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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. Welcome to the November meeting of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. I am calling this meeting -- I'm Kathleen Drew, Chair, and I am calling this meeting to order.

Ms. Mastro, will you please call the roll?

MS. MASTRO: Thank you, Chair Drew. For the record, this is Tammy Mastro.

The Department of Commerce?

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, present.

MS. MASTRO: Department of Ecology?

MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, present.

MS. MASTRO: Fish and Wildlife?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Hi, Mike Livingston, present.

MS. MASTRO: The Department of Natural Resources representative is vacant.

Utilities and Transportation Commission?

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.
MS. MASTRO: Chair, I mark you as present and there is a quorum for the EFSEC Council.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. MASTRO: Assistant Attorney General Jon Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Present.

MS. MASTRO: Can the court reporter please identify themselves?

THE COURT REPORTER: This is Tayler Garlinghouse, present.

MS. MASTRO: Thank you.

Sonia Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus, present.

MS. MASTRO: Ami Kidder?

MS. KIDDER: Ami Kidder, present.

MS. MASTRO: Amy Moon?

MS. MOON: Amy Moon, here.

MS. MASTRO: Kyle Overton?

MR. OVERTON: Kyle Overton's here.

MS. MASTRO: Joan Owens?

MS. OWENS: Joan Owens is here.

MS. MASTRO: Patricia Betts?

MS. BETTS: Patricia Betts, present.

MS. MASTRO: Stewart Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: I'm here.
MS. MASTRO:  Stephen Posner?

Thank you, Chair Drew.

CHAIR DREW:  Is there anyone else who would like to identify themselves for the meeting?

MR. SHERIN:  Chris Sherin, Grays Harbor Energy Center.

MR. SMITH:  Jeremy Smith and Mark Miller for Chehalis Generation Facility.

MR. HURD:  Owen Hurd for --

[Multiple speakers.]

MS. DIAZ:  Jennifer Diaz for Puget Sound Energy.

MR. MCMAHON:  Tim McMahon, Stoel Rives.

MS. MCGAFFEY:  Karen McGaffey, Perkins Coie.

[Multiple speakers.]

MS. EVANS:  Mackenzie Evans and Sarah de Groot from Grays Harbor Energy Center.

MR. STROUD:  John Stroud from Timmons Group.

CHAIR DREW:  I heard Dave Arbaugh, would you like to again say your association?


CHAIR DREW:  Thank you.

I also heard Owen Hurd?

MR. HURD:  That's correct, yeah, for Columbia Solar Project.
CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. BOSH: And Joni Bosh, Northwest Energy Coalition.

MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis, Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you. Moving on to the proposed agenda. This morning we sent out a revised agenda which only reordered the items on our agenda since I was concerned about the weather forecast for this afternoon, and since we have a remote call, with the high wind warning, I wanted to make sure we took care of our business action item, potential action item, up front. So instead of last on the agenda, we have moved Grays Harbor Energy Center to first on the agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as amended?

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster. I'll make a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments?

Hearing none, all those in favor, say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: All opposed? Motion carries.

Moving on to the meeting minutes from the
October 20th meeting. Is there a motion to approve the meeting minutes?

MS. KELLY: This is Kate Kelly. Motion to approve the meeting minutes from October 20th.

MR. DENGEL: Rob Dengel, second.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Are there -- is there any discussion or any corrections?

Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the meeting minutes from October 20th, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed? The minutes are approved.

So moving on, then, to our first item on the agenda, Grays Harbor Energy Center. We will start with the operational update. Mr. Sherin?

MR. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Councilmembers. For the month of October, I don't have -- I -- there are no nonroutine items to report operationally. I will note, though, that we did submit additional information to EFSEC Staff early in the month in response to follow-up requests on our site certification amendment application. And that is all.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Any questions?
Next we have Mr. Kyle Overton with the SCA, SEPA, and PSD update.

MR. OVERTON: Yes, thank you. My name is Kyle Overton. I'm the EFSEC site specialist for the Grays Harbor facility. First for the PSD update, Staff continue to work with Ecology and ORCAA contractors to develop draft PSD permit modification documents. Once the final draft is completed, the documents will be provided for the Council for their review prior to making the decision to release documents for public comment.

