

**Minutes**  
**Energy Facility Siting Council Meeting**  
**Columbia Gorge Discovery Center**  
**5000 Discovery Drive**  
**The Dalles, OR 97058**  
**August 25, 2006**

*Approved by Energy Facility Siting Council with revision.  
December 15, 2006*

**Energy Facility Siting Council**

Hans Neukomm, Chair  
David Ripma, Vice Chair  
Lori Brogoitti  
Martha Dibblee  
Karen Green  
Robert Shiprack  
David Tegart

**Oregon Department of Energy:**

Tom Stoops, Council Secretary  
Adam Bless, Project Officer  
Catherine Van Horn, Project Officer  
John White, Project Officer  
Shelley Carlson, Administrative Assistant

**Oregon Department of Justice:**

Jan Prewitt, Assistant Attorney General

**Others:**

Carlos Pineda  
Rick Tetzloff  
Tom Koehler

Chair Hans Neukomm called the meeting to order.

**I. Consent Calendar:**

**A. Announcements.**

Chair Neukomm introduced Shelley Carlson, who recently took the position of Administrative Assistant with the Department of Energy. He also announced that this would be the last meeting for him and Karen Green, having served eight years. Chair Neukomm commended the staff for their help and dedication.

Chair Neukomm also announced there would be an item added to the agenda, the election of officers, which will be right before lunch.

**B. Approval of the May 19, 2006 Energy Facility Siting Council meeting minutes.**

Jan Prewitt, Oregon Department of Justice said Mike Grainey's name was not listed as being in attendance, which he should be added; also there were some blanks in the minutes. Tom Stoops, Council Secretary, said the tapes were listened to several times and it was hard to hear who seconded the motion (which was left blank on the minutes) and also there was a word to be added, "cellulosic" in the second blank. Karen Green said she has notes that would clarify who seconded the motion.

Ms. Prewitt said the motion can be made to approve the minutes subject to the changes being added. Karen Green made a motion to approve the minutes with authorization for the Staff to add the name as mentioned and fill in the word cellulosic. Martha Dibblee seconded the motion and Council was polled:

<b>Lori Brogoitti</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Ripma</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Martha Dibblee</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Bob Shiprack</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Karen Green</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Tegart</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Hans Neukomm</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**C. Approval of the June 6, 2006 Energy Facility Siting Council meeting minutes.**

Tom Stoops said this item will be handled at a later date, due to one page missing.

**II. Action Items:**

**A. Approval of Gilliam and Morrow counties as Special Advisory Group for Shepherd's Flat**

Cathy Van Horn explained the procedure for appointing a special advisory group. Ms. Van Horn said that since the project stretches into two counties the Staff is recommending appointing the local jurisdiction of Gilliam and Morrow Counties as the special advisory group.

David Ripma moved to approve Gilliam and Morrow County's local jurisdiction as the special advisory group; Martha Dibblee seconded the motion and Council was polled:

<b>Lori Brogoitti</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Ripma</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Martha Dibblee</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Bob Shiprack</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Karen Green</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Tegart</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Hans Neukomm</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**B. Authorization to conduct rulemaking; discussion of potential future rulemaking**

Tom Stoops, Council Secretary, reviewed some items that need to be brought up to date, and mentioned that any key items the Council would like to be worked on need to be discussed.

John White, Oregon Department of Energy, discussed rulemaking, and stated that it has been three years since changes have been made. Mr. White said new definitions need to be adopted. There are 11 core divisions of rules that deal with the siting of energy facilities. Also, there are an additional 8 divisions of rules, which will be referred to as the "nuclear rules," some of which haven't been looked at for 20 years.

For the core rules, Division 1 contains mostly definitions. The definition of "study area" should be amended. Each standard has a geographic scope that applicants review and analyze. Wind facility micrositing is a new term that needs to be incorporated. In Division 1, rules regarding energy generation areas should be reviewed base on discussion of expansion of wind facilities in recent meetings.

