the effective rules in Division 15 and 25 to readopt the changes made in October 2017. We would then propose suspending all the Division 27 rules that were adopted or amended by that rulemaking. That includes, I think, all of the Division 27 rules, except for 120 and 140. There’s maybe two rules that were unaffected.

. . . We would then adopt new rules to . . . replace those invalidated rules with the—and they would be substantially similar to the rules that were suspended

. . . And then just to clarify that these are new rules, the new Division 27 rules would be adopted under new numbers. We’re proposing to start with the 300 series, so they would start with rule 345-027-0311 and then continue from there with the same last two digits, as the existing rules have.

(ER-91–ER-92.) (statement of Christopher Clark, EFSC Rules Coordinator). To

summarize, only four rule sections or subsections contained new rule language²⁷; all other language in the 2019 rules was identical to the 2018 rules, except that it was placed at new OAR numbers. (*See* ER-91–ER-92, ER-110.)

The APA expressly prohibits temporary rule language from being in effect for more than 180 days. ORS 183.335(6)(a).²⁸ It also allows temporary rule language to be subsequently adopted as an “identical” permanent rule. *Id.* But the converse is not true: the APA does *not* allow a permanent rule to be subsequently adopted as (or converted to) an identical temporary rule²⁹—*especially not* rule language that has already been in effect in excess of 180 days.

In fact, the Oregon Attorney General specifically cautions agencies against using the temporary/emergency rule procedures to readopt rule language that was already in effect, describing this as “circumvent[ing] permanent rulemaking procedures”:

A temporary rule is effective for a maximum of 180 days. ORS 183.335(6)(a). No temporary rule may be renewed to give it effect for more than 180 calendar days. ORS 183.335(6)(a). The agency may,

²⁷ OAR 345-027-0311, 345-027-0368(3)(e)(E), 345-027-0372(3)(d), 345-027-0372(5) (2019); *see also* ER-110 (showing the rule revisions).

²⁸ “A rule adopted, amended, or suspended under [ORS 183.335(5)] is temporary and may be effective for a period of not longer than 180 days. The adoption of a rule under this subsection does not preclude the subsequent adoption of an identical rule under [ORS 183.335(1) to 183.335(4)].” ORS 183.335(6)(a).

²⁹ ORS 183.335(6)(a) authorizes the making of temporary rules permanent. But there is no authorization to readopt permanent rules as temporary rules. The Legislature obviously knew how to authorize the adoption and sequencing of rules, and here, chose to allow that sequencing in only one direction.

however, adopt an identical permanent rule upon appropriate notice in accordance with ORS 183.335(1)–(4).

An agency should not attempt to circumvent permanent rulemaking procedures by adopting temporary rules. ORS 183.335(11)(a) states that “a rule is not valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of this section in effect on the date that the notice required under subsection (1) of this section is delivered to the Secretary of State.” Arguably, if a temporary rule has been in effect for 180 days, adopting a “new” temporary rule that is essentially the same as a prior temporary rule does not substantially comply with ORS 183.335(5) and (6). Similarly, it would not be appropriate to readopt a temporary rule after a short interval of time following the lapse of the 180 days from initial adoption of the temporary rule. In addition, a party to a contested case may recover reasonable attorney fees against the agency if that party successfully appeals from a contested case order that was based upon an invalid temporary rule. ORS 183.497.

Oregon Attorney General’s Administrative Law Manual at 48 (2014).

Here, the rule language in question had already been in effect for more than 650 days, at which time this language was readopted as “new” temporary rules. Although the “new” temporary rules were placed at new OAR sections, the 2019 rules in question are otherwise identical to the 2018 rules.

This Court should not allow state agencies, such as EFSC and ODOE, to circumvent the APA’s rulemaking procedures and limits, nor to exploit the APA’s emergency rulemaking procedures, by readopting as so-called “temporary” rules the same rule language that had already been in effect in excess of 180 days. The APA’s 180-day limit on temporary rules is mandatory and must be complied with. EFSC’s action here in “readopting” the 2018 permanent rules as identical temporary rules exceeds the APA’s 180-day limit, and thus was not “within the

reach of [EFSC's] authority," and also "departed from a legal standard expressed or implied in the particular law being administered." *Planned Parenthood Ass'n*, 297 Or at 565. As a result, the challenged 2019 rules are invalid, and EFSC's decision to adopt them must be reversed.

D. Petitioners intend to seek attorney fees and costs pursuant to ORS 183.497.

If Petitioners prevail in this matter, Petitioners will seek attorney fees and costs pursuant to ORS 183.497. Petitioners intend to seek fees and costs under ORS 183.497(1)(b), which mandates an award of reasonable fees and costs if the Court finds in favor of Petitioners and determines that Respondents acted without a reasonable basis in fact or law. In addition, Petitioners intend to seek fees and costs under ORS 183.497(1)(a), which allows an award of reasonable fees and costs, in the discretion of the Court, if the Court finds in favor of Petitioners.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, this Court should declare the 2019 rules invalid, should clarify that the 2017 rules are reinstated, and should specify pursuant to ORAP 14.05(2)(c) that its decision is effective immediately.

Dated this 4th day of October, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

REEVES, KAHN, HENNESSY & ELKINS

/s/ Gary K. Kahn

Gary K. Kahn, OSB No. 814810
Of Attorneys for Petitioners

FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

/s/ Nathan J. Baker

Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980
Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge

/s/ Steven D. McCoy

Steven D. McCoy, OSB No. 074643
Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge

OREGON NATURAL DESERT
ASSOCIATION

/s/ Peter M. Lacy

Peter M. Lacy, OSB No. 013223
Attorney for ONDA

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH BRIEF
LENGTH AND TYPE SIZE REQUIREMENTS**

I hereby certify that this Opening Brief complies with the word-count limitation in ORAP 5.05(1)(b)(i)(A), and that the word-count of this Opening Brief (as described in ORAP 5.05(1)(a)) is 11,147 words.

I further certify that the size of the type in this Opening Brief is not smaller than 14 point for both the text of the Brief and the footnotes as required by ORAP 5.05(3)(a)(ii).

FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

/s/ Nathan J. Baker

Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980

Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge

**INDEX TO APPENDIX
FOR PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF**

Date	Description of Document	App. Page Nos.
Oct. 2019	ORS 183.335	App-1 – App-5
Aug. 22, 2019	OAR 345-027-0311 (2019)	App-6
Sept. 2017	OAR ch. 345, div. 15 (select provisions) OAR ch. 345, div. 27	App-7 – App-37
Aug. 22–23, 2019	Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council, Meeting Notice and Agenda	App-38 – App-41
Aug. 22–23, 2019	Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council, Meeting Minutes	App-42 – App-51
Aug. 23, 2019	Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council, Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate for the Montague Wind Power Facility (excerpts)	App-52 – App-54
Aug. 23, 2019	Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council, Final Order on Request for Amendment 4 to the Site Certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm (excerpts)	App-55 – App-62

183.335 Notice; content; public comment; temporary rule adoption, amendment or suspension; substantial compliance required. (1) Prior to the adoption, amendment or repeal of any rule, the agency shall give notice of its intended action:

(a) In the manner established by rule adopted by the agency under ORS 183.341 (4), which provides a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to be notified of the agency's proposed action;

(b) In the bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360 at least 21 days prior to the effective date;

(c) At least 28 days before the effective date, to persons who have requested notice pursuant to subsection (8) of this section; and

(d) Delivered only by electronic mail, at least 49 days before the effective date, to the persons specified in subsection (15) of this section.

(2)(a) The notice required by subsection (1) of this section must include:

(A) A caption of not more than 15 words that reasonably identifies the subject matter of the agency's intended action. The agency shall include the caption on each separate notice, statement, certificate or other similar document related to the intended action.

(B) An objective, simple and understandable statement summarizing the subject matter and purpose of the intended action in sufficient detail to inform a person that the person's interests may be affected, and the time, place and manner in which interested persons may present their views on the intended action.

(b) The agency shall include with the notice of intended action given under subsection (1) of this section:

(A) A citation of the statutory or other legal authority relied upon and bearing upon the promulgation of the rule;

(B) A citation of the statute or other law the rule is intended to implement;

(C) A statement of the need for the rule and a statement of how the rule is intended to meet the need;

(D) A list of the principal documents, reports or studies, if any, prepared by or relied upon by the agency in considering the need for and in preparing the rule, and a statement of the location at which those documents are available for public inspection. The list may be abbreviated if necessary, and if so abbreviated there shall be identified the location of a complete list;

(E) A statement of fiscal impact identifying state agencies, units of local government and the public that may be economically affected by the adoption, amendment or repeal of the rule and an estimate of that economic impact on state agencies, units of local government and the public. In considering the economic effect of the proposed action on the public, the agency shall utilize available information to project any significant economic effect of that action on businesses which shall include a cost of compliance effect on small businesses affected. For an agency specified in ORS 183.530, the statement of fiscal impact shall also include a housing cost impact statement as described in ORS 183.534;

(F) If an advisory committee is not appointed under the provisions of ORS 183.333, an explanation as to why no advisory committee was used to assist the agency in drafting the rule; and

(G) A request for public comment on whether other options should be considered for achieving the rule's substantive goals while reducing the negative economic impact of the rule on business.

(c) The Secretary of State may omit the information submitted under paragraph (b) of this subsection from publication in the bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360.

(d) When providing notice of an intended action under subsection (1)(c) of this section, the agency shall provide a copy of the rule that the agency proposes to adopt, amend or repeal, or an explanation of how the person may acquire a copy of the rule. The copy of an amended rule shall show all changes to the rule by striking through material to be deleted and underlining all new material, or by any other method that clearly shows all new and deleted material.

(3)(a) When an agency proposes to adopt, amend or repeal a rule, it shall give interested persons reasonable opportunity to submit data or views. Opportunity for oral hearing shall be granted upon request received from 10 persons or from an association having not less than 10 members before the earliest date that the rule could become effective after the giving of notice pursuant to subsection (1) of this section. An agency holding a hearing upon a request made under this subsection shall give notice of the hearing at least 21 days before the hearing to the person who has requested the hearing, to persons who have requested notice pursuant to subsection (8) of this section and to the persons specified in subsection (15) of this section. The agency shall publish notice of the hearing in the bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360 at least 14 days before the hearing. The agency shall consider fully any written or oral submission.

(b) If an agency is required to conduct an oral hearing under paragraph (a) of this subsection, and the rule for which the hearing is to be conducted applies only to a limited geographical area within this state, or affects only a limited geographical area within this state, the hearing shall be conducted within the geographical area at the place most convenient for the majority of the residents within the geographical area. At least 14 days before a hearing conducted under this paragraph, the agency shall publish notice of the hearing in the bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360 and in a newspaper of general circulation published within the geographical area that is affected by the rule or to which the rule applies. If a newspaper of general circulation is not published within the geographical area that is affected by the rule or to which the rule applies, the publication shall be made in the newspaper of general circulation published closest to the geographical area.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) of this subsection, the Department of Corrections and the State Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision may adopt rules limiting participation by inmates in the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of any rule to written submissions.

(d) If requested by at least five persons before the earliest date that the rule could become effective after the agency gives notice pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, the agency shall provide a statement that identifies the objective of the rule and a statement of how the agency will subsequently determine whether the rule is in fact accomplishing that objective.

(e) An agency that receives data or views concerning proposed rules from interested persons shall maintain a record of the data or views submitted. The record shall contain:

(A) All written materials submitted to an agency in response to a notice of intent to adopt, amend or repeal a rule.

(B) A recording or summary of oral submissions received at hearings held for the purpose of receiving those submissions.

(C) Any public comment received in response to the request made under subsection (2)(b)(G) of this section and the agency's response to that comment.

(D) Any statements provided by the agency under paragraph (d) of this subsection.

(4) Upon request of an interested person received before the earliest date that the rule could become effective after the giving of notice pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, the agency shall postpone the date of its intended action no less than 21 nor more than 90 days in order to allow the requesting person an opportunity to submit data, views or arguments concerning the

proposed action. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude an agency from adopting a temporary rule pursuant to subsection (5) of this section.

(5) Notwithstanding subsections (1) to (4) of this section, an agency may adopt, amend or suspend a rule without prior notice or hearing or upon any abbreviated notice and hearing that it finds practicable, if the agency prepares:

(a) A statement of its findings that its failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the public interest or the interest of the parties concerned and the specific reasons for its findings of prejudice;

(b) A citation of the statutory or other legal authority relied upon and bearing upon the promulgation of the rule;

(c) A statement of the need for the rule and a statement of how the rule is intended to meet the need;

(d) A list of the principal documents, reports or studies, if any, prepared by or relied upon by the agency in considering the need for and in preparing the rule, and a statement of the location at which those documents are available for public inspection; and

(e) For an agency specified in ORS 183.530, a housing cost impact statement as defined in ORS 183.534.

(6)(a) A rule adopted, amended or suspended under subsection (5) of this section is temporary and may be effective for a period of not longer than 180 days. The adoption of a rule under this subsection does not preclude the subsequent adoption of an identical rule under subsections (1) to (4) of this section.

(b) A rule temporarily suspended shall regain effectiveness upon expiration of the temporary period of suspension unless the rule is repealed under subsections (1) to (4) of this section.

(7) Notwithstanding subsections (1) to (4) of this section, an agency may amend a rule without prior notice or hearing if the amendment is solely for the purpose of:

(a) Changing the name of an agency by reason of a name change prescribed by law;

(b) Changing the name of a program, office or division within an agency as long as the change in name does not have a substantive effect on the functions of the program, office or division;

(c) Correcting spelling;

(d) Correcting grammatical mistakes in a manner that does not alter the scope, application or meaning of the rule;

(e) Correcting statutory or rule references; or

(f) Correcting addresses or telephone numbers referred to in the rules.

(8)(a) Any person may request in writing that an agency send to the person copies of the agency's notices of intended action issued under subsection (1) of this section. The person must provide an address where the person elects to receive notices. The address provided may be a postal mailing address or, if the agency provides notice by electronic mail, may be an electronic mailing address.

(b) A request under this subsection must indicate that the person requests one of the following:

(A) The person may request that the agency mail paper copies of the proposed rule and other information required by subsection (2) of this section to the postal mailing address.

(B) If the agency posts notices of intended action on a website, the person may request that the agency mail the information required by subsection (2)(a) of this section to the postal mailing

address with a reference to the website where electronic copies of the proposed rule and other information required by subsection (2) of this section are posted.

(C) The person may request that the agency electronically mail the information required by subsection (2)(a) of this section to the electronic mailing address, and either provide electronic copies of the proposed rule and other information required by subsection (2) of this section or provide a reference to a website where electronic copies of the proposed rule and other information required by subsection (2) of this section are posted.

(c) Upon receipt of any request under this subsection, the agency shall acknowledge the request, establish a mailing list and maintain a record of all mailings made pursuant to the request. Agencies may establish procedures for establishing the mailing lists and keeping the mailing lists current. Agencies by rule may establish fees necessary to defray the costs of mailings and maintenance of the lists.

(d) Members of the Legislative Assembly who receive notices under subsection (15) of this section may request that an agency furnish paper copies of the notices.

(9) This section does not apply to rules establishing an effective date for a previously effective rule or establishing a period during which a provision of a previously effective rule will apply.

(10) This section does not apply to ORS 279.835 to 279.855, 279A.140 to 279A.161, 279A.250 to 279A.290, 279A.990, 279B.050 to 279B.085, 279B.200 to 279B.240, 279B.270, 279B.275, 279B.280, 279C.360, 279C.365, 279C.370, 279C.375, 279C.380, 279C.385, 279C.500 to 279C.530, 279C.540, 279C.545, 279C.550 to 279C.570, 279C.580, 279C.585, 279C.590, 279C.600 to 279C.625, 279C.650 to 279C.670 and 279C.800 to 279C.870 relating to public contracts and purchasing.

(11)(a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this subsection, a rule is not valid unless adopted in substantial compliance with the provisions of this section in effect on the date that the notice required under subsection (1) of this section is delivered to the Secretary of State for the purpose of publication in the bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360.

(b) In addition to all other requirements with which rule adoptions must comply, a rule other than a rule amended for a purpose described in subsection (7) of this section is not valid if the rule has not been submitted to the Legislative Counsel in the manner required by ORS 183.355 and 183.715.

(c) A rule is not subject to judicial review or other challenge by reason of failing to comply with subsection (2)(a)(A) of this section.

(12)(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (11) of this section, but subject to paragraph (b) of this subsection, an agency may correct its failure to substantially comply with the requirements of subsections (2) and (5) of this section in adoption of a rule by an amended filing, as long as the noncompliance did not substantially prejudice the interests of persons to be affected by the rule.

(b) An agency may use an amended filing to correct a failure to include a fiscal impact statement in a notice of intended action, as required by subsection (2)(b)(E) of this section, or to correct an inaccurate fiscal impact statement, only if the agency developed the fiscal impact statement with the assistance of an advisory committee or fiscal impact advisory committee appointed under ORS 183.333.

(13) Unless otherwise provided by statute, the adoption, amendment or repeal of a rule by an agency need not be based upon or supported by an evidentiary record.

(14) When an agency has established a deadline for comment on a proposed rule under the provisions of subsection (3)(a) of this section, the agency may not extend that deadline for another agency or person unless the extension applies equally to all interested agencies and persons. An agency shall not consider any submission made by another agency after the final deadline has passed.

(15) The notices required under subsections (1) and (3) of this section must be given by the agency to the following persons:

(a) If the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal results from legislation that was passed within two years before notice is given under subsection (1) of this section, notice shall be given to the legislator who introduced the bill that subsequently was enacted into law, and to the chair or cochair of all committees that reported the bill out, except for those committees whose sole action on the bill was referral to another committee.

(b) If the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal does not result from legislation that was passed within two years before notice is given under subsection (1) of this section, notice shall be given to the chair or cochair of any interim or session committee with authority over the subject matter of the rule.

(c) If notice cannot be given under paragraph (a) or (b) of this subsection, notice shall be given to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate who are in office on the date the notice is given.

(16)(a) Upon the request of a member of the Legislative Assembly or of a person who would be affected by a proposed adoption, amendment or repeal, the committees receiving notice under subsection (15) of this section shall review the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal for compliance with the legislation from which the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal results.

(b) The committees shall submit their comments on the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal to the agency proposing the adoption, amendment or repeal. [1971 c.734 §3; 1973 c.612 §1; 1975 c.136 §11; 1975 c.759 §4; 1977 c.161 §1; 1977 c.344 §6; 1977 c.394 §1a; 1977 c.798 §2; 1979 c.593 §11; 1981 c.755 §2; 1987 c.861 §2; 1993 c.729 §3; 1995 c.652 §5; 1997 c.602 §3; 1999 c.123 §1; 1999 c.334 §1; 2001 c.220 §1; 2001 c.563 §1; 2003 c.749 §5; 2003 c.794 §206; 2005 c.17 §1; 2005 c.18 §1; 2005 c.382 §1; 2005 c.807 §5; 2007 c.115 §1; 2007 c.768 §58; 2011 c.380 §2; 2017 c.518 §2]

OAR 345-027-0311

Applicability

(1) The rules in this division apply to all requests for amendment to a site certificate and amendment determination requests for facilities under the Council's jurisdiction that are submitted to, or were already under review by, the Council on or after the effective date of the rules. The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

(2) Notwithstanding section (1) of this rule, these rules do not apply to facilities described in ORS 469.410(1).

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.501

History:

[EFSC 9-2019, temporary adopt filed 08/22/2019, effective 08/22/2019 through 02/17/2020](#)

**OAR CHAPTER 345
DIVISION 15**

**PROCEDURES GOVERNING COUNCIL AND DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING SITE CERTIFICATE HEARINGS**

* * *

345-015-0014

Contested Case Notices

(1) The Department shall issue notices for Council contested case proceedings as provided in OAR 137-003-0001 and shall include in the notices:

- (a) A date by which persons must request party or limited party status.
- (b) The date of the pre-hearing conference.
- (c) The time and place of the hearing.

(2) In addition to the requirements of section (1), for a contested case notice on a proposed order as described in OAR 345-015-0230 or following a Council decision to grant a contested case hearing under 345-015-0310, the Department shall include in the notice a statement that participation as a party or limited party in the contested case proceeding and the opportunity to raise any issue are subject to the limitations described in OAR 345-015-0016.

(3) The Department shall send a contested case notice by registered or certified mail to the following persons:

(a) For a contested case notice on a proposed order as described in OAR 345-015-0230, to the applicant and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in 345-015-0220.

(b) Following the Council's decision to grant a contested case proceeding on a proposed order on an application for a site certificate for a special criteria facility, to the applicant and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing on the proposed order described in OAR 345-015-0320.

(c) Following a Council decision to grant a contested case proceeding on a proposed site certificate amendment under OAR 345-027-0070, 345-027-0080 or 345-027-0090, to the certificate holder and to all persons who requested a contested case proceeding as described in 345-027-0070(6) or 345-027-0080(5).

(d) For Council contested case proceedings described under OAR 345-029-0070, 345-029-0100 or 345-060-0004, to persons who have an interest or represent a public interest in the outcome of the proceeding.

(4) The Department shall request that the applicant notify the hearing officer and the Department, by the date described in subsection (1)(a), of any issues the applicant desires to raise in the contested case proceedings described in subsections (3)(a) and (b).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.373 & 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.085, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-015-0016

Requests for Party or Limited Party Status

(1) Notwithstanding OAR 137-003-0005(2), a person requesting to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding shall submit a petition to the hearing officer by the date specified in the Department of Energy's contested case notice issued under OAR 345-015-0014.

(2) Persons who have an interest in the outcome of the Council's contested case proceeding or who represent a public interest in such result may request to participate as parties or limited parties.

(3) Except as described in section (4), only those persons who have commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-015-0220 may request to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding on an application for a site certificate. To raise an issue in a contested case proceeding, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing, unless the Department of Energy did not follow the requirements of ORS 469.370(2) or (3) or unless the action recommended in the proposed order described in OAR 345-015-230, including any recommended conditions of approval, differs materially from the action recommended in the draft proposed order, in which case the person may raise only new issues within the jurisdiction of the Council that are related to such differences. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the hearing officer shall not consider the issue in the contested case proceeding. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support the person's position on the issue.

(4) Following a Council decision to grant a contested case hearing under OAR 345-015-0310, only those persons who have commented in person or in writing on the record of the public

hearing described in OAR 345-015-0320 may request to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding on an application for a site certificate. To raise an issue in a contested case proceeding, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the hearing officer shall not consider the issue in the contested case proceeding. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support the person's position on the issue.

(5) In a petition to request party or limited party status, the person requesting such status shall include:

(a) The information required under OAR 137-003-0005(3).

(b) A short and plain statement of the issue or issues that the person desires to raise in the contested case proceeding.

(c) A reference to the person's comments at the public hearing showing that the person raised the issue or issues at the public hearing.

(d) A detailed description of the person's interest in the contested case proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

(6) The hearing officer's determination on a request to participate as a party or limited party is final unless the requesting person submits an appeal to the Council within seven days after the date of service of the hearing officer's determination.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.373 & 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 14, f. & ef. 10-12-76; EFSC 8-1980, f. & ef. 10-31-80; EFSC 6-1986, f. & ef. 9-12-86; EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07

* * *

345-015-0080

Participation by Government Agencies

(1) Any state or local government agency other than the Department of Energy may request participation in a contested case as a party, limited party or interested agency, subject to the limitations described in OAR 345-015-0016. The agency shall submit the request to the hearing officer in writing by the date specified in the Department of Energy's contested case notice issued under OAR 345-015-0014.

(2) The Department of Energy shall participate in all contested case proceedings conducted by the Council and shall have all the rights of a party.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 14, f. & ef. 10-12-76; EFSC 8-1980, f. & ef. 10-31-80; EFSC 6-1986, f. & ef. 9-12-86; EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93, Renumbered from 345-015-0026; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07

345-015-0083

Prehearing Conference and Prehearing Order

(1) The hearing officer may cancel or reschedule any previously noticed prehearing conference.

(2) The hearing officer may conduct one or more prehearing conferences for the purposes and in the manner described in OAR 137-003-0035. At the conclusion of the conference(s), the hearing officer shall issue a prehearing order stating the issues to be addressed in the contested case hearing and, in a contested case on an application for a site certificate, limiting parties to those issues they raised on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-015-0220. The hearing officer shall not receive evidence or hear legal argument on issues not identified in the prehearing order.

(3) Failure to raise an issue in the prehearing conference(s) for the contested case hearing constitutes a waiver of that issue.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07

* * *

**OAR CHAPTER 345
DIVISION 27**

**SITE CERTIFICATE CONDITIONS, AMENDMENT, TRANSFER AND
TERMINATION
AND DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY APPROVAL OF GAS STORAGE TESTING
PIPELINES**

345-027-0000

Certificate Expiration

If the certificate holder does not begin construction of the facility, the site certificate expires on the construction beginning date specified by the Council in the site certificate or in an amendment of the site certificate granted according to the rules of this division.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.370 & 469.501

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. f. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07

345-027-0011

Applicability

The rules in this division do not apply to facilities covered by ORS 469.410(1), including the Trojan energy facility.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.501

Hist.: EFSC 1-1995, f. & cert. f. 5-15-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99

345-027-0020

Mandatory Conditions in Site Certificates

The Council shall impose the following conditions in every site certificate. The Council may impose additional conditions.

(1) The Council shall not change the conditions of the site certificate except as provided for in OAR Chapter 345, Division 27.

(2) The certificate holder shall submit a legal description of the site to the Department of Energy within 90 days after beginning operation of the facility. The legal description required by this rule means a description of metes and bounds or a description of the site by reference to a map

and geographic data that clearly and specifically identify the outer boundaries that contain all parts of the facility.

(3) The certificate holder shall design, construct, operate and retire the facility:

(a) Substantially as described in the site certificate;

(b) In compliance with the requirements of ORS Chapter 469, applicable Council rules, and applicable state and local laws, rules and ordinances in effect at the time the site certificate is issued; and

(c) In compliance with all applicable permit requirements of other state agencies.

(4) The certificate holder shall begin and complete construction of the facility by the dates specified in the site certificate.

(5) Except as necessary for the initial survey or as otherwise allowed for wind energy facilities, transmission lines or pipelines under this section, the certificate holder shall not begin construction, as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, or create a clearing on any part of the site until the certificate holder has construction rights on all parts of the site. For the purpose of this rule, “construction rights” means the legal right to engage in construction activities. For wind energy facilities, transmission lines or pipelines, if the certificate holder does not have construction rights on all parts of the site, the certificate holder may nevertheless begin construction, as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, or create a clearing on a part of the site if the certificate holder has construction rights on that part of the site and:

(a) The certificate holder would construct and operate part of the facility on that part of the site even if a change in the planned route of a transmission line or pipeline occurs during the certificate holder’s negotiations to acquire construction rights on another part of the site; or

(b) The certificate holder would construct and operate part of a wind energy facility on that part of the site even if other parts of the facility were modified by amendment of the site certificate or were not built.

(6) If the certificate holder becomes aware of a significant environmental change or impact attributable to the facility, the certificate holder shall, as soon as possible, submit a written report to the Department describing the impact on the facility and any affected site certificate conditions.

(7) The certificate holder shall prevent the development of any conditions on the site that would preclude restoration of the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition to the extent that prevention of such site conditions is within the control of the certificate holder.

(8) Before beginning construction of the facility, the certificate holder shall submit to the State of Oregon, through the Council, a bond or letter of credit in a form and amount satisfactory to the Council to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition. The certificate holder shall

maintain a bond or letter of credit in effect at all times until the facility has been retired. The Council may specify different amounts for the bond or letter of credit during construction and during operation of the facility.

(9) The certificate holder shall retire the facility if the certificate holder permanently ceases construction or operation of the facility. The certificate holder shall retire the facility according to a final retirement plan approved by the Council, as described in OAR 345-027-0110. The certificate holder shall pay the actual cost to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition at the time of retirement, notwithstanding the Council's approval in the site certificate of an estimated amount required to restore the site.

(10) The Council shall include as conditions in the site certificate all representations in the site certificate application and supporting record the Council deems to be binding commitments made by the applicant.

(11) Upon completion of construction, the certificate holder shall restore vegetation to the extent practicable and shall landscape all areas disturbed by construction in a manner compatible with the surroundings and proposed use. Upon completion of construction, the certificate holder shall remove all temporary structures not required for facility operation and dispose of all timber, brush, refuse and flammable or combustible material resulting from clearing of land and construction of the facility.

(12) The certificate holder shall design, engineer and construct the facility to avoid dangers to human safety presented by seismic hazards affecting the site that are expected to result from all maximum probable seismic events. As used in this rule "seismic hazard" includes ground shaking, landslide, liquefaction, lateral spreading, tsunami inundation, fault displacement and subsidence.

(13) The certificate holder shall notify the Department, the State Building Codes Division and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries promptly if site investigations or trenching reveal that conditions in the foundation rocks differ significantly from those described in the application for a site certificate. After the Department receives the notice, the Council may require the certificate holder to consult with the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries and the Building Codes Division and to propose mitigation actions.

(14) The certificate holder shall notify the Department, the State Building Codes Division and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries promptly if shear zones, artesian aquifers, deformations or clastic dikes are found at or in the vicinity of the site.

(15) Before any transfer of ownership of the facility or ownership of the site certificate holder, the certificate holder shall inform the Department of the proposed new owners. The requirements of OAR 345-027-0100 apply to any transfer of ownership that requires a transfer of the site certificate.

(16) If the Council finds that the certificate holder has permanently ceased construction or operation of the facility without retiring the facility according to a final retirement plan approved

by the Council, as described in OAR 345-027-0110, the Council shall notify the certificate holder and request that the certificate holder submit a proposed final retirement plan to the Office within a reasonable time not to exceed 90 days. If the certificate holder does not submit a proposed final retirement plan by the specified date, the Council may direct the Department to prepare a proposed final retirement plan for the Council's approval. Upon the Council's approval of the final retirement plan, the Council may draw on the bond or letter of credit described in section (8) to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition according to the final retirement plan, in addition to any penalties the Council may impose under OAR Chapter 345, Division 29. If the amount of the bond or letter of credit is insufficient to pay the actual cost of retirement, the certificate holder shall pay any additional cost necessary to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition. After completion of site restoration, the Council shall issue an order to terminate the site certificate if the Council finds that the facility has been retired according to the approved final retirement plan.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.401 & 469.501

Hist.: NTEC 9, f. 2-13-75, ef. 3-11-75; EFSC 6-1980, f. & ef. 8-26-80; EFSC 1-1985, f. & ef. 1-7-85; EFSC 4-1986, f. & ef. 9-5-86; EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; Renumbered from 345-026-0035, 345-026-0040, 345-026-0130, 345-026-0180; 345-079-0011, 345-100-0011, 345-111-0010, 345-115-0040, 345-125-0060 & 345-125-0065; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. f. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0023

Site-Specific Conditions

The Council may include the following conditions, as appropriate, in the site certificate:

(1) If the facility uses coal, the certificate holder shall take all necessary steps to ensure that surface and groundwater are not contaminated by run off or seepage associated with coal or ash storage, transport or disposal. The certificate holder shall handle coal and ash so as to minimize the likelihood of coal dust and ash being windblown and causing an environmental or public health problem. If the certificate holder permanently disposes of ash on the facility site, the certificate holder shall cover the ash with a layer of topsoil and revegetate the area.

(2) If the energy facility or related or supporting facility is a natural gas pipeline, the certificate holder shall submit to the Department copies of all incident reports involving the pipeline required under 49 CFR Sec. 191.15.

(3) If the facility includes any pipeline under Council jurisdiction:

(a) The certificate holder shall design, construct and operate the pipeline in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation as set forth in Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 192, in effect on August 15, 2011; and

(b) The certificate holder shall develop and implement a program using the best available practicable technology to monitor the proposed pipeline to ensure protection of public health and safety.

(4) If the facility includes any transmission line under Council jurisdiction:

(a) The certificate holder shall design, construct and operate the transmission line in accordance with the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the National Electrical Safety Code approved on June 3, 2011, by the American National Standards Institute; and

(b) The certificate holder shall develop and implement a program that provides reasonable assurance that all fences, gates, cattle guards, trailers, or other objects or structures of a permanent nature that could become inadvertently charged with electricity are grounded or bonded throughout the life of the line.

(5) If the proposed energy facility is a pipeline or a transmission line or has, as a related or supporting facility, a pipeline or transmission line, the Council shall specify an approved corridor in the site certificate and shall allow the certificate holder to construct the pipeline or transmission line anywhere within the corridor, subject to the conditions of the site certificate. If the applicant has analyzed more than one corridor in its application for a site certificate, the Council may, subject to the Council's standards, approve more than one corridor.

(6) If the facility is a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir, the Council shall, in the site certificate, specify the site boundary and total permitted daily throughput of the facility.

(7) If the facility is subject to a carbon dioxide emissions standard adopted by the Council or enacted by statute, the Council shall include in the site certificate appropriate conditions as described in OAR 345-024-0550, 345-024-0560, 345-024-0590, 345-024-0600, 345-024-0620, 345-024-0630 and 345-024-0710.

[Publications: Publications referenced are available from the agency.]

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.501 & 469.503

Hist.: EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. f. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2003, f. & cert. ef. 9-3-03; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12; EFSC 2-2015, f. & cert. ef. 10-20-15

345-027-0028

Monitoring and Mitigation Conditions

In the site certificate, the Council shall include conditions that address monitoring and mitigation to ensure compliance with the standards contained in OAR Chapter 345, Division 22 and Division 24. The site certificate applicant, or for an amendment, the certificate holder, shall

develop proposed monitoring and mitigation plans in consultation with the Department and, as appropriate, other state agencies, local governments and tribes. Monitoring and mitigation plans are subject to Council approval. The Council shall incorporate approved monitoring and mitigation plans in applicable site certificate conditions.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.501, 469.503 & 469.507

Hist.: EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. f. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0030

Amendment to Extend Construction Beginning and Completion Deadlines

(1) The certificate holder may request an amendment to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction of the facility that the Council has specified in a site certificate or an amended site certificate. The certificate holder shall submit a request that includes an explanation of the need for an extension and that conforms to the requirements of 345-027-0060 no later than six months before the date of the applicable deadline, or, if the certificate holder demonstrates good cause for the delay in submitting the request, no later than the applicable deadline.

(2) A request within the time allowed in section (1) to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction suspends those deadlines until the Council acts on the request.

(3) The Council shall review the request for amendment as described in OAR 345-027-0070.

(4) If the Council grants an amendment under this rule, the Council shall specify new deadlines for beginning or completing construction that are not more than two years from the deadlines in effect before the Council grants the amendment.

(5) To grant an amendment extending the deadline for beginning or completing construction of an energy facility subject to OAR 345 024 0550, 345 024 0590, or 345 024 0620, the Council must find that the facility complies with the carbon dioxide standard in effect at the time of the Council's order on the amendment.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.370, 469.405 & 469.503

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0050

When an Amendment is Required

(1) Except as allowed under sections (2) and (6), the certificate holder must submit a request to amend the site certificate to design, construct or operate a facility in a manner different from the description in the site certificate if the proposed change:

- (a) Could result in a significant adverse impact that the Council has not addressed in an earlier order and the impact affects a resource protected by Council standards;
- (b) Could impair the certificate holder's ability to comply with a site certificate condition; or
- (c) Could require a new condition or a change to a condition in the site certificate.

