



ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions
Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

Transcript of Proceedings

July 13, 2023

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council v.

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lrf, mdb accessed via *paperclip* icon

1 ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

2
3 Desert Claim Wind Project
4 Request to Amend Site Certification Agreements
5 Informational Public Meeting
6

7
8 July 13, 2023
9

10
11
12 Via Teams Video Conferencing
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Reported by: STEVEN B. CRANDALL, CER
25 Certified Electronic Reporter #1198

1 (Meeting called to order at 5:00 p.m.)

2
3 CHAIR DREW: Good evening. This is
4 Kathleen Drew, chair of the Washington Energy Facility
5 Site Evaluation Council, calling this meeting to order.
6 This is the informational public meeting pursuant to
7 Washington Administrative Code 463-66-030 regarding the
8 Desert Claim Wind Power Project and their amendment
9 request. We will hear from the certificate holder and
10 EFSEC staff about the process and then we will move to
11 any public comments.

12 Ms. Grantham, will you call the role?

13 STAFF GRANTHAM: Certainly. Department of
14 Commerce.

15 KATE KELLY: Kate Kelley, present.

16 STAFF GRANTHAM: Department of Ecology.

17 ELI LEVITT: Eli Levitt, present.

18 STAFF GRANTHAM: Department of Fish and
19 Wildlife.

20 (No response.)

21 Department of Natural Resources.

22 LENNY YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

23 STAFF GRANTHAM: Utilities and
24 Transportation Commission.

25 STACEY BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster,

1 present.

2 STAFF GRANTHAM: Assistant Attorney

3 Generals. Jenna Slocum.

4 (No response.)

5 John Thompson.

6 JON THOMPSON: Jon Thompson is present.

7 STAFF GRANTHAM: Administrative Law Judge,

8 Dan Gerard.

9 JUDGE GERARD: Present.

10 STAFF GRANTHAM: For council staff, Sonia

11 Bumpus.

12 (No response.)

13 Ami Hafkemeyer.

14 AMI HAFKEMEYER: Present.

15 STAFF GRANTHAM: Amy Moon.

16 AMY MOON: Amy Moon, present.

17 STAFF GRANTHAM: Stew Henderson.

18 (No response.)

19 Joan Owens.

20 JOAN OWENS: Present.

21 STAFF GRANTHAM: Dave Walker.

22 (No response.)

23 Sonja Skavland.

24 SONJA SKAVLAND: Present.

25 STAFF GRANTHAM: Lisa Masengale.

1 (No response.)
2 Sara Randolph.
3 (No response.)
4 Sean Greene.
5 (No response.)
6 Lance Caputo.
7 (No response.)
8 John Barnes.
9 JOHN BARNES: Present.
10 STAFF GRANTHAM: Osta Davis.
11 OSTA DAVIS: Present.
12 STAFF GRANTHAM: Joanne Snarski.
13 (No response.)
14 STAFF GRANTHAM: Alex Shiley.
15 ALEX SHILEY: Present.
16 STAFF GRANTHAM: Ali Smith.
17 (No response.)
18 And Karl Holappa.
19 KARL HOLAPPA: Present.
20 STAFF GRANTHAM: And do we have anyone for
21 the Counsel for the Environment present?
22 BILL SHERMAN: Bill Sherman from the
23 Counsel for the Environment.
24 STAFF GRANTHAM: Thank you, Bill. Chair,
25 there is a quorum.

1 DAVE WALKER: And Andrea, this is Dave
2 Walker. I am present. I couldn't get off mute.
3 Apologies.

4 STAFF GRANTHAM: Thank you, Dave. No
5 worries.

6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. So with that, we
7 have the agenda in front of us and we will move on now
8 to the certificate holder presentation. Go ahead.

9 RICK MILLER: Okay. Thank you very much,
10 Kathleen. Good evening, chair, council members, EFSEC
11 staff, members of the public, other members who just
12 said they were present. Thank you for all taking the
13 time to attend this public meeting for the Desert Claim
14 Wind Project. We greatly appreciate everyone's time on
15 this matter. We'd like to briefly describe, for those
16 of you that are not familiar with the project, a little
17 bit about it so that you could become more familiar with
18 it and we can explain the rationale and basis for our
19 request for an additional extension of time to complete
20 the construction of the proposed project.