In Division 11, which contains rules on Council process, there are a few minor changes to be done. Division 15 is the set of procedures both for contested cases and how the Staff reviews applications. One rule in particular that needs a lot of attention is the completeness procedure. Mr. White explained the process, and the need to clarify and simplify the process. Division 20 deals with the Notice of Intent (NOI). Staff has discussed whether to make changes in distributing paper versions of the NOI to everyone. Karen Green said that putting the NOI on a CD would be a good idea, along with reviewing it as an information item at a meeting.

Mr. White said this meeting is to ask the Council for authorization to formally begin a rulemaking. After authorization, the formal process starts with a notice in the Secretary of State's bulletin. There will be one or more informal workshops where the public is

invited, in particular the development community. Council members are welcome to come to the workshops, which take place before the formal announcement. By the time of the formal announcement in the Secretary of State's bulletin, there will be a draft set of amendments to the rules. Following the formal announcement, there will be a formal public hearing at which the Department will present its final recommendations and members of the public can go on record with any comments they may have. The hearing officer will issue a report, and then the proposed rules will be presented to the Council for a decision. Mr. White said that the decision meeting could be in January or February. Updates will be given to Council members at meetings taking place before then.

Mr. White then discussed possible amendments in Division 21, which contains the instructions to applicants for what goes into an application. These rules define the information that applicants must submit. This is the first place where the rules mention liquefied natural gas (LNG) storage facilities. This needs to be looked at to see if the recent federal takeover for siting LNG import terminals affects the state's rules for storage facilities.

There are also procedures for submission of applications in Division 21. Mr. White explained there is a difference between "submitting" applications and "filing" applications. This wording may be changed to "preliminary application" and "filed application."

Division 22 contains the core siting standards, and this is where the "balancing rule" appears. The statute allows the Council to waive any of the standards upon a finding that the overall public benefit of waiving the standard and allowing the facility to be built outweighs the damage to the resource that the standard protects. An attempt was made three years ago to clarify and improve how that is done, which was followed by applying the rule during the site certificate review for the Klamath Generation Facility. This revealed that the rule was a problem and might need to be revised.

One idea that has come up is whether the balancing rule should be divided into two separate Council decisions. The first decision would be "Should balancing be allowed? Is it necessary?" This evolves into a question of "is there any reasonable way to mitigate for the damage?" The current rule says that the Council will engage in a balancing analysis if there is no reasonable way to meet the standard in question. Mr. White felt this might be a separate process early in the review, perhaps before an application is considered complete. Sometimes the applicant doesn't see any reasonable way to mitigate and therefore meet a particular standard. The Staff could review all facts with the Council and a decision could be made whether balancing should even be considered. The second decision would come later, if balancing is considered. This second decision would be "Do the overall public benefits outweigh the harm?"

Another standard in Division 22 is the habitat standard. Recent applications involving monitoring of habitat, mitigation and the issue of whether the Council has any way to look at the impacts of a facility ten or twenty years in the future. The current practice is to

have a snapshot of monitoring in the years right after a facility is built, and to determine whether there is an impact.

Division 23 rarely comes to the Council's attention. Division 23 contains the need standard. Most facilities are not required to apply with a need standard but this is a place in the rules where there is a need standard for liquefied natural gas storage facilities. There may be a need for clarification between a LNG storage facility and a LNG import terminal.

Division 24 is tied to particular types of facilities. For example, Division 24 contains specific standards for wind facilities. When these rules were put in place, there was not much experience in wind facilities. The phrase "cumulative impacts" is used in Division 24, but there are not clear rules listed to handle multiple facilities in one area. Ms. Green asked about looking at a way to have a multiple agency review and consider cumulative impacts within a certain area. Cathy Van Horn commented that it had been discussed in the past to arrange but the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) was unable to at that time. Mr. White said if it really is to be done right the State of Washington should be involved also.

Chair Neukomm asked whether this could involve the PUC wanting to establish a need for these facilities if there is a cumulative impact that may point toward a problem. Mr. White said not all facilities are in the jurisdiction of the PUC, but this could be an issue of concern. Mr. White said the Council itself does not have a need standard. Ms. Green said that would be a legislative call because the need standard was abandoned to adopt the CO<sub>2</sub> standard. Jan Prewitt, Department of Justice, stated that one thing the PUC does is require industrial utilities to prepare an integrated resource plan (IRP) which forms the basis of their acquisition of resources over the next period of time, usually ten to twenty years. Need is being determined there, based on what are the least cost resources a utility might acquire over that time. She further stated there are two parts to the need issue and to some extent the planning process that's being undertaken by the PUC in the IRP process accounts for some of the need and the mix of resources that are going to be acquired by the utility.

