

EFSEC JULY 13, 2010 MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

Page 1

STATE OF WASHINGTON  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL  
P.O. Box 43172 - Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

July 13, 2010 Monthly Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Luce called the July 13, 2010 monthly meeting to order at 905 Plum Street, S.E., Room 301, at 1:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Council Members present:

Jim Luce, Chair  
Jeff Tayer, Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Richard Fryhling, Department of Commerce  
Hedia Adelsman, Department of Ecology (via phone)  
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County  
Mary McDonald, Department of Natural Resources  
Dennis Moss, Utilities and Transportation Commission  
Judy Wilson, Skamania County

Staff in attendance:

Al Wright, EFSEC Manager; Jim La Spina, EFS Specialist;  
Stephen Posner, EFS Specialist; Tammy Talburt, Commerce  
Specialist; Kyle Crews, Assistant Attorney General; Kayce  
Michelle, Office Assistant; Sonia Bumpus, Office Assistant

Guests in attendance:

Brett Oakleaf, Invenergy; Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie;  
Mark Anderson, Department of Commerce; Darrel Peeples,  
Attorney at Law; Kevin Warner, GHE; Tim McMahan, Stoel  
Rives; Todd Gatewood, GHE; Steve Prickett, BPA; Liz Klump,  
BPA

Guests in Attendance via phone:

Kelly Mosier, Perkins Coie; Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound  
Energy; Colin Meskell, Horizon Wind Energy; Tom Drake,  
SOSA; Rob Swedo, BPA; Don Coody, Energy Northwest; C.  
Robert Wallis, Administrative Law Judge; Carol Cohoe,  
Aramburu & Eustis

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROPOSED AGENDA

CHAIR LUCE: Have Council Members had a chance to review the proposed agenda? Are there any additions, corrections? Hearing none, the agenda is adopted as proposed.

MR. POSNER: Excuse me, Chair Luce. There is one correction under Item H, Transmission Lines Updates. Sonia Bumpus will be making that presentation.

CHAIR LUCE: All right. Thank you very much. Are there any other updates? Hearing none the agenda is amended as proposed.

MINUTES

CHAIR LUCE: Have Council Members had a chance to review the meeting minutes of June 8, 2010? That's the abbreviated; is that correct?

MS. TALBURT: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: If you have any comments now would be the appropriate time to make them. All right. I'm hearing no comments.

MR. FRYHLING: I so move to approve the minutes as prepared.

CHAIR LUCE: There's a motion to adopt as prepared. Is there a second?

MR. POSNER: Chair Luce, I'm sorry to interrupt you. We just realized that this agenda is not the correct agenda. Tammy is getting a copy of it right now. There was one change concerning the Satsop facility concerning some permits authorization to the Council.

CHAIR LUCE: I recall that and I wondered why it wasn't on here.

MR. POSNER: Yes, and we made that change and it was sent out last week to everybody, but unfortunately the wrong copy was made for the packet so Tammy is going to get that right now.

CHAIR LUCE: That's great. We will proceed as we are now, and when the amended agenda comes in we will put it before Council Members.

1 MS. ADELSMAN: Stephen, I'm sorry. The agenda that was  
2 received in the mail that says revised agenda that's the  
correct one; is that right?

3 MR. POSNER: Yes, it should be under Item G, Satsop Grays  
4 Harbor Energy. There should be I believe three bullets.

5 MS. ADELSMAN: Yes.

6 MR. POSNER: One of them deals with possible Council  
action.

7 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. You have the correct one, Hedia.

8 MR. POSNER: Yes.

9 MS. ADELSMAN: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIR LUCE: We have a motion. Do we have a second to  
adopt the minutes?

11 MR. MOSS: I'll second the motion.

12 CHAIR LUCE: We have a motion and second. Discussion?  
13 Hearing no discussion, the question is called for. All in  
14 favor of adopting the minutes will say Aye. Let the record  
reflect that it was an unanimous vote.

15 DESERT CLAIM WIND POWER PROJECT UPDATE

16 CHAIR LUCE: We have a project update, David Steeb, Desert  
17 Claim.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have an e-mail received today  
19 from David just informing us that they had fully intended  
20 to have Desert Claim under construction within the summer  
of 2010, and they are notifying us that they are not going  
to start any construction at all until probably sometime in  
the spring of 2011.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. We'll assume that's the update  
22 from Desert Claim unless there's anyone here to add to  
that. Hearing no one else.

23 The white sheet, the revised agenda is before you and you  
24 will note that under Satsop there is a third bullet:  
Council delegation to Manager Wright to authorize Grays  
25 Harbor County as the designated representative for the  
Satsop CT project plant. We will be acting on this taking

1 a final action. I'm not sure it's necessary to have a  
2 final action because I believe the authority rests with the  
3 manager. That would be the Chair's interpretation, but  
4 nevertheless to clarify this issue we will take a final  
5 action on that at the time that it arises on the agenda.  
6 Any objections to that? Thank you.

4 WILD HORSE WIND POWER PROJECT

5 CHAIR LUCE: Wild Horse Wind Power Project. Jennifer,  
6 you're on the phone?

7 MS. DIAZ: Yes, sir, I am. Thank you, Chair Luce.  
8 Jennifer Diaz, Puget Sound Energy, Wild Horse Wind  
9 Facility. I have a very brief update. Wind production for  
10 June generation totalled 55,900 megawatt hours for an  
11 average capacity factor of 28.5 percent. The Fuller  
12 Demonstration project generated 80,700 kilowatt hours in  
13 June. Under safety there were no lost-time accidents or  
14 safety incidents to report in June. Under compliance and  
15 environmental, the June Stormwater Discharge Monitoring  
16 Report for the expansion area was submitted to the  
17 Department of Ecology. Precipitation in June did not  
18 produce any stormwater runoff, and stormwater BMPs are in  
19 good condition. The site remains in compliance with the  
20 construction stormwater permit, and that's all I have.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Council Members, have any  
22 questions for Jennifer Diaz? Hearing no questions, we'll  
23 move ahead to Kittitas Valley Wind Project.

16 KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER PROJECT UPDATE

17 MR. MESKELL: All right. This is Colin Meskell with  
18 Horizon Wind Energy and update on the Kittitas Valley Wind  
19 Power Project starting with safety. We continue to be  
20 doing very well. There's been zero recordable incidents or  
21 loss-time accidents on site at this time. The Kittitas  
22 County Fire Marshal continues to attend all of our safety  
23 meetings every month, and currently the fire warning level  
24 is still at a one, but they expect that to bump up to a two  
25 sometime towards the end part of this month.

26 As far as where we are during construction, we've got about  
27 95 percent of our roads complete. We actually just poured  
28 our last foundation this Saturday I believe it was, and so  
29 we're about 98 percent done with that. It's not backfilled  
30 yet. We've got 44 percent of our wind turbine bases set,  
31 and we're expecting to start topping them off coming up  
32 here it says July 12, but we were winded out. So I think  
33 the wind is suppose to die down possibly next week and

1 we'll get some going up there. So we have no turbines  
fully erected, of course, none complete.

2

3 As far as electrically goes, we have 69 percent of our  
4 circuit in the ground, substations at 20 percent, with the  
foundations being at about 58 percent complete.

5 Environmental Compliance Project is in compliance, and  
we've had no internal NCRs since our EFSEC report so the  
contractors are doing much better.

