

**Approved Minutes
Energy Facility Siting Council Meeting
Oregon Department of Energy
Troutdale City Hall
Troutdale, Oregon
April 18, 2008**

Energy Facility Siting Council

David Ripma, Chair
Martha Dibblee, Vice Chair
Lori Brogoitti
Michael Haglund
Robert Shiprack
David Tegart
Bryan Wolfe

Oregon Department of Energy:

Tom Stoops, Council Secretary
Adam Bless, Project Officer
Susan Hughs, Senior Policy Analyst
John White, Project Officer
Ken Niles, Assistant Director NUCSAFE/Siting
Michael Grainey, Director of ODOE
Jill Hendrickson, Administrative Assistant

Oregon Department of Justice:

Jan Prewitt, Assistant Attorney General

Others:

Tamara Brickman, Oregon Dept of Admin Services (DAS)
Doug Young, US Fish & Wildlife
Mike Burnett, Oregon Climate Trust
Sarah Parsons, PPM
David Filippi, Stoel Rives
Bob Hall, Robert Hall Government Relations
Suzanne Leta Liu, Renewable Northwest Project
David Rankin, Geo Engineering for Golden Hills Wind
Jesse Groner, PPM
Russ Dorran, former EFSC member
Arlo Corwin, Horizon Wind Energy
Cliff Graham, FLP Energy
Judge Thompson
John DeMoss
David Neikirk

Chair David Ripma called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

I. Consent Calendar:

A. Announcements.

Tom Stoops, Council Secretary, announced this meeting would be David Ripma and David Tegart's last meeting. He also introduced Michael Haglund, new EFSC member and mentioned Cheri Davis also is a new member but could not attend today.

Michael Grainey, Director of Oregon Department of Energy, presented Mr. Ripma and Mr. Tegart with plaques, thanking them for their years of service since 1999. Mr. Tegart spoke briefly about his tenure on the Council before departing,

Mr. Stoops announced that Mike Burnett, Executive Director of The Climate Trust, would be presenting a report today.

II. Action Items:

A. Approval of the November 16, 2007 Energy Facility Siting Council meeting minutes.

Martha Dibblee moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2007 meeting of the Energy Facility Siting Council; Bryan Wolfe seconded the motion and Council was polled:

Lori Brogoitti	Yes	Bob Shiprack	Yes
Martha Dibblee	Yes	David Tegart	Yes
Michael Haglund	Yes	Bryan Wolfe	Yes
David Ripma	Yes		

B. Approval of the December 18, 2007 Energy Facility Siting Council meeting minutes.

Bryan Wolfe moved to approve the minutes of the December 18 2007 meeting of the Energy Facility Siting Council; Lori Brogoitti seconded the motion and Council was polled:

Lori Brogoitti	Yes	Bob Shiprack	Yes
Martha Dibblee	Yes	David Tegart	Yes
Michael Haglund	Yes	Bryan Wolfe	Yes
David Ripma	Yes		

C. Election of New Siting Council Chairman

Lori Brogoitti moved to appoint Bob Shiprack as the new Energy Facility Siting Council Chairman; Bryan Wolfe seconded the motion and Council was polled:

Lori Brogoitti	Yes	Bob Shiprack	Yes
Martha Dibblee	Yes	David Tegart	Yes
Michael Haglund	Yes	Bryan Wolfe	Yes
David Ripma	Yes		

There was discussion about whether a nomination was needed for Vice-Chair. Lori Brogoitti moved to appoint Martha Dibblee as the Vice Chair of the Energy Facility Siting Council; Michael Haglund seconded the motion and Council was polled:

Lori Brogoitti	Yes	Bob Shiprack	Yes
Martha Dibblee	Yes	David Tegart	Yes
Michael Haglund	Yes	Bryan Wolfe	Yes
David Ripma	Yes		

III. Information Items:

A. Top 10 Things Public Officials Should Know & Top 10 Myths about New Ethics Laws

Jill Hendrickson reviewed information on the new ethics laws. Jan Prewitt stated she is available if any Council members have questions at any time.

Bob Shiprack asked about reporting expenses and the procedures. Ms. Prewitt said she would do research on the matter.

Lori Brogoitti asked about the phrase “income exceeding \$1,000...” Ms. Prewitt discussed activities related to being a public official, but stated she will look at the statutes and laws. She stated she would get more information to Council members.