(2) A site certificate amendment is not required if a proposed change in the design, construction or operation of a facility is in substantial compliance with the terms and conditions of the site certificate and is a change:

- (a) To an electrical generation facility that would increase the electrical generating capacity and would not increase the number of electric generators at the site, change fuel type, increase fuel consumption by more than 10 percent or enlarge the facility site;
- (b) To the number or location of pipelines for a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir that would not result in the facility exceeding permitted daily throughput or enlarge the facility site;
- (c) To the number, size or location of pipelines for a geothermal energy facility that would not enlarge the facility site;
- (d) To a pipeline or transmission line that is a related or supporting facility that would extend or modify the pipeline or transmission line or expand the right-of-way, when the change is to serve customers other than the energy facility; or
- (e) To an aspect or feature of the facility, operating procedures or management structures not addressed in the site certificate.

(3) If the certificate holder concludes that a proposed change does not require a site certificate amendment under section (1), the certificate holder shall, nevertheless, complete an investigation sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed change in the design, construction or operation of the facility would comply with applicable Council standards. The certificate holder shall complete the investigation before implementing the proposed change. The certificate holder shall prepare a written evaluation describing the investigation and shall make the evaluation available to the Department for inspection at any time.

(4) In the annual reports and semiannual construction progress reports required by OAR 345-026-0080, the certificate holder shall describe all significant changes made during the reporting period to the design, construction and operation of the facility without an amendment of the site certificate. The certificate holder shall keep a written record of the basis for concluding that an amendment of the site certificate was not required. The Department, at any time, may inspect the

changes made to the facility and may inspect the certificate holder's written record of the basis for concluding that an amendment of the site certificate was not required.

(5) A certificate holder may submit a change request in writing to the Department for a determination whether a proposed change requires a site certificate amendment. In the change request, the certificate holder must describe the proposed change, explain the basis for the certificate holder's conclusion that an amendment is not required under section (1), and provide the written evaluation described in section (3). The Department shall respond in writing as promptly as possible. The Department may refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection. At the request of the certificate holder or a Council member, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection.

(6) A site certificate amendment is not required for the construction of a pipeline less than 16 inches in diameter and less than five miles in length that is proposed to be constructed to test or maintain an underground gas storage reservoir. If the proposed pipeline would connect to a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir for which the Council has issued a site certificate or to a gas pipeline for which the Council has issued a site certificate, the certificate holder must obtain, prior to construction, the approval of the Department for the construction, operation and retirement of the proposed pipeline. To obtain Department approval, the certificate holder shall submit a request as described in OAR 345-027-0210 through 345-027-0240.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 3-1995, f. & cert. ef. 11-16-95; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0060

Request to Amend Certificate

(1) To request an amendment of a site certificate, the certificate holder shall submit a written request to the Department of Energy that includes the information described in section (2) and the following:

(a) The name and mailing address of the certificate holder and the name, mailing address, email address and phone number of the individual responsible for submitting the request.

(b) A description of the facility including its location and other information relevant to the proposed change.

(c) A detailed description of the proposed change and the certificate holder's analysis of the proposed change under the criteria of OAR 345-027-0050(1).

(d) The specific language of the site certificate, including affected conditions, that the certificate holder proposes to change, add or delete by an amendment.

(e) A list of the Council standards relevant to the proposed change.

(f) An analysis of whether the facility, with the proposed change, would comply with the requirements of ORS Chapter 469, applicable Council rules, and applicable state and local laws, rules and ordinances if the Council amends the site certificate as requested. For the purpose of this rule, a law, rule or ordinance is “applicable” if the Council would apply or consider the law, rule or ordinance under OAR 345-027-0070(10).

(g) An updated list of the owners of property located within or adjacent to the site of the facility, as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f).

(2) In a request to amend a site certificate, the certificate holder shall provide the information described in applicable subsections of OAR 345-021-0000 and OAR 345-021-0010. The certificate holder may incorporate by reference relevant information that the certificate holder has previously submitted to the Department or that is otherwise included in the Department’s administrative record on the facility.

(3) Before submitting a request to amend a site certificate, the certificate holder may prepare a draft request and may confer with the Department about the content of the request. Although the Council does not require the certificate holder to prepare a draft request and confer with the Department, the Council recommends that the certificate holder follow this procedure.

(4) The certificate holder shall submit an original and two printed copies of the amendment request to the Department. Upon a request by the Department, the certificate holder must submit printed copies of the amendment request for members of the Council. In addition to the printed copies, the certificate holder shall submit the full amendment request in a non-copy-protected electronic format acceptable to the Department. The certificate holder shall provide additional copies of the amendment request to the Department upon request and copies or access to copies to any person requesting copies. If requested by the Department, the certificate holder shall send copies of the request to persons on a mailing list provided by the Department.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2003, f. & cert. ef. 9-3-03; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0070

Review of a Request for Amendment

Except as specified in OAR 345-027-0080, the Council shall review a request for amendment of a site certificate as follows:

(1) Within 15 days after receiving a request to amend a site certificate, the Department of Energy shall determine whether the amendment requires extended review based on the criteria in section (2) and:

(a) Distribute copies of the request, or instruct the certificate holder to distribute copies of the request, to the persons on a distribution list that includes the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010 and that may include additional persons, with a request for comments on the request by a specified date. The distribution may be done by courier delivery or mailing of printed copies or, with the approval of the Department, any form of electronic delivery.

(b) Send a notice of the amendment request by mail or email to all persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list supplied by the certificate holder under 345-027-0060(1)(g) and specify a date by which comments on the request are due.

(c) Post an announcement on the Department's website to notify the public that an amendment request has been received.

(d) Send a notice by mail or email to the certificate holder specifying a date for issuance of a proposed order. The Department shall specify a date that is no later than 60 days after the date of the notice unless the Department has determined that the amendment requires extended review. For extended review, the Department shall explain the basis of its determination and specify a date that is not more than 180 days after the date of the notice. Within 10 days after the Department sends notification that an amendment requires extended review, the certificate holder may request Council review of the determination. Upon a request for Council review, the Department shall refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection.

(2) The Department may determine that an amendment requires extended review if:

(a) The certificate holder requests extended review;

(b) The Department finds that the amendment request does not contain the information required by OAR 345-027-0060 or does not contain information sufficient for the Department to prepare a proposed order;

(c) The Department needs to hire a consultant to assist in reviewing the request;

(d) The amendment:

(A) Would require construction on land zoned residential or exclusive farm use;

(B) Would require construction in a zone for which the use is not permitted;

(C) Would require construction on land that may qualify as Habitat Category 1 or 2 land as described in OAR 635-415-0025;

(D) Would result in incremental carbon dioxide emissions that the certificate holder elects to offset, in compliance with the applicable carbon dioxide emissions standard, by a means other than by payments described under OAR 345-024-0560(3), 345-024-0600(3) and (4) or 345-024-0630(2), (4) and (5); or

(E) Could require the Council to determine, according to OAR 345-022-0000(2), that the overall public benefits of the facility outweigh any adverse effects on a resource or interest that is protected by an applicable standard the facility would not meet if the amendment is approved; or

(e) The Department anticipates a high volume of public comment.

(3) The Office may hold one or more public meetings during the review of a request for amendment of the site certificate.

(4) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no later than the date the Department has specified in the notice described in subsection (1)(d), the Department shall issue a proposed order, recommending approval, modification or disapproval of the requested amendment. If the Department needs additional time to prepare the proposed order, the Department may issue the proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than the date the Department has specified in the notice, notify the certificate holder in writing of the circumstances that justify the delay.

(5) After issuing the proposed order, the Department shall send a notice of the proposed order by mail or email to the persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility, to the updated property owner list supplied by the certificate holder under OAR 345-027-0060(1)(g) and to the distribution list described in subsection (1)(a). In the notice, the Department shall state that all comments must be submitted in writing and must be received by the Department by a specified deadline that is at least 30 days from the date of the notice. The Department shall post an announcement on its website to notify the public of the issuance of the proposed order.

(6) Any person may, by written request submitted to the Department no later than the deadline described in section (5), ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding on the proposed order. For the purpose of this rule, the request is submitted when it is received by the Department. In the request, the person shall provide a description of the issues to be contested, a statement of the facts believed to be at issue and the person's mailing address and email address.

(7) To determine that an issue justifies a contested case proceeding under section (8), the Council must find that the request raises a significant issue of fact or law that may affect the Council's determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets an applicable standard. If the Council finds that the request would not affect the Council's determination if the alleged facts were found to be true but that those facts could affect a site certificate condition, the

Council may deny the request and may adopt appropriate conditions. If the Council does not have jurisdiction over the issue raised in the request, the Council must deny the request.

(8) The Council shall determine whether any issue identified in a request for a contested case proceeding justifies a contested case proceeding, and:

(a) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more issues that justify a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to OAR 345-015-0085 limited to the issues that the Council found sufficient to justify the proceeding.

(b) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more issues that an amendment of the proposed order would settle in a manner satisfactory to the Council, the Council may deny the request as to those issues and direct the Department to amend the proposed order and send a notice of the amended proposed order to the persons described in section (5). Any person may, by written request submitted to the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the notice of the amended proposed order, ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding limited to issues raised by the amendment to the proposed order. For the purpose of this rule, the request is submitted when it is received by the Department. In the request, the person shall provide a description of the issues to be contested, a statement of the facts believed to be at issue and the person's mailing address and email address. As described in this section, the Council shall determine whether any issue identified in the request for a contested case proceeding justifies a contested case proceeding.

(c) If the Council finds that the request does not identify any issue that justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council shall deny the request. In a written order denying the request, the Council shall state the basis for the denial. The Council shall then adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in section (10). In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the applicant.

(9) If there is no request for a contested case proceeding as described in section (6) or subsection (8)(b), the Council, may adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in section (10). In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the applicant.

(10) In making a decision to grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall apply the applicable substantive criteria, as described in OAR 345-022-0030, in effect on the date the certificate holder submitted the request for amendment and all other state statutes, administrative rules, and local government ordinances in effect on the date the Council makes its decision. The Council shall consider the following:

(a) For an amendment that would change the site boundary or the legal description of the site, the Council shall consider, for the area added to the site by the amendment, whether the facility complies with all Council standards;

(b) For an amendment that extends the deadlines for beginning or completing construction, the Council shall consider:

(A) Whether the Council has previously granted an extension of the deadline;

(B) Whether there has been any change of circumstances that affects a previous Council finding that was required for issuance of a site certificate or amended site certificate; and

(C) Whether the facility complies with all Council standards, except that the Council may choose not to apply a standard if the Council finds that:

(i) The certificate holder has spent more than 50 percent of the budgeted costs on construction of the facility;

(ii) The inability of the certificate holder to complete the construction of the facility by the deadline in effect before the amendment is the result of unforeseen circumstances that are outside the control of the certificate holder;

(iii) The standard, if applied, would result in an unreasonable financial burden on the certificate holder; and

(iv) The Council does not need to apply the standard to avoid a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment;

(c) For any amendment not described above, the Council shall consider whether the amendment would affect any finding made by the Council in an earlier order.

(d) For all amendments, the Council shall consider whether the amount of the bond or letter of credit required under OAR 345-022-0050 is adequate.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 2-2000, f. & cert. ef. 11-20-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2003, f. & cert. ef. 9-3-03; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12; EFSC 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 5-18-15

345-027-0080

Review of a Request by a Certificate Holder for Expedited Amendment

(1) A certificate holder may ask the Council Chair to grant expedited review of an amendment request. The certificate holder shall submit a request for expedited review to the Department of Energy in writing and, in addition, the certificate holder shall submit the full amendment request in a non-copy-protected electronic format acceptable to the Department. The certificate holder shall include in the request:

(a) The information listed in OAR 345-027-0060(1) and (2), and

(b) Reasons why the certificate holder needs expedited review of its request and an explanation of why the need for expedited review arose and could not have reasonably been foreseen by the certificate holder.

(2) The Chair may grant a request for expedited review if the Chair finds that a delay would unduly harm the certificate holder and if the facility, with the proposed change, would not likely result in a significant new adverse impact. If the Chair decides not to grant the request for expedited review, the Chair shall issue a written decision as soon as is reasonably practicable. In a written decision denying the request, the Chair shall give an explanation of the reasons for the denial.

(3) Within 7 days after the Chair grants expedited review, the Department shall:

(a) Send copies of the amendment request by mail or email to the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010 and ask those agencies to comment on the request within not more than 21 days after the date of the notice.

(b) Send a notice of the amendment request by mail or email to all persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list supplied by the certificate holder under OAR 345-027-0060(1)(g) specifying a date, not more than 21 days after the date of the notice, by which comments are due.

(c) Post an announcement of the amendment request on its website.

(4) Within 60 days after the Chair grants expedited review, the Department shall issue a proposed order, recommending approval, modification or disapproval of the requested amendment. If the Department recommends approval, the Department shall include in the proposed order any new or modified conditions it recommends and shall explain why expedited Council action was warranted.

(5) The Department shall send a notice of the proposed order by mail or email to the persons on the Council's general mailing list, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list supplied by the certificate holder under OAR 345-027-0060(1)(g). In addition, the Department shall post the notice on its website. In the notice, the Department shall include information on the availability of the proposed order, the date of the Council meeting when the Council will consider the proposed order and issue a temporary order as described in

section (5), a date by which comments on the proposed order are due and the deadline for any person to request a contested case proceeding on the Council's temporary order.

(6) After considering the proposed order, the Council may issue an order temporarily amending the site certificate. In making a decision whether to issue a temporary order under this rule, the Council shall consider the factors listed in OAR 345-027-0070(10). The Council shall apply the applicable substantive criteria, as described in OAR 345-022-0030, in effect on the date the certificate holder submitted the request for amendment and all other state statutes, administrative rules, and local government ordinances in effect on the date the Council issues the temporary order.

(7) Before implementing any change approved by the Council's temporary order, the certificate holder must submit an authorized acknowledgement that the certificate holder accepts all terms and conditions of the temporary order. The acknowledgement may be submitted to the Department by fax or email if the certificate holder promptly submits a signed original to the Department by mail or hand delivery.

(8) Any person may, by written request submitted to the Department within 15 days after the date the Council issues the temporary order described in section (5), ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding on the temporary order. For the purpose of this rule, the request is submitted when it is received by the Department. In the request, the person shall provide a description of the issues to be contested, a statement of the facts believed to be at issue and the person's mailing address and email address.

(9) The Council shall determine whether any issue identified in a request for a contested case proceeding justifies a contested case proceeding.

(a) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more issues that justify a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to OAR 345-015-0085 limited to the issues that the Council found sufficient to justify the proceeding.

(b) If the Council finds that the request does not identify any issue that justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council shall deny the request. In a written order denying the request, the Council shall state the basis for the denial. The Council shall adopt the temporary order as a final order. In the final order, the Council may modify the language of the temporary order, consistent with due process. In the final order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the applicant.

(10) If there is no request for a contested case proceeding as described in section (8), the Council shall adopt the temporary order as a final order. In the final order, the Council may modify the language of the temporary order, consistent with due process. In the final order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an

amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the applicant.

(11) The certificate holder shall not abuse this rule by failing to make timely application for an amendment and thus creating the need for expedited review.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0090

Request by Any Person for Amendment to Apply Subsequent Laws or Rules

(1) Any person may submit to the Department of Energy a request for an amendment of a site certificate to apply a local government ordinance, statute or Council rule adopted after the date the site certificate was executed. The Department itself may initiate such a request.

(2) In an amendment request under this rule, the person shall include the following:

(a) The name, mailing address, email address and telephone number of the person submitting the request;

(b) The name and address of the certificate holder;

(c) Identification of the facility for which the site certificate in question was granted and its location;

(d) Identification of the local government ordinance, statute or Council rule that the person seeks to apply to the facility;

(e) The particular facts that the person believes demonstrate that failure to apply the ordinance, statute or rule identified in subsection (d) presents a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment; and

(f) The specific language of the site certificate that the person proposes to change, delete or add by an amendment.

(3) If the Department receives a request to amend a site certificate as described in this rule from any person other than the certificate holder, the Department shall send a copy of the request to the certificate holder with a notice stating the date by which the certificate holder must submit a response.

(4) The Council shall review the request for amendment as described in OAR 345-027-0070, except that:

(a) After receiving the certificate holder's response as requested under (3), the Department may ask the Council to determine whether the request demonstrates that failure to apply the ordinance, statute or rule identified in subsection (2)(d) presents a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment. If the Council determines that applying the ordinance, statute or rule is not justified by a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment, then the Council may deny the amendment request.

(b) Within 15 days after receiving the certificate holder's response as requested under (3) or within 15 days after a Council determination under (a) that applying the ordinance, statute or rule is justified by a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment, the Department shall determine whether the amendment request requires expedited review, based on the criteria in OAR 345-027-0070(2), and shall send the notices described in OAR 345-027-0070(1)(a), (b) and (d).

(c) If the Department recommends approval or modification of the requested amendment, the Department shall include in the proposed order described in OAR 345-027-0070(4) any new or modified site certificate conditions necessary to assure compliance with the statutes, Council rules, and local government ordinances applied to the facility under the proposed order;

(d) If the Department in its proposed order recommends approval or modification of the requested amendment, the certificate holder may, by written request submitted to the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the proposed order, ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding on the proposed order. For the purpose of this rule, the request is submitted when it is received by the Department. In the request, the certificate holder shall provide a description of the issues to be contested and a statement of the facts believed to be at issue. If the site certificate holder requests a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to 345-015-0085 limited to the issues stated by the certificate holder; and

(e) The Council shall include new conditions in a site certificate amended under this rule only if the certificate holder agrees to the new conditions or the Council finds that the conditions are necessary based upon a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.401 & 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0100

Transfer of a Site Certificate

(1) For the purpose of this rule:

(a) A transfer of ownership requires a transfer of the site certificate when the person who will have the legal right to possession and control of the site or the facility does not have authority under the site certificate to construct, operate or retire the facility;

(b) “Transferee” means the person who will become the new applicant and site certificate holder.

(2) When a certificate holder has knowledge that any transfer of ownership of the facility that requires a transfer of the site certificate is or may be pending, the certificate holder shall notify the Department of Energy. In the notice, the certificate holder shall include, if known, the name, mailing address and telephone number of the transferee and the date of the transfer of ownership. If possible, the certificate holder shall notify the Department at least 60 days before the date of the transfer of ownership.

(3) The transferee is not allowed to construct or operate the facility until an amended site certificate as described in section (10) or a temporary amended site certificate as described in section (11) becomes effective.

(4) To request a transfer of the site certificate, the transferee shall submit a written request to the Department that includes the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(a), (d), (f) and (m), a certification that the transferee agrees to abide by all terms and conditions of the site certificate currently in effect and, if known, the date of the transfer of ownership. If applicable, the transferee shall include in the request the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(y)(O)(iv).

(5) The Department may require the transferee to submit a written statement from the current certificate holder, or a certified copy of an order or judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, verifying the transferee’s right, subject to the provisions of ORS Chapter 469 and the rules of this chapter, to possession of the site or the facility.

(6) Within 15 days after receiving a request to transfer a site certificate, the Department shall send a notice of the request by mail or email to the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, to all persons on the Council’s general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list submitted by the transferee under subsection (4). In the notice, the Department shall describe the transfer request, specify a date by which comments are due and state that the date of the Council’s informational hearing will be announced on the Department’s website.

(7) Before acting on the transfer request, the Council shall hold an informational hearing. The Council shall hold the informational hearing during a Council meeting and shall provide notice of the hearing on its meeting agenda, which will be sent by mail or email to the Council’s general mailing list in advance of the meeting. The informational hearing is not a contested case hearing.

(8) At the conclusion of the informational hearing or at a later meeting, the Council may issue an order approving the transfer request if the Council finds that:

(a) The transferee complies with the standards described in OAR 345-022-0010, 345-022-0050 and, if applicable, 345-024-0710(1); and

(b) The transferee is or will be lawfully entitled to possession or control of the site or the facility described in the site certificate.

(9) Except as described in section (12), the Council shall not otherwise change the terms and conditions of the site certificate in an order approving the transfer request.

(10) Upon issuing the order described in section (8), the Council shall issue an amended site certificate that names the transferee as the new certificate holder. The amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the transferee. The Council shall issue the amended site certificate in duplicate counterpart originals and each counterpart, upon signing, will have the same effect.

(11) If the Council chair determines that special circumstances justify emergency action, the Council chair may, upon a written request from the transferee that includes a showing that the transferee can meet the requirements of section (8), issue a temporary amended site certificate that names the transferee as the new certificate holder. The temporary amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the transferee. The temporary amended site certificate expires when an amended site certificate as described in section (10) becomes effective or as the Council otherwise orders.

(12) The Council may act concurrently on a request to transfer a site certificate and any other amendment request subject to the procedures described in this rule for the transfer request and:

(a) The procedures described in OAR 345-027-0030 for an amendment to extend construction beginning and completion deadlines.

(b) The procedures described in OAR 345-027-0090 for an amendment to apply subsequent laws or rules.

(c) The procedures described in OAR 345-027-0060 and 345-027-0070 for any amendment request not described in (a) or (b).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.401 & 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0110

Termination of a Site Certificate

- (1) A certificate holder may apply to the Council to terminate a site certificate at any time, subject to the requirements of this rule.
- (2) A certificate holder must apply to the Council to terminate a site certificate within two years following cessation of construction or operation of the facility.
- (3) If the certificate holder fails to apply to the Council to terminate the site certificate and the Council finds that the certificate holder has permanently ceased construction or operation of the facility, then the Council may terminate the site certificate according to the procedure described in OAR 345-027-0020(16).
- (4) In an application for termination of the site certificate, the certificate holder shall include a proposed final retirement plan for the facility and site. The certificate holder shall submit an original and two printed copies of the application for termination and the proposed final retirement plan to the Department. Upon a request by the Department, the certificate holder must submit printed copies of the application for termination and the proposed final retirement plan for members of the Council. In addition to the printed copies, the certificate holder shall submit the full copies of the application for termination and the proposed final retirement plan in a non-copy-protected electronic format acceptable to the Department.
- (5) In the proposed final retirement plan, the certificate holder shall include:
 - (a) A plan for retirement that provides for completion of retirement without significant delay and that protects public health, safety and the environment.
 - (b) A description of actions the certificate holder proposes to take to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition, including information on how impacts to fish, wildlife and the environment would be minimized during the retirement process.
 - (c) A current detailed cost estimate and a plan for ensuring the availability of adequate funds for completion of retirement.
 - (d) An updated list of the owners of property located within or adjacent to the site of the facility, as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f).
- (6) Within 15 days after receiving an application for termination of a site certificate, the Department of Energy shall:
 - (a) Send a notice of the application by mail or email to all persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list submitted by the certificate holder under subsection (5) specifying a date by which comments on the application are due.

(b) Send copies of the application for termination by mail or email to the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010 and shall ask those agencies to comment by a specified date.

(c) Post an announcement of the application for termination on the Department's website.

(7) The Council shall review the proposed final retirement plan and shall consider any comments received from the public and the reviewing agencies. The Council may approve the proposed final retirement plan or modify the plan to comply with the rules of this chapter and applicable conditions in the site certificate. The Council shall issue an order authorizing retirement according to the approved or modified final retirement plan and subject to any conditions the Council finds appropriate. The Council's order may be appealed as described in ORS 183.480.

(8) When the Council finds that the certificate holder has completed the retirement of the facility according to the Council's order authorizing retirement, the Council shall issue an order terminating the site certificate.

(9) When the Council finds that the site certificate has expired as described in OAR 345-027-0000, the Council shall issue an order terminating the site certificate.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.470

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405 & 469.501

Hist.: EFSC 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 1-15-93; EFSC 5-1994, f. & cert. ef. 11-30-94; EFSC 2-1999, f. & cert. ef. 4-14-99; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2003, f. & cert. ef. 9-3-03; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

Department of Energy Approval of Gas Storage Testing Pipelines

345-027-0210

General

(1) A person shall not construct a gas storage testing pipeline unless the certificate holder of the Council certified facility to which the pipeline would connect obtains, before construction, the approval of the Department of Energy for the construction, operation and retirement of the proposed pipeline as required under ORS 469.405(3).

(2) For the purposes of OAR 345-027-0210 through OAR 345-027-0240:

(a) "Gas storage testing pipeline" means a pipeline, but not a temporary pipeline, that is less than 16 inches in diameter and less than five miles in length, that is used to test or maintain an underground gas storage reservoir and that would connect to a Council certified facility if the storage reservoir proves feasible for operational use;

(b) "Temporary pipeline" means a pipeline that has no potential for operational use;

(c) “Council certified facility” means an energy facility for which the Council has issued a site certificate that is either a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir or a gas pipeline;

(d) “Connect” means join for the purpose of operational use;

(e) “Test or maintain” means transporting gas to an underground gas storage reservoir for the purposes of determining whether the reservoir is feasible for operational use or maintaining the gas storage capacity of the reservoir but does not include operational use;

(f) “Operational use” means transporting gas to an underground gas storage reservoir for the purpose of storing gas until it is needed for sale or for withdrawing gas from an underground gas storage reservoir for the purpose of sale;

(g) “Council substantive standards” means the following standards:

(A) Structural Standard, OAR 345-022-0020;

(B) Soil Protection, OAR 345-022-0022;

(C) Protected Areas, OAR 345-022-0040(1) but excluding (2) and (3);

(D) Retirement and Financial Assurance, OAR 345-022-0050;

(E) Fish and Wildlife Habitat, OAR 345-022-0060;

(F) Threatened and Endangered Species, OAR 345-022-0070

(G) Scenic Resources, OAR 345-022-0080;

(H) Historic, Cultural and Archaeological Resources, OAR 345-022-0090;

(I) Recreation, 345-022-0100;

(J) Public Services, OAR 345-022-0110;

(K) Waste Minimization, OAR 345-022-0120; and

(L) Public Health and Safety, OAR 345-024-0030(2), (3) and (4);

(h) “Information requirements” means information that would support the findings described in OAR 345-024-0030(2) and the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(h), (i), (j), (L), (m), (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), (u), (v), and (w).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.405

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405

Hist.: EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0220

Request for Approval

(1) Before submitting a request for approval to construct, operate and retire a gas storage testing pipeline, the certificate holder shall:

(a) Inform the Department of Energy of the proposed pipeline, including its diameter, length, location, capacity and maximum operating pressure; and

(b) Provide to the Department a map showing the location of the proposed pipeline.

(2) After receiving the information described in section (1), the Department shall confer with the certificate holder about the Council substantive standards and information requirements that might apply to the proposed pipeline and any extraordinary circumstances that might affect the time requirements for completing the approval process. Within 7 days after conferring with the certificate holder, the Department shall send a letter to the certificate holder that includes the following:

(a) Identification of the Council substantive standards that are applicable to the request for approval of the proposed pipeline;

(b) Identification of the information requirements that are applicable to the request for approval of the proposed pipeline;

(c) The time requirements for the approval process, if different from the time requirements described in OAR 345-027-0230.

(3) The certificate holder shall submit to the Department a written request for approval to construct, operate and retire a gas storage testing pipeline with the fee required by the fee schedule established under ORS 469.441. The certificate holder shall submit the original and two paper copies of the request to the Department. The certificate holder shall provide additional copies to the Department upon request and copies or access to copies to any person requesting copies. In addition to the printed copies of the request for approval, the certificate holder shall submit the full request in a non-copy-protected electronic format acceptable to the Department.

(4) In a request for approval, the certificate holder shall include:

(a) The name and mailing address of the certificate holder and the name, mailing address, email address and phone number of the individual responsible for submitting the request;

(b) A description of the purpose and operation of the proposed pipeline and a discussion of whether the use of the gas storage testing pipeline for reservoir testing or maintenance will

require an increase in the compression available in the Council certified facility to which the proposed pipeline would connect in addition to the compression that is permitted under the site certificate;

(c) Identification of the Council certified facility to which the proposed pipeline would connect;

(d) A description of the proposed pipeline, including its diameter, length, location, capacity and maximum operating pressure;

(e) A map showing the location of the proposed pipeline;

(f) A list of the names and mailing addresses of all owners of record, as shown on the most recent property tax assessment role, of property where the proposed pipeline is located and within 500 feet of the location of the proposed pipeline;

(g) The information that the Department has identified in the letter described in section (2); and

(h) Any other information that the Department requests as needed to make the findings described in the applicable standards.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.405

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405, 469.421 & 469.441

Hist.: EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0230

Review of a Request for Approval

(1) Within 7 days after receiving a request for approval to construct, operate and retire a gas storage testing pipeline, the Department of Energy shall:

(a) Send copies of the request by mail, email or any other form of electronic delivery to the following agencies with a notice asking the agencies to submit written comments on the request within 14 days from the date of the notice:

(A) Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife;

(B) Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries;

(C) Oregon Public Utility Commission;

(D) Oregon Department of Agriculture;

(E) Division of State Lands; and

(F) State Historic Preservation Office.

(b) Send a notice of the request, including a map showing the location of the proposed pipeline, by mail, email or any other form of electronic delivery to the following stating that the agencies and planning authority may submit written comments on the request within 14 days from the date of the notice:

(A) Oregon Department of Forestry;

(B) Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; and

(C) The planning authority of the county or counties where the proposed pipeline is located.

(c) Send a notice of the request, including a map showing the location of the proposed pipeline, by mail or email to the property owners the certificate holder has listed in the request stating that property owners may submit written comments on the request within 14 days from the date of the notice.

(d) Post an announcement of the request on the Department's website.

(2) Within 21 days from the deadline for comments described in section (1) or such longer period as the Department has specified in the letter described in OAR 345-027-0220(2), the Department shall issue a final order stating its findings on the applicable Council substantive standards and its approval or disapproval of the request. In an order approving a request, the Department shall include conditions that the Department finds necessary to ensure compliance with the applicable standards and conditions required by OAR 345-027-0240.

(3) The Department shall send a notice of the final order to the certificate holder, to the property owners the certificate holder listed in the request and to any person who commented on the request. In the notice, the Department shall state that judicial review of the order is as provided in ORS 469.403.

(4) The Department may amend an order approving the construction, operation and retirement of a gas storage testing pipeline.

(5) Notwithstanding ORS 469.503(3), the Department shall not review the proposed pipeline for compliance with other state standards.

(6) Notwithstanding ORS 469.401(3), the approval of a gas storage testing pipeline by the Department does not bind any state or local agency.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.405

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 4-3-02; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07; EFSC 1-2012, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-12

345-027-0240**Conditions**

In an order approving the construction, operation and retirement of a gas storage testing pipeline, the Department may impose conditions it finds necessary to ensure compliance with the Council substantive standards it identified as applicable in the letter described in OAR 345-027-0220(2). In addition, the Department shall impose the following conditions:

- (1) The certificate holder shall design, construct, operate and retire the gas storage testing pipeline in compliance with applicable Council rules and applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and ordinances in effect at the time the Department issues the order;
- (2) The certificate shall design, construct, operate and retire the gas storage testing pipeline substantially as described in representations in the request for approval and supporting record that the Department finds to be binding commitments made by the certificate holder;
- (3) The certificate holder shall prevent the development of any conditions in the area of the gas storage testing pipeline that would preclude restoration of the area to a useful, non-hazardous condition to the extent that prevention of such conditions is within the control of the certificate holder;
- (4) Upon completion of construction of the pipeline, the certificate holder shall dispose of all refuse and remove all temporary structures not needed to test or maintain an underground gas storage reservoir;
- (5) The certificate holder shall notify the Department of Energy, the State Building Codes Division and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries promptly if investigations or trenching in the area of the pipeline reveal soil or geological conditions that differ significantly from those described in the request for approval;
- (6) The certificate holder shall submit to the Department copies of all incident reports involving the gas storage testing pipeline required under 49 CFR Sec. 191.15;
- (7) The certificate holder shall allow properly identified representatives of the Council or Department of Energy to inspect the pipeline at any time, including all materials, activities, premises and records pertaining to design, construction, operation or retirement of the pipeline;
- (8) The certificate holder shall notify the Department when it begins construction, shall keep the Department informed of construction progress and any unusual events or circumstances and shall notify the Department when it begins to use the pipeline for reservoir testing or maintenance;
- (9) The certificate holder shall notify the Department if it terminates use of the gas storage testing pipeline; and

(10) If the certificate holder decides to convert the gas storage testing pipeline to operational use, the certificate holder shall notify the Department and, if required under OAR 345-027-0050, submit a request to amend the site certificate.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 469.405

Stats. Implemented: ORS 469.405 & 469.992

Hist.: EFSC 1-2000, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-00; EFSC 1-2007, f. & cert. ef. 5-15-07



ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL

Energy Facility Siting Council Meeting Notice and Agenda

**Port of Morrow – Riverfront Room
2 Marine Drive
Boardman, OR**

Thursday, August 22, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

Friday, August 23, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.

Please Note: Every effort will be made to consider items as they are indicated. However, the Council agenda and the order of agenda items are subject to change.

Thursday, August 22, 2019

Roll Call and Opening Remarks

- A. Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Information Item)** – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst. The Council will receive a presentation on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility site certificate; a public hearing will be conducted as Agenda Item C; the comment period extends through September 9, 2019. Request for Amendment 4 (RFA4) seeks Council approval to add 1,527 acres to the approved site boundary within Morrow County for construction and operation of up to 150 megawatts (MW) of photovoltaic solar energy facility components, up to 41 distributed energy storage (battery) system sites and expansion the Wheatridge West collector substation. RFA4 also seeks Council approval for site certificate condition amendments. The certificate holder's RFA4 and the Department's Draft Proposed Order on RFA4 are available for review at: [Department's Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility webpage.](#)
- B. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Information Item)** – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. The Council will receive a presentation on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Perennial Wind Chaser Station site certificate; a public hearing will be conducted as Agenda Item D, which will then conclude the public comment period. Request for Amendment 1 (RFA1) seeks Council approval to extend the construction commencement and completion timelines by two years for the previously approved 450 MW natural gas-fueled power generation facility and related or supporting facility components. The certificate holder's RFA1 and the Department's Draft Proposed Order on RFA1 are available for review at: [Department's Perennial Wind Chaser Station Webpage.](#)

- C. Site Certificate Amendment Process Rulemaking (Action Item)** – Patrick Rowe, Department of Justice and Christopher Clark, Rulemaking Coordinator. On October 24, 2017, the Energy Facility Siting Council filed Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017, amending OAR 345-025 and 345-027. The rules were intended to improve the process by which the Council reviews requests for amendments to site certificates. On August 1, 2019, the Oregon Supreme Court decided that these rules were invalid because the Council failed to substantially comply with ORS 183.335(3)(d) because Council did not provide a written statement identifying how it would later determine whether the proposed rules were accomplishing their objective. In addition, the Court held that the Council exceeded its statutory authority by adopting rules that limited the scope of judicial review of an order amending a site certificate under the Type B review process. Council will consider two actions to address these issues:
- I. The Council will first consider adopting temporary rules to replace the amendment rules adopted on October 24, 2017. The temporary rules would be similar to the October 2017 amendment rules, except that they would include modifications to:
 1. Establish that the Department and Council will apply the temporary rules to requests for amendments and other review processes submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council or the Department has not yet made a final decision, without requiring certificate holders to resubmit a new request for amendment or amendment determination request.
 2. Amend provisions identified by the Supreme Court as exceeding the Council’s statutory authority because they limited judicial review under the Type B review process.
 - II. The Council will then consider initiating a rulemaking process to adopt permanent rules for the review of amendments to site certificates. Council must adopt permanent rules within 180 days. Council may adopt permanent rules that are the same as temporary rules, or may make modifications based on input from stakeholders. Staff recommends Council solicit written advice from stakeholders on potential improvements to the amendment rules prior to issuing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
- D. [5:00 pm] Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Public Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Hearing)** – Barry Beyeler, Council Chair/Presiding Officer. The public hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 (RFA4) of the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility site certificate will begin after Council receives a brief overview from staff. The purpose of the hearing is for members of the public to provide verbal comments to Council members on RFA4 and the Draft Proposed Order on RFA4. RFA4 seeks Council approval to add 1,527 acres to the approved site boundary within Morrow County for construction and operation of up to 150 MW of photovoltaic solar energy facility components, up to 41 distributed energy storage (battery) system sites and expansion of the Wheatridge West collector substation. RFA4 also seeks Council approval for site certificate condition amendments. The written comment period on the draft proposed order and amendment request is open until September 9, 2019 at 5:00 PM, unless extended by Council.
- E. [5:45pm] Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Public Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Hearing)** – Barry Beyeler, Council Chair/Presiding Officer. The public hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 (RFA1) of the Perennial Wind Chaser site certificate will begin after Council receives a brief overview from staff. The purpose of the hearing is for members of the public to provide verbal comments to Council members on RFA1 and the Draft Proposed Order on RFA1. RFA1 seeks Council approval to extend the

construction commencement and completion timelines by two years. The comment period on the Draft Proposed Order and RFA1 closes at the end of the hearing, unless extended by Council.

