WASHINGTON STATE
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
Lacey, Washington
Monday, September 27, 2021
5:00 p.m.

Videoconference EFSEC Goose Prairie Photovoltaic Project
Public Comment Meeting
Verbatim Transcript of Proceedings

(All participants appeared virtually.)
Appealances

Council Members:

Kathleen Drew, Chair
Kate Kelly, Department of Commerce
Mike Livingston, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Lenny Young, Department of Natural Resources
Rob Dengel, Department of Ecology
Stacey Brewster, Utilities and Transportation Commission

UTC Staff:

Kyle Overton
Andrea Grantham

Local Government and Optional State Agencies:

William Sauriol, Department of Transportation
Byron Gumz, Yakima County

EFSEC Staff:

Joan Owens
Sonia Bumpus

Also present:

Blake Bjornson, OneEnergy
Timothy McMahen, Stoel Rives
Bill Sherman, AGO for the Environment
Ed Lisowski
Stewart Henderson
Tom Sieh
Kayne Segura
Shannon Turner
Linnea Fossum
Mark Scanlan
Richard Stetler
Julian Ellison
Jessica Wadsworth
Jason Earles
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2021

5:00 P.M.

-000-

MS. DREW: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Kathleen Drew, Chair of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, and we begin our public informational meeting -- public -- excuse me, our public comment meeting on the Goose Prairie Solar Photovoltaic Project. And the proposed project location is in Yakima County near the city of Moxee and will have a maximum generating capacity of 80 megawatts.

If you are on the phone, would you please mute your phones unless you were going to speak, since it is giving us a little feedback.

So this comment meeting is in order to receive verbal comments on conditions to be included in a draft Site Certification Agreement for the proposed project, and we will begin with calling the roll for the EFSEC Council.

Ms. Owens, will you call the roll.

MS. OWENS: Department of Commerce.

MS. KELLY: Kate Kelly, present.

MS. OWENS: Department of Ecology.

Department of Fish and Wildlife.

MS. DREW: Excused.
MS. OWENS: Thank you. Department of Fish and Wildlife -- sorry.

Department of Natural Resources.

MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

MS. OWENS: Utilities and Transportation Commission.

MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.

MS. OWENS: For the Goose Prairie Project, Department of Transportation.

MR. SAURIOL: Bill Sauriol, present.

MS. OWENS: Thank you. Chair, there is a quorum for the Council.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

MS. OWENS: And for Council staff, Sonia Bumpus.

MS. DREW: Here is Mr. Dengel. Thank you.

MS. OWENS: For Council staff, Sonya Bumpus.

MS. BUMPUS: Sonya Bumpus is present.

MS. OWENS: Kyle Overton.

MR. OVERTON: Kyle Overton here.

MS. OWENS: Thank you.

MS. DREW: We also have joining us counsel for the environment.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Drew. Bill Sherman for the Attorney General's Office as counsel for
MS. DREW: Thank you. Our agenda tonight is -- if you have the screen in front of you, is on the screen. And we will start with the EFSEC staff with an explanation of the review process and then we will go on to a presentation by OneEnergy Renewables and then we will have public comments.

We do have five people signed up to comment at this point in time. And we will allow 3 minutes a piece, and then we will move on to people who haven't signed in who maybe want to make a comment at that point.

So we will begin with Mr. Kyle Overton.

MR. OVERTON: Yes. Thank you.

This is Kyle Overton, the EFSEC site specialist that is working with the Goose Prairie project. I'll be providing a brief talk here, as Chair Drew said, kind of go over the history of our review here and our process and a little bit of why we're meeting here tonight.

EFSEC reviews applications for the siting of energy facilities and prepares a recommendation to the governor on whether to approve or reject the application.

If EFSEC recommends approval, it prepares a
draft site certification agreement, or SCA, that must include conditions to protect state or local governmental or community interests affected by the construction or operation of the energy facility.

The draft agreement must also include conditions designed to recognize the purpose of applicable state and local laws and ordinances which are preempted to the extent that they regulate the location, construction, and operation of energy facilities under EFSEC's jurisdiction. If signed by the governor and the applicant, the site certification agreement is binding.

So the applicant requested that EFSEC review its application for site certification, or ASC, under expedited processing. And if that expedited processing is granted, EFSEC does not conduct an adjudicated hearing on the application before preparing its recommendation to the Governor.

To be eligible for expedited processing the environmental impacts of the proposed energy facility must not be significant or must be mitigated to a nonsignificant level and must also be found consistent and in compliance with local land use plans and zoning ordinances.

