

# MINUTES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

## August 13, 2001 – Regular Meeting

Rowe Six Conference Center  
Building 1  
4224 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE  
Lacey, Washington

### Item 1: Call to Order

Acting Chair Charles Carelli called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

### Item 2: Roll Call

#### EFSEC COUNCIL MEMBERS

**Community, Trade & Economic Development**  
**Department of Ecology**  
**Department of Fish & Wildlife**  
**Department of Natural Resources**  
**Utilities and Transportation Commission**

Heather Ballash  
Charles Carelli  
Jenene Fenton  
Tony Ifie  
Dick Byers

#### EFSEC STAFF AND COUNSEL

Allen Fiksdal  
Mike Mills  
Michelle Elling

Irina Makarow  
Mariah Laamb  
Robert Fallis, AAG, EFSEC

#### GUESTS

Bill Staeger, Jones & Stokes  
Lynn Albin, Dept. of Health  
Laura Schinnell, Energy Northwest  
Diane Schwickerath  
Kirk Deal, Carpenters Union  
Mike Dunning, CFE-AGO  
Richard King, IBEW  
Alan Harger, WSDOT

Grant Bailey, Jones & Stokes  
Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie  
Mike Sotak, Duke Energy  
William Frymire, AGO  
Andrea McNamara, Senate Energy Cmt  
Ron Lavigne, CFE-AGO  
Steve Hall, Ecology & Environment  
Cindy Custer, BPA

### Item 3: Approval of Minutes – June 18, 2001 Special Meeting and July 2, 2001 Special Meeting

Heather Ballash made the following motion.

**Motion:** To approve the minutes for the June 18<sup>th</sup> and July 2<sup>nd</sup> Special meetings as presented. Jenene Fenton seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion was passed unanimously.

#### **Item 4: Adoption of the Proposed Agenda**

The agenda was accepted after moving Item # 12, Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, to agenda Item # 5.

#### **Item 5: Satsop Combustion Turbine Project**

##### ***PSD Permit Review-Status***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow presented a report on the status of the application for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) air permit review. EFSEC's Ecology permit writer issued a letter last week indicating he had received all the information needed to complete the review and prepare the draft PSD permit for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project. He expects to provide the draft to Ecology, EPA, EFSEC staff and federal land managers for internal review by the middle of August, so that EFSEC would be ready to issue the draft permit for public comment by August 24, 2001. At that time, a 30-day public comment period will start. Staff will advertise the 30-day public comment period and the public hearing date at the same time. At the end of the 30 days, the Ecology permit writer and staff will take the comments into consideration and prepare a responsiveness summary for the Council to consider in acting upon the permit. Staff expects it could take up to ten days to respond to comments. Staff is currently planning to bring the final draft PSD permit to the Council for action at its October meeting.

##### ***Natural Gas Pipeline***

***Chuck Carelli, Acting Chair***

Mr. Carelli requested comments on a draft letter responding to state Department of Fish and Wildlife concerns on the proposed natural gas pipeline for the Satsop CT Project. Counsel Rusty Fallis and Mr. Carelli collaborated on this letter and are asking that comments from Council members be e-mailed to Mr. Carelli by close of business, Tuesday, August 14, 2001.

##### ***Plan Reviews***

***Mike Mills, EFSEC Staff***

Mr. Mills introduced Mr. Mike Sotak, Duke Energy, and Ms. Laura Schinnell, Energy Northwest, who presented a report on the status of construction plans for the Satsop CT Project. On June 25 and August 1, 2001, Duke Energy/Energy Northwest (Duke) submitted a number of plans and specifications that require Council review and approval prior to the start of construction. These initial plans primarily cover site preparation and grading activities, along with general environmental and safety procedures. Duke would like to mobilize and begin site preparation activities during the first week in September. Mr. Mills indicated that staff didn't have a problem with contractor staging and some limited clearing of vegetation beginning then, but before excavation and grading work could begin, the more detailed drawings and specifications would need to be approved.

Mr. Mills indicated that the review of the site procedures/plans and construction drawings and specifications for site preparation and grading is being coordinated with by the state Department of Ecology, Department of Fish & Wildlife, and Grays Harbor County. Staff, in cooperation

with the reviewing agencies, expects to bring the plans to the Council at its September meeting for action.