Friday, August 23, 2019

- F. **Consent Calendar** – Approval of minutes; Council Secretary Report; and other routine Council business.
- G. **The Climate Trust Audit Update (Information Item)** – Maxwell Woods, Acting Council Secretary. The Council will receive a presentation on The Climate Trust’s 2017 Financial Audit.
- H. **[9:00 am] Rulemaking Hearing: 2019 Housekeeping Rulemaking Project (Hearing)** – Christopher Clark, Rules Coordinator. The Council will receive oral public comments on the proposed amendments to OAR chapter 345. The deadline to provide the Council with oral or written comments on the proposed rule amendments is the close of the hearing.
- I. **Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Council Review of Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Information Item)** – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. Council will review the Draft Proposed Order, consider comments received on the record of the Draft Proposed Order public hearing, and may provide comments to staff on the Draft Proposed Order for consideration in the Proposed Order.
- J. **Public Comment** – This time is reserved for the public to address the Council regarding any item within the Council’s jurisdiction that is not otherwise closed for comment.
- K. **Nolin Hills Wind Power Project, Request for Extension of Notice of Intent Timeline (Action Item)** – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. Council will consider a request from Capitol Power Corporation to extend the expiration date for the Notice of Intent for the proposed Nolin Hills Wind Power Project by one year.
- L. **Montague Wind Power Facility, Council Review and Decision on Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Action Items)** – Chase McVeigh-Walker Senior Siting Analyst. Council will review the Proposed Order on Amendment 4 and will either adopt, modify, or reject the proposed order as the final order. Request for Amendment 4 seeks Council approval of the following: Expansion of the site boundary and micro-siting corridor; construction and operation of up to 81 wind turbines; construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic generating system of up to 1,189 acres; construction and operation of up to a 100-megawatt battery storage system, and related or supporting facility components.
- M. **Summit Ridge Wind Farm, Council Decision on Requests for Contested Case; and the Amended Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Action Items)** – Maxwell Woods, Acting Council Secretary. The Council will first consider requests for contested case on the Amended Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Summit Ridge Wind Farm site certificate. If Council accepts a contested case request, it will direct a contested case to be conducted. If Council denies all contested case requests, Council will proceed to review the Amended Proposed Order on Amendment 4 and will either adopt, modify, or reject the Amended Proposed

Order as the final order. Request for Amendment 4 seeks Council approval to extend the construction commencement and completion deadlines by two years.

- I. **Council Decision on Requests for Contested Case** – The Council will consider requests for contested case on the Amended Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4.
- II. **Council Decision on Proposed Order** – Unless a contested case proceeding is granted, Council will proceed to review the Amended Proposed Order on Amendment 4 and will either adopt, modify, or reject the Amended Proposed Order as the final order.

N. Rulemaking: 2019 Housekeeping – Council Deliberation (Action Item) – Christopher Clark, Rules Coordinator. After considering all the comments received on the record for this rulemaking (i.e. before the comment deadline at the close of the hearing that occurred as Agenda Item H), the Council will deliberate and decide whether to approve final rule language, or provide additional direction to staff.

Adjourn

Anticipated Future Energy Facility Siting Council Meetings:

- **September 26-27, 2019** – Clatskanie
- **October 24-25, 2019** – location to be determined
- **November 21-22, 2019** – location to be determined
- **December 19-20, 2019** – location to be determined

To participate by teleconference please call toll-free: 1-877-873-8017 and enter code 799345.

Webinar Presentation: [Join Skype Meeting](#) Trouble Joining? [Try Skype Web App](#)

Meeting Materials associated with the agenda items are available at:

<https://www.oregon.gov/energy/facilities-safety/facilities/Pages/Council-Meetings.aspx>

Requests to the Council to Address an Issue:

Pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule 345-011-0035, the public may ask the Council formally to address relevant issues within the Council's jurisdiction at future meetings. Please be sure to include information about why the issue should be on the agenda. Your request must be in writing and received at least 14 days before the Council meeting.

To ask the Council to address an issue, call or write:

EFSC Secretary

Energy Siting Division/ODOE

550 Capitol St. NE

Salem, OR 97301-3737

Toll-Free (in Oregon): 1-800-221-8035

Phone: 503-378-8328

<https://www.oregon.gov/energy/facilities-safety/facilities>

Americans with Disabilities Act: The Oregon Department of Energy will make reasonable accommodations upon request. Please contact us at least 72 hours before the meeting. Call Sean Mole at 503-934-4005; Fax 503-373-7806, or toll free in Oregon at 800-221-8035. TTY users should call the Oregon Relay Service at 711.



ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL

Barry Beyeler, Chair ■ Hanley Jenkins, Vice-Chair ■ Marcy Grail ■ Ann Gravatt ■ Kent Howe ■ Mary Winters

Energy Facility Siting Council August 22-23, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 22, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

Friday, August 23, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.

Port of Morrow - Riverfront Room

2 Marine Drive Boardman, OR

Table of Contents

- A. Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Request for Amendment 4, Draft Proposed Order - Staff Presentation (Information Item) – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst
- B. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Request for Amendment 1, Draft Proposed Order - Staff Presentation (Information Item) - Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst
- G. The Climate Trust Audit Update (Information) – Maxwell Woods, Senior Policy Advisor
- C. Site Certificate Amendment Process Rulemaking (Action) –Patrick Rowe, Department of Justice and Chris Clark, Rulemaking Coordinator
- D. Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Request for Amendment 4, Draft Proposed Order Public Hearing (Hearing) – Barry Beyeler, EFSC Chair and Presiding Officer
- E. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Request for Amendment 1, Draft Proposed Order Public Hearing (Hearing) – Barry Beyeler, EFSC Chair and Presiding Officer
- F. Consent Calendar (Information and Action Items) – Maxwell Woods, Senior Policy Advisor
 - 1) Meeting Minutes – June 18-27 EFSC Meetings
 - 2) Council Secretary Report
- H. 2019 Housekeeping Rulemaking Project Public Hearing (Hearing)- Christopher Clark, Rulemaking Coordinator
- I. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Request for Amendment 1 - Council Review of DPO (Information) [note, item was continued to September 26-27, 2019 meeting] – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst
- J. Public Comment
- K. Nolin Hills Wind Energy Project – Notice of Intent Extension Request (Action) - Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst
- L. Montague Wind Power Facility, Request for Amendment 4, Council Review of Proposed Order (Action) - Chase McVeigh-Walker, Senior Siting Analyst
- M. Summit Ridge Wind Farm, Request for Amendment 4, Contested Case Request Review and Council Review of Amended Proposed Order (Action) – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst
- N. 2019 Housekeeping Rulemaking - Council Deliberation (Action) [note, item was continued to September 26-27, 2019 meeting] - Christopher Clark, Rulemaking Coordinator

The meeting materials presented to Council are available online at: <https://www.oregon.gov/energy/facilities-safety/facilities/Pages/Council-Meetings.aspx>

Thursday, August 22, 2019 - Boardman

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on August 22, 2019 by Chair Barry Beyeler.

Roll Call: Council Chair Barry Beyeler, Council Members Marcy Grail and Kent Howe were present. Council Member Mary Winters arrived shortly after roll call at approximately 3:10 p.m. Council Member Ann Gravatt attended remotely via telephone but did not attend until 5 p.m.

Oregon Department of Energy representatives present were Senior Policy Advisor Maxwell Woods, Senior Siting Analyst Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst Chase McVeigh-Walker, Rules Coordinator Christopher Clark, Operations Analyst Sean Mole, Temporary Division Assistant Erica Euen, and Communications Outreach Jennifer Kalez. EFSC Counsel Patrick Rowe of the Department of Justice was also present.

A. Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Information Item) – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst, gave a presentation on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility site certificate; a public hearing was conducted as Agenda Item D; the written comment period extended through September 9, 2019. Request for Amendment 4 (RFA4) seeks Council approval to add 1,527 acres to the approved site boundary within Morrow County for construction and operation of up to 150 megawatts (MW) of photovoltaic solar energy facility components, up to 41 distributed energy storage (battery) system sites and expansion the Wheatridge West collector substation. RFA4 also seeks Council approval for site certificate condition amendments. The certificate holder's RFA4 and the Department's Draft Proposed Order on RFA4 are available for review at: [Department's Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility webpage](#).

Council Member Kent Howe asked Sarah if the Conditional Use Permit must be applied for through Morrow County or if the permit is incorporated into the EFSC process. Sarah answered that it is incorporated in the process.

B. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Information Item) – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst, gave a presentation on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Perennial Wind Chaser Station site certificate; a public hearing was conducted as Agenda Item D, which concluded the public comment period. Request for Amendment 1 (RFA1) seeks Council approval to extend the construction commencement and completion timelines by two years for the previously approved 450 MW natural gas-fueled power generation facility and related or supporting facility components. The certificate holder's RFA1 and the Department's Draft Proposed Order on RFA1 are available for review at: [Department's Perennial Wind Chaser Station Webpage](#).

Council Member Mary Winters asked Katie to clarify why the department thought the certificate holder had met two or more criteria under ORS 215.274 / UCDC § 152.617(II)(7)(B).

Katie explained the department's findings and conclusion.

Max requested Katie explain the ZLD (zero liquid discharge) options.

Katie explained that it is an option for managing cooling tower system water.

Max asked to make sure Council understood the monetary path option for compliance with the EFSC Carbon standard.

Max noted that the meeting was ahead of schedule and asked to move to agenda item G.

Chair Beyeler approved the agenda modification.

G. The Climate Trust Audit Update (Information Item) – Maxwell Woods, Acting Council Secretary, gave a presentation on The Climate Trust's 2017 Financial Audit.

C. Site Certificate Amendment Process Rulemaking (Action Item) – Patrick Rowe, Department of Justice and Christopher Clark, Rulemaking Coordinator. Christopher Clark provided an overview of the history of the 2017 Amendment Rulemaking project, including adoption of permanent rules in October 2017 through Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017. Patrick Rowe provided an overview of the decision that the Supreme Court issued on August 1, 2019. He explained that the Court held that there had been one procedural error and one substantive error in the rulemaking. The procedural error said that the October 2017 rules were invalid because the Council had failed to substantially comply with ORS 183.335(3)(d). The substantive error appeared in three rules, which stated that the right to seek judicial review of an amendment proceeding under the Type B review process was limited to those persons who had provided written comments by the written comment deadline, and that judicial review would be limited to the issues raised in that person's comments. Mr. Rowe explained that the rules were based on ORS 469.403, which limits judicial review for decisions that have gone through a contested case proceeding. Mr. Rowe explained that because Type B review does not allow for contested cases, the Court held a different statute, ORS 183.482, governs judicial review of Type B amendment decisions and that that statute does not include any requirement for a person to have commented on the record to obtain judicial review. Mr. Rowe and Mr. Clark explained the Department's recommendation for Council to adopt temporary rules to replace the rules that were held invalid. Mr. Clark discussed the procedures for adopting temporary rules. Mr. Rowe discussed the justification for adopting temporary rules, including the State's position that failure to adopt temporary rules could result in serious prejudice to certificate holders with pending amendment requests who are dependent on a timely decision on their request from Council. Mr. Clark and Mr. Rowe also recommended the Council initiate rulemaking to adopt permanent rules within 180 days.

Mary Winters asked if there was any case law interpreting authority to adopt temporary rules in a similar situation where a rule was invalidated.

Patrick Rowe answered yes, about four that he knows of. He explained that in one of those situations it was interpreted that the court would not put itself in the agency's position, so if the agency identifies the need for the temporary rules the court would uphold the temporary rules.

Kent Howe asked for clarification of which facilities are included under ORS 469.410(1), which the temporary rules would not be applied to.

Christopher Clark answered that the rules would not apply to old facilities existing prior to the siting process.

Christopher Clark provided a projected timeline for adoption of permanent rules, which include a 30-day period to solicit written input from stakeholders prior to considering proposed rules in October, a rulemaking hearing in November, and consideration of permanent rules in December.

Marcy Grail noted that the timeline to make new permanent rules seems too ambitious and that there could be weather or other issues delaying the process.

Max Woods explained that the Department had that in mind when creating the timeline and there is a buffer around the timeline to ensure accordance with the 180-day expiration of the temporary rules.

Chair Beyeler asked what would happen if the temporary rules expired before new rules were adopted.

Patrick explained that if that happened we would be in a similar situation as we are now.

Ann Gravatt asked for clarification on the timeline for new rulemaking process and noted that she would like to hear from stakeholders/public.

Max and Chris explained that a public comment period and hearing would take place for the permanent rule making.

Marcy Grail moved to adopt recommended temporary rules and file rules immediately.

Kent Howe seconded that motion commenting that because of extreme prejudice against and comments from certificate holders in the process it is important to move forward with temporary rules.

Motion passed unanimously.

Marcy Grail moved to initiate permanent rule making, direct staff to solicit permanent rules to propose, and propose those permanent rules at the Oct 2019 EFSC meeting.

Mary Winters seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

D. [5:00 pm] Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, Public Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on

Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Hearing) – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst, gave a brief presentation. Barry Beyeler, Council Chair/Presiding Officer, opened the public hearing at 5:55 pm on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 (RFA4) of the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility site certificate after Council received a brief overview from staff. The purpose of the hearing was for members of the public to provide verbal comments to Council members on RFA4 and the Draft Proposed Order on RFA4. RFA4 seeks Council approval to add 1,527 acres to the approved site boundary within Morrow County for construction and operation of up to 150 MW of photovoltaic solar energy facility components, up to 41 distributed energy storage (battery) system sites and expansion of the Wheatridge West collector substation. RFA4 also seeks Council approval for site certificate condition amendments. The written comment period on the draft proposed order and amendment request was open until September 9, 2019 at 5:00 PM.

NextEra Energy (Certificate Holder) Mike Papalardo – Thanked the department and council for their efforts.

Carla McLane – Representing Morrow County clarified that Next Era does have a conditional use permit and are working diligently toward other permits. The county has encountered a few things that they will be asking for clarification on, but nothing problematic or too concerning. She mentioned working with NextEra staff has been pleasant. She offered to answer any questions concerning the county on the matter.

Irene Gilbert – Noted there was extreme prejudice and that she doesn't like that EFSC approved temporary rules without input from the public.

Chair Beyeler asked the certificate holder if they would like to request the comment period to be extended.

Certificate holder answered, "No."

Written public comment period closed September 9, 2019 at 5pm.

Chair Beyeler closed the public hearing at 6:10PM

E. [5:45pm] Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Public Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request

for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Hearing) – Barry Beyeler, Council Chair/Presiding Officer, opened the public hearing on the Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 (RFA1) of the Perennial Wind Chaser site certificate. The purpose of the hearing was for members of the public to provide verbal comments to Council members on RFA1 and the Draft Proposed Order on RFA1. RFA1 seeks Council approval to extend the construction commencement and completion timelines by two years. The comment period on the Draft Proposed Order and RFA1 closed at the end of the hearing.

Richard Allen (Certificate Holder's legal representation) – Thanked Katie and the department/council. Spoke to applying for an amendment under the rules. Touched on comments they had received and explained that they had responded to them. Offered to answer any questions and asked the Council to refer to their written comment submittal.

Ryan Rittenhouse (Friends of the Columbia Gorge) – Stated that the site certificate is expired and cannot be renewed or changed. Thinks the request for amendment was submitted under invalid rules. Thinks they must submit a new application for a site certificate. Asking ODOE/Council not to process amendment request. Reiterated that the site certificate is expired and void. Mentioned public health and environment concerns including climate change issues. Other methane gas power plants are nearby, so this would create a hotspot of emissions.

Dan Serres (Columbia Riverkeeper) – Agreed with prior testimony by Ryan Rittenhouse. Stated that site certificate is void. Council must consider changes in facts or law, such as the cradle-to-grave impacts of fracked gas and more information about how climate change is a threat to Oregon and the Columbia River watershed. Methane leaks are likely from facility

operation. The facility would also result in VOC emissions and other air pollution. The Carty Generating Station emitted more air pollution than the facility was originally permitted for. The Perennial Wind Chaser Station would be non-base load, and air emissions are not limited by the DEQ permit during facility startup/shutdown; therefore, VOCs from Perennial are likely to be more than expected too. Smog-forming pollution from the facility may impact air quality at protected areas. The DEQ Air Contaminant Discharge Permit expires July 26, 2020 if Perennial does not commence construction by that date, but their request for amendment to their site certificate is for a construction commencement date later than that. There is no place for natural gas in Oregon's energy future. The facility is not needed and hasn't demonstrated a market for it.

(by phone) Emily Krafft (350 PDX) – Presented concern with the DPO and stated the site certificate is invalid. Adverse impacts on environment, health, and climate. Significant changes since site certificate was issued. We must reduce GHGs and phase out fossil fuels and increase renewable energy. Does this facility promote Oregon's energy policy (ORS 469.010)? The facility would impede OR's transition to renewable energy. Fracked gas is now known to be comparable to coal instead of a bridge fuel. Perennial Power Holdings, Inc. owns a 40 percent stake in American Bituminous Power Partners. In 2018 the Associated Press reported that American Bituminous Power Partners was at risk of bankruptcy. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has found that the coal waste plant was not fully in compliance with Clean Air Act requirements. Urged council to deny the request.

(by phone) Dena Turner – Urged council to deny the RFA stating that there are no customers for the facility and noting they do not have a power purchase agreement. Fracked gas has cradle-to-grave impacts. Changes in fact or law include climate science that shows natural gas is no longer a bridge fuel. The site certificate is invalid.

(by phone) Janine O'Rourke (350 PDX) – Facility will negatively affect our future. Approving would go against OR's GHG reduction goals. There is no market need for this facility. Urged council to review public comments and to deny request.

(by phone) Eileen Fromer – Reject the request for amendment due to the climate change implications. Threatens health and climate. Oregon energy policy is moving away from natural gas infrastructure. There is no power purchase agreement, and this facility is not needed or wanted. Urged council to deny the request.

Richard Allen (Certificate Holder) – Council does not have authority over federally-delegated programs so air quality permits do not fall under council but instead DEQ. As for climate the council has the Carbon Dioxide standard. Responding to the comment that the plant is not needed he said there is no need standard that council has and that the market will decide whether they get a purchase agreement.

Marcy Grail asked if Richard Allen would be present tomorrow.
Richard Allen responded yes.

Chair Beyeler closed the hearing at 6:57PM

Meeting Adjourned at 6:58PM

Friday, August 23, 2019 - Boardman

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 8:30 p.m. on August 23, 2019 by Chair Barry Beyeler.

Roll Call: Council Chair Barry Beyeler and Council Members Marcy Grail, Kent Howe, and Mary Winters were present. Council Member Ann Gravatt attended remotely via telephone.

Oregon Department of Energy representatives present were Senior Policy Advisor Maxwell Woods, Senior Siting Analyst Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst Chase McVeigh-Walker, Rules Coordinator Christopher Clark, Operations Analyst Sean Mole, Temporary Division Assistant Erica Euen, and Communications Outreach Jennifer Kalez. EFSC Counsel Patrick Rowe of the Department of Justice was also present.

F. Consent Calendar – Approval of minutes; Council Secretary Report; and other routine Council business.

Marcy Grail moved that meeting minutes from May and June be approved.
The motion passed unanimously.

Availability for future meetings –

September: Mary Winters is unavailable

October: Kent Howe and Ann Gravatt are unavailable

(Agenda Item G occurred between B & C)

H. [9:00 am] Rulemaking Hearing: 2019 Housekeeping Rulemaking Project (Hearing) – Christopher Clark, Rules Coordinator, introduced the hearing and invited public comments on the proposed amendments to OAR chapter 345. Mr. Clark confirmed that the deadline to provide the Council with oral or written comments on the proposed rule amendments was the close of the hearing.

Ann Gravatt asked for Patrick Rowe’s advice on the verbiage of “will” vs. “shall.”

Max assured Ann that Patrick would speak to that later in the meeting, as part of Agenda Item N.

Marcy noted that there was concern mentioned in public comment that we did not give enough notice.

No one expressed interest in providing public comment so Mr. Clark recessed the hearing at 9:04 am. The hearing was reopened at 9:30 am during discussion of Agenda Item I. No one expressed interest in providing public comment and the hearing was adjourned.

I. Perennial Wind Chaser Station, Council Review of Draft Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate (Information Item) – Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. Council will review the Draft Proposed Order, consider comments received on the record of the Draft Proposed Order public hearing, and may provide comments to staff on the Draft Proposed Order for consideration in the Proposed Order.

Katie discussed the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation’s request that a cultural resources monitor be present during construction ground-disturbing activities. In response to a question from Chair Beyeler, Katie stated that the Department would have to consider whether construction worker training would still be necessary if a cultural resources monitor is present.

Kent Howe asked if the PUC has determined that the facility is needed to meet the State of Oregon’s energy needs. Max explained that is a little outside our scope but that the PUC considers whether power generating plants are needed when they evaluate rate cases (rate recovery requested by regulated investor-owned utilities). However, Council cannot consider whether it is needed or not because by statute, Council is precluded from considered “need” for a power generating facility.

Mary Winters asked about the limits of the information request based on testimony about a parent company going into bankruptcy. She wanted to know if they can only ask for information or if they can check into the legitimacy of the information. Katie responded by going over the applicable rules that requires the certificate holder to explain the need for the timeline extension and let council know it is just an information requirement.

Max said not having a power purchase agreement is a common reason for a timeline extension request. He added that regarding the concern about the parent company, ODOE staff will need to investigate that further and consider that in light of the Organization Expertise standard before they can speak to that.

Marcy asked about a comment that indicated the certificate holder did not meet the timeline for submitting an amendment. Max explained that they did meet the deadline.

Mary said that if the Council must simply take at face value the certificate holder's explanation of the need for a timeline extension, it's not particularly helpful information to Council. Max suggested that the permanent rulemaking contemplate this.

Ann commented that she does not see any evidence that the facility is something that one of the utilities has included in their integrated resource plan; therefore, Council cannot look to the PUC for any indication that the facility is needed by an investor-owned utility in Oregon.

Mary asked for staff comment on the comments made about the DEQ air quality permit.

Katie responded that they need to investigate that further before they can discuss it in depth.

Max added that the council does not have an air quality standard, but the Council considers visibility and plumes related to the Protected Areas and Scenic Resources.

Marcy asked how in-depth the Council should look into changes in fact or law.

Max and Katie provided examples and said that Council should look into changes as they pertain to Council standards.

Marcy said it's important to help the public understand the scope of Council's review (specifically, any limits on that scope).

Ann noted that the Council is under a fair level of public scrutiny and that members of the Council have been appointed by the Governor and approved by the legislature to act as representatives of the public. Ann takes public comment seriously. She is aware of what the Council's limitations are, but also notes that Council members are there to act as representatives of the public.

Based on staff recommendation, Council carried over the review of comments and the DPO to the September 26-27, 2019 meeting.

J. Public Comment – This time was reserved for the public to address the Council regarding any item within the Council's jurisdiction that was not otherwise closed for comment.

Jodi Parker – encouraged council and local government to adopt hiring standards for construction on energy facilities to require utilizing local workforces.

Carla McLane – wanted to remind council about the disconnect between county process and council process, specifically goal 3 and goal 5 standards.

Chair Beyeler closed the public comment period at 9:40 a.m.

K. Nolin Hills Wind Power Project, Request for Extension of Notice of Intent Timeline (Action Item) –

Katie Clifford, Senior Siting Analyst. Council considered a request from Capitol Power Corporation to extend the expiration date for the Notice of Intent for the proposed Nolin Hills Wind Power Project by one year.

Marcy moved that council approve request to extend the expiration date for the Notice of Intent for the proposed Nolin Hills Wind Power Project by one year.

Kent Howe Seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

L. Montague Wind Power Facility, Council Review and Decision on Amendment 4 of the Site

Certificate (Action Items) – Chase McVeigh-Walker Senior Siting Analyst. Council reviewed the Proposed Order on Amendment 4. Request for Amendment 4 seeks Council approval of the following: Expansion of the site boundary and micro-siting corridor; construction and operation of up to 81 wind turbines; construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic generating system of up to 1,189 acres; construction and operation of up to a 100-megawatt battery storage system, and related or supporting facility components.

Chair Beyeler asked if turbines would be constructed in the same area as the solar array as depicted in the image.

Chase explained the image was of a combination of options so no, it would be either solar or turbines in that specific area on the map.

Kent Howe asked about turbine set back requirement terminology.

Max clarified for him.

Beyeler asked about a minor discrepancy in the DPO.

Chase noted he mislabeled a condition (52) so a numbering typo made two conditions 52, the second one should be 53.

Marcy moved to approve the Proposed Order on Amendment 4 with modifications.

Kent Howe seconded.

Motioned passed unanimously.

M. Summit Ridge Wind Farm, Council Decision on Requests for Contested Case; and the Amended Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Site Certificate (Action Items) – Sarah Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst. The Council first considered requests for contested case on the Amended Proposed Order on Request for Amendment 4 of the Summit Ridge Wind Farm site certificate, and then reviewed the Amended Proposed Order on Amendment 4. Request for Amendment 4 seeks Council approval to extend the construction commencement and completion deadlines by two years.

Max explained Supreme Court decision.

Marcy asked for clarification on why the department did not seek out more information regarding Irene Gilbert's comment.

Marcy asked for clarification on why the department did not seek out more information regarding to Gilberts comment.

Sarah explained it was because it wasn't applicable to this actual site.

Mary asked how public participation and response will work into the process.

Sarah explained how public will be noticed and given the opportunity to comment.

Action Item 1:

Sarah explained the 3 action options.

Council deliberated.

Marcy Grail moved to deny contested case because the request did not raise significant issues of law or fact.

Motion was seconded by Kent Howe

Motion passed unanimously.

Action Item 2:

Sarah explained the 3 action options.

Marcy Grail moved to approve the Amended Proposed Order and adopt the Final Order with modifications related to renumbering rule references.

Motion was seconded by Kent Howe

Barry Beyeler, Mary Winters, Kent Howe, and Marcy Grail voted yes. Ann Gravatt voted no. Motion passed 4-1.

N. Rulemaking: 2019 Housekeeping – Council Deliberation (Action Item) – Christopher Clark, Rules Coordinator, provided an overview of the rulemaking project and summarized public comments received before the close of the public comment period. As of that time, the Council had received two public comment letters and one comment letter from staff. Mr. Clark summarized the issues raised in the public comment letters and provided department responses. The first issue was to reject all rule changes which would revise rules declared invalid in Friends v. EFSC. Mr. Clark explained that the department agrees with this recommendation for separate reasons. The second issue is to retain the word "shall" to denote an obligation instead of "must" or "will."

Marcy Grail expressed hesitancy to discuss this issue before counsel has reviewed.

Patrick Rowe stated that Council could discuss, but may choose to defer a decision pending further review.

Ann Gravatt asked what the intent of the changes from “shall” to “must” and “will” was.

Mr. Clark explained the rationale behind the department’s drafting choices and explained that there was not an intent to create a substantive change in the operation of the rules.

Mary Winters stated that there is a legal debate about use of the word shall, and that there is a general move away from its use.

Mr. Clark recommended Council defer action until counsel has reviewed.

Marcy Grail asked why we have received comments that this change was not properly noticed.

Mr. Clark explained that non-substantive changes are often not specifically described in notice, but that the language was included in both draft and proposed rules provided to stakeholders.

Mr. Clark summarized the third recommendation to revise the term “by mail or email” to state that notices will be sent by “mail and email” in all proposed and existing rules. Mr. Clark explained that the Department does not recommend taking action on this issue at this time.

Mr. Clark summarized the Department’s testimony and recommendations on the rules.

Council deliberated.

Council decided to defer action until September.

Irene Gilbert commented on the rulemaking off the record.

Mr. Clark added that Irene did provide advice on this rulemaking project.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:30 pm.

For more details visit the [Council Meetings website](#)

**BEFORE THE
ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL
OF THE STATE OF OREGON**

In the Matter of Request for Amendment 4 for the
Montague Wind Power Facility Site Certificate

)
) FINAL ORDER ON
) REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT 4 TO
) THE SITE CERTIFICATE

August 23, 2019

1 **I.D. Procedural History**

2

3 The Council issued the *Final Order on the Application for Site Certificate for the Montague Wind*
 4 *Power Facility (Final Order on the Application)* on September 10, 2010, which authorized
 5 construction and operation of a 404 MW wind energy generation facility, with up to 269 wind
 6 turbines and related or supporting facilities.

7

8 On December 28, 2012, the certificate holder submitted to the Department its Request for
 9 Amendment 1 (RFA1) for the facility. RFA1 requested extension of the construction
 10 commencement and completion deadlines by two years, reduction in the minimum
 11 aboveground blade-tip clearance, and transfer of the site certificate.⁴ The Council issued a *Final*
 12 *Order on Amendment 1 of the Site Certificate* on June 21, 2013, which authorized an extension
 13 of the construction commencement deadline from September 14, 2013 to September 14, 2015;
 14 and, extension of the construction completion deadline from September 14, 2016 to September
 15 14, 2018.

16

17 On March 11, 2015, the certificate holder submitted to the Department its Request for
 18 Amendment 2 (RFA2). RFA2 requested extension of the construction commencement and
 19 completion deadlines by two years. The Council issued a *Final Order on Amendment 2 of the*
 20 *Site Certificate* on December 4, 2015 which authorized an extension of the construction
 21 commencement deadline from September 14, 2015 to September 14, 2017; and, extension of
 22 the construction completion deadline from September 14, 2018 to September 14, 2020.

23

24 On May 4, 2017, the certificate holder submitted to the Department its Request for
 25 Amendment 3 (RFA3). RFA3 requested authorization to change a wind turbine dimension – to
 26 reduce the minimum aboveground blade-tip clearance. The Council issued a *Final Order on*
 27 *Amendment 3 of the Site Certificate* on July 12, 2017, which authorized the change in minimum
 28 aboveground blade-tip clearance.

29

30 On January 9, 2018, the Department received the preliminary Request for Amendment (pRFA4)
 31 to the Montague Wind Power Facility’s existing site certificate.⁵ The Department initiated
 32 consultation with reviewing agencies and posted an announcement on the Department’s
 33 website notifying the public that pRFA4 had been submitted. Under OAR 345-027-0363(5), an
 34 RFA is complete when the Department finds that a certificate holder has submitted information
 35 adequate for the Council to make findings or impose conditions on all applicable laws and
 36 Council standards. Pursuant to OAR 345-027-0363(2), on February 20, 2018 the Department

⁴ Transfer of the site certificate to Portland General Electric was not completed and Montague Wind Power Facility LLC remains the site certificate holder.

⁵ The Department received pRFA4 on November 21, 2017. However, based on outstanding unpaid invoices for ongoing siting work related to the Montague Wind Power facility at the time, the Department was restricted from commencing work on pRFA4 by a “stop work order” to be lifted upon unpaid invoice resolution. On January 9, 2018, Avangrid Renewables, the parent company of Montague Wind Power Facility, LLC made full payment of fees and the Stop Work Order was lifted.

1 determined pRFA4 to be incomplete. The Department issued requests for additional
 2 information on March 9, May 24, June 15, July 25, August 15, September 21, and December 7,
 3 2018.⁶ The certificate holder provided revised exhibits, responses to the information requests,
 4 and additional revisions to the scope of the amendment request from April through December,
 5 2018. After reviewing the revised exhibits, the Department determined the RFA to be complete
 6 and, on January 15, 2019, the certificate holder filed a complete RFA4. On March 25, 2019, the
 7 certificate holder submitted an amended RFA4, which was found to be complete on April 4,
 8 2019. The certificate holder filed a complete revised RFA4 on April 5, 2019 and on the same
 9 day, the Department posted an announcement on the Department’s website notifying the
 10 public that the complete RFA had been received.

11

12 **II. AMENDMENT PROCESS**

13

14 **II.A. Requested Amendment**

15

16 In RFA4, the certificate holder requests Council approval to amend its site certificate for the
 17 construction and operation of new facility components (referred to as “Phase 2”); addition of
 18 new area within the site boundary and micrositing corridor; and, new and amended site
 19 certificate conditions.

20

21 The certificate holder seeks flexibility to install any combination of the wind and solar energy
 22 facility components as long as the total maximum output of Phase 2 would not exceed 202
 23 MW.⁷ The certificate holder states that the combined maximum output from Phase 1 and 2
 24 would not exceed 404 MW.⁸ To support the flexibility requested, the certificate holder
 25 performed comprehensive field surveys to support the requested increase in micrositing

⁶ MWPAMD4. Request for Additional Information. 2018-03-09; 2018-05-24; 2018-06-15; 2018-07-25; 2018-08-15; 2018-09-21; 2018-12-07.

⁷ MWPAMD DPO Comments Gilbert 2019-05-16. On the record of the draft proposed order, as an individual and on behalf of the Friends of the Grande Ronde Valley (collectively referred to as Ms. Gilbert), Ms. Gilbert expresses concerns that there is not enough evidence on the record to ensure that the facility would comply with ORS 469.310. However, ORS 469.310 is a policy statement and does not contain substantive review criteria. Additionally, Ms. Gilbert states that the site certificate fails to meet the requirements of ORS 469.401(2) and does not provide information necessary to determine compliance with the standards, statutes and rules described in ORS 469.501. Ms. Gilbert indicates that the provided flexibility denies the public, reviewing agencies, and any other interested party the information necessary to evaluate impacts to any of the evaluated criteria contained in Division’s 22 and 24 (visual, noise, health and safety, land use, habitat impacts, impacts to threatened and endangered wildlife, etc.). As presented in Section III. *Review of the Requested Amendment* of this the draft proposed order and this proposed order, the Department, recognizing the potential of the final Phase 2 design layout differing from the three design scenarios provided, recommends that Council impose conditions, as needed, based on the methodology and maximum impact evaluated for each design scenario but not be prescriptive to a design scenario or specific facility component. The Department has evaluated the full range of potential impacts in accordance with Council rule and standards, and stands by its recommendations and findings that Council approve RFA4.

⁸ The specific power generating capacity of an energy facility or facility components, such as an individual wind turbine, is not relevant to a Council standard.

