

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

July 19, 2004 Meeting
925 Plum Street S.E., Building 4, Room 308
Olympia, Washington 1:30 p.m.

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER

MR. IFIE: The Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council meeting for Monday, July 19, 2004, will come to order. Mike Mills, our clerk, call the roll, please.

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
Kittitas County

Richard Fryhling
Hedia Adelsman
Chris Towne
(Acting Chair) Tony Ifie
Tim Sweeney
(via phone) Patti Johnson

MR. MILLS: I note that Chair Jim Luce is absent today, and Tony Ifie is the Acting Chair today, and there is a quorum.

MR. IFIE: Thank you, Mike.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

EFSEC STAFF AND COUNSEL

Allen Fiksdal
Mike Mills
Ann Essko, AAG
Shaun Linse, Court Reporter

Irina Makarow
Mariah Laamb
Adam Torem, Kittitas ALJ

EFSEC GUESTS

Darrel Peeples – Kittitas Valley Wind Power
Project & Wild Horse Wind Power Project
Chris Taylor – Zilkha Renewable Resources

Karen McGaffey – Perkins Coie (via phone)
John Lane – Counsel for the Environment

Jim Hurson – Kittitas County DPA
Alan Harger – Transportation
Mot Hedges – Energy Northwest

Clay White – Kittitas County (via phone)
Mark Anderson – CTED Energy Policy
Timothy McMahan

ITEM NO. 3: ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AGENDA

MR. IFIE: The next agenda item is adoption of the proposed agenda, the first item. Have Councilmembers had a chance to review the agenda?

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes.

MR. IFIE: Are there any additions, corrections, or modifications?

MS. TOWNE: Question for Mike Mills. The WNP-1 item, does that cover the mitigation project?

MR. MILLS: Yes, it will.

MS. TOWNE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FIKSDAL: There's one other change I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. Under Item No. 6, the second bullet the allocation is an action item. That should be under No. 7 EFSEC operations. It's not part of the rules. That was a mistake. So if you will move the second bullet under Item 6 to the second bullet under Item 7.

MR. IFIE: Okay. Any other changes, additions, modifications? Hearing no more changes, the agenda as proposed, as changed, as modified is adopted.

ITEM NO. 4: MINUTES

MR. IFIE: Next item, minutes.

MS. TOWNE: If I may ask a question of Mariah. Did we have the draft of June 21? I'm trying to remember if I reviewed it.

MS. LAAMB: I believe you were on vacation when I sent it out last week, so it went out Wednesday probably, is my recollection.

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes, we received it.

MS. LAAMB: You just probably didn't have time.

MS. TOWNE: Well, I just got home last night.

MS. LAAMB: Right. Since you returned on a weekend.

MR. IFIE: Are you requesting for more time to review the minutes?

MS. TOWNE: That is at your discretion. I have not reviewed them.

MR. IFIE: If you are requesting, we could --

MR. FIKSDAL: If I might, Mr. Chairman. If the rest of the Council wants to pass the minutes subject to any changes that Councilmember Towne might have, and if they appear to be substantive, we can come back to the Council.

MS. TOWNE: That would be fine. Thank you. Mariah, if you could re-email them because I can't recall seeing them.

MS. LAAMB: Yes, I will.

MR. IFIE: Are there any other comments about the minutes of the June 21, 2004 meeting?

MR. FRYHLING: I move that we adopt the minutes.

MS. ADELSMAN: I second it.

MR. IFIE: It's been moved and seconded that we adopt the minutes. Any call for the question?

MR. SWEENEY: Question.

MR. IFIE: All those in favor say aye.

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

ITEM NO. 5: PROJECT UPDATES

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <i>Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project</i> | <i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i> |
|--|------------------------------------|

MR. IFIE: The next one is project updates. Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, Irina.

MS. MAKAROW: The only update I have is that we have received recommendations from our Ecology and Fish and Wildlife contractors on certain permitting aspects of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. We did receive copies of those today. With respect to Fish and Wildlife, the only permitting requirement that they have identified is that the project would require a hydraulic project approval which is for stream crossings, and their letter basically outlines those recommendations that they want the Council to consider for site certification agreement, if the Council decides to recommend approval of this project that they be included. With regard to Ecology, the outstanding issue that they were working on was with respect to wetlands mitigation. As it turns out, the wetlands work that would be needed by the Kittitas Valley Project falls under the coverage of two nationwide Corps permits, which I believe they're 12 and 16 for utilities. Subject to those permits, what happens then is that the state has the opportunity to decide whether any additional wetlands mitigation is needed, in addition to whatever requirements are set up by the nationwide permits prepared by the Corps. Our contractor has looked at the project and looked at the Corps permits, and he's recommending that no additional mitigation requirements are needed for this project. So there's no individual 401 certification, and basically the conditions under the Corps permits are sufficient, and that's what is related in his letter to the Council. I believe that is all I have to update the Council on for Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project, except that you have received an administrative review version of the Supplemental Draft EIS that analyzes off-site alternatives for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. I have not yet given you a deadline for comments. You are going to be juggling that with another document which is probably a little bit more urgent which I'll get to under the BP project. So in the next couple of days I will figure out exactly by when I'll need your comments on that document. I'll also email it to you, so you will have an electronic version. That is all I have to report on the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

MR. IFIE: Thank you, Irina. Any comments, questions from the Council? Moving along, the Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Irina.

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <i>Wild Horse Wind Power Project</i> | <i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i> |
|---|------------------------------------|

MS. MAKAROW: The camera-ready Draft EIS went to the Department of Printing on Friday, so we're expecting to have the document mailed and issued on Tuesday, August 3, and a public comment hearing to be held on Tuesday the 24th. Don't quote me. It's either the 23rd or the 24th. If any changes are needed to that public comment meeting date, I do need to know immediately because I would have to get those changes into the document that's currently being printed by the Department of Printing. We have allowed an extended comment period through September 10, and, of course, the time that we do issue the document, which would be August 3, we would also get the notice of opportunity for intervention out that same day. That is all that I have to report on the Wild Horse project.

MR. IFIE: Any comments, questions from Councilmembers?

MR. PEEPLES: Are we going to do the update?

MS. MAKAROW: Oh, yes. I apologize. The Applicant is here to give us an update on their progress regarding resolution of the land use consistency for the Wild Horse Wind Power Project with Kittitas County, and Darrel Peeples is here for that.

