

MINUTES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

April 9, 2001 – Regular Meeting

Rowe Six Conference Center

Building 1

4224 6th Avenue SE

Lacey, Washington

Item 1: Call to Order

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

Item 2: Roll Call

Department of Agriculture	Daniel Jemelka
Community, Trade & Economic Development	Heather Ballash
Department of Fish & Wildlife	Jenene Fenton
Department of Health	Ellen Haars
Military Department	Maillian Uphaus
Department of Natural Resources	Tony Ifie
Department of Transportation	John Doyle
Utilities and Transportation Commission	Dick Byers

Others in Attendance

EFSEC Staff and Counsel

Allen Fiksdal	Irina Makarow
Mike Mills	Mariah Laamb
Michelle Elling	Robert Fallis, AAG, EFSEC

Guests

Alan Harger, WSDOT	Brian Carpenter, REBOUND
John Barratt, Natural Carbon	Gayle Rothrock
Bill Kiel, Energy Northwest	John Arbuckle, Energy Northwest
Doug Pearman, SAIC	Bill Staeger, Jones & Stokes
Andrew Fitz, AAG, Ecology	Randall Doneen, Ecology-Yakima
Tony Usibelli, OTED	Katy Chaney, URS
Chuck Lien, Perkins Coie	Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie
Liz Thomas, Perkins Coie	Wayne White, Tractebel
John Mudge, CIC	Ron Lavigne, AAG-CFE
Mike Sotak, Duke Energy	Kevin Finan, Tractebel
Beth Spelsberg, Golder Associates	Charles Lockhart, Golder Associates

Michael O'Connell, Stoel Rives
Mike Elmer, Starbuck Power
Cynthia Peabody, Nisqually Indian Tribe

Laura Schinell, Energy Northwest
David Schaefer, Starbuck Consultant
Ivy Anderson, Van Ness Feldman

Item 3: Adoption of Proposed Agenda

The Agenda was adopted with the following changes. Item 6. Chehalis Generation Facility-PSD Permit Approval will be an information item only. Item 10. Cogentrix-Mercer Ranch Generation Facility to follow Item 6. Chehalis Generation Facility. Also, include an action item in Item 8. Jones & Stokes Contract Amendment to follow the Progress Report.

Item 4: Public Hearing for Columbia Generating Station National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Acting Chair Jenene Fenton, presiding over the meeting today, is also conducting the public hearing portion of the meeting. She presented the following information for the hearing.

This is a public hearing before the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. The purpose of this hearing is to receive oral public testimony regarding the Council's tentative decision to renew the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or NPDES wastewater discharge permit for the Columbia Generating Station, formerly known as WNP-2, operated by Energy Northwest.

My name is Jenene Fenton and I am the acting Chair of the Council for today's hearing. The Council is the state agency responsible for issuing NPDES permits for energy facilities for which a Site Certification Agreement has been executed such as the Columbia Generating Station. The Council is made up of a citizen chair appointed by the Governor and representatives from nine state agencies.

This hearing is being held at 1:30 p.m. at the Rowe Six Conference Center, on Monday, April 9, 2001. Public notice was given in the Tri-City Herald, the Yakima Herald Republic, and the Spokesman Review on February 23rd. Letters of notice were sent to a list of interested parties and additional notices were posted at various public locations. The written comment period ended on Monday, March 26, 2001. There were no substantive written comments.

As background, the Columbia Generating Station is located on the U. S. Department of Energy Hanford Site, in Benton County, about 12 miles north of Richland, Washington. The site includes several buildings and structures on approximately 400 acres three (3) miles west of the Columbia River.

This permit, (No. WA-002515-1) was first issued in 1975 and has been reissued four times previously. The current permit for this facility was issued October 9, 1995. The permit has an expiration date of October 9, 2000. Reapplication forms

were received by EFSEC on April 10, 2000. On the basis of this application, which was deemed timely and sufficient, the last permit continues in effect until a new permit decision is made.