Under WAC 463, and that is 26-090, the applicant provided a certification letter from Yakima
County which certified that the project: (A) is defined as a power-generating facility under Yakima County Code, Title 19, the Unified Land Development Code; (B) is proposed to be within the agricultural zoning district within which power-generating facilities are a Type 3 use pursuant to Table 19.14-1 allowable land uses; and (C) is consistent with Title 19 and would be eligible for review and permitting under Yakima County processes.

Yakima County Code, Title 19.14.010(2) states: Type 3 uses are uses which may be authorized subject to the approval of the conditional use permit as set forth in Section 19.30.030. Type 3 conditional uses are not generally appropriate through the zoning district. Type 3 uses require hearings and review of applications subject to a Type 3 review and under procedures in 19.30.100 and Yakima County subsection 16B.03.030(1)(c).

So in review of the expedited processing application, EFSEC issued a mitigated determination of nonsignificance under the State Environmental Policy Act on July 30th, 2021. Based on this determination and on EFSEC's finding that the project is consistent and in compliance with local land use plans and zoning ordinances, EFSEC granted the applicant's request for expedited processing on August 6th, 2021, with
Order 879.

However, EFSEC stipulated it would hold a hearing akin to the County's conditional use permit hearing to receive comment on whether any additional conditions should be required to meet the purposes of Yakima County's conditional use criteria.

During EFSEC's staff's review of the application for site certification, EFSEC contracted with Yakima County to conduct a review of the ASC materials, as they relate to Yakima County land use plans and development ordinances.

The Yakima County Planning Division reviewed OneEnergy's ASC, including the land use consistency analysis mentioned earlier in regard to the land use provided by OneEnergy, and their Attachment A to its application for site certification. And provided EFSEC with a review summary. That summary, which is dated March 15th, 2021, and is posted on our website, identified the additional requirements Yakima County staff would recommend be imposed upon the project if the project were to go through the County's conditional use permit process.

These items were: One, a statement that the project is within the agricultural zoning district; that Yakima County is a right to farm county, codified in the
Yakima County Code 6.22, declaring that a farm or farm operation shall not be found to be a public or private nuisance if the farm operation existed before the change in land use or occupancy by an adjacent land use, and that the project may be subject to impacts, such as dust from surrounding areas; and the second condition was the source of water for Washington solar panels shall have a legal and physical availability of water; and, three, the habitat management and mitigation plans shall be implemented prior to development of the site.

EFSEC staff are currently drafting a site certification agreement that, if approved, would require OneEnergy to adhere to all the commitments made in the revised ASC and associated documents and to all identified mitigation measures in the revised MDNS mentioned previously.

The MDNS includes 19 mitigation measures to address potential impacts related to wind erosion, wildlife habitat, water needs, noise and visual impacts, any cultural and archeological resources.

The additional recommendations recommended by the County Planning Division in the review summary will be implemented via commitments made in the revised ASC, mitigation measures identified in the revised MDNS or be incorporated in the draft SCA, if it's approved.
Specifically, areas where the County's recommendations in their review summary are currently being addressed.

EFSEC staff plans to include an acknowledgement of Item 1 in the draft SCA that we plan to present to the Council for its consideration at that -- potentially, yeah, present to the Council for its consideration.

Item 2 is currently addressed in mitigation Item 4 in the revised MDNS. This mitigation item calls for a certification of water availability for the construction operational needs by EFSEC prior to approval for construction.

And Item 3 is currently addressed in Sections 2.8.5, 2.8.6, and 4.9.D in the revised ASC. These sections require the revised -- these sections of the revised ASC require that the habitat management and mitigation plans are approved by EFSEC prior to authorizing the start of construction.

The County's review summary also recommends in the body of the document the creation of a dust control plan. Additionally, a recommendation is made that consultation with the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation, or DAHP, and the Yakima Nation on cultural resources plans and permits be required.

The applicant has committed to working with
EFSEC and Yakima County officials to ensure all construction and grating activities meet standards for sediment and erosion control. And part of this commitment will entail the development of a sediment and erosion control plan which will be -- which will require approval by EFSEC prior to construction and that commitment is made in their ASC.

Additionally, in the -- in their ASC, the applications also commit to consulting with DAHP and affected tribes regarding cultural resource management, and there's further impositions on that consultation in Mitigation Items 18 and 19.

So the public comment period, which started September 13th and concludes today, September 27th, and this meeting are being held to fulfill that requirement in Order 879 to obtain public comment on conditional use criteria.