6 We did have a cultural discovery of the granite pestle on  
7 the Jenson property. It's on the eastern half of the  
property. We reported this to AINW and the representatives  
8 of the Yakama Nation. They came out on site and they  
started doing some screening. At that time we shut down  
9 all construction in that area and we're actually looking at  
doing a reroute of our collection system so we can avoid  
10 this area while the Yakama Nation and the AINW does their  
research and their investigation of that area.

11 On the environmental, our rate survey is 100 percent  
complete and we are now working with our contractors to  
12 procure the specified regional base seed mix for the  
restoration. The Department of Ecology toured the site in  
13 the middle of last month, and they noted a couple of minor  
BMPs which we went ahead and took, and we met with our  
14 landowner Jenson who came out to the site. He doesn't live  
there, but he came out and looked at the land and he was  
15 very happy with what we had done on his land and that is  
all I have to report.

16

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. It's a good report. Council  
17 Members questions?

18

Hearing no questions, we'll move ahead.

19

#### COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION UPDATE

20

CHAIR LUCE: Columbia Generating Station, Don, are you on?

21

MR. COODY: Yes, I am. Good afternoon, Chair Luce and  
Council.

22

CHAIR LUCE: Do you have a new acting CEO?

23

MR. COODY: Yeah, I'm going to touch base on that.

24

CHAIR LUCE: All right.

25

MR. COODY: Yep. That's one of the planned activities I'll

1 discuss. Regarding our operational status Columbia  
2 Generating Station is currently operating at hundred  
3 percent power. We're producing 1,443 megawatts and we've  
4 been on line for 242 days. One of the planned activities  
5 is our Columbia Operating license renewal. Three important  
6 milestones for Columbia license renewal were completed by  
7 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Three site audits to  
8 verify evaluations for aging effects and environmental  
9 impacts were completed from May 11 through June 10. The  
10 environmental audit was supported by staff from both  
11 Ecology and the State Department of Health. The audits  
12 resulted in requests for additional information for which  
13 Energy Northwest is presently responding. The next  
14 milestone scheduled for December 15 is our issuance of the  
15 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement otherwise  
16 known as the SEIS. The SEIS will assess the impact  
17 attributable to another 20 years of operation. A Federal  
18 Register notice is scheduled to be published on December 22  
19 announcing the SEIS will be available for comment. As  
20 always as I've mentioned in previous meetings more  
21 information is available on the NRC website. I included a  
22 link to that in my status notes which I think is your  
23 package. I'm not sure.

24 Now to the chief executive officer. Energy Northwest  
25 Executive Board voted on June 17 to hire Mark E. Reddemann  
as the agency vice president to serve as interim CEO  
effective July 15. Mr. Reddemann will replace Vic Parrish  
who retires tomorrow July 14. At this time the executive  
board hasn't announced a selection of a permanent CEO.  
Prior to his joining Energy Northwest, Mr. Reddemann was  
vice president of operations support with Xcel Energy  
during which he also served on the Energy Northwest  
Corporate Nuclear Safety Review Board. From 2005 to 2006,  
he was vice president of nuclear assessment with Nuclear  
Management Company known as on NNC.

Prior to that position he was Vice President of the Plant  
Technical Support at the Institute of Nuclear Power  
Operations, followed positions as Vice President of  
Engineering at NNC and Site Vice President at NNC's  
Kewaunee and Point Beach Nuclear Power Plants. Those are  
in Wisconsin. Before joining NNC which was previously  
Wisconsin Electric he was Quality Assurance Manager and  
later Plant Manager.

He works at several nuclear power plants across the  
country, including Oak Creek, Salem, WNP-2, and Prairie  
Island. Mark holds a bachelor's degree in applied  
mathematics, engineering, and physics from the University

1 of Wisconsin Madison and is a graduate of the Minnesota  
 2 Management Institute of the University of Minnesota Curtis  
 3 L. Carlson School of Management. It's a mouthful. Mr.  
 4 Reddemann also has held a Senior Reactor Operator License.  
 5 We refer to that as an SRO license at a pressurized water  
 6 reactor and an SRO certification at a boiler water reactor.

7 Then have I have one brief update on our industrial  
 8 development complex, the water rights. Energy Northwest is  
 9 in the process of preparing an application for a water  
 10 right permit that will be submitted to the Department of  
 11 Ecology. The scope of the permit application is for  
 12 nonindustrial business activities at the industrial  
 13 development complex during post-site restoration.  
 14 Questions?

15 CHAIR LUCE: Questions, Council Members? Hearing no  
 16 questions, I'll let it go at that. Thank you very much,  
 17 Don.

18 MR. COODY: You're welcome. Thank you.

19 CHEHALIS GENERATING STATION UPDATE

20 CHAIR LUCE: Chehalis Generating? Do we have a report from  
 21 Chehalis?

22 MR. LA SPINA: No.

23 CHAIR LUCE: All right. There's no report.

24 MR. WRIGHT: There is a report in your packet.

25 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Council Members will take the  
 opportunity to review the packet if you have not already  
 done so. Unless staff has anything to add we'll move  
 ahead.

MR. WRIGHT: You might want to point out we do have a  
 response to the carbon offset project question that was  
 offset raised at the last meeting. So they have been  
 responsive to your question.

CHAIR LUCE: Okay. All right. Thank you. Any questions  
 from the Council regarding the yellow sheet for Chehalis?  
 Hearing none, Whistling Ridge.

(Report Submitted For Chehalis Power:

Safety: There were no medical treatments or recordable

1 incidents this reporting period and the plant staff has  
2 achieved 2,822 days without a lost-time accident.

3 Environment: The plant site continues to be maintained in  
4 excellent condition. Stormwater and waste water discharge  
5 monitoring results are in compliance with the permit  
6 limits.

7 Carbon Offset Project: PacifiCorp procurement will release  
8 the RFP for the Carbon Offset Project on July 16, 2010 with  
9 proposals due on September 10, 2010. The expectation would  
10 be to award a contract by December 17, 2010.

11 Personnel: Authorized plant staffing level is currently 18  
12 with 17 positions filled. The plant Manager role has been  
13 filled by Mark Miller and a job posting has been released  
14 for a new Operations Manager.

15 Operations and Maintenance Activities: June: The plant  
16 did not operate during this period. Year to date the plant  
17 has generated 417,526 megawatt hours. The auxiliary boiler  
18 was delivered to the site on July 12, 2010 with  
19 installation progressing on schedule. This project is on  
20 schedule for compliance date of February 2011.

21 Regulatory/Compliance: There were no NERC Critical  
22 Infrastructure Protection Standards (CIPS) violations or  
23 issues during this reporting period. Other: Sound  
24 monitoring: No noise complaints were received during this  
25 operation period.)

#### WHISTLING RIDGE ENERGY PROJECT

1 CHAIR LUCE: Do we have an update, Mr. Posner?

2 MR. POSNER: Yes, I have a short update. Good afternoon,  
3 Chair Luce, Council Members. Since our last meeting we  
4 have had the public meetings on the 16th and 17th. These  
5 are public comment meetings for the Draft EIS. Most of you  
6 participated in those meetings. We also had a prehearing  
7 conference on June 17. Since that time we have issued  
8 Prehearing Council Order No. 848, and that order set an  
9 adjudicative schedule among other things, and then there  
10 was since that order was issued June 29 by July 8 there was  
11 an objection filed by SOSA and Friends of the Columbia  
12 Gorge, as well as I believe the Yakama Nation or one of the  
13 tribes. I'm not sure. I apologize.