***Grays Harbor County Contract***

***Mike Mills, EFSEC Staff***

Mr. Mills reported that staff has prepared a contract to secure the services of Grays Harbor County to review construction and building plans for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, but they may not be able to start as soon as EFSEC would like. Mr. Mills is meeting with county officials this week to discuss the draft contract and the work the county would be conducting as part of the plan review. Mr. Mills is hopeful that the county will be able to review the review services and expects to bring the contract before the Council at its next meeting. No action is being requested at today's meeting.

***Site Visit***

The Council requested that staff arrange a visit to the Satsop CT Project site, to be scheduled the afternoon of the same day as the evening air permit hearing in late September or early October.

**Item 6: Rulemaking**

***Progress Report***

***Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager***

Mr. Fiksdal reported on rulemaking activities that the Council has initiated. The Executive Committee met last week and directed Mark Anderson to complete a matrix he is compiling of the comments the Council has received about rulemaking. He will use the comments provided by Deborah Ross' White Paper; Charlie Earl's report to the Governor regarding the EFSEC; the Joint Legislative Task Force Report; and other comments received by staff.

Mr. Anderson has created a matrix, which identifies similar areas where possible rule changes may be necessary, and for each of those areas, summarizes comments that were made in the reports listed above. He will also categorize the rules into two groups: 1) Administrative – revisions requiring minor review; and 2) Complex – revisions needing in depth review, and perhaps additional public input. Staff is asking the Council to review the matrix and make suggested amendments to the categories the rules have been sorted into, or if there needs to be a correction to the explanation for each rule change or category in the matrix.

Ms. Fenton pointed out that only Executive Committee members received Mr. Anderson's original matrix, covering the proposed rule changes, which was handed out with a memo at the August 6 Executive Committee meeting. Staff will provide this memo, along with the original matrix, to all Council members.

**Item 7: Sumas Energy 2**

***Updated Schedule***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow reported that on August 8, 2001, the Council issued Order No. 760, Order No. 2, as part of its considerations of the Sumas Energy 2 (SE2) Second Revised Application. That order presented a schedule, which is being amending as follows; August 14, 2001, Public Informational Meeting to be held in Whatcom County; September 4, 2001, 3<sup>rd</sup> Pre-hearing Conference in Olympia; mid-September, EFSEC will issue the draft Supplemental

Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), with a public hearing scheduled for October 16<sup>th</sup>; end of September, EFSEC will issue the draft Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) air permit for public comment. Both of these documents have a 30-day public comment period. By mid-October, the comment period on the draft SEIS will close. Prior to the closing date, EFSEC will hold a Public Comment Hearing meeting in Whatcom County to receive public comments. The first week of adjudicative hearings will take place in Bellingham the week of October 29<sup>th</sup>, with two evening meetings to receive general public comments on the project and on the PSD permit. The adjudicative hearings will resume the week of November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2001, in Olympia. After the end of the adjudicative hearings, the Council will receive sequential briefings from the Applicant and Parties through December 24, 2001. The final supplemental EIS is expected to be available for the Council by the end of the year. Staff will distribute the updated schedule to all Council members and interested parties.

### ***Ecology Contract-Wetlands Review***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow reported that Ecology, represented by Susan Meyer, as EFSEC's 401 contractor, met with Sumas Energy 2 representatives and EFSEC staff on August 8, 2001, to discuss how the proposed changes to the SE2 project affect wetlands mitigation. Following this meeting, Ms. Meyer reported that the Ecology 401 team did not have resources to enter into a new contract with EFSEC to review wetlands mitigation for the proposed project.

Staff is working on finding a new contractor to perform the wetlands mitigation review. Staff is proposing that the work be integrated into the Jones and Stokes contract. Staff is recommending that Jones and Stokes review the Second Revised Application and the wetlands mitigation proposal therein, comparing that proposal to the analysis previously received from Ecology. Jones and Stokes can assess how the changes to the application meet the comments that Ecology had made at the end of last year and document suggested changes to the wetlands mitigation plan in the SEIS. This would allow integration of the 401 Water Quality certification public process into the SEIS comment schedule. Jones and Stokes could analyze all comments that are received and prepare a mitigation plan for the Council to review during deliberations, once the final EIS has been issued.