MR. PEEPLES: Essentially we have prepared an application. It's been reviewed by the County, and we thought we would file it towards the end of last week, and then the County raised an issue regarding the adjoiner list. I have Chris Taylor with me right now, so he's had more hands on the issue than I have. Chris, could you just briefly go over what's happening.

MR. TAYLOR: Sure. For the record, Chris Taylor representing the Applicant. We submitted I believe all of the required information by June 24. We initially filed an application with the County on or around June 4, then received notification from Clay White after he reviewed it that some additional information was required which we submitted on June 24. Then in the middle of last week, we received a phone call from Clay White saying he completed his review and believed that the application was complete. And the reason, just to clarify that the County considers an application, and correct me if I'm wrong, Jim, to be complete, is when you submit the requisite number of copies. So we needed to know from the County that the application was complete before we made the 100 or 200 or however many copies are needed. As we prepared to make those copies, the County identified what they believed was a problem with respect to the list of adjoining property owners. We have received a letter from the County dated July 15 outlining this issue, and we're still trying to clarify exactly who needs to be on that list. We are working as quickly as we can to resolve that. My understanding of the interpretation of the codes is that the issue relates to how you interpret the County's Code Chapter 15(a) with respect to the notification of affected or adjacent property owners.

MR. PEEPLES: I'd just add the interpretation may be significant, and we need to clarify what is meant because it includes an additional 75 square miles of area with adjoining property owners.

MR. IFIE: Any comments, questions from Councilmembers? Any comments, questions from members of the public?

MR. HURSON: Clay, are you on the line?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. HURSON: Do you want to respond or fill in?

MR. WHITE: Yes. This is Clay White. We received an application on June 4 which specifically lacked an application for a comprehensive plan amendment which as you know is one of the three required elements, and so that was not included in the June 4 application. When I discovered that, I alerted Zilkha staff, Chris Taylor, specifically. They turned that application in on June 25, so we had all elements of the application. At that time it was reviewed, and we were ready for them to have print copies. What was discovered was that they haven't provided us with a list of property owners within 300 feet of the proposal and adjoining property owners. It's a specific requirement. Our code says it on the front page of our application, so as soon as we can get that from them, we can proceed. I know they're looking for some clarification. They can call me at any time if they have questions, but this isn't something that was a surprise. It's been in our code for years. It's on the front page of the application, so I really want to get going with the notice of application. I can't do that until we get a list of joiners within 300 feet and adjoining properties as is stated in our code. So we're just waiting on the Applicant. That's all I have.

MR. IFIE: Any other comments, questions from members of the public? Irina.

MS. MAKAROW: I would just have one comment to make. The Applicant was planning to make their next update regarding the land use issues at the second Council meeting in August, and there's been some discussion among staff that that second meeting might get shifted around because that's the date that we are in Ellensburg, so I would just like to put Mr. Peebles and Mr.

Hurson and Mr. White and Mr. Taylor on notice that you might have to end up giving it a little bit earlier.

MR. PEEPLES: That's fine. We will give it at the next Council meeting. We'll probably update you anyway at that time so.

MS. MAKAROW: I think that is all I have for the Wild Horse Project.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Ifie, I have one more comment.

MR. IFIE: Go ahead.

MR. WHITE: Originally the Council had said that we should be looking at getting this procedure completed by the end of August, and that was at the June 7 hearing. Maybe that was working on the assumption that the Applicant would have turned in a complete application on June 4. As you know it's July 19 now, and we still don't have that application. So we basically have one month to complete a several thousand acre rezone and a several thousand acre comprehensive plan amendment, so we want to get this notice of application out as soon as possible, but we need the full application copies. That's where we are right now, but we're already another month behind from the March 9 submittal date to EFSEC.

MR. IFIE: Any comments from the Applicant?

MR. TAYLOR: We will work as fast as we can to get this resolved.

MR. PEEPLES: Right now everything is ready to go except the issue of adjoining lands, and it has to do with DNR lands and how far you push them, the ones that are an interlocked grid of every other section. But does it stop at DNR's property or does it go and encompass 75 miles worth of property?

MR. IFIE: Okay. Thank you. Okay. We are ready to move on to the next project. BP Cherry Point, again, Irina.

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>BP Cherry Point Power Project</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| | <i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i> |
|--|------------------------------------|

MS. MAKAROW: All right. The Councilmembers should all have by now a copy of the administrative review version of the Final EIS, and we have until -- I think until noon of this Friday to get comments back to me. For Hedia, Tim, and Tony I have your copies over here, and I'll give them to you after the meeting. We are on a rather aggressive schedule to issue the Final EIS, so that Bonneville can get on with their decision making. The next step will also be the post hearing, the reconvened hearing to be held in Seattle on Monday, the 26th, and Mariah will get in touch with you with regard to how we'll arrange travel for that meeting. That is all that I have to report.

MR. IFIE: Any questions for Irina from the Council? Any questions, comments from the public on BP Cherry Point? Thank you, Irina. Next, we move on to Chehalis Generation Facility, Mike Mills.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Chehalis Generation Facility</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| | <i>Mike Mills, EFSEC</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|

MR. MILLS: I received a report from Duncan McCaig, plant manager, at Chehalis today. He indicates the plant is currently operating at full load, and that they were off line much of the past month due to low power prices. They have successfully installed additional silencing equipment on the reheat vents, and they will be running tests to evaluate the effectiveness of that installation. They had one trip on Sunday, July 18, caused by a faulty pressure transmitter and did receive a complaint from a neighbor concerning noise, and they're going to contact the neighbor and try to pin down their complaint and then take a look at how it impacts some of the improvements that they have been making in their program. I think that will conclude that report.

MR. IFIE: Thank you, Mike. Any comments for Mike? Questions? Moving along, I think Mike on WNP-1.

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| WNP-1 | Mike Mills, EFSEC |
|--------------|--------------------------|

MR. MILLS: For WNP-1, I would simply indicate that last week we received news from the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation that negotiations with the property owner in Benton County have moved to a point that there's a draft purchase & sales agreement that's being reviewed right now. Staff intends to meet with the department this week and have an opportunity to go over that agreement and make sure that we understand it and understand how the department and the potential seller can make all of this happen. Staff is working on it, the Chair has been involved in that discussion, and Ann and Allen and I will meet with the department representatives this week. I think this is very good news. It's moving forward at about the schedule that we thought it would and we've indicated the Council will do everything it can to make this happen. Very good news.