**BEFORE THE
ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL
OF THE STATE OF OREGON**

In the Matter of Request for Amendment 4 for the
Summit Ridge Wind Farm Site Certificate

)
) FINAL ORDER ON REQUEST FOR
) AMENDMENT 4 TO THE SITE
) CERTIFICATE

August 23, 2019

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**
2

3 The Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council (Council or EFSC) issues this final order, in accordance
4 with Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 469.405(1) and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 345-027-
5 0371, based on its review of Request for Amendment 4 (amendment request or RFA4) to the
6 Summit Ridge Wind Farm site certificate, as well as comments and recommendations received by
7 specific state agencies, local and Tribal governments, and members of the public during the draft
8 proposed order comment period. The certificate holder is Summit Ridge Wind, LLC (Summit Ridge
9 or certificate holder) which is wholly owned by Pattern Energy Group 2 LP.

10
11 The certificate holder requests that Council approve changes to the site certificate to extend the
12 construction commencement and completion deadlines. In accordance with the existing site
13 certificate, construction must have begun by August 19, 2018 and be completed by August 19,
14 2021.¹ The amendment requests that the construction deadlines be extended by two years; the
15 amendment requests that the construction commencement deadline be extended to August 19,
16 2020 and that the construction completion deadline be extended to August 19, 2023. For
17 amendments requesting to extend construction deadlines, the Oregon Department of Energy
18 (Department or ODOE) and Council evaluate whether there have been “changes in fact or law”
19 since the site certificate or amended site certificate was issued to determine whether, based on
20 changes in fact or law, the facility would continue to satisfy requirements of the standard.²

21
22 Based upon review of this amendment request, in conjunction with comments received by
23 members of the public and recommendations received by state agencies and local governments,
24 the Council issues a fourth amended site certificate for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm, subject to
25 the existing, new, and amended conditions set forth in this final order.

26
27 **I.A. Name and Address of Certificate Holder**
28

29 Summit Ridge Wind, LLC
30 c/o Pattern Renewables 2 LP
31 Pier 1, Bay 3
32 San Francisco, CA 94111
33

34 ***Parent Company of the Certificate Holder***
35

36 Pattern Renewables 2 LP (subsidiary of Pattern Energy Group 2 LP)
37 Pier 1, Bay 3
38 San Francisco, CA 94111

¹ The certificate holder submitted the request to extend the construction commencement and completion deadlines before the applicable construction deadlines and therefore satisfies the requirements of OAR 345-027-0385(1), and suspends the deadlines until Council decides on the amendment request.

² OAR 345-027-0375(2)(b)

1 **II. AMENDMENT PROCESS**

2
3 **II.A. Requested Amendment**

4
5 The certificate holder requests an amendment to the site certificate to extend the deadline (1) to
6 begin construction from August 19, 2018 to August 19, 2020, and (2) to complete construction
7 from August 19, 2021 to August 19, 2023.

8
9 OAR 345-027-0360(1)(d) requires that the certificate holder provide the specific language for
10 changes in the site certificate, including affected conditions. The certificate holder proposes
11 altering the dates contained within conditions 4.1 and 4.2 to reflect its proposed changes to
12 construction deadlines.

13
14 **II.B. Amendment Review Process**

15
16 Council rules describe the differences in review processes for the Type A and Type B review paths
17 at OAR 345-027-0351.⁷ The Type A review is the standard or “default” amendment review
18 process for changes that require an amendment. A key procedural difference between the Type A
19 and Type B review process is that the Type A review requires a public hearing on the draft
20 proposed order, and provides an opportunity to request a contested case proceeding on the
21 Department’s proposed order. Another difference between the Type A and Type B review
22 process relates to the time afforded to the Department in its determination of completeness of
23 the amendment and issuance of the draft proposed order. It is important to note that Council
24 rules authorize the Department to adjust the timelines for these specific procedural
25 requirements, if necessary.

26
27 A certificate holder may submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a
28 written determination of whether a request for amendment justifies review under the Type B
29 review process. The certificate holder has the burden of justifying the appropriateness of the
30 Type B review process as described in OAR 345-027-0351(3). The Department may consider, but
31 is not limited to, the factors identified in OAR 345-027-0357(8) when determining whether to
32 process an amendment request under Type B review.

33
34 On August 17, 2018, the certificate holder submitted a Type B review amendment determination
35 request (Type B Review ADR) in conjunction with its preliminary Request for Amendment 4

⁷ SRWAMD4. Draft Proposed Order Public Comments FOCG. 2019-02-22. On the record of the draft proposed order, Friends of the Columbia Gorge (FOCG) assert that because Council’s OAR Chapter 345 Division 27 rules (adopted October 2017) are on appeal at the Oregon Supreme, the amendment request is invalid. While portions of the rules are being challenged in the Oregon Supreme Court, a stay of the rules or any other injunction against using the rules has not been issued. As such, the rules are valid and are applicable to the amendment request, as well as all other amendment requests pending with EFSC at this time. The prior rules were repealed in 2017, and are not applicable to the review of the RFA4.

1 (pRFA4). The Type B Review ADR requested that the Department review and determine whether,
 2 based on evaluation of the factors contained within OAR 345-027-0357(8), the RFA should be
 3 reviewed under the Type B review process. On August 23, 2018, the Department determined that
 4 Type A review be maintained due to the insufficiency of the certificate holder's Type B Review
 5 ADR evaluation of OAR 345-027-0357(8) factors. On September 5, 2018, the certificate holder
 6 submitted a supplement to its Type B Review ADR and requested that the Department re-
 7 evaluate its Type A Review determination. On November 28, 2018, based upon review of the
 8 certificate holder's supplemental material and responses to the Department's Request for
 9 Additional Information, the Department determined that the RFA4 could be reviewed under the
 10 Type B review process.

11
 12 Pursuant to OAR 345-027-0363(2), on September 28, 2018, the Department determined pRFA4 to
 13 be incomplete and issued a request for additional information.⁸ On November 20, 2018, the
 14 Department issued its second request for additional information. The certificate holder provided
 15 responses to the information requests on November 7 and November 30, 2018.

16
 17 After reviewing the responses to its information request, the Department determined the RFA to
 18 be complete on January 10, 2019. Under OAR 345-027-0363(5), an RFA is complete when the
 19 Department finds that a certificate holder has submitted information adequate for the Council to
 20 make findings or impose conditions for all applicable laws and Council standards. On January 16,
 21 2019, the Department posted an announcement on its project website notifying the public that
 22 the complete RFA had been received. The Department issued its DPO on RFA4, under the Type B
 23 process, on January 16, 2019, and opened a public comment period.

24
 25 On February 1, 2019, the certificate holder requested to withdraw the Type B review request and
 26 instead process the RFA under the Type A review process. As such, the Department reissued its
 27 DPO and processed the amendment request in accordance with Type A procedures at OAR 345-
 28 027-0367. The Council held a public hearing on the reissued DPO at is February 22, 2019 EFSC
 29 meeting at 10 AM at the Columbia Gorge Discovery Center in The Dalles.

30
 31 All comments previously submitted on the January 16 DPO were valid and wee addressed by the
 32 Department in its proposed order on the RFA, which was issued on April 2, 2019.

33
 34 *Reviewing Agency Comments on Preliminary Request for Amendment 4*

35
 36 As presented in Attachment B of the order, the Department received comments on pRFA4 from
 37 the following reviewing agencies:

- 38
 39
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
 - Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries

⁸ SRWAMD4Doc5. Incomplete Determination Letter and RAIs. 2018-09-28.

- 1 • Wasco County Board of County Commissioners (Special Advisory Group)
- 2 • Wasco County Planning Department
- 3 • Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon

5 **II.C. Council Review Process**

7 *Draft Proposed Order*

9 On January 16, 2019 the Department issued the draft proposed order, and a notice of a comment
 10 period on RFA4 and the draft proposed order (notice) under the Type B review process. The
 11 notice was distributed to all persons on the Council's general mailing list, to the special mailing
 12 list established for the facility, to an updated list of property owners supplied by the certificate
 13 holder, and to a list of reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52).

15 On February 1, 2019, at the request of the certificate holder, the Department reissued the DPO
 16 under the Type A review process, and a notice of comment period on the RFA4 and the DPO
 17 (notice) on the same day. The notice was distributed to all persons on the Council's general
 18 mailing list, to the special mailing list established for the facility, to an updated list of property
 19 owners supplied by the certificate holder, and to a list of reviewing agencies as defined in OAR
 20 345-001-0010(52). The comment period extended from January 16, 2019 through the close of the
 21 draft proposed order public hearing (11:51 a.m.) at the February 22, 2019 Council meeting.

23 On February 22, 2019, Council Chair Beyeler conducted a public hearing on the draft proposed
 24 order in The Dalles, Oregon.⁹ The record of the public hearing closed on February 22, 2019 at the
 25 conclusion of the public hearing, as provided in the public notice of the draft proposed order. The
 26 Council reviewed the draft proposed order and comments received on the record of the public
 27 hearing at its regularly scheduled Council meeting on February 22, 2019 and March 22, 2019.

29 The Department received approximately 900 comments on the record of the draft proposed
 30 order. Attachment C of this proposed order includes an index presenting date comment received,
 31 commenter name and organization. Issues raised that are within the Council's jurisdiction and
 32 related to the amendment request are addressed under the applicable standards section below.

34 On February 20, 2019, the Department provided Council copies of all distinct comments that had
 35 been received to date. On February 22, 2019 at 7:30 a.m., prior to the draft proposed order
 36 public hearing, the Department provided Council electronic access to a complete set of
 37 comments, which was again updated on February 25, 2019 based on all comments received
 38 through the close of the draft proposed order public hearing (which occurred at 11:51 a.m. on

⁹ SRWAMD4. Draft Proposed Order Public Comments FOCG. 2019-02-22. On the record of the draft proposed

1 February 22, 2019), as posted to its project website. All comments received on the record of the
 2 DPO were transmitted to Council.¹⁰

3
 4 The comments related, in pertinent part, to issues including: (1) the “need” for the deadline
 5 extension; (2) reliance on outdated habitat and species surveys; (3) using best available science
 6 (technologies) to evaluate and mitigate potential impacts to (avian) species; (4) legitimacy of
 7 Department’s actions due to pending Oregon Supreme Court review of amendment rules; (5)
 8 significance of wind turbine visibility to the Deschutes River; (6) division 27 procedural rules; (7)
 9 water use; (8) weed management; (9) Wasco County land use zoning ordinances. These issues are
 10 discussed within this proposed order.

11
 12 *Proposed Order*

13
 14 The Department issued its initial proposed order on April 2, 2019, taking into consideration
 15 Council comments, any comments received “on the record of the public hearing” (i.e., oral
 16 testimony provided at the public hearing and written comments received by the Department
 17 after the date of the notice of the public hearing and before the close of the public hearing
 18 comment period, including comments submitted on the record of the DPO), including any
 19 comments from reviewing agencies, special advisory groups, and Tribal Governments. Concurrent
 20 with the issuance of the April 2, 2019 proposed order, the Department also issued a Notice of
 21 Opportunity to Request a Contested Case and a public notice of the proposed order.¹¹

22
 23 *Contested Case Requests on Proposed Order*

24
 25 Only those persons who commented on the record of the draft proposed order were eligible to
 26 request a contested case proceeding on the proposed order. The opportunity to request a
 27 contested case on the proposed order extended from April 2 through May 2, 2019. The following
 28 three individuals or groups requested Council grant a contested case to evaluate specific issues
 29 on the proposed order: 1) a group of five organizations, jointly: Friends of the Columbia Gorge,
 30 Oregon Wild, Oregon Natural Desert Association, Central Oregon LandWatch, and the East
 31 Cascades Audubon Society (Friends); 2) Irene Gilbert, as an individual and also representing
 32 Friends of the Grande Ronde Valley (Gilbert); and Fuji and Jim Kreider.

33
 34 A summary of issues raised in the three requests for contested case received is provided below.
 35 The analysis and Council decision denying the requests for a contested case proceeding are
 36 provided in the July 2019 Order on Requests for Contested Case on the Proposed Order on
 37 Request for Amendment 4 of the Summit Ridge Wind Farm Site Certificate (July Order on
 38 Requests).

39

order, Friends of the Columbia Gorge note that all comments received on the record must be considered by the
 Council as required by OAR 345-027-0367 and OAR 345-027-0371.

¹¹ See OAR 345-027-0371.

1 If the Council does not issue an order in response to a petition for reconsideration, per OAR 345-
 2 001-0080(4) and ORS 183.484(2), the petition for reconsideration shall be deemed denied the
 3 60th day following the date the petition was filed, and in such case, a petition for judicial review
 4 shall be filed within 60 days only following such date.

5
 6 *Amended Proposed Order*

7
 8 During review of issues raised in requests for a contested case proceeding on the proposed order,
 9 while Council denied a contested case proceeding, as allowed under OAR 345-027-0371(10)(b),
 10 Council found that two issues could be could be settled in a manner satisfactory to the Council
 11 with amendments to the proposed order, including modifications to conditions.

12 Council directed the Department to amend Condition 10.7, which as previously imposed required
 13 that the certificate holder submit to the Department and ODFW a pre-construction habitat
 14 assessment based on field surveys conducted in accordance with an ODFW-approved protocol.
 15 Council directed the Department to amend the condition to require that the pre-construction
 16 habitat survey include all area within the micrositing corridor, or site boundary, not including
 17 lands actively used for agricultural activities. Council also directed the Department to amend
 18 Condition 10.7 requiring that the field survey report be posted to the Department's website and
 19 be presented by the Department and ODFW to Council at a future Council meeting.

20
 21 Council directed the Department to amend Condition 10.5, which as previously imposed required
 22 that, prior to construction, the certificate holder finalize and obtain approval from the
 23 Department in consultation with ODFW, of a Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WMMP), to
 24 be implemented during operation. Council directed the Department to amend Condition 10.5 to
 25 require consultation with ODFW to review the results of the two-year post construction bird and
 26 bat fatality monitoring study; require mitigation if the results show exceedances of thresholds of
 27 concern in the WMMP; require Department staff and ODFW staff to present the results of the
 28 fatality monitoring study and consultation outcomes to Council. Finally, Council directed the
 29 Department to amend condition 10.4 to provide clarity that the habitat assessment conducted at
 30 the habitat mitigation sites be field-based (rather than a desk-top analysis).

31
 32 The Department issued its Amended Proposed Order on RFA4 on July 3, 2019, including changes
 33 to findings and conditions imposed under the Council's Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Threatened
 34 and Endangered (T&E) Species standards (Conditions 10.4, 10.5 and 10.7) as directed by Council
 35 during its May 16-17, 2019 Council meeting based on its review of the three requests for
 36 contested case received on the Department's April 2, 2019 Proposed Order on RFA4. On the
 37 same day, the Department issued Notice of the Amended Proposed Order and Notice of an
 38 Opportunity Request a Contested Case Proceeding on the Amended Proposed Order in
 39 accordance with OAR 345-027-0071(10)(b), specifying August 5, 2019 as the deadline for requests
 40 for a contested case on the material changes presented in the Amended Proposed Order.

41
 42 *Contested Case Requests on Amended Proposed Order*

1 extend the construction commencement deadline from 2018 until 2020. As approved, RFA4
 2 results in a construction extension of 6 years, with the construction commencement deadline
 3 representing 9 years in duration from the issuance of the initial site certificate.

4
 5 OAR 345-028-0385(5) addresses energy facilities such as Summit Ridge that were issued a site
 6 certificate by Council prior to October 24, 2017. Under OAR 345-027-0385(5), there is no
 7 specified maximum allowable number of time extensions that can be authorized by Council, but
 8 each extension can be no more than two years from the deadline in effect before Council grants
 9 the amendment.¹⁸ The Council notes that while there is no maximum allowable time extension
 10 for the Summit Ridge facility, given that the current RFA 4 would result in a construction
 11 commencement extension of a total of 6 years, the extension request would allow a timeline to
 12 construct the facility consistent with what would be available to a site certificate holder for an
 13 energy facility approved after the Council's amendment rules took effect, October 24, 2017 (OAR
 14 345-027-0385(3) and (4)).

15
 16 *Site Certificate Expiration [OAR 345-027-0313]*

17
 18 Under OAR 345-027-0313, in order to avoid expiration of the site certificate, the certificate holder
 19 must begin construction of the facility no later than the construction beginning date specified in
 20 the site certificate, unless expiration of the site certificate is suspended pending final action by
 21 the Council on a request for amendment to a site certificate pursuant to OAR 345-027-0385(2).
 22 The certificate holder submitted the request to extend the construction commencement and
 23 completion deadlines before the applicable construction deadlines and therefore satisfies the
 24 requirements of OAR 345-027-0385(1).

25
 26 OAR 345-027-0385(5) authorizes Council to grant construction commencement and completion
 27 deadline extensions of up to two years from the deadlines in effect prior to the Council's decision
 28 on the amendment.¹⁹ In RFA4, the certificate holder requests to amend Conditions 4.1 and 4.2 to
 29 extend its construction commencement and completion deadlines by two years, the maximum
 30 extension allowed by rule.

31
 32 Council approves the construction commencement and completion deadline extension request
 33 and imposes the following amended site certificate conditions:

34
 35 **Amended Condition 4.1:** The certificate holder shall begin construction of the facility by
 36 August 19, 2020. The Council may grant an extension of the deadline to begin construction in
 37 accordance with OAR 345-027-0385 or any successor rule in effect at the time the request for
 38 extension is submitted.

¹⁸ SRWAMD4. In a request for contested case on the proposed order, Friends et al raised issues related to the certificate holders' ability to properly explain the need for the construction deadline extension request, which is evaluated in the Council's July 9, 2019 Order on Requests for Contested Case on the Proposed Order for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm Site Certificate (July Order on Requests).

¹⁹ OAR 345-027-0385(5) is specific to facility site certificates approved prior to October 24, 2017.

**INDEX TO EXCERPT OF RECORD
FOR PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF**

Rec. Page Nos.	Date	Description of Document	ER Page Nos.
Rec. 4-73	8/22/2019	EFSC Temporary Administrative Order No. EFSC 9-2019	ER-1- ER-70
Tr. 1-38	8/22/2019	Transcript of August 2019 EFSC Meeting, Agenda Item C: Site Certificate Amendment Process Rulemaking	ER-71- ER-108
Rec. Ex. A9	8/20/2019	Memorandum to EFSC from Christopher M. Clark, EFSC Rules Coordinator	ER-109- ER-110

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

BEV CLARNO
SECRETARY OF STATEA. RICHARD VIAL
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE

ARCHIVES DIVISION

STEPHANIE CLARK
INTERIM DIRECTOR800 SUMMER STREET NE
SALEM, OR 97310
503-373-0701**TEMPORARY ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER**
INCLUDING STATEMENT OF NEED & JUSTIFICATION**EFSC 9-2019**CHAPTER 345
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL**FILED**08/22/2019 5:53 PM
ARCHIVES DIVISION
SECRETARY OF STATE
& LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

FILING CAPTION: Temporary rules governing the process for amending energy facility site certificates.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 08/22/2019 THROUGH 02/17/2020

AGENCY APPROVED DATE: 08/22/2019

CONTACT: Christopher Clark

550 Capitol St. NE

503-373-1033

Salem, OR 97301

EFSC.Rulemaking@oregon.gov

Filed By:

Christopher Clark

Rules Coordinator

NEED FOR THE RULE(S):

Given the Oregon Supreme Court's August 1, 2019 decision in Friends of the Columbia River Gorge v. EFSC, S065478, the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council ("EFSC" or the "Council") needs to adopt temporary rules governing the process for amending energy facility site certificates in order to ensure that the Oregon Department of Energy ("ODOE") and the Council may process pending applications for site certificate amendments without prejudice to the certificate holders that submitted those applications and to provide regulatory certainty and continuity in the processing of new applications for site certificate amendments.

JUSTIFICATION OF TEMPORARY FILING:

(1) Specific consequences that would result from the failure to immediately adopt, temporary rules.

In October 2017, the Council amended its administrative rules relating to the procedures for the amendment of site certificates. Those rules were challenged in the Oregon Supreme Court by the Friends of the Columbia River Gorge (Friends) and other groups. On August 1, 2019, the Supreme Court issued a decision declaring that the rules are invalid. That decision will become legally effective on the date that the appellate judgment issues; that future date is unknown, but could occur as soon as August 22, 2019. Because the Council repealed its previous rules for the amendment of site certificates, the invalidation of the October 2017 rules could result in there being no rules in place to allow for amendment of a site certificate. As a result, there is confusion among interested parties as to how applications that are already pending should be processed, and what, if any, rules will be in effect when the appellate judgment issues.

While the current rules are legally operative until the entry of the appellate judgment, EFSC will respect the decision of the court even before the appellate judgment issues. The petitioners in the court case have taken the position that, following the Supreme Court ruling invalidating the current rules, the pre-October 2017 rules are in effect and certificate holders that had applied for amendments under the now invalidated rules must reapply for amendments under the pre-October 2017 rules. However, when Council adopted the amendment rules in October 2017, it also

repealed OAR 345-027-0070 (the rule that had previously governed the process for site certificate amendments) in Order EFSC 5-2017. Given the Council's prior repeal of the pre-October 2017 amendment rule, if the Council does not take any action now, upon the Supreme Court's entry of the appellate judgment, it is possible that there will be no rules in place governing site certificate amendments whatsoever. Therefore, certificate holders have questions and significant concerns regarding how the Council will proceed with pending requests for amendment, and ODOE is uncertain how to process any new requests that it may receive. Further, even if Council assumed that the pre-October 2017 rules are effective, it would be unfair and substantially prejudicial to require certificate holders who have pending applications for site certificate amendments to resubmit their requests for amendment under the pre-October 2017 rules and restart the entire amendment process.

The specific consequences for each of the six pending amendment requests, as well as amendment requests that may be filed before permanent rules are adopted, are more specifically set forth in the discussion below.

(2) Who would suffer these consequences.

The consequences of the uncertainty will fall on the public, the applicants, the agency, and on participants in the site certificate amendment process, as further discussed below.

(3) Why or how failure to immediately take rulemaking action would cause these consequences.

If no action is taken, the Council may be unable to process requests for amendment until permanent rules are adopted or, at best, the amendment rules would revert to the version that was in effect prior to October 24, 2017 and Council would need to require all certificate holders with pending applications for site certificate amendments to resubmit their requests under the pre-October 2017 rules, causing those certificate holders to suffer serious prejudice.

(4) How the temporary action will avoid or mitigate those consequences.

The adoption of temporary rules will allow the orderly processing of amendment requests, including requests in progress, by allowing those amendments to be addressed under the temporary rules without requiring the certificate holder to reapply for an amendment and restart the amendment process. The temporary rules will also remove particular provisions regarding judicial review that the Supreme Court held were not within the Council's statutory authority.

Statement of Findings that failure to act promptly will result in serious prejudice to the interest of parties concerned:

There are currently six site certificate amendment requests in process with the Council. (Although not directly relevant to the Council's adopting temporary rules, it bears noting that each of these requests has been proceeding under the Type A amendment process, which does not implicate the legal concerns regarding judicial review of Type B

amendments identified in the Supreme Court decision).

If it does not adopt temporary rules governing the process for reviewing and taking action on those amendment requests, in order to process those requests Council would have to assume that the pre-October 2017 amendment rules are in effect (which is a legally questionable position) and require those six certificate holders to resubmit their requests for amendment under the pre-October 2017 rules, thus restarting the amendment process under those rules. As discussed further below, pursuing this course of action would cause serious prejudice to the interests of those certificate holders.

Additionally, if it does not adopt temporary rules, as new amendment requests are submitted, Council would also have to process them under the pre-October 2017 amendment rules (the legality of which is uncertain) or refuse to process such requests until it has an opportunity to adopt new permanent amendment rules. Were Council to begin processing new amendment applications under the pre-October 2017 rules, Council would have to determine how to handle those applications once new permanent amendment rules are adopted.

In addition to the findings above, the Council makes the following findings with regard to each of the six projects currently under review by the Council:

Summit Ridge Wind Farm

On August 16, 2018, the holder of the site certificate submitted a request for amendment to extend the construction start and end deadlines by two years. The certificate holder responded to a number of requests for additional information, and on January 16, 2019, ODOE issued a draft proposed order (DPO) under the Type B amendment process. After issuance of the DPO, the certificate holder voluntarily requested to use the Type A process. ODOE issued a new DPO in accordance with the Type A amendment process on February 1. The Council heard testimony on the proposal on February 22, 2019, and a written comment period was also open until the close of the public hearing on February 22, 2019, and ODOE prepared a Proposed Order (PO) and contested case notice, released on April 2, 2019. Three requests for contested case were received, which were evaluated by the Council at its May 17, 2019 meeting. Council directed ODOE to prepare an amended PO addressing issues raised in the contested case requests. ODOE prepared an amended PO and contested case notice, released on July 3, 2019, and two contested case requests were filed on August 5, 2019. At the August Council meeting, Council is scheduled to consider the contested case requests, and if contested case requests are denied, Council will also consider the amended PO.

The certificate holder advises, and the Council finds, that if, as the result of the Supreme Court opinion, the certificate holder were forced to start the site certificate amendment process anew, it would result in serious prejudice to the interests of the certificate holder because it will have lost a year of time and the significant financial expenditures made on the amendment to date. (See August 12, 2019 letter from counsel for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm certificate holder). The certificate holder advises, and the Council finds, that if the certificate holder were forced to reapply for an amendment (or is otherwise subject to substantial delay), it would result in serious prejudice to the interests of the certificate holder because processing the request anew under the pre-October 2017 amendment rules would likely result in a final decision on the request for amendment being pushed well into 2020. The delay would likely impact the

certificate holder's ability to retain construction contractors, procure equipment, and market the power to be produced.

Further, petitioners in the lawsuit have taken the position that as a result of the Supreme Court's decision, the permission to construct the Summit Ridge Wind Farm has expired and if the certificate holder still desires to pursue the project it must file an application for a new site certificate – "effectively starting the permitting process over from scratch." (See August 1, 2019 Friends of the Columbia River Gorge press release). Under such circumstances, the entire facility may then be in jeopardy, causing serious prejudice to the certificate holder.

The Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the Summit Ridge Wind Farm certificate holder. The Council finds that this prejudice presents a separate and independent basis for the need to adopt temporary rules for the amendment of site certificates.

Perennial Wind Chaser Station

The certificate holder submitted a request to extend the deadlines for starting and completing construction on August 2, 2018. On July 8, 2019, ODOE issued a DPO on the project and initiated a public comment period, which extends through the close of a public hearing scheduled for August 22, 2019.

The Council finds that Perennial will be seriously prejudiced if it were to have to resubmit an amendment request because the certificate holder will have lost at least a year of time and financial resources invested. If Perennial were to proceed under the rules in effect prior to October 2017, the DPO already issued, the public comment period currently running, and the public hearing scheduled for August 22 would all be set aside to ensure compliance with the procedures required under the earlier rules. Perennial contends (See August 12, 2019 letter from Perennial Power Holdings, Inc.) and the Council finds that Perennial would be harmed and seriously prejudiced by the delay.

Further, petitioners in the lawsuit have taken the position that as a result of the Supreme Court's decision, the permission to construct the Perennial Wind Chaser facility has expired and if the certificate holder still desires to pursue the project it must file applications for new site certificates – "effectively starting the permitting process over from scratch." (See August 1, 2019 Friends of the Columbia River Gorge press release). Under such circumstances, the entire facility may then be in jeopardy.

The Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the Perennial Wind Chaser Station certificate holder. The Council finds that this prejudice alone presents a separate and independent basis for the need to adopt temporary rules for the amendment of site certificates.

Council further finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the public and in particular those who have or intend to submit comments regarding the requested amendment to the Perennial Wind Chaser Station site certificate, by having their concerns set aside and deferred.

Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility

The certificate holder submitted a request for amendment to the site certificate on November 30, 2018, seeking a number of amendments to the original certificate. The certificate holder responded to a number of requests for information from ODOE, and its application was deemed complete on July 1, 2019. ODOE issued a DPO on July 25, and the Council is scheduled to hold a public hearing on August 22, 2019. A written comment period is open until September 9, 2019.

Like other applicants, Wheatridge will lose significant time and financial resources already expended if forced to start the amendment process again. The approval process would likely extend well into 2020. The certificate holder advises (See August 9, 2019 letter from counsel or Wheatridge Wind Energy LLC), and the Council finds that, if required to start the amendment process again, the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility certificate holder would be in jeopardy of not meeting contractual obligations to begin construction of certain components of the facility in 2021.

The Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility certificate holder. The Council finds that this prejudice alone presents a separate and independent basis for the need to adopt temporary rules for the amendment of site certificates.

Council further finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the public and in particular those who have or intend to submit comments regarding the requested amendment to the Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility site certificate, by having their concerns set aside and deferred.

Port Westward Generating Project

The certificate holder, Portland General Electric, submitted a request for amendment to the site certificate on April 23, 2019 requesting Council approval to amend the site certificate in order to construct and operate a battery energy storage facility adjacent to the existing power generating station. The certificate holder did not request Type B review, although the amendment is considered by PGE to be minor, and the request is being processed as a Type A amendment. Before the Supreme Court decision was issued, ODOE informed the certificate holder that the amendment request was complete on July 17, 2019, and that ODOE intended to issue a DPO on or before August 30. Assuming that to be the case, the certificate holder expects that a final order could issue as soon as November 2019. The certificate holder has stated, and the Council finds, that any delay would have serious implications for the certificate holder, in that HB 2193 (2015) requires electric companies like the certificate holder to invest in energy storage projects and to have a contract to procure 5 MWh of energy storage executed by January 1, 2020. (See August 13, 2019 letter from Portland General Electric).

If the certificate holder were required to start a new amendment request, the best case scenario would be that a final order could issue in early 2020. The certificate holder might then be required to enter into the energy storage contract without knowing fully what conditions might be imposed on any amendment that is approved, or could be forced to

meet the statutory requirement with a different project not requiring council approval; until bids are received, it is unknown if another project might meet the statutory mandate. (See August 13, 2019 letter from Portland General Electric). Adoption of temporary rules allowing for the continued processing of the current request for amendment would likely eliminate these uncertainties.

For the foregoing reasons, the Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of Portland General Electric – the Port Westward Generating Project certificate holder. The Council finds that this prejudice alone presents a separate and independent basis for the need to adopt temporary rules for the amendment of site certificates.

The Council further finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will also result in serious prejudice to the interests of the public and in particular those who have submitted comments regarding the requested amendment by having their concerns set aside and deferred.

Montague Wind Power Facility

The certificate holder filed a request for amendment on January 9, 2018. Throughout 2018, the certificate holder responded to a number of requests for information from ODOE, and the certificate holder also changed certain details regarding the facility design. The department deemed the request for amendment complete on April 4, 2019. A DPO was issued on April 5, 2019. A public hearing was held in front of Council on May 16, 2019. On July 9, 2019, ODOE issued a PO and contested case notice. No requests for contested case were made. The Council is scheduled to consider the PO at its August 22-23, 2019 meeting. Because this request is at the final decision stage, requiring Montague to file a new request at a later date, after permanent rulemaking was completed, would result in the complete loss of the time and financial resources expended on this request, as well as the efforts of ODOE staff and members of the public who may have reviewed. Further, as the certificate holder has pointed out, regulatory uncertainty regarding the current status of the amendment rules can pose increased risk for project financing, contract obligations, and investor relations. (See August 13, 2019 letter from Avangrid Renewables).

The Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the Montague Wind Power Facility certificate holder. The Council finds that this prejudice alone presents a separate and independent basis for the need to adopt temporary rules for the amendment of site certificates.

The Council further finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the public and in particular those who have or intend to submit comments regarding the requested amendment to the Montague Wind Power Facility site certificate, by having their concerns set aside and deferred.

Other Facilities

If a certificate holder were to apply for an amendment to a site certificate at this time, it is not clear what, if any, rules

would govern the Department and Council's review of that request.

The Supreme Court's decision concludes "The rules approved by the Energy Facility Siting Council through Permanent Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017 are invalid." It does not state, for example, that "all actions taken" by EFSC under those Administrative Orders are invalid. Therefore, given that EFSC 5-2017 repealed OAR 345-027-0070 (the rule that had previously governed the process for site certificate amendments) if Council does not take action, upon the Court's issuing an appellate judgment it is possible that there will be no rules in place governing site certificate amendments. At best, the amendment rules would revert to the version that was in effect prior to October 24, 2017. It is necessary to take immediate action to resolve this situation, not only to avoid serious prejudice to certificate holders with pending requests for amendments, but also to provide regulatory certainty to certificate holders seeking new site certificate amendments regarding what rules apply. Adopting the temporary rules will provide certainty that the temporary rules govern the amendment process until the Council can adopt new permanent rules. Further, adopting the temporary rules may also improve the prospects for continuity in the processing of applications for site certificate amendments once the permanent rules are adopted, as the new permanent rules are likely to be more similar to the temporary rules than the pre-October 2017 amendment rules.

In addition, the rules adopted on October 24, 2017 contained provisions allowing for streamlined review of requests for amendment under the Type B process. A primary focus of the challenge to the rules was the Council's authority to enact these provisions. The opinion of the Supreme Court confirmed the Council's authority to develop the amendment process "largely as [Council] sees fit", which includes processing amendments under the Type B review. The Council finds that failure to promptly adopt these temporary rules, which will continue to allow for the possibility of a Type B review, would impose unnecessary delays and costs to certificate holders seeking site certificate amendments that qualify for Type B review under the rules. This would run contrary to the public interest in the development of important energy facilities and to the interests of certificate holders that may need to amend existing certificates. The Council finds that failure to act promptly by adopting these temporary rules will result in serious prejudice to the interests of the public in the orderly processing of requests for amendment of site certificates and serious prejudice to the interests of certificate holders of site certificates that may require amendment.

DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON, AND WHERE THEY ARE AVAILABLE:

The following documents were relied upon in development of rules and the Statements of Need and Justification:

August 12, 2019 letter from counsel for the Summit Ridge Wind Farm certificate holder
 August 1, 2019 Friends of the Columbia River Gorge press release
 August 12, 2019 letter from Perennial Power Holdings, Inc.
 August 9, 2019 letter from counsel of Wheatridge Wind Energy LLC
 August 13, 2019 letter from Portland General Electric
 August 13, 2019 letter from Avangrid Renewables
 EFSC 5-2017

All documents are available from the Oregon Department of Energy upon request, and may be accessed at:
<https://www.oregon.gov/energy/Get-Involved/Pages/Energy-Facility-Siting-Council-Rulemaking.aspx>

RULES:

345-015-0014, 345-015-0016, 345-015-0080, 345-015-0083, 345-025-0006, 345-025-0010, 345-025-0016, 345-027-0011, 345-027-0013, 345-027-0050, 345-027-0051, 345-027-0053, 345-027-0055, 345-027-0057, 345-027-0059, 345-027-0060, 345-027-0063, 345-027-0065, 345-027-0067, 345-027-0068, 345-027-0071, 345-027-0072, 345-027-0075, 345-027-0080, 345-027-0085, 345-027-0090, 345-027-0100, 345-027-0311, 345-027-0313, 345-027-0350, 345-027-0351, 345-027-0353, 345-027-0355, 345-027-0357, 345-027-0359, 345-027-0360, 345-027-0363, 345-027-0365, 345-027-0367, 345-027-0368, 345-027-0371, 345-027-0372, 345-027-0375, 345-027-0380, 345-027-0385, 345-027-0390, 345-027-0400

AMEND: 345-015-0014

RULE SUMMARY: States how and to whom the Department sends notice of a contested case. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-015-0014

Contested Case Notices ¶¶

(1) The Department shall issue notices for Council contested case proceedings as provided in OAR 137-003-0001.¶¶

(a) Contested case notices regarding proposed orders for site certificate applications shall include:¶¶

(A) A date by which persons must request party or limited party status.¶¶

(B) The date of the pre-hearing conference.¶¶

(C) The time and place of the hearing.¶¶

(b) Contested case notices regarding proposed orders for site certificate amendments shall include:¶¶

(A) The date of the pre-hearing conference.¶¶

(B) The time and place of the hearing.¶¶

(C) The issues and the parties the Council identified for the contested case as described in OAR 345-027-0071.¶¶

(2) In addition to the requirements of section (1), for a contested case notice on a proposed order as described in OAR 345-015-0230 or following a Council decision to grant a contested case hearing under 345-015-0310, the Department shall include in the notice a statement that participation as a party or limited party in the contested case proceeding and the opportunity to raise any issue are subject to the limitations described in OAR 345-015-0016.¶¶

(3) The Department shall send a contested case notice by registered or certified mail to the following persons:¶¶

(a) For a contested case notice on a proposed order as described in OAR 345-015-0230, to the applicant and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in 345-015-0220.¶¶

(b) Following the Council's decision to grant a contested case proceeding on a proposed order on an application for a site certificate for a special criteria facility, to the applicant and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing on the proposed order described in OAR 345-015-0320.¶¶

(c) Following a Council decision to grant a contested case proceeding on a proposed site certificate amendment under OAR 345-027-0071 or 345-027-0090, to the certificate holder and to the parties the Council granted contested case party status to.¶¶

(d) For Council contested case proceedings described under OAR 345-029-0070, 345-029-0100 or 345-060-0004, to persons who have an interest or represent a public interest in the outcome of the proceeding.¶¶

(4) The Department shall request that the applicant notify the hearing officer and the Department, by the date described in subsection (1)(a), of any issues the applicant desires to raise in the contested case proceedings described in subsections (3)(a) and (b).

