

**STATE OF WASHINGTON  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL**

**January 13, 2003 - Regular Meeting<sup>1</sup>**

4224 6th Avenue S.E., Building 1  
Lacey, Washington - 1:30 p.m.

**ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER**

**CHAIR LUCE:** The Monday, January 13, 2003 meeting of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council will come to order.

**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  
Chair**

Dick Fryhling  
Chuck Carelli  
Jenene Fenton  
Tony Ifie  
Tim Sweeney  
Jim Luce

**MR. MILLS:** I note the presence of Chair Jim Luce and there is a quorum.

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

**EFSEC Staff and Counsel**

Allen Fiksdal  
Mike Mills  
Michelle Elling  
Ann Essko – AAG

Irina Makarow  
Mariah Laamb  
Pete Dewell – ALJ (via phone)

**EFSEC Guests**

Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie  
Lynn Albin, Department of Health  
Tom Schneider, Chehalis Power  
Mike Lufkin, CFE  
Kirk Deal, Carpenter's Union  
John Mudge, Critical Issues Council  
Lauri Vigue, WDFW  
Andrew Young, Zilkha Renewable Energy  
Ryan Vancil, B.C. Government (via phone)

Laura Schinnell, Energy Northwest  
John Arbuckle, Energy Northwest  
Darryl Peeples, Wallula  
Andy McNeil, Duke Energy Grays Harbor  
Mike Torpey, BP Cherry Point  
Cindy Custer, BPA  
Sonia Wolfman, Attorney General's Office  
Chris Taylor, Zilkha Renewable Energy

---

<sup>1</sup> The minutes are in transcript style and have had minor editing for clarity purposes.

**ITEM NO. 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**CHAIR LUCE:** We have before us two sets of minutes, the minutes of November 12 and the minutes of December 9? Have Council members had an opportunity to review these minutes? Having reviewed them are there any changes, corrections, additions, admissions, or deletions? Do I have a motion to accept the minutes as rendered?

**MS. FENTON:** So moved.

**MR. IFIE:** Second.

**CHAIR LUCE:** All in favor say Aye.

**COUNCIL MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR LUCE:** The minutes are approved.

**ITEM NO. 4: ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AGENDA**

**CHAIR LUCE:** The adoption of the proposed agenda is the next item on the agenda. Do Council members have any additions, corrections? Hearing none, the adoption of the proposed agenda is approved.

**ITEM NO. 5: ZILKHA RENEWABLE ENERGY**

<b>Presentation</b>	<b>Chris Taylor, Zilkha Renewable Energy</b>
---------------------	--

**CHAIR LUCE:** The next item on the agenda is an information item, Zilkha Renewable Energy. Chris Taylor, will you be doing the introduction here? I welcome Chris, and please introduce the other parties who are with you. We look forward to hearing from you.

**MR. PEEPLES:** I would like to introduce Chris Taylor on my immediate right and next to him is Andrew Young. They're from Zilkha Renewable Energy. Chris's title is Project Development Manager and Andrew is Director of Project Development for the Northwest Region. At about 11:45 a.m. today we filed an application with EFSEC for a wind project. We have given staff a cashier's check for \$45,000, and we're commencing the certification through EFSEC for the project in the Ellensburg area. We have a 15-minute presentation we would like to make to orient the Council to the project. It will be the first wind project you will be doing. We are opting in to the EFSEC process based on the statute that was passed just a couple of years ago. Quite frankly, the primary reason we're coming to EFSEC is because of the appeal process time. The legal appeals are somewhat limited at EFSEC, and so that's the primary reason we are coming before you because of the straight circuit to the Supreme Court. I would like to have Chris Taylor do a brief description of the project.

**CHAIR LUCE:** You're supposed to say you're coming to us because of the reasonableness of the body and their open mindedness and their sensitivity to the policy and the need for abundant power at a reasonable price and protecting the environment and public interest. So I will pretend that that's what you said.

**MR. TAYLOR:** Thank you very much. You should also have received a printed copy of the presentation (Power Point slide show) you can keep with you. So I will start with giving you a brief outline of what we would like to present. We are just going to briefly introduce ourselves, Zilkha Renewable Energy, and, we will give a very, very brief overview of wind power, and then

get right into the specifics of the project site and what's proposed; briefly touch on the Applicant's choice of EFSEC's jurisdiction. I'll cover all those things that Chairman Luce brought up there, and logistics and then we'll take any questions you might have. (Referring to a map) Our headquarters is in Houston, Texas. We have offices in Ellensburg, Washington, and Portland, Oregon. Out here in the Northwest we have operating projects and several locations throughout the United States, so the windmills and shovels are places where we have projects under development that we're moving forward.

We're a privately owned company. We're not a subsidiary of any other company. We are well capitalized which is somewhat unusual in the wind energy industry. We're highly specialized. All we do is wind farm development and operation. That's our sole focus. We have experienced management in both conventional and renewable energy. We own and operate projects in Iowa, Pennsylvania, and Costa Rica, a total of 137 megawatts of installed capacity. Early growth of the company was fueled through acquiring existing projects, and now our focus is really on green-field development, such as the project that we are proposing here today. We have projects under development in ten states around the country. And I think the last point is very important. Our owners and management are committed to developing quality projects, and we feel that the project that we're bringing you today certainly meets that definition.

Just a little bit of what we've been doing recently. In 1999, we built Tierras Morenas down in Costa Rica, which is the largest wind farm in Central America, and two projects in Pennsylvania, Mill Run and Summerset, that are near each other as a combined 24 megawatts, which was in 2001. Also in 2001, Top of Iowa project, 80-megawatt project, in Northern Iowa just south of the Minnesota border.

I'm sure you all know, since you're in the business of approving energy projects, that energy has a pretty heavy toll on the environment. These are national statistics, but obviously we all know sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, greenhouse gas emissions, and mercury are significant impacts associated with conventional and fossil fuel burning plants, some of the things to keep in mind when looking at the advantage of the wind power project. A couple other quick things about wind energy. No air emissions, no fuel to transport, mine, or store; which people sometimes forget about those impacts associated with a conventional project. No cooling water to withdraw or discharge and no wastes, solid or hazardous, generated through operating the project.

On the economic side, we've seen all the impacts of having all your eggs in one energy basket, whether that's hydroelectric or natural gas. Wind is not dependent on fossil fuel prices, and I would also note it's less volatile year to year in terms of production than hydroelectric. Wind variation annually is much less than hydroelectric. It does vary but considerably less. Obviously reducing our dependence on fossil fuels through energy diversity is a good thing and unlike most other renewable energy technology, wind is actually cost competitive with today's gas prices which is part of the reason that wind is actually the fastest growing energy source in the world in terms of the percent increase year to year and the install capacities the fastest growing.