MR. IFIE: Any comments?

MS. TOWNE: Question. Will the purchase and sale agreement touch on O & M at all or is that separate?

MR. MILLS: That will be separate.

MS. TOWNE: How will that be dealt with?

MR. MILLS: Staff's proposal is that we would deal with that through a contract amendment with the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

MS. TOWNE: I guess my preference would be to have the two actions be coupled, so that the purchase isn't made unless and until there is something simultaneously ready to go dealing with the O & M.

MR. MILLS: Our intent would be that through the contract amendment we would deal with any transfer of money needed for the acquisition, in addition to any O & M provisions that we would need to include. It would be one action with those two elements involved.

MS. TOWNE: Thank you.

MR. IFIE: The follow-up question to that would be, is there enough money left over for the O & M after the acquisition transaction?

MR. MILLS: Based on the numbers that I've seen there is sufficient money to do the O & M, and we believe there will also be a balance that will be available for the Council to look at some other projects perhaps.

MR. IFIE: Great. Other comments for Mike? Moving on to Columbia Generating Station, Mike.

MR. MILLS: Mot Hedges is here from Energy Northwest and I'd ask him to brief the Council on -- we didn't have it listed, Mot, but I think we can go over the plant operations just briefly too, and then we have another couple of items that he's going to cover.

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Columbia Generation Station | Mot Hedges, Energy Northwest |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

MR. HEDGES: Columbia Generating Station is on line today at 100 percent power, and this is our 382nd day on line. This is an all time record for us and everyday continues that record.

Condenser Water Disposal - Closeout

MR. HEDGES: On the agenda for today, the first item is the condenser water disposal closeout. Let's see. We had EFSEC Resolution 307 that allowed us to dispose the water from the condenser cleaning into the ground. That was finished last year, and all the required samples have been taken and analyzed. The data was transmitted to the Department of Ecology, and the

department has completed their review and had no issues. So I don't think there's any actions remaining on this, so we were just looking to close out this issue if anybody had any questions.

MS. TOWNE: Is the Council required to sign off on anything to affirmatively accept the termination of this?

MR. MILLS: What I think I would like is a direction from the Council to let staff issue a letter indicating that they have complied with the terms of the resolution, and the soil samples didn't indicate anything, and that would be the closeout.

MS. TOWNE: Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: Is there a provision in the site certification agreement at least to be then addressed by saying they do not need to comply any more with that in the monitoring plan or not? Is there any specific language in the site certification agreement that relates to that?

MR. FIKSDAL: This wasn't an action on a site certification agreement. It was a resolution that the Council passed later, in 2003. The site certification agreement was issued in 1997. So this is just an action that recently has come to pass. The Council, in many cases, issues a resolution directing the certificate holder to do a certain action. They completed that action. As required by the resolution, it's been reviewed by the Department of Ecology. They bought off on it, so what we're looking for is a motion from the Council to authorize the staff to essentially close out the action item.

MS. TOWNE: Do you want a motion?

MR. FIKSDAL: I think that would be appropriate, yes.

MS. TOWNE: So moved.

MR. IFIE: Before we vote on that, I was just curious about when you said there was something that came from Ecology already.

MS. ADELSMAN: Do we have a copy of that?

MR. MILLS: The Ecology letter that's in your packets.

MS. TOWNE: It's on the right, second sheet down.

MR. MILLS: Their conclusion was on the second page. Ecology determined discharge did not raise the copper concentrations in the soils significantly above the local background level of approximately 10 mg/kg for copper. Ecology therefore has no further concerns regarding this disposal of the waste water to the ground under the above referenced permit.

MR. IFIE: So it's been moved and seconded that the Council authorize staff to write a letter to -- who's the letter going to?

MR. MILLS: The letter would go to Energy Northwest.

MR. IFIE: Energy Northwest indicating that the disposal of the stored waste water that came out of Resolution 307 is a success and has been complied with. Is that what you meant to move?

MS. TOWNE: Yes.

MR. IFIE: It's been seconded. It's been moved and seconded. All in favor say aye.

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

MR. IFIE: The motion has passed.

MS. ADELSMAN: I just wanted to ask a question. I'm sorry. I was slow. When the resolution was passed before requesting that the site certificate holder do this monitoring, was it just on the copper or were there other things included in there?

MS. TOWNE: No, it was just copper.

MS. ADELSMAN: This letter is just on copper. The original document that was issued to Northwest Energy did it affect anything else besides the copper?

MR. FRYHLING: I think when the condenser water came out of there it was supposed to be high, and it could be possibly high in copper content, so that's why they monitored it when they dumped that large amount of water.

MS. TOWNE: Well, the original certificate didn't deal with this problem because as I recall this was a later request from Columbia Generating station to pump out these holding ponds and do a surface --

MS. ADELSMAN: I understand that. Mostly it says in anticipation of copper concentrations, so it was limited to the copper because the letter from Ecology is only on copper. So the resolution was only on copper.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MR. HEDGES: That's correct. Our condenser is made of admiralty brass, so it's 70 percent copper; copper is the main element of concern in there.

MS. TOWNE: You were scaling; weren't you?

MR. HEDGES: Right.

MS. TOWNE: Descaling, whatever you call it.

MR. HEDGES: It would be scaling. We had scaled and we were now descaling.

MR. IFIE: Thanks for the clarification. So do you have any other questions as Council?

MR. FRYHLING: I will call for the question.

MR. IFIE: You want us to vote again?

MR. FRYHLING: Oh, we did? Okay. All right.

MS. TOWNE: The question was after the fact.

MR. FRYHLING: After the question. Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: That's because he went so fast. I was still thinking.

MR. IFIE: Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: I'm fine.

MR. IFIE: Are we ready to move onto the visitor information requirements?

Visitor Information Requirements

MR. HEDGES: This one does deal with the site certification agreement. There is a condition in the site certification agreement for Energy Northwest to provide a Visitor Center for the Columbia Generating Station. Effectively since 9/11 our Visitor Center has been closed. The location of it is now inside an area where the public does not have access, and with the increased security mandates on us the chances of us being able to have some kind of effective Visitor Center anywhere close to the plant is pretty remote, and so we're looking at some type of permanent fix to this. We're coming back to the Council saying we'll probably never be able to have a Visitor Center out there. We are continuing to try to educate the public. We do give tours on a very limited basis for some people. I think we have been averaging about 300 people a year through there as opposed to a couple of thousand a year previous to 9/11. So we still give tours. We have information set up on our website, and we are working with the local museum to try to get a small section in there for Energy Northwest and Columbia Generating Station to continue to educate the public. But right now I think we are looking for some type of a resolution to the site certification agreement that requires us to have a Visitor Center.