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.373, 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.085, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615, 469.992

AMEND: 345-015-0016

RULE SUMMARY: States who is eligible to request party status to a contested case on an application for a site certificate and the process by which those requests must be made. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-015-0016

Requests for Party or Limited Party Status in Contested Cases on Applications for a Site Certificate ¶

(1) Notwithstanding OAR 137-003-0005(2), a person requesting to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding shall submit a petition to the hearing officer by the date specified in the Department of Energy's contested case notice issued under OAR 345-015-0014.¶

(2) Persons who have an interest in the outcome of the Council's contested case proceeding or who represent a public interest in such result may request to participate as parties or limited parties.¶

(3) Except as described in section (4), only those persons who have commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-015-0220 may request to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding on an application for a site certificate. To raise an issue in a contested case proceeding, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing, unless the Department of Energy did not follow the requirements of ORS 469.370(2) or (3) or unless the action recommended in the proposed order described in OAR 345-015-230, including any recommended conditions of approval, differs materially from the action recommended in the draft proposed order, in which case the person may raise only new issues within the jurisdiction of the Council that are related to such differences. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the hearing officer shall not consider the issue in the contested case proceeding. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support the person's position on the issue.¶

(4) Following a Council decision to grant a contested case hearing under OAR 345-015-0310, only those persons who have commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in 345-015-0320 may request to participate as a party or limited party in a contested case proceeding on an application for a site certificate. To raise an issue in a contested case proceeding, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the hearing officer shall not consider the issue in the contested case proceeding. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support the person's position on the issue.¶

(5) In a petition to request party or limited party status, the person requesting such status shall include:¶

(a) The information required under OAR 137-003-0005(3).¶

(b) A short and plain statement of the issue or issues that the person desires to raise in the contested case proceeding.¶

(c) A reference to the person's comments at the public hearing showing that the person raised the issue or issues at the public hearing.¶

(d) A detailed description of the person's interest in the contested case proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding.¶

(6) The hearing officer's determination on a request to participate as a party or limited party is final unless the requesting person submits an appeal to the Council within seven days after the date of service of the hearing officer's determination.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.373, 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615, 469.992

AMEND: 345-015-0080

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which any state or local government agency may request to participate in a contested case. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-015-0080

Participation by Government Agencies ¶

(1) Any state or local government agency other than the Department of Energy may request participation in a contested case as a party, limited party or interested agency, subject to the limitations described in OAR 345-015-0016. For a contested case on a site certificate application, the agency shall submit the request to the hearing officer in writing by the date specified in the Department of Energy's contested case notice issued under 345-015-0014. For a contested case on a site certificate amendment, the agency shall submit the request to the Department by the date specified in the notice of the opportunity to request a contested case issued under OAR 345-027-0071.¶

(2) The Department of Energy shall participate in all contested case proceedings conducted by the Council and shall have all the rights of a party.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615, 469.992

AMEND: 345-015-0083

RULE SUMMARY: States the purpose and requirements of the prehearing conference and prehearing order related to contested cases. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-015-0083

Prehearing Conference and Prehearing Order ¶¶

(1) The hearing officer may cancel or reschedule any previously noticed prehearing conference.¶¶

(2) The hearing officer may conduct one or more prehearing conferences for the purposes and in the manner described in OAR 137-003-0035. At the conclusion of the conference(s), the hearing officer shall issue a prehearing order stating the issues to be addressed in the contested case hearing and, in a contested case on an application for a site certificate, limiting parties to those issues they raised on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-015-0220. The hearing officer shall not receive evidence or hear legal argument on issues not identified in the prehearing order.¶¶

(3) Failure to raise an issue in the prehearing conference(s) for the contested case hearing on an application for a site certificate constitutes a waiver of that issue.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 183.415, 469.370, 469.405, 469.440, 469.605, 469.615, 469.992

AMEND: 345-025-0006

RULE SUMMARY: Provides conditions to be included in every site certificate. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-025-0006

Mandatory Conditions in Site Certificates ¶

The Council shall impose the following conditions in every site certificate. The Council may impose additional conditions.¶

(1) The Council shall not change the conditions of the site certificate except as provided for in OAR chapter 345, division 27.¶

(2) The certificate holder shall submit a legal description of the site to the Department of Energy within 90 days after beginning operation of the facility. The legal description required by this rule means a description of metes and bounds or a description of the site by reference to a map and geographic data that clearly and specifically identify the outer boundaries that contain all parts of the facility.¶

(3) The certificate holder shall design, construct, operate and retire the facility:¶

(a) Substantially as described in the site certificate;¶

(b) In compliance with the requirements of ORS Chapter 469, applicable Council rules, and applicable state and local laws, rules and ordinances in effect at the time the site certificate is issued; and¶

(c) In compliance with all applicable permit requirements of other state agencies.¶

(4) The certificate holder shall begin and complete construction of the facility by the dates specified in the site certificate.¶

(5) Except as necessary for the initial survey or as otherwise allowed for wind energy facilities, transmission lines or pipelines under this section, the certificate holder shall not begin construction, as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, or create a clearing on any part of the site until the certificate holder has construction rights on all parts of the site. For the purpose of this rule, "construction rights" means the legal right to engage in construction activities. For wind energy facilities, transmission lines or pipelines, if the certificate holder does not have construction rights on all parts of the site, the certificate holder may nevertheless begin construction, as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, or create a clearing on a part of the site if the certificate holder has construction rights on that part of the site and:¶

(a) The certificate holder would construct and operate part of the facility on that part of the site even if a change in the planned route of a transmission line or pipeline occurs during the certificate holder's negotiations to acquire construction rights on another part of the site; or¶

(b) The certificate holder would construct and operate part of a wind energy facility on that part of the site even if other parts of the facility were modified by amendment of the site certificate or were not built.¶

(6) If the certificate holder becomes aware of a significant environmental change or impact attributable to the facility, the certificate holder shall, as soon as possible, submit a written report to the Department describing the impact on the facility and any affected site certificate conditions.¶

(7) The certificate holder shall prevent the development of any conditions on the site that would preclude restoration of the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition to the extent that prevention of such site conditions is within the control of the certificate holder.¶

(8) Before beginning construction of the facility, the certificate holder shall submit to the State of Oregon, through the Council, a bond or letter of credit in a form and amount satisfactory to the Council to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition. The certificate holder shall maintain a bond or letter of credit in effect at all times until the facility has been retired. The Council may specify different amounts for the bond or letter of credit during construction and during operation of the facility.¶

(9) The certificate holder shall retire the facility if the certificate holder permanently ceases construction or operation of the facility. The certificate holder shall retire the facility according to a final retirement plan

approved by the Council, as described in OAR 345-027-0110. The certificate holder shall pay the actual cost to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition at the time of retirement, notwithstanding the Council's approval in the site certificate of an estimated amount required to restore the site.¶

(10) The Council shall include as conditions in the site certificate all representations in the site certificate application and supporting record the Council deems to be binding commitments made by the applicant.¶

(11) Upon completion of construction, the certificate holder shall restore vegetation to the extent practicable and shall landscape all areas disturbed by construction in a manner compatible with the surroundings and proposed use. Upon completion of construction, the certificate holder shall remove all temporary structures not required for facility operation and dispose of all timber, brush, refuse and flammable or combustible material resulting from clearing of land and construction of the facility.¶

(12) The certificate holder shall design, engineer and construct the facility to avoid dangers to human safety and the environment presented by seismic hazards affecting the site that are expected to result from all maximum probable seismic events. As used in this rule "seismic hazard" includes ground shaking, ground failure, landslide, liquefaction triggering and consequences (including flow failure, settlement buoyancy, and lateral spreading), cyclic softening of clays and silts, fault rupture, directivity effects and soil-structure interaction. For coastal sites, this also includes tsunami hazards and seismically-induced coastal subsidence.¶

(13) The certificate holder shall notify the Department, the State Building Codes Division and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries promptly if site investigations or trenching reveal that conditions in the foundation rocks differ significantly from those described in the application for a site certificate. After the Department receives the notice, the Council may require the certificate holder to consult with the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries and the Building Codes Division to propose and implement corrective or mitigation actions.¶

(14) The certificate holder shall notify the Department, the State Building Codes Division and the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries promptly if shear zones, artesian aquifers, deformations or clastic dikes are found at or in the vicinity of the site. After the Department receives notice, the Council may require the certificate holder to consult with the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries and the Building Codes Division to propose and implement corrective or mitigation actions.¶

(15) Before any transfer of ownership of the facility or ownership of the site certificate holder, the certificate holder shall inform the Department of the proposed new owners. The requirements of OAR 345-027-0100 apply to any transfer of ownership that requires a transfer of the site certificate.¶

(16) If the Council finds that the certificate holder has permanently ceased construction or operation of the facility without retiring the facility according to a final retirement plan approved by the Council, as described in OAR 345-027-0110, the Council shall notify the certificate holder and request that the certificate holder submit a proposed final retirement plan to the Office within a reasonable time not to exceed 90 days. If the certificate holder does not submit a proposed final retirement plan by the specified date, the Council may direct the Department to prepare a proposed final retirement plan for the Council's approval. Upon the Council's approval of the final retirement plan, the Council may draw on the bond or letter of credit described in section (8) to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition according to the final retirement plan, in addition to any penalties the Council may impose under OAR chapter 345, division 29. If the amount of the bond or letter of credit is insufficient to pay the actual cost of retirement, the certificate holder shall pay any additional cost necessary to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition. After completion of site restoration, the Council shall issue an order to terminate the site certificate if the Council finds that the facility has been retired according to the approved final retirement plan.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.501

AMEND: 345-025-0010

RULE SUMMARY: Provides site-specific conditions which may be included in a site certificate. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-025-0010

Site-Specific Conditions ¶¶

The Council may include the following conditions, as appropriate, in the site certificate:¶¶

- (1) If the facility uses coal, the certificate holder shall take all necessary steps to ensure that surface and groundwater are not contaminated by run off or seepage associated with coal or ash storage, transport or disposal. The certificate holder shall handle coal and ash so as to minimize the likelihood of coal dust and ash being windblown and causing an environmental or public health problem. If the certificate holder permanently disposes of ash on the facility site, the certificate holder shall cover the ash with a layer of topsoil and revegetate the area.¶¶
- (2) If the energy facility or related or supporting facility is a natural gas pipeline, the certificate holder shall submit to the Department copies of all incident reports involving the pipeline required under 49 CFR Sec. 191.15.¶¶
- (3) If the facility includes any pipeline under Council jurisdiction:¶¶
 - (a) The certificate holder shall design, construct and operate the pipeline in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation as set forth in Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 192, in effect on August 15, 2011; and¶¶
 - (b) The certificate holder shall develop and implement a program using the best available practicable technology to monitor the proposed pipeline to ensure protection of public health and safety.¶¶
- (4) If the facility includes any transmission line under Council jurisdiction:¶¶
 - (a) The certificate holder shall design, construct and operate the transmission line in accordance with the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the National Electrical Safety Code approved on June 3, 2011, by the American National Standards Institute; and¶¶
 - (b) The certificate holder shall develop and implement a program that provides reasonable assurance that all fences, gates, cattle guards, trailers, or other objects or structures of a permanent nature that could become inadvertently charged with electricity are grounded or bonded throughout the life of the line.¶¶
- (5) If the proposed energy facility is a pipeline or a transmission line or has, as a related or supporting facility, a pipeline or transmission line, the Council shall specify an approved corridor in the site certificate and shall allow the certificate holder to construct the pipeline or transmission line anywhere within the corridor, subject to the conditions of the site certificate. If the applicant has analyzed more than one corridor in its application for a site certificate, the Council may, subject to the Council's standards, approve more than one corridor.¶¶
- (6) If the facility is a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir, the Council shall, in the site certificate, specify the site boundary and total permitted daily throughput of the facility.¶¶
- (7) If the facility is subject to a carbon dioxide emissions standard adopted by the Council or enacted by statute, the Council shall include in the site certificate appropriate conditions as described in OAR 345-024-0550, 345-024-0560, 345-024-0590, 345-024-0600, 345-024-0620, 345-024-0630 and 345-024-0710.¶¶

[Publications: Publications referenced are available from the agency.]

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.501, 469.503

AMEND: 345-025-0016

RULE SUMMARY: Provides procedures related to monitoring and mitigation plans. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-025-0016

Monitoring and Mitigation Conditions ¶

In the site certificate, the Council shall include conditions that address monitoring and mitigation to ensure compliance with the standards contained in OAR Chapter 345, Division 22 and Division 24. The site certificate applicant, or for an amendment, the certificate holder, shall develop proposed monitoring and mitigation plans in consultation with the Department and, as appropriate, other state agencies, local governments and tribes.

Monitoring and mitigation plans are subject to Council approval. The Council shall incorporate approved monitoring and mitigation plans in applicable site certificate conditions.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.501, 469.503, 469.507

SUSPEND: 345-027-0011

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0011~~

~~Applicability ¶~~

~~The rules in this division apply to all facilities under the Council's jurisdiction except those facilities described in ORS 469.410(1), including the Trojan energy facility, and except that rules OAR 345-027-0050 through 345-027-0100 that were in effect prior to October 24, 2017 apply to requests for amendments to site certificates and change requests that have been received by the Department prior to October 24, 2017.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.501~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0013

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0013~~

~~Certificate Expiration ¶~~

~~If the certificate holder does not begin construction of the facility by the construction beginning date specified in the site certificate or amended site certificate, the site certificate expires on the construction beginning date specified, unless expiration of the site certificate is suspended pending final action by the Council on a request for amendment to a site certificate pursuant to OAR 345-027-0085(2).~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.370, 469.501~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0050

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0050~~

~~Changes Requiring an Amendment ¶¶~~

~~Except for changes allowed under OAR 345-027-0053 of this rule, an amendment to a site certificate is required to:¶¶~~

~~(1) Transfer ownership of the facility or the certificate holder as described in OAR 345-027-0100;¶¶~~

~~(2) Apply later-adopted law(s) as described in OAR 345-027-0090;¶¶~~

~~(3) Extend the construction beginning or completion deadline as described in OAR 345-027-0085;¶¶~~

~~(4) Design, construct or operate a facility in a manner different from the description in the site certificate if the proposed change:¶¶~~

~~(a) Could result in a significant adverse impact that the Council has not addressed in an earlier order and the impact affects a resource or interest protected by a Council standard;¶¶~~

~~(b) Could impair the certificate holder's ability to comply with a site certificate condition; or¶¶~~

~~(c) Could require a new condition or a change to a condition in the site certificate.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0051

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0051~~

~~Review Processes for Requests for Amendment~~

~~(1) The transfer review process, described in 345-027-0100, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment to a site certificate to transfer a site certificate.¶~~

~~(2) The type A review process, consisting of rules 345-027-0059, 0060, 0063, 0065, 0067, 0071 and 0075, is the default review process and shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment proposing a change described in 345-027-0050(2), (3), and (4).¶~~

~~(3) The type B review process, consisting of rules 345-027-0059, 0060, 0063, 0065, 0068, 0072, and 0075, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment that the Department or the Council approves for type B review under 345-027-0057.¶~~

~~(4) The type C review process, described in 345-027-0080, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment that the Department or the Council approves for type C review under 345-027-0080.¶~~

~~(5) The Council may act concurrently on any combination of proposed changes included in a request for amendment. Concurrent proposed changes are subject to the substantive requirements applicable to each respective proposed change and the Council shall review all proposed changes through the process with the more procedural steps applicable to any one of the proposed changes.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0053

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0053~~

~~Changes Exempt from Requiring an Amendment~~

~~An amendment to a site certificate is not required if the proposed change in the design, construction or operation of a facility is in substantial compliance with the terms and conditions of the site certificate, and is a change:¶¶~~

- ~~(1) To an electrical generation facility that would increase the electrical generating capacity and would not increase the number of electric generators at the site, change fuel type, increase fuel consumption by more than 10 percent or enlarge the facility site;¶¶~~
- ~~(2) To the number or location of pipelines for a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir that would not result in the facility exceeding permitted daily throughput or a change to the site boundary;¶¶~~
- ~~(3) To the number, size or location of pipelines for a geothermal energy facility that would not result in a change to the site boundary;¶¶~~
- ~~(4) To a pipeline that is a related or supporting facility that delivers natural gas to the energy facility if the change would extend or modify the pipeline or expand the right-of-way, when the change is exclusively to serve gas users other than the energy facility;¶¶~~
- ~~(5) To a transmission line that is a related or supporting facility if the change would extend or modify the transmission line or expand the right-of-way, when the change is exclusively to serve the transmission needs of a separate energy facility or energy user; or¶¶~~
- ~~(6) To construct a pipeline less than 16 inches in diameter and less than five miles in length to test or maintain an underground gas storage reservoir. If the proposed pipeline would connect to a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir for which the Council has issued a site certificate or to a gas pipeline for which the Council has issued a site certificate, the certificate holder must obtain, prior to construction, the approval of the Department of Energy for the construction, operation and retirement of the proposed pipeline. To obtain Department approval, the certificate holder must submit a request as described in OAR 345-027-0210 through OAR 345-027-0240.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0055

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0055~~

~~Written Evaluations for Changes Not Requiring Amendment~~

~~(1) For a proposed change that would add area to the site boundary, see OAR 345-027-0057(1). For a proposed change to the facility that does not include adding area to the site boundary, the certificate holder may evaluate OAR 345-027-0050 and 345-027-0053 and conclude that the proposed change does not require an amendment. If the certificate holder concludes that a proposed change to the facility does not require an amendment to the site certificate, the certificate holder must complete a written evaluation if the change:~~

~~(a) Could be included in and governed by the site certificate, but the certificate holder has concluded the change is not described in 345-027-0050; or~~

~~(b) Is exempt from requiring an amendment under 345-027-0053.~~

~~(2) The written evaluation must explain why an amendment is not required, must be completed before implementing any change, and must be included in the next semiannual construction progress report or the Facility Modification Report required under 345-026-0080. The written evaluation must be retained for the life of the facility.~~

~~(3) The Department of Energy may, at any time, inspect the changes made to the facility and may inspect the certificate holder's written evaluation concluding that the change did not require an amendment.~~

~~(4) When the certificate holder implements a change without an amendment, the Department may initiate an enforcement action as described in Division 29 if the Department determines the change required an amendment to the site certificate.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0057

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0057~~

~~Amendment Determination Request~~

- ~~(1) For a proposed change that would add area to the site boundary, the certificate holder must either:~~
- ~~(a) submit a request for amendment to the Department of Energy; or~~
 - ~~(b) submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of whether the proposed change requires an amendment under OAR 345-027-0050 and is not exempt under 345-027-0053.~~
- ~~(2) For a proposed change that would not add area to the site boundary, the certificate holder may submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of:~~
- ~~(a) whether the proposed change requires an amendment under OAR 345-027-0050; or~~
 - ~~(b) whether the proposed change is exempt from requiring an amendment under 345-027-0053.~~
- ~~(3) For any request for amendment, the certificate holder may submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of whether a request for amendment justifies review under the type B review process described in 345-027-0051(3).~~
- ~~(4) Requests described in section (1), (2), and (3) must be submitted in writing to the Department and must include:~~
- ~~(a) A narrative description of the proposed change;~~
 - ~~(b) Maps and/or geospatial data layers representing the effects and/or location of the proposed change;~~
 - ~~(c) The certificate holder's evaluation of the determination(s) it is requesting under sections (1), (2), and (3); and~~
 - ~~(d) Any additional information the certificate holder believes will assist the Department's evaluation.~~
- ~~(5) After receiving an amendment determination request, the Department shall post an announcement on the Department's website to notify the public that an amendment determination request has been received. The announcement shall include a copy of the amendment determination request.~~
- ~~(6) Upon receiving a request for a written determination described in section (1) and (2), the Department shall, as promptly as possible, issue a written determination to the certificate holder. After the Department issues its written determination, the Department shall, as promptly as possible, provide the request and the written determination to the Council and post the written determination to its website. At the first Council meeting after the Department issues its written determination, the Department shall provide verbal notice of the request and the written determination to the Council during the consent calendar agenda item. The Department may refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification, or rejection. At the request of the certificate holder or a Council member, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection.~~
- ~~(7) Upon receiving a request for a written determination described in section (3), the Department shall, as promptly as possible, issue a written determination to the certificate holder. At the request of the certificate holder, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification, or rejection.~~
- ~~(8) In determining whether a request for amendment justifies review under the type B review process described in 345-027-0051(3), the Department and the Council may consider factors including but not limited to:~~
- ~~(a) The complexity of the proposed change;~~
 - ~~(b) The anticipated level of public interest in the proposed change;~~
 - ~~(c) The anticipated level of interest by reviewing agencies;~~
 - ~~(d) The likelihood of significant adverse impact; and~~
 - ~~(e) The type and amount of mitigation, if any.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0059

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0059~~

~~Pre-Amendment Conference~~

~~(1) Prior to submitting a preliminary request for amendment to the site certificate as described in OAR 345-027-0060, the certificate holder may request a pre-amendment conference with the Department of Energy to discuss the scope, timing, and applicable laws and Council standards associated with the request for amendment.¶~~

~~(2) A pre-amendment conference request must be in writing and must include a description of the proposed change and, if applicable, maps or geospatial data layers representing the location of the proposed change.¶~~

~~(3) Upon receipt of a request as described in section (1), the Department must, as promptly as possible, set a date and time for a pre-amendment conference.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0060

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0060~~

~~Preliminary Request for Amendment ¶¶~~

~~(1) To request an amendment to the site certificate required by OAR 345-027-0050(3) and (4), the certificate holder shall submit a written preliminary request for amendment to the Department of Energy that includes the following: ¶¶~~

~~(a) The name of the facility, the name and mailing address of the certificate holder, and the name, mailing address, email address and phone number of the individual responsible for submitting the request. ¶¶~~

~~(b) A detailed description of the proposed change, including: ¶¶~~

~~(A) a description of how the proposed change affects the facility, ¶¶~~

~~(B) a description of how the proposed change affects those resources or interests protected by applicable laws and Council standards, and ¶¶~~

~~(C) the specific location of the proposed change, and any updated maps and/or geospatial data layers relevant to the proposed change. ¶¶~~

~~(c) References to any specific Division 21 information that may be required for the Department to make its findings. ¶¶~~

~~(d) The specific language of the site certificate, including conditions, that the certificate holder proposes to change, add or delete through the amendment. ¶¶~~

~~(e) A list of the Council standards and all other laws—including statutes, rules and ordinances—applicable to the proposed change, and an analysis of whether the facility, with the proposed change, would comply with these applicable laws and Council standards. For the purpose of this rule, a law or Council standard is "applicable" if the Council would apply or consider the law or Council standard under OAR 345-027-0075(2). ¶¶~~

~~(f) An updated list of the owners of property located within or adjacent to the site of the facility, as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f). ¶¶~~

~~(2) After receiving a preliminary request for amendment, the Department shall post an announcement on its website to notify the public that a preliminary request for amendment has been received. The announcement shall include a copy of the preliminary request for amendment. ¶¶~~

~~(3) For any Council standard that requires evaluation of impacts within an analysis area, the analysis area shall be the larger of either the study area(s) as defined in OAR 345-001-0000(59) or the analysis area(s) described in the project order for the application for site certificate, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Department following a pre-amendment conference. ¶¶~~

~~(4) The certificate holder may incorporate, by specific reference, evidence previously submitted to the Department in the application for site certificate or previous request for amendment, or evidence that is otherwise included in the Department's record on the facility.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0063

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0063

Determination of Completeness for a Request for Amendment

- (1) Until the Department of Energy determines the request for amendment to the site certificate is complete, it is a preliminary request for amendment. After receiving a preliminary request for amendment, the Department may seek comments from reviewing agencies to determine whether that request is complete.¶
- (2) Unless the certificate holder agrees to additional time, within 60 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment under type A review, and within 21 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment under type B review, the Department shall notify the certificate holder whether the request for amendment is complete. In the notification, the Department shall:¶
- (a) State that the request for amendment is complete; or¶
- (b) State that the request for amendment is incomplete and:¶
- (A) Describe any additional information needed to complete the request for amendment to the extent known to the Department at the time of the notification, including identification of applicable laws and Council standards not addressed in the preliminary request for amendment;¶
- (B) Ask the certificate holder to submit the additional information by the due dates described in section (4), and¶
- (C) Estimate the additional time the Department will need to make a determination of completeness following the submittal of the additional information by the certificate holder.¶
- (3) If the Department does not notify the certificate holder as described in section (2), the request for amendment under type A review is deemed complete 60 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment, and the request for amendment under type B review is deemed complete 21 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment. Otherwise, the request for amendment is complete as determined under section (5). ¶
- (4) The Department may specify a date by which the certificate holder must submit additional information needed to complete the request for amendment. If follow-up requests for additional information are needed, the Department may specify dates by which the certificate holder must submit the information. At the request of the certificate holder, the Department may allow additional time for submission of the information. If the certificate holder does not submit the information by the deadline specified by the Department, including any allowed extension, the Council may reject the preliminary request for amendment. The rejection of a preliminary request for amendment is subject to appeal under ORS 469.403(3).¶
- (5) A request for amendment is complete when the Department finds that the certificate holder has submitted information adequate for the Council to make findings or impose conditions on all applicable laws and Council standards. The Department shall notify the certificate holder when the Department finds that the request for amendment is complete.¶
- (6) After receiving notification from the Department that the preliminary request for amendment is complete, the Department may require the certificate holder to prepare a consolidated request for amendment that includes all revisions to the preliminary request for amendment and all additional information requested by the Department before the determination of completeness. Upon a request by the Department, the certificate holder shall submit paper and non-copy-protected electronic copies of the consolidated request for amendment to the Department as specified by the Department.¶
- (7) If, after a determination that a request for amendment is complete, the Department identifies a need for additional information during its review of the request for amendment, the Department may request additional information from the certificate holder.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0065

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0065~~

~~Draft Proposed Order for a Request for Amendment~~

~~(1) Within 7 days after a request for amendment to the site certificate described in OAR 345-027-0050(3) and(4), or a request for amendment to apply later-adopted laws described in OAR 345-027-0090, is determined to be complete, the Department of Energy shall:~~

~~(a) Send notice to the certificate holder specifying a date for issuance of a draft proposed order. The date of issuance of a draft proposed order for a type A request for amendment shall be no later than 120 days after the date of the notice. The date of issuance of a draft proposed order for a type B request for amendment shall be no later than 60 days after the date of the notice.~~

~~(b) Post an announcement on the Department's website to notify the public that a complete request for amendment has been received. The announcement shall include:~~

~~(A) A copy of the complete request for amendment;~~

~~(B) The date the draft proposed order will be issued, as specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a); and~~

~~(C) A statement that the public comment period begins upon issuance of the draft proposed order.~~

~~(2) No later than the date specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a), the Department shall issue a draft proposed order recommending approval, modification, or denial of the requested amendment. The Department may issue the draft proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than the date the Department has specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a), notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay. The draft proposed order may include, but is not limited to draft proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions concerning the facility's compliance with applicable laws and Council Standards.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0067

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0067~~

~~Public Comment and Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order for Requests for Amendment Under Type A Review~~

~~(1) After issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0065, the Council shall conduct a public hearing on the request for amendment to the site certificate in the vicinity of the facility. The public hearing must be held at least 20 days after the draft proposed order is issued. The public hearing is not a contested case hearing.~~

~~(2) Concurrent with the issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0065, the Department of Energy shall:~~

~~(a) Send the notice described in section (3) of this rule by mail or email to:~~

~~(A) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020;~~

~~(B) Persons on any special mailing list established for the facility;~~

~~(C) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52); and~~

~~(D) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F;~~

~~(b) Post the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order, and the notice of the draft proposed order and public hearing on the Department website, and~~

~~Make physical copies of the draft proposed order available to the public for inspection.~~

~~(3) Notice of the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order and public hearing shall include:~~

~~(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.~~

~~(b) The date, time and location of the public hearing described in this rule.~~

~~(c) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for additional information.~~

~~(d) Addresses of the physical location(s) and the website where the public may review copies of the complete request for amendment and draft proposed order.~~

~~(e) The deadline for the public to submit written comments to be included in the record of the public hearing and how such comments should be submitted.~~

~~(f) A statement that:~~

~~(A) A complete request for amendment has been received and reviewed by the Department.~~

~~(B) The Department has issued a draft proposed order.~~

~~(C) To raise an issue on the record of the public hearing, a person must raise the issue in person at the public hearing or in a written comment submitted after the date of the notice of the public hearing and received by the Department before the close of the record of the public hearing.~~

~~(D) A person's failure to raise an issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing precludes the Council's consideration of whether to grant that person's subsequent contested case request.~~

~~Failure to raise an issue with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the Department, and the certificate holder an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes the Council from considering whether that issue justifies a contested case proceeding.~~

~~(F) To raise an issue with sufficient specificity, a person must present facts, on the record of the public hearing, that support the person's position on the issue.~~

~~(G) The Council will not accept or consider any further public comment on the request for amendment or on the draft proposed order after the close of the record of the public hearing.~~

~~(4) During the public hearing, the Department shall explain the amendment process, including the means and opportunities for the general public to participate in the process. The Department may provide this explanation by a written handout.~~

~~(5) At the commencement of the public hearing, the presiding officer shall read aloud the following:~~

~~(a) A person who intends to request a contested case on the proposed order for a site certificate amendment must~~

comment in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing.¶

(b) A person who intends to raise an issue that may be the basis for granting a contested case proceeding must raise that issue on the record of the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the department and the certificate holder an adequate opportunity to respond to the issue. To raise an issue with sufficient specificity, a person must present facts, on the record of the public hearing, that support the person's position on the issue.¶

(6) At the public hearing, any person may present information regarding the pending request for amendment without administration of an oath. The presiding officer shall record all presentations made during the public hearing. The presentations are part of the decision record for the request for amendment.¶

(7) Following the close of the record of the public hearing on the draft proposed order, the Council shall review the draft proposed order, shall consider all comments received on the record of the hearing, and may provide comments to the Department regarding the draft proposed order. When the Council meets to review a draft proposed order, the Council does not permit the certificate holder, reviewing agencies or the public to comment on any issue that may be the basis for a contested case request.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0068

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0068~~

~~Public Written Comment on the Draft Proposed Order for Requests for Amendment Under Type B Review~~

~~(1) After issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0065, the Council shall solicit and receive written public comments on the draft proposed order. The Department of Energy shall specify a written comment deadline at least 20 days after the draft proposed order is issued. ¶~~

~~(2) Concurrent with the issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0065, the Department shall: ¶~~

~~(a) Send the notice described in section (3) of this rule by mail or email to: ¶~~

~~(A) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020; ¶~~

~~(B) Persons on any special mailing list established for the facility; ¶~~

~~(C) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52); and ¶~~

~~(D) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F, ¶~~

~~(a) Post the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order, and the notice of the draft proposed order and written comment deadline on the Department website, and ¶~~

~~(b) Make physical copies of the draft proposed order available to the public for inspection. ¶~~

~~(3) Notice of the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order and written comment deadline shall include: ¶~~

~~(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location. ¶~~

~~(b) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for additional information. ¶~~

~~(c) Addresses of the physical location(s) and the website where the public may review copies of the complete request for amendment and draft proposed order. ¶~~

~~(d) The deadline for the public to submit written comments to be included in the record of the draft proposed order and how such comments should be submitted. ¶~~

~~(e) A statement that: ¶~~

~~(A) A complete request for amendment has been received and reviewed by the Department. ¶~~

~~(B) The Department has issued a draft proposed order. ¶~~

~~(C) To raise an issue on the record of the draft proposed order, a person must raise the issue in a written comment submitted after the date of the notice of the draft proposed order and written comment deadline, and received by the Department before the written comment deadline. ¶~~

~~(D) The Council will not accept or consider any further public comment on the request for amendment or on the draft proposed order after the written comment deadline that closes the record on the draft proposed order. ¶~~

~~(E) Only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person's written comments.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0071

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0071

Proposed Order, Requests for Contested Case and Council's Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type A Review

- (1) No later than 30 days after the Council has reviewed the draft proposed order and considered all comments received on the record of the public hearing under 345-027-0067, the Department of Energy shall issue a proposed order recommending approval, modification or denial of the request(s) for amendment to the site certificate. The Department must consider any oral comments made at the public hearing, written comments received before the close of the record of the public hearing, agency consultation, and any Council comments. The Department may issue the proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than 30 days after the Council has reviewed the draft proposed order and considered all comments received on the record of the public hearing, notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay.¶¶
- (2) Concurrent with issuing the proposed order, the Department shall issue public notice of the proposed order by posting public notice as an announcement on its website and by sending public notice by mail or email to:¶¶
- (a) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020,¶¶
 - (b) Persons on any special list established for the facility,¶¶
 - (c) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52), and¶¶
 - (d) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F.¶¶
- (3) Notice of the proposed order shall include: ¶¶
- (a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.¶¶
 - (b) A description of the process for requesting a contested case.¶¶
 - (c) The physical and website addresses of where the public may review copies of the proposed order.¶¶
 - (d) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for more information.¶¶
- (4) On the same date the notice of proposed order as described in section (2) is issued, the Department shall send a notice of the opportunity to request a contested case to the certificate holder and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing as described in OAR 345-027-0067. The notice shall include the deadline for requesting a contested case and restatements of sections (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9).¶¶
- (5) Only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-027-0067 may request a contested case proceeding on the proposed order for an amendment to the site certificate. To properly raise an issue in a request for a contested case proceeding on the proposed order for an amendment, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing, unless the Department of Energy did not follow the requirements of OAR 345-027-0067, or unless the action recommended in the proposed order differs materially from the draft proposed order, including any recommended conditions of approval, in which case the person may raise only new issues within the jurisdiction of the Council that are related to such differences. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the Council shall not grant a contested case proceeding for that issue. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support that person's position on the issue.¶¶
- (6) Contested case requests must be submitted in writing and must be received by the Department by a specified deadline that is at least 30 days from the date of notice in section (4). Contested case requests must include:¶¶
- (a) The person's name, mailing address and email address and any organization the person represents;¶¶
 - (b) A short and plain statement of the issue or issues the person desires to raise in a contested case proceeding;¶¶
 - (c) A statement that describes why the Council should find that the requester properly raised each issue, as described in section (7), including a specific reference to the person's prior comments to demonstrate that the

person raised the specific issue or issues on the record of the public hearing, if applicable;¶