Ms. Hendrickson continued reviewing the new ethics laws. Ms. Brogoitti asked if the new laws are posted on the website. Ms. Hendrickson confirmed that they are.

Chair Ripma asked about Item 9 and the definition of “lobbying.” Ms. Prewitt stated she would get clarification on that matter.

Martha Dibblee asked about data being available on the website. There was more discussion about the need for relatives to be listed. Chair Ripma expressed his concern for resignations occurring in towns and the potential loss of the important volunteer element that has always been in Oregon.

Chair Ripma called on Dave Tegart to talk about his experience on the Council. Mr. Tegart talked about projects the Council was involved with and the many land use laws that he has learned over the years.

B. Oregon Climate Trust Annual Report

Mike Burnett, Executive Director of The Climate Trust introduced himself and stated he would be reviewing the annual report with a slide presentation.

Mr. Burnett began by giving some background history about carbon offsets. The Oregon carbon dioxide standard has been a big success for the state and for EFSC. The State of Oregon is viewed internationally as a leader in the US carbon offset market. The Climate Trust, a non-profit organization, is a pioneer in the US carbon offset marketplace. They are known for their management of high quality offset projects. The Climate Trust believes that high quality offset projects are very important and advocate high quality offset projects to mitigate carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr. Burnett discussed Oregon's statutory requirement for a Qualified Organization (i.e., a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization to manage offset acquisitions in the Oregon Carbon Dioxide Standard, and how The Climate Trust meets the requirements. In his review he explained what offsets are and the purpose of the the monitoring and verification plan, which is required of all projects.

One project that was discussed was Truck Stop Electrification, which provides commercial truck drivers with an alternative for using grid electricity to power accessories instead of using diesel fuel idling for electric power generation during required stops. Using grid power saves an estimated 10 million gallons of diesel fuel each year, along with the benefit of reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr Burnett discussed the Climate Trust's two main program areas, Offset Acquisition (the Oregon Carbon Dioxide Standard) and Offset Policy. In selecting quality offset projects there is a rigorous internal and external review process. Ensuring the quality of offset projects and mitigating risk are the top priorities for The Climate Trust.

The Climate Trust's Portfolio was presented, which shows the following sector distribution: energy efficiency (31%); cogeneration (18%); transportation efficiency (11%); material substitution (10%); renewable energy (6%); fuel replacement (3%); and biological sequestration (21%). Mr. Burnett stated that 89% of the funds obligated in the portfolio come from Oregon projects.

Mr. Burnett discussed the status of offset funds and stated that there are pending offset funds for the Klamath Cogen true-up in the amount of \$2.4 million. There was discussion among the Council, Jan Prewitt and Adam Bless about what a "true-up" involves.

Ms. Prewitt, in her explanation of "true-up", stated that before the carbon dioxide standard was in place, the Department held a one-time competition for exemption from

the Need for Power Standard. The exemption was available for an electric generating project with a total capacity of less than 500 megawatts. Klamath Cogen project won the competition and was awarded the exemption based on its proposed carbon dioxide offset projects, which were to be implemented. Klamath Cogen did not meet their carbon dioxide emission offset commitment, which was to supply waste heat in the form of steam to a nearby steam host (client), as required by site certificate conditions. To make up the difference, the Council approved a “true-up” payment to the Climate Trust.

Mr. Burnett discussed new initiatives, which included the establishment of the National Climate Trust, which was formed in August of 2007.

Bob Shiprack asked about the “cap-and-trade”, which led to more discussion. Bryan Wolfe stated that with respect to offset and energy costs, consumers are the ones that end up paying, not the companies themselves. Mr. Burnett further discussed projects and their cost/benefit ratios.

Chair Ripma asked if any members of the public would like to speak.

David Niekirk introduced himself and asked about offsetting the CO2 excess from the gas plants. Mr. Burnett stated that any gas plants sited in Oregon would be going through the process discussed, including the requirement for offset payment.

This being Chair Ripma’s final Council meeting, he reviewed his past years of service and representing the citizens of Oregon. He said the Department of Energy has given much support.

(Lunch Break)

Suzanne Leta Liu, Renewables Northwest Project Consumer Policy Advocate, introduced herself. She stated that their organization works to promote environmentally responsible renewable energy in the northwest. She discussed goals and procedures they follow to help consumers.