When considering conditional use criteria, Yakima County Code 19.30.100(2) allows a hearings examiner to impose additional requirements as conditions of approval of a Type 3 conditional use to: (A) comply with the development standard or criteria for approval set forth in the Yakima County code; (B) mitigation material impacts of the development; (C) ensure capability of the development with existing neighboring
land uses and ensure consistency with the intent and
classification of the zoning district involved; and (D)
ensure that the certificates — the structures and areas
proposed are surfaced, arranged, and screened in such a
manner that they are compatible with and not detrimental
to existing or reasonable expected future development of
the neighborhood or resource uses consist with
the comprehensive plan; and (E) achieve and further the
intent, goals, objectives, and policies of the
comprehensive plan and this title, Title 19.

Any comments received during this period and
this meeting will be taken into consideration when
proceeding with EFSEC's review of the ASC and
development of the recommendation of the governor under
WAC 463-43, and at the end of this presentation -- the
presentations by myself and the applicant tonight, the
members of the public who wish to speak may make
comment.

Are there any questions? That was a lot of
info —

MS. DREW: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Overton.
The court reporter has asked if you can
provide your written comments as well.
And this I will say to the speakers
continuing on tonight, if we can speak just a little bit
more slowly so she can catch it for the transcripts, that would be terrific.

MR. OVERTON: Yes, my apologies. I will get that to her.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Are there questions from Council members?

Okay. Thank you for that explanation of the project and its review to date.

We will now move on to OneEnergy solar presentation.

And Mr. Bjornsen, I would ask you to introduce yourself and I think Mr. McMahan, who are the speakers tonight.

MR. BJORNSEN: Yes. Thank you.

Can you see and hear me.

MS. DREW: I can.

MR. BJORNSEN: Great. And also can you see my screen with the outline?

MS. DREW: Yes.

MR. BJORNSEN: Awesome. Okay. Good evening, Chair Drew, EFSEC Council, and members of the public. Glad to be here. My name is Blake Bjornsen. I'm an Associate Director with OneEnergy. And as Chair Drew mentioned, we have Tim McMahan here as well who is from Stoel Rives and is representing the project.
So tonight I'm just going to do a very quick background on OneEnergy and the project. As I know, you know, many have learned about the project before. I'm going to hand it over to Tim to discuss conditional use consistency and then I'll wrap it up with a quick note on project status.

So just a quick note about OneEnergy. We are headquartered here in the state of Washington. We have had success developing projects throughout the west and throughout the country now. We're about -- we're just over 10 years old as a company. And this project that we're talking about today, Goose Prairie, being in the state of Washington is one that we, as a team, are very excited about being in our home state here.

I want to touch just two slides on why -- why solar is a great -- great for the state of Washington and also for the local area.

Starting with the state of Washington, of course, we all know about the Clean Energy Transformation Act, CETA, 100 percent greenhouse gas neutral electricity supply by 2030, 100 percent clean energy by 2045. This project is -- is one that will help the State achieve that goal.

And, you know, I just wanted to highlight in the recent -- recently released 2021 Energy Strategy
document that was released by the Department of Commerce states that significant quantities of new clean energy generation be required to meet the future energy requirements of Washington's businesses and households.

And, again, just want to highlight that this is a project that will help the State meet those goals.

It's also great because it's compatible with agriculture. This is going to provide supplemental income to our land owners that are -- that desire this project to be on their properties. There's no impact on common local farming practices. It's a nonpermanent use. We can restore the land at the end of the project life so that it can be returned to agricultural use.

And just a last note, just, you know, solar in general, not an intensive use of water; no fuel price risk. Once we have the project built, the sun does the rest for us for free.

Talking a little bit more specifically about the area. We think about some of the benefits in these four categories. Of course, we have property taxes -- taxes in general, property taxes being the main one through the life of the project, there's also sales taxes and -- and so throughout the life of the project that funding will provide, you know, really important funding for the county, for Yakima County.
Recurring annual expenditures in the form of lease payments to the land owners each year and also the operations and maintenance that goes on through the project.

Local spending -- start with jobs and labor. We -- we estimate that there will be up to 300 jobs during the construction phase of the project and some -- some of the local spending, both direct and indirect, that will happen with that construction in terms of, you know, any purchasing of -- of products whether that be -- sorry, gas -- gas stations and equipment rentals and hardware stores, building suppliers, all those type of things that see some indirect spending.

Okay. Just to talk a little bit about project in particular. This is a photo of the site. You can actually see the Bonneville Power Administration line on the right there that we'll be connecting to. So this is a panorama from one of the corners of the project site.