For the SEPA update, there's a little more substance there. Staff has completed the State -- State Environmental Policy Act, or SEPA review, which has been provided to the Council. As SEPA review was separated for each of the two aspects of facility's request, there is one SEPA review Staff memo and one addendum for the inflation of the Advanced Gas Path Package to Units 1 and 2. And there's a second SEPA review Staff memo and a second addendum for extending the deadline for the commencing of construction of Units 3 and 4.

No new mitigation was identified as a result of this review and the proposed change was determined to be minor in nature. Our SEPA review was based on the current condition. With the issuances of SEPA addendum,
no additional SEPA review will be done at the time of request to commence construction without the submission of another SCA amendment request.

If the Council wants to be able to conduct additional SEPA review at the time of construction without an SCA amendment request, then that would need to be included as an addition of the SCA. The recommendation memos and addendums have been completed and have uploaded to the Council SharePoint site to allow the Council to view these documents. This completes EFSEC's responsibility to comply with SEPA.

And are there any questions at this time?

CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions?

MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengel. Just to clarify, you're right about to go into Units 3 and 4, correct?

MR. OVERTON: Sorry, can you repeat the question again?

MR. DENGEL: So this is -- this is Rob Dengel with Ecology. You're right about to discuss Units 3 and 4 immediately after this, correct?

MR. OVERTON: I believe Sonia Bumpus is going to be discussing that stuff after my little presentation here.

MR. DENGEL: Okay. I'm just going to ask
that when we start, making sure we have time to talk
about the -- the two projects respectively. So thank
you.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you. We will do that.

Ms. Bumpus?

MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Drew. Good
afternoon, Councilmembers. In light of Councilmember
Dengel's question, I'm going to go ahead and start with
my discussion on the schedule extension for Units 3 and
4. So we'll -- we'll do that first.

So under direction of the Council, EFSEC
Staff have worked to develop a Staff recommendation for
the Grays Harbor SCA amendment request. Staff's
recommendation I did want to note and as Kyle Overton
indicated in his SEPA summary, the Staff recommendation
bifurcates Grays Harbor Energy's SCA amendment request
into two separate recommendations from Staff for the
Council to consider.

One of our recommendations addresses the
decision before the Council on the Advanced Gas Path
Package, which are the upgrades to Units 1 and 2. The
other Staff recommendation we've developed addresses the
schedule extension request for SCA Amendment 5, which
authorized the construction and operation of Grays
Harbor Units 3 and 4.
So this was mentioned in the October meeting, but I wanted to just reiterate. I know Councilmembers are familiar with the requirements in WAC 463-66-040. In that rule, it talks about what the Council shall consider when it's reviewing an amendment request. It says that the Council -- and I'm paraphrasing, but that the Council will consider whether the amendment request is consistent with one, the intention of the original SCA; two, applicable laws and rules; three, public health, safety, and welfare; and four, EFSEC's requirements related to site restoration and preservation in WAC 463-72.

So moving forward into the discussion about the SCA schedule extension request for Units 3 and 4, the -- the request is to extend the two thousand -- extend to 2028 the deadline for commencing construction of Units 3 and 4.

Staff conducted SEPA and reviewed the considerations that are in WAC 463-66-040 in order to develop our recommendation. For SEPA, EFSEC reviewed and analyzed new information to determine if there were any likely significant adverse environmental impacts not covered by the impacts and mitigation analyzed in the existing SEPA document. No additional mitigation beyond what was identified for the 2010 mitigation was found.
And this is documented in EFSEC’s Staff memo for each of the environmental topics.

However, EFSEC did note during its SEPA review that the Department of Ecology is currently creating a new rule for Governor Inslee’s Directive 19-18 to address greenhouse gas impacts and mitigation with an overall goal of no net increase of greenhouse gas emissions. These new rules are due to be in place in September 2021, and we wanted to note these because it remains to be seen how these might impact this facility.