MR. FIKSDAL: If I recall correctly, the site certification agreement says that Energy Northwest or at that time it was Washington Public Power Supply, should set up a Visitor Center. It didn't say anything about maintaining it indefinitely. They were just supposed to set it up. So the question now is how do you resolve this issue? Do you go through an SCA amendment to

change that, or can you acknowledge that, and say they set it up, they did everything in good faith, and now it's okay to close it?

MS. TOWNE: I would like to see an 'in lieu of' proposal. Now I am prepared to say, yes, that's a good and sufficient reason to be excused from the continued operation or resumed operation of the Visitor Center because it is no longer reasonable and feasible, but there is an implied duty to inform which you have been seeking other means to address, and with a letter from you with that proposal, the museum, the website, limited tours, whatever other outreach programs you're conducting, then I would be prepared to support a resolution of the Council to waive that requirement or presumed requirement or implied requirement or whatever it may be, but, yes.

MS. ADELSMAN: Allen, was the purpose of the Visitor Center to try to make sure that the public is informed and aware of what's happening on site? Are they feeling comfortable? I mean this has always been a tough issue if the public feels like they're being kept out.

MS. TOWNE: They are.

MS. ADELSMAN: No, at the same time I would like to second what Chris is saying. I think we need to explore other options, alternatives, like a video of the plant inside that's available in libraries. Anything that would keep the public informed, that would be easily accessible to them.

MR. FIKSDAL: I assume, and maybe Mike can correct me, again, this was quite a ways back, 20 years ago or more, and I don't recall. I think the condition could have been that the Supply System just provides public information and for public relations reasons decided to volunteer to have a Visitor Center and the Council put it in the site certification agreement.

MS. ADELSMAN: I too think it's good for public relations.

MR. FIKSDAL: The original intent I don't know. Mot, do you have any idea?

MR. HEDGES: I'm not sure.

MR. FIKSDAL: It's been so long ago.

MR. MILLS: I think speaking for Energy Northwest, we're aware that they've had a fairly substantial public affairs, public information program in place for both WNP-2, now the Columbia Generating Station, and even at the one and four sites when they were under construction or in a preservation mode. I think the suggestion is a good one if Energy Northwest could prepare a letter and come back to the Council. We would have a chance to work with them and draft a resolution that we could bring back to the Council for consideration. I think Mot has spoken to some of the things that they are continuing to do, and perhaps there are some other things that they could offer up that would inform the public as I know they want to. Again, they have many different programs, so I think it's just us trying to capture them and bring them back to the Council and say this is their program now. We realize that many security changes have been made since 9/11. So I think that's a good suggestion, and, Mot, if you would work on that and staff would work with you to bring that back to the Council.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think we need to talk to Ann also to have her look at the words to see if we could do a technical amendment which is a change to the site certification agreement without going through hearings and recommendations to the Governor. There isn't an impact to the environment. I think a few months ago or almost a year ago we were talking to Energy Northwest, and between Mike and me we recommended that they come to the Council because we knew the Visitor Center was out of bounds, and that there was a requirement for one. They tried to work for a long time I think, they being Energy Northwest, trying to keep something going without this happening, but it just doesn't look like it's going to.

MS. ADELSMAN: So I'm assuming we are asking Ann to research what would be the best way to proceed with that one.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think we need to ensure that the conditions of the site certification agreement are met, and decide if a resolution is okay or if a letter is okay. I would hope we don't have to prepare a full amendment to the site certification agreement.

MS. ESSKO: Let me run it through the Goldberg contraption of the rule seeing what mechanism comes out at the end. The issue of what the Council wants to do in terms of visitation is sort of a policy issue for the Council if it wants to change or do something different, but I can come up with a recommendation on what mechanism.

MS. ADELSMAN: Any possibility, Mike, that you could again look to see why this was requested or required?

MR. MILLS: We can look back and try to see.

MR. FIKSDAL: The conditions have changed. I mean I think you look at the newspapers and see the report of a photography student who took a picture of the Locks and got hassled.

MS. ADELSMAN: I know.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think Energy Northwest is in a situation where they want to tell their story, but they aren't able to invite the public out there any more.

MS. ADELSMAN: I'm not saying it's not a reasonable request. I'm just saying when we make a decision we need to be properly informed.

MR. FIKSDAL: Maybe we can. It's a lot of work to research very far back, especially if we can't find it easily.

MR. MILLS: Actually I think the resolution was attached to their request. It looks like it has a chronology of events, and that may be just what happened. The original SCA said they needed to provide information facilities and then as the plant became operational, everyone agreed a Visitor Center near the site would be the way to go.

MR. IFIE: Okay.

MR. MILLS: We'll reserve this for the next meeting.

MR. IFIE: So what is the action on this item for today? There is going to be some research done by Ann. There's going to be some research on what the Council needs to do.

MS. ESSKO: Yes.

MR. FIKSDAL: Mr. Chairman, I think you inadvertently skipped Satsop Turbine Project.

MS. TOWNE: Well, Cherry Point too.

MR. FIKSDAL: No, we did Cherry Point.

MR. IFIE: Let's conclude on this Columbia Generation Station. So Ann is going to do some stuff, and then the Council will move on from there.

MR. FIKSDAL: At your next meeting we'll try to have something.

MS. TOWNE: If I can encapsulate the issue, it sounds like what Mike has just said is that the ways will remain the same. They will inform the public. The means of informing the public will be changed to acknowledge current conditions, and it sounds to me like at the most that's a technical amendment of the SCA and maybe a resolution or whatever will do that. That's not a legal analysis, just what those words seem to imply.

MS. ESSKO: My target to get back to you all is the next meeting which is August 2. Is that all right?

MS. TOWNE: Right.

MR. IFIE: Yes. Anything else, Mot?

MR. HEDGES: That will conclude my Energy Northwest Report. Thank you.