Bob Shiprack asked Ms. Green about cumulative effects, in particular the CO<sub>2</sub>, and whether it just included energy facilities. He said there could be sources other than energy facilities that could have a cumulative impact. Ms. Green said that is why Washington should be brought in also or a piece of the picture is missing. It may take years to develop.

Cathy Van Horn referred to Congressman Brian Baird's letter to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on LNG; she stated that because of the Bradwood facility proposed on the Gorge, there should be equal responsibility placed upon both the federal government and the states of OR and WA. Ms. Van Horn also said that because of the LNG facilities that the Department has been working on with Washington now, the relationship is building so it may be a good time to develop more connections.

Mr. White said in discussing the CO<sub>2</sub> standard in Division 24, the Council has the authority to change the monetary offset rate which is currently at 85 cents per ton. Council may increase or decrease the monetary rate by no more than 50% in any two-year period. The rate has not been adjusted in quite awhile.

Mr. White discussed Division 26, which deals a lot with reporting and with Trojan. One item needing to be brought up is that there are older facilities that were issued site certificates a long time ago. These site certificates are very brief. For example, the Springfield Utility Industrial Center in Eugene has a site certificate which has shortcomings, including having no process for amendments. The Department of Justice has advised the Staff that one way of dealing with shortcomings in the site certificate would be in rulemaking in Division 26.

Mr. White stated that Division 29 involves violations of a site certificate, which have never had to be used. Division 27 has mandatory site certificate conditions, along with the site certificate amendment process and the process for terminating a site certificate. Another place to discuss long-term impacts in monitoring might be in the mandatory conditions in Division 27. Mr. White stated that Ms. Green has mentioned a rule that requires the certificate holder to report any changes in environmental effects that might impact compliance with a site certificate condition. It does not have any operative language for the Council to take any action for unanticipated impact that may occur ten to twenty years after the facility is built.

Ms. Green asked why the Trojan rules should be kept on the books. Adam Bless said that when decommissioning was declared over and the independent spent fuel storage installation became the only remaining facility, the rules that the Council adopted in April of 2005 were written with the long view in mind. He stated that these are in place and apply and give a regulatory basis for any inspections or actions that may be necessary. Mr. Bless further discussed the rules and why they should remain at this time.

Chair Neukomm said that it looks like nuclear power will be in our life again and asked if it makes sense to work on this before there is something concrete to deal with. He further asked if somebody proposes construction of a nuclear plant, are the existing rules able to deal with this? Mr. Bless said there was a ballot initiative in 1980 that effectively blocks the construction of new nuclear power plants in Oregon. The 1980 ballot initiative resulted in changes to the Oregon constitution. Tom Stoops, Council Secretary, said he reviewed those rules last month and said the Council would go through its siting process and the Council would determine if a proposed nuclear facility could go forward. That would trigger a ballot initiative for a vote of the people. David Tegart referred to what would happen in regards to the federal government suggestion made on the LNG facilities. Mr. Bless said that one finding the Council would have to make under this ballot initiative is that there is an operating federal spent fuel repository. Mr. Bless recommended that the Council not consider nuclear siting rules at this time, because no one is proposing any new nuclear plants in Oregon and because if the Council were to

adopt rules at this time those rules would almost certainly be obsolete by the time anyone proposed any new facilities, especially in light of the slow progress on Yucca Mountain.

Cathy Van Horn said that as Mr. Stoops pointed out, an application could be received where rules would have to be applied and the Council would have to make a decision whether it could move forward. Ms. Prewitt, Department of Justice, said emergency rulemaking could be done when the time comes, or the Council could do rulemaking as part of the decision process. The Council has the authority to do both. Mr. White said that the nuclear rules need to be looked at, and if there are no changes then a statement should be put in the rulemaking record explaining the reason why the rules remain.