21 So, let me start by saying first, my name is
22 Rick Miller. I am a senior development director at a
23 company called EDF Renewables. We have been the owner
24 and developer of the Desert Claim Wind Project, LLC
25 project for several years, quite a long time, actually.

1 And it's been our pleasure to work with EFSEC staff in
2 the past and the local community in getting the most
3 recent SCA approval completed. With me is my colleague,
4 Levi Cox. He is --

5 KAREN MCGAFFEY: Why don't we advance the
6 slide. I think you're going to have to tell them, Rick.

7 RICK MILLER: Oh, gotcha. Sorry. Thank
8 you, Karen. Levi Cox, thank you, is a project
9 developer. He's relatively new to the Desert Claim
10 Project, like some of the EFSEC members, so we're all on
11 the same boat. Levi is an experienced developer and he
12 is well versed in projects that have complicated
13 permitting approvals and mitigation plans. He's most
14 famously done several very large BLM projects in
15 southern California and Riverside County that are our
16 solar PV. And he has some experience in wind as well.
17 We've been working together for almost 15 years.

18 So, I wanted to take this opportunity to
19 introduce Levi Cox to the EFSEC members and the members
20 of the public as he will likely become the lead
21 developer for the project moving forward. And then,
22 Karen McGaffey from Perkins Coie, who I think some of
23 you know. She's been helping EDF Renewables with this
24 project since its inception, a very long time. Helping
25 to keep us on the straight and narrow and always

1 appreciate her counsel.

2 And so, I'm going to run through some of the
3 project and then Karen can run through some of the SCA
4 amendment requests and then we can answer any questions
5 you might have.

6 Could you advance to the next slide, please.

7 So this is simply a project location map. The
8 project is in Kittitas County in central Washington.
9 It's shown here on the map. The project has a maximum
10 generating capacity of one hundred megawatts.

11 If we could turn to the next slide, please.

12 And I just want to say, if anyone has any
13 questions, I don't mind taking questions as I go.
14 Otherwise, I'm going to just run through the slides but
15 do not feel shy to raise your hand or ask me a question.
16 I'm happy to stop, and pause, if a question arises.
17 More specifically, this project is located approximately
18 eight miles north of the town of Ellensburg. The site
19 is outlined there in blue. You can see Ellensburg there
20 in the lower right hand corner. You see Interstate 90
21 running through on this map. You can see where Highway
22 97 runs north from I-90, just to the left of the project
23 for orientation.

24 Next slide, please.

25 So the project is on approximately 4,000 acres.

1 The land is described generally as agricultural land.
2 It's currently used for grazing, dry-land farming. The
3 entire project area is designated as rural in the
4 county's comprehensive plan and the individual parcels
5 that make up the project are zoned either agricultural
6 20 or forest and range. The site area is relatively
7 flat. It does rise gradually from the south to the
8 north, gaining approximately 400 feet in elevation from
9 front to back. There are six high-voltage transmission
10 lines that run across the project, BPA and Puget Sound
11 Energy lines. You sort of see them on the base map
12 here.

13 So as folks know, you know, renewable energy,
14 and wind specifically, is very site specific. This site
15 -- one of the reasons why it isn't built yet -- is it
16 suffers from relatively low wind resource. Not bad wind
17 resource, but relatively low. It's not a screaming net
18 capacity factor but it does have very close proximity to
19 transmission. And the project substation will be
20 located right under the PSE 230 kV line and we will line
21 cap and break that 230 kV line. So it does have
22 excellent transmission access.

23 On the next slide is simply a demonstration of
24 a possible turbine layout. You know, a 100 megawatt
25 project, the permit allows for up to 31 individual

1 units. We showed several different figures in the 2018
2 EFSEC permit application. This is one of the possible
3 configurations. Just, for what it's worth, each yellow
4 dot is a turbine pad tower and generating unit with road
5 and electrical collection being shown with the lines
6 connecting the different units together. And then
7 you'll see there's a project substation down there by
8 what's shown as B12.

9 On the next slide -- we can always go back to
10 anything if you want -- and the next slide is just to
11 give context for EFSEC members that are not familiar
12 with Desert Claim because it hasn't been heard by you
13 all in quite a while now. These are some of the other
14 projects that you might be familiar with that are in
15 close proximity to the project. Immediately in front of
16 the project, if you will, to the west is the Kittitas
17 Valley Wind Power Project and then a smaller Sauk Valley
18 Wind Project as well. And then, if you would, behind it
19 to the east is the Wild Horse Wind Facility owned and
20 operated by PSE. And then a little further back is the
21 Vantage Wind Project.