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Satsop CT – PSD Permit</i> | <i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i> |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|

MR. IFIE: Thank you. I skipped or passed over Satsop CT PSD permit. Irina.

MS. MAKAROW: It's just a quick update to remind the Council the permit is out there for comment. We did receive a comment letter from the Grays Harbor County Commissioners in support of the extension, and I did hear back from a staff member working for the Quinault Tribe, and they will be getting comments in also. So the comment period for that ends -- August 2? I can't remember.

MR. IFIE: Sometime in August?

MS. MAKAROW: Sometime in August.

MR. IFIE: Any questions from the Council on this? Any questions or comments from the public?

MR. HARGER: The Keys Road intersection is still working great, folks. At some point you may want to insert that in the record.

MR. FIKSDAL: As I've driven through there a couple times in the last couple months it looked very nice, wide open with complete access.

MR. HARGER: And it's working. I met with county public works folks too. That's why I mentioned it. Just at some point you may want to put something in the record to that effect because Duke was instrumental in coming forward and writing a check for that. And it's obviously got impact, very positive impacts on a lot of other things.

MR. FIKSDAL: Not only the Keys Road but the Brady intersection. Is that the county? Did money help that too?

MR. HARGER: I think we're using other money for that.

MR. MILLS: For the record this is Alan Harger with the State of Department of Transformation, and he worked with us and Duke and Energy Northwest on some improvements to access the Satsop site.

MR. HARGER: It's working well for everybody, not just at the site for Satsop but also for the community and for through traffic. I mean it's good. It was the right thing to do.

MR. IFIE: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

ITEM NO. 6: EFSEC RULES

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

MR. IFIE: Let's see. Moving long, EFSEC rules, Allen.

MR. FIKSDAL: In your packet today was a black book that contains the CR 102 and all of the rules and other information in the back.

MS. TOWNE: The SBEIS.

MS. MAKAROW: The Small Business Economic Impact Statement.

MS. TOWNE: Minus the appendices.

MS. MAKAROW: I think they should be in there.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think they are, Appendix B.

MS. TOWNE: Oh, I thought we were --

MS. ADELSMAN: No, it's included.

MS. MAKAROW: The version that went to the code reviser for publication was the short one, but we do have everything else on the web and being distributed.

MS. TOWNE: Okay. That's fine.

MR. FIKSDAL: Comment ends on this, I believe it's August 13 when all comments have to be in, and we are scheduled to have a comment meeting on August 10 here in this room.

MS. MAKAROW: That's correct.

MR. FIKSDAL: It's either 10:00 or 2:00.

MS. ADELSMAN: It says two o'clock on this.

MS. TOWNE: Are we expected to go through this?

MR. FIKSDAL: You should be knowledgeable about your rules.

MS. TOWNE: Yes.

MR. FIKSDAL: You've been through it a hundred times.

MS. TOWNE: Is a 101 required?

MR. FIKSDAL: If you notice editorial or I guess --

MS. TOWNE: You don't really want to know do you?

MR. FIKSDAL: Not editorial, but nonsubstantive errors and scripting errors. Scriptor's errors, that would be fine. Yes, we would like to know those. If there are substantive issues, I mean it's your right to bring those up and any right of the public to bring those up to the Council. After we get all the comments in, Mr. Carelli is going to prepare a response to comments and at some time, probably in I would guess October, you will be asked to issue the CR 103 which is essentially an order adopting the rules.

MS. ADELSMAN: Unless there were a lot of substantive changes.

MR. FIKSDAL: Unless there are a lot of substantive changes. If there are substantive changes, then you have to issue a CR 102 again for those issues.

MS. TOWNE: Will the Carelli response to comments follow the mode that he laid out in the draft we got a couple months ago? I never heard after commenting on it.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think he is, yes, is the short answer. There may be modifications.

MS. ADELSMAN: The matrix it has.

MR. FIKSDAL: I guess I'm not expecting a lot whole lot of comments. So far I have heard from maybe two different organizations about the rules. One, I think it's Renewable Energy, Sonja Ling, asked if her previous comments would be considered rather than going through it again. I think Mr. Carelli will look at all the comments and have some response to the previous comments. I just don't expect a whole lot of comments on the rules.

MS. TOWNE: Well, recalling our two hearings there were very few other than the CO2.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think most of his responses will probably cover things that we've received so far if that's the way it turns out. But that's my expectation. I may be totally wrong. So in October sometime I suspect early October we'll be bringing this to the Council for the CR 103.

MS. TOWNE: Is it 30 days after publication or 30 days after filing a CR 103?

MR. FIKSDAL: It's 31 days after you file CR 103.

MS. TOWNE: So November we have new rules.

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes. That's a possibility, yes. But given the history of the scheduling no guarantees, but, yes, we could have. Chuck thinks he will be able to give his draft stuff to you by the first of September, and so you have a month. If there aren't substantive issues that have to be resolved, then I think you could look at the first part of October. That's all.

MR. IFIE: Any other comments on rules?

ITEM NO. 7: EFSEC OPERATIONS

Update

Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager

MR. IFIE: Moving along, EFSEC Operations updates.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think it's supposed to be the allocation plan. If you recall at your last meeting we passed out a draft allocation plan. I think I put that in the back of your packets and a draft of actual allocations for this quarter, and we asked you to look at that and see if you had any comments or suggestions. If not, I would like to have the Council adopt that if you are ready or decide what else you might like to do. Lacking any allocation distribution for those percentages we have been charging those as I told you at the last meeting because we had to move on it, but I would like to have that finalized and validated by the Council and then formalized, so that we have it in the record.

MS. ADELSMAN: Allen, did you ever get any comments? If I remember right the Chair was asking I think the two Counsel-- who is it -- Mr. Peeples and Ms. McGaffey -- for comments on this.

MR. FIKSDAL: I haven't heard from them directly. We heard from other certificate holders / applicants that they don't agree and would like a lower rate on theirs, but they didn't want to come and whine to the Council about this. They felt in particular, it was Duke Energy, felt that they should have -- I think their percentage should be 9.5 or 11, something, whatever I have. The reason that we raised it a little bit is because we expect while we're going through the current PSD review, there will be a little bit of an increase in work. There is at times ongoing inspections up there. They do have a facility, and they do have a site. There are issues at certain times, so I think the Council will spend a little more time on the Satsop CT project than maybe someone like Wallula or Sumas. If we reduce their percentage somebody else's percentage is going to go up. And who deserves it is the question and how do you justify it? So in a way this is somewhat arbitrary, although we did look and try to use some facts and figures by looking at the last year's FTE charges to all the different projects and what we anticipate as work for the next quarter. I think it is pretty reasonable in the distribution or the allocation. If there's any other reason to change it, I'm sure I'm willing to listen, but that's our best estimate based on what we know.