Obviously the air emissions and the lack of CO<sub>2</sub> or other greenhouse gas emissions are pretty significant.

So to talk a little bit specifically about the project that we are filing for today, it's the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. These are basically the key factors that we look at in identifying a site. That's a really important thing, and it's different than other kinds of energy projects. You have to go where the wind resource is. You can't put wind in a pipeline and move it where you would like it to be. You have to go to where it is, and in Washington State there are not a lot of places with adequate wind resources that are also adjacent to transmission, which is number two.

You need to find a place with the intersection of a vigorous wind resource and adequate transmission capacity and then hopefully all the other things as well, including landowner receptivity. We don't purchase the land where the projects are located, in general. Most often in the wind industry, you lease that land through an arrangement with the landowner through annual payments, so the willingness and interest that landowners have of facilities on their land is obviously a big factor.

Regarding environmental considerations, we put over a year of study into this site to determine its compatibility with wind power development, wanting to avoid sensitive habitat areas, critical wildlife habitat, etc. Regarding land use compatibility, a lot of things come under that heading. You know downtown Seattle is a windy place, but it probably wouldn't be a great place for a wind farm just because of land use compatibility, and the site that we've chosen is very compatible. And then site accessibility, being in a location that has existing roads that you can get to is very important. (Referring to a wind blown tree) That's the kind of picture that gets us excited, a tree with all the branches on one side heavily flagged. That's a pretty good indication that it's windy there and a bunch of transmission lines in the background. That's a picture from the site as an excellent wind resource. Again, you have to keep coming back to that. This is one of the best sites we believe in the Northwest. We've spent a year and a half looking at different sites around the Pacific Northwest and almost two years actually now, and this is really among the top sites. At this site we have several years of wind data. We have nine of our test towers on sites, so we have conclusive information that we're quite confident about the wind resource. The second point I think is really important if you're not familiar too much with wind energy is that minor changes in annual average wind speed translate into drastic changes in energy production. For instance, a two-mile per hour difference, say from a 15-mile an hour site to a 17-mile an hour site, average annual wind speed, translates into a 15 percent change and how much energy you can produce. That's actually the BPA corridor that runs through there. There's a lot of transmission lines running through this area, there's six sets of lines. There's a corridor of four BPA lines, then a Puget Sound Energy line to the north of that, and another set of BPA lines that access both through the Mid-C trading (Slides of transmission lines) and also up into the Puget Sound area. This is another picture of the BPA corridor with the lines right overhead. Another thing about this site is it doesn't require building any new transmission lines. You can directly interconnect with existing lines right there.

Another thing is compatible land use. That's a picture from a helicopter of the area. You can see it's basically open-range land, zoned forest and range and ag20. (Slide of open land) This is an area that doesn't have a lot of residential development, not a lot of other activities, just basically very low-intensity cattle grazing as the main economic activity in this area. There's some gravel pits, some highways, and some transmission lines. Landowners are eager to sign up. Many of them said to us when we came to them, "Boy, finally somebody has thought of a way to use this wind that's been beating us up for as long as we can remember and do something useful with it." It's very, very windy there to the point of being a nuisance, so people are excited to see a way to make use of it. Also, there are a lot of good roads. You can see right there you've got U.S. Highway 97 on the left corner of the picture, which provides access to the site; as well as a network of existing gravel and dirt roads such as the one you see there. As I mentioned, I believe this is one of the only sites in the State of Washington with all the key development features that I've referred to, and in our opinion, definitely among the top five type sites in the Pacific Northwest in terms of wind resource, transmission access, etc.

Let me talk a little bit more about where it is. (Slide of project map) On this map, Highway 97 is the red line. The black outline figure is the rough project boundary. You can see it's criss-crossed by transmission lines. That's U.S. 90 on the left side coming over Snoqualmie Pass. The project site is to the north of U.S. 90. That's Highway 97 heading from Ellensburg towards Wenatchee and Blewett Pass, and that's Highway 10 and the Yakima River just north of U.S. 90. I've got two sets of maps I'll pass around for people to look at, a topography map with the project layout superimposed on it, as well as an aerial photo of the site with the project superimposed on it. Those will also be in our application.

This is a picture of a modern wind project. (Slide of wind project) That's the Van Syssel Wind project in Oregon to give you an idea of what a modern wind project looks like. This picture is a cut of a Vestas V-80 turbine to show the basic components there. We're proposing up to 121 individual turbines for a total install capacity of 181.5 megawatts. We haven't made a final selection of the specific turbine that we are going to use, and our application details the range of possibilities under consideration, but all of the turbines we're looking at are commercially proven technologies. They all are very similar. Certainly from a layperson's perspective they're nearly identical three-bladed upwind machines. They're mounted on tubular steel towers and a word you want to learn is nacelle. That's where all the machinery is behind the rotor and the blades. To give you an idea this is a question we get asked all the time. How big are they? What do they look like? Those are people walking around in the picture (Slide of wind turbine components) on the left next to a rotor hub and a rotor being assembled. The blades come separately obviously to transport them. That's getting ready to hoist up and mount. A 1.5 megawatt rating capacity is the general size we're looking at. The footprint of the turbine is relatively small, and the rotor diameter is about 225 feet. That still leaves about a hundred feet above the ground. You can see those measurements there in the photo to the right.

A little bit about the overall project footprint. The total area occupied by the project, and this is everything, the turbines, the road, the substation, the O & M facility, everything, is about 90 acres. That's not an enormous amount of land. It's spread out over a large area, five or six thousand acres, but the total project footprint is fairly small. No new transmission lines are necessary. Again, that really minimizes impacts, both visual and environmental. We are trying to use existing roads, and our proposal explains that. You can actually see on the area photos when the lights come on, where a lot of our roads that we're proposing to build are on top of existing roads, and we are trying to make use of those wherever possible. Most of the turbines are on privately owned land. About 25 to 30 percent of the turbines are proposed to reside on land owned by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. We are in discussions with them about a walk-in lease agreement that's weather intent included, and that's in our application. Also the collector cables, each of the turbines obviously have to be connected to each other in order to transmit the power from each turbine to the project substation interconnection point. Those were all proposed, with only one exception I believe, underground, so that you don't have the visual impacts or also environmental impacts, especially birds with overhead transmission lines.

**MR. YOUNG:** I guess on the use of existing roads, we have about 23 miles of construction that needs to occur for the project, and just a little less than half of ten miles of the road is actually existing road that will just simply be improved. So of the 90 acres of disturbed permanent footprint it's probably a little less than half of that is actually already, you know, disturbed area that other vehicles and someone are actually using for the project. So I think that's important to mention as well.