(d) A statement that describes why the Council should determine that each identified issue justifies a contested case, under the evaluation described in section (9); ¶

(e) A detailed description of the person's interest in the proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding; ¶

(f) Name and address of the person's attorney, if any; ¶

(g) A statement of whether the person's request to participate in a contested case is as a party or a limited party, and if as a limited party, the precise area or areas in which participation is sought; ¶

(h) If the person seeks to protect a personal interest in the outcome of the proceeding, a detailed statement of the person's interest, economic or otherwise, and how such interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding; ¶

(i) If the person seeks to represent a public interest in the results of the proceeding, a detailed statement of such public interest, the manner in which such public interest will be affected by the results of the proceeding, and the person's qualifications to represent such public interest; and ¶

(j) A statement of the reasons why others who commented on the record of the public hearing cannot adequately represent the interest identified in subsections (h) or (i). ¶

(7) Before considering whether an issue justifies a contested case proceeding under section (9), the Council must determine that the person requesting a contested case commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing and properly raised each issue included in the request. To determine that a person properly raised each issue included in the request, the Council must find that: ¶

The person making the contested case request raised the issue on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-027-0067 with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the Department and the certificate holder an adequate opportunity to respond to the issue; ¶

The Department did not follow the requirements of OAR 345-027-0067; or ¶

If the action recommended in the proposed order, including any recommended conditions of approval, differs materially from the action recommended in the draft proposed order, the contested case request identified new issues that are related to such material differences. ¶

(8) If the Council finds that the person requesting a contested case failed to comment in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing or failed to properly raise any issue, as described in section (7), the Council must deny that person's contested case request. If the Council finds that the person requesting a contested case commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing and properly raised one or more issues, the Council's determination of whether an issue justifies a contested case, as described in section (9), shall be limited to those issues the Council finds were properly raised. ¶

(9) After identifying the issues properly raised the Council shall determine whether any properly raised issue justifies a contested case proceeding on that issue. To determine that an issue justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council must find that the request raises a significant issue of fact or law that may affect the Council's determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable laws and Council standards included in chapter 345 divisions 22, 23 and 24. If the Council does not have jurisdiction over the issue raised in the request, the Council must deny the request. ¶

(10) The Council must take one of the following actions when determining if a request identifying one or more properly raised issues justifies a contested case proceeding: ¶

(a) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more properly raised issues that justify a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to 0014 and 345-015-0018 to 0085. The Council shall identify the contested case parties and shall identify the issues each contested case party may participate on. The parties to a contested case proceeding shall be limited to those persons who commented on the record of the public hearing and who properly raised issues in their contested case request that the Council found sufficient to justify a contested case, except that the certificate holder is an automatic party to a contested case. The issues a party to a contested case proceeding may participate on shall be limited to those issues that party properly raised in its contested case request that the

Council found sufficient to justify a contested case, except that the certificate holder may participate on any issue the Council found sufficient to justify a contested case proceeding.¶¶

(b) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more properly raised issues that an amendment to the proposed order, including modification to conditions, would settle in a manner satisfactory to the Council, the Council may deny the request as to those issues and direct the Department to amend the proposed order and send a notice of the amended proposed order to the persons described in section (4). Only the certificate holder and those persons who commented on the record of the hearing may, in a writing received by the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the notice of the amended proposed order, request a contested case proceeding limited to issues related to the amendment to the proposed order. As described in section (9), the Council shall determine whether any issue identified in the request for a contested case proceeding justifies a contested case proceeding. A person's contested case request under this subsection shall include:¶¶

(A) The person's name, mailing address and email address;¶¶

(B) A statement of the contested issues related to the amendment to the proposed order, including facts believed to be at issue; and¶¶

(C) A statement that describes why the Council should find an issue justifies a contested case, as described in section (8).¶¶

(c) If the Council finds that the request does not identify a properly raised issue that justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council shall deny the request. In a written order denying the request, the Council shall state the basis for the denial. The Council shall then adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0075. In a written order the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.¶¶

(11) If there is no request for a contested case proceeding as described in section (6) or subsection (10)(b), the Council, may adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0075. In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.¶¶

(12) Judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0072

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0072

Proposed Order and Councils Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type B Review

(1) No later than 21 days after the written comment deadline that closes the record on the draft proposed order, the Department of Energy shall issue a proposed order recommending approval, modification or denial of the request(s) for amendment to the site certificate. The Department must consider any written comments received before the close of the record on the draft proposed order and any agency consultation. The Department may issue the proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than 21 days after the close of the record on the draft proposed order, notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay.¶

(2) Concurrent with issuing the proposed order, the Department shall issue public notice of the proposed order by posting public notice as an announcement on its website and by sending public notice by mail or email to:¶

(a) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020,¶

(b) Persons on any special list established for the facility,¶

(c) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52), and¶

(d) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F.¶

(3) Notice of the proposed order shall include:¶

(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.¶

(b) The physical and website addresses of where the public may review copies of the proposed order.¶

(c) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for more information.¶

(d) A statement that only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person's written comments.¶

(4) The Council, may adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0075. In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.¶

(5) Judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403, provided that only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person's written comments.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0075

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0075~~

~~Scope of Council's Review~~

~~(1) In making a decision to grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall apply the applicable laws and Council standards required under section (2) and in effect on the dates described in section (3).~~ ¶

~~(2) To issue an amended site certificate, the Council shall determine that the preponderance of evidence on the record supports the following conclusions:~~ ¶

~~(a) For a request for amendment proposing to add new area to the site boundary, the portion of the facility within the area added to the site by the amendment complies with all laws and Council standards applicable to an original site certificate application.~~ ¶

~~(b) For a request for amendment to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction, after considering any changes in facts or law since the date the current site certificate was executed, the facility complies with all laws and Council standards applicable to an original site certificate application. However, for requests to extend completion deadlines, the Council need not find compliance with an applicable law or Council standard if the Council finds that:~~ ¶

~~(A) The certificate holder has spent more than 50 percent of the budgeted costs on construction of the facility;~~ ¶

~~(B) The inability of the certificate holder to complete the construction of the facility by the deadline in effect before the amendment is the result of unforeseen circumstances that are outside the control of the certificate holder;~~ ¶

~~(C) The standard, if applied, would result in an unreasonable financial burden on the certificate holder; and~~ ¶

~~(D) The Council does not need to apply the standard to avoid a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment;~~ ¶

~~(c) For any other requests for amendment not described above, the facility, with the proposed change, complies with the applicable laws or Council standards that protect a resource or interest that could be affected by the proposed change.~~ ¶

~~(d) For all requests for amendment, the amount of the bond or letter of credit required under OAR 345-022-0050 is adequate.~~ ¶

~~(3) In making the findings required to grant an amendment under section (2), the Council shall apply the applicable law and Council standards in effect on the following dates:~~ ¶

~~(a) For the applicable substantive criteria under the Council's land use standard, as described in OAR 345-022-0030, the date the certificate holder submitted the request for amendment, and~~ ¶

~~(b) For all other applicable laws and Council standards, the date the Council issues the amended site certificate.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0080

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0080~~

~~Type C Review Process for Pre-Operational Requests for Amendment ¶¶~~

~~(1) A certificate holder may only request the type C review for a request for amendment when the change proposed in the request for amendment relates to the facility, or portion/phase of the facility, not yet in operation, but approved for construction in the site certificate or amended site certificate. A certificate holder cannot request type C review of a request for amendment proposing to extend construction deadlines.¶¶~~

~~(2) Requests under section (1) must be submitted in writing to the Department of Energy and must include:¶¶~~

~~(a) A complete request for amendment, including the information described in 345-027-0060(1);¶¶~~

~~(b) The reasons why the certificate holder needs type C review of its request for amendment;¶¶~~

~~(c) An explanation of why the proposed change could not have been reasonably foreseen by the certificate holder;¶¶~~

~~(d) An explanation of why the proposed change is unavoidable; and¶¶~~

~~(e) Reasons why the type C review is adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts to the resources and interests protected by Council standards.¶¶~~

~~(3) Upon receiving a request under sections (1) and (2), the Department shall post the request and the request for amendment on the Department's website.¶¶~~

~~(4) Within 3 business days after receiving a request under sections (1) and (2), the Department shall issue a written determination either granting or denying type C review. Upon issuance, the Department shall post the written determination on its website.¶¶~~

~~(5) If the Department denies type C review, the certificate holder may request the Department's determination to be referred to the Council. If requested, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection. Upon a Department determination being referred to the Council, the Council chair shall convene a Council meeting as promptly as possible as described in OAR 345-011-0015. ¶¶~~

~~(6) To grant a request under section (1), the Department or the Council must find:¶¶~~

~~(a) Construction of the certificated energy facility, or portion of the certificated energy facility, has not been deemed complete;¶¶~~

~~(b) The request for amendment is complete;¶¶~~

~~(c) Type C review is necessary;¶¶~~

~~(d) The proposed change could not have been reasonably foreseen by the certificate holder;¶¶~~

~~(e) The proposed change is unavoidable; and¶¶~~

~~(f) Type C review is adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts to the resources and interests protected by the Council's standards.¶¶~~

~~(7) Within 7 days after a request under section (1) is granted, the Department shall:¶¶~~

~~(a) Issue a draft temporary order approving or denying the request for amendment, including a recommendation to the Council on whether Council review should be completed through the type A or type B review process; and¶¶~~

~~(b) Post the draft temporary order on the Department's website. ¶¶~~

~~(8) The Council shall, at its first meeting following the Department's issuance of a draft temporary order, consider the draft temporary order and consider whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process. Upon issuance of a draft temporary order, the Council chair may call a special Council meeting, as described in OAR 345-011-0015, to be held as promptly as possible.¶¶~~

~~(9) After considering the draft temporary order and the Department's recommendation on whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process, the Council shall adopt, modify, or reject the draft temporary order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0075, and the Council shall decide whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process. In a written temporary order,~~

the Council shall either temporarily grant issuance of an amended site certificate, or deny issuance of an amended site certificate.¶

~~(10) Before implementing any change approved by the Council's temporary order, the certificate holder must submit an authorized acknowledgement that the certificate holder accepts all terms and conditions of the temporary order.¶~~

~~(11) If review is to be completed through the type A review process, review proceeds as described in 345-027-0067, -0071, and -0075, where the temporary order replaces all references to the draft proposed order.¶~~

~~(12) If review is to be completed through the type B review process, review proceeds as described in 345-027-0068, -0072, and -0075, where the temporary order replaces all references to the draft proposed order.¶~~

~~(13) Action taken by the certificate holder under the authority of the temporary order that is inconsistent with the language and conditions of the final order is not a violation so long as the inconsistency is remedied by the certificate holder as specified by the Council in the final order.~~

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0085

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0085~~

~~Request for Amendment to Extend Construction Deadlines ¶¶~~

~~(1) The certificate holder may request an amendment to the site certificate to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction of the facility, or portion/phase of the facility, that the Council has approved in a site certificate or an amended site certificate by submitting a preliminary request for amendment in accordance with 345-027-0060. The preliminary request for amendment must include an explanation of the need for an extension and must be submitted to the Department of Energy before the applicable construction deadline, but no earlier than the date twelve months before the applicable construction deadline. ¶¶~~

~~(2) A preliminary request for amendment received by the Department within the time allowed under section (1) to extend the deadlines for beginning and completing construction suspends expiration of the site certificate or amended site certificate until the Council acts on the request for amendment. If the Council denies the extension request after the applicable construction deadline, the site certificate is deemed expired as of the applicable construction deadline specified in the site certificate or amended site certificate. ¶¶~~

~~(3) If the Council grants an amendment under this rule, the Council shall specify new deadlines for beginning or completing construction that are the later of: ¶¶~~

~~(a) Three years from the deadlines in effect before the Council grants the amendment, or ¶¶~~

~~(b) Following a contested case proceeding conducted pursuant to OAR 345-027-0071, two years from the date the Council grants the amendment. ¶¶~~

~~(4) For requests for amendment to the site certificate received under this rule to extend construction deadlines for facilities or portions of the facility the Council shall not grant more than two amendments to extend the deadline for beginning construction of a facility or a phase of a facility. ¶¶~~

~~(5) For requests for an amendment to the site certificate to extend construction deadlines for facilities, or portions/phases of facilities, not yet in construction, but already approved for construction in the site certificate or amended site certificate prior to October 24, 2017: ¶¶~~

~~(a) Sections (1) and (2) of this rule apply; ¶¶~~

~~(b) Sections (3) and (4) of this rule do not apply; ¶¶~~

~~(c) When considering whether to grant a request for amendment for a deadline extension made under this section, the Council shall consider how many extensions it has previously granted; and ¶¶~~

~~(d) If a request for amendment for a deadline extension made under this section is granted, the Council shall specify new deadlines for beginning or completing construction that are not more than two years from the deadlines in effect before the Council grants the amendment.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.370, 469.405, 469.503~~

SUSPEND: 345-027-0090

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

~~345-027-0090~~

~~Request by Any Person for Amendment to Apply Later-Adopted Laws ¶¶~~

~~(1) Any person may request an amendment of a site certificate to apply a law(s), including local government ordinances, statutes, rules or Council standards, adopted after the date the site certificate was executed, if the person contends failure to apply the law(s) results in a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment. The Department of Energy itself may initiate such a request.¶¶~~

~~(2) To request an amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) under this rule, the person shall submit a preliminary request for amendment to the Department with the information described in 345-027-0060(1)(a),(c),(d) and the following: ¶¶~~

~~(a) Identification of the law(s) that the person seeks to apply to the facility; and ¶¶~~

~~(b) The particular facts that the person believes clearly show a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s).¶¶~~

~~(3) If the Department receives a preliminary request for amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) as described in this rule from any person other than the certificate holder, the Department shall send a copy of the request to the certificate holder. The transmittal shall include a deadline by which the certificate holder must submit a response to the Department. In its response, the certificate holder shall state whether it agrees that there is a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s).¶¶~~

~~(a) If the certificate holder concludes the later-adopted law(s) should be applied to the facility, the Council shall review the request to apply later-adopted law(s) as a complete request for amendment in accordance with section (5).¶¶~~

~~(b) If the certificate holder concludes that the law(s) should not be applied to the facility, or if the certificate holder does not respond with its conclusion before the specified deadline, the Department shall ask the Council to determine whether the request clearly shows a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s).¶¶~~

~~(A) If the Council determines there is not a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s), the Council shall deny the request to apply later-adopted law(s).¶¶~~

~~(B) If the Council determines there is a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s), the Council shall review the request to apply later-adopted law(s) as a complete request for amendment in accordance with section (5).¶¶~~

~~(4) A preliminary request for amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) under this rule is considered a complete request for amendment for purposes of OAR 345-027-0063 on:¶¶~~

~~(a) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by the certificate holder, the date the request is received by the Department.¶¶~~

~~(b) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by a person other than the certificate holder, and if the certificate holder responds as described in subsection (3)(a), the date the response described in subsection (3)(a) is received by the Department.¶¶~~

~~(c) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by a person other than the certificate holder, and if the certificate holder responds as described in subsection (3)(b) or does not respond before the specified deadline under section (3), the date of the Council's determination under paragraph (3)(b)(B).¶¶~~

~~(5) After receiving a complete request for amendment under section (4) of this rule, the Council shall review the request for amendment as described in OAR 345-027-0065, 345-027-0067, 345-027-0071 and 345-027-0075, except that: ¶¶~~

~~(a) If the Department recommends approval or modified approval of the requested amendment, the Department shall include in the proposed order described in OAR 345-027-0071 any new or modified site certificate conditions necessary to assure compliance with the law(s) applied to the facility under the proposed order; and~~
~~(b) If the Department in its proposed order recommends approval or modified approval of the requested amendment, the certificate holder may, by written request submitted to and received by the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the proposed order, ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding on the proposed order. In the request, the certificate holder shall provide a description of the issues to be contested and a statement of the facts believed to be at issue. If the certificate holder requests a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to 0014, and 345-015-0018 to 345-015-0085 limited to the issues stated by the certificate holder; and~~
~~(c) The Council shall include new conditions in a site certificate amended under this rule only if the Council finds that the conditions are necessary based upon a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment.~~

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.405

SUSPEND: 345-027-0100

RULE SUMMARY: Suspends Div. 27 rules approved through Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0100

~~Request for Amendment to Transfer Ownership, Possession or Control of the Facility or the Certificate Holder~~

~~(1) For the purpose of this rule:¶¶~~

~~(a) A request for amendment to a site certificate to transfer the site certificate is required for a transaction that results in a change in the ownership, possession or control of the facility or the certificate holder.¶¶~~

~~(b) "New owner" means the person or entity that will gain ownership, possession or control of the facility or the certificate holder.¶¶~~

~~(2) When the certificate holder has knowledge that a transaction that requires a transfer of the site certificate as described in section (1)(a) is or may be pending, the certificate holder shall notify the Department of Energy. In the notice, the certificate holder shall include the name and contact information of the new owner, and the date of the transfer of ownership. If possible, the certificate holder shall notify the Department at least 60 days before the date of the transfer of ownership.¶¶~~

~~(3) A transaction that would require a transfer of the site certificate as described in subsection (1)(a) does not terminate the transferor's duties and obligations under the site certificate until the Council approves a request for amendment to transfer the site certificate and issues an amended site certificate. The new owner is not allowed to construct or operate the facility until an amended site certificate as described in section (10) or a temporary amended site certificate as described in section (11) becomes effective.¶¶~~

~~(4) To request an amendment to transfer the site certificate, the new owner shall submit a written request to the Department that includes the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(a), (d), (f) and (m), a certification that the new owner agrees to abide by all terms and conditions of the site certificate currently in effect and, if known, the expected date of the transaction. If applicable, the new owner shall include in the request the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(y)(O)(iv).¶¶~~

~~(5) The Department may require the new owner to submit a written statement from the current certificate holder, or a certified copy of an order or judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, verifying the new owner's right, subject to the provisions of ORS Chapter 469 and the rules of this chapter, to possession or control of the site or the facility.¶¶~~

~~(6) Within 15 days after receiving a request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, the Department shall send a notice of the request by mail or email to the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, to all persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list submitted by the new owner under section (4). In the notice, the Department shall describe the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, specify a date by which comments are due and state that the date of the Council's transfer hearing will be announced on the Department's website.¶¶~~

~~(7) Before acting on the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, the Council shall hold a transfer hearing. The Council shall hold the transfer hearing during a Council meeting and shall provide notice of the hearing on its meeting agenda, which will be sent by mail or email to the Council's general mailing list in advance of the meeting. The transfer hearing is not a contested case hearing. During the hearing the Council will accept comments from the public, reviewing agencies and new owner regarding the new owner's compliance with the Council standards described in subsection (8)(a).¶¶~~

~~(8) At the conclusion of the transfer hearing or at a later meeting, the Council may issue an order approving the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate if the Council finds that:¶¶~~

~~(a) The new owner complies with the Council standards described in OAR 345-022-0010, 345-022-0050 and, if applicable, OAR 345-024-0710(1); and¶¶~~

~~(b) The new owner is or will be lawfully entitled to possession or control of the site or the facility described in the site certificate.¶¶~~

~~(9) Except as described in OAR 345-027-0051(5), the Council shall not otherwise change the terms and conditions of the site certificate in an order approving the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate. ¶~~

~~(10) Upon issuing the order described in section (8), the Council shall issue an amended site certificate that names the new owner as the new certificate holder or as the new owner of the certificate holder. The amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the new owner. The Council shall issue the amended site certificate in duplicate counterpart originals and each counterpart, upon signing, will have the same effect. ¶~~

~~(11) If the Council chair determines that special circumstances justify emergency action, the Council chair may, upon a written request from the new owner that includes a showing that the new owner can meet the requirements of section (8), issue a temporary amended site certificate that names the new owner as the new certificate holder or as the new owner of the certificate holder. The temporary amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the new owner. The temporary amended site certificate expires when an amended site certificate as described in section (10) becomes effective or as the Council otherwise orders.~~

~~Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470~~

~~Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.405~~

ADOPT: 345-027-0311

RULE SUMMARY: States applicability of temporary rules related to site certificate amendments. Clarifies that the Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0311

Applicability

(1) The rules in this division apply to all requests for amendment to a site certificate and amendment determination requests for facilities under the Council's jurisdiction that are submitted to, or were already under review by, the Council on or after the effective date of the rules. The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

(2) Notwithstanding section (1) of this rule, these rules do not apply to facilities described in ORS 469.410(1).

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.501

ADOPT: 345-027-0313

RULE SUMMARY: Provides that site certificates expire when deadlines to begin construction are not met. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0313

Certificate Expiration

If the certificate holder does not begin construction of the facility by the construction beginning date specified in the site certificate or amended site certificate, the site certificate expires on the construction beginning date specified, unless expiration of the site certificate is suspended pending final action by the Council on a request for amendment to a site certificate pursuant to OAR 345-027-0385(2).

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.370, 469.501

ADOPT: 345-027-0350

RULE SUMMARY: States what types of changes require a certificate holder to submit a request for amendment to the Department. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0350

Changes Requiring an Amendment

Except for changes allowed under OAR 345-027-0353 of this rule, an amendment to a site certificate is required to:

(1) Transfer ownership of the facility or the certificate holder as described in OAR 345-027-0400;

(2) Apply later-adopted law(s) as described in OAR 345-027-0390;

(3) Extend the construction beginning or completion deadline as described in OAR 345-027-0385;

(4) Design, construct or operate a facility in a manner different from the description in the site certificate if the proposed change:

(a) Could result in a significant adverse impact that the Council has not addressed in an earlier order and the impact affects a resource or interest protected by a Council standard;

(b) Could impair the certificate holder's ability to comply with a site certificate condition; or

(c) Could require a new condition or a change to a condition in the site certificate.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0351

RULE SUMMARY: States the different review processes for different types of requests for amendments. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0351

Review Processes for Requests for Amendment

(1) The transfer review process, described in 345-027-0400, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment to a site certificate to transfer a site certificate.¶

(2) The type A review process, consisting of rules 345-027-0359, -0360, -0363, -0365, -0367, -0371 and -0375, is the default review process and shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment proposing a change described in 345-027-0350(2),(3), and (4).¶

(3) The type B review process, consisting of rules 345-027-0359, -0360, -0363, -0365, -0368, -0372, and -0375, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment that the Department or the Council approves for type B review under 345-027-0357.¶

(4) The type C review process, described in 345-027-0380, shall apply to the Council's review of a request for amendment that the Department or the Council approves for type C review under 345-027-0380.¶

(5) The Council may act concurrently on any combination of proposed changes included in a request for amendment. Concurrent proposed changes are subject to the substantive requirements applicable to each respective proposed change and the Council shall review all proposed changes through the process with the more procedural steps applicable to any one of the proposed changes.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0353

RULE SUMMARY: States what types of changes are exempt from requiring an amendment to the site certificate. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0353

Changes Exempt from Requiring an Amendment

An amendment to a site certificate is not required if the proposed change in the design, construction or operation of a facility is in substantial compliance with the terms and conditions of the site certificate, and is a change:

- (1) To an electrical generation facility that would increase the electrical generating capacity and would not increase the number of electric generators at the site, change fuel type, increase fuel consumption by more than 10 percent or enlarge the facility site;
- (2) To the number or location of pipelines for a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir that would not result in the facility exceeding permitted daily throughput or a change to the site boundary;
- (3) To the number, size or location of pipelines for a geothermal energy facility that would not result in a change to the site boundary;
- (4) To a pipeline that is a related or supporting facility that delivers natural gas to the energy facility if the change would extend or modify the pipeline or expand the right-of-way, when the change is exclusively to serve gas users other than the energy facility;
- (5) To a transmission line that is a related or supporting facility if the change would extend or modify the transmission line or expand the right-of-way, when the change is exclusively to serve the transmission needs of a separate energy facility or energy user; or
- (6) To construct a pipeline less than 16 inches in diameter and less than five miles in length to test or maintain an underground gas storage reservoir. If the proposed pipeline would connect to a surface facility related to an underground gas storage reservoir for which the Council has issued a site certificate or to a gas pipeline for which the Council has issued a site certificate, the certificate holder must obtain, prior to construction, the approval of the Department of Energy for the construction, operation and retirement of the proposed pipeline. To obtain Department approval, the certificate holder must submit a request as described in OAR 345-027-0210 through OAR 345-027-0240.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0355

RULE SUMMARY: States that a certificate holder must perform a written evaluation for changes that it determines do not require an amendment, and states what the certificate holder must do with that evaluation. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0355

Written Evaluations for Changes Not Requiring Amendment

(1) For a proposed change that would add area to the site boundary, see OAR 345-027-0357(1). For a proposed change to the facility that does not include adding area to the site boundary, the certificate holder may evaluate OAR 345-027-0350 and 345-027-0353 and conclude that the proposed change does not require an amendment.

If the certificate holder concludes that a proposed change to the facility does not require an amendment to the site certificate, the certificate holder must complete a written evaluation if the change:

(a) Could be included in and governed by the site certificate, but the certificate holder has concluded the change is not described in 345-027-0350; or

(b) Is exempt from requiring an amendment under 345-027-0353.

(2) The written evaluation must explain why an amendment is not required, must be completed before implementing any change, and must be included in the next semiannual construction progress report or the Facility Modification Report required under 345-026-0080. The written evaluation must be retained for the life of the facility.

(3) The Department of Energy may, at any time, inspect the changes made to the facility and may inspect the certificate holder's written evaluation concluding that the change did not require an amendment.

(4) When the certificate holder implements a change without an amendment, the Department may initiate an enforcement action as described in Division 29 if the Department determines the change required an amendment to the site certificate.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0357

RULE SUMMARY: States the process a certificate holder must go through when submitting an Amendment Determination Request to the Department. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0357

Amendment Determination Request

(1) For a proposed change that would add area to the site boundary, the certificate holder must either:

(a) submit a request for amendment to the Department of Energy; or

(b) submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of whether the proposed change requires an amendment under OAR 345-027-0350 and is not exempt under 345-027-0353.

(2) For a proposed change that would not add area to the site boundary, the certificate holder may submit an

amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of:

(a) whether the proposed change requires an amendment under OAR 345-027-0350; or

(b) whether the proposed change is exempt from requiring an amendment under 345-027-0353.

(3) For any request for amendment, the certificate holder may submit an amendment determination request to the Department for a written determination of whether a request for amendment justifies review under the type B review process described in 345-027-0351(3).

(4) Requests described in section (1), (2), and (3) must be submitted in writing to the Department and must include:

(a) A narrative description of the proposed change;

(b) Maps and/or geospatial data layers representing the effects and/or location of the proposed change;

(c) The certificate holder's evaluation of the determination(s) it is requesting under sections (1), (2), and (3); and

(d) Any additional information the certificate holder believes will assist the Department's evaluation.

(5) After receiving an amendment determination request, the Department shall post an announcement on the Department's website to notify the public that an amendment determination request has been received. The announcement shall include a copy of the amendment determination request.

(6) Upon receiving a request for a written determination described in section (1) and (2), the Department shall, as promptly as possible, issue a written determination to the certificate holder. After the Department issues its written determination, the Department shall, as promptly as possible, provide the request and the written determination to the Council and post the written determination to its website. At the first Council meeting after the Department issues its written determination, the Department shall provide verbal notice of the request and the written determination to the Council during the consent calendar agenda item. The Department may refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification, or rejection. At the request of the certificate holder or a Council member, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection.

(7) Upon receiving a request for a written determination described in section (3), the Department shall, as promptly as possible, issue a written determination to the certificate holder. At the request of the certificate holder, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification, or rejection.

(8) In determining whether a request for amendment justifies review under the type B review process described in 345-027-0351(3), the Department and the Council may consider factors including but not limited to:

(a) The complexity of the proposed change;

(b) The anticipated level of public interest in the proposed change;

(c) The anticipated level of interest by reviewing agencies;

(d) The likelihood of significant adverse impact; and

(e) The type and amount of mitigation, if any.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0359

RULE SUMMARY: States that a certificate holder may elect to participate in a pre-amendment conference with the Department. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0359

Pre-Amendment Conference

(1) Prior to submitting a preliminary request for amendment to the site certificate as described in OAR 345-027-0360, the certificate holder may request a pre-amendment conference with the Department of Energy to discuss the scope, timing, and applicable laws and Council standards associated with the request for amendment.¶

(2) A pre-amendment conference request must be in writing and must include a description of the proposed change and, if applicable, maps or geospatial data layers representing the location of the proposed change.¶

(3) Upon receipt of a request as described in section (1), the Department must, as promptly as possible, set a date and time for a pre-amendment conference.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0360

RULE SUMMARY: States what a certificate holder must submit to the Department when making a request for amendment, and that this submittal is considered a preliminary request for amendment until the Department determines the request is complete. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0360

Preliminary Request for Amendment

(1) To request an amendment to the site certificate required by OAR 345-027-0350(3) and (4), the certificate holder shall submit a written preliminary request for amendment to the Department of Energy that includes the following:¶

(a) The name of the facility, the name and mailing address of the certificate holder, and the name, mailing address, email address and phone number of the individual responsible for submitting the request.¶

(b) A detailed description of the proposed change, including:¶

(A) a description of how the proposed change affects the facility.¶

(B) a description of how the proposed change affects those resources or interests protected by applicable laws and Council standards, and¶

(C) the specific location of the proposed change, and any updated maps and/or geospatial data layers relevant to the proposed change.¶

(c) References to any specific Division 21 information that may be required for the Department to make its findings.¶

(d) The specific language of the site certificate, including conditions, that the certificate holder proposes to change, add or delete through the amendment.¶

(e) A list of the Council standards and all other laws - including statutes, rules and ordinances - applicable to the proposed change, and an analysis of whether the facility, with the proposed change, would comply with those applicable laws and Council standards. For the purpose of this rule, a law or Council standard is "applicable" if the Council would apply or consider the law or Council standard under OAR 345-027-0375(2).¶

(f) An updated list of the owners of property located within or adjacent to the site of the facility, as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f).¶

(2) After receiving a preliminary request for amendment, the Department shall post an announcement on its website to notify the public that a preliminary request for amendment has been received. The announcement shall include a copy of the preliminary request for amendment.¶

(3) For any Council standard that requires evaluation of impacts within an analysis area, the analysis area shall be the larger of either the study area(s) as defined in OAR 345-001-0000(59) or the analysis area(s) described in the project order for the application for site certificate, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Department following a pre-amendment conference.¶

(4) The certificate holder may incorporate, by specific reference, evidence previously submitted to the Department in the application for site certificate or previous request for amendment, or evidence that is otherwise included in the Department's record on the facility.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0363

RULE SUMMARY: States that the Department must first determine a request for amendment is complete (and how that completeness is determined) before it proceeds to writing and issuing a Draft Proposed Order. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0363

Determination of Completeness for a Request for Amendment

- (1) Until the Department of Energy determines the request for amendment to the site certificate is complete, it is a preliminary request for amendment. After receiving a preliminary request for amendment, the Department may seek comments from reviewing agencies to determine whether that request is complete.¶
- (2) Unless the certificate holder agrees to additional time, within 60 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment under type A review, and within 21 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment under type B review, the Department shall notify the certificate holder whether the request for amendment is complete. In the notification, the Department shall:¶
- (a) State that the request for amendment is complete; or¶
- (b) State that the request for amendment is incomplete and:¶
- (A) Describe any additional information needed to complete the request for amendment to the extent known to the Department at the time of the notification, including identification of applicable laws and Council standards not addressed in the preliminary request for amendment.¶
- (B) Ask the certificate holder to submit the additional information by the due dates described in section (4), and¶
- (C) Estimate the additional time the Department will need to make a determination of completeness following the submittal of the additional information by the certificate holder.¶
- (3) If the Department does not notify the certificate holder as described in section (2), the request for amendment under type A review is deemed complete 60 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment, and the request for amendment under type B review is deemed complete 21 days after receipt of a preliminary request for amendment. Otherwise, the request for amendment is complete as determined under section (5).¶
- (4) The Department may specify a date by which the certificate holder must submit additional information needed to complete the request for amendment. If follow-up requests for additional information are needed, the Department may specify dates by which the certificate holder must submit the information. At the request of the certificate holder, the Department may allow additional time for submission of the information. If the certificate holder does not submit the information by the deadline specified by the Department, including any allowed extension, the Council may reject the preliminary request for amendment. The rejection of a preliminary request for amendment is subject to appeal under ORS 469.403(3).¶
- (5) A request for amendment is complete when the Department finds that the certificate holder has submitted information adequate for the Council to make findings or impose conditions on all applicable laws and Council standards. The Department shall notify the certificate holder when the Department finds that the request for amendment is complete.¶
- (6) After receiving notification from the Department that the preliminary request for amendment is complete, the Department may require the certificate holder to prepare a consolidated request for amendment that includes all revisions to the preliminary request for amendment and all additional information requested by the Department before the determination of completeness. Upon a request by the Department, the certificate holder shall submit paper and non-copy-protected electronic copies of the consolidated request for amendment to the Department as specified by the Department.¶
- (7) If, after a determination that a request for amendment is complete, the Department identifies a need for additional information during its review of the request for amendment, the Department may request additional information from the certificate holder.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0365

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which the Department issues a Draft Proposed Order. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0365

Draft Proposed Order for a Request for Amendment

(1) Within 7 days after a request for amendment to the site certificate described in OAR 345-027-0350(3) and(4), or a request for amendment to apply later-adopted laws described in OAR 345-027-0390, is determined to be complete, the Department of Energy shall:

(a) Send notice to the certificate holder specifying a date for issuance of a draft proposed order. The date of issuance of a draft proposed order for a type A request for amendment shall be no later than 120 days after the date of the notice. The date of issuance of a draft proposed order for a type B request for amendment shall be no later than 60 days after the date of the notice.

(b) Post an announcement on the Department's website to notify the public that a complete request for amendment has been received. The announcement shall include:

(A) A copy of the complete request for amendment;

(B) The date the draft proposed order will be issued, as specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a); and

(C) A statement that the public comment period begins upon issuance of the draft proposed order.

(2) No later than the date specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a), the Department shall issue a draft proposed order recommending approval, modification, or denial of the requested amendment. The Department may issue the draft proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than the date the Department has specified in the notice required by subsection (1)(a), notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay. The draft proposed order may include, but is not limited to draft proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions concerning the facility's compliance with applicable laws and Council Standards.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0367

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which Public Notice and Comment occurs on Draft Proposed Orders for Request for Amendment under Type A Review. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0367

Public Comment and Hearing on the Draft Proposed Order for Requests for Amendment Under Type A Review

(1) After issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0365, the Council shall conduct a public hearing on the request for amendment to the site certificate in the vicinity of the facility. The public hearing must be held at least 20 days after the draft proposed order is issued. The public hearing is not a contested case hearing.