Staff recommends amending the Jones and Stokes contract to add Scope and Budget to their current contract to complete the additional wetlands analysis. Since the draft SEIS needs to be prepared by mid-September, Jones and Stokes would need to start on this project quickly. Staff recommends the Council hold a special meeting on Monday, August 20, prior to the beginning of the Executive Committee meeting, to amend the Jones and Stokes contract to include this work. Staff also plans to submit an amendment to the Jones and Stokes contract to include review of the Applicant's flood modeling work, consistent with the Council's discussion at the August 1st pre-hearing conference.

Ms. Fenton asked about Ecology's inability to provide the wetland mitigation review services for the SE2 application and how that would affect their ability to provide the same services to EFSEC for future applications. Ms. Makarow reported that EFSEC staff is working with other Ecology staff, on an overall proposal on how the department could address wetlands, water quality and air quality reviews in a timely manner for future EFSEC projects. EFSEC staff

expects to have a report from Ecology on this subject at the first Executive Council meeting in September.

***Office of Administrative Hearings Contract Extension***

***Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager***

Mr. Fiksdal reported that the Council needed to extend the contract currently in place with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for the services of an Administrative Law Judge. Judge Nan Thomas is currently providing law judge services for the Sumas project under this contract and EFSEC will continue to need her services during the Second Revised Application review process. This item was brought before the Executive Committee and it was recommended to continue with the contract as written, extending the contract's end date to December 31, 2002.

Staff is recommending that any future OAH contracts for new applications be written more specifically to include requirements for the law judge to oversee the adjudicative proceedings, as well as the drafting of Council orders to support the overall review process.

Dick Byers made the following motion.

**Motion:** To extend the current contract with the Office of Administrative Hearings to support the Sumas adjudicative process until December 31, 2002.

Jenene Fenton seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion passed unanimously.

**Item 8: Energy Northwest Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4**

***Columbia Operations***

***Mike Mills, EFSEC Staff***

Mr. Mills presented the Energy Northwest report on Columbia Generating Station (Columbia) Operations. On July 26, 2001, the plant was taken offline to repair a reactor re-circulation pump seal. It was repaired and on August 2<sup>nd</sup> the plant was synchronized to the BPA grid, officially ending the successful forced outage. On August 3<sup>rd</sup> the plant reached 100% power and is currently operating at 100% power.

***Resolution-Columbia Cooling System Sediments***

***Lynn Albin, Dept. of Health***

Ms. Albin reported on Energy Northwest's request for approval for the onsite disposal of contaminated sediments removed from cooling systems at the Columbia Generating Station. Ms. Albin explained that it takes large volumes of water to run the plant and that water is pulled from the Columbia River for the plant's cooling systems. Operation of those systems causes radionuclides contained in the source water or entrained from plant emissions to become concentrated in the sediment that accumulates in the various cooling systems (e.g., cooling tower decks and basins, spray ponds, etc.). The concentrations of radionuclides in the sediment often exceed the lower levels of detection for environmental measurements, thus requiring that the material be managed as low-level radioactive waste when cooling system components are cleaned.

Ms. Albin continued that in May 1995, the Council approved Resolution No. 278, thereby approving a plan allowing for the onsite disposal of cooling tower sediments. In June 2000, Energy Northwest submitted a revised application requesting long-term authorization to dispose of spray pond and other cooling systems at the Columbia site in the disposal area approved under Resolution 278.

Ms. Albin stated that the Departments of Health and Ecology have reviewed the revised application and supplemental information provided by Energy Northwest, and find that the proposed disposal plan, utilizing the previously approved disposal area, is a good idea and provides sufficient protections for public health and the environment. In a letter dated July 27, 2001, the Department of Health advised the Council that it supports the proposed amendment to Resolution No. 278, as it allows for the safe disposal of slightly contaminated sediments and follows the state's regulations for alternate disposal of slightly radioactive waste. Ms. Albin added that the revised disposal plan provides for a single, monitored location, while setting concentration limits, and sampling and monitoring requirements. To avoid confusion with the existing resolution, the department encourages the Council to issue a new resolution.

Mr. Mills reviewed several technical changes to draft Resolution No. 299 prepared by the Department of Health. Staff is recommending that the Council close out Resolution No. 278, and approve the onsite disposal plan proposed in Resolution No. 299.

