

# ENERGY FACILITY SITING COUNCIL

CINDY CONDON, CHAIR~ ANN BEIER, VICE CHAIR  
MARCY GRAIL, KENT HOWE, RICHARD DEVLIN, PATRICIA PERRY

## Energy Facility Siting Council February Meeting Minutes

Oregon Department of Energy  
550 Capitol St. NE  
Salem, OR 97301

Friday, February 13, 2026, 8:30 AM

- A. Consent Calendar (Action & Information Item)<sup>1</sup> – Approval of December 19, 2026, Meeting Minutes; Council Secretary Report; and other routine Council business.
- B. Overview of Recent Executive Orders Issued by Governor Kotek (Information Item)<sup>2</sup>
- C. Exemption Rulemaking Public Hearing (Public Hearing)<sup>3</sup>
- D. Tribal Communication Notice Rulemaking – Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Action Item)<sup>4</sup>
- E. Public Comment Period<sup>5</sup>
- F. Appointment of Hearing Officer for Future Contested Case Proceeding on Proposed Order on ASCs for Saddle Butte Energy Facility, Speedway Energy Facility and Well Springs Solar Project (Action Items)<sup>6</sup>
- G. Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Quarterly Construction Update (Information Item)<sup>7</sup>
- H. Compliance Program Update (Information Item)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item A = 00:03:29 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>2</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item B = 00:28:31 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>3</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item C = 01:21:47 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>4</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item D = 01:26:38 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>5</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item E = 01:41:30 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>6</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item F = 02:00:58 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>7</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item G = 02:08:28 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>8</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item H = 02:52:41 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

I. Radioactive Materials Enforcement Rulemaking Five-year review (Action Item)<sup>9</sup>

The meeting materials presented to Council are available online [here](#).

**Call to Order:** Vice-Chair Beier called the meeting to order at 8:30 am

**Roll Call:** Vice-Chair Ann Beier, Council Members Kent Howe, Richard Devlin and Patty Perry were present in person.

Oregon Department of Energy representatives present were Assistant Director for Siting/Council Secretary Todd Cornett; Senior Policy Advisor Sarah Esterson, Rules Coordinator Tom Jackman, Compliance Officers Brett Farman, Egan Bull and Hannah Satein, and Administrative Assistant Nancy Hatch. Oregon Department of Justice Senior Assistant Attorney General Patrick Rowe was present virtually.

**Agenda Modification:** There were no agenda modifications.

**A. Consent Calendar (Action & Information Item)**<sup>10</sup> – Approval of December 2025 Meeting Minutes; Council Secretary Report; and other routine Council business.

1. Approval of December 2025 Meeting Minutes

**Council Member Howe motioned that the Council approve the minutes of the December 19, 2025, meeting as presented and recommended by Staff.**

**Council Member Devlin seconded the motion.**

**The motion was carried unanimously.**

2. Council Secretary Report - Secretary Cornett offered the following comments during his report to the Council:

Legislative Updates

- HB 4031- Would amend EFSC's exemption statute (469.320) to allow developers to opt out of EFSC jurisdiction and apply to the applicable city or county for any solar, wind or geothermal project until December 31, 2028.
- HB 4076 - Creates a new concept of surplus interconnection and appears to allow new projects or amendments to existing projects that would use up that surplus capacity as long

<sup>9</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item I = 03:59:30 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

<sup>10</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item A = 00:05:41 – 2026-02-13-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

as it was within 2 miles of the point of interconnect and would give them a pass on a reasons exception, no matter the type of farmland soils that the new project or amended project was located on.

- HB 4084 - Establishes a Joint Permitting Council made up of agency representatives with the purpose of directing the applicable regulatory entity to expedite permit reviews.

*Vice Chair Beier questioned whether the proposed house bill applies to only energy facilities.*

*Secretary Cornett provided the house bill refers to permits in general, but it has thresholds for a hundred million dollars' worth of value of the project. While it would include EFSC projects, it would also include other agencies permits such as ODOT or DEQ.*

- HB 4019 - Except when otherwise required by state statute or federal law, an agency shall base approval or denial of an application for a new permit on the rules and standards that are applicable at the time that the agency determines the application is complete.