Some of you saw this slide before. This is some of the stakeholders that we've engaged with through the development of this project since 2017. Kyle just mentioned a lot of the information that relates to some of these groups that we've developed over the last four years, and we look forward to continuing to work with
them as we get into construction and operation.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this. This is the preliminary site plan just to kind of -- just as a reminder for folks. And this layout does incorporate all of the applicable elements of the Yakima County plan; some of which we're discussing tonight in terms of land use consistency and things like that. So offsets from property boundaries, distance from the streams, all those types of things have been incorporated. And as we get into a little bit more, we provided an attachment that goes line by line through that Yakima County code to show how we're complying with that.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Tim to talk about Yakima County CUP code consistency.

MR. MCMANAN: Thank you, Blake.

Chair Drew, Members of the Council, thank you for being here this evening. Blake and I are really excited about the stage of this project and kind of getting to this point.

Can you hear me and see me okay?

All right. I'm going to go through a few slides. I'm going to do them relatively quickly. And the reason that I think we can do this relatively quickly is, as Kyle indicated and Blake also punctuated,
we have filed a very detained analysis of compliance
with the local condition of use permit code for Yakima
County. And the County as a contractor to EFSEC and
EFSEC staff walked through that submittal, our
application for site certification -- I better slow
down. Okay. I'm going to slow down. I looked at that
frown from the Chair.

We walked through the code quite -- quite
deeply, and the County took our evaluation and --
and did a review to ensure that we had addressed the
code as concisely and appropriately as we could, and the
County did make that recommendation to the Council as a
contractor to EFSEC. So I hope that's clear.

I do want to punctuate something that Blake
said. And that is really the importance of EFSEC's
involvement in these proceedings and the implementation
of CETA.

In the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy
Terminal Project, this is language that you have in
front of you that we lifted from the report to the
governor recommending denial of that project for its
failure to implement some very key goals and policies
and objectives here, which EFSEC has adopted in order to
implement state policy and laws. And so I think it is
important really at every turn to remember that this is
a very important guiding objective of the siting Council as we consider these projects, which are of great importance to the state of Washington in our view.

Next slide, Blake.

As I indicated, the application for site certification and the Yakima County March 11th submittal, the reports to the Council does walk through these criteria in great detail. And so we've submitted Attachment A, which is in the large notebooks, and again, you have in front of you, hopefully, or Council staff can provide you Yakima County's review of our Attachment A land use in that March 15th letter.

Next slide.

All right. Just, really, a few of the key criteria here that is evaluated through the conditional use permit process and would be evaluated if we were planning locally for these permits.

Conditional use permits are intended to allow the approval of permitable uses through the implementation of conditions that mitigate the impacts of those uses. That's fundamentally what CUPs are about and how they are generally implemented at the local level.

One of the key questions and issues that are -- that is asked in the -- in the conditional use
permit processes at the local level is whether there is any impact to or would require the need for extension of utility services or other urban services of the kind that one -- one would usually expect with a significant amount of development of rural residential or just residential areas outside of -- of urban growth areas.

Solar facilities do not and this project in particular does not require the extension of urban utility or other urban services. Does not require the extension of water, wastewater, and it is, therefore, benign in terms of fiscal impacts on the county to implement a use that has, again, a very high value in implementing state policy.

So that is really a key concern in the CUP process that is not a problem for this facility as a solar facility.

Touching on what Blake indicated, this project will provide a new clean renewable energy source supporting Washington policy. The project supports the community's present and future needs for sustainable energy generation and allows for short- and long-term economic impacts, including a peak level of around 300 or so workers during the construction process. Those are family-wage jobs that this project provides during the construction phase.
Next slide, Blake.

This is really, I think, the key thing I want to expand a bit on. The key requirement in a local conditional use permit review and local hearing is to demonstrate whether or not a project is compatible with or would any way undermine existing here agricultural uses.

So compatibility. The compatibility test is a very fundamental requirement for the issuance of conditional use permits. And when we talk about compatibility, it is with the existing active agricultural activities in the rural area. This project would not in any way impair or be incompatible with ongoing farming on the surrounding properties and surrounding sites; in fact, it provides some additional financial incentives and abilities for agricultural land owners to continue agricultural operations with a new, fresh steady stream of income provided by this project.

So the use is consistent with the agricultural zoning district. That is the most important factor. There will not be disruption of those uses.