22 So barring any questions, we can flip to the
23 next slide. And this is when Karen gets to take it over
24 and give you a little bit about the EFSEC process.
25 Thanks again for your time and attention to the slides.

1 I'm happy to come back and answer any questions you
2 might have about the project.

3 KAREN MCGAFFEY: Okay. Thanks, Rick. And
4 thank you, council, staff, and members of the public. I
5 just want to give a little bit of context about the
6 EFSEC process that has occurred. As many of you
7 probably know, the Desert Claim Project has been on
8 EFSEC's roster of energy facilities for some time now.
9 EFSEC originally recommended approval of the project and
10 the governor executed the Site Certification Agreement
11 initially in 2010.

12 At that time, the company had proposed quite a
13 large project. It would have been more than 5,200
14 acres. It would've had almost a 100 turbines. And it
15 would've had a capacity of about 190 megawatts. As
16 you -- so that was kind of the initial plan. Then in
17 2018, the company came back to EFSEC with a redesign
18 project.

19 And Rick has kind of explained some of the
20 details of that project. It's smaller. It takes up
21 less area. It's only a third as many turbines with the
22 maximum of 31. And it's only about half the capacity
23 with a 100 megawatts.

24 Now, by reducing the size of the project, that
25 significantly reduced the environmental impacts

1 associated with the project. And it also allowed the
2 company to reduce the impacts on neighboring property
3 owners by moving the turbines further away from
4 neighboring residences.

5 So in 2018, when the company came to EFSEC with
6 this redesigned project, EFSEC did a pretty rigorous
7 review of that project. It started with the certificate
8 holder submitting new environmental studies on all of
9 the, sort of, different potential effects of the
10 project. EFSEC staff sent a series of information
11 requests to the applicant or to the certificate holder
12 which they then provided additional information about
13 the project.

14 Ultimately EFSEC developed a SEPA addendum
15 associated with the redesign project and, of course, the
16 council held hearings in the community. Back in the
17 days when we actually went to the community and were
18 able to meet in person. So it was a pretty robust
19 project, a pretty robust process in 2018, and that
20 resulted in amendment one to the Site Certification
21 Agreement.

22 So if we could go to the next slide, please.

23 Now, for those of you who are familiar with
24 EFSEC Site Certification Agreements for wind projects,
25 the Desert Claim SCA looks pretty familiar. It

1 incorporates the best practices for wind projects that
2 have been developed over time. It also incorporates
3 some agreements that were entered into with the Counsel
4 for the Environment and other stakeholders throughout
5 this process. So I think much of it will look familiar
6 to you. It has a lot of, kind of, the similar features.

7 For example, before the company can begin
8 construction of the project, it has to submit literally
9 dozens of plans to EFSEC for review, detailed review,
10 and approval. During construction, there are a lot of
11 different measures and requirements to minimize and
12 avoid environmental impacts and an environmental monitor
13 is required. During operations, there are also various
14 types of monitoring that were required. And there's a
15 technical advisory committee or TAC like you have with,
16 I believe, both The Kittitas Valley and Wild Horse
17 Projects. So a lot of these things that you see in the
18 Site Certification Agreement, I think, are very familiar
19 and are similar to what you've seen in other wind
20 project SCAs. What I want to assure you today is that
21 the company is not requesting any changes to any of
22 these provisions that were approved in 2018. What the
23 company is really just requesting is an extension in the
24 timeframe to complete construction of the project.

25 So if we can go to the next slide, I will pass

1 it back to Rick to explain a little bit more about why
2 you want the extension.

3 RICK MILLER: Right. Thank you, Karen.
4 So in the -- in the existing permit approval, we're
5 supposed to have construction substantially completed by
6 November of 2023. In anticipation of not starting
7 construction, we sent a letter on May 5th outlining a
8 request for a 5-year extension. And the purpose for
9 that, as Karen kind of alluded to, the project, we
10 believe, has a very high likelihood of still succeeding
11 and getting built.

12 What we're -- what we've been working on is a
13 long-term energy contract with an offtaker such as a
14 utility or a large C&I, commercial or industrial,
15 customer. That's typically what you see for a wind
16 project, a 15 or 20 year like power purchase agreement,
17 for instance. And we're still marketing the project and
18 attempting to secure that type of an agreement which
19 would allow us the financial surety to begin the
20 construction of the project, which is a relatively high
21 capital intensive endeavor.