MR. SWEENEY: I was going to say the two numbers that seem to be out of whack with '04 is the Wild Horse and BP. Is there reasons for why that's such a wide difference?

MR. FIKSDAL: BP had a heavy work load last year, and we don't expect it to be very high in the upcoming period. We are going to have a hearing next week and then finalize the order by the end of year. Wild Horse was I think low; is that right?

MR. SWEENEY: Yes, it's low, so it's just the reverse.

MR. FIKSDAL: It's the reverse because they're going to be starting work on the Draft EIS, that is going to be out real soon. You're going to have the Draft EIS hearing. After that, intervention is going to happen. We're going to have some prehearing conferences, so I think your work load is going to go up regarding Wild Horse.

MR. SWEENEY: And, of course, this is for the nondirect. We already directly attribute all our specific work.

MR. FIKSDAL: That's correct.

MS. ADELSMAN: Allen, we continue to have discussions with our clients. We have a meeting on the 26th with some of the people interested in this. Personally I would like to see this for a

quarter and then we base it on the discussions that we are going to be having between now and then, and then maybe this will change.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MS. ADELSMAN: Just to be sure that it is just for this quarter so at least we have something to code to.

MR. FIKSDAL: In the draft plan it says the Council or staff will review the FTEs quarterly to see if these need to be adjusted, and so I think that is the plan to do it quarterly, or if there's also a sudden major shift if we were to get a new application next week for some reason then I think would be appropriate to look at these and shift all the percentages. Quarterly is appropriate, and we will be looking at it next quarter.

MS. TOWNE: So what could I assume about the first quarter of FY 2005 which we're now in? I see by quarter for '04, but what is the allocation? And I have a narrative description under each of the projects, but that doesn't tell me anything about the percents.

MR. FIKSDAL: What we think it's going to be?

MS. TOWNE: Yes.

MR. FIKSDAL: That's true.

MS. TOWNE: So there's no guesstimate.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think the guesstimate is the percents that I'm proposing. See what the last quarter was or the last year. So this next quarter you're asking for it.

MS. TOWNE: This quarter that we're now in.

MR. FIKSDAL: This quarter my guess is what you're seeing.

MS. TOWNE: You mean what you have alone for the nondirect? The only percents for '05 are the nondirect.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MS. TOWNE: So should I assume those same percentages would apply for the percentage of FTEs charged by project?

MR. FIKSDAL: These nondirect charges we will have our administrative staff charging at that percentage, so those FTEs will be charged at those percents.

MS. TOWNE: Okay. Well, the way it's labeled the percentages at the bottom of this page one would not assume that they are applicable for FY '05 first quarter to the FTE charges. It looks like they're other.

MR. FIKSDAL: It will be for some FTE charges. That clarification I will make.

MS. TOWNE: Okay. Then the other question is so this is the FTE charges. Does that include the direct overhead office space, computers, Xerox?

MR. FIKSDAL: We will be charging those charges at this rate.

MS. TOWNE: Okay. But the header is FTEs charged to projects by quarter which seems to limit it to you and Mike, Irina and Mariah and Tammy and nothing else.

MR. FIKSDAL: That is I guess the only indicator that I have come up with on how to calculate a distribution. Everything that is directly charged is directly charged, whether it's rent or FTEs or whatever. The indirect charges or the nondirect charges -- I shouldn't say indirect. The nondirect charges is what we're struggling with to determine how to calculate what the percentage may be. And what I'm using as a basis and as part of the plan is it's going to be based on essentially the work load of the Council. How do you measure the work load of the Council? The numbers we have are FTEs.

MS. ADELSMAN: So, Allen, you're using the FTEs as a proxy to do the work load analysis.

MR. FIKSDAL: Correct.

MS. ADELSMAN: And you're saying based on the work load analysis which this is what the percentages are, and then that will apply to us as we address this project or to overhead.

MR. FIKSDAL: We'll address that, and when we get a bill for the quarterly bill for our rent or phones or something we will apply this charge now, and then for the administrative staff which is kind of a nondirect charge they'll apply this percentage wise. In a way it's self-perpetuating, but on the other hand, we don't have a way to measure other work load.

MS. TOWNE: I've been thinking about this for months, and I read this, and I don't understand it and pity the poor public. There ought to be a way.

MR. FIKSDAL: There ought to be.

MS. TOWNE: I know.

MR. FIKSDAL: I've been trying to figure one out for a long time too.

MS. TOWNE: I hope people will grasp what we're getting at here.

MR. FIKSDAL: I haven't heard any cries of anger over this. In fact, we haven't heard hardly anything. I know Ms. McGaffey and Mr. Peebles got it last meeting, and they haven't gotten back to us over it.

MR. IFIE: Do we need to take action on this today or is this something we can think about it?

MR. FIKSDAL: I would like you to take action if you are comfortable and set this plan as the plan for developing our allocation and adopt this rate for this quarter, so that we have the Council taking an action, and I can go ahead with a more clear conscience in charging at this rate.

MR. IFIE: Personally I think I will need more time to look at it. The reason is I'd like to look at other options. There's a meeting coming up on the 26th along with some of other folks. That would give us some more --

MR. FIKSDAL: If you were to do that what I would like is a general nod I guess of approval that we can be charging at this rate for the bills that come in until you officially adopt it. We need something to charge. We need something, and this is the only thing we have so far.

MR. IFIE: So that's what I'm asking. Do we need to do something today because on the 26th it's still within July?

MR. FRYHLING: The 26th is BP. I don't necessary want to deal with that.

MR. FIKSDAL: That's outside of the settlement hearing. I think Jim and Tony and Hedia and I are going to meet with NIPPC and maybe somebody else.

MR. MILLS: I think Energy Northwest.

MR. FIKSDAL: Energy Northwest to discuss this.