#### Project Updates

- Klamath Cogeneration Project Amendment 6 – The Department has received an amendment request for the Klamath Cogeneration Project. This is a 535 MW Natural Gas fired, combined cycle cogeneration facility located approximately 3 miles southwest of the city of Klamath Falls. The project was approved in 1997. The parent company is Avangrid Renewables. The amendment seeks to change a condition related to boiler blowdown and its use as makeup water for the cooling tower. This is a condition that the compliance team has identified the certificate holder has failed to meet and gave them the option of adhering to the condition or applying for an amendment. Staff have determined the certificate holder did not provide sufficient information to justify the adjacent property owner notification information was accurate and determined the amendment request incomplete. Once that information is received, Staff will provide public notice and post the amendment to the project page.
- Yellow Rosebush Contested Case – This is an 800 MW Solar and battery storage project proposed in Wasco County on approximately 12 square miles located approximately 9 miles east of the City of Maupin. The applicant is wholly owned subsidiary of Savion, LLC, which is part of the Shell Group. Two petitions were received requesting to participate in the contested case phase. The petitions have been reviewed by the applicant, the Department and the hearing officer. Based on that review, the hearing officer issued an Order on Party Status and Issues, granting party status to 1 petitioner on 1 issue. One petition was denied because they did not provide comments on the record of the Draft Proposed Order, which is a requirement to participate in the contested case phase.

The sole issue for the contested case proceeding is: Whether, pursuant to OAR 345-022-0060(1) the design, construction, and operation of the facility, taking into account

mitigation, are consistent with the general fish and wildlife habitat mitigation goals and standards of OAR 635-415-0025(1) through (6) in effect as of February 24, 2017, for “Habitat Category 2” fish or wildlife species, population, or unique assemblage of species, in that it results in a no net loss of either habitat quantity or quality and provides a net benefit of habitat quantity or quality. The hearing officer has scheduled a prehearing conference for February 17, 2026 to establish the schedule for the contested case phase.

- Biglow Canyon Wind Farm Amendment #4 – This is a 450 MW operational wind project located approximately 2 miles northeast of Wasco in Sherman County. It is owned by Portland General Electric. Amendment #4 proposes to add up to 125 MW of solar on 2.2 square miles. Amendment 4 is the first amendment going through the Council’s new amendment rules, as adopted in October 2025. The new amendment rules eliminated the possibility for a contested case but added an enhanced comment process, where following the comment period, the certificate holder and Department have opportunities to respond to commenters, commenters have an opportunity to reply, and certificate holder and Department have a final opportunity to offer sur-replies.

The Council held a hearing on the Proposed Order and Amendment Request at the January 15, 2026 meeting; the comment period closed on January 30. Comments were received from 17 commenters, including the certificate holder. The deadline for the certificate holder and the Department to respond to comments is February 13. The Department has already provided its response to the commenters, where the response has been provided in 1 document, organized by standard and then issue.

All comments received, and all subsequent responses, replies and sur-replies will be available on the Department’s project page so that Council and members of the public can review at anytime the comments, issues and evaluation. Replies by commenters are due by Feb 27; sur-replies by the certificate holder and the Department are due by March 6. The Department is then planning to present the results of the new comment process in a draft of the final order for review at the March meeting.

Active Renewable Energy Project Overview – Secretary Cornett provided a table that shows all the EFSC jurisdictional renewable energy projects that had been provided in the Monthly Siting report.

- Operational – There are currently mostly operational wind projects with a few Solar ones, all totaling a little over 3 Gigawatts.
- Construction – There are currently no EFSC jurisdictional renewable energy projects in construction.
- Approved But Not Built – Projects that get approved by EFSC do not necessarily immediately go into construction. Some ultimately build all that is approved, some build a portion of what is approved, and others do not move forward and terminate their site certificate. Of the 3.2 Gigawatts of renewable energy that have been approved by EFSC

but have not initiated construction, the range of the approval dates is from April 2020 to Nov. 2024.

- Under Review Application – There are no wind projects that have submitted their application and 2 Gigawatts of Solar project that have.
- Under Review Notice of Intent – For those in the Notice of Intent, or pre-application stage, there are 1.5 Gigawatts of Wind and 4.1 Gigawatts of Solar.

#### Compliance and Inspections Updates

- Montague Wind Power Facility – Montague Wind Power Facility is a 201 MW wind energy facility located in Gilliam County. The project has been operational since 2019 and the parent company is Avangrid Renewables. The site has made significant progress towards revegetation, but the monitoring report notes there are significant weed issues across the site that have worsened over the last three years and the certificate holder submitted limited evidence regarding weed control. The site has not submitted a site-specific fire safety plan. The site did complete the required raptor nest occupancy monitoring, but the report for the second year of monitoring lacks the required analysis of both monitoring years. For all these conditions, as well as some others of less note, the Department has issued information requests for resolution this month.