Water is used at the nuclear power plant for various purposes. The scope of the NPDES permit is intended to cover discharges of pollutants (those not otherwise covered by EFSEC Resolution or other authority such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission) in any wastewater discharges to waters of the state. There are three defined point-source discharges described in the permit application, one to surface water (the Columbia River), and two to land (which potentially lead to a ground water discharge).

The procedure for today's hearing will be as follows: first, Council staff will provide an overview of the review process and describe any written comments that have been received."

Next, we will take oral statements from any persons desiring to testify on the Council's tentative decision to renew Columbia Generating Station's NPDES permit.

Let me introduce EFSEC staff person, Michelle Elling, technical specialist, who will explain the review process that has occurred and describe any written comments received.

Thank you Madame Chair. Working cooperatively with Washington Department of Ecology's Water Program, the permit application was reviewed and a draft permit developed. Prior to commencing the public comment period, EPA and the Department of Health also had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed draft permit.

Written comments by Energy Northwest were received before the close of the comment period. These comments were, for the most part, editorial changes that improve the permit. Energy Northwest also requested re-examination of a temperature monitoring requirements at Outfall 002 which discharges to ground. Written comments by Mr. Jerry Dierker and Mr. Joe Cole were also received. These comments concerned the current projected drought conditions and temperatures.

Concerning temperature, a water quality standard for temperature is currently being developed by EPA Region 10, Washington Department of Ecology, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, tribes, and other stakeholders. This group is primarily focused on making sure that the Pacific Northwest Water Quality Temperature Criteria Guidance is practical and that it complies with the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act and tribal trust responsibilities. When this project is complete, Columbia Generating Station may be subject to a new temperature standard that would require monitoring, and potentially, temperature limitations.

Currently, Columbia Generating Station is allowed to discharge the circulating cooling water at the lowest temperature of the circulating cooling water. Unless temperature criteria is set that raises concerns about the highest anticipated discharge temperature of the circulating cooling water blowdown (30° C), there is no current basis for requiring additional temperature monitoring at this facility.

Concerning sampling, in the last permit cycle, an outage waste stream from the diesel generator building floor drains was required to be sampled and analyzed once per year. A discharge from the diesel generator floor drains of 3000 gallons might occur two or three times a year. Outfall 002 typically has approximately 20,000 gallons of wastewater discharged per day. The diesel generator floor drains represent a very minor fraction of this waste stream and five years of data is sufficient to characterize this minor waste stream. Columbia Generating Station will not be required to sample the diesel generator building floor drains during the new permit cycle.

Ms. Fenton, Acting Chair asked for oral statements, if any, from those that have signed up. Ms. Elling reported that no one has signed up to present an oral statement. Acting Chair Fenton asked staff if they have a recommendation for the Council?

Ms. Elling offered the following recommendation to the Council, “The final permit meets state and federal water quality standards for the discharge of wastewater per Chapter 463-38 WAC (EFSEC’s rules regarding compliance with the NPDES permit program), Chapter 173-200 WAC (Ecology’s rules regarding discharge to surface water), and Chapter 173-201 WAC (Ecology’s rules regarding discharge to groundwater). Staff recommends the Council renew Columbia Generating Station’s NPDES Permit with the changes in response to written comments incorporated.”

Acting Chair Fenton closed the public portion of the hearing and asked for the Council to consider the staff’s recommendation for the NPDES permit.

Motion: To reissue the NPDES permit for the Columbia Generating Station.

Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Item 5: Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the regular meetings, February 12, 2001 and March 12, 2001, were adopted as presented, with one correction of Gayle Rothrock’s last name, on the March 12, 2001 minutes.

Item 6: Chehalis Generation Facility

<i>Initial Site Restoration Plan</i>	<i>Mike Mills, EFSEC staff reporting</i>
--------------------------------------	--

Chehalis Power submitted a draft Initial Site Restoration Plan for Council review six months prior to the scheduled commencement of construction start date of June 2001. The plan has been

reviewed by staff and counsel over the past several months and there is agreement on an approach to satisfy public health and safety requirements.