Heather Ballash made the following motion.

**Motion:** To approve Resolution No. 299, and Attachment No. 1, thereby authorizing the onsite disposal of cooling system sediments from the Columbia Generating Station.

Dick Byers seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion was passed unanimously.

### ***Resolution-Sanitary Waste Treatment Facility***

***Lynn Albin, Dept. of Health***

Ms. Albin reported on changes requested by Energy Northwest in operating and monitoring requirements for the Sanitary Waste Treatment Facility (SWTF) that serves the Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1/4 sites. In 1991, the Council approved Resolution No. 259, that would allow the SWTF to accept wastes from U.S. Department of Energy" (USDOE) 400 Area (Fast Flux Test Facility). The resolution set the general monitoring and discharge requirements for operating the SWTF, and specific conditions for accepting wastes from the 400 Area. The Energy Northwest SWTF, built to accommodate the three nuclear projects, had the capacity to handle the 400 Area wastes because it was only using about 30,000 gallons per day of its design capacity of 170,000 gallons per day.

In 1994, Resolution No. 259 was amended to modify the monitoring requirements and discharge standards for the SWTF. At that time, no waste from the 400 Area had been delivered to the facility, except for an incident in 1992 in which some sewage accidentally overflowed into the line connected to Energy Northwest's facility. At that point, Energy Northwest blocked the line to prevent any 400 wastes from accidentally entering the SWTF. In April 1997, Energy Northwest advised the Council that negotiations had been completed with USDOE and they would begin to accept 400 Area wastes, subject to the conditions of Amendment 1 to Resolution 259.

Ms. Albin stated that in June 2001, Energy Northwest had again requested changes in monitoring requirements to focus more on what's coming into the treatment facility versus what's being discharged into the ponds; and at the same time was requesting authorization to receive and treat sanitary waste from offsite sources (primarily expected to be USDOE contractors on the Hanford Site). She indicated that the Department of Health had reviewed the proposed changes and didn't object to allowing additional waste sources, provided that the waste does not contain radionuclides above levels found in the environment (man-made); new waste sources are fully characterized; and only sanitary wastes will be accepted. The department is also agreeable to the change in the monitoring location, feeling that it will be a more representative sampling system. It was noted that the Department of Ecology has also reviewed the proposed changes and concurs with Health's findings.

Ms. Albin also pointed out that Energy Northwest and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) are currently discussing any possible licensing issues that might arise with the tritium that is in the waste stream coming from the 400 Area. Tritium, a radiological contaminant, comes from the contaminated groundwater that is the drinking water source for the 400 Area. The department recognizes that tritium from 400 Area drinking water will enter the SWTF, but is satisfied, as confirmed by sampling results, that the levels are below Safe Water Drinking Act limits, and does not represent a health hazard. The department supports continuing to allow treatment of the 400 Area wastes in the SWTF.

While the department and staff do not feel that the Energy Northwest and NRC discussions should delay acting on the resolution, it might be advantageous to see if they can reach some agreement in the near future. The Council decided to defer this item to the September regular meeting.

In response to a question, Ms. Albin confirmed that the SWTF is a non-radiological waste facility, and other than the 1992 incident and the tritium exception noted above, no radiological waste is to come into Energy Northwest's facility. The resolution reaffirms that they will not be able to accept any radiological waste or other non-sanitary waste streams at the facility.

***Dept. of Health FY 2001 Contract Amendment***

***Mike Mills, EFSEC Staff***

Mr. Mills informed the Council that the Department of Health (Health) recently became aware that they had exceeded the funding limit on their FY 2001 Emergency Preparedness contract by \$6,200. The Health program manager had provided justification for the over-expenditure and staff was reviewing if it could be approved for payment after the close of the fiscal year with counsel Rusty Fallis and the accounting office at Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED). Based on initial advise from Mr. Fallis, from a legal standpoint it appears that the Council could approve payment because it received the benefit of the services; the work was done in good faith and was allowable under the scope of work; and it is assumed if the Council had known of the exceeded amount in a timely manner (prior to June 30), the work would have been approved. However, Mr. Mills reported that CTED had raised a concern with approving the expenditure after the contract expiration date.

Acting Chair Carelli directed staff to pursue this matter further with counsel and CTED accounting to see if the contract could be amended to allow the department to be reimbursed for the additional \$6,200.