14 CHAIR LUCE: It was the Yakama Nation.



1 MR. POSNER: Due to the furloughs I've been unable to stay  
updated.

2 CHAIR LUCE: I understand that.

3 MR. POSNER: I believe that's what's happened. I believe  
4 that's it as far as I know.

5 CHAIR LUCE: We'll wait for our Administrative Law Judge's  
6 draft response to the objections and not discuss that  
further here.

7 MS. TALBURT: Judge Wallis issued an order extending the  
comment period in response to objections on Friday the 9th.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Then we'll allow that to run its due course.

9 MS. TALBURT: Which is next Monday.

10 CHAIR LUCE: Any Council Members questions about Whistling  
11 Ridge?

12 MR. POSNER: One last thing I'm not sure I mentioned.

13 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

14 MR. POSNER: The public comment period for the DEIS closes  
on the 19th.

15 CHAIR LUCE: On the 19th. All right. Thank you. Hearing  
16 no more --

17 MR. TAYER: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIR LUCE: Yes, sir.

19 MR. TAYER: Just one thing on Whistling Ridge. I want to  
20 make sure since there were significant issues raised  
concerning the wildlife issues related to the project that  
21 we heard at some point from our contractor the Department  
of Fish and Wildlife what their analysis is of the issues  
that are raised.

22 MR. POSNER: Have we are you asking?

23 MR. TAYER: No, I know we haven't, but at some point.

24 CHAIR LUCE: We want to make sure that we do.

25 MR. POSNER: Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIR LUCE: There were other questions raised during the proceeding so I'm assuming that staff is working through those.

MR. POSNER: We are in contact with them, yes, the DFW representatives.

CHAIR LUCE: Anything else?

SATSOP - GRAYS HARBOR ENERGY PROJECT UPDATE

CHAIR LUCE: All right. Satsop - Grays Harbor Project do you have an operational update it appears?

MR. GATEWOOD: Sort of.

CHAIR LUCE: Sort of.

MR. GATEWOOD: Good afternoon, Chair Luce and Council Members. For the month of June Grays Harbor did not have any -- actually for the year 2010 we have had no any safety incidents or accidents to date. Environmentally we submitted our May DMR. We had two chloride exceedances on that, zero iron, and as we all know the amendment to the NPDES permits are in the final stages of being exceeded.

CHAIR LUCE: They're not exceedances, they're just ministerial.

MR. GATEWOOD: Right.

CHAIR LUCE: But we'll leave that aside.

MR. GATEWOOD: Okay. Operation we ran zero days so we had zero noise complaints. We had a capacity factor of 11 percent year to date. Obviously for the month of June it was zero. We submitted a letter to EFSEC I believe it was Friday night. You may not have received it until Tuesday morning with regards to our intent to implement some mitigation measures for noise.

CHAIR LUCE: We will talk about that tonight maybe. All right. Anything else?

MR. GATEWOOD: Nope.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Mr. La Spina, do you have something on the expedited

1 process?

2 MR. LA SPINA: Yes, Chair Luce. As you probably all know  
3 by now we're having public meetings this evening, tomorrow  
4 evening, and Thursday evening. I just wanted to add that  
5 we have extended public notice to August 13 to receive  
6 public comments for the amendment request and the NPDES  
7 permit. With all this furlough stuff I don't quite  
8 remember. Are we having a meeting on August 10?

9 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. The evening of August 10 in the Grays  
10 County Courthouse, and a notice is going out soon, today or  
11 tomorrow morning.

12 MS. WILLIS: Can I make a slight correction? It's actually  
13 in the administration building, the Grays Harbor County  
14 Administration Building. The courthouse is our historic  
15 building that you see when you go up there, but the  
16 administration building is right next door to this.

17 CHAIR LUCE: You sure we can't get a courthouse room, the  
18 chambers?

19 MS. WILLIS: Well, you're going to use the commissioners  
20 room which has nice seats and padded seats and everything  
21 so everybody should be comfortable.

22 CHAIR LUCE: You've got a beautiful courthouse so I would  
23 like to go there.

24 MS. WILLIS: Yes, it is very nice.

25 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Thank you, Mr. La Spina.

MR. LA SPINA: Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: We'll see Council Members not just there but  
we'll see Council Members in Montesano tonight.

20 Transmission line update.

21 I'm sorry. Yes, Ms. McGaffey.

22 MS. MCGAFFEY: As Mr. Gatewood referred, the facility is  
23 not currently operating, and it is not expected to be  
24 operating tomorrow. We had originally planned on giving  
25 everyone a tour of the area tomorrow afternoon, and I guess  
my suggestion since we're coming back in August and the  
facility is likely to be operating, then that we postpone  
the tour until the facility is operating.

1

CHAIR LUCE: That would be a good idea. Any objection to that by Council Members? All right. So done.

2

MS. WILLIS: Mr. Chair.

3

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

4

MS. WILLIS: Before you move he mentioned a letter that they had written to the organization. Are we going to have that available this evening before the meeting a copy of it?

5

CHAIR LUCE: Yes, that would be available. I assume Ms. McGaffey will present that at the appropriate time.

6

7

MS. MCGAFFEY: I guess related to that point we've put together for each of the Council Members a binder that contains all of the materials that have been the web, as well as copies of the power point presentations that are going to be given over the next couple of nights, a copy of that letter, various other materials. So we will be bringing those all tonight for each of you.

8

9

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

10

MR. WRIGHT: Are you planning on in your presentation on noise are you planning on going through what this letter says or somebody?

11

12

MS. MCGAFFEY: The presentation will allude to it. I think as far as whether there are questions about those are probably best addressed by the company folks in the first panel. Todd and Brett will be on that. So they will I think refer to that in the presentation and certainly be able to answer any questions about it.

13

14

CHAIR LUCE: Walk us through that mitigation package. All right. Thank you. I think that would be the appropriate time to do that.

15

Transmission lines updates.

16

17

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, on the white agenda you still have another item.

18

CHAIR LUCE: I'm sorry. I mentioned it and forgot. All right. Council delegation. Do you want to state the question, Mr. Wright?

19

1 MR. WRIGHT: You all have received from me an e-mail with a  
2 draft letter attached where we have asked your authority to  
3 delegate the authority to oversee some buildings of the  
4 Satsop by Grays Harbor County. In the past traditionally  
5 what has been done is the Council has contracted with the  
6 county and then the county becomes the Council's agent by  
7 contract and then the county bills EFSEC, EFSEC bills the  
8 applicant, and it comes back through again. Somewhere in  
9 the past we decided to cut out the middle man and just have  
10 the county deal directly with the applicant. But that does  
11 require every time the contract expires it does require a  
12 letter with your authority delegating your authority to the  
13 county to deal directly with the applicant. That's what  
14 this letter does, and there was some question raised about  
15 first-party, second-party authority to delegate  
16 responsibilities. So we thought it best just to simply  
17 have you make a motion, and then I will send a letter on  
18 your behalf that says that you voted in the Council meeting  
19 to delegate the authority directly to Grays Harbor Energy  
20 County to deal with the applicant. That's eliminating the  
21 contracting responsibilities third party through EFSEC.  
22 So, Mr. Chairman, all we need is a motion to approve the  
23 letter.

13 MR. FRYHLING: I so move.

14 CHAIR LUCE: Do we have a second?

15 MR. TAYER: I'll second it.

16 CHAIR LUCE: I have just a question. Do we want to amend  
17 that motion to provide the manager continuing authority to  
18 sign such letters so we don't get these coming back at  
19 times in the future?