Chehalis Power project director, Kevin Finan, summarized key provisions of their plan for the Council. It basically provides two things; a corporate guarantee in the event that the construction at the site is halted prior to the project being ready for commercial operation, and a financing plan for meeting permanent site restoration obligations.

Tractebel Power will provide a \$5 million corporate guarantee for payment of site restoration, which will remain in effect from the date construction commences, through the time a fund of \$5 million accumulates. Starting with the sixth year of commercial operation of the project, Tractebel Power will commit \$500,000 annually, until the retirement fund reaches \$5 million, which must occur on or before the 16th year of operation.

Mr. Mills stated that the recommendation from staff is for the Council to approve the Initial Site Restoration Plan, with the changes agreed to with Chehalis Power/Tractebel.

Motion: To approve the Initial Site Restoration Plan for the Chehalis Generation Facility, as presented to the Council at today’s meeting.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

<i>Plan Approval Delegation</i>	<i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager reporting</i>
---------------------------------	---

Mr. Fiksdal presented a recommendation regarding the approval of construction and design plans for the Chehalis Generation Facility. He stated that only two plans, the Initial Site Restoration Plan, which the Council just approved, and the Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan, which will be reviewed later, are considered to require approval by the full Council. The other construction plans, that are specified for approval in the Site Certification Agreement (SCA), could be approved by the EFSEC Manager, if the Council agrees to delegate the manager such approval. State and local agencies, including city and county planning authorities, are reviewing all of those plans, some of which some are very technical in nature, and the staff believes the state and local agencies are doing a thorough job. If agencies recommend approval of the plans, then they could come to the manager for approval. If an agency or local government has questions on the plans, they are encouraged to meet with and try to work out the differences with Tractebel. If agencies or local government cannot come to a resolution on the plans with Tractebel, they can ask EFSEC staff to intercede and attempt to work out a resolution. If unsuccessful, then the plan(s) will come to the Council for a decision.

Staff is recommending that authority to approve or deny construction plans, with the exception of the Initial Site Restoration Plan and the Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan, be given to the staff manager and not have to go through the Council for approval.

Motion: To delegate approval authority to the EFSEC Manager for Chehalis Generation Facility construction plans (as specified in the SCA), with the exception of the Initial Site Restoration

Plan and the Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan. If agreement cannot be reached by state and/or local agencies and Tractebel, then the plan(s) must come before the Council for a decision.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

The PSD Permit Approval agenda item was postponed. Staff is recommending the Council hold a special meeting to address this agenda item on Friday, April 13th. Council members agreed to hold a special meeting, starting at 9 am, at the EFSEC office, 925 Plum Street, Building 4, 3rd floor conference room. Notification will be sent to the minutes and agenda mailing list, persons who participated in the Chehalis amendment hearings, and any others who requested to be notified regarding Council special meetings. E-mail and flyer notification will go out within the next day or two.

The special meeting will have three agenda items for the Council to address. The first one is to consider approval the PSD Permit for the Chehalis Generation Facility, the second is to review the proposed technical amendment to the SCA for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, and the third is to consider authorization of a lease between Energy Northwest and Northwest Regional Power on the WNP-1 site.

The notification for the special Council meeting will include an agenda, the meeting location, and our website address.

7. Cogentrix – Mercer Ranch Generation Facility

<i>Progress Report</i>	<i>Doug Pearman, SAIC reporting</i>
------------------------	-------------------------------------

Mr. Pearman, SAIC Project Manager, presented a monthly progress report. Progress has been slow and written information from the proponent has not been presented to SAIC until the Council meeting today. SAIC and Ms. Elling will be attending a meeting on April 30, 2001 at Mercer Ranch to discuss issues with Dept. of Ecology, Fish & Wildlife, the Corp of Engineers and the proponent on wetlands; water; and the reservoir.