22 We think the project has a high likelihood of
23 success. Maintaining the SCA and the EFSEC approval is
24 paramount to our ability to do that, though. And as
25 Karen said, we feel confident that the permit approval

1 and all the mitigation measures that were originally
2 required will be -- can and would be complied with when
3 we get the project off the ground.

4 You know, Washington state, I don't need to
5 tell you, you're all in the forefront of it, but it is
6 really leading the nation in the transition to a clean
7 and decarbonized energy generation system. We believe
8 Desert Claim Project can be a part of that future. We
9 know that Washington state specifically is looking, you
10 know, to almost -- they'll have almost double their
11 electricity demand by the year 2050. So we know that
12 the demand is there for a product like Desert Claim and
13 we think that this 100 megawatt wind product will fit
14 nicely into that energy mix for the state.

15 So it's our deep hope and desire that we can
16 answer any questions you have and we can seek this
17 5-year extension to the permit allowing us a nice runway
18 to continue to market the project, complete some of the
19 other outstanding development items, such as finalizing
20 and executing an interconnection agreement, which are
21 still being worked out, for instance. So, you know, the
22 development process is a long one but we are still
23 dedicated to trying to see this one through to
24 completion with your assistance. Of course, without
25 being too wordy, I think that probably wraps up what I

1 wanted to say and happy to answer any questions anyone
2 might have.

3 CHAIR DREW: Council members, do you have
4 any questions? Mr. Young.

5 LENNY YOUNG: Yeah. Without revealing or
6 disclosing any proprietary information that you need to
7 hold close. Could you briefly sketch out what kind of
8 obstacles you're running into that are preventing you
9 from being in a power purchase agreement right now?

10 RICK MILLER: Yeah, absolutely. I think
11 it's a combination of factors. One, net capacity
12 factor. The megawatt hours generated from a 100
13 megawatt project significantly impacts the megawatt hour
14 price. And so, for instance, you know, a site that
15 enjoys a 40 percent net capacity factor versus, like, a
16 relatively low 30 percent net capacity factor will have
17 a significant difference in power purchase price.

18 And this site does not enjoy what I would call
19 a robust wind regime but a relatively steady and
20 middle-of-the-road wind regime. And so it challenges
21 the power price that the utility would pay to secure it.
22 So at different times it looks more or less attractive
23 compared to alternate -- to alternatives such as
24 hydroelectric power or solar PV. And we went through a
25 period of time recently where solar photovoltaics were

1 going down in price precipitously and it was difficult
2 for wind generation to compete in The Pacific Northwest
3 with that. I think that pendulum is likely to swing
4 back the other way, but that was one factor.

5 So technology type and a relatively challenged
6 wind regime made the power purchase price a little
7 difficult. I'd also don't mind saying that there are
8 always -- you'll hear this a lot in renewable energy in
9 general -- but the electrical grid was really set up at
10 a time when renewables weren't even imagined. And there
11 are a lot of transmission constraints on the system, on
12 the native utility system, that make it difficult to
13 move some of this power generation around and move it to
14 load. And this area is somewhat cut off from the load
15 centers to the west.

16 And so, with some of the host utilities and
17 some other companies, we've ran into some challenges in
18 our ability to move the power to their load and need,
19 again, some of those upgrades are always happening. But
20 I would say a -- in summary, kind of a combination of
21 relatively high energy price, but everything's relative,
22 and transmission constraints have added to the
23 challenges in getting and securing a power purchase
24 agreement.

25 LENNY YOUNG: Thank -- thank you. I

1 really appreciate that explanation.

2 CHAIR DREW: Any other questions from
3 council members? Ms. Brewster.

4 STACEY BREWSTER: You mentioned the
5 challenging wind capacity there. What capacity do you
6 expect the Desert Claim to operate at?

7 RICK MILLER: It's a very fair question.
8 And the -- and it's generated by the way I answered the
9 question. Different turbine generating technologies
10 will garner different net capacity factors so, for
11 instance, like, a smaller generating capacity machine
12 of, like, two megawatts normally will garner a larger
13 NCF and a larger generating capacity machine, like a
14 three to four megawatt machine, would have a lower net
15 capacity factor in comparison.