C. Defining Separate Wind Projects

Tom Stoops, Council Secretary, referred to the map given to Council members showing jurisdictional projects sited by EFSC and also sub-jurisdictional projects sited by the local county land use process. He also discussed the Department’s new guidance document listing fifteen “Questions for Determining When Energy Projects are Separate Projects” (“Questions”), which staff have been using to determine an applicant’s jurisdiction (i.e., county or state).

John White, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), stated that this is being brought to the Council’s attention because, although being used as guidance, it is a question of policy. ODOE staff is not supposed to make policy, only carry out policy that EFSC sets.

For the time being, however, staff is using the “Questions” as guidance to assist in the review process and to determine jurisdiction.

Mr. White explained the background of the “Questions” and why there is a concern. State policy requires that development of energy facilities must protect the environment. Impacts must be mitigated. The process begins by determining applicant jurisdiction. In 2001, the Legislature raised the jurisdictional threshold for Siting Council jurisdiction of wind-powered energy facilities from 25 megawatts average to 35 megawatts average (105 megawatts peak). This meant that some wind facilities no longer received the scrutiny of the Siting Council. The Stateline facility is an example of a project that would not have been under EFSC jurisdiction under the new legislation. Jurisdiction that is outside of EFSC jurisdiction (“sub-jurisdictional”) is usually reviewed by counties, using local land-use laws. Counties have different considerations, however, and issues of local interests. Their focus is on their land use standards, as opposed to EFSC review in which land use is only one of the standards used.

In 2005, a request for expedited review was received for the Klondike III facility. Klondike I, which consisted of 16 turbines in Sherman County, had been permitted by the county and was up and operating. Klondike II also had been permitted by Sherman county and was under construction. One of the first questions ODOE staff had to answer when the request for expedited review was received for Klondike III was whether Klondike III should be treated as a separate facility. To help answer this question, the list of fifteen questions was compiled.

Subsequently, there have been a number of cases where a sub-jurisdictional facility existed and the developer wanted to build a second sub-jurisdictional facility next to it, geographically. Developers asked whether these fifteen questions might be used to find that the two facilities are separate.

This scenario is an issue because if the two sub-jurisdictional projects are combined as one facility, that “complex” would need an EFSC site certificate. If they are treated separately, each 104-megawatt facility, standing by itself, is below EFSC jurisdiction, and both energy facilities avoid the requirement for site certificate.

Mr. White stated there are a number of these requests before ODOE right now. Staff has discussed this as a policy question. Are these the right questions, or should other questions be asked? Staff needs to know what latitude should be given to allow two sub-jurisdictional projects, being developed by the same corporate parent next to each other. If the fifteen questions and answers find that the geographically-related projects are one facility, a site certificate is required and if not, the developer needs to show that the finding is incorrect.

Mr. White referred to the list of facility projects each Council member received in their packet and pointed out that there are more facilities being developed that are not under EFSC jurisdiction than are under EFSC jurisdiction.

Chair Bob Shiprack asked if there were any questions. Lori Brogoitti asked whether the 15 questions were in rule or whether they were a working document. Mr. White stated this is not rule, it is a working document.

(Martha Dibblee commented – could not hear on recording)
(Also had trouble hearing any comments of Chair Bob Shiprack)

Jan Prewitt stated that from a legal standpoint, by the Staff, potential rulemaking needs to be considered at some point. Ms. Prewitt further stated that to what extent, if Council adopts policy, that policy needs to be promulgated through rulemaking with opportunity for notice and comment.

Bryan Wolfe raised a concern about the cumulative effects of the wind projects and suggested that the issue of cumulative effects could drive the Council's direction.

Lori Brogoitti asked if the issue is only for wind projects, or if there are similar issues with non-jurisdictional facilities for are ethanol or some other type of facility. Tom Stoops said that right now the focus is wind, because the ethanol facilities tend to be industrial facilities that go through the exemption process.

Martha Dibblee asked if a question sixteen will be added to the list concerning cumulative effects since this has been discussed extensively over the last few years.

Mr. White stated that part of the problem is that cumulative effects are not known unless comparable impact data has been collected. If projects are not going through EFSC jurisdiction they don't have the same studies conducted or reports to compare.