#### Upcoming Meeting Dates

- March 19-20- Meeting to be held in Boardman Oregon at the Sage Center
- April 16-17- TBD

*Council Member Devlin questioned whether the 2024 Annual Report refers to the year of the report or of the incidents.*

*Secretary Cornett provided the information is from the 2024 annual report which was submitted at the end of April 2025.*

**B. Overview of Recent Executive Orders Issued by Governor Kotek (Information Item)** – Amy Schlusser; Natural Resources Climate Advisor; and Chandra Ferrari, Natural Resources Policy Advisor presented an overview of recent Executive Orders.

*Council Member Howe questioned the definition of “working lands and waters” in Oregon.*

*Ms. Ferrari clarified the term refers to lands and waters that are used and useful for producing a commodity in Oregon, including Exclusive Farm Use land as well as ocean waters. There are some provisions that are specific to the near shore environment recognizing that there is not a robust economic engine that relies upon those resources, but there are a lot of resilience challenges there for communities and for resources.*

*Council Member Devlin questioned how the Executive Order relates to the issues that occur because of interactions with federal partners and state partners, particularly with Washington State.*

*Ms. Ferrari stated while there is nothing directly in the executive order that controls our federal partners, it does anticipate that the State is going to place ourselves in a position to leverage the partnerships to the greatest degree possible by being very intentional about work being done and the priorities of the work.*

*Vice Chair Beier stated EFSC relies on a lot of partnerships such as land trusts and mitigation banks which will contribute to the Executive Order goal.*

*Ms. Ferrari confirmed adding that this is a goal that absolutely relies on other partners. There is no way the State would be able to meet the goal on their own.*

*Vice Chair Beier, noting the statement that the natural resource agencies budgets are stretched, questioned whether there are any resources available for additional efforts to achieve the goals in the Executive Order.*

*Ms. Ferrari stated this does not come with new resources at this moment. She stated we are going to position ourselves through being intentional, prioritized, and focused with our work to make the best case for additional funding sources.*

*Council Member Howe questioned direction for the 10 by 10 component of the Executive Order.*

*Ms. Ferrari explained the 10 by 10 mandate is quite broad and it is not a strict protection campaign though it was inspired by some of those campaigns. It is referring to any action taken that in a durable way improves resilience.*

*Vice Chair Beier stated, in reference to the Community and Wildfire Resilience component, EFSC would like to be informed/involved with discussions regarding wildfire resilience as it is of significant issue for members of the public involved in the EFSC process.*

*Ms. Ferrari stated the Executive Order requires the initiation of interagency leadership team to implement this work, which includes representatives from all of the natural resources agencies. They are also the conduits to boards and commissions because the work plans that are being developed must be shared with boards and commissions as well as an opportunity for public comments must be provided.*

*Council Member Devlin noted that while most people think of forest fires when thinking about wildfires, grassland fires are of concern for wind and solar facilities.*

*Ms. Ferrari acknowledged her agreement and stated as agencies develop their workplans, one of the tasks is to identify areas of opportunities or missing gaps. Rangeland resilience is one of the topics that has arisen from the task.*

*Council Member Howe noted the issue is not just rangeland but also farmland.*

*Vice Chair Beier, noting her tenure on the Council, stated Staff and Council have been working on streamlining and clarifying the EFSC process in Rulemaking by addressing perceived barriers within the statutory mandates that are required. The effort is well underway to make the process easier for developers, for the public and clearer and more transparent. It is challenging as there is a balance between the governor's interests, the climate change interests, and the interests of the public. She stressed that the input from the public is vital though some may see it as a barrier. Agency engagement with the public is one of the things that Oregonians value.*

*Council Member Devlin stated EFSC has numerous projects that have been approved but are not under construction. While part of the reason for that might be changes in federal subsidies, a large issue is regarding how BPA allocates its transmission. The issue is how transmission capabilities are allocated as well as the issue of risk. Developers do not want to develop a facility unless they have a power purchase agreement. He stated there are also some issues with some of the proposals in the legislature to basically allow any jurisdiction to approve applications. In most cases, those jurisdictions do not have the resources to review the relative requirements. The problems are larger than Oregon, and larger than a small council that approves projects in accordance with state statutes and regulations. There is no national energy policy.*