18 MR. FRYHLING: I would agree to that amendment.

19 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Will the second?

20 MR. TAYER: Yes.

21 CHAIR LUCE: A motion and second to make this a longer term  
22 delegation of authority. Do we have any discussion?

23 MS. ADELSMAN: The only thing, Jim.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

25 MS. ADELSMAN: The only thing I would like is I'm assuming  
it's going to happen I'm sure is they have to come back to

1 us every time he's using such authority just to let us know  
2 what it was about and then to use his discretion on whether  
3 it goes beyond what's being delegated or not?

3 CHAIR LUCE: I think as a matter of comity we certainly  
4 would do that with Ecology or any other agency.

4 MS. ADELSMAN: Well, I'm talking about the Council not  
5 Ecology. Well, we'll do that with the Council as well.  
6 All right. Motion, a second, discussion beyond question?  
7 Question is called for. All in favor say Aye.

7 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. I think that that resolves that  
9 issue hopefully now and for the future. I know, Al, that  
10 you'll come back to the Council if there was a significant  
11 issue and apprise us of what's going on.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Most certainly.

11 TRANSMISSION LINES UPDATE

12 CHAIR LUCE: Transmission update, Ms. Posner.

13 MR. POSNER: Sonia will be issuing that report.

14 CHAIR LUCE: You told me that earlier. Now, neither my  
15 visual nor my hearing --

16 MR. FRYHLING: Is this a new staff member? Maybe an  
17 introduction would be in order.

17 MS. BUMPUS: My name is Sonia Bumpus. Hello, Mr. Chair.  
18 Hello, Council Members. I'm an intern that attended  
19 Evergreen State College and graduated June of this year and  
20 was asked to stay on for a bit longer.

20 CHAIR LUCE: With a degree in?

21 MS. BUMPUS: Biological sciences and I minored in  
22 environmental science.

22 CHAIR LUCE: And you've been with us for?

23 MS. BUMPUS: Since December of last year.

24 CHAIR LUCE: This is your first time appearing before the  
25 Council to make a presentation.

1 MS. BUMPUS: Before the Council.

2 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you for appearing here. So, Ms. Bumpus,  
what do you have to tell us?

3

4 MS. BUMPUS: I just have a brief update concerning the  
5 continuing BPA transmission lines projects. Central Ferry  
6 and Lower Monumental Draft Environmental Impact statement  
7 was released for agency review earlier this month on  
8 July 2. The comment period will close on August 16, 2010.  
9 BPA will be holding a public meeting on July 21 from 5:00  
10 to 7:00 p.m. at the Seneca Activities Center in Dayton  
11 Washington to answer questions and take comments on the  
12 Draft EIS.

13

14 For Big Eddy-Knight the Preliminary Draft EIS was released  
15 last month for agency review, and I am pleased to report  
16 that all agency comments were received by the close of the  
17 commenting period on July 9, 2010. The Draft EIS is  
18 currently expected to be released sometime in September of  
19 this year.

20 For I-5 the Preliminary Draft EIS is scheduled for release  
21 in March of 2011, and the Draft EIS is expected in August  
22 of 2011. That's all I have.

23 CHAIR LUCE: Did we with respect to Big Eddy then make a  
comment regarding cumulative impacts?

24

25 MS. BUMPUS: We did.

26

27 CHAIR LUCE: Good. I think, Mr. Tayer, you and I and other  
28 Council Members discussed the issue of cumulative impacts  
29 associated particularly with that line and other lines that  
30 are used to facilitate wind generation. So I want to make  
31 sure we got that placeholder in there because we continue  
32 to view that as a very significant issue. Thank you.

33 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you.

34 CHAIR LUCE: All right. Update on the move to UTC.

35 MR. POSNER: Chair Luce, we have one other item. We  
actually have Steve Prickett from BPA who is here to make a  
presentation at the request of the Council Members if  
you're looking at the agenda.

36

37 CHAIR LUCE: Yes, I am again.

38

39 Steve is going to talk to us about Big Eddy-Knight.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. POSNER: He's going to talk to us about Big Eddy-Knight.

CHAIR LUCE: Would love to hear about it, especially those cumulative impacts.

MS. KLUMP: So I'm going to start off. I'm Liz Klump and work for Bonneville out of the Olympia office. I'm going to hand out our Big Eddy project facts sheet from December. I think Steve Prickett who's our project manager for Big Eddy-Knight and Stacy Mason our NEPA lead for Big Eddy-Knight and I were all here I want to say 10 to 12 months ago when the whole process was just beginning.

The project team has made a lot of progress since then, and I also want to mention that I believe Rob Swedo in Spokane is on the phone.

CHAIR LUCE: Rob, are you there?

MR. SWEDO: I'm here.

MS. KLUMP: Okay. Rob works with the local government officials and other east side government constituency. So, Rob, Steve is just posting a large scale map of the project.

MR. SWEDO: I would expect that.

MS. KLUMP: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. PRICKETT: Chair Luce, Council Members, appreciate the opportunity to come in and talk about Bonneville Power's Big Eddy-Knight Transmission Project. If I'm speaking loud enough for those on the phone to hear, I hope that everyone on the phone could respond. Are you hearing me okay at this level? Do I have to talk louder?

MS. ADELSMAN: A little bit too loud.

MR. PRICKETT: A little too loud? Okay.

CHAIR LUCE: That's never been a problem.

MS. KLUMP: Rob, tell us if he is fading.

MR. SWEDO: Okay. Fading.

MR. PRICKETT: So you have a handout that is somewhat



1 slightly dated, and I apologize to the folks on the phone  
2 who can't see, but there's a handout that was sent to the  
3 public around the first of the year asking for additional  
4 comments and updating the public and interested parties on  
5 the progress of the project.

6 Strapped to the easel which you also can't see is a large  
7 version of the routes that are being considered, and if I  
8 could direct your attention to the map right in the middle  
9 of the handout. It's basically the same thing as what is  
10 posted on the easel. So with that in mind, my  
11 understanding was that the Council was interested in having  
12 kind of a general update on the routing process and perhaps  
13 other questions. So please feel free to chime in at any  
14 point and ask those additional questions. Other than that,  
15 I'll just give a general overview of the project, its  
16 schedule, and the proposed potential routes.

17 The Big Eddy-Knight Project is one of several what  
18 Bonneville refers to as NOS projects. NOS stands for  
19 Network Open Season. Big Eddy-Knight was born, if you  
20 will, from the 2008 Network Open Season Process, and we  
21 began to work through the process of considering the route  
22 in February of 2009. At that time we proposed what was  
23 roughly a 48-month schedule that to the extent that the  
24 project were to move forward it would be energized roughly  
25 in February of 2013. So 48 months from start to finish.  
And, of course, these are merely proposed projects at this  
time. The actual decision will be made by the Bonneville  
Power Administrator in June of 2011. That will be the  
Record of Decision, and the Administrator at that time will  
choose between the no-build option and one of several  
potential routes that we are studying three currently right  
at the moment. So that puts us about one year away.

18 Currently we've had a series of public meetings where we  
19 are asking for comments from the public on several  
20 different routes. I have my high-tech pointer here. So  
21 excuse me, nothing fancy. But there are three main routes  
22 that are being considered.