(2) Concurrent with the issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0365, the Department of Energy shall:

(a) Send the notice described in section (3) of this rule by mail or email to:

(A) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020;

(B) Persons on any special mailing list established for the facility;

(C) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52); and

(D) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F;

(b) Post the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order, and the notice of the draft proposed order and public hearing on the Department website, and Make physical copies of the draft proposed order available to the public for inspection.

(3) Notice of the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order and public hearing shall include:

(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.

(b) The date, time and location of the public hearing described in this rule.

(c) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for additional information.

(d) Addresses of the physical location(s) and the website where the public may review copies of the complete request for amendment and draft proposed order.

(e) The deadline for the public to submit written comments to be included in the record of the public hearing and how such comments should be submitted.

(f) A statement that:

(A) A complete request for amendment has been received and reviewed by the Department.

(B) The Department has issued a draft proposed order.

(C) To raise an issue on the record of the public hearing, a person must raise the issue in person at the public hearing or in a written comment submitted after the date of the notice of the public hearing and received by the Department before the close of the record of the public hearing.

(D) A person's failure to raise an issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing precludes the Council's consideration of whether to grant that person's subsequent contested case request. Failure to raise an issue with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the Department, and the certificate holder an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes the Council from considering whether that issue justifies a contested case proceeding.

(E) To raise an issue with sufficient specificity, a person must present facts, on the record of the public hearing, that support the person's position on the issue.

(G) The Council will not accept or consider any further public comment on the request for amendment or on the draft proposed order after the close of the record of the public hearing.

(4) During the public hearing, the Department shall explain the amendment process, including the means and opportunities for the general public to participate in the process. The Department may provide this explanation by a written handout.

(5) At the commencement of the public hearing, the presiding officer shall read aloud the following:

(a) A person who intends to request a contested case on the proposed order for a site certificate amendment must comment in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing.¶

(b) A person who intends to raise an issue that may be the basis for granting a contested case proceeding must raise that issue on the record of the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the department and the certificate holder an adequate opportunity to respond to the issue. To raise an issue with sufficient specificity, a person must present facts, on the record of the public hearing, that support the person's position on the issue.¶

(6) At the public hearing, any person may present information regarding the pending request for amendment without administration of an oath. The presiding officer shall record all presentations made during the public hearing. The presentations are part of the decision record for the request for amendment.¶

(7) Following the close of the record of the public hearing on the draft proposed order, the Council shall review the draft proposed order, shall consider all comments received on the record of the hearing, and may provide comments to the Department regarding the draft proposed order. When the Council meets to review a draft proposed order, the Council does not permit the certificate holder, reviewing agencies or the public to comment on any issue that may be the basis for a contested case request.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0368

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which Public Notice and Comment occurs on Draft Proposed Orders for Request for Amendment under Type B Review. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017. Provides that judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0368

States the process by which Public Notice and Comment occurs on Draft Proposed Orders for Request for Amendment under Type B Review.

(1) After issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0365, the Council shall solicit and receive written public comments on the draft proposed order. The Department of Energy shall specify a written comment deadline at least 20 days after the draft proposed order is issued.

(2) Concurrent with the issuance of the draft proposed order as described in OAR 345-027-0365, the Department shall:

(a) Send the notice described in section (3) of this rule by mail or email to:

(A) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020;

(B) Persons on any special mailing list established for the facility;

(C) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52); and

(D) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F.

(b) Post the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order, and the notice of the draft proposed order and written comment deadline on the Department website, and

(c) Make physical copies of the draft proposed order available to the public for inspection.

(3) Notice of the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order and written comment deadline shall include:

(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.

(b) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for additional information.

(c) Addresses of the physical location(s) and the website where the public may review copies of the complete request for amendment and draft proposed order.

(d) The deadline for the public to submit written comments to be included in the record of the draft proposed order and how such comments should be submitted.

(e) A statement that:

(A) A complete request for amendment has been received and reviewed by the Department.

(B) The Department has issued a draft proposed order.

(C) To raise an issue on the record of the draft proposed order, a person must raise the issue in a written comment submitted after the date of the notice of the draft proposed order and written comment deadline, and received by the Department before the written comment deadline.

(D) The Council will not accept or consider any further public comment on the request for amendment or on the draft proposed order after the written comment deadline that closes the record on the draft proposed order.

(E) Judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0371

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which the Proposed Order is issued, the process for requesting and granting a Contested Case, and the process for how the Council makes its Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type A Review. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0371

Proposed Order, Requests for Contested Case and Council's Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type A Review

- (1) No later than 30 days after the Council has reviewed the draft proposed order and considered all comments received on the record of the public hearing under 345-027-0367, the Department of Energy shall issue a proposed order recommending approval, modification or denial of the request(s) for amendment to the site certificate. The Department must consider any oral comments made at the public hearing, written comments received before the close of the record of the public hearing, agency consultation, and any Council comments. The Department may issue the proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than 30 days after the Council has reviewed the draft proposed order and considered all comments received on the record of the public hearing, notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay.¶
- (2) Concurrent with issuing the proposed order, the Department shall issue public notice of the proposed order by posting public notice as an announcement on its website and by sending public notice by mail or email to:¶
- (a) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020.¶
- (b) Persons on any special list established for the facility.¶
- (c) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52), and¶
- (d) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F.¶
- (3) Notice of the proposed order shall include:¶
- (a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.¶
- (b) A description of the process for requesting a contested case.¶
- (c) The physical and website addresses of where the public may review copies of the proposed order.¶
- (d) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for more information.¶
- (4) On the same date the notice of proposed order as described in section (2) is issued, the Department shall send a notice of the opportunity to request a contested case to the certificate holder and to all persons who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing as described in OAR 345-027-0367. The notice shall include the deadline for requesting a contested case and restatements of sections (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9).¶
- (5) Only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-027-0367 may request a contested case proceeding on the proposed order for an amendment to the site certificate. To properly raise an issue in a request for a contested case proceeding on the proposed order for an amendment, the issue must be within the jurisdiction of the Council, and the person must have raised the issue in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing, unless the Department of Energy did not follow the requirements of OAR 345-027-0367, or unless the action recommended in the proposed order differs materially from the draft proposed order, including any recommended conditions of approval, in which case the person may raise only new issues within the jurisdiction of the Council that are related to such differences. If a person has not raised an issue at the public hearing with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker an opportunity to respond to the issue, the Council shall not grant a contested case proceeding for that issue. To have raised an issue with sufficient specificity, the person must have presented facts at the public hearing that support that person's position on the issue.¶
- (6) Contested case requests must be submitted in writing and must be received by the Department by a specified deadline that is at least 30 days from the date of notice in section (4). Contested case requests must include:¶
- (a) The person's name, mailing address and email address and any organization the person represents;¶
- (b) A short and plain statement of the issue or issues the person desires to raise in a contested case proceeding;¶

- (c) A statement that describes why the Council should find that the requester properly raised each issue, as described in section (7), including a specific reference to the person's prior comments to demonstrate that the person raised the specific issue or issues on the record of the public hearing, if applicable;¶
- (d) A statement that describes why the Council should determine that each identified issue justifies a contested case, under the evaluation described in section (9);¶
- (e) A detailed description of the person's interest in the proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding;¶
- (f) Name and address of the person's attorney, if any;¶
- (g) A statement of whether the person's request to participate in a contested case is as a party or a limited party, and if as a limited party, the precise area or areas in which participation is sought;¶
- (h) If the person seeks to protect a personal interest in the outcome of the proceeding, a detailed statement of the person's interest, economic or otherwise, and how such interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding;¶
- (i) If the person seeks to represent a public interest in the results of the proceeding, a detailed statement of such public interest, the manner in which such public interest will be affected by the results of the proceeding, and the person's qualifications to represent such public interest; and¶
- (j) A statement of the reasons why others who commented on the record of the public hearing cannot adequately represent the interest identified in subsections (h) or (i).¶
- (7) Before considering whether an issue justifies a contested case proceeding under section (9), the Council must determine that the person requesting a contested case commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing and properly raised each issue included in the request. To determine that a person properly raised each issue included in the request, the Council must find that:¶
- (a) The person making the contested case request raised the issue on the record of the public hearing described in OAR 345-027-0367 with sufficient specificity to afford the Council, the Department and the certificate holder an adequate opportunity to respond to the issue;¶
- (b) The Department did not follow the requirements of OAR 345-027-0367; or¶
- (c) If the action recommended in the proposed order, including any recommended conditions of approval, differs materially from the action recommended in the draft proposed order, the contested case request identified new issues that are related to such material differences.¶
- (8) If the Council finds that the person requesting a contested case failed to comment in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing or failed to properly raise any issue, as described in section (7), the Council must deny that person's contested case request. If the Council finds that the person requesting a contested case commented in person or in writing on the record of the public hearing and properly raised one or more issues, the Council's determination of whether an issue justifies a contested case, as described in section (9), shall be limited to those issues the Council finds were properly raised.¶
- (9) After identifying the issues properly raised the Council shall determine whether any properly raised issue justifies a contested case proceeding on that issue. To determine that an issue justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council must find that the request raises a significant issue of fact or law that may affect the Council's determination that the facility, with the change proposed by the amendment, meets the applicable laws and Council standards included in chapter 345 divisions 22, 23 and 24. If the Council does not have jurisdiction over the issue raised in the request, the Council must deny the request.¶
- (10) The Council must take one of the following actions when determining if a request identifying one or more properly raised issues justifies a contested case proceeding:¶
- (a) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more properly raised issues that justify a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to -0014 and 345-015-0018 to -0085. The Council shall identify the contested case parties and shall identify the issues each contested case party may participate on. The parties to a contested case proceeding shall be limited to those persons who commented on the record of the public hearing and who properly raised issues in their contested case request that the Council found sufficient to justify a contested case, except that the

certificate holder is an automatic party to a contested case. The issues a party to a contested case proceeding may participate on shall be limited to those issues that party properly raised in its contested case request that the Council found sufficient to justify a contested case, except that the certificate holder may participate on any issue the Council found sufficient to justify a contested case proceeding.¶

(b) If the Council finds that the request identifies one or more properly raised issues that an amendment to the proposed order, including modification to conditions, would settle in a manner satisfactory to the Council, the Council may deny the request as to those issues and direct the Department to amend the proposed order and send a notice of the amended proposed order to the persons described in section (4). Only the certificate holder and those persons who commented on the record of the hearing may, in a writing received by the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the notice of the amended proposed order, request a contested case proceeding limited to issues related to the amendment to the proposed order. As described in section (9), the Council shall determine whether any issue identified in the request for a contested case proceeding justifies a contested case proceeding. A person's contested case request under this subsection shall include:¶

(A) The person's name, mailing address and email address;¶

(B) A statement of the contested issues related to the amendment to the proposed order, including facts believed to be at issue; and¶

(C) A statement that describes why the Council should find an issue justifies a contested case, as described in section (8).¶

(c) If the Council finds that the request does not identify a properly raised issue that justifies a contested case proceeding, the Council shall deny the request. In a written order denying the request, the Council shall state the basis for the denial. The Council shall then adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR-345-027-0375. In a written order the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.¶

(11) If there is no request for a contested case proceeding as described in section (6) or subsection (10)(b), the Council, may adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0375. In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.¶

(12) Judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0372

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which the Proposed Order is issued, the process for requesting and granting a Contested Case, and the process for how the Council makes its Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type B Review. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017. Provides that judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0372

Proposed Order and Councils Final Decision on Requests for Amendment Under Type B Review

(1) No later than 21 days after the written comment deadline that closes the record on the draft proposed order, the Department of Energy shall issue a proposed order recommending approval, modification or denial of the request(s) for amendment to the site certificate. The Department must consider any written comments received before the close of the record on the draft proposed order and any agency consultation. The Department may issue the proposed order at a later date, but the Department shall, no later than 21 days after the close of the record on the draft proposed order, notify the certificate holder in writing of the reasons for the delay.

(2) Concurrent with issuing the proposed order, the Department shall issue public notice of the proposed order by posting public notice as an announcement on its website and by sending public notice by mail or email to:

(a) Persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020,

(b) Persons on any special list established for the facility,

(c) The reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010(52), and

(d) The updated property owner list as described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(f) Exhibit F.

(3) Notice of the proposed order shall include:

(a) A description of the facility and the facility's general location.

(b) The physical and website addresses of where the public may review copies of the proposed order.

(c) The name, address, email address and telephone number of the Department representative to contact for more information.

(d) A statement that judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

(4) The Council, may adopt, modify or reject the proposed order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0375. In a written order, the Council shall either grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate. If the Council grants issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall issue an amended site certificate, which is effective upon execution by the Council Chair and by the certificate holder.

(5) Judicial review of the Council's final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0375

RULE SUMMARY: States the scope of Council's review and what standards and laws apply to the Council's review of various types of changes proposed in a request for amendment. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0375

Scope of Council's Review

(1) In making a decision to grant or deny issuance of an amended site certificate, the Council shall apply the applicable laws and Council standards required under section (2) and in effect on the dates described in section (3).¶

(2) To issue an amended site certificate, the Council shall determine that the preponderance of evidence on the record supports the following conclusions:¶

(a) For a request for amendment proposing to add new area to the site boundary, the portion of the facility within the area added to the site by the amendment complies with all laws and Council standards applicable to an original site certificate application.¶

(b) For a request for amendment to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction, after considering any changes in facts or law since the date the current site certificate was executed, the facility complies with all laws and Council standards applicable to an original site certificate application. However, for requests to extend completion deadlines, the Council need not find compliance with an applicable law or Council standard if the Council finds that:¶

(A) The certificate holder has spent more than 50 percent of the budgeted costs on construction of the facility;¶

(B) The inability of the certificate holder to complete the construction of the facility by the deadline in effect before the amendment is the result of unforeseen circumstances that are outside the control of the certificate holder;¶

(C) The standard, if applied, would result in an unreasonable financial burden on the certificate holder; and¶

(D) The Council does not need to apply the standard to avoid a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment;¶

(c) For any other requests for amendment not described above, the facility, with the proposed change, complies with the applicable laws or Council standards that protect a resource or interest that could be affected by the proposed change.¶

(d) For all requests for amendment, the amount of the bond or letter of credit required under OAR 345-022-0050 is adequate.¶

(3) In making the findings required to grant an amendment under section (2), the Council shall apply the applicable law and Council standards in effect on the following dates:¶

(a) For the applicable substantive criteria under the Council's land use standard, as described in OAR 345-022-0030, the date the certificate holder submitted the request for amendment, and¶

(b) For all other applicable laws and Council standards, the date the Council issues the amended site certificate.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0380

RULE SUMMARY: States when and how the Type C review process could be approved, and the procedural steps of the Type C review process. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0380

Type C Review Process for Pre-Operational Requests for Amendment

- (1) A certificate holder may only request the type C review for a request for amendment when the change proposed in the request for amendment relates to the facility, or portion/phase of the facility, not yet in operation, but approved for construction in the site certificate or amended site certificate. A certificate holder cannot request type C review of a request for amendment proposing to extend construction deadlines.¶
- (2) Requests under section (1) must be submitted in writing to the Department of Energy and must include:¶
- (a) A complete request for amendment, including the information described in 345-027-0360(1);¶
- (b) The reasons why the certificate holder needs type C review of its request for amendment;¶
- (c) An explanation of why the proposed change could not have been reasonably foreseen by the certificate holder;¶
- (d) An explanation of why the proposed change is unavoidable; and¶
- (e) Reasons why the type C review is adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts to the resources and interests protected by Council standards.¶
- (3) Upon receiving a request under sections (1) and (2), the Department shall post the request and the request for amendment on the Department's website.¶
- (4) Within 3 business days after receiving a request under sections (1) and (2), the Department shall issue a written determination either granting or denying type C review. Upon issuance, the Department shall post the written determination on its website.¶
- (5) If the Department denies type C review, the certificate holder may request the Department's determination to be referred to the Council. If requested, the Department must refer its determination to the Council for concurrence, modification or rejection. Upon a Department determination being referred to the Council, the Council chair shall convene a Council meeting as promptly as possible as described in OAR 345-011-0015.¶
- (6) To grant a request under section (1), the Department or the Council must find:¶
- (a) Construction of the certificated energy facility, or portion of the certificated energy facility, has not been deemed complete;¶
- (b) The request for amendment is complete;¶
- (c) Type C review is necessary;¶
- (d) The proposed change could not have been reasonably foreseen by the certificate holder;¶
- (e) The proposed change is unavoidable; and¶
- (f) Type C review is adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts to the resources and interests protected by the Council's standards.¶
- (7) Within 7 days after a request under section (1) is granted, the Department shall:¶
- (a) Issue a draft temporary order approving or denying the request for amendment, including a recommendation to the Council on whether Council review should be completed through the type A or type B review process; and¶
- (b) Post the draft temporary order on the Department's website.¶
- (8) The Council shall, at its first meeting following the Department's issuance of a draft temporary order, consider the draft temporary order and consider whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process. Upon issuance of a draft temporary order, the Council chair may call a special Council meeting, as described in OAR 345-011-0015, to be held as promptly as possible.¶
- (9) After considering the draft temporary order and the Department's recommendation on whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process, the Council shall adopt, modify, or reject the draft temporary order based on the considerations described in OAR 345-027-0375, and the Council shall decide whether review should be completed through the type A or type B review process. In a written temporary order,

the Council shall either temporarily grant issuance of an amended site certificate, or deny issuance of an amended site certificate.

(10) Before implementing any change approved by the Council's temporary order, the certificate holder must submit an authorized acknowledgement that the certificate holder accepts all terms and conditions of the temporary order.

(11) If review is to be completed through the type A review process, review proceeds as described in 345-027-0367, -0371, and -0375, where the temporary order replaces all references to the draft proposed order.

(12) If review is to be completed through the type B review process, review proceeds as described in 345-027-0368, -0372, and -0375, where the temporary order replaces all references to the draft proposed order.

(13) Action taken by the certificate holder under the authority of the temporary order that is inconsistent with the language and conditions of the final order is not a violation so long as the inconsistency is remedied by the certificate holder as specified by the Council in the final order.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0385

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which certificate holders can make a request for amendment to extend construction deadlines. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0385

Request for Amendment to Extend Construction Deadlines

(1) The certificate holder may request an amendment to the site certificate to extend the deadlines for beginning or completing construction of the facility, or portion/phase of the facility, that the Council has approved in a site certificate or an amended site certificate by submitting a preliminary request for amendment in accordance with 345-027-0360. The preliminary request for amendment must include an explanation of the need for an extension and must be submitted to the Department of Energy before the applicable construction deadline, but no earlier than the date twelve months before the applicable construction deadline.

(2) A preliminary request for amendment received by the Department within the time allowed under section (1) to extend the deadlines for beginning and completing construction suspends expiration of the site certificate or amended site certificate until the Council acts on the request for amendment. If the Council denies the extension request after the applicable construction deadline, the site certificate is deemed expired as of the applicable construction deadline specified in the site certificate or amended site certificate.

(3) If the Council grants an amendment under this rule, the Council shall specify new deadlines for beginning or completing construction that are the later of:

(a) Three years from the deadlines in effect before the Council grants the amendment, or

(b) Following a contested case proceeding conducted pursuant to OAR 345-027-0371, two years from the date the Council grants the amendment.

(4) For requests for amendment to the site certificate received under this rule to extend construction deadlines for facilities or portions of the facility the Council shall not grant more than two amendments to extend the deadline for beginning construction of a facility or a phase of a facility.

(5) For requests for an amendment to the site certificate to extend construction deadlines for facilities, or portions/phases of facilities, not yet in construction, but already approved for construction in the site certificate or amended site certificate prior to October 24, 2017:

(a) Sections (1) and (2) of this rule apply;

(b) Sections (3) and (4) of this rule do not apply;

(c) When considering whether to grant a request for amendment for a deadline extension made under this section, the Council shall consider how many extensions it has previously granted; and

(d) If a request for amendment for a deadline extension made under this section is granted, the Council shall specify new deadlines for beginning or completing construction that are not more than two years from the deadlines in effect before the Council grants the amendment.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.370, 469.405, 469.503

ADOPT: 345-027-0390

RULE SUMMARY: States the process by which a person may request that subsequent laws or rules (laws that became effective after an approved site certificate or amended site certificate was issued) be made applicable to a facility and a site certificate holder. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0390

Request by Any Person for Amendment to Apply Later-Adopted Laws

- (1) Any person may request an amendment of a site certificate to apply a law(s), including local government ordinances, statutes, rules or Council standards, adopted after the date the site certificate was executed, if the person contends failure to apply the law(s) results in a significant threat to the public health or safety or to the environment. The Department of Energy itself may initiate such a request.¶
- (2) To request an amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) under this rule, the person shall submit a preliminary request for amendment to the Department with the information described in 345-027-0360(1)(a),(c),(d) and the following:¶
- (a) Identification of the law(s) that the person seeks to apply to the facility; and¶
- (b) The particular facts that the person believes clearly show a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later adopted law(s).¶
- (3) If the Department receives a preliminary request for amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) as described in this rule from any person other than the certificate holder, the Department shall send a copy of the request to the certificate holder. The transmittal shall include a deadline by which the certificate holder must submit a response to the Department. In its response, the certificate holder shall state whether it agrees that there is a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s).¶
- (a) If the certificate holder concludes the later-adopted law(s) should be applied to the facility, the Council shall review the request to apply later-adopted law(s) as a complete request for amendment in accordance with section (5).¶
- (b) If the certificate holder concludes that the law(s) should not be applied to the facility, or if the certificate holder does not respond with its conclusion before the specified deadline, the Department shall ask the Council to determine whether the request clearly shows a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later-adopted law(s).¶
- (A) If the Council determines there is not a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later adopted law(s), the Council shall deny the request to apply later-adopted law(s).¶
- (B) If the Council determines there is a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment that requires application of the later adopted law(s), the Council shall review the request to apply later-adopted law(s) as a complete request for amendment in accordance with section (5).¶
- (4) A preliminary request for amendment to apply later-adopted law(s) under this rule is considered a complete request for amendment for purposes of OAR 345-027-0363 on:¶
- (a) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by the certificate holder, the date the request is received by the Department.¶
- (b) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by a person other than the certificate holder, and if the certificate holder responds as described in subsection (3)(a), the date the response described in subsection (3)(a) is received by the Department.¶
- (c) If the request to apply later-adopted law(s) is made by a person other than the certificate holder, and if the certificate holder responds as described in subsection (3)(b) or does not respond before the specified deadline under section (3), the date of the Council's determination under paragraph (3)(b)(B).¶
- (5) After receiving a complete request for amendment under section (4) of this rule, the Council shall review the request for amendment as described in OAR 345-027-0365, 345-027-0367, 345-027-0371 and 345-027-0375.

except that:

(a) If the Department recommends approval or modified approval of the requested amendment, the Department shall include in the proposed order described in OAR 345-027-0371 any new or modified site certificate conditions necessary to assure compliance with the law(s) applied to the facility under the proposed order;

(b) If the Department in its proposed order recommends approval or modified approval of the requested amendment, the certificate holder may, by written request submitted to and received by the Department within 30 days after the Department issues the proposed order, ask the Council to hold a contested case proceeding on the proposed order. In the request, the certificate holder shall provide a description of the issues to be contested and a statement of the facts believed to be at issue. If the certificate holder requests a contested case proceeding, the Council shall conduct a contested case proceeding according to the applicable provisions of OAR 345-015-0012 to -0014, and 345-015-0018 to 345-015-0085 limited to the issues stated by the certificate holder; and

(c) The Council shall include new conditions in a site certificate amended under this rule only if the Council finds that the conditions are necessary based upon a clear showing of a significant threat to the public health, safety or the environment.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.405

ADOPT: 345-027-0400

RULE SUMMARY: States the circumstances that require a request for amendment to transfer the site certificate and the process by which that review is completed. Adopts provisions included in Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017.

CHANGES TO RULE:

345-027-0400

Request for Amendment to Transfer Ownership, Possession or Control of the Facility or the Certificate Holder ¶

(1) For the purpose of this rule:¶

(a) A request for amendment to a site certificate to transfer the site certificate is required for a transaction that results in a change in the ownership, possession or control of the facility or the certificate holder.¶

(b) "New owner" means the person or entity that will gain ownership, possession or control of the facility or the certificate holder.¶

(2) When the certificate holder has knowledge that a transaction that requires a transfer of the site certificate as described in section (1)(a) is or may be pending, the certificate holder shall notify the Department of Energy. In the notice, the certificate holder shall include the name and contact information of the new owner, and the date of the transfer of ownership. If possible, the certificate holder shall notify the Department at least 60 days before the date of the transfer of ownership.¶

(3) A transaction that would require a transfer of the site certificate as described in subsection (1)(a) does not terminate the transferor's duties and obligations under the site certificate until the Council approves a request for amendment to transfer the site certificate and issues an amended site certificate. The new owner is not allowed to construct or operate the facility until an amended site certificate as described in section (10) or a temporary amended site certificate as described in section (11) becomes effective.¶

(4) To request an amendment to transfer the site certificate, the new owner shall submit a written request to the Department that includes the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(a), (d), (f) and (m), a certification that the new owner agrees to abide by all terms and conditions of the site certificate currently in effect and, if known, the expected date of the transaction. If applicable, the new owner shall include in the request the information described in OAR 345-021-0010(1)(y)(O)(iv).¶

(5) The Department may require the new owner to submit a written statement from the current certificate holder, or a certified copy of an order or judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, verifying the new owner's right, subject to the provisions of ORS Chapter 469 and the rules of this chapter, to possession or control of the site or the facility.¶

(6) Within 15 days after receiving a request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, the Department shall send a notice of the request by mail or email to the reviewing agencies as defined in OAR 345-001-0010, to all persons on the Council's general mailing list as defined in OAR 345-011-0020, to any special list established for the facility and to the updated property owner list submitted by the new owner under section (4). In the notice, the Department shall describe the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, specify a date by which comments are due and state that the date of the Council's transfer hearing will be announced on the Department's website.¶

(7) Before acting on the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate, the Council shall hold a transfer hearing. The Council shall hold the transfer hearing during a Council meeting and shall provide notice of the hearing on its meeting agenda, which will be sent by mail or email to the Council's general mailing list in advance of the meeting. The transfer hearing is not a contested case hearing. During the hearing the Council will accept comments from the public, reviewing agencies and new owner regarding the new owner's compliance with the Council standards described in subsection (8)(a).¶

(8) At the conclusion of the transfer hearing or at a later meeting, the Council may issue an order approving the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate if the Council finds that:¶

(a) The new owner complies with the Council standards described in OAR 345-022-0010, 345-022-0050 and, if applicable, OAR 345-024-0710(1); and¶

(b) The new owner is or will be lawfully entitled to possession or control of the site or the facility described in the site certificate.¶

(9) Except as described in OAR 345-027-0351(5), the Council shall not otherwise change the terms and conditions of the site certificate in an order approving the request for amendment to transfer the site certificate.¶

(10) Upon issuing the order described in section (8), the Council shall issue an amended site certificate that names the new owner as the new certificate holder or as the new owner of the certificate holder. The amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the new owner. The Council shall issue the amended site certificate in duplicate counterpart originals and each counterpart, upon signing, will have the same effect.¶

(11) If the Council chair determines that special circumstances justify emergency action, the Council chair may, upon a written request from the new owner that includes a showing that the new owner can meet the requirements of section (8), issue a temporary amended site certificate that names the new owner as the new certificate holder or as the new owner of the certificate holder. The temporary amended site certificate is effective upon execution by the Council chair and the new owner. The temporary amended site certificate expires when an amended site certificate as described in section (10) becomes effective or as the Council otherwise orders.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 469.470

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 469.401, 469.405



COURT REPORTING

LEGAL VIDEOGRAPHY

VIDEOCONFERENCING

TRIAL PRESENTATION

MOCK JURY SERVICES

LEGAL TRANSCRIPTION

COPYING AND SCANNING

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS



FINAL

ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL MEETING

AGENDA ITEM C: SITE CERTIFICATE AMENDMEN PROCESS

RULEMAKING

HELD ON

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 2019

PORT OF MORROW - RIVERFRONT ROOM

2 MARINE DRIVE

BOARDMAN, OREGON



DEPOSITION AND TRIAL



(800) 528-3335

NAEGELIUSA.COM

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

APPEARANCES

Maxwell Woods, ODOE Senior Policy Advisor, Acting
Council Secretary

Christopher Clark, ODOE Energy Policy Analyst

Patrick Rowe, ODOJ Assistant Attorney General

Barry Beyeler, EFSC Chair

Hanley Jenkins, EFSC Vice Chair

Marcy Grail, Council Member

Ann Gravatt, Council Member (telephonically)

Kent Howe, Council Member

Mary Winters, Council Member

1 **FINAL**

2 **ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL MEETING**

3 **AGENDA ITEM C: SITE CERTIFICATE AMENDMEN PROCESS**

4 **RULEMAKING**

5 **HELD ON**

6 **THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 2019**

7
8 **MR. BEYELER:** Okay. It's 5:00. We'll get
9 back to work. And the next item on the agenda is
10 Item C, Site Certificate Amendment Process
11 rulemaking. Patrick?

12 **MR. WOODS:** Sure. Chair Beyeler and,
13 Patric, before we start, I just want to confirm that
14 Council Member Ann Gravatt's on the line and can
15 hear us okay?

16 **MS. GRAVATT:** Yeah, I'm here.

17 **MR. WOODS:** Great. Thank you. Mr. Chair,
18 you have a quorum, and we may proceed.

19 **MR. CLARK:** All right. For the record,
20 this is Christopher Clark, the rules coordinator for
21 the Council and analyst for the Department. We're
22 going to talk today about the site certificate
23 amendment process rulemaking, make a recommendation
24 for temporary rules. Before we get to that, I'd
25 like to provide a brief background on the amendment

1 rulemaking and what brings us here today.

2 So the amendment rules date back to late
3 2011 when the Council requested department staff
4 provide a briefing on the amendment process and
5 potential improvements to rules. Following that
6 briefing and several other meetings, the Council
7 formally initiated a rulemaking process in late
8 2012. As part of that process, in early 2013, the
9 staff facilitated two public workshops, and then
10 after receiving the feedback from those workshops,
11 appointed a RAC to provide additional input. Over
12 the next two years, the RAC met three times and
13 staff began the lengthy process of drafting proposed
14 rules, which were presented to and approved by
15 Council in November of 2016.

16 Staff issued a notice of proposed
17 rulemaking in January 2017, initiating the formal
18 rulemaking process as summarized in the Supreme
19 Court's decision in Friends vs. EFSC -- that is,
20 Friends of the Columbia Gorge vs. the Energy
21 Facility Siting Council that was released August 1st
22 of this year. The Council issued six public notices
23 about the rulemaking process, extended the comment
24 period four times, held three public hearings,
25 circulated three draft versions of proposed rules

1 and considered more than 150 written comments
2 between January and October 2017.

3 The final rules were then adopted by the
4 Council on October 19th, 2017, and filed on October
5 24th, 2017, through administrative orders EFSC 4-
6 2017 and 5-2017.

7 **MR. ROWE:** For the record, Patrick Rowe,
8 Department of Justice. I'm going to walk Council
9 through the decision that the Supreme Court issued
10 on August 1st. As Chris mentioned, Friends of the
11 Gorge, in December 2017, petitioned the Supreme
12 Court for review of the rules that were adopted.
13 I'll refer to those as the October 2017 rules. You
14 know them potentially as the Type A or Type B
15 amendment rules.

16 In their petition, the petitioners alleged
17 that there were three procedural and two substantive
18 errors. On August 1st, the Supreme Court released
19 its decision, and it held that there had been one
20 procedural error and one substantive error. And
21 I'll slow down a bit and describe each of those.

22 The procedural error, as noted in this
23 slide, said that the rules approved through the
24 orders issued in October 2017 were invalid because
25 the Council had failed to substantially comply with

1 ORS 183.335(3)(d). So what does that state? This
2 may ring a bell for those of you on the Council that
3 were members of the Council back when these rules
4 were adopted. That statute requires that, upon
5 request, an agency proposing a rule must "provide a
6 statement that identifies the objective of the rule
7 and a statement of how the agency will subsequently
8 determine whether the rule is, in fact,
9 accomplishing that objective."

10 So the issue that was presented by the
11 petitioners was whether the Council had provided the
12 latter statement, how it would determine if the rule
13 is satisfying its objective. The statute does not
14 say to whom the statement must be provided. It
15 doesn't say when it must be provided or whether --
16 or the manner in which it must be provided, whether
17 the statement can be oral or it must be written.
18 Petitioner has alleged that they needed to receive a
19 written statement from the Council laying out how
20 the Council would monitor the success of the rules.

21 At meetings discussing the rules, before
22 the rules were adopted, Council and staff discussed
23 how the success of the rules might be traced.
24 However, the Supreme Court held that those
25 discussions were not sufficient to meet the

1 statutory requirement for a statement. The court
2 found that the Council did not reach a final
3 decision as to how it would track the success of the
4 rules, and that the statement must be in writing,
5 specifically -- the Supreme Court's words -- "in
6 some written form that can be stored and retrieved."
7 So it was due to that lack of a written statement
8 indicating how the success of the rules would be
9 monitored. On that basis, that procedural error,
10 the court held that the rules adopted pursuant to
11 those two orders were invalid. That was the
12 procedural error.

13 The substantive error, the Court held that
14 there was one substantive error in all of the rules
15 that were adopted. That error appeared in three
16 rules. And that was a statement regarding judicial
17 review of Council decisions on amendments subject to
18 Type B review.

19 So as you'll recall, as you're probably
20 familiar with by now, Type B review, under the
21 October 2017 rules, is a more expedited review.
22 Under that review, Council considers written
23 comments on a proposed amendment, but Council does
24 not hold a public hearing, nor is there an
25 opportunity to request a contested case for

1 amendments that are subject to that Type B review.

2 Again, the idea is that would be a more expedited
3 review.

4 Three of the amendment rules stated that
5 the right to seek judicial review regarding an
6 amendment to proceeding under Type B review was
7 limited to those persons who had provided written
8 comments by the written comment deadline, and that
9 judicial review would be limited to issues raised in
10 that person's comments. So why did Council adopt
11 that rule? Council adopted that rule because that
12 rule is already in statute, addressing judicial
13 review of Council decisions on applications for site
14 certificates and site certificate amendments -- but
15 here's the catch -- that have gone through a
16 contested case proceeding.

17 So again, there is a statute. It's ORS
18 469.403. It says if you've gone through a contested
19 case proceeding, you can seek judicial review, only
20 if you previously commented on the record about that
21 amendment or that site certificate. That statute
22 does not have a provision regarding judicial review
23 of requests for amendment that do not go through a
24 contested case proceeding.

25 So because Type B review does not allow

1 for contested cases, the Court held that a different
2 statute governs judicial review of Type B amendment
3 decisions. That statute is ORS 183.482. That
4 statute does not include any requirements that a
5 person must have commented on the record in order to
6 be able to obtain judicial review. Rather, it
7 allows a petition for review to be filed by, among
8 others, "a person adversely affected or aggrieved by
9 the agency order." So in other words, the court
10 held that the Council exceeded its authority when it
11 adopted those three rules that stated only persons
12 who have commented on the record could seek judicial
13 review of a Type B amendment decision.

14 Now, significantly, those are the only
15 provisions in the October 2017 amendment rules that
16 the court held the Council did not have the
17 authority to adopt. As Chris will discuss, the
18 Department is recommending a temporary rule. He will
19 talk about when temporary rules may be adopted and
20 the mechanics of doing so. I'll discuss why the
21 Department is recommending temporary rules.