Council member Byers raised the point that the Council had dealt with a similar matter recently with the Jones and Stokes contract, and any action on the Health contract should be consistent with how that was resolved.

### **Item 9: Starbuck Power Project**

#### ***Application Submittal***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow presented an update on the Starbuck Power Project. She reported that the proponents expect to submit their application on August 27, 2001.

#### ***Jones and Stokes Contract Amendment***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow presented staff's recommendation to amend the Jones and Stokes contract to include Scope and Budget changes related to the review of the Starbuck application and preparation of a joint SEPA/NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She provided the Council with a summary list of all previous amendments to the Jones and Stokes contract. The proposed contract amendment - #16 – proposes to increase the contract by \$372,900.00. The scope would cover review of the Starbuck Application and preparation of EISs, including the draft, preliminary final and final EISs. The EISs would cover the requirements of both the state and national environmental policy acts (SEPA/NEPA). This is similar work as that completed under the Sumas Energy 2 contract, with the addition of the preliminary final EIS.

The Council asked what the costs are in preparing administrative drafts for Council review, and what impacts the preparation of the administrative drafts has on the overall Jones and Stokes contract budget and on the project schedule. Grant Bailey from Jones and Stokes indicated that they estimate cost of an administrative draft for Council review to be about \$10,000. Another issue needing to be considered is that if a NEPA/SEPA document is to be publicly issued, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) wants to review it before it is released. The preliminary final EIS would be subject to Bonneville's review, and the only savings to be recognized would be in copying costs, approximately \$500, and the integration of Council comments prior to the final EIS. Ms. Makarow summarized there would not be any significant savings in eliminating the preparation of administrative drafts for Council review.

The Jones and Stokes contract will also need to have its total contract limit increased over the current \$1.5 million cap. This amendment, along with other anticipated amendments, will raise the total of the Jones and Stokes contract to approximately \$2.1 million. The Council is being asked to approve the contract amendment to provide for: 1) the review of the Starbuck application and preparation of the EISs, an increase of \$372,900, thus increasing the total committed contract amount to approximately \$1.7 million; and 2) an increase in the overall contract of \$1.0 million, raising the total contract value to \$2.5 million.

Staff explained that it makes every effort to discuss and inform the applicant regarding needed budget increases for additional work prior to requesting a contract amendment. EFSEC's laws

and rules require that the applicant approve expenses incurred in application review exceeding \$25,000. This amendment memorializes the additional work that Jones and Stokes would do for the Starbuck project once the application is submitted, and the amount of the budget increase has been discussed with the applicant. The \$372,900 is an estimate to cover review work done on the application by the consultant, and to produce the draft, preliminary draft and final environmental impact statements (EISs).

Counsel Fallis recommended that this (and future) amendment(s) reflect clearly the increase to the total contract, as well as each specific task as it applies to the three projects being reviewed under this contract.

Heather Ballash made the following motion.

**Motion:** To approve Jones and Stokes Contract Amendment # 16, thereby increasing Task 3 for the Starbuck Power Project by an additional \$372,900; and increasing the overall Jones and Stokes contract by \$1.0 million, for a total of \$2.5 million.

Jenene Fenton seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Item 10: Wallula Power Project**

##### ***Application Submittal***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow presented an update on the Wallula Power Project. She reported that the proponents expect to submit their application on August 17, 2001.

##### ***Jones and Stokes Contract Amendment***

***Irina Makarow, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Makarow presented staff's recommendation to amend the Jones and Stokes contract to include Scope and Budget changes related to the review of the Wallula application and preparation of a joint SEPA/NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She provided the Council with a summary list of all previous amendments to the Jones and Stokes contract. The contract amendment - #17 proposes to increase the contract by \$364,500.00. The scope would cover review of the Wallula Application and preparation of EISs, including preparation of the draft, preliminary final and final EISs. The EISs would cover the requirements of both the state and national environmental policy acts (SEPA/NEPA).

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is providing technical expertise to Jones and Stokes to coordinate the preparation of a joint SEPA/NEPA EIS for each of the Starbuck and Wallula projects, as approved by both the Council and BPA. There is a significant cost savings to the applicant by having a joint EIS process. BPA is preparing the analysis of cumulative impacts in the region with respect to natural gas pipelines under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) jurisdiction; BPA transmission lines and air quality impacts. This is a substantial effort and is a major contribution to the EIS.