23 One we are calling our Western Route which goes basically  
24 due north of Bonneville Power's Big Eddy substation located  
25 in The Dalles Oregon, heads north through our vacant  
corridor -- that is rights of way easements that Bonneville  
Power owns but does not occupy currently -- makes river  
crossings, and heads west and north to other existing  
facilities that Bonneville presently has. We have a lower  
voltage 115 kV wind pole line, an easement that takes us  
for 16 miles just west of Goldendale, and then we would

1 strike north through areas that currently have no easement.  
2 So that would be brand new transmission right of way that  
3 does not exist.

4 So when Bonneville was thinking about developing a new  
5 transmission line one of the main considerations is do we  
6 have existing facilities? Do we have existing easements  
7 anywhere? It seems much more expedient to use existing  
8 right of ways when its there. It's far more difficult to  
9 develop right of ways where none exists today.

10 So Bonneville was attracted to the Western option because  
11 of the fairly extensive number of miles of existing  
12 corridor that is currently there. We would perhaps remove  
13 the line that is presently occupying that right of way and  
14 replace it with the larger voltage towers and that was the  
15 Western alternative.

16 Another corridor that exists that is fairly wide and would  
17 be a good candidate for improving to the larger voltage  
18 that we're considering is an existing line that runs from  
19 west to east for 14 miles. It crosses the Columbia River  
20 at an existing river crossing, and then it strikes due  
21 north and runs for about another 14 miles up to the  
22 proposed substation sites. As an alternative to that we  
23 also considered striking north prior to Centerville. What  
24 we want to do in some degree is to recognize land use and  
25 areas where we have quite a few folks living. So  
Centerville seemed to be that point that we straddle either  
to the east or to the west.

So the two eastern routes each follow the existing corridor  
from Big Eddy at The Dalles and then straddle Centerville.  
The area around Centerville is largely agricultural. The  
areas to the west on the Western alternative especially  
crosses a couple of interesting and sensitive areas. One  
is the Washington State Park area, and it also passes  
through the sensitive area of the Scenic Gorge. Once it  
passes through that area there is quite a bit of grazing  
land, and then when we head east it goes through some areas  
that are currently being considered for the development for  
residential applications. All the routes join together at  
about five miles south of the substation and run up to one  
of two possible sites. Both of the sites that are being  
considered are directly adjacent to one another. One is  
located on DNR property right next to Knight Road, and the  
other is private property immediately to the west of the  
DNR land.

The reason that Bonneville's attracted to the location

1 being considered for both Options 1 and 2 of the substation  
2 site is that it's an electrical sweet spot, if you will,  
3 which is more or less electrically halfway between two  
4 important substations to the east Wautoma substation and to  
5 the west Ostrander substation. Either of those two  
6 locations would serving be from an electrical point of  
7 view.

8 So once again that's, of course, how the project got its  
9 name. It goes from Big Eddy substation to Knight  
10 substation. So Big Eddy-Knight is about 28 miles in length  
11 as proposed. Each of the three routes have a variety of  
12 different attributes and advantages, one over the other.  
13 Some of the routes are a little more expensive to build by  
14 virtue of the fact that they're a little bit longer or the  
15 way that we would treat them from a design point of view.

16 Some of them are more sensitive to environmental concerns.  
17 Some of them are more sensitive to state concerns. All  
18 three routes pass through the Scenic Columbia Gorge;  
19 therefore, there's a considerable amount of interest from  
20 the Gorge Commission and from the Forest Service who will  
21 join hands collectively to review the project and compare  
22 it against their management practices as they stand today.

23 Of course, the Western alternative we go through the  
24 Washington State Park Bureau Columbia Hills Park. There  
25 are also various plots of Department of Natural Resources  
land that are affected by that as well.

26 At this point Bonneville Power has decided to announce that  
27 it does have a preferred route. The preferred route was  
28 identified in the preliminary Draft EIS which has been out,  
29 reviewed, and the comments have been returned to us. And  
30 in there we have identified that the Eastern Route, that is  
31 the one that goes for 14 miles along the existing wide  
32 corridor and easement that we currently own then heads 14  
33 miles north from that corridor area to the substation has  
34 been identified as the preferred option. So the preferred  
35 option means preferred but does not mean selected.

36 CHAIR LUCE: Excuse me, Steve. Whoever is typing or doing  
37 something with your software could you put your phone on  
38 mute so we don't have to hear it. Thank you.

39 MR. PRICKETT: The preferred option only means that it is  
40 currently favored by the project team that is working on  
41 it. It does mean that it's selected. The actual selection  
42 will take place at the records decision next June by the  
43 Administrator, and once again he will decide again between

1 the no build and the other three other options that we've  
2 identified. At that time we will have gone about 28 months  
3 into a 48-month schedule. In the event that the  
4 administrator chooses to proceed with the project, we will  
5 then have about a 20-month window for construction. During  
6 that time we would build the brand new substation at Knight  
7 which currently does not exist. We would locate it  
8 directly underneath a 500 kV line which is currently there  
9 to provide an interconnection and a direct connectivity to  
10 The Dalles area at Big Eddy substation.

11 That would accomplish several different things in the event  
12 that we proceed. One is it would allow Bonneville to offer  
13 additional transmission services for generators who  
14 participated in the Network Open Season in 2008 and once  
15 again in 2009. It would also provide additional  
16 reliability to the Portland area in the event that we lost  
17 connection between The Dalles and Portland on the Oregon  
18 side of the river. So two important advantages would  
19 result from this project in the event that it gets built.  
20 Overall the cost would be in the order of 110 to 120  
21 million dollars. That would include the transmission line,  
22 the land easements, land that we had purchased for the  
23 substation, the new substation switch yard at Knight  
24 substation next to Knight Road, and the enlargement of the  
25 Big Eddy substation at The Dalles. So that's kind of fast  
and furious, but if there is any other questions.

CHAIR LUCE: Council Member questions?

Mr. Tayer.

MR. TAYER: You said one of the advantages of constructing  
this was related to new production. I'm assuming you're  
talking about wind power production primarily. How many --  
will this interconnect serve all of wind production that's  
been developed in Klickitat County?

MR. PRICKETT: The 2008 Network Open Season asks potential  
generators who wanted new transmission services to identify  
themselves, kind of raise their hand and say, yes, we want  
in. They expressed their interest and their commitment.  
There's a long list of generators who the majority of those  
generators are wind generators, but not all of the requests  
are coming from the wind generators. So, first of all,  
yes, the majority are wind driven, but it's not just that.

MS. KLUMP: I think I'm hearing a second part of the  
question which is would all the wind projects in Klickitat  
County have sufficient capacity on the transmission system

1 with respect to this line?

2 MR. TAYER: And will this facilitate that buildout?

3 MS. KLUMP: Right.

4 MR. PRICKETT: To the extent that it does get built it  
5 certainly will facilitate access to transmission for the  
6 wind generators in that area. It will not by itself serve  
7 all that need, but it will be an important part of that.

8 MR. TAYER: Thank you.

9 CHAIR LUCE: It will enable their ability to utilize  
10 transmission to move their generation.

11 MR. PRICKETT: I don't know if I'd use the word enable, but  
12 I would say that it would allow the agency to offer those  
13 transmission contracts.

14 MS. KLUMP: So I'm going to add a little bit of  
15 clarification as I understand it, and that is that -- and I  
16 don't know the wind projects by name in this context, but  
17 Big Eddy in and of itself does enable some of the requests  
18 for service we have. But some of the requests for service  
19 we got only enabled when Big Eddy is done and the I-5  
20 project is done. Some of the requests for service are done  
21 when Big Eddy and McNary-John Day are done. So they  
22 operate in cooperation with each other in complex ways that  
23 mere mortals barely understand.