16 So, in this example, we're looking at a low 30
17 percent net capacity factor somewhere between, say, 30
18 and 33, 34 percent. And for comparison, for what it's
19 worth, on the same type of scale, the center of the
20 country -- the bread basket, if you will -- Oklahoma,
21 Texas, areas that have a lot of wind, those are seeing
22 sites that are almost 50 percent net capacity factor as
23 a comparison tool. And in California, some of the areas
24 in, like, the desert southwest are similarly in the low
25 30 percent and some of the robust wind areas in, like,

1 the Altamont would be, like, 40 to 45 percent net
2 capacity factor. I hope that's helpful.

3 CHAIR DREW: So is that not unusual in
4 Washington state, that net capacity factor?

5 RICK MILLER: It is not unusual, yeah.
6 Not as bad as Arizona, where the wind does not blow at
7 all, but that net capacity factor for wind is relatively
8 low. And we like this site because of its setting and
9 we think the net capacity factor is robust enough to
10 eventually be a good economical project for rate payors
11 and helping to add to the decarbonization of the grid.

12 CHAIR DREW: Did you have another
13 question, Ms. Brewster?

14 STACEY BREWSTER: No. Thanks. I
15 appreciate the comparison because I'm thinking about
16 Kittitas Valley and ~~Iron~~ ^{Wild} Horse nearby with similar
17 capacities. Thank you.

18 CHAIR DREW: Other questions from council
19 members? Okay. Hearing none. Thank you very much for
20 the presentation and we'll move on to Ms. Hafkemeyer
21 who's going to talk about our process.

22 AMI HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair Drew.
23 Welcome, everybody. Thank you for making the time this
24 evening. My name is Ami Hafkemeyer, the Director of
25 Siting Compliance for EFSEC and I'll be giving a brief

1 presentation on the EFSEC amendment review process.

2 Next.

3 A little bit of history about EFSEC. EFSEC was
4 created in 1970 for the siting of thermal power plants.
5 The intent was to create one-stop permitting agency for
6 large energy facilities. EFSEC is comprised of state
7 and local government members who review each application
8 before voting to make a council recommendation to the
9 governor. If recommending approval, the package to the
10 governor includes a draft Site Certification Agreement,
11 or SCA, which defines all preconstruction, construction,
12 and operation plans. If approved by the governor's
13 office, this decision preempts other state and local
14 regulations.

15 Next.

16 Multiple energy facilities fall under EFSEC's
17 jurisdiction. Some projects are required to be sited
18 through EFSEC such as nuclear facilities with the
19 primary purpose of generating and selling electricity,
20 thermal power plants greater than 350 megawatts, while
21 others such as wind, solar, green hydrogen storage, or
22 clean-energy manufacturing can opt into the EFSEC
23 process. And there are a handful of other facility
24 types that may also opt into the process as well.

25 Next.

1 EFSEC is comprised of different state-level
2 agencies. The chairperson is appointed by the governor
3 and there are standing members from five other agencies
4 appointed by those agencies to sit on the council. The
5 current council is made up of Chairwoman Kathleen Drew,
6 Eli Levitt from the Department of Ecology, Mike
7 Livingston from the Department of Fish and Wildlife,
8 Kate Kelly from the Department of Commerce, Lenny Young
9 from the Department of Natural Resource, and Stacey
10 Brewster from the Utilities and Transportation
11 Commission.

12 There are additional agencies that may elect to
13 appoint a council member during the review of a new
14 application. These agencies are the Department of
15 Agriculture, the Department of Transportation, the
16 Department of Health, and the Military Department. ^{For} ~~for~~
17 the review of an application amendment. ^{this} ~~This~~ is not a
18 part of the process. The standing council oversees
19 those requests.

20 Next.

21 Here's a map of the facilities that are
22 certificated or have applied for certification under
23 EFSEC's jurisdiction. You can see, marked in green,
24 there are six operating facilities, including two
25 natural gas facilities, one nuclear facility, one solar

1 facility, and two wind facilities. If you'll recall
2 from the previous presentation, the Kittitas Valley and
3 Wild Horse wind facilities are EFSEC regulated
4 facilities in the area but the other wind projects shown
5 on that presentation did not elect to site through EFSEC
6 and so they do not fall under our jurisdiction. The
7 blue marks indicate the four additional facilities that
8 are approved but not yet constructed, including the
9 Desert Claim facility. The clear marker is the one
10 facility in the process of decommissioning and EFSEC is
11 currently reviewing applications for five projects
12 marked in yellow.