MR. IFIE: I am just thinking about options. I see a proposal here, but I don't see any options to consider it prior to coming out with this proposal, and I am thinking maybe the order that we collect like at the Department of Natural Resources we do it by operating FTEs, so the operating FTE will not include your FTE. It will include just Mike and Irina or maybe yours but not all the FTEs.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MR. IFIE: What I'm looking at here has all the FTEs.

MR. FIKSDAL: Well, that's correct.

MR. IFIE: I think with all the FTEs, and so it doesn't make it as clean as it could be. So people that tend to charge to projects maybe 80 percent of the time will be the ones that you will be using for doing this kind of stuff. Because right now the question that Chris came up with helped me a little bit because she was saying is this what you use? Because an Applicant will be looking at this or a Certificate Holder will be looking at this thinking that the percentages presented here will reflect the actual amounts that they will be paying, but not necessarily

because it depends on the activity going on within that project. So let's say Satsop starts up again. The percentage would go up. This percentage says 11 percent. They might end up paying 23 percent because of the increased activity in which we will increase the amount of charges going to that project. So it seems like the real issue will be who are the people, the FTEs, that you can use as a proxy. You were talking about proxy.

MS. ADELSMAN: I think given that it's already July and already the 19th, and I know some of that is in time sheets. If not, you don't get paid. I still think that at least we should take action for this month, and then maybe based on the 26th, then have I mean with Jim away we are going to have to decide what are we going to bring on the 2nd of August as this is what we want to do for the quarter or we want to do for the alternative. But I personally propose this for the month of July, and then we could always go back and correct or make adjustment if this is wrong. But our next meeting is not until the 2nd of August.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MS. ADELSMAN: Which is really past, but I don't know what the other members will think.

MR. FRYHLING: I think that's a good thing to do. It gives them something to do for this month and revisit it on August 2 after the meeting has been held on the 22nd.

MR. SWEENEY: I second it.

MR. IFIE: Would that work just for one month?

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes.

MR. IFIE: I put that in the form of a motion and it's been seconded by Tim.

MS. McGAFFEY: Excuse me, Tony. This is Karen McGaffey. Will you be taking comments from the public on this subject?

MR. FIKSDAL: Karen, I'm sorry. We didn't know you were on the line.

MS. McGAFFEY: Because I was being so quiet for a change.

MR. IFIE: Yes. Why don't you hold on, Karen. Let me make sure all the comments from the Councilmembers are in.

MS. McGAFFEY: That's fine.

MR. IFIE: Any other comments from Councilmembers on this? Before we vote maybe we should get comments from the public. Karen, why don't you go ahead with your comment.

MS. McGAFFEY: Yes, I have just a few comments. First of all, while I understand staff's concern about having the Council approve the percentages that are going to be used during the current month and the desire to have that approval now, I think the Council should be cautious about taking an action that would approve this entire policy document. It seems to me that there hasn't been much discussion about everything that's in the document. Some concerns have been raised today, and I think that perhaps maybe some other issues about the document. So if the Council is inclined to take interim action that would cover this month, perhaps it would be more appropriate just to adopt some percentages without necessarily approving this whole policy document.

MS. TOWNE: Karen, we have two pieces of paper in front of us. One is a four pager entitled cost allocation plan dated July 2004, and the other is a draft nondirect cost allocation plan, a one pager. So when you're talking about the whole plan are you talking about the four pager?

MS. McGAFFEY: I guess I have all five of those pages stapled together, so I wasn't distinguishing those as two different documents.

MS. ADELSMAN: So the last page I think of that package; is that right, Allen?

MR. FIKSDAL: I was envisioning having, if you want, two technical, two separate documents. These are two separate documents. I was envisioning the plan the Council adopted that's for I

guess for a better word a policy or the plan for allocation. Each quarter would be this one page document that would end up being signed and dated that would be the official allocation rate, if you will, for the quarter, so that essentially based on whatever plan you end up developing each quarter, you would have a piece of paper to look at and then the rate would be approved.

MS. TOWNE: Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: Allen, I think I was proposing that this one sheet would be just instead of saying the first quarter, just say for the month of July.

MR. FIKSDAL: That's fine.

MS. ADELSMAN: And then have just the percentage, and then I think Tony was talking about waiting. We were going to wait on the policy part until after the meeting of the 26th. There may be further discussions and so on.

MR. IFIE: So I'm taking it that there was a motion to vote on each issue or more discussion?

MR. FRYHLING: The motion included only this page. It was only this page for one month.

MR. IFIE: For one month.

MR. FIKSDAL: Karen, he was waiving the one-page document.

MR. FRYHLING: The last page probably on hers.

MS. MCGAFFEY: If I could just make a couple of more points with respect to just the one-page document. As I understand it the idea is to vote on that, but to modify it so it's just July instead of the first quarter, right?

MR. IFIE: Correct.

MS. MCGAFFEY: With respect to that document, I don't think I have any comments about specific allocations. It's my understanding that individual applicants or certificate holders were going to talk to Allen or submit comments on their own, and I do think it's probably a good idea for you to limit your action today to a single month because I suspect based on those comments which it sounds like the Council hasn't seen or heard in detail there may be further discussion about whether these numbers are appropriate. With respect to the action in general, however, it seems to me, although many of my concerns are about the other document that you're not voting on, so I won't talk about those here. I do think even for July the Council should consider also requiring a clearer documentation and accounting of what are direct costs and what are indirect nonproject costs. I think one of the frustrations that applicants and certificate holders have had all along is that their billing statements don't make this distinction, and so it's hard to analyze or criticize the percentages that are being allocated when they don't understand exactly what they're being billed for that's direct versus what they've just been allocated as indirect. So I think going forward if that kind of accounting could take place, and if you reported that to the applicant and to the certificate holders I think it would be helpful to inform these discussions in the future. So I guess that is my suggestion to add on to this action for July.

MR. IFIE: Thank you, Karen. Any comments from Allen or staff?

MR. FIKSDAL: Putting it bluntly, it's going to be a lot of work to separate the charges because of the way that things work in not only EFSEC but within CTED and their financial process. Let me look at how difficult it is and how much time and effort it may take. It may be easier than I believe it will be. I need to talk to both our fiscal people in CTED and our administrative staff to see what it would take to do that type of breaking out of accounts. And so that's my initial comment.

MR. IFIE: Any other comments from the Council on this?

MR. SWEENEY: No, no comments.

MR. IFIE: Is there any need to wait for that kind of detail?