Martha Dibblee said the NRC is making an effort to push the nuclear initiative and believes this should be looked at so the Council will be prepared if the federal government asserts sole jurisdiction, as they did with LNG. If a reasonable state siting framework exists, at least that will be in place if the federal government comes in.

David Ripma stated he's not so sure time should be spent on nuclear rules unless he hears a reason from Staff to consider this because the process of rulemaking can be excruciating. Mr. Ripma also referred back to the NOI and agreed that excess paper is not needed; in fact probably not the CD unless someone individually requests it.

Mr. Ripma also mentioned the balancing rule and said without an actual case he felt it would be hard to decide the rules. On the cumulative impacts, if addressed, he felt there is not enough information to set up rules. Mr. Ripma stated he welcomes Staff's suggestions about rules that would help streamline the process for applicants and everyone involved, rather than get into philosophical discussions about the rules.

Mr. White said that Staff agrees with looking at practical changes to clarify and eliminate rules that have expired or have errors. The nuclear rules mentioned also discuss uranium mills and research reactors, radioactive waste materials and transportation of these materials. These rules should be reviewed, but the conclusion for the rulemaking record could be that Staff recommends taking no action.

Ms. Dibblee stated that there is the possibility that nuclear fuel will be recycled rather than stored, which may impact the siting statute.

Lori Brogoitti commented that, not having been through a rulemaking process, she would like to see everything done that needs to be, but to leave everything else alone.

Chair Neukomm said the approval of the Council is necessary. Karen Green made a motion to authorize Staff to conduct rulemaking and keep the Council informed about the progress, Martha Dibblee seconded the motion, Council was polled and motion passed unanimously:

<b>Lori Brogoitti</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Ripma</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Martha Dibblee</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Bob Shiprack</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Karen Green</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Tegart</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Hans Neukomm</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

### **III. Information Items:**

#### **A. COB Energy Facility Update**

Cathy Van Horn began the discussion on the COB Energy Facility, recalling the Supreme Court's decision to uphold the Energy Facility Siting Council decision for a site certificate. Ms. Van Horn stated that typically there is a start construction deadline as well as a complete construction deadline. If the site certificate holder does not meet the deadline to start construction, then the site certificate holder must request a site certificate extension six months before the date that the site certificate would expire. COB was notified in mid-August that the deadline was coming, and COB requested an extension of one month because they are undergoing a sale. Staff agreed to the extension.

Ms. Van Horn said that in the sale, the site certificate is not for sale, only the LLC. There are rules of how to transfer a site certificate, but not just the LLC. Jan Prewitt, Oregon Department of Justice, stated the re-opener is with the extension request. Any Council standard that is changed can be looked at and make sure they still comply. If it's a sale or transfer of ownership that isn't the LLC then the Council must review the new owner for compliance with the Expertise and Financial Assurance standards. Ms. Van Horn said the Council doesn't lose anything because COB has applied for the extension of the construction dates. The Council depended on COB's parent company to make its findings about organizational expertise; with the transfer of the LLC they will no longer have access to that parent company. Ms. Van Horn stated this kind of situation will be discussed in rulemaking to make sure it does not happen again. A letter was sent out to the COB mailing list and also COB is requesting an extension of its DEQ air permit. A request should be received in September.

Bob Shiprack asked what would take place in September. Ms. Van Horn said the request should come in with a package that discusses the new ownership and the extension for the start of construction dates. Ms. Van Horn said public comment is expected about why the Council should or should not extend those dates. Lori Brogoitti asked about the construction date change; Ms. Van Horn explained the process.

Chair Neukomm asked if there were any other questions; there were none.

#### **B. Briefing on Port Westward Amendment #5.**

Adam Bless, Oregon Department of Energy, said this briefing is for information only and there will be no decisions made at this meeting. He began the presentation showing slides of the construction site. Construction is nearing completion. The plant is not running yet but is expected to begin commercial operation in the spring. Mr. Bless showed slides of the facility, and also Cascade Grain Ethanol Facility which is adjacent to the Port Westward facility. He mentioned the Cascade Grain Ethanol Facility qualified for an exemption from the Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC) over six years ago. It was the first ethanol facility to qualify for the exemption. The construction has just begun on that facility, which brings out the reason for Amendment #5 on Port Westward.