Jenene Fenton made the following motion.

**Motion:** To approve the Jones and Stokes Contract Amendment # 17, thereby increasing Task 2 for the Wallula Power Project by an additional \$364,500.

Dick Byers seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion was approved unanimously.

### **Item 11: BP Cherry Point Project**

#### ***Shapiro Contract Amendment***

***Michelle Elling, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Elling presented an update on the BP Cherry Point project. Four days prior to the due date for the draft Potential Site Study, BP Cherry Point requested EFSEC staff delay issuance of the draft, to allow the project proponent to submit additional information on the project to EFSEC's consultant, Shapiro and Associates. The design of the BP project had changed significantly since the initial request for a Potential Site Study (PSS), and BP has provided additional materials to Shapiro.

Shapiro has developed a budget to complete the work of incorporating the new information into the PSS, as well as a schedule for completion of the work, with a draft PSS being available by the end of August and the final PSS provided by the end of September. The additional cost to complete this work is estimated at \$55,000.

Ms. Elling reported that one significant change was that the proposed footprint of the project was reduced from 25 acres of wetlands to approximately 15 acres of wetlands. Other major changes include moving from water-cooling to air-cooling systems, and using existing natural gas pipelines in the area instead of building a new one. These changes will be covered in the final Potential Site Study.

In response to a Council member question, staff responded that the next opportunity for the public to comment on the project would be when PB Cherry Point submits their application. There will be an initial public meeting, when project details will be available for review; followed by public comment on the draft EIS prepared for this project.

Ms. Karen McGaffey, counsel for the proponent, described BP's process of looking at alternatives in developing this project. As review of the project has proceeded over the past several months, many options were considered. Through that process, which included considering comments received from public meetings, and working with the consultants, the design of the project has evolved. BP is continuing to meet with agencies, officials and public organizations, to provide information and opportunities for involvement. She stated, "In this regard, the study process is a success."

Heather Ballash made the following motion.

**Motion:** To approve Amendment # 2 to the Shapiro contract, in the amount of \$55,000, thereby increasing the total to \$195,000.

Jenene Fenton seconded the motion.

**Action:** The motion approved unanimously.

## **Item 12: Mercer Ranch Power Project**

### ***Potential Site Study***

***Michelle Elling, EFSEC Staff***

Ms. Elling provided an update on the status of the Mercer Ranch Power Project. The final Potential Site Study (PSS) was received by EFSEC from Shapiro and Associates this week. A few changes to the document need to be made prior to the release of the document, which is planned Friday, August 17<sup>th</sup>.

### ***SAIC Contract***

***Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager***

Mr. Fiksdal reported that staff would like to defer action on the contract until after meeting with SAIC and Cogentrix next week.

## **Item 13: Chehalis Generation Facility**

### ***Site Visit-September 10<sup>th</sup>***

***Mike Mills, EFSEC Staff***

Mr. Mills reported that staff and members plan to visit the Chehalis site on Monday, September 10, 2001, prior to the September Council meeting. Staff is requesting confirmation of attendance via e-mail from interested Council members, and will arrange transportation from the Rowe Six Conference Center in Lacey, leaving at 9:30 am and returning at approximately 1:00 pm. Council members and staff will have an opportunity to meet with Chehalis Power personnel and review construction progress at the site.

## **Item 14: Other**

Acting Chair Carelli reported that the Governor's Office is continuing to work on the appointment of a Council Chair and expect to have a decision soon. Interviews are expected to be conducted in the next few weeks. The Council will be notified as soon as the Governor makes his decision.

Ms. Fenton inquired about the scope of the BPA cumulative impact study and the potential impact on EFSEC's EIS schedule. Ms. Makarow confirmed that BPA has coordinated it schedule to coincide with EFSEC's processes. Mr. Grant Bailey, Jones and Stokes, added the one element of BPA's study that would take the most time is the air quality cumulative analysis. Most of the transmission line cumulative analysis will be based on tiering previous BPA documents, such as the business plan EIS that was prepared in the past.

Acting Council Chair Carelli requested public questions and or comments. None were made.

## **Item 15: Adjourn**

The Council was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.