MR. FRYHLING: No. I think he still needs to have a -- he would still like to have this approved for this month. The indirect and direct we can address that at a later time, and if it's possible to break it out, then we will break it out.

MR. FIKSDAL: Without breaking the bank and doing it. My concern is that it could take a lot of time and cost a lot of money to do this, but I mean if that's what people want, then I guess that's what they may have to pay for.

MR. FRYHLING: If Allen would do that and report back to us at the August meeting what kind of effort it is to get this out of CTED, I think that would be reasonable.

MR. IFIE: So the first issue is to scope out what it would take.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right. Try to determine and record the direct and nondirect charges for each of the projects.

MR. IFIE: The next question that I have is if we voted on this today and approved it is it possible to do any adjustment in the future retroactively?

MR. FIKSDAL: It's possible, yes.

MR. IFIE: Without too much effort.

MR. FIKSDAL: Well, one of the issues is that every time let's say we get a hundred dollar bill for something, let's say it's for computer upgrades or network charges, each one under this scheme, like the Columbia Generating Station, would be charged 14 and each one of these would be charged individually a certain rate. What we would have to do is go back and call for a JV or put a journal voucher in for each one of these again.

MS. TOWNE: And pay another ten bucks to CTED to process.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right. And we are charged by CTED essentially an accounting fee for each input (transaction) we have.

MS. TOWNE: Which would exceed the cost of the items being allocated.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right. I mean you could have anything less than fifty dollars. It just isn't fair for something that's four thousand dollars versus something that's five dollars. I mean how do you gauge which? It would be easier just to charge one entity, but you can't. It's not fair to that entity. So, again, I will look at what it takes. Yes, it's possible to do that, Tony, but it could be more expensive than it's worth. Depends on the size of the bill.

MR. FRYHLING: Could we call for the question. I had a motion, and it was seconded, and we've had 15 minutes of discussion. I would like to call for the question at this point.

MR. IFIE: Okay. It's been moved and seconded that we approve the proposed allocation plan.

MR. FRYHLING: No, it's just the nondirect allocation for one month.

MR. IFIE: The nondirect cost allocation for July 2004. Only. All right. Are we ready to vote? Those in favor say aye.

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

MR. IFIE: Those opposed say nay. None opposed. Motion passed.

MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you.

MR. FRYHLING: Now the rest of the discussion such as Allen doing the research, he'll do that for us at the next meeting.

MS. TOWNE: And presumably after the 26th meeting of the subcommittee you will have a further recommendation to us to be acted upon on August 2; is that correct?

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes. And Karen?

MS. McGAFFEY: Yes.

MR. FIKSDAL: If any of your clients or people that you talk to have concerns, please have them get to us.

MS. McGAFFEY: Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: Is Karen going to be at the meeting on the 26th?

MR. FIKSDAL: I don't know. She didn't say.

MS. ADELSMAN: Karen, are you going to be at the meeting on the 26th?

MS. McGAFFEY: I'm sorry. I don't know where and when the meeting on the 26th is.

MR. FIKSDAL: We're going to be in Seattle and Jim had invited Bob Kahn, and I think Energy Northwest to meet with himself, I think Hedia is going to be there, and Tony and myself to have a discussion over some of these issues to begin with.

MS. McGAFFEY: Allen, Bob had mentioned that. I was planning on going along with Bob. I'm assuming that's an afternoon meeting since we have the BP hearing in the morning.

MR. FIKSDAL: Jim's been arranging this and all I know is we're going to be in Seattle on Monday, July 26. It's at the Attorney General's Office.

MS. McGAFFEY: Right. I guess to answer Hedia's question, yes, I'm assuming that I'm going to be at that meeting at the 26th because I'm assuming we're all going to be at the ten o'clock BP thing, so it will be at a different time than that.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right. Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: Okay.

MR. IFIE: Any other comments on this? I know some folks want to move on.

ITEM NO. 8: OTHER

MR. IFIE: Okay. Let's off move on to "Other." Any other comments or items on that topic?

MR. FIKSDAL: I have one, and that is the August 16 meeting you're scheduled for, your normal Council meeting for Monday, August 16. That is the first day of your hearing in Ellensburg. Do you wish to cancel that meeting now or do you want to wait until August 2 and decide then?

MR. SWEENEY: Why don't we wait until then.

MS. ADELSMAN: There may be some actions including what we've been talking about and so on that we may want to take.

MR. FIKSDAL: I think you're going to have a difficult time getting out of your hearing mode to have a special Council meeting, so I'm willing to wait. Just start thinking about it. But I would recommend that you just think about canceling it rather than packing too much in.

MR. SWEENEY: But we can decide on August 2 to do that.

MR. FIKSDAL: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. IFIE: Thank you. Well, any other items for the good of the order?

MS. LAAMB: I know that several of you have been asking about reservations and plans for the Kittitas meeting in Ellensburg the weeks of the 16th and the 23rd, and I will send information electronically. I will put it all together and send it out to you this week, so if you have any other questions or comments you can get back to me with questions for that as well.

MR. FRYHLING: Jim Hurson doesn't want to have us all at his house?

MR. HURSON: If I had enough room, I would be happy to.

MS. LAAMB: No KOA.

MR. FRYHLING: No KOA either?

MR. FIKSDAL: Unless you want to stay there.

MS. ADELSMAN: You're also going to give us information on transportation; is that right?

MS. LAAMB: We will be discussing transportation issues, so between Irina and me, we will be putting together that whole information packet. I have hotel information and logistics and then we'll talk about how you're getting there. But we have previously discussed that it will likely be a van and personal cars.

MS. ADELSMAN: Sunday or Monday?

MS. LAAMB: Sunday because the hearings are planning to start at 8:30, 9:00 on Monday, so we are reserving rooms for you on Sunday night.

MR. SWEENEY: Okay.

MS. ADELSMAN: And then on the twenty --

MS. LAAMB: And you go home on the weekends.

MS. ADELSMAN: 22nd is also Sunday.

MS. LAAMB: Sunday.

MR. FIKSDAL: Most likely you will start bright and early Monday morning. You can drive over early Monday morning.

MR. FRYHLING: Or you can stay there over the weekend.

MS. ADELSMAN: No, I have my daughter coming to visit.

ITEM NO. 9: ADJOURN

MR. IFIE: Okay. Any other comments for the good of the order? Hearing none, meeting adjourned.

(Council meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)