The County has -- as Blake indicated and as Kyle indicated, the County has chosen to allow renewable energy generation as a conditional use. The lands here
generally meet the criteria, particularly the County
code does allow for pockets, quote/unquote, of
nonagricultural land uses. And we consider this use to
be pursuant to that code provision -- or excuse me, the
comprehensive plan provision. And the application
evaluates in detail compatibility and analyzes any
disruption of existing agricultural uses. And really, I
think what that boils down to is at least several key
things, which is this project will not increase any
costs of farming activities.

The project will not interfere with any
agricultural practices, things like impairing
farm-to-market transportation. Especially during
harvest season, this project will not interfere with
those uses. This project will not force conversions of
agricultural uses to other uses. We find conversion,
you know, as a land use matter when, for example, a
significant amount of residential development shows up
in agricultural areas and starts pressuring agricultural
uses to abandon those uses because it is just too
difficult to continue farming sometimes. So that's kind
of a key concept involved in that factor.

Thank you, Blake. Yeah, you were right to
hit that one.

Again, we have concurrence with the County.
This provision -- 19.30.100 -- is kind of the end of the County's conditional use code and authorizes and directs conditions of approval for Type 3 applications. And we -- OneEnergy, I should say, does concur with conditions that have been recommended by Yakima County. And we're certainly interested in making sure this project does in -- you know, any other way reasonable provide for conditioning so that there are no detrimental or deleterious consequences of the project that would undermine existing rural land uses.

So just walking through these very quickly, the project that the counsel has authorized to provide mitigation measures under the code. And I've got kind of A through E here, as they are set up by the code. Compliance with any development standard or criteria set forth in the development code. Again, all the development standards are specifically addressed in the application for site certification with concurrence of Yakima County. Secondly, mitigating material impacts of the development, whether environmental or otherwise. The development standards are specifically addressed in the ASC. And as the Council is well aware, and as Kyle mentioned, the Council has issued a SEPA determination of nonsignificance responding with
mitigation measures that are, again, very much echoing Yakima County's concerns and requests to the siting council.

Next, as a conditionally allowed use, the County allows solar energy facilities in agricultural areas. Compatibility measures are, again, addressed in detail in the ASC. And the Council does, of course, retain and possess authority under these provisions and under its own statute to address impacts on surrounding agricultural land uses to the extent those impacts exist.

The neighborhood in the context of subsection D is dominated by agricultural land uses and future development is limited by the uses allowed in the zoning code. So this project is not expected, again, to interfere with existing or future agricultural practices. And, again -- I'll say it again, Yakima County does concur with that finding.

And finally the project achieves and furthers intents, goals, objectives and policies of the plan, the comprehensive plan in the UDC, and we've chosen not to spend many, many, many minutes summarizing all those provisions because they are found in the document itself, in the ASC document itself.

So I will be very happy to answer any
questions that you might have at the end of the presentation. And I'm going to hand this back to Blake.

MR. BJORNSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Tim.
Okay. Yeah. I'm going to close up with one final note on the project status and just focus on the final two here.

I think when we spoke last to the EFSEC Council in March, at that time we were in negotiations on -- on energy sales and just wanted to -- cannot speak to any of the specifics, but we are moving closer and closer to finalizing that and also look forward to this EFSEC process wrapping up, hopefully, by the end of the year is what I think we're looking at here based on -- I know we discussed during the last EFSEC meeting the extension of the recommendation to the Governor to October 31st; so looking forward to the next month and a half of working through that and then finalizing that at the end of the year.

So with that, I think I have on here questions and discussion, but I think we're actually going to turn back to Kyle and then go from there after that. So thank you for listening.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Mr. Overton, you have something further?

MR. OVERTON: This is Kyle Overton, Counsel
Specialist. I do not. I believe the agenda got changed a little bit, so I had the one presentation.

MS. DREW: Okay. Thank you.

Are there any questions from Council Members?

Hearing none, we'll proceed to the comment period.

I had an echo. There.

Okay. Ms. Owens, will you call the first couple of speakers' names so they know that they are up next.

MS. OWENS: Yes. So apologies in advance if I mispronounce anything.

We currently have five speakers, and I will call the first three so that they know who they are. Kayne Segura, Gunther Liddell, and Jessica Bosse Wadsworth.

So if we could please start with Kayne Segura.

MS. DREW: You have three minutes as soon as you begin.

MR. SEGURA: I am here.

Thank you, Chair Drew and the entire Council.

Can everybody hear me okay? All right.
MS. DREW: Yes, I can.