24 CHAIR LUCE: So I have a question. Assuming which I do  
25 that Big Eddy-Knight enables a certain amount of generation  
that otherwise would not have access to transmission does  
the environmental impact statement look at the cumulative  
impact associated with enabling that generation? And I  
think it's variant on what you were suggesting, Jeff. We  
have some very significant avian issues and wildlife issues  
in the Gorge that will be impacted and are impacted already  
by the generation, by the wind generation. There has been  
no cumulative impact analysis done by this office, and I'm  
asking that Bonneville do one as a part of its  
environmental analysis on Big Eddy-Knight.

And I know we've had this discussion before at different  
levels, but I'm going to restate and reemphasize my belief  
that that is necessary for this at least for this Council  
Member to sign off on that line's final environmental  
impact statement and provide appropriate mitigation  
necessary for these impacts not just associated with the

1 Big Eddy-Knight line for 16 miles, but the impacts that are  
2 enabled or impacts that are caused and they may not  
3 directly cause them, indirectly caused by the construction  
4 of this line. So I want to make sure that that's on the  
5 record.

6 MR. PRICKETT: Certainly. Bonneville's position is that  
7 each of the Network Open Season projects stand alone and  
8 that the environmental work that was done supports each of  
9 those efforts stand alone.

10 CHAIR LUCE: I understand that. That's sort of pointing  
11 your finger in the left and pointing your finger in the  
12 right and nothing in the middle. I don't find that an  
13 acceptable answer.

14 MR. TAYER: Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

16 MR. TAYER: I would just add that Bonneville's in a real  
17 unique place as they look at the region and its energy  
18 needs and all of the components that go into that to create  
19 an analysis that looks at the whole thing at one time, and  
20 no other entity that I know of anyway is doing that. And  
21 so it's a unique place for Bonneville to be and a good time  
22 to do it as you brought up hundreds of millions if not  
23 billions of dollars are being invested. It seems like an  
24 overarching look at what we're going to do and then the  
25 cumulative impacts what we're going to do is appropriate  
26 for now.

27 MR. PRICKETT: We will certainly take those remarks back to  
28 Bonneville and share those with the folks that are involved  
29 with looking at the collective projects.

30 CHAIR LUCE: That's a reasonable thing to do, and you  
31 should expect, Bonneville should expect continuing comments  
32 along these lines as we move toward consideration by this  
33 Council as to whether we recommend that the Governor sign  
34 off on this line.

35 MR. PRICKETT: Certainly.

36 MS. McDONALD: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

37 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

38 MS. McDONALD: I'm looking at this map. Why was this  
39 portion eliminated? There was a portion of the west

1 alternative that was to go up and it was eliminated from  
2 further consideration. What was the reason?

2

3 MR. PRICKETT: So what's not shown on the large map that is  
4 shown in the handout? During the earlier public work we  
5 had considered an alternative route which would have taken  
6 the Western Route and continued along the existing corridor  
7 that is also empty that the agency still owns, and it runs  
8 kind of up to this white spot here a few miles west of the  
9 newly proposed substation sites.

6

7 As we considered using that corridor we began to realize  
8 that to utilize the corridor would require the removal of  
9 several homes, and avoiding homes and other types of  
10 structures are one of the goals as we site these. So we  
11 decided that it was impractical to proceed with that  
12 proposed route because of that.

13 CHAIR LUCE: So I would follow along the question. You're  
14 looking at all of these lines as a package. Basically  
15 you're looking at the I-5, the Low-Mo and the Big  
16 Eddy-Knight. Did I just hear you express that BPA's  
17 preference is to avoid homes in urban areas?

18 MR. PRICKETT: I can really only address the Big  
19 Eddy-Knight project. It stands by itself from our point of  
20 view, and the EIS that we're preparing addresses  
21 specifically the Big Eddy-Knight project.

15

16 CHAIR LUCE: I want to carry it a little bit further. So  
17 you said that Bonneville's preference overall I believe was  
18 your generic comment is to avoid urban areas and  
19 residential areas; is that correct?

20 MR. PRICKETT: We have a variety of siting criteria that we  
21 use when we site new lines.

19

20 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. But you're suppose to be guided by the  
21 Council, this Council in our MOA and MOU by our siting  
22 criteria. I won't ask you to answer yes or no to that. I  
23 think the MOA and MOU stand for themselves. But we're to  
24 provide -- you don't have to get a license from us, but you  
25 do have to follow or should be guided our siting criteria.  
And I think you just said something to the effect that you  
prefer to avoid urban areas and residential neighborhoods.

24 MR. PRICKETT: In this particular project we preferred to  
25 avoid homes period so they didn't have to be removed. So  
we no longer considered them.

1 CHAIR LUCE: What about in the I-5 project where you have  
2 an existing right of way that goes right through the heart  
of Clark County in a very major significant urban area?  
What about that project?

3  
4 MR. PRICKETT: I'm sorry. I really can't comment on I-5.  
This is really about the Big Eddy-Knight.

5 CHAIR LUCE: Oh, so it would be different in I-5 than they  
would be on Big Eddy-Knight?

6  
7 MS. KLUMP: I guess I'll try and answer that.

8 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

9 MS. KLUMP: So the corridor that goes through the urban  
area on the I-5 project we own an existing right of way.

10 CHAIR LUCE: I understand that.

11 MS. KLUMP: And if there are homes that have been built  
12 within that easement and, you know, if we were to pick that  
route those homes would need to be relocated. But the only  
13 reason that path goes through an urban area is because that  
easement was bought decades ago, conceivably four decades  
14 ago, and construction and development has happened adjacent  
to it.

15 CHAIR LUCE: I understand that.

16 MS. KLUMP: But in practicality to build along that  
easement may not, may not involve relocating homes, and so  
17 when we have said on the I-5 project that one of our  
priorities is to minimize the relocation of households,  
18 it's my understanding that relocating households would  
happen if they fell within the right of way.

19  
20 CHAIR LUCE: So to the extent they don't and you own an  
existing right of way, you would prefer to use that  
existing right of way in I-5 notwithstanding the fact that  
21 there's --

22 MS. KLUMP: That's not what I said at all.

23 CHAIR LUCE: I'm sorry. I misunderstood.

24 MS. KLUMP: Yes. You asked me about moving homes. So we  
do have a priority to minimize the need to relocate  
25 households.



1 CHAIR LUCE: Let me restate it. Do you have a preference  
or priority as to whether you build large transmission  
2 lines, existing right of way or not, through urban areas  
where there is substantial residential neighbors?

3  
4 MS. KLUMP: We are just beginning the environmental review  
to assess the human property and natural impacts on the I-5  
project, and we don't have a preferred route.

5  
6 CHAIR LUCE: That wasn't the question.

7  
8 MS. KLUMP: Yes.

9  
10 CHAIR LUCE: The question was as a policy matter does  
Bonneville have a priority to avoid urban areas  
irrespective whether they own the existing right of way?

11  
12 MS. KLUMP: I don't know that we've stated a preference so  
I would say we don't have a preference.

13  
14 CHAIR LUCE: You don't have a preference with that. I find  
that an interesting comment.

15  
16 The other question I have is, Steve, you said NEPA would,  
if I understood this correctly, you have to have a NEPA  
analysis or no build option or no-action alternative.