Chair Bob Shiprack asked if there were any public comments.

Jesse Gronner, PPM Energy, introduced himself. He stated he was the developer involved with Klondike III and these questions were posed at that time. As projects are planned, each will be reviewed against the fifteen questions to help determine whether they are subjurisdictional (separate projects) or within EFSC jurisdiction.

Dave Filippi, Attorney with Stoel Rives, representing PPM, introduced himself. As a broad overview, even if there are two projects side by side and the parent company is PPM, those projects are owned by different LLCs. There are separate power purchase agreements for each project and each project can operate on its own. He further stated that in answering the question of whether each can be operated separately, and are not dependent on one another, the view is that those projects can be permitted separately.

Mr. Filippi referred to Ms. Dibblee's comment about adding question sixteen to cover cumulative impacts and stated that it is a question worth inquiry; it doesn't have anything to do with jurisdiction, however, since the projects could be permitted separately.

Lori Brogoitti commented that some sub-jurisdictional facilities have the look of being an attempt to subvert the EFSC process and asked what PPM (and others) was doing to alleviate that.

Mr. Filippi replied that projects being planned as stand alone do have cumulative impacts looked at in a county process. He said that developers might choose to go through the EFSC process if a wind project had significant local opposition.

Lori Brogoitti commented that it does look like there is an effort to avoid EFSC jurisdiction. Mr. Filippi replied that the question of jurisdiction is a legal threshold.

Sara Parsons, Biologist with PPM, discussed some of the work they are doing to protect the environment. She also noted that PPM is a member of the Oregon-Washington Task Force to look at cumulative impacts.

Jesse Gronner said that if you look at question 15, “What other information would support a conclusion that the proposed project would be a separate wind energy project and not an expansion of a nearby wind energy project? In what other ways would the projects be operated or otherwise treated as separate projects...”, PPM has addressed the issue to show that they have exceeded the minimum requirements, and they expect other applicants to do so also.

Chair Shiprack asked for further comments.

Jesse Gronner said he wanted to comment regarding Sara’s remarks. He stated there is incentive to meet or exceed the EFSC standard whether sub-jurisdictional or not because at some time in the future the project might expand to exceed the EFSC threshold (i.e., 35 Mw average and 105 Mw peak). This is part of the reason PPM wants a project that can withstand the Council’s review at any time.

Chair Shiprack commented about legislative decisions on jurisdiction.

John White said he didn’t feel the legislators were faced with the question whether the same corporate developer wanted to build two 104-megawatt facilities right next to each other.

Mr. White also stated he doesn’t agree that the same level of scrutiny or work goes into a conditional use permit application as a site certificate application. If you will do the same amount of work anyway, why not get a site certificate to begin with then a new permitting process will not be necessary if expansion or amending is in the future.

Adam Bless, Oregon Department of Energy, said a real life illustration between an EFSC project and a sub-jurisdictional project is the Cascade Wind Project. The scenic and aesthetic standard is a concern with this project, being hundreds of yards away from a

national scenic area, but not in the scenic area. The EFSC scenic and aesthetic standards allows for consideration of an adverse impact for the facility near the scenic area. The Columbia Gorge Commission, which would be the sub-jurisdictional authority, has stated they do not have authority outside their boundaries. This is a protection that EFSC can offer but the Columbia Gorge Commission could not.

Tom Stoops talked about more information becoming available that will be distributed to Council members. He also referred to Sara Parson's comments on the studies of birds and bats and that as soon as those guidelines are available they also will be distributed.

Mike Haglund noted that the Cascade Wind project has a capacity of 60 megawatts, and asked why it is under EFSC jurisdiction.

Adam Bless answered by saying that Wasco County's land use and zoning ordinance limits their jurisdiction to 25 megawatts, so anything above that falls to EFSC by default.

Mr. Bless also mentioned that another difference between an EFSC project and a non-EFSC project would be the noise standard. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has noise standards that apply to all industrial facilities, whether they are EFSC jurisdictional or not. DEQ noise standards are enforceable by EFSC for EFSC jurisdictional facilities, and by the county for sub-jurisdictional facilities. Applicants for a site certificate are expected to do noise studies. Staff has available a noise consultant, one of the best in the state, who does an independent study, rather than relying on the applicant's noise study., Most counties do not have the resources to independently check the applicants' noise studies. The EFSC process provides extra assurance that DEQ standards will be met.