13 Next please.

14 Here is a flowchart showing the general process
15 an applicant will ^{go} through when they submit an
16 application for a new facility. The Desert Claim
17 proposal underwent this multitiered review at the time
18 of application as described in the previous
19 presentation. Additional State Environmental Policy Act
20 or SEPA analysis was conducted at the time of the 2018
21 amendment request.

22 Next please.

23 The review process for an amendment differs
24 from that of a new application. When an amendment
25 request is received, an informational meeting is

1 required, which brings us here this evening. With an
2 administrative amendment, such as the one requested for
3 this project, no SEPA addendum is required. Following
4 the informational meeting, the council will review the
5 request before them and vote to approve or deny the
6 amendment. For decisions that substantially change the
7 project, the recommendation is sent to the governor for
8 final decision. For decisions that do not substantially
9 change the project and/or are administrative in nature,
10 this approval or denial may be decided by the council.

11 Next please.

12 That concludes my presentation for this
13 evening. I don't actually see any members of the public
14 on the call but if there's anybody there who I'm not
15 seeing on the attendance list, I would like to remind
16 you how you can submit comments. You can indicate that
17 you would like to speak this evening. If you're joining
18 virtually or by phone, you may call the EFSEC main line
19 at 360-664-1345 to be added to the speaker list. And
20 you may also send in written comments by postal mail to
21 our office, 621 Woodland Square Loop, PO Box 43172,
22 Olympia, Washington 98504-3172. Comments may also be
23 submitted to our online comment database at
24 <https://comments.efsec.wa.gov> and that is up on the
25 screen and there's a link available on our website as

1 well.

2 CHAIR DREW: Mr. Sherman, you also have a
3 comment to make. Please go ahead.

4 BILL SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Drew. I
5 guess I have a question. This is probably directed at
6 Ms. McGaffey. I expect that there's no reason to
7 believe that the action that council may take would have
8 any effect on the stipulation that your client and
9 Counsel for the Environment came to in 2009, correct?

10 KAREN MCGAFFEY: Correct.

11 BILL SHERMAN: Great. That's my only
12 question. Thank you so much.

13 CHAIR DREW: At this point, Judge -- Oh,
14 Ms. Kelly. Go ahead.

15 KATE KELLY: Thank you, chair. And I only
16 meant to raise my hand once. The question I have is,
17 and I apologize if I might have missed it, is this -- is
18 extension of the SCA for five years considered
19 legislative and -- a legislative or just an
20 administrative action in terms of the process that Amy
21 just described.

22 CHAIR DREW: The process, it would be the
23 council's decision.

24 KATE KELLY: Okay. That was my question.

25 CHAIR DREW: So, right. Right. To take

1 that into consideration, not administrative through the
2 staff, but through the council.

3 KATE KELLY: But not going to the
4 governor?

5 CHAIR DREW: Correct. Correct. Because
6 only decisions that would make a substantial change in
7 the SCA -- only amendments that make substantial changes
8 would go to the governor.

9 KATE KELLY: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIR DREW: Any other questions?

11 AMI HAFKEMEYER: That is spelled out in
12 our WAC. That website is down so I don't have the
13 citation for you this evening, but I can provide that.
14 So, I can access the information if you'd like.

15 CHAIR DREW: I think that's just Bill
16 Sherman and he asked his question, I believe. Unless
17 you have another question.

18 BILL SHERMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't
19 realize I hadn't lowered my hand. Thank you.

20 CHAIR DREW: That's okay. So Judge
21 Gerard, at this point, what I'll do is I'll ask if
22 there's anyone here who wants to make public comment
23 in -- and we'll go from there. Is there anyone on
24 this -- in this meeting, virtual meeting, who'd like to
25 make a comment? Asking again, is there anyone in this

1 meeting who would like to make a comment? One final
2 time, is there anyone here who would like to make a
3 comment? Hearing none, we will see what comments may
4 come in through our other means of getting public
5 comments, but this public hearing is -- public
6 informational meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

7
8 (Meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, Steven B. Crandall, certify that the foregoing transcript is a full, true, and accurate transcription of the proceedings and testimony taken in the matter of the above-entitled proceeding.

That the foregoing meeting was taken before me, via Teams video conference, completed on July 13, 2023, and thereafter transcribed by me;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any party to this action, or relative, or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on this 27th day of July, 2023.



Steven B. Crandall, CER
Certified Electronic Reporter #1198