Now, as for the other aspects of the provisions and the rule that needs to be considered, there were no other proposed changes to the terms or conditions of the existing SCA, and presumably related conditions and technological upgrades to the facility would be addressed through future SCA amendments and plan approval prior to commencing construction.

However, in reviewing the timeframe requirements in the SCA for the start of construction and operation, Staff did conclude in consultation with our assistant attorney general, Jon Thompson, that the extension request beyond a ten-year expiration of the SCA is not consistent with the original SCA.

So that being said and, you know, based on
all those considerations, Staff concluded that if the Council were to approve the extension request, the Council should include some conditions to ensure it can update its SEPA analysis before the start of construction.

We also concluded that with an approval, there would be a need for approval by the governor and this is pursuant to what is in WAC 463-66-080. So I just wanted to put that out there before I discuss Staff's recommendation.

So for our recommendation, I wanted to note first that I did consider the concerns expressed by some of our Councilmembers related to questions about need and the extent of SEPA analysis for this SCA extension request. In thinking about those concerns and input from our assistant attorney general and the consistency with the four requirements in our rule, I -- I essentially concluded that the Council should deny the extension request without prejudice. This would mean that the current SCA would expire in February next year. The denial could be -- a denial could be documented by a resolution for the Council to review and approve if everything looks okay.

So that concludes my presentation on the extension request and I can -- I can take questions if...
there are any.

CHAIR DREW: Are there questions?

Mr. Dengel, did you want to ask a question at this point?

MR. DENGEL: Yes. So I did have one -- one question. So with the updated -- for -- I want to make sure I'm getting the right project here. For the turbines 3 and 4 going through an additional SEPA process at a later time prior to construction, my question is, what additional information would you think we would be able to have that would -- that is not currently addressed in the -- in the current SEPA analysis that has been completed in addition to taking into light, you know, new state regulations on power use?

MS. BUMPUS: That's an excellent question. And before I answer, I wanted to see if Patty Betts or Kyle Overton would like to respond first?

MS. BETTS: This is Patty. I can -- I can make a few comments. So when we reviewed the proposal of currently, we're -- it's based on what we know today and also what the current environmental conditions are today. And we can potentially guess or extrapolate what they might be, let's just say six to eight years from now, but we don't know for sure.
We do know that climate conditions, the effects of greenhouse gases are, you know -- that the effects are -- and our information about those effects are -- are -- are changing relatively rapidly. So we don't really know what the situation for sure is going to be like six years from now.

We also don't know what technologies are going to be out there, and we don't even know what the status of -- of even other forms of energy, et cetera are going to be. So it's possible that even -- not only -- not only the environmental -- the significance of the environmental effects, the -- or new information, new science about environmental effects and/or even -- we don't even know for sure whether the rule that they're currently working on will actually be in effect.

So it's possible that there may not be adequate regulations to deal with greenhouse gas emissions at that point that are you might say kind of out of sync with the -- the current situation.

So SEPA -- SEPA is there to address gaps, and we can tell you what the gaps are today, but we don't know for -- we can't -- it would be much more difficult and inaccurate for us to anticipate exactly what the gaps and existing regulations and environmental protection are six years from now.
So that's why we do -- when we have -- when we have an action to take, that's why we have to kind of recheck and rel ook and see if there's new information that -- that changes our analysis of environmental impacts and/or whether the changes that are being proposed by the proposal itself are creating a change in the environmental impacts.

Was that helpful?

MR. DENGEL: Yes. Thank you very much.

MS. MCGAFFEY: Excuse me, Chair Drew, this is Karen McGaffey. May I address the Council?

CHAIR DREW: At this point, we're having a Council discussion, so I think that we will continue with that. Thank you.

So, Councilmembers, are there other questions about either the SEPA review or the recommendation?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Chair Drew, this is Councilmember Livingston. I have a question.

CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I just -- so I understand the procedural differences between Council approving an extension in the near-term, before February 21, and -- versus allowing the expiration of that current SCA for the sites 3 and 4 and for a later date for the Grays
Harbor to come back for an amendment, and can we kind
of -- I just want to understand what procedures they'll
have to follow to ask for that amendment later on.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Either Ms. Bumpus or Mr. Thompson?