D. Transmission Update

Adam Bless presented a slide presentation discussing transmission lines. The following highlights were discussed:

Transmission Lines Under EFSC Jurisdiction: Lines that are 230 kV or more and 10 miles or more long; lines within 500 feet of an existing right of way (ROW) of a large line (230 kV) are exempt, which is a time honored principal that the legislature and land use agencies have used to encourage builders to use existing ROW to the extent possible. Lines under EFSC can include *interstate* and *intrastate*, unlike natural gas pipelines that EFSC only handles as *intrastate*.

No EFSC lines sited in 20 years: Other than Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) there have been no major transmission lines constructed in Oregon in the last 20 years. Part of the reason EFSC doesn't site much is because so much of it is BPA and they are a federal agency; the state does not have jurisdiction. The real barrier in building transmission lines though is the cost – 1½ million dollars per mile. Also, there is a challenge to define need in a regional market.

Reasons to Build New Lines: The load growth and congestion keep going up. The electric power industry across the United States now has stronger reliability rules than it did in the 1990's. Mr. Bless discussed blackouts throughout the country, which is the federal government's number one priority. Wind, solar and geothermal integration are also coming.

Times Change: Mr. Bless stated in 2006 the focus was on reliability, congestion and the Federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Epack). In 2008 the focus is on renewables integration. There are renewable portfolio standards (RPS) in 9 western states, with the best renewable resources far from the load. Wyoming has approximately 86,000 megawatts of developable wind; in comparison in the last few years EFSC has sited approximately 2,000 megawatts.

RPS's create need for Transmission: Mr. Bless stated that if all the states are going to meet their aggressive renewable portfolio standards, especially California, they won't be able to without wind power from Wyoming and Montana. This creates the need for transmission, which will come through Oregon.

Regional Coordinate Planning: Balancing authorities get together in different regional committees. Mr. Bless reviewed six such committees. Over the six committees is the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) which has new power under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

New Transmission – Western Interconnect: There are many new proposed transmission projects. Last year the US Department of Energy published its National Congestion Study, which identified the most congested transmission areas in the nation. Only one critical congestion area was noted on the West Coast. That area was the Phoenix to Los Angeles corridor.

Transmission Projects – NW: There was a review of major transmission lines in Oregon. Siting agencies try to have developers use the same path over and over again. This is considered a sound land use practice, but it could create a grid reliability problem, because if a storm takes out one line, it could take out others in the same corridor. Transmission lines are being considered from Eastern Oregon to Western Oregon. Some of these lines don't go through the Gorge, in order alleviate the reliability problems caused by having too many transmission lines in one corridor..

New Transmission Projects Converging at Boardman: There are new projects currently going through WECC review for planned operation in the years 2010 – 2015. Impacts on the grid are being studied now before siting can start.

Transmission Project in or soon to be in WECC: Some projects in WECC review will be in EFSC jurisdiction; others will be outside EFSC jurisdiction.

Idaho – Boardman Project: Hemingway is a sub-station near Boise, Idaho. The Idaho Power company plans to build a transmission line from Hemingway to the Boardman hub. This line will be used for BPA power going into the Idaho market. A Notice of Intent (NOI) is expected soon, 2008 – 2009.

PGE Southern Crossing Project: This project is very likely to be proposed by PGE, starting in Boardman and ending at a substation in the Salem area. This would cross the Cascades rather than go through the Gorge, to alleviate the reliability problem in the Gorge. This will be a challenge crossing the Cascades, both physically and environmentally with EFSC being the lead environmental agency.

EFSC Issues: Although transmission lines are not popular with people who have to look at them or ranches where they are located, the State will not be able to meet the Renewable Portfolio Standards without new transmission lines. There is a known congestion problem, not nearly as bad as California's which is facing FERC preemption. Oregon would like to solve congestion problems before that threat has to be faced.

Transmission Siting Challenges: The EFSC scenic standard, which only protects visual resources that are named in something like a county land use plan or federal land management plan. The scenic standard does not necessarily protect the view from a private landowner's backyard. People will be objecting when this happens. Bird impacts have been discussed recently because of wind projects, which will be an issue with transmission lines as well. The electromagnetic fields (EMF) may require having a special committee formed as it has been done in the past. Other challenges will be coordination with Washington, Idaho, the Federal agencies and Tribes.