17  
18 MR. PRICKETT: That is included as one of the standards  
that's within our EIS process.

19  
20 CHAIR LUCE: No, I understand that. And you need more --  
how many alternatives do you need to study in a NEPA  
analysis? I know that the no-action alternative always  
exists. Do you need only one option or alternative, two,  
three, four? Is one enough?

21  
22 MR. PRICKETT: There is not an exact science to this.

23  
24 CHAIR LUCE: Okay. So one conceivably would be enough.

25  
MR. PRICKETT: I don't know that would seem to be  
appropriate in all cases.

CHAIR LUCE: No, I wasn't asking in all cases, but it  
would be enough. Depending on the circumstances one option  
with a no-build option would be acceptable.

MR. PRICKETT: Generally speaking that hasn't normally  
been the case with most of our projects and it wasn't  
appropriate for Big Eddy-Knight to have single alternative.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIR LUCE: I wasn't asking about generally speaking. I was asking whether that's a correct approach under NEPA. Can you utilize --

MR. SWEDO: I believe it is.

CHAIR LUCE: It is, isn't it?

MR. SWEDO: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

MS. ADELSMAN: Who's speaking?

MR. SWEDO: Rob.

MS. ADELSMAN: Rob who?

MR. SWEDO: Swedo. We have had other instances where we've only had one additional alternative.

CHAIR LUCE: Okay. That's helpful. I'm looking as you may surmise at not just the Big Eddy-Knight but at all Bonneville transmission projects where there may be multiple alternatives, some of which cross very large substantial urban areas and some of which don't.

MS. ADELSMAN: Jim, given that we are trying to integrate SEPA and the NEPA in these cases, I think the same question should be asked if the NEPA addresses only one alternative is that going to be sufficient? And, you know, usually, traditionally we have not just chosen one alternative. Usually at the minimum we have three, a no action and two other ones.

CHAIR LUCE: I understand that, Hedia. The question wasn't what we do usually, but whether it was legally sufficient.

MS. ADELSMAN: I know, but I'm trying to understand where you're going with asking questions.

CHAIR LUCE: Well, I'm going to I-5 which is not what Mr. Prickett is here to talk about. But I-5 has three options and one option goes over DNR property, primarily Weyerhaeuser's property, and has no substantial residential impact or urban area impact or impact on the city of Vancouver. The other option to which Bonneville has the right of way goes right through the middle of the urban area and right through the middle of the primary

1 residential impacts. And what I'm hoping that Mr. Prickett  
2 will carry back to Bonneville is something that he didn't  
3 come here to carry back, but nevertheless my belief, hope  
4 that Bonneville will very quickly move away from those  
5 options. Admittedly it has right of way right now, but  
6 admittedly move away from those options to go through the  
7 urban part of Clark County which will hold Clark County  
8 effectively hostage from a land use perspective for the  
9 next two years until this EIS is finished and continue its  
10 good work with DNR and choose that as the preferred  
11 alternative and remove these other two options leaving you  
12 with one option, the DNR option and a no-build alternative.

13 MR. FRYHLING: Jim, I think what you're discussing here  
14 isn't on our agenda. It has nothing to do with this, and I  
15 don't think it's a proper time for this to be discussed. I  
16 think this needs to be discussed at a different meeting.

17 CHAIR LUCE: Well, I'm discussing it now. I'll leave it  
18 there.

19 MR. FRYHLING: And I'm saying I don't think it needs to be  
20 discussed at this meeting. I think we should stick with  
21 what's on the agenda, and then we can go I-5 someplace down  
22 the road. We all know that's going to be the big one that  
23 we're going to have to deal with.

24 CHAIR LUCE: Right, I understand that.

25 MR. FRYHLING: So we need to have that at a different  
26 meeting not this meeting when we're talking Big Eddy.

27 CHAIR LUCE: I've raised the issue and that's all I wanted  
28 to do.

29 MS. McDONALD: Mr. Chair, I had one more question.

30 CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

31 MS. McDONALD: Are you going to have a preferred substation  
32 location?

33 MR. PRICKETT: We do.

34 MS. McDONALD: You said there were some sweet spots, but  
35 which one is sweeter?

36 MR. PRICKETT: There was an oversight that the preferred  
37 substation site was not included in the preliminary Draft  
38 EIS. In fact, it is site No. 1 which is immediately west

1 of the DNR property on Knight Road.

2 MS. McDONALD: Thank you.

3 MR. PRICKETT: Chair Luce, the handout that was just passed  
4 around identifies considerations when we're siting  
5 transmission facilities. The siting process is not a  
6 science, and the items listed on this page are not the only  
7 issues, and they are not weighted on any particular order.  
8 Since it's impossible to come up with a mathematical  
9 process to determine which is best, instead the agency  
10 weighs the major features and would gladly add additional  
11 features to be weighed.

12 But one of which at the top but not necessarily the most  
13 important is whether or not we have any existing corridors.  
14 To the extent that there's an existing corridor, then it  
15 seems less intrusive to use the easements and facilities  
16 that are currently there that people are currently accustom  
17 to. That is just one.

18

19 Are The road systems adequate? In the event that they are,  
20 then roads are a major factor when we build transmission  
21 lines. If the road system is already there, then there's  
22 much less environmental disturbance when we have to create  
23 new roads.

24

25 Are there homes in the way? Of course, that is not  
26 necessarily once again ranked third in order. It is merely  
27 an important consideration. If we could avoid removing a  
28 home, we certainly would for Big Eddy-Knight, and that is  
29 why we made the alterations around the first of that  
30 current route and shared that with the public.

31

32 And, of course, it has to make electrical sense, and we've  
33 located this substation at an electrical sweet spot. That  
34 is to say, electrically it feels like the mid point between  
35 the two substations that we're trying to connect the Big  
36 Eddy substation.

37

38 At the bottom, I won't go through all of them, but the cost  
39 of the line is listed here as well. It's not the only  
40 consideration, but from a ratepayer point of view  
41 Bonneville Power would prefer to spend the money  
42 efficiently as we deploy any physical assets.

43

44 If we turn the page over, there are a list of the  
45 environmental considerations which I won't read through,  
46 but at the end of the day many pressures come to bear as  
47 the agency attempts to site new facilities. Of course,

48

1 wherever we go with a brand new 500 kV transmission line we  
2 very rarely are met with welcome open arms. That's just  
3 the fact of the matter. It's not just Bonneville Power.  
4 It's everybody in the entire county and it's becoming more  
5 and more difficult over time to site new transmission  
6 lines. This is not a surprise.

7 So the science of putting it together is not exact, and it  
8 brings into account the considerations that are pointed out  
9 to us during the public process to the extent that the  
10 state of Washington has selection criteria that's  
11 considered. To the extent that the Department of Natural  
12 Resources has interest and concerns they share those, blend  
13 those in together. All the Forest Service who will  
14 actually be permitting Bonneville Power and the Big  
15 Eddy-Knight project to proceed have a variety of interests  
16 that they're sharing with us. The Gorge Commission which  
17 was formed which is funded by both the State of Oregon and  
18 the State of Washington have a variety of special interest  
19 concerns. They have management practices. At the end of  
20 the day we have to blend all the organizations and all the  
21 groups that are interested in these projects into a giant  
22 balancing act where we consider the input from all of these  
23 different organizations. It's a great challenge, one that  
24 we roll our sleeves up and attack with great gusto, and  
25 that we're pleased to serve to help provide that balance.