MR. SEGURA: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak to you all this evening. My name is Kayne Segura and I am the business manager of Labor Local 348 in Richland. I represent over a thousand hardworking men and women in the Central Washington area, including Yakima County.

I am here this evening on behalf of the membership, their families, and the potential jobs available for this project. I can't discuss this project without discussing the importance of local hire and ability trades. We look forward to seeing how OneEnergy and whoever constructs the project plans to utilize local hire and the requirements under CETA standards for the Goose Prairie Solar Project.

Our members are trained and skilled not only in heavy highway construction and building construction, but also in all renewable energy construction as well. And we have worked on numerous projects throughout the Central Washington area where we have provided skilled, trained, and reliable workers to do the job from start to finish, and we look forward to the opportunity to continue building these projects for the community. For these reasons and more, we thank you for your time.

Thank you.
MS. DREW: Thank you very much.

Gunther Liddell.

MR. LIDDELL: Good evening, Councilmen or women. I would just like to say I support this project a hundred percent. I've been a laborer with the Local 348 for 25 years. And I've worked in -- I believe in all the above energy policies that rely on a mix of fuel to create good jobs and to ensure that our nation has abundant, affordable energy now and in the future. I would just like to say I think this is a great project for the community, for all the jobs and for the money going back into the community from these jobs. Thank you very much. Have a great night.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Jessica Bosse Wadsworth.

MS. BOSSE WADSWORTH: Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak to you. My name is Jessica Bosse Wadsworth, and I live in Benton City. I joined the Laborers Union Leadership Program in 2007. This has given me a lifelong career making family-wage income. I know brothers and sisters that have personally benefitted from green energy construction projects. We are experienced construction craft laborers. We build roads, bridges, tunnels, transit, water, and energy systems. Our members rely on a diverse set of skills
performed on a variety of different jobs. I fully
support this project. Thank you so much.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Ms. Owens.

MS. OWENS: We have two left on the list at
this point, they are Rich Stetler and Aubrey Newton.

So Rich Stetler.

MR. STETLER: Can you hear me?

MS. DREW: Yes, I can.

MR. STETLER: Hi. My name is Richard
Stetler, and I'm also a member of LIUNA and resident of
Yakima. I just wanted to say that -- excuse me. I just
wanted to say that the members valued good energy jobs
because they offer family-supporting careers and
straighten our country. Thank you.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Our last speaker, Aubrey Newton.

MS. NEWTON: Good afternoon. And thank you,
Chair Drew.

Can everybody hear me okay.

MS. DREW: We can. Thank you.

MS. NEWTON: As reference, my name is Aubrey
Newton. I work with the Laborers out of the regional
office. And I am from the Central Washington area, born
and raised. I am here this evening to speak on behalf

As a few of my former colleagues have referenced, the Laborers' International Union of North America performs on renewable energy projects throughout not only our northwest region but right here in the Central Washington area.

These scopes that we work from start to finish on these projects can be referenced on any letter of assignment, any project labor agreement, community benefits agreement, memorandum of understanding, or similar agreements with the local laborers' union and the general contractor that would be working on this project.

I'm here speaking on behalf of the members, as my colleagues also mentioned. And again just wanting to reference and appreciate the time that OneEnergy has taken to speak with us at this moment in time, and we look forward to the continued work that they will be doing to put forth this project in front of the community.

The members, as referenced, that we work with are trained, skilled, and qualified workers ready to work on these projects. We have a robust recruitment system that reaches statewide and focuses on good-paying
jobs for our members. LIUNA works with its employers to make sure that the workers on the job are skilled/trained/reliable; we get the job done ahead of schedule and go home safely at the end of the day. It is for these reasons and many more that we support this project. Thank you for your time this evening.

MS. DREW: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak during this public comment period?

Again, is there anyone else who would like to speak during this public comment meeting? It looks like someone is trying to speak. I see -- can you see that, Ms. Owens?

MS. OWENS: Somebody just might have their microphone on.

MS. DREW: Okay. And I will ask for a final time. Is there anyone else who would like to speak at this public comment meeting?

If you would like to submit a written comment -- is our comment database going to remain open, Ms. Owens?

MS. OWENS: I believe it closes at seven o'clock tonight.

MS. DREW: Okay. So you have until seven o'clock tonight to submit a written comment to
Final call. Is there anyone else who would like to make a verbal comment at this meeting?

Okay. Thank you all for joining us this evening. Thank you for your comments and presentations. And this meeting and public comment meeting is now adjourned. Good night.

(Hearing adjourned at 5:41 p.m.)
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