**MR. TAYLOR:** Just a quick summary of what was in this application. We have been studying the site for over a year. We have a very experienced set of consultants chosen specifically for their expertise in each discipline. The avian team, the botanical consultants, the people who did the visual impact analysis, the noise impact analysis. We are very pleased with the quality of people that did this work, and we hope that it's reflected in the application for site certification. But it has been studied thoroughly and intensively, and we think it's very responsive to all the WACs; although, you will notice obviously getting into it some of the questions are the WACs that address thermal projects really just aren't relevant to a wind power project, but we have explained that in each case.

We've been coordinating with affected agencies from the beginning. We have been meeting with DNR, Department of Fish and Wildlife, the County for almost a year now, and in sharing with affected parties the draft study protocol before we went out there and did them. And we coordinated also with the Yakama Nation on cultural resource studies, so we've tried to engage with all the people who are now going to be reviewing these studies ahead of time, so they knew what the studies were going to look like, and what protocols we're following, and we followed in most cases, protocols that are well accepted and established protocols. Also we've been doing pretty active outreach to local stakeholders. As I mentioned we have an office in Ellensburg. Ellensburg is a pretty small town and we're pretty well known in Ellensburg already, and I've spoken with just about every civic group in Kittitas County. I've done tons of presentations. We've made copies of our visual assimilation available to the local library, all this prior to even filing for a permit. So we really have tried to do a lot of outreach and education in the community. Our goal is to build and operate a model 21st century wind farm. That way we would be a credit to the history and to the County.

A little bit about why we are here at EFSEC versus a different permitting jurisdiction.

Obviously, you know, one of the core things about EFSEC is that you coordinate multiple agencies and jurisdictions that are involved here, and that's an advantage from the Applicant's standpoint. We welcome the rigorous review. We think public participation is important. We have permitted and built wind projects in places where we think it's good. Let the public get involved and have a chance to ask questions and make sure that their questions have been answered and their concerns addressed. Kittitas County is going through some pretty tough budgetary times right now. They've had to lay off staff in some departments, and the complexity of reviewing this project would potentially be a burden on them. And as Darrel mentioned, the potential appeals that are expedited in case there is one. I'll bring it forward right now, two copies of our application, and we left one over at the EFSEC office.

: We are submitting two copies, a hard copy as well as CD, so it can be put up onto your website. We are submitting those today, and we've been coordinating with Mr. Fiksdal and Ms. Makarow to directly mail out all the other copies, so, Council Members, you will be receiving yours this Friday. They will be going out in the mail to you and everybody else on the EFSEC mailing list, and we've provided it also in electronic format. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

**MR. FRYHLING:** Have you been involved in the controversy that's been going on with the County for the last year regarding placement of wind towers? Are you in the middle of that or part of that?

**MR. TAYLOR:** I've been at I think just about every single one of those hearings.

**MR. FRYHLING:** I know it's been pretty hotly contested.

**MR. TAYLOR:** We submitted testimony and testified and participated in that process. It's spelled out in the land use section of our application, but the County has gone through quite a few contortions about how they would like to consider and review wind power proposals. And there's a copy of their most recent ordinance that was adopted in December is in our application.

**MR. PEEPLES:** One thing I would like to add for Mr. Ifie. There will be some DNR leased land that will be part of the wind farm, and so you're going to have some DNR leased land generating money in the area. The other thing that we are not anticipating is the need for a NEPA statement. There is a series of BPA and Puget Sound Energy lines going through. Quite frankly, preference would be to use the Puget Sound Energy lines. That's what our understanding of it is now. We would like to go down and meet with BPA and with EFSEC staff soon on in the process to get BPA's concurrence on that, so we probably will not be looking at any NEPA/SEPA statement, just a SEPA statement.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I was going to ask, if there's interconnection available, is there firm transmission available?

**MR. YOUNG:** Yes. We are in the application queue for both interconnection and point-to-point wheeling on a BPA system, and we've met, had several meetings with Puget Sound Energy's transmission group to get a feel for what kind of outlet capacities are available, so we are just about, you know, ready to submit and go through the cue system and system impact study, facility impact study with Puget as well. So we wanted to have a preliminary review there with them to ask them about the options and the anticipated facility impacts and facility upgrades that would be required, and that actually help dictate the size of the project.

**MR. CARELLI:** How many separate landowners do you plan on working with or how many are identified in here?

**MR. TAYLOR:** I believe it's about 20. I can count them very quickly. I think it's in the neighborhood of 20.

**MR. CARELLI:** And DNR would be the largest landowner?

**MR. YOUNG:** Yes, they will. They have the most number of turbines on their property, as a single landowner in the project.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Mr. Taylor, did you say how many turbines you expect to be putting up?

**MR. TAYLOR:** 121.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Over what time frame?

**MR. TAYLOR:** We would like to begin construction at the end of this year, and the construction can be completed within a year, so to be on line and operating in 2004.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Any Council Members have any questions?

**MR. IFIE:** What is your anticipated size of land are you leasing from DNR?

**MR. TAYLOR:** You can see on the map the affected parcels are spread out across several different sections. The area of land on DNR that we would actually need is less than that whole - - we would anticipate they would continue to lease that. This land I should mention that the DNR land is currently leased for cattle grazing or not being used in any economic way. At this point there's no forestry activity on these lands, so we would anticipate just leasing the linear area needed to install the turbines and maintain them, and the rest of it they could continue to lease for cattle grazing or other activities. So given that it's about 90 acres for 120 turbines and DNR is about a third of that, somewhere in the neighborhood of 25 or 30 acres.

**MR. IFIE:** Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Questions?

**MS. FENTON:** Are any of the DNR acres currently leased to the Department of Fish and Wildlife?

**MR. TAYLOR:** No, they're not. They're all private leases. Some of the people use them for cattle grazing and some of them appear to lease them and not use them in any way that we can determine, but none of it's currently in DFW lease.

**MR. PEEPLES:** There will be no wetlands. No wetlands will be touched either.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Especially after the President's recent announcement.