CHAIR LUCE: Totally agree with that. We have these same  
considerations and the same considerations for siting new  
projects only we have hearings such as we're going to have  
tonight. So to the extent that I deviated from Big  
Eddy-Knight to make a larger point about siting  
considerations, I apologize. However, nonetheless I do  
believe that under our existing MOA and MOU with Bonneville  
the state through EFSEC makes recommendations to Bonneville  
regarding the siting criteria, and the opportunity to  
present to the Governor to sign that letter we speak for  
the State of Washington in that respect. So simply I  
apologize if I got off subject a little bit, but I want to  
make it clear at least this member's views with respect to  
siting criteria are.

MR. PRICKETT: Very good. We appreciate the opportunity to  
hear them stated so plainly and we'll definitely take those  
back.

CHAIR LUCE: Other Council Members?

MR. TAYER: Would you mind sharing with us sort of the  
30-second summary of the comments you received from the

1 Gorge Commission, the Forest Service and, etc., in terms of  
2 this project?

3 MR. PRICKETT: Well, there are others who could do a much  
4 better job than I would. Unfortunately our lead  
5 environmentalist is not going to be available, was not  
6 available today so I'm a poor substitute to speak to the  
7 environmental side and the comments that were received back  
8 from that. So honestly I'm not really prepared to respond  
9 to those details that they included. My apologies.

10 CHAIR LUCE: Perhaps when your lead environmental  
11 specialist is back maybe a discussion with Manager Wright  
12 which he could then share with us would be appropriate, and  
13 I'd also be interested to know what the Friends of the  
14 Gorge comments might have been.

15 MR. PRICKETT: Yes, we can certainly take that back and  
16 provide that information at that time, certainly.

17 CHAIR LUCE: Other Council Member questions?

18 Well, thank you so very much for coming.

19 MR. PRICKETT: Certainly.

20 CHAIR LUCE: Do we have anything else from Bonneville  
21 transmission or transmission?

22

#### 23 UPDATE ON MOVE TO UTC

24

25 CHAIR LUCE: Do we have an update on the UTC move?

26

27 MR. WRIGHT: Just quickly, we have UTC personnel and  
28 ours -- by the way, today is the 13th and we have been UTC  
29 employees for 13 days or 12 days I guess. One doesn't  
30 count. So we have reached a preliminary agreement with UTC  
31 staff on the layout and the facilities for the physical  
32 move. It's now in the hands of I guess the general  
33 administration and the Office of Financial Management.  
34 They will get back to us and then depending on the outcome  
35 of that we will actually start doing the buildouts that are  
36 necessary for the move. The projected time now is the most  
37 optimistic middle of August, probably most reasonable is  
38 early September for the physical move.

39 As I said, administratively we belong to UTC now. We are  
40 in the process of doing a lot of the administrative  
41 shifting from budgeting and accounting and a host of other  
42 administrative activities from Commerce over to UTC. Most

1 of that will probably be done by the end of the month.  
2 Next week in late afternoon on Thursday until Monday  
3 morning we will be off the grid. You won't be able to  
4 contact us. Our computerized system will be shut down to  
5 make the transition from Commerce to UTC. So from three  
6 o'clock Thursday until eight o'clock Monday morning we  
7 won't be able to -- I think the phones will be operational,  
8 but the computerized system will not be. So we will be  
9 going through that process. My understanding until we  
10 physically move to UTC our phones will stay the same  
11 because they're actually hooked into the Washington State  
12 University phone system. So those will just -- and the  
13 numbers as I understand it will stay the same until we  
14 move, and when we move we will have new phone numbers. So  
15 that's kind of where we are. I don't know. Do we have the  
16 August meeting set here?

17 MS. TALBURT: Yes.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Which I imagine will be probably the last one.

19 MS. TALBURT: We also reserved this room for September's  
20 date.

21 CHAIR LUCE: Reserved for September just in case.

22 MS. ADELSMAN: Hey, Al, I have a quick suggestion. This  
23 week we have the three public meetings and a lot of us are  
24 limited to 32 hours. I'm wondering if you could look at  
25 the future temporary layoff days and see if we are going to  
also have similar constraints. It may be really good to  
avoid having additional public meetings during those weeks.

MR. WRIGHT: We will definitely do that. The 32-hour  
restriction kind of blind sided us. We knew we had a  
furlough day -- well, actually when we set these dates we  
didn't. Even with the furlough day we didn't think it was  
a problem, but then the resulting activities from that and  
everybody becoming hourly employees for a week and being  
restricted to 32 hours was something we did not anticipate,  
and it's created some hurdles that we have had to get over,  
but we won't do this again.

MS. ADELSMAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIR LUCE: Anything else?

MR. WRIGHT: The only thing is what time are anybody that  
wants a ride to Satsop meeting: five o'clock?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. POSNER: 5:00.

MS. ADELSMAN: 5:00 by the parking lot?

MR. WRIGHT: Out in the parking lot.

MS. ADELSMAN: It's the parking lot not on the street, but the other one; is that right?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, the one that's the parking lot that's between the two buildings. Right on the corner of Union and Plum.

CHAIR LUCE: Where the statute of Mark Twain is.

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes, I'll be there.

CHAIR LUCE: Anything else?

MR. WRIGHT: We are cancelling the tour; is that right?

MS. ADELSMAN: Oh, wonderful.

MR. WRIGHT: That was a question, but I wanted to reaffirm that; that we're going to cancel the tour.

MS. ADELSMAN: I think because of the constraints of time it's maybe good to schedule it another time.

CHAIR LUCE: The project won't be operating, Hedia, so there wouldn't be any noise. Not that there would be an unacceptable necessarily amount of noise. We don't know that, but there would be no noise whatsoever.

MS. ADELSMAN: So, Al, tomorrow would be at five o'clock again?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MS. ADELSMAN: So I'll plan on driving with you guys again also.

MR. WRIGHT: Love to have you.

MS. ADELSMAN: Thank you.

MS. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to spin my hat for a second and act as the Grays Harbor County Commissioner and thank the EFSEC board and its members and staff who



1 participated, and I'm not sure in what way, but I remember  
2 them being announced in the turbine projects that were just  
3 started on June 26 between Pacific County and Grays Harbor  
4 County. There were four of them. I do remember that  
5 somebody was mentioned in the audience from the EFSEC  
6 group. So did you folks have a permitting process that you  
7 went through in order for those wind turbines to be part of  
8 the --

9 MR. LA SPINA: Is that Radar Ridge?

10 MS. WILLIS: No, this is the pilot project for the CAP  
11 funding.

12 CHAIR LUCE: Thank you for thanking us, but I don't think  
13 we had anything to do with it.

14 MS. WILLIS: These were wind turbines that will create  
15 funds for the CAP organization, which is Community Action  
16 Program, which means they'll be actually turned into the  
17 communities and help some of our residents who have issues  
18 that they can't handle themselves. And so they went on the  
19 grid on June 26. Senator Hargrove was there and pushed the  
20 button and actually started them, and so we're excited to  
21 not only have the funds generated, but that it's done in  
22 this manner. And it's the first one in the United States I  
23 believe. This is a pilot project that went very well. It  
24 was ten years in the making. A lot of work put in it. I'm  
25 sorry to hear that you guys didn't work on it. It was a  
great project.

CHAIR LUCE: All right. We're adjourned.

\* \* \* \* \*

(Monthly meeting adjourned 2:51 p.m.)

(These are minutes only, not a verbatim report of  
proceedings.)