The next slide shown was the Port Westward Peninsula, an industrial area owned by the Port of St. Helens. Portland General Electric (PGE) leases a lot of the land on a long term. Mr. Bless pointed out the Beaver Power Plant, which began in the early 1970's, has had many upgrades all along, and will share many common facilities with the Port Westward Plant.

Mr. Bless talked about the gas pipeline construction going to Cascade Grain Ethanol, which is 12 inches in diameter, so it is sub-jurisdictional to EFSC. While it is under construction PGE and Northwest Natural Gas felt this would be a good opportunity to provide a secondary gas supply to the Port Westward Power Plant. The pipeline would be built, owned and operated by Northwest Natural. Mr. Bless continued to describe the area and show slides where the pipeline would be constructed.

Mr. Bless said the request for Amendment was received on July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Public notice was issued on July 21<sup>st</sup>. The same notice was issued to other agencies. It requested comments by August 21<sup>st</sup> (the traditional 30 days) and no comments were received from the public. One comment was received from the Endangered Plant Program saying if existing site certificate conditions were complied with, it looks like enough to protect any endangered plants that may be found. A Proposed Order was issued August 22<sup>nd</sup>. The site certificate conditions regarding the pipeline will apply to Northwest Natural as if it were their own. Notice of the Proposed Order was issued to the public, put on the website, and public comments are due by September 20<sup>th</sup> (30 days). Northwest Natural would like a decision as soon as possible because of the rainy season approaching.

Bob Shiprack asked what the source is for primary gas for Port Westward. Mr. Bless said a line coming across the river, the Beaver Kelso Pipeline, owned jointly by three owners. Northwest Natural and PGE are two of the owners. Mr. Shiprack questioned the need for these site certificate amendments. He asked why the review cannot be streamlined so projects are not held up so long. Mr. Bless said it is a challenging issue, which the expedited amendment process is one way around the long process.

Chair Neukomm asked how the grain comes to the site for the Cascade Grain Ethanol Facility. Mr. White said it comes by rail.

### **C. Other Updates/Project Overviews**

Cathy Van Horn said that ODOE recently received the request regarding Portland General Electric (PGE) buying the Orion Project. The amendment will be passed and done at the September or October meeting.

Cathy Van Horn said the Project Order for Shepherd's Flat, the wind facility project for Gilliam and Morrow counties, is close to being released. An application probably will be submitted by the end of September. The proposed facility would be 700 MW, which is large, but there are only a couple of landowners that will continue farming. They are going to sell the project before the application phase. There is a Notice of Intent (NOI) from Lifeline, but when the application is received it will be under a different name. The original people will still be involved in some capacity. There was a public meeting and people were in support.

The Shepherd's Flat Wind Project is getting attention for environmental reasons, bird issues and cumulative impact issues, and it is also close to the Boardman range so there is concern about the height of the towers.

John White gave updates on Leaning Juniper and Klondike III.

On Leaning Juniper, a PPM Energy project, the Department received an application in February for a site certificate for Leaning Juniper 1 and 2. Leaning Juniper 1 has already received a conditional use permit and is under construction, nearly complete. Phase 2 would add turbines in the same general area, three or four miles south of Arlington. In May, the applicant notified ODOE of a pending sale of Leaning Juniper 1 and if that sale was completed Leaning Juniper 1 would be removed from the site certificate process. Progress could not be made on the Draft Proposed Order because of this change. PPM Energy announced the sale of Leaning Juniper 1 to PacifiCorp at the end of July and advised ODOE they would submit an amended application on Leaning Juniper 2 and in the process would expand the number of turbines and generating capacity of the proposed project.

Mr. White next gave an update on Klondike III, another PPM Energy project. A site certificate was approved at the end of June; a request for an amendment has been received, even though it is pre-construction. The primary issue for the request is the turbine types. The site certificate restricts the types of turbines can be used. The request is to use larger turbines, but only in certain locations. Also, they want to make adjustments in the layout – an elimination of a 230-kV line along Klondike Lane that they have authorization to build, and they want an alternate O&M facility location and will eliminate one substation. Notice of Amendment was issued, with the deadline for comment August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Mr. White has started preparing a Proposed Order and the earliest time to take action would be mid-October.