Based upon information submitted by the proponent, SAIC wants to meet with EFSEC staff to receive direction whether to proceed with the potential site study or continue to put the project on hold. SAIC is spending some man hours, but has not been able to put together a potential site study, and that is consuming some of the budget that was assumed to be spent on SAIC staff working on the potential site study.

Mr. Charles Lockhart, Golder and Associates, (consultant for Cogentrix), responded that information needing to be sent to EFSEC's consultant, SAIC, is being presented to them as quickly as it is being gathered. Work is being done and decisions are being made, yet this project is in its early stages of development. Part of the potential site study is to find areas where not all the questions and answers are known yet and with the help of federal, state, and local agencies and local interested groups, the information can be brought forward and help create a better prepared application for submittal.

Mr. Andy Fitz, Attorney General for Department of Ecology, spoke to the delay of the potential site study being related to the difficult water resources issues connected with the project. One issue is the backlog of projects at the Department of Ecology. Another issue is whether the water in the reservoir is a concern for the State of Washington. These are questions that still need to be addressed. Cogentrix is working to answer these questions and yet some questions cannot be answered until the Department of Ecology provides some information to Cogentrix. Ecology is working with Cogentrix to provide the necessary information related to the project.

8. Satsop Combustion Turbine (CT) Project

<i>SCA Amendment Request</i>	<i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager reporting</i>
------------------------------	---

Mr. Fiksdal presented information regarding the review of Duke Energy and Energy Northwest request to amend the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project Site Certification Agreement (SCA). A public meeting was held at the Elma High School on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, with 40-60 persons in attendance. At the meeting, EFSEC discussed the proposed amendment and whether it could be considered as a technical amendment or not. Generally, testimony was in favor of granting a technical amendment. Staff would like to defer making their recommendation to the Council until the special meeting scheduled for this Friday, April 13, 2001. There are several questions that were asked during the public meeting, which staff is researching and expects to have responses completed by the Friday special Council meeting.

Mr. Fiksdal stated that as the responsible official under the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA), he had issued an Addendum to the Adoption Notice of the existing National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) Environmental Document. The addendum recognizes that the requested amendment changes are consistent with and are covered under the existing NEPA environmental impact statement that the Council adopted on January 20, 1996. The addendum was filed with the Department of Ecology on Friday, April 6, 2001, and is listed in the State Environmental Protection Act register, satisfying the SEPA requirements for the amendment request.

In response to a question on how issues raised at the hearing concerning noise, glare and lighting were being addressed, Mr. Fiksdal responded that they were covered in the EIS and the applicant must meet the requirements for noise as outlined in the SCA. The applicant has not asked for any changes in the area of lighting or glare, but must meet its' earlier commitments to meet all requirements set out in the SCA.

Ms. Fenton requested clarification on the amount of the existing 22-acre site to be used for the plant, as proposed in the new plans. Laura Schinell of Energy Northwest explained that the CT project would take up about 12 acres, leaving the remaining 10 acres open. It was clarified that the raw water well provides the drinking water on the site and the Ranney Wells will be used to provide water for the combustion turbine project.

Mr. Fiksdal summarized written comments submitted by Jerry Lee Dirker and Joe Cole. Their issues of concern were for a configuration change from a one on one (combustion turbine to steam turbine) to a two on one. The original SCA arrangement was for a one on one

configuration, one combustion turbine to one steam engine. The proposed amendment would change the configuration to a two on one, i.e., two combustion engines that will drive one steam turbine. They want more information about this proposed change. Their second concern was about changes to air emission limits, water usage or other environmental mitigations. Mr. Dirker and Mr. Cole believe there may be indirect causes or increases in pollution because of the change in turbines. They also believe there may be changes to the environmental water quality, discharge water temperatures and other environmental issues. Mr. Fiksdal stated that the company is seeking no changes to the existing permit conditions regarding water, temperature levels, emissions, etc.