MS. BUMPUS: This is Sonia Bumpus. So Jon
Thompson may want to weigh in, but I'll just go ahead.

So if the -- if the SCA expires as it's -- as it's
scheduled to do next year in twenty -- February 2021,
I -- my understanding is that Grays Harbor could come
back with another amendment request to the Council
similar to how the original amendment request was -- was
pursued when Units 3 and 4 were sited by the Council in
2010. So I -- I think that that's one way that they may
proceed.

Jon, did you want to add anything to that?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I think that captures it.

I mean, there -- the -- there is a provision in the
existing SCA Amendment No. 5 that describes what the --
the certificate holder has to do if they have not
commenced construction within five years of execution of
the -- of the SCA, which -- so I guess that would have
been, well, about five years ago now.

Anyway, it provides that the applicant has
to provide additional information about changed
regulatory conditions, you know, other -- other changes
and to -- to propose any amendments to the SCA that are
needed to address those.

So it's -- but it seems to envision a
presumption of, you know, that siting is allowed and is
just a matter of updating with new information and
potentially new regulatory information. But so that's
if -- if the extension is granted. Presumably it would
still be under that -- under that framework.

But if a -- if the SCA is allowed to expire
under its own terms, then presumably there would be
something that looks more like an original application
for site certification. And in that case, it would be
much clearer that -- that the Council has the authority
to evaluate the request anew and to balance the
considerations of need for the facility against the --
its environmental impacts at the site where it's
proposed to be constructed and the full SEPA review
could be conducted anew at that time.

So that's really the difference in a
nutshell about -- of -- of allowing an extension to the
current SCA versus allowing it to expire and then -- and
then if the need -- if need for the facility were to
arise, you know, in the next few years, then Grays
Harbor Energy could come back and -- and basically
start -- start from scratch as it were with a new request for amendment or application for certification.

CHAIR DREW: Mr. Livingston, does that answer your question?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, it does. Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: So following up on that, Mr. Thompson, as we review the SEPA documents, the SEPA is one part of the Council's decision, and actually the SEPA decision is made by the EFSEC manager and provided as information to the Council. But the other -- there are other parts of a decision that the Council has to weigh in either a new application or an amendment; is that correct?

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, correct. The SEPA, you know, is to inform the decision-makers, you know, in addition to the -- the considerations that the -- that the Council already take into account in -- in reviewing an application, yeah.

CHAIR DREW: And as you reviewed the decision by the Council in 2009, was there -- I think in the memo you may have -- have shared about -- or perhaps Ms. Bumpus did if I'm -- I'm trying to find the discussion that the Council had at the time about a construction window.

MR. THOMPSON: Right. So in the -- it was
actually 2011 that the -- that the Council finally -- or
the Council recommended approval and the governor
executed the SCA Amendment No. 5. But yeah, in the --
in the Council's recommendation to the governor in
explaining the ten-year expiration date and the -- and
the sort of five-year provisions, I'll just read the
quote. It said, (as read) They acknowledged that there
is a benefit to the public to have permitted facilities
ready to be constructed whenever it becomes known that
more generation capacity is needed. However, the
Council recognized that -- quoting now -- that an
unlimited build window for a proposed project is not
appropriate as over time technology or mitigation
measures presented in an application may no longer be
protective of environmental standards and conditions at
the time the facility is constructed. And that was in
Council Order No. 860, which was the recommendation to
the governor for approval of construction of Units 3 and
4.

So that was one consideration going to the
question of consistency with the original site
certification agreement. And then another issue is --
another kind of general issue is that at the time the
Council recommended approval of construction of Units 3
and 4, it considered need for the facilities as it had
done previously for Units 1 and 2 when those were approved. And so in other words, the -- the Council didn't just rely on the statutory statement that there's a need for abundant energy, but instead found -- found it necessary to determine that there was a need for the -- for the project, for the specific project in order to be able to balance that need against the -- the impacts from it.

So I think another -- there's another question of whether it's appropriate to -- to authorize an extension when there's not evidence of immediate -- immediate need since that was part of the consideration for the Council to have recommended approval in the first instance back in 2011.