*Council Member Howe noting his agreement with Council Member Devlin's comments, added Council approval of a site certificate is speculative and the industry has to implement what Council has authorized. Many are approved and not implemented.*

*Ms. Schlusser stated Council's comments are issues that were considered through the creation of the executive order. There are a myriad of challenges and complex issues that are affecting clean energy deployment in Oregon. The siting process is not the problem. The intent of the executive order was to look at where the State has control over processes as there are certain elements and certain issues involved which the State has limited power to address. The executive order and the Governor's focus is what the state can do with the tools that it has available to it to help projects get deployed more quickly across Oregon in a way that is still transparent and provides for public process engagement. She emphasized that the executive order does not intend to erode protections for the things that Oregon cares about or eliminate public process or reduce transparency or ask the Council to be rubber stamping projects.*

*Council Member Devlin suggested if the four northwestern states worked together with BPA, it might have a possibility of improving the transmission allocations.*

Secretary Cornett questioned the definition of “barrier” in terms of the siting process. He stated the perception of a barrier varies. A barrier could be a very different thing based on the particular person or stakeholder group.

Ms. Schlusser stated It is not a defined term for the reasons that were articulated. The hope is that Council can help the Governor’s office better understand how it balances those complex issues and perspectives and priorities and how they interact and how they affect the timelines for approving siting certificate applications.

Secretary Cornett stated if a barrier is removed that can maybe benefit one stakeholder group, it can equally and oppositely negatively impact another stakeholder group.

Vice Chair Beier noted her appreciation for the presentation. She stated she encouraged the Governor’s office to track Council’s extensive ongoing rulemaking. She noted that there have been more notices of intents in the past five months meaning there are projects coming in the pipeline. There is a lot being done to make the process easier while still getting input from all other agencies involved. Given the current political environment regarding renewable energy and climate change, it is important that the State stay tough on these issues and working with the developers and the public to help address these really complex issues.

**C. Exemption Rulemaking Public Hearing (Public Hearing)** – Tom Jackman, Siting Policy Analyst & Rules Coordinator, explained the legal requirements for providing comments on the record and facilitated the public hearing.

**There were no public comments provided during the public hearing.**

**D. Tribal Communication Notice Rulemaking – Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Action Item)** – Tom Jackman, Siting Policy Analyst & Rules Coordinator. Council considered staff’s recommendation to formally initiate the Tribal Communication Rulemaking by filing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking with the Oregon Secretary of State.

Council Member Howe questioned if the language “Indian historic and cultural resources” regarding the requirement for the protection of tribal lands has the specificity needed in the rulemaking.

Secretary Cornett stated it is important to recognize that the language is not asking for any specific information. The idea is for developers to talk to the tribal governments before money and time are spent developing a project in a specific location. The Tribal communities will be able to provide to the developers information related to cultural resources that may not be available elsewhere.

**Council Member Howe motioned the Council approve initiation of formal proceedings on the Tribal Communication Rulemaking, with the scope and objectives recommended in the staff report; approve Staff to file a notice of proposed rulemaking with the draft rules that are**

**included in Attachment 1 to the staff report; and authorize Staff to schedule a public hearing during the public comment period.**

**Council Member Perry seconded the motion.**

**The motion was carried unanimously.**

**E. Public Comments (Information Item)<sup>11</sup>** – This time was reserved for the public to address the Council regarding any item within Council jurisdiction that is not otherwise closed for comment.

Ms. Connie Lee – Ms. Lee expressed deep concern about large-scale solar energy developments planned in rural Oregon. She explained that these projects will cover hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland and long-established communities, including their own on Juniper Flat where families have lived for generations. They worry about impacts such as extensive fencing, millions of solar panels, lithium battery installations, and miles of energized transmission lines. While they support renewable energy, they feel the pace and scale of development are overwhelming communities, driven by incentives for developers rather than long-term responsibility. She urged Council to carefully consider environmental and community impacts, questioning whether the current approach is sustainable or responsible for Oregon’s future. She acknowledged the difficulty of balancing these issues and thanked Council for their work.

Mr. Brett Smith – Mr. Smith, an attorney representing 13 landowners in eastern Oregon affected by Idaho Power’s Boardman-to-Hemingway (B2H) transmission line explains that while just compensation is being addressed in court, landowners still face major uncertainties tied to the project’s construction and