22 **MR. CLARK:** Thank you, Patrick. Yeah so
23 as Patrick mentioned, I'll just walk through the
24 statutory requirements for adoption of temporary
25 rulemaking. Under ORS 183.335(5), "Temporary rules

1 may be adopted without prior notice or hearing, or
2 upon any abbreviated notice or hearing that Council
3 finds practical, if it finds that its failure to act
4 promptly will result in serious prejudice to the
5 public interest or the interests of the parties
6 concerned."

7 Regarding notice, while it is not
8 required, we do want you to know that we did send
9 notice to our rulemaking email list that this would
10 be considered at today's meeting. We sent out notice
11 of the agenda when it was issued early last week,
12 and then notice to the email list again two days
13 ago.

14 One of the sort of procedural
15 considerations to make when adopting temporary rules
16 is that they may only be in effect for 180 days.
17 That means if you were to adopt rules today, they
18 could only be in effect until February. At that
19 time, they would automatically expire and revert to
20 what is in effect right now. And then the rules may
21 be effective upon filing with the Secretary of
22 State. So if you were to take action today, it
23 would be effective as soon as I am able to submit
24 whatever your decision is to the Secretary of State.

25 I think -- yeah, that is all, unless there

1 are additional questions about what the sort of
2 requirements are for temporary rules.

3 **MR. ROWE:** As you've seen from the packet,
4 the Department is recommending temporary rules, but
5 then also opening up new permanent -- discussions of
6 new permanent rules that would take place of the
7 temporary rules.

8 So one of the key things that Chris just
9 mentioned on the prior slide that justify temporary
10 rules is there being substantial prejudice to the
11 public or to interested parties if temporary rules
12 are not adopted.

13 I need to make sure that you understand
14 what's our status today. So our status today is the
15 Supreme Court issued its decision on August 1st.
16 Again, that decision held that all of the rules
17 adopted under the two orders that Council issued in
18 October 2017, that those rules are invalid. But
19 that decision does not actually take effect until
20 the court issues what's called an appellate
21 judgment.

22 The Court, as of today, has not issued an
23 appellate judgment, and it will not issue an
24 appellate judgment until the attorney fee issue is
25 resolved. And what I mean by that is both sides, at

1 this point in time, have had, up until today was the
2 the deadline to submit to the court a petition for
3 attorney's fees. So if you're a prevailing party,
4 you can say, Court, I won on issues X, Y and Z; I am
5 entitled to attorney's fees.

6 So we're waiting to see. We anticipate
7 that the petitioners will be submitting -- they may
8 have already done it by now while we've been here
9 today -- a petition for fees. The court won't issue
10 its appellate judgment until any dispute over
11 attorney's fees are resolved. Then it will issue an
12 appellate judgment that includes a final order, and
13 the final order will say, Okay, this is what our
14 decision was, and this is how we find with regard to
15 the petition for attorney's fees.

16 So what does that mean? It means as of
17 today, we're still operating under the October 2017
18 Type A, Type B, Type C amendment rules until that
19 appellate judgment is issued. Nevertheless, it's
20 State policy that when the court comes out with a
21 decision, that we'll honor that decision, even prior
22 to the appellate judgment being entered.

23 So the temporary rules -- once that
24 appellate judgment is issued, then the question
25 becomes what are we left with once that judgment is

1 actually issued. Petitioners assert that all of the
2 pre-October 2017 rules will revert to those rules
3 and requests for amendment -- here's the key part --
4 that are already in process. Because right now, as
5 you're aware, we have half a dozen requests for
6 amendment that have been submitted under the October
7 2017 rules. Petitioners assert that those requests
8 for amendment would have to be resubmitted under the
9 rules that were in place prior to October 2017. So
10 in other words, go back to go and start that process
11 again, but start that process under the rules that
12 were in place prior to October 2017.

13 The State is not certain and is
14 uncomfortable with assuming that the October -- the
15 rules that were in place prior to October 2017 will
16 automatically be in place. The reason for our
17 discomfort over that issue is because the manner
18 which the court issued its decision, the court
19 concluded, as I've mentioned, that the rules adopted
20 in October 2017 are invalid. But in October 2017,
21 when the Council adopted the Type A, Type B
22 amendment rules, it also repealed the rules that
23 were place prior to then.

24 Councilman Winters?

25 **MS. WINTERS:** There was no savings clause.

1 There was nothing. They were just repealed, which
2 sometimes happens.

3 **MR. ROWE:** Yeah, the rules were appealed
4 and the new rules adopted.

5 **MS. WINTERS:** Yeah.

6 **MR. ROWE:** And so there is a possibility
7 that once the appellate judgment issues, we would be
8 left with no rules whatsoever. That possibility
9 exists. Or as petitioners assert, we could revert
10 to the pre-October 2017 rules. Even if the rules
11 that were in place prior to October 2017 apply, the
12 Department believes that requiring resubmission of
13 requests for amendment under those rules would cause
14 serious prejudice to to those certificate holders.
15 And I will discuss that more in a moment.

16 The temporary rules, as Chris will walk
17 through, also, in a few minutes, they would avoid
18 prejudicing those certificate holders with pending
19 requests by allowing those requests to be processed
20 without having to resubmit their request and without
21 having to repeat procedural steps already taken.
22 The temporary rules, the Department believes, would
23 provide regulatory certainty and continuity in the
24 processing, also, of new requests for amendments
25 that may come in until permanent rules are adopted.

1 So discussing the potential for serious
2 prejudice to existing certificate holders with
3 pending requests for amendment. As I've mentioned,
4 currently, there are six pending requests for
5 amendment that are in various stages of being
6 reviewed by the Department and the Council.
7 Significantly, all of those are requests that have
8 been reviewed under the Type A process. The focus
9 of the challenge in the Supreme Court was on the
10 Type B review process. That was what petitioners
11 really had an issue with.

12 Most of the certificate holders whose
13 requests are pending are anticipating a decision on
14 those requests in the next few months. Two are
15 anticipating a decision at this meeting, the August
16 meeting. Requiring those certificate holders to
17 submit a new amendment application under the old
18 rules, the pre-October 2017 rules, would set them
19 back by at least several months, or potentially a
20 year or more, depending on how far they were into
21 the process. It would cause them to lose
22 significant time, financial resources already
23 expended in this process. For some, it would result
24 in project delays, potentially, lost contracts that
25 were based on expected timing of a decision from the

1 Council. It could result in them not meeting
2 contractual or other obligations dependent on a
3 timely decision from the Council.

4 So I can talk a bit -- in your materials
5 are letters from five of the certificate holders.
6 Max Woods sent those to you this Tuesday afternoon.
7 They are letters from five of the certificate
8 holders that describe what it would mean to them if
9 Council required them to resubmit a new request for
10 amendment.

11 First is Summit Ridge Wind Farm. That is
12 -- again, you have, in the materials Max emailed to
13 you on Tuesday afternoon, it's called a draft
14 Statement of Need. There's a Statement of Need for
15 the temporary rules. Attachment 1 to that document
16 is a letter from counsel for Summit Ridge regarding
17 why they would be prejudiced if they had to resubmit
18 their request for amendment.

19 The certificate holder advises that if it
20 were forced to start the site certificate amendment
21 process anew, it would result in serious prejudice
22 to its interests because it will have lost a year of
23 time and significant financial expenditures made on
24 the amendment to date. It would cause delay in
25 approving -- or a delay in approving the amendment

1 would likely impact the certificate holder's ability
2 to retain construction contractors, to procure
3 equipment, and market the power to be produced.

4 I will also note that petitioners in the
5 lawsuit have taken the position that, as a result of
6 the Supreme Court's decision, the permission to
7 construct the Summit Ridge Wind Farm has expired,
8 and the certificate holder -- if the certificate
9 holder still desires to pursue the project, it must
10 file an application for a new site certificate, not
11 for an amendment, and the words of the petitioner's
12 "effectively starting the permitting process over
13 from scratch." That was in petitioner's press
14 release about the Supreme Court's decision. Under
15 such circumstances, the entire facility may then be
16 in jeopardy, which obviously would cause serious
17 prejudice to the certificate holder.

18 Also attached to your materials is a
19 letter from Perennial Wind Chaser. If it were
20 forced to start the site certificate amendment
21 process anew, it would result in serious prejudice
22 to its interests because, again, it will have lost a
23 year of time and financial resources. In its
24 letter, Perennial contends that it would be harmed
25 and seriously prejudiced by the delay. That is

1 Attachment 3 to the draft Statement of Need in your
2 materials.

3 As with Summit Ridge, petitioners in the
4 lawsuit have taken the position that as a result of
5 the Supreme Court's decision, the permission to
6 construct the Perennial Wind Chaser facility has
7 also expired, and they would need to pursue an
8 application for a brand new site certificate.

9 Wheatridge Wind Energy Facility, that is a
10 letter from Council for the certificate holder, is
11 attachment 4 to the draft Statement of Need.

12 Counsel for the certificate holder advises that if
13 required to start the amendment process again, the
14 certificate holder would lose significant time and
15 financial resources already expended. They would be
16 in jeopardy of not meeting contractual obligations
17 to begin construction of certain components of the
18 facility.

19 Port Westward Generating Project, this is
20 a letter -- attachment 5 -- to the draft Statement
21 of Need. This is a Portland General Electric
22 project. The certificate holder has informed the
23 Department that any delay would have serious
24 implications for its ability to comply with a
25 statutory requirement that electric companies,

1 including the certificate holder, including PGE --
2 there's a statutory requirement that electric
3 companies invest in energy storage projects and have
4 a contract to procure 5 megawatts of energy storage
5 executed by January 1 of 2020. Again, that's
6 attachment 5, an August 13, 2019 letter from PGE.

7 I'm doing my best to, essentially,
8 summarize what's in these letters. I recommend, if
9 you haven't already done so, to take a careful look
10 at the letters directly from the certificate holders
11 or their counsel. Adoption of these temporary rules
12 would allow for continued processing of the current
13 request for amendment and would likely serve to
14 avoid this prejudice to PGE.

15 Montague Wind Power Facility, the
16 certificate holder -- the developer for Montague
17 sent a general letter in support of the temporary
18 rules. That's attachment 6. They didn't call out
19 Montague specifically, but it's from Avangrid
20 Renewables, and Avangrid is the developer for
21 Montague. In their letter, the certificate holder
22 points out that regulatory uncertainty regarding the
23 current status of the amendment rules can pose
24 increased risk for project financing, for contract
25 obligations, and investor relations.

1 So those are the reasons why the
2 Department recommends adoption of temporary rules to
3 avoid serious prejudice to each one of these
4 certificate holders that has amendments in process.
5 I want to make sure that you're understanding that
6 what the Department is proposing is that these
7 temporary rules also apply, as I mentioned earlier,
8 to new requests for amendment that may come in until
9 permanent rules are adopted.

10 Again, if a certificate holder were to
11 apply for an amendment to a site certificate, once
12 that appellate judgment is issued, it's not clear
13 what, if any, rules would govern the Department and
14 Council's review of that request. Adopting the
15 temporary rules would provide certainty that it's
16 the temporary rules that govern the amendment
17 process until the Council can adopt new permanent
18 rules. It would also provide -- temporary rules
19 would also provide continuity in processing for the
20 Department and for certificate holders who have been
21 operating under the October 2017 rules, obviously,
22 for nearly two years and now understand that process
23 and are accustomed to it.

24 So those are the reasons why the
25 Department believes there's substantial prejudice to

1 the certificate holders, why it's essential that
2 temporary rules be adopted also for new -- to
3 process new amendment requests that come in.

4 **MR. CLARK:** So once again, this is Chris
5 Clark, the rules coordinator. To meet the
6 objectives that Patrick just laid out for you all,
7 we are proposing a number of rulemaking actions.
8 Essentially, these would readopt the rules adopted
9 in 2017 in substantially the same form that they
10 were then. To do that, we would amend the effective
11 rules in Division 15 and 25 to readopt the changes
12 made in October 2017. We would then propose
13 suspending all the Division 27 rules that were
14 adopted or amended by that rulemaking. That
15 includes, I think, all of the Division 27 rules,
16 except for 120 and 140. There's maybe two rules
17 that were unaffected.

18 You cannot repeal rules through temporary
19 rulemaking. You can only suspend. So that would
20 put those rules out of effect for 180 days. We
21 would then adopt new rules to a replace those
22 invalidated rules with the -- and they would be
23 substantially similar to the rules that were
24 suspended, except for we would amend the
25 applicability rule to clarify the -- as Patrick

1 explained that the rules would apply to any pending
2 applications that were received on or before the
3 effective date of these rules, received and in
4 process. They would also -- we would make an
5 explicit statement that -- a statement that we would
6 continue processing any requests that were currently
7 in process. And I'll show you that language on the
8 next slide.

9 We'd also be amending the three specific
10 provisions that were identified as exceeding
11 statutory authority by the court. And I'll show you
12 that language as well. And then to just clarify
13 that these are new rules, the new Division 27 rules
14 would be adopted under new numbers. We're proposing
15 to start with the 300 series, so they would start
16 with rule 345-027-0311 and then continue from there
17 with the same last two digits, as the existing rules
18 have.

19 **MS. WINTERS:** Can I ask a question of
20 counsel?

21 **MR. CLARK:** Yeah.

22 **MS. WINTERS:** Just in the event that the
23 authority to adopt temporary rules is challenged, I
24 was -- the criteria in the statute, the (5)(a) that
25 you were just going over, seems fairly fact specific

1 -- and I've read the findings and the letters -- on
2 meeting that test of public interest or interests of
3 the parties concerned. But what I was wondering is
4 is there any case law out there interpreting for
5 another agency when there was a procedural or
6 substantive challenge where a rule was invalidated?

7 **MR. ROWE:** Yes, there is case law
8 interpreting that. And, you know, there's probably
9 about four different cases, and one, in particular -
10 - I'm paraphrasing it -- but it essentially said
11 that the court will not analyze the -- the court is
12 not going to put itself in the agency's position.
13 If the agency perceives there to be a substantial
14 prejudice or a need for the temporary rules and
15 identifies what that prejudice or that need is, then
16 the court will uphold the temporary rules. And I
17 could share that cite with you.

18 **MR. CLARK:** So as I mentioned, this would
19 be the amendment to the applicability rule. As you
20 can see, new text is underlined; removed text is in
21 strike through. We'd be adding some substantial
22 language there to clarify that the Department and
23 Council will continue to process all requests for
24 amendment and amendment determination requests
25 submitted on or after October 24, 2017, for which

1 Council has not made a final decision prior to the
2 effective date of these rules, without requiring the
3 certificate holder to resubmit the request or to
4 repeat any steps taken as part of the request, prior
5 to the effective date of these rules. We believe --
6 well, yeah, we had been advised that that is
7 sufficient to cover anything that is currently in
8 process. Yeah, we believe it's a good idea to make
9 that explicit statement as well, just to give
10 ourselves (inaudible).

11 The changes to the subsection -- or
12 Section 2, just remove the applicability statement
13 for the October 2017 rules, which are no longer
14 relevant. I will say that I did also delete the
15 phrase, "including the Trojan Energy Facility,"
16 because that facility is covered under ORS 469.410,
17 and now only consists of ISFISI.

18 To remedy the judicial review sections,
19 we're just proposing removing any language limiting
20 judicial review and reliance solely upon the
21 reference to ORS 469.403. We believe that these
22 rules should be well within mere statutory authority
23 because they mostly -- because they rely just on
24 statute.

25 So as we discussed earlier -- oh, I'm very

1 sorry.

2 **MR. HOWE:** Chair Beyeler, quick question.

3 On --

4 **MR. CLARK:** Would you like me to go back?

5 **MR. HOWE:** No. No, I just found it.

6 Yeah, the prior slide, it was referencing number 2
7 there that said notwithstanding Section 1 in the
8 rule, the rules don't apply to a facility described
9 in 469.410. What are those facilities?

10 **MR. CLARK:** Those are dates -- those are
11 facilities that were in operation before 19 --

12 **MR. WOODS:** Old facilities. They're
13 facilities that existed prior to EFSC existing.

14 **MR. HOWE:** Okay. Thanks.

15 **MR. CLARK:** There are a number of them,
16 but not too many left anymore. So as I mentioned
17 earlier, the temporary rules could only be in effect
18 for 180 days. So permanent rulemaking, whether or
19 not you adopt temporary rules, permanent rulemaking
20 will be required to replace the invalid rules. You
21 have several options for how you want to proceed
22 with the permanent rule making process. One of
23 those is the way that you would solicit public input
24 early in the process before initiating the formal
25 rulemaking process by filing notice of proposed

1 rulemaking action.

2 Essentially, you've used three options in
3 the past, that is, one, you could go ahead and issue
4 a notice now and just start a formal comment period,
5 respond to those comments as they come in; you could
6 solicit written input on proposed rules to give
7 stakeholders a chance to say what they think should
8 be included or amended in proposed rules; or you
9 could convene a rules advisory committee meeting.

10 Considering the time constraints, the 180-
11 day time constraints, and the significant amount of
12 public input that was gathered in the initial 2017
13 rulemaking, we are recommending that you seek
14 written input only and provide 30 days for
15 stakeholders to provide that advice to the
16 Department. Then we would bring back --

17 **MR. ROWE:** Could somebody on the phone
18 please mute your phone, please? Thank you.

19 **MR. CLARK:** Yeah. So we recommend
20 soliciting written input and providing a period of
21 time for stakeholders to provide that advice to you.

22 As I mentioned, the permanent rulemaking
23 process must be completed in 180 days, but because
24 rules may be effective no earlier than dates
25 provided in ORS 183.335(1), we would need to file

1 that notice of proposed rulemaking at least 49 days
2 before they could become effective. That is the
3 longest time.

4 **MR. WOODS:** And I will note that if
5 chosen, that middle option that Chris just
6 described, there is still a hearing on the proposed
7 rules. And Chris has a slide -- I think the next
8 slide is a schedule, and we would anticipate that
9 occurring in November.

10 **MR. CLARK:** Yeah. So this timeline
11 represents how the permanent rulemaking process
12 could play out under the recommendation that we just
13 proposed. So if you were to approve temporary rules
14 today and initiate a permanent rulemaking process
15 today, the last day temporary rules could be
16 effective is February 17, 2020. So if we were to go
17 out next week and solicit written advice from
18 stakeholders and provide them 30 days, we would
19 anticipate that we could bring proposed rule
20 language to you for your October meeting. Some of
21 these earlier dates are representing the normal
22 production cycle, so we would try to get that to you
23 with plenty of time to review.

24 We'd also be preparing all of the filing
25 forms associated with those in that time so that we

1 could issue the notice of proposed rulemaking by the
2 end of October. There would be a formal public
3 comment period after that, with the option to
4 provide an oral hearing that is not required unless
5 requested under certain conditions, but it is
6 general practice just to have one and schedule one
7 in advance. We would recommend that you schedule
8 that for November so that you have an additional
9 month to consider any comments and oral testimony
10 received. And we would kind of bring some revised
11 proposed rules back to you in December and have you
12 consider them for adoption at your December meeting.

13 If all that went through as planned,
14 permanent rules could be effective, I guess, as
15 early as December 23rd, which is the Monday after
16 your meeting, which would give us about a month of
17 buffer time before the temporary rules were to be
18 suspended. So there's a little bit of extra time
19 built into this, but not a whole lot.

20 So to summarize what we've just gone over,
21 our recommendation to you is to adopt temporary
22 rules that are substantially similar to rules
23 adopted on October 24th, 2017, with the changes that
24 we described before to the applicability rule and
25 correcting the substantive errors identified by the

1 Supreme Court. We're also asking you to initiate
2 permanent rulemaking to adopt permanent rules for
3 the review of site certificate amendments.

4 We would like you to also provide your
5 input on how you would like us -- how you would like
6 to solicit input, with our recommendation that you
7 direct us to solicit written input only and provide
8 30 days.

9 And then the third recommendation is not
10 something that you need to act on today, but as
11 Patrick explained, the procedural error we made was
12 that we did not provide a written statement that
13 explained how we would evaluate the previously
14 adopted amendment rules. So we would like you to,
15 at some point in time, provide guidance on what you
16 think that evaluation should be and when it should
17 be conducted. We will bring our recommendation to
18 you with proposed rules. But if you have any input
19 in the meantime, we are definitely welcome to it and
20 look forward to hearing it.

21 I believe that concludes our statements,
22 unless you have any further questions.

23 **MS. GRAIL:** For the record, this is Marcy
24 Grail, and yes, I have questions or comments or
25 something. So obviously, a fairly aggressive

1 timeline. And I like to be optimistic, but as I'm
2 looking at the sunshine right now, I know that's not
3 going to happen. So we start thinking about our
4 meetings later in the year and weather, and then I'm
5 looking at holidays. So I don't know what that
6 means. I'll just saying I'm logically thinking
7 about that.

8 And then I would request that you're
9 asking us about guidance. I would hope that that
10 would be clear in whatever you're soliciting from
11 the public, because if we are not -- if we've got a
12 big gap between what our perception is of what that
13 should be and what the public thinks, then we're
14 going to be, I suspect, right back to having more
15 problems.

16 **MR. CLARK:** That's specifically on the
17 third item.

18 **MR. WOODS:** I definitely agree. The back
19 of the calendar slide -- we built in a buffer the
20 best we could. Right? Timing is tough, 180 days
21 total temporary rule length. And so December -- in
22 years past, we have had -- I think it was two years
23 ago, we had December meeting that was snowed out.
24 That was in Salem. The buffer is about a month.
25 Now we haven't released or even discussed 2020

1 meeting dates yet, but presumably, we would keep the
2 third week of the month schedule, something like
3 that. So if we missed a meeting -- say there was
4 weather in December, as an example -- you could come
5 back in January and, weather permitting, consider
6 and adopt permanent rulemaking and still be within
7 that 180-day window. But that's the best we can do
8 with the schedule.

9 **MR. WOODS:** Questions? Comments?
10 Deliberation?

11 **MR. BEYELER:** What happens if you don't
12 make the 180 days?

13 **MR. CLARK:** So the Council would be
14 prohibited from adopting identical temporary rules.
15 There is precedent for adopting temporary rules that
16 are -- have some substantial changes made to them.
17 That would be one thing. If no action was taken at
18 the end of that 180 days, we would essentially be in
19 the position that we're in today where there's not a
20 lot of clarity about what rules are in effect.

21 **MR. BEYELER:** Well, it's only the
22 temporary rules that are putting back in the
23 previous language that we had before we passed the
24 2017 rules. So would that -- what you're changing
25 in language to revert it back to that, basically,

1 would that go away at the end of 180 days?

2 **MR. ROWE:** Basically, you'd be in a
3 position similar to where we are now. As Chris
4 said, you would either have no rules or the rules
5 that were in place prior to October 2017.

6 **MR. BEYELER:** Any other questions?

7 **MS. GRAVATT:** Yeah, Barry, it's Ann. And
8 I will fully admit, I can't hear well. What I'm not
9 clear about -- I understand the temporary rulemaking
10 recommendations. I'm really not clear on the timing
11 and the -- of the permanent rulemaking. And I
12 honestly would also like like to hear from
13 stakeholders on what they would want on the
14 permanent rulemaking.

15 **MR. CLARK:** Yeah, we don't know if you can
16 see the proposal. We would recommend soliciting
17 input before proposed rules, but in any case, there
18 would be a public comment period for people to
19 provide additional comment.

20 **MR. WOODS:** Yeah, Council Member Gravatt,
21 can you hear us okay? Absolutely, on the permanent
22 rulemaking, it would actually have a written -- if
23 Council takes up what we've proposed -- a written
24 comment period from, basically, next week, when
25 Chris can get this request for information out,

1 soliciting written comments and what the form of the
2 permanent rulemaking should look like. We would
3 then have staff prepare a draft of those rules,
4 bring it back to Council. That opens opens up a
5 permanent rulemaking, the official process -- I
6 don't know exactly what it's called -- on those
7 recommended permanent rules would include another
8 written comment period on the proposed rules, as
9 well as I would recommend -- we recommend the
10 Council adopt a requirement for a hearing on those
11 permanent rules, likely at the November Council
12 meeting. So there would be a lot of opportunity for
13 public input on the permanent rulemaking to fully
14 agree. Does that answer your question?

15 **MS. GRAVATT:** Sort of. I really can't
16 hear you, Max.

17 **MR. WOODS:** Okay. I apologize. I'll try
18 and yell. And your second request was around
19 listening to stakeholder input. That was on the
20 permanent rule making, correct?

21 **MS. GRAVATT:** Yes.

22 **MR. WOODS:** Okay. Absolutely, we will
23 have multiple opportunities, both written and, I
24 would recommend, oral added testimony, opportunity
25 for public input, stakeholder input, on the

1 permanent rulemaking.

2 **MS. WINTERS:** So I understand it, so
3 that's at the November hearing. But then staff
4 would potentially revise the rules, and Council
5 would consider them. But there wouldn't be another
6 chance for the public to comment to Council on the
7 revised rules? If they're minor revisions, it maybe
8 wouldn't matter. But if they weren't that, that was
9 an issue --

10 **MR. WOODS:** That's a good question,
11 Councilwoman Winters. I looked at Chris. I guess
12 it's possible that Council could open up another
13 comment period on revised rules.

14 **MR. CLARK:** It is possible. So generally
15 speaking, once you make your proposal, we would only
16 be making changes in response to comments already
17 received, at which point that would be -- there
18 would be another chance for you to deliberate. Once
19 the comment period is closed, though, you would not
20 consider any further comments, unless you extended
21 the public comment period.

22 So yeah, we could renote. That would
23 create some significant delays, and would not be
24 wise. We would only be revising proposed rules in
25 response to comments. You would have a chance to

1 deliberate, advise any other changes that you want
2 to see in response to issues raised by by
3 stakeholders.

4 **MR. WOODS:** Any further questions?
5 Comments? Deliberation?

6 Okay. Council, you have in front of you
7 Option for Motion Language. We request two motions,
8 one on the temporary rules and a second motion on
9 the initiation of permanent rulemaking.

10 **MS. GRAIL:** Chair Beyeler?

11 **MR. BEYELER:** Go ahead.

12 **MS. GRAIL:** Are we ready, folks? Okay.

13 Mr. Chair, I move to adopt temporary rules as
14 recommended by staff and direct staff to file the
15 rules with the Oregon Secretary of State
16 immediately.

17 We're doing them one at a time, right?

18 **MR. WOODS:** You have a move. Do we have
19 second?

20 **MR. HOWE:** Yeah, I'll second.

21 **MR. BEYELER:** We have a motion and a
22 second. Any further discussion?

23 **MR. HOWE:** Yeah, I would just simply say,
24 in support of that, that because of the serious
25 prejudice that we received comment from the Summit

1 Ridge and Perennial Wind Chaser, Wheatridge Wind,
2 Port Westward, and the Montague Wind, those are
3 serious considerations, and they've identified the
4 prejudice that they would experience if we didn't do
5 something here. And the Supreme Court has kind of
6 set this up so that we do need to do something. And
7 so I'm in support of the motion. It will provide
8 continuity, and it gives an opportunity for people
9 to have input in making whatever permanent rules as
10 we move on down the road. But I'm kind of moving
11 out of this motion, so I'll stop with that.

12 **MR. BEYELER:** Anything else? Mr.
13 Secretary, please call for the role.

14 **MR. WOODS:** Barry Beyeler?

15 **MR. BEYELER:** Aye.

16 **MR. WOODS:** Marcy Grail?

17 **MS. GRAIL:** Yes.

18 **MR. WOODS:** Kent Howe?

19 **MR. HOWE:** Yes.

20 **MR. WOODS:** Mary Winters?

21 **MS. WINTERS:** Yes.

22 **MR. WOODS:** Ann Gravatt?

23 **MS. GRAVATT:** Yes.

24 **MR. WOODS:** The motion passes.

25 **MS. GRAIL:** Okay. Moving on. Mr. Chair,

1 I move to initiate permanent rulemaking and direct
2 staff to solicit written input from stakeholders on
3 potential improvements on the temporary rules and
4 present proposed permanent rules to Council at the
5 October 2019 meeting.

6 **MR. BEYELER:** Do I hear a second?

7 **MS. WINTERS:** Second.

8 **MR. BEYELER:** Any discussion? Mr.
9 Secretary, please call the role.

10 **MR. WOODS:** Barry Beyeler?

11 **MR. BEYELER:** Aye.

12 **MR. WOODS:** Marcy Grail?

13 **MS. GRAIL:** Yes.

14 **MR. WOODS:** Kent Howe?

15 **MR. HOWE:** Yes.

16 **MR. WOODS:** Mary Winters?

17 **MS. WINTERS:** Yes.

18 **MR. WOODS:** Ann Gravatt?

19 **MS. GRAVATT:** Yes.

20 **MR. WOODS:** The motion passes.

21 Okay. That concludes Agenda Item C.

22 **MR. BEYELER:** Thank you, gentlemen.

23 **(Whereupon, Agenda Item C was concluded.)**

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, Robyn Fiedler, do hereby certify that I
4 reported all proceedings adduced in the foregoing matter
5 and that the foregoing transcript pages constitutes a
6 full, true and accurate record of said proceedings to the
7 best of my ability.

8
9 I further certify that I am neither related
10 to counsel for any party to the proceedings nor have any
11 interest in the outcome of the proceedings.

12
13 IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my
14 hand this 11th day of September, 2019.

15
16 

17
18
19 _____
20 Robyn Fiedler
21
22
23
24
25



Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor



550 Capitol St. NE

Salem, OR 97301

Phone: 503-378-4040

Toll Free: 1-800-221-8035

FAX: 503-373-7806

www.oregon.gov/energy

To: Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council

From: Christopher M. Clark, Rules Coordinator

Date: August 20, 2019

Subject: Agenda Item C Supplement: Summary of proposed temporary rules for Site Certificate Amendment Rulemaking for the August 22-23, 2019 EFSC Meeting.

Staff recommends Council adopt temporary rules in place of the October 2017 site certificate amendment rules. Specifically, temporary rules would allow Council to: (1) replace the amendment rules adopted on October 24, 2017; (2) clarify the process the Council will use to review requests for amendments and other review processes submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not yet made a final decision; and (3) amend provisions which exceeded the Council's statutory authority under the Type B review process, as identified by the Supreme Court. Additionally, Council must provide a statement of need and justification for temporary rulemaking. Staff and Oregon Department of Justice are providing Council with recommended draft statement of need and justification as a separate document, for Council's consideration.

Staff proposes the following rulemaking actions:

- 1. Amend** OAR 345-015-0014, 345-015-0016, 345-015-0080, 345-015-0083, 345-025-0006, 345-025-0010, and 345-025-0016 to reflect changes to rules made under Administrative Orders EFSC 4-2017 and EFSC 5-2017.
- 2. Suspend** OAR 345-027-0011, 345-027-0013, 345-027-0050, 345-027-0051, 345-027-0053, 345-027-0055, 345-027-0057, 345-027-0059, 345-027-0060, 345-027-0063, 345-027-0065, 345-027-0067, 345-027-0068, 345-027-0071, 345-027-0072, 345-027-0075, 345-027-0080, 345-027-0085, 345-027-0090, and 345-027-0100.
- 3. Adopt** OAR 345-027-0311, 345-027-0313, 345-027-0350, 345-027-0351, 345-027-0353, 345-027-0355, 345-027-0357, 345-027-0359, 345-027-0360, 345-027-0363, 345-027-0365, 345-027-0367, 345-027-0368, 345-027-0371, 345-027-0372, 345-027-0375, 345-027-0380, 345-027-0385, 345-027-0390, 345-027-0400.

Adopted rules will reflect rules adopted by Administrative Order EFSC 5-2017, except for the following changes (deleted language is in ~~strikethrough~~; new language is underlined):

OAR 345-027-00311:

(1) The rules in this division apply to all requests for amendment to a site certificate and amendment determination requests for facilities under the Council's jurisdiction that are submitted to, or were already under review by, the Council on or after the effective date of the rules. The Department and Council will continue to process all requests for amendment and amendment determination requests submitted on or after October 24, 2017 for which Council has not made a final decision prior to the effective date of these rules, without requiring the certificate holder to resubmit the request or to repeat any steps taken as part of the request prior to the effective date of these rules.

(2) Notwithstanding section (1) of this rule, these rules do not apply to except those facilities described in ORS 469.410(1), including the Trojan energy facility, and except that rules OAR 345-027-0050 through 345-027-0100 that were in effect prior to October 24, 2017 apply to requests for amendments to site certificates and change requests that have been received by the Department prior to October 24, 2017.

OAR 345-027-00368(3)(e)(E):

“(3) Notice of the complete request for amendment, draft proposed order and written comment deadline shall include: * * *

(e) A statement that:

* * *

~~“(E) Only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review shall be as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person’s written comments.”~~

OAR 345-027-00372(3)(d):

“(3) Notice of the proposed order shall include:

~~* * *(d) A statement that only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review shall be as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person’s written comments.”~~

OAR 345-027-00372(5):

~~“(5) Judicial review of the Council’s final order either granting or denying an amended site certificate shall be as provided in ORS 469.403, provided that only those persons, including the site certificate holder, who provided written comment by the written comment deadline may seek judicial review as provided in ORS 469.403 and issues eligible for judicial review are limited to the issues raised in that person’s written comments.”~~

1 **CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

2 I hereby certify that on the date set forth below, I filed the foregoing PETITION FOR
3 RECONSIDERATION OR REHEARING with the Energy Facility Siting Council via USPS
4 mail and e-mail at the following mailing address and e-mail addresses:
5

6 Energy Facility Siting Council
7 c/o Oregon Department of Energy
8 550 Capitol St. NE, 1st Floor
9 Salem, OR 97301
energy.siting@oregon.gov
SummitRidge.AMD4@Oregon.gov

10 DATED: November 29, 2019

11
12 FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

13 /s/ Nathan J. Baker

14 Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980

15 Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on the date set forth below, I served a true and accurate courtesy
3 copy of the foregoing PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OR REHEARING via e-mail on
4 each of the following persons listed below at the following email addresses:
5

6 Todd Cornett, Division Administrator
7 Energy Facility Siting Division
8 Oregon Department of Energy
todd.cornett@oregon.gov

Dyann Blaine, Vice President and
Assistant General Counsel
Pattern Energy Group Inc.
dyann.blaine@patternenergy.com

9 Maxwell Woods, Senior Policy Advisor
10 Energy Facility Siting Division
11 Oregon Department of Energy
maxwell.woods@oregon.gov

Kevin Wetzel, Senior Manager,
Project Development
Pattern Energy Group Inc.
kevin.wetzel@patternenergy.com

12 Sarah T. Esterson, Senior Siting Analyst
13 Energy Facility Siting Division
14 Oregon Department of Energy
sarah.esterson@oregon.gov

Irene Gilbert, Legal Research Analyst
Friends of the Grand Ronde Valley
ott.irene@frontier.com

15 Patrick Rowe, Senior Assistant Attorney General
16 Oregon Department of Justice
17 patrick.g.rowe@doj.state.or.us

Fuji Kreider and Jim Kreider
fkreider@campblackdog.org
jkreider@campblackdog.org

18 I further certify that on the date set forth below, I served a true and accurate courtesy
19 copy of the foregoing PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OR REHEARING via USPS
20 mail on the registered agent for Summit Ridge Wind, LLC at the following mailing address:
21

22 Summit Ridge Wind, LLC
23 c/o C T Corporation System
24 780 Commercial St. SE, Ste 100
Salem, OR 97301

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 DATED: November 29, 2019
2

3 FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

4 /s/ Nathan J. Baker

5 Nathan J. Baker, OSB No. 001980

6 Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28