Adam Bless said a request was recently received for expedited review of a new wind facility on the bluffs overlooking The Dalles. The size is only 60 MGW so it's not a

large project, and could be sub-jurisdiction, but they have opted in for reasons that will become clear once the application is received. The applicant is a company called UPC.

Mr. Bless said this is close enough to the federally designated Gorge National Scenic Area that the scenic standard may be used. Under expedited review, a Notice of Intent is not necessary. Mr. Bless introduced Mike McLaughlin, a consultant working for UPC Wind Management. Mr. McLaughlin said he would be the project manager for this project and said they are putting exhibits together to present.

Bob Shiprack asked about UPC. Mr. McLaughlin said the main office of the company is located in Boston and have been studying the area for a couple of years for wind energy. Dave Ripma asked if this would be visible from the Gorge. Mr. McLaughlin said they are working to minimize any impact in the area. He also said there will be no turbines in the scenic area. Some of the land leased is in the adjacent area. Mr. Ripma said the federal scenic area does not allow houses to be built in this area.

Mr. Bless said all of the regulations will be discussed, including whether areas outside the scenic area are included in the regulations.

Bob Shiprack asked about the Summit Westward Project. Mr. Bless said their site certificate is dated October of 2002. They were granted a two-year extension in October 2004. The expiration date is October of 2006, but in May of 2006 they requested Amendment #6 which would be another two-year extension. The ODOE asked the applicant for more information involving who the company is, the change of partnership and financial backing. The applicant said they do not intend to pursue building a natural gas fired facility there. The extension would be more of a placeholder. What they are thinking about is an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle facility (IGCC). Legally they might be able to make that conversion as an amendment but it is a totally different facility. In discussions with the applicant and ODOE, they may let the current site certificate expire and have a new Notice of Intent at that site. It may be treated as a new facility.

Mr. Shiprack also asked about Calpine's bankruptcy and the facility in Hermiston. Cathy Van Horn said nothing has been heard yet. Jan Prewitt, Oregon Department of Justice, said more will be heard when the time comes for the letter of credit to be renewed. The bankruptcy court has to approve the letter of credit. A notice will be received from the Court when the time comes.

David Tegart mentioned an article in The Oregonian on hobby wind farms, which are one to five turbines, some of which are being financed through the ODOE, some being subsidized in terms of rates through the Energy Trust. He expressed his concern that EFSC possibly should consider this along with the cumulative impact. Tom Stoops, Council Secretary for EFSC, said he will contact the Renewable and Financing group and find out more.

Jan Prewitt said she has done work with that group on PUC proceedings, particularly determining Public Utility Resources (PURPA) rules. Mr. Shiprack said years ago there was a big pitch for Hydro power. He said there is a real public safety issue that needs to be looked at when integrating these mini projects into the grid.

Lori Brogoitti asked Mr. Stoops about a workshop. Ms. Van Horn said a lot of people are interested in this and they are working on presenting a workshop.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, said Mike Grainey regrets not being at the meeting. He talked about Council members being volunteers, expressed appreciation for the time involved, and thanked Hans Neukomm and Karen Green for their past eight years serving on the Council. Jan Prewitt spoke for the Department of Justice, thanking them for their great help.

Chair Neukomm asked for public comments. There were none.

Chair Neukomm discussed electing new officers. Karen Green made a motion to elect David Ripma as the Chair and Martha Dibblee as the Vice-Chair. Bob Shiprack seconded the motion, Council was polled and motion passed unanimously:

<b>Lori Brogoitti</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Ripma</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Martha Dibblee</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Bob Shiprack</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Karen Green</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>David Tegart</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Hans Neukomm</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

Chair Neukomm and Ms. Green gave closing comments.

Chair Neukomm passed the gavel to David Ripma.

Chair Ripma announced the working lunch is next on the agenda.

#### **IV. Working Lunch:**

Adam Bless gave a short transmission briefing. The U.S. Department of Energy is moving forward with studies mandated by Congress. The Executive Summary was sent to all Council members. There was discussion about the studies and the people and information involved from Oregon in the studies.

Chair Ripma adjourned the meeting.