Mr. Bless asked for any questions or comments. Bryan Wolfe commented that it would be very educational for the Council to visit BPA's transmission control center. Mr. Bless stated that is in the process of happening.

E. Project Updates

LNG and Pipeline Projects

Susan Hughs, Senior Policy Analyst for Oregon Department of Energy began her presentation on Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) and Pipeline Projects in Oregon. These projects are not in EFSC jurisdiction any longer but it is part of the energy mix to make other decisions.

One slide shown was showing the transmission lines and natural gas pipelines that are being proposed. It is not logical that they will all be built but they could be permitted by FERC. Each LNG project says they are going to put one billion cubic feet per day into a pipeline and they will all come online sometime between 2011 and 2014.

Jan Prewitt, Oregon Department of Justice, discussed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the LNG licensing process.

Ms. Hughs next discussed the Jordan Cove Energy Project, which is around Coos Bay and North Bend. She explained the process of LNG and how it is converted to the natural gas in the pipelines. Oregon Gateway is a project of the Port of Coos Bay, which isn't an LNG project but it is affected by Jordan Cove. The environmental effects of the combined projects have to be considered.

The next slide showed the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline project. FERC is considering the Jordan Cove LNG terminal and the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline as one project.

Ms. Hughs said the developers for the Palomar Pipeline are Trans-Canada and Northwest Natural Gas and this becomes the only east-west route between the Northwest Pipeline. The line may be brought from Molalla up to virtually where Bradford would be. The Palomar developers and the Oregon LNG Developers are being encouraged to somehow cooperate so that two pipeline would not have to be permitted and built. There was discussion about the pipeline going through the Warm Springs Reservation also.

There was discussion about Mist, which is an existing gas storage facility owned and operated by Northwest Natural and is an EFSC site certificate. Mr. Bless stated it is the only geological gas storage area in the whole state. It would be advantageous for Palomar a way of tapping into Mist.

The Ruby Pipeline, another proposal, consists of the developers, El Paso, Western Pipeline, Pacific Gas and Electric and Colorado Interstate Gas. This is a 680 mile 42" pipeline that comes out of Wyoming and would come through Utah, Nevada, California and Oregon. This has been filed with FERC as of January 31, 2008.

Another proposal is the Bronco Pipeline from Colorado and Wyoming to Malin, Oregon. The proposed initial phase is for 2011, second phase mid-2012. This proposal has not been introduced to FERC at this time.

The proposed Sunstone route, a Williams pipeline, (Williams being the largest pipeline company in the country if not the world) and Trans-Canada, again comes out of Wyoming and would come into Oregon approximately around Ontario. It would follow the existing electric transmission route to Stanfield. It would be 585 miles, 42" pipe, mostly in existing rights of way and no compressors in Oregon. They expect to file with FERC in August 2008.

The Blue Bridge Pipeline would be a spur off of the Sunstone route from Stanfield Oregon to the Portland and Seattle markets. The developers are Williams and Puget Sound Energy. It is anticipated to operate as part of Northwest Pipeline's system for 172 miles, 30" and 36" pipelines. They won't add compressor stations but will add horsepower at three locations.

Ms. Hughs also included in packets for the Council letters from Governor Kulongoski to FERC and their response and also a letter from Members of the Congress to FERC and follow-up information.

Mist Project

Adam Bless stated a Proposed Order was issued on April 17, 2008 to approve Mist Underground Storage Facility Site Certificate Amendment #10. May 19th will be the end of the 30-day comment period so at the next meeting a Council decision could be forthcoming.

Shepherds Flat

John White said the Draft Proposed Order has a public hearing scheduled for May and so he would request an EFSC meeting later in May also. Mr. White explained procedures to be followed. That meeting will not be the decision meeting for EFSC; it will be the EFSC focused review meeting. Following that meeting a Proposed Order will be issued and a Notice of Contested Case. If there are no parties for a contested case the subsequent meeting will be the decision meeting on the Shepherds Flat Project.

Tom Stoops and Council members discussed meeting dates and locations.

Chair Bob Shiprack adjourned the meeting at 2:53 p.m.