So those are the couple of considerations that seemed to me were relevant to the question of whether the extension request was consistent with the intention of the original SCA.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Are there other questions from Councilmembers?

Okay. Hearing none, why don't we proceed and hear the discussion about the gas path for Units 1 and 2, and -- and then we'll have a conversation about if we might want to propose any actions today.
MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair Drew. So the installation of the Advanced Gas Path Package, or AGP, is an equipment and software improvement to combustion turbines 1 and 2, and it is expected to increase facility efficiency output.

So EFSEC Staff have looked at the four considerations under WAC 463-66-040, as I discussed in the presentation on Units 3 and 4, and what we've noted is that the facility would continue to operate with Units 1 and 2 to produce energy under its current SCA pursuant to the existing SCA terms and conditions.

The AGP involves minor changes to the operating facility, and none of these changes substantially alter the analysis of the significant impacts and alternatives in existing environmental documents that we have reviewed.

So we -- we did not identify any -- any new impacts or -- or new mitigation. The facility has an approved greenhouse gas mitigation plan that addresses mitigation of potential carbon dioxide emissions from the facility. And the facility's Prevention of Significant Deterioration, or PSD permit, is actually in the process of being updated to reflect the upgrades.

So for the Advanced Gas Path Package, Staff's recommendation to the Council is to approve the
request for the AGP package upgrade by resolution under WAC 463-66-070. Staff -- if the Council agrees with that recommendation, Staff could prepare a draft resolution for the Council's review and approval at a subsequent meeting.

CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions about that?

Okay. Hearing none, Councilmembers, I'd like to have a discussion about the recommendation to bifurcate the decision into two pieces. What are your thoughts about that?

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster, I am in favor of bifurcating the -- the two parts to this amendment. They seem different and I believe considering them separately would work for us.

CHAIR DREW: Mr. Thompson, do you think we need to have a motion on the floor for this?

MR. THOMPSON: I -- I don't -- I don't see it as a separate issue. I mean, I think you can just take separate actions with -- with respect to the different -- two different aspects of the request.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Other thoughts?

MR. DENGEL: Just to kind of jump onto the last comment there, I would note that it also seems, you
know, in addition to their nature, both of the
timeframes and the certainty of the different projects
going forward are -- are very different too. Just kind
of seems to lead me to the point of agreeing that the
projects would benefit from being bifurcated.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

So at this point, why don't we start with
the Advanced Gas Path. Is there a motion on that part
of the SCA to perhaps, let's see, direct the Staff to
draft a resolution for our next meeting approving that
part of the SCA, that part of the amendment?

MS. KELLY: Chair -- Chair Drew, this is
Kate Kelly. So I move that the Council request Staff to
prepare a resolution that would support amending the SCA
to allow for the Advanced Gas Path Package to become
part of the operations for the Units 1 and 2. I don't
know if I said that right, but...

CHAIR DREW: I think that works. Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Okay.

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, I'll second
the motion.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Discussion?

Okay. All those in favor, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIR DREW: Opposed? Motion carries.

So now is there -- let's -- let's discuss the extension of the construction window.

Councilmembers, is -- are there -- is there more information that you would like to have? Would you like to -- would you like to have a motion to accept -- to follow the recommendation of this -- not to follow the -- take the recommendation of the Staff and not allow the extension of the construction period, what -- what direction would you like to go on this?

MS. KELLY: So, Madame Chair, this is Kate Kelly. And first of all, I can -- I would like to just extend my appreciation to Staff and to Jon for providing us all the support during this process. I really appreciate the amount of information we've gotten in response to our questions just to help inform our decision on this.

The question I have at this point is not for more information, just what -- what does this look like? Are we asking for -- are we needing to do a resolution if we were going to accept Staff's recommendation? Is that -- is that a resolution to deny the request for -- how does that work? Or do we just not take action on it and it expires by its own terms?

CHAIR DREW: Mr. Thompson, can you help with
that?