It was noted that Energy Northwest and Duke Energy have not asked for any changes regarding the gas pipeline, which is permitted in the original SCA. If Williams Pipeline builds onto their existing pipeline to supply the project with natural gas, then EFSEC would not have any jurisdiction over the pipeline, as Williams is an interstate pipeline company, which is regulated by the federal government. At this point, it is not clear whether the Council deems it necessary to change the SCA if some of the work permitted in the SCA, such as pipelines, is not done. It is possible that the building of a pipeline under the existing SCA may not need to be completed in order to be in compliance with the SCA.

Notification will be published in the local newspapers as well as sent to those who signed up at the last public meeting in Elma regarding the agenda and the special meeting date and location.

9. Starbuck Potential Site Study

<i>Progress Report</i>	<i>Bill Staeger, Jones & Stokes reporting</i>
-------------------------------	--

Mr. Staeger reported on activities that have taken place since last months meeting. The final Potential Site Study on the Starbuck Project was submitted to the Council on March 5, 2001. The work was completed on schedule and within budget. The draft application review is the next step in the process. Meetings have taken place with Jones and Stokes (J&S) and the Applicant, working out details for the sections to be submitted. The Applicant notified JSA they will be delayed in submitting portions of the draft application, with the project description being the first submittal. Jones and Stokes anticipates receiving the project description in early May, which will delay the schedule by a few months, but at this point is not expected to affect the budget for the project.

Jones and Stokes is working on the BPA EIS for a 70-mile line between John Day and McNary Dams, as well as coordinating gathering of the information on the transmission lines for both the Starbuck and Wallula projects, as they continue working on the three separate EIS's. Jones and Stokes stressed the importance of having consistent information and consistent formats in each of the documents. Jones and Stokes, the Applicants and BPA will meet on an "as needed" basis during the development of the applications to keep the information flowing smoothly to coordinate the EIS's for the projects in this region. FERC will be involved in the pipelines for both the Starbuck and Wallula projects and Tom McKinney of BPA has taken the role of coordinating with FERC as a cooperating agency.

Cumulative impacts on power generation projects will be done by a contractor to BPA, working toward a completion date for that report in early September. BPA will study cumulative impacts on the transmission of power in the Northwest, which will give an overall view of the issues involved and how the projects will add to the issues. Gas supply in the Northwest may also be reported on by BPA in a general overview for the region.

<i>Jones & Stokes Contract Amendment 14</i>	<i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC staff reporting</i>
---	---

Ms. Makarow reported on a proposed amendment to the JSA contract, (No. 14, Task 3). Staff recommends a change to the Scope of Work in the contract to clarify interactions with the Applicant, the Applicants' consultants, BPA and EFSEC, including meetings, telephone discussion, and written correspondence. That work would begin in April and is expected to extend through the end of July. The schedule change is necessary to cover a delay in receiving information from the Applicant. The budget would increase by \$8,191.00 to cover coordinating activities regarding transmission lines between the end of the potential site study and the submittal of the environmental work on the electrical transmission line.

Staff recommends the Council allow staff to draft an amendment to the contract based on the details provided by JSA to EFSEC staff and authorize the Chair to sign the Amendment, once it is completed.

Mr. Mike Elmer, from Starbuck reported the Applicant is in agreement with the proposed amendment for JSA and announced that much work has taken place with their consultants, CH2M Hill, and they plan to submit an application close to their proposed date of July 2001.

Motion: To authorize staff to prepare an amendment to the Jones & Stokes contract, to clarify the Scope of Work and increase funding by \$8,191, and authorize the Chair to sign it once completed.

Action: Motion passed unanimously.

10. Newport Northwest - Wallula

<i>Progress Report</i>	<i>Bill Staeger, Jones & Stokes reporting</i>
------------------------	---

Mr. Staeger reported on activities that have taken place since the last months report. On February 28, 2001, the administrative draft of the Potential Site Study was submitted to ESFEC. Comments were due by March 16th, with a final potential site study report due Monday, April 2nd. Newport requested a meeting in which they wanted Jones and Stokes to provide answers and details to questions on criteria documentation, so a meeting was held at the end of March. Newport was interested in changing some of the criteria requirements based on changes they have made to the project. They understand the potential site study is an optional (preferred) process, rather than a requirement of certification, and would like to alter some procedures and understand that could cause delays in the processing of an application. With the revisions needing to be incorporated into the document, the final Potential Site Study is now scheduled to be provided to EFSEC by the end of April.

<i>JSA Contract Amendment 13</i>	<i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC staff reporting</i>
----------------------------------	---

Ms. Makarow presented a request for an amendment to the Jones and Stokes contract for the Wallula project. The amendment, (No. 13, Task 2), would include additional work on the potential site study, including Jones & Stokes site visit of the route of the proposed transmission lines, reviewing the alignment of the transmission lines; and coordinating additional BPA status meetings. The proposed budget increase to cover the additional work is \$19,100.00.

Charles Lean, Perkins Coie, attorney for the applicant, stated the applicant approves of the proposed amendment and associated costs.

An update on the Jones and Stokes contracts and all their tasks listed separately, was provided to the Council at the meeting today.

Motion: To approve the contract amendment to the Jones and Stokes – Wallula contract, to include a site visit of the route of the proposed transmission lines, rewriting portions of the Potential Site Study, and coordinating additional BPA status meetings, with a budget increase of \$19,100.00.

Action: The motion was approved unanimously.

11. BP Cherry Point Project

<i>Delegate Chair Authority for Consultant Approval</i>	<i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager reporting</i>
---	---

Mr. Fiksdal presented a staff recommendation regarding the hiring of a consultant for the BP Cherry Point Project. Interviews will be held later this week and to avoid waiting almost another month for the May meeting for Council approval on hiring a consultant, staff recommends that the Chair be authorized to sign a contract with a consultant, provided there is unanimous approval of one company. If there is not unanimous approval, then the recommendation will be brought to the Council for a final decision.

Motion: To authorize the Chair to sign a contract with a consultant to conduct the preliminary site study and provide assistance with review for the BP Cherry Point Project, provided there is unanimous approval of one company. If there is not unanimous approval, then the recommendation will be brought to the Council for a final decision.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

<i>Status Report</i>	<i>Michelle Elling, EFSEC staff reporting</i>
----------------------	---

The first public and agency meetings for the BP Cherry Point project will be held during the first week of May. Logistics are still being arranged, and when they are final, the Council, agencies and the public will be notified of the time, date and location.

Ms. Makarow presented the Council with a preliminary schedule for the new projects proposed to EFSEC for certification, including the Starbuck, Wallula and Mercer Ranch projects. It is subject to change and will be revised monthly.

12. Energy Northwest Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4

<i>Columbia Operations</i>	<i>John Arbuckle, ENW staff reporting</i>
----------------------------	---

Mr. Arbuckle presented a report for the Columbia Generating Station. The plant has been running smoothly for 200 days continuously and is currently running at 99.6% of full power. The plant is at a natural coast down of about .5% per day, due to the depletion of the core, and will continue to ramp down until they go into their outage on May 19th, at which time they will load a 24-month supply of fuel.

At WNP-1, Energy Northwest is implementing a viability study requested by Congressmen Hastings and Neathercut. The study is estimated to be complete by mid-July. WNP-1 has a construction permit, which expires on June 1, 2001. Energy Northwest has sent a letter requesting the NRC reissue their permit and extend their current permit to cover the time to complete the study by the end of July. Energy Northwest issued their letter requesting the extension more than the minimum of 30 days prior to the expiration date, therefore, the permit will remain in effect until the NRC takes action on their request for renewal.

A letter was submitted to the Council from Energy Northwest requesting a lease to Northwest Regional Power for the purpose of putting temporary electric generators at the WNP-1 site, to produce salable power, with a proposed operation start date of May 2001. The Department of Ecology-Kennewick Office would be the authorizing authority for the air permit necessary to operate the business. A PSD permit is not necessary as there would be not be over 100 tons of pollutants dispersed into the air. There will be five 20,000-gallon storage tanks for diesel fuel at this location. The WNP-1 site spill prevention plan will be in place as part of a lease agreement.

Discussion followed on emergency response procedures for lessee personnel at the WNP-1 site. All lessees on site must respond to Columbia emergency response signals, if they are within the 1.2-mile exclusionary boundary of the site, and follow the response plan set up for the WNP-1 site. There is training information provided to lessee employees when they first come on-site. Yearly, a community right to know document is updated, listing large storage of chemicals on site, with locations mapped, and copies being provided to the local emergency management agencies. Fire protection is provided at the WNP-1 site by the U. S. Department of Energy fire department.

Energy Northwest is requesting the Council authorize a lease with Northwest Regional Power to locate electric generators at the WNP-1 site. A standard lease agreement with environmental protection, spill plans, etc., items specific to the proposed activity, is proposed. The Council wants to be assured that the proper safeguards are in the lease language to protect the safety of workers and the public and that lessee personnel can comply with emergency response procedures.

The Council chose to defer action on this item to the special meeting being held on Friday, April 13, 2001.

<i>FY 2002 Preparedness Contracts</i>	<i>Mike Mills, EFSEC staff reporting</i>
--	---

Mr. Mills presented staff’s recommendation for renewing interagency contracts with the four (4) state agencies and six (6) counties that support the Columbia Generating Station Emergency Preparedness (EP) Plan. The Columbia SCA requires the support of these state and local agencies as part of the emergency plan for this site. A study done in 1997 provided a base level of funding for the agencies to provide emergency preparedness services and a four (4)-year commitment was set in place. During the past four years, salaries and benefit costs have increased in the area of mandated salary increases, COLA’s, union increases, etc. Over the past four years, the overall cost has increased from \$1.014 million to \$1.085 million. Staff proposes base level funding for the FY 2002 contracts be set at a total of \$1.099 million. All avenues for cost savings at the state and local levels have been reviewed with each agency and staff believes the proposed base level is an appropriate funding level for this year’s contracts.

Staff recommends setting the base funding level for FY 2002 at \$1.099 million dollars and asks Council to give staff authority to amend the associated resolution, (No. 287). The amended resolution would update the survey findings, document the funding levels proposed today, and restate the Council’s commitment to funding this program at a sustainable, base funding level. Mr. Fallis suggested that any action on amending the resolution be deferred to a subsequent meeting.

Motion: To approve the following budgets totaling \$1,099,169 for the FY 2002 emergency preparedness agency contracts.

Military	
Planning	\$242,329
Counties (6)	<u>322,800</u>
Total	\$565,129
Agriculture	\$ 81,575
Health	\$444,287
State Patrol	<u>\$ 8,178</u>
<u>Total</u>	1,099,169

A roll call vote was taken:

- Department of Agriculture – Yes, except for Agriculture’s contract - abstain
- Community, Trade, and Economic Development – Yes
- Department of Fish and Wildlife – Yes
- Department of Health – Yes, except for Health’s contract – abstain
- Military Department – Yes, except for Military’s contract – abstain

Department of Natural Resources – Yes
Department of Transportation – Yes
Utilities and Transportation – Yes

Action: Motion passed unanimously, with abstentions noted.

13. Legislation

<i>Update</i>	<i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager reporting</i>
---------------	---

Mr. Fiksdal reported that no bills pertaining to EFSEC made it out of the opposite house. As of March 30, 2001, all the proposed stand-alone bills were dead. There is a possibility that a budget bill might include some changes to EFSEC that could still be considered.

14. Other

Interviews for the consultants who will work on the BP Cherry Point Project will begin at 9am, on Thursday, April 12th, at the EFSEC office building, conference room 308.

15. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.