**MR. PEEPLES:** These are up on the top of ridges, and there are no wetlands there.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Staff, what's the time frame over here?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** The law requires the Council to have a public meeting within 60 days of receipt of the application, so that would mean by March 14 you have to hold a public meeting in or close to the site. We propose that the meeting be held in Ellensburg. I think there's a nice civic meeting space that we've used before. We propose to do that in late February or early March. At the same time, we will hold our SEPA scoping meeting.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Anything else?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** We will be contacting our consultant right after the meeting today. We've determined that Shapiro & Associates will be the consultant for this application, and Mr. Taylor and Mr. Peeples have asked for a meeting with them as soon as possible, and we'll try to arrange that. We need to prepare a task order for Shapiro. We will do that very soon, and we need to supply Zilkha an estimated cost for this project, and they're going to be required to deposit money into the State Treasury, so that we can get the consultant working and EFSEC working. They did submit the required \$20,000 for EFSEC to begin work and \$25,000 for the consultant to begin work, so we have received their check for \$45,000.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Okay. No more questions? Thank you for the presentation. We look forward to working closely with you, and we look forward to working closely with the public, and the public will be attending I'm sure meetings and such additional adjudicatory procedure to the extent that they occur.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** A couple other things. We are preparing letters to send out to the county commissioners informing them of the application. Also asking the county to appoint a local representative for the project. I don't believe there's a public port district in that area, so that isn't a factor. We also will prepare letters to each of the agencies and to the Attorney General's Office to inform them we have received an application and they need to appoint a Counsel for the Environment for this project, and other letters will go out to inform EFSEC stakeholders that we received the application. We will attempt to get the application on our website this evening or by tomorrow hopefully at the latest.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Well, I inadvertently earlier failed to introduce our new Assistant Attorney General who is going to be breaking ground with all of us on this wind project, so I will do that at this time. Ann Essko is assuming the responsibilities of legal counsel for EFSEC, and we look forward to working with her closely. She has an outstanding background having worked with many of the agencies, which are represented on the EFSEC board. I don't think Ann's been through a wind project. Certainly none of us have, but she has worked closely with many of the member agencies that have responsibility, Tony at DNR and Ecology I believe; is that correct?

**MS. ESSKO:** Yes.

**CHAIR LUCE:** So welcome, Ann, and we'll all have fun together.

**CHAIR LUCE:** We'll recess for five minutes to take down the equipment. (Recess taken)

## ITEM NO. 6: BP CHERRY POINT

<b>Progress Report</b>	<b>Mike Torpey, BP Cherry Point</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------------

**CHAIR LUCE:** Council, come back to order. The next information item concerns BP Cherry Point.

**MR. TORPEY:** Thank you, and good afternoon. I appreciate the opportunity to update the Council on BP Cherry Point Co-Generation Project. When we met last, we were working on the wetland mitigation proposal and the cultural resources report. We needed to finish that work for Shapiro to finish the DEIS. Both these reports were finished and distributed prior to the holidays. The wetland mitigation proposal was distributed on December 18, and the cultural resources report was distributed on December 19.

On the wetland mitigation plan our initial proposal actually was submitted on August 6, but since that time we have been working with the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Ecology to incorporate their comments and suggestions. We have had several working meetings. We've gone back and forth several times on the report, made a significant number of changes. It's in review right now with the Corps of Engineers, and we are waiting to hear about their review and approval.

On the cultural resources, the investigation covered the entire project site, lay-down areas, access roads, transmission corridor, and it included a fairly extensive cultural resources investigation, which included a pedestrian survey across the entire portion and 316 subsurface probes in all. No significant cultural resources were identified; however, there was one small area in one small corner of the lay-down Area 3, it was described as containing a phenyl scatter but was determined not eligible for inclusion in the national register for historic places. I understand that BPA will be coordinating with the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation on this part of the project, so the cultural resources section will be updated to include this new information. Since we last met there have been several project changes.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Julian, is that you on the bridge line?

**MR. DEWELL:** Yes, it is.

**MR. TORPEY:** One of the first changes we've made, and I think it's a very good one is that we've been working with Alcoa and the Whatcom PUD to develop an industrial water reuse project. Both plant managers for BP Refinery and Alcoa have met and agreed that this was a good project and we should move this forward. We are in the process of working on a letter of intent in order to move ahead on this project should the co-generation project be approved. The industrial water from Alcoa allows the co-generation project to incorporate water-cooling into the project versus air-cooling and with the added benefit of actually using less water overall. If you were to draw a circle around BP Refinery, Alcoa, and the co-generation project, the reuse project provides more than enough water for the water-cooling at the co-generation project. It also increases the efficiency of the project compared to air-cooling, so we will make some changes in the application. We will remove air-cooling and substitute water-cooling. We're not looking for both options.

The second change that we are looking at is to work with the developer Trans Canada. At this time it's entirely a BP project. It has been a BP project all along. We will continue to be a BP project until we have a commercial agreement with Trans Canada, but we are working together. The project stays basically the same size, 720-megawatt, three gas turbines, and one steam turbine. The footprint stays within the footprint of the original application. We still supply

about 500,000 pounds per hour of co-generation steam directly to the refinery and about 85 megawatts of power again supplied directly to the refinery.

So the changes that you will be seeing that we need to make in the application are water-cooling substitute for air-cooling, a slight change in the equipment arrangement within the same footprint overall as the original application, but the equipment is slightly rearranged, a small diesel fire water pump, a small diesel start-up generator. Those will be included, as well as have to be incorporated into the air modeling. The application to change from air-cooling to water-cooling requires a large number of relatively small changes in the application, and we are working on those now. We will be supplying then new sections when those sections change and tables for the application. Timing wise, it's difficult to predict the timing of this. I was going to say sometime in February we would be able to get these done. This project is still very important to BP Cherry Point. It's a way to ensure that the refinery continues to receive lower cost steam and lower cost power while reducing the market risk for volatility in power. Are there any questions?

**MR. CARELLI:** I do have one. I'm assuming that you're talking about reusing Alcoa's industrial wastewater.

**MR. TORPEY:** That's correct.

**MR. CARELLI:** As opposed to any industrial water supply.

**MR. TORPEY:** That's correct. Alcoa has a process. They're running cooling water, fresh water through an air compressor, and at that point it comes out, at most five degrees warmer than it goes in, but it's non-contact. It looks the same as the fresh water coming in. We will take that water and put it back into the supply line that goes to the refinery, so that's how we get to five degrees warmer, but it's the same water.

**MR. CARELLI:** What does Alcoa currently do to discharge or get rid of their cooling wastewater?

**MR. TORPEY:** That's collected with the rest of the refinery. That would not be correct. Alcoa's waste-water that gets discharged to the bay.

**MR. CARELLI:** Thank you.

**MR. TORPEY:** Anything else?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Could you give me a 30 second description of Trans Canada.

**MR. TORPEY:** Trans Canada is a company out of Canada. They have developed I think their niche in the power business is developing co-generation projects. They were one of several developers that we started working with, and as it turns out Trans Canada came out on top of that. They understand co-generation. They understand working with a steam host and developing relationships with steam partners, so that's what we're working on now.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Follow-up question regarding transmission. What agreement, if any, do you have with Bonneville? I know you have to do the interconnection, but for firm transmission from the site assuming the plant is built and completed onto the Bonneville grid.

**MR. TORPEY:** We are in the queue for interconnection and firm transmission. We don't have an agreement yet.

**CHAIR LUCE:** In the queue does that mean that who pays the cost of any upgrades that are necessary on the main Bonneville grade to accommodate your project?

**MR. TORPEY:** My understanding is that we pay the interconnection costs. I don't know what happens to modifications to the grid.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you. Any questions from other Council members? Allen.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** So we can assume, Mr. Torpey, that in February sometime you will be submitting either, an amendment to the application or a revision to the application.

**MR. TORPEY:** We will turn in revisions to the application. So if a section of the application changes, we'll hand a new section then to replace the old section, page-by-page type replacement, and we'll correct some of the errata that we submitted last time.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Jenene.

**MS. FENTON:** If you submit corrections rather than amendments, what does that do to our time frame for review? Aren't we like six months past where we should have been and hasn't the clock already started on this project?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Well, in my opinion I believe under our rules it says that a company cannot submit revisions to the application within 30 days prior to the adjudicative hearings. So I think the Applicant is free to submit revisions or amendments at any time. What it does to the schedule? It will lengthen the schedule because our consultant will have to review that information and changes and look at how it impacts the development of the Draft EIS. It will take some time for that to happen because we have to have time for our consultant to look at the revisions and get back to the Council on what they think. We don't know what the tentative draft date for the EIS will be yet.

**MS. FENTON:** Does the Council or our consultant have to come up with another letter indicating that the application is complete and ready for the next step in the process?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Why don't we consult with our legal counsel on that particular issue.

**MS. FENTON:** My major concern is that this particular Applicant wanted us to move forward quickly, and I think we tried to accommodate it, but unfortunately EFSEC has some rules that they were supposed to process this application within a certain period of time. And through no fault of EFSEC it has been delayed, and I would just prefer we not get a black eye over it.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I understand your point. I guess what I would request perhaps when BP files their revisions is that they send EFSEC a letter recognizing that there have been substantial modifications to the project as it was initially proposed, and then I think it's a 12-month time frame within which we had anticipated to be able to process this application is understood that through no fault of EFSEC's that will not be possible. We both pledge to commit to moving expeditiously with the new information, something along those lines. And I'm thinking you could work with Allen and our legal counsel and write some letter like that.

**MR. TORPEY:** Certainly.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I know BP would never utilize this delay adversely to EFSEC, but there are some people who would be critical of the EFSEC process.

**MR. TORPEY:** Okay.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you.

**MS. FENTON:** Exactly. Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Any other questions? Any other comments? All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate your report.

## **ITEM NO. 7: SATSOP COMBUSTION TURBINE PROJECT**

<b>Phase I Status</b>	<b>Andy McNeil, Duke Energy Grays Harbor</b>
-----------------------	--

**CHAIR LUCE:** The next item on the agenda is the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project.

**MR. McNEIL:** For December we averaged approximately 100 people performing work. Presently we have a small composite staff working on site during this deferral. In December, we completed work that was needed for preservation, the HRSGs we completed, weld out of casing and the roof panels. We have completed energizing the essential equipment for electrical, and we are putting the gas and steam turbines in a preservation mode, putting dehumidified air through those, and that's about where we stand for the December update. Any questions?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Jenene.

**MS. FENTON:** Did you do the hydrostatic testing? Has that been done yet?

**MR. McNEIL:** Several things for the NPDES permit were due. We have sent a response. Due to the weather the hydrostatic testing for the C-1 pond in the winter months is hard to do, and we've asked for a delay in doing that testing until the weather permits. We have gone ahead and have done the surveying of the C-1 pond. We have hired an engineer to do the oil & water separator design and we have written a response to Allen on those regards.

**MS. FENTON:** One more question. The C-1 pond, I understand that there may have been some problems with it. What's the status of the C-1 pond?

**MR. McNEIL:** We did notice some seepage in the dam. Due to the nice weather that we had last week, the PDA came in and resurfaced the dam. They did notice that where the toe of the rock toe meets the cement when they had put in the toe itself it, caused some damage to the old gunnite that surfaced and they re-gunned that on Friday. During the rain that we experienced this weekend we did not notice any seepage coming from the dam after the repair.

**MS. FENTON:** What's gunnite? Is that the cement looking stuff?

**MR. McNEIL:** Yes. It's what swimming pools used to be surfaced with. It's a very sandy cement.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Staff was aware that there was seepage from the pond. We asked Duke Energy and Energy Northwest to take samples of that seep, and they did do that. Duke reported to us everyday that it did seep. They reported the turbidity of those samples and compared them to the turbidity of the Satsop and Chehalis River and other discharges, so that we're well aware of the seep and the turbidity of that seep. But they do have to perform some of the work that we've requested or required as part of the NPDES permit.

**MR. CARELLI:** Was there discharge to the river?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** No.

**MR. McNEIL:** There was no discharge and the water quality, from the water that did seep through did meet water quality standards, but there was no discharge. What we were able to see is that within about a hundred feet of the dam it would have been resolved or gone into the ground surface.

**MR. CARELLI:** About the same place that it was apparent last year?

**MR. McNEIL:** Yes.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** I have another question. In your report you stated that you had about a hundred workers in December, and then the assumption is you have fewer workers now on site.

**MR. McNEIL:** That is correct. We have a very small composite staff working.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Because of this would it be appropriate for EFSEC to conclude that construction has completely stopped on the site?

**MR. McNEIL:** Work is not completely stopped, but I do believe that we need to look at the requirements in the PSD and the SCA with you. We are continuing to work, but it's at a very reduced level.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Mr. Chairman, in the site certification agreement and the prevention of significant deterioration permit, there are clauses and conditions that if work ceases, then certain things occur, and so we will be working with the company and the Council to see about those requirements.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I think that's very unfortunate, but I think it's appropriate. Thank you.

**MR. McNEIL:** Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Mike, you're up.

<b>Phase I Greenhouse Gas Report</b>	<b>Mike Mills, EFSEC</b>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------

**MR. MILLS:** In your packets you will find three items related to the requirements that the Satsop project prepare a greenhouse gas report. There was a requirement that Duke and Energy Northwest prepare a greenhouse gas report, and that be filed with the Council no later than one year prior to each turbine coming on line. The company did submit a proposal or report in July of the past year, and staff has not brought that forward. We feel it's appropriate this be brought forward to the Council at this time given the status of the project, and that we take a look at the requirements of not only the SCA but also Resolution No. 298, which is also included with the information we gave you. We propose that this be discussed at your next executive committee.

**CHAIR LUCE:** That's sound like a reasonable approach. Council Members thoughts or observations?

**MS. FENTON:** That works for me.

**MR. IFIE:** That's fine.

**CHAIR LUCE:** We've been using quite a bit of the time at the executive meetings to work on rules, so if you could give us prior to the next meeting some estimate of how much time you think we are going to take, then we will continue to have enough time left to work on rules.

**MR. MILLS:** We'll do that. Sure.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thanks.

## **ITEM NO. 8: CHEHALIS GENERATION FACILITY**

<b>Construction Progress Report</b>	<b>Tom Schneider, Chehalis Power</b>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

**CHAIR LUCE:** Tom Schneider, Chehalis Generating Facility.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Council. My name is Tom Schneider. I'm the site manager for Tractebel on the Chehalis project. I believe you do have a handout, which is a small project update that might be helpful as we go through the status of the project.

**MR. MILLS:** You'll have two handouts. One is a construction report and then another just entitled Project Update.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:** Basically our project status is as follows: Our engineering is considered 100 percent complete while we do have the engineering support on site now from the Houston corporate offices of Parson's to help us as we continue completing construction. Procurement is listed at 96.8 percent complete with the bulk of all major equipment on site is set. Some bulk materials are still being bought as needed. Construction is shown as 67.6 percent complete. This data is as of the end of December 2002, and the overall project of all that combined is considered to be 88.9 percent complete to date.

As far as the schedule goes, we are still scheduled to be complete and in commercial operation on the 31st of October this year. Due to early arrivals of major equipment components we hope to be a little bit earlier than that date, but we don't have a firm date for that. Everybody would like to know what that is within our group, but it looks like there's a good possibility that we could be completing in the August-September time frame.

Looking further at the basic installation activities, HRSG and general steel erection is going very well. As you might see there both HRSGs are basically erected and cleanup work is proceeding on those. Stack erection is also continuing and nearing complete. Above ground piping is also moving well. We expect to have all of the prefabricated large bore piping up by the end of February. Electrical work is also moving along very well. We do have almost a million feet of wire on this project and wire pulling is well along, and we did have a major milestone completed in December as we completed electrical backfeed from BPA into the project site on the 15th of December as scheduled. Actually it was ahead of our original schedule. It was our recent schedule.

Mechanical equipment as I noted earlier is all basically set in place. All the major equipment is continuing to work on component parts. The CTs are well along. Of course, they're received almost completely installed or assembled, so it's mostly external piping and compartment work that we are going to enclose the units. The steam turbine, on the other hand, is an item that takes a lot of assembly on site, and that's also moving well with the HP and IP sections completely set and the LP section is currently being set. If you would like to look at some of the pictures that we gave to you in this little handout, that might be helpful. The first picture is the air-cooled condenser. That shows five of the six risers complete going up into the coil section of the unit. All coils are set, and basically that unit is installed and complete except for the sixth riser. All the fans are in place and most of the electrical is completed as well. That unit went together a little better than we had hoped or expected, and so we're very pleased with the way it has been assembled. A gas turbine shown as Unit 2, we have a picture of next for you. It's a G.E. Frame 7 unit sitting in place and tied into the HRSG with the generator on the right-hand side just out of the picture. The next picture you have before you is the LP turbine rotor being set. It's a good-sized piece of equipment, and that's the largest major component piece we have to install for the steam turbine. That's the principal pictures that I brought in for you to give you a feeling for how things are looking on site. The administrative offices and service building is generally complete, and our operating staff has now moved it, so we are kind of at home finally.

Switchyard and transmission work is complete. As I mentioned earlier we have achieved backfeed so BPA is essentially complete with their work. Again, that was well ahead of schedule. Any off-site services, gas, water, and sewer is also all complete and ready for service. We are using the water and sewer at this time for construction support, and the gas system is laid up with nitrogen waiting for construction to request the gas. That will probably occur in April, with the way things are going at this time. Startup is also beginning now. Our startup crew is in place, and we have initiated startup on five systems. We have 55 systems total on the project, and we're working closely with local government folks on various inspections that they do routinely. We have no outstanding issues.

There are a couple other items I should note. Our safety on the project is very good. I think we are at 1.3 IR for a project as a whole. TIC is a very, very safety oriented company. I am very pleased with that. Purchase of water rights is also nearing completion and has been submitted to EFSEC for approval. I would like to also mention TIC's community involvement. We are very pleased also not only with their safety considerations but also with the way they work with the

local community. This past Thanksgiving and Christmas were wonderful examples of how they have worked with the community and how the construction workers on site, which we're now standing at about 650 and should be at a peak, have been very generous and willing to donate to the community whenever asked. I think we supported 15 families during Christmas, and with over, oh, gosh -- What was it? - over ten thousand dollars in donations all picked up in one day. I mean they supported the local food bank, which seems to have been in trouble at Thanksgiving with also a total of over \$15,000 worth of donations through Safeway. So I am very pleased with the way TIC is supporting and working with the community. So that's about it for our update. Any questions that I can respond to?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:** You're welcome.

**MR. CARELLI:** One question. Down the last line of your startup you have the abbreviation DCS FAT was completed in Cleveland.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:** Acronyms are a problem, aren't they? The DCS is our control system for the project. It's in the main control room in the administration building. The FAT is a factory acceptance test that was done in Cleveland where it was built.

**MR. CARELLI:** Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Is there anything else?

**MR. MILLS:** I think that covers it. Mr. Schneider, we will bring to the executive committee the package that was submitted on the water mitigation, water rights acquisition, and there's also a copy of that package in your packets today, so I ask you to bring that to the executive committee, please.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:** Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you.

## **ITEM NO. 9: WALLULA POWER PROJECT**

<b>Status Report</b>	<b>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

**CHAIR LUCE:** Irina, do you have something on Wallula?

**MS. MAKAROW:** Just a short status report. The Governor acted to approve the Wallula Power Project on December 18 of last year, and following that approval staff proceeded with issuing the Notice of Construction Air Emissions Permit because that was the state only permit that became effective when the Governor approved the project.

The Prevention of Significant Deterioration permits have been sent out to EPA Region 10 for their co-signature. In the past week staff has been contacted by the certificate holder with some questions about changes in the company ownership, and we expect to receive a letter from them with more details about that in the next week to ten days. So at the executive committee meeting we will bring that forward to you when we receive it.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you. Any questions for Irina?

**ITEM NO. 10: ENERGY NORTHWEST COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION & WNP-1/4**

<b>Columbia Operations/Dry Cask Storage</b>	<b>John Arbuckle, Energy Northwest</b>
---	--

**CHAIR LUCE:** All right. The next item is also an information item, Energy Northwest Columbia Generating Station. John is here to give us a presentation on Columbia Operations/Dry Cask Storage.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Good afternoon. I have with me Lynn Albin. She's with the Department of Health, and she was involved heavily in the NRC inspection effort of the dry cask storage and was involved in installing several radiological monitoring stations around the facility. She is going to cover that piece when we get to that. Columbia has been on line for 323 consecutive days. The power is at hundred percent. Last year we set a generation record of 8.9 million megawatt hours. Our previous record was 8.6 in the year 2000, so we had a very, very, very good year there. That's about it for Columbia.

**MR. CARELLI:** Any questions from Council Members?

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Mike asked me to give a brief update on Council Resolution 295. I gave you a handout with some pictures of the dry cask storage area. We essentially had six NRC demonstrations, the final one was the week of September 13th when we actually loaded our first cask. NRC stated that they've never ever seen a first cask loading go as well as that one. It was very, very successful. We completed loading the fifth cask the week of December 2, and we are going to be resuming loading some more casks after our refueling outage at the end of June. I guess that Lynn worked closely with the NRCs. She was involved with the NRC team, and you might want to cover what you found from a radiological perspective.

**MS. ALBIN:** Okay. Per EFSEC Resolution 295 the Department of Health was directed to conduct activities to assure that the public health and the environment are not harmed by the dry cask operations, and to this end the Department undertook two major activities. The first is we reviewed documents and participated in the NRC inspections, and we conducted on-site observations of dry cask operations. And the Department finds that the personnel that are involved with this at Energy Northwest are very confident and well trained, and this led to very safe loading of the casks.

The second task was that the Department was directed to establish an acceptable monitoring system to ensure that public health and the environment are safe once the casks are loaded and stored outside the reactor building on the concrete pad. To do this we set up radiation dosimeters several years ago, actually, to get some baseline data of the environmental radiation levels in that area, and as soon as the cask or the security fence was constructed we put dosimeters directly on that security fence and collected another couple quarters worth of data, and so that when all the casks were loaded during the fourth quarter of 2002 we had a significant amount of background data in which to compare the dose rates once the casks were put out on the pad. And we did see elevated radiation levels, but the area where the public would be able to come in contact or the closest point to the dry cask area, the radiation levels at that area remained at background not seeing anything significant. We're going to continue to monitor. We're going to continue to accompany the NRC inspections and follow this. Those are our activities to date.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Would you like me to walk you through the pictures that we have here? The very first picture you have here is these four empty casks and they're sitting on the south pad. There's also a north pad up there, and the next picture is the first cask coming out the railroad bay. It's loaded with the spent fuel getting ready to be transported to the storage area.

The next picture is the cask being moved towards the crawler, which actually moves at .3 miles an hour around the site. It takes a long time to get there, and then the fourth picture the cask on the right, that's the first loaded cask.

The ones on the left are empty, and right now if we look at it today, there are five casks on the right here. They're all loaded and on the storage pad. The next pictures are from the 606 refueling area. This is a picture of what is called a high track. There's a multi-purpose canister that holds 68 fuel assemblies. This transport mechanism was used to hold those, transport around within the reactor building, out of the pool within the reactor building until we actually loaded them into the canister. That's the overpack, that's actually loaded up onto the 606. And the next picture is the high track internal transfer cask being loaded out of the spent fuel pool, and then we actually have a picture of the spent fuel pool itself. That person in the center is running the three fuel masts, and you can see how clear the water is. If you look to the left, that little container down there, that's actually the high track and the multi-purpose canister is in that, and that's where we're actually loading fuel. So we're actually grappling onto a fuel bundle here, and they will move it over into the spent fuel canister.

If you go to the next page, then you actually see that's actually the mast and a bundle. On the left that little square grid area there, that's the spent fuel pool, and they have taken one from there and they're moving it into the multi-purpose canister there, and you can see how clear the water is.

That's 22 feet of water from the top of the spent fuel pool here. That's all I have.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you. Questions? Yes, Allen.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** How many total casks are you going to load this first time?

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** We did five.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** And that's it.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** I don't know what the schedule is for the rest of the year, but we met our goal at five, which is 340 assemblies.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** So each time you refuel you're going to load up some and put them out there.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Yes, as we want to create more space, so we can have a full core off-load capability in case we have some problems in the core and then can take the fuel out and work on them.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** As a two-year refuel cycle?

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Yes.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** So every two years you will be loading some number of casks.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Well, actually the casks will be loading ongoing throughout the year efforts. It's not refueling outage limited.

**MR. CARELLI:** The outage is scheduled to begin when?

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** May 10 and end on June 10. The plan is to synchronize to the grid on June 12.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thanks.

**MR. ARBUCKLE:** Thanks.

<b>WNP-1/4 Site Restoration</b>	<b>Jim Luce, EFSEC Chair</b>
---------------------------------	------------------------------

**CHAIR LUCE:** I have nothing significant to report on the WNP-1/4 site restoration. All negotiations are completed. The documents are being hopefully finalized, going through the Bonneville pack, their 568 process, and Energy Northwest Process and the EFSEC process. I have expressed that my strong interest is in having everything signature ready, so that if we get short notice on signing, which is not desirable but just might happen, that we won't be in the

position of having to say, "Well, we completed the negotiations three months ago, but we haven't got the documents ready to sign yet." That would be awkward to explain. I know everybody is working really hard. Ed Gross has been doing a great job, and Cindy at Bonneville, and DOE Richland, so let's just get them signature ready. Any questions on that?

**ITEM NO. 11: EFSEC RULES**

<b>Rules Development</b>	<b>Chuck Carelli, Ecology</b>
--------------------------	-------------------------------

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you. Chuck, you want to lead the discussion? We have a number of EFSEC rules, a rules development process that's been put together by Charles Carelli of Ecology. We have several rules, CT Chapter Foundation, Seismic, Noise, and Administration. You want to take it from there, Chuck?

**MR. CARELLI:** As most of you know, in November the Council adopted a process we would follow while looking at the adoption of rules for siting combustion turbine electric generating projects, and that process is right now contained on the EFSEC website if anybody needs to look at that and remind themselves of how we're going to go about doing this. But briefly it amounts to EFSEC dedicating portions of executive committee meetings to working through a number of possible areas where revisions to our rule is necessary.

Jenene Fenton and Tony Ifie have spent a good deal of time and put together a rather complete list of all of the EFSEC rules and also identified those rules that they felt needed some attention through the rule development process. They in turn also prioritized those rules as far as which ones we should work on first, and the Council is now moving from top to bottom, from the No. 1 Priority on down to the No. 5 Priority, and by being a No. 5 Priority does not mean something is not important, but it's something that is only used to indicate when we are going to get to those items. We will do some things first and some things fifth. What we've done is we've put together a good deal of information on administration and the foundation why we are doing this. We also have specific rules promoting a standard for seismicity and for noise, the manner in which we would support mediation among parties to an adjudication is also being worked on and nearly complete, but we are not quite there with the final language on that. What we've done is the executive committee has looked at four of these five, if we drop off mediation, and has essentially said that we are pretty good to go on these four. Let's take them to the Council, and by doing that generally make them available for public review and comment if folks are interested. We don't think that we have a complete package or something that we could at this time take out into the public as a formal rule that we could say that this is the rule we're going to adopt. What we're going to do I believe, what I'm going to suggest at any rate is that we take those four items, we place them onto our website, and encourage people to look at them, to review them, and to provide comments to EFSEC staff and/or individual Council members if they are interested. At the same time if anybody here wants to comment on those four areas, and you have a copy in the back of the room, we certainly would be pleased to hear those comments. Once we have a package of rules we think is sufficiently significant that would warrant our starting the rule development process, the formal process, we would schedule public information meetings on those rules, gather the comments that we have at that time, decide if additional changes or revisions to these initial drafts are necessary, make those changes, and then proceed with the rule development process in what under state law has us filing a Form CR-102, that will

move us to a formal public review and comment process on these rules, so I think that's where we are.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I think you captured pretty well what my sense and I think the sense of the Council is. We would hope to have a package ready for some public discussion I would guess mid-March. I have worked through enough of these at the executive session, but it was believed that if we take them up individually right now probably wouldn't be as beneficial to members of the public. One, because they wouldn't have had a chance to read them until today; and, two, because I think we look at the whole package rather than looking at the component parts and it's easier to evaluate and get good meaningful public comment on that. And I think we also intend at some point in time when a CR-102 is filed, to hopefully hold a larger public meeting both on the east side and on the west side. It will be somewhere in the Seattle area and somewhere on the east side to get a broader public comment. Any other comments, Council Members? Thank you. Jenene, you had something?

**MS. FENTON:** Only just a point of clarification for the chapter foundation. The first item on the agenda is called CT Chapter Foundation, and that we intended to be kind of the purpose of intent for the new chapter dealing with CT rules. When we looked at and discussed the individual standards that we are going to be looking at, we found that we have existing WACs that may relate to them. In the case of the foundation WACs, there were two WACs that needed minor modifications that exist currently, and those will be the two WACs that will be placed on the website. The actual foundation WAC intent and purpose WAC won't be put forth until we conclude many more discussions on more of the standards because it was hard to finalize that particular section of the new WAC until we had gone through all the discussions on all the different issues, so that's where the foundation WACs are. The other ones are pretty much stand alone, but that one is just a little different.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Any comments from the public?

**MR. CARELLI:** I would offer one last thing. Jenene and I had a little discussion before the meeting got started today, and our review of where we are in the process seems to indicate that maybe the next topics for discussion might be site restoration, water resources, water supply, water quality and/or fish and wildlife, so those might be the next areas that we would begin discussing.

**CHAIR LUCE:** That's great. Do we want to choose a couple today?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Could you say those again.

**MR. CARELLI:** Site restoration, water quality, water quantity, and fish and wildlife.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Thanks.

**MS. FENTON:** You would like a volunteer for specific issues? Well, I think I might volunteer for fish and wildlife.

**MR. CARELLI:** I wanted that one.

**MS. FENTON:** I think you should do water.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I have a background there too. Let's see.

**MR. CARELLI:** We need this today?

**CHAIR LUCE:** No. I am trying to think water quality, water quantity.

**MR. CARELLI:** If we do those, I think we should lump them together.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I agree.

**MR. CARELLI:** For what it's worth categorically I think I might offer to take that on.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Thank you, sir. Site restoration is the next one.

**MR. FRYHLING:** I can think about it. I will see.

**CHAIR LUCE:** You get to drive past No. 4 and 5 on the way home, so you can give it a lot of thought. All right.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Just a reminder, the next executive committee we still have socioeconomic that Mr. Fryhling is working on, and we will bring mediation back.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Okay. Well, then we've got those two, and then we are going to have some additional discussion about matters that were raised here today. Is that going to be a full enough executive session or do we want to add another rule?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** With these four that you have just added?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Yes.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Plus the two?

**CHAIR LUCE:** Plus the two that are coming back, the mediation and socioeconomic. Do we want to add anything other than those given the rest of the agenda for the executive committee?

**MR. FIKSDAL:** No.

**MS. FENTON:** Mr. Chair, I am shooting for the following executive committee to have the draft on fish and wildlife. I've pretty much got it drafted, but I kind of need to share it with my agency first.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Okay. Great.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** I think also the Council should start thinking about consistency in format, and how we want to deal with that.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Do correct me, but don't we have some office within the state government that

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Not to begin with.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Not to begin with. All right. We have an officer within the state government.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** The Attorney General's Office I think.

**MR. CARELLI:** Jim, for what it's worth in that regard I have a lady in our office that took a look at the noise rule, and she said, "Wow, that was interesting. If you have more of that kind of thing that needs review, I would be glad to do that."

**CHAIR LUCE:** Volunteers are wonderful.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** Whoever criticized the Department of Ecology?

**CHAIR LUCE:** I note for the record there was a glowing Seattle Times editorial on the Department of Ecology and the steps that have been taken in the last year, so congratulations to the Department of Ecology.

**MR. CARELLI:** Thank you.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Anything else?

## **ITEM NO. 12: OTHER**

**MR. FRYHLING:** Jim, I just wanted to make a comment. We had a couple items that were on the agenda today that because we have taken little trips to these sites, it makes sense to me. This thing over in Columbia Generating Station, those pictures wouldn't have meant a thing to me except we toured the site, and so I understood what it was. The same thing applies on some of these other sites that we went to. I can look at these pictures but couldn't tell you much, but once we walked down there it's just enlightening, so I understand what they're talking about. So if we continue to do this as we go on through this, what we have done in the past has been very beneficial for me.

**CHAIR LUCE:** I think when we go over for our public meetings in Ellensburg, I would like to have some tour of the site, a site visit, if that's permissible of counsel. I would like to go out and look at the land.

**MS. ESSKO:** That's fine.

**MR. FIKSDAL:** We will also try to arrange before that or during that time I know Ms. Essko hasn't seen some of the stuff that you have seen, and it would be nice for her to get a tour of Columbia.

**MR. MILLS:** John indicated that Energy Northwest Nine Canyon Wind Project could certainly be toured.

**CHAIR LUCE:** A couple of other items. We've been meaning to put together a meeting with the Columbia Inter-Tribal Energy Commission on Tribal Energy Policy which I think would be very interesting to hear what their thinking is. And then recently there has been a number of issues on transmission, and I think it might be helpful to have somebody from Bonneville and maybe somebody from a private utility and somebody from an independent power company give a presentation on what they see as the major issues facing the region in terms of transmission, firm transmission especially. I don't think that has to happen immediately, but it's going to be increasingly important. Cindy, does that make sense?

**MS. CUSTER:** Yes. I think we can get somebody.

**CHAIR LUCE:** The whole question is can you get it firm? If you can't get it firm, do you have to build it? If you have to build it, who pays for it? And if who pays for it, how do you pay for it? And everyone is destitute. So what sort of creative ways are we going to figure out to provide what is necessary within the time frame that it's needed? Cindy, maybe you could start thinking about that.

**MS. CUSTER:** Yes.

### **ITEM NO. 13: ADJOURN**

**CHAIR LUCE:** Great. Thank you everybody. Do we have anything else to come before the Council? We stand adjourned.

(Council meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.)