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, certainly. My recommendation is that what you would do if you want to take Staff's recommendation is to -- and -- and Ms. Bumpus can -- can correct me if she sees this differently. But I think the way it goes to direct Staff to -- to prepare a resolution denying the request for an extension of the construction deadline. So yeah, I think you need to -- again, this goes back to the bifurcation and the need to memorialize, I think, in -- in different decisions, your decision with respect to the Advanced Gas Path for Units 1 and 2 and then -- and then another -- another decision memorialized in a different resolution that denies the request from Grays Harbor Energy for an extension of the SCA. That would be my recommendation.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

MS. BUMPUS: And this is Sonia Bumpus. I agree with Jon's recommendation.

MR. DENGEL: This is Rob Dengel. I'd like to make a motion. See if I get this right. So make a motion for Staff to prepare a resolution to the -- deny the Grays Harbor extension of -- of gen- -- construction on 3 and 4 without prejudice.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, I would second.

CHAIR DREW: Okay. Discussion?

I think the information that we have been provided, particularly in the context of the Council resolution and recommendation to the governor from -- from 2011 regarding unlimited construction windows, the fact that with a new SCA meet -- should be taken into consideration. It doesn't deny the ability for Grays Harbor Energy to come back when there is actually a project in the offing to bring that and -- with a site certification agreement amendment to the Council. But at that point in time, the Council would consider the need as well as any revised environmental regulations that would be enforced at the time.

So that is my comment on the subject. Are there other comments?

MS. BREWSTER: This is Stacey Brewster. I would like to agree with your comment. My concern is mostly with new rules that are being developed at this time, and I think the ability to consider it when a project is imminent is more important.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Okay. At this point, all those in favor of the motion to direct Staff to draft a resolution denying the extension of the construction period for Units 3 and
4, please say "aye."

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR DREW: Opposed? Motion carries.

Thank you all. And thank you, yes, to Staff

and to our certificate holder for all the work done on

this -- this project on this amendment.

Okay. Moving on in our facility updates.

Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project?

MR. MELBARDIS: Good afternoon, Chair Drew,

EFSEC Council, and Staff. This is Eric Melbardis with

EDP Renewables for the Kittitas Valley Wind Power

Project. We have nothing nonroutine to report for the

period.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Ms. Diaz, Wild Horse Wind Power Project?

MS. DIAZ: Yes, thank you, Chair Drew,

Councilmembers, and Staff. This is Jennifer Diaz

representing Puget Sound Energy for the Wild Horse Wind

Facility. I have no nonroutine updates for the month of

October.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Moving on to Chehalis Generation Facility,

Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair Drew,

Council, and Staff. This is Jeremy Smith, the
environmental analyst for the Chehalis Generation Facility. The Chehalis Facility does not have any nonroutine items to report for the month of October at this time.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Desert Claim Wind Power Project, Ms. Moon?

MS. MOON: Good afternoon, Council Chair Drew and Councilmembers. As Chair Drew said, this is Amy Moon providing an update for the Desert Claim Project. EFSEC Staff continue to coordinate with Desert Claim; however, there are no project updates at this time.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

Columbia Solar Project project update, Ms. Kidder?

MS. KIDDER: Thank you, Chair Drew. Good afternoon, Chair and Councilmembers. For the record, my name is Ami Kidder. The certificate holder continues to update EFSEC Staff on their preconstruction activity. We have no further project updates at this time.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

WNP-1/4 and also Columbia Generating Station, Mr. Whitehead? Or Ms. Moon?

MS. MOON: Okay. I believe that there was nothing nonroutine to report and they -- Columbia
Generating Station continues to address the COVID
response by having nonessential employees work away from
the office. That's about it. Thank you.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

With no other business to come before us at
this point in time, the meeting's adjourned. Thank you
very much.

MS. MOON: Oh, Council Chair Drew. So for
WNP-1/4.

CHAIR DREW: Yes.

MS. MOON: That also gets reported by Kip
Whitehead, there's also no nonroutine items to report
for that.

CHAIR DREW: Thank you for that.

MS. MOON: You're welcome.

CHAIR DREW: Now our meeting is adjourned.

Thank you all.

(Adjourned at 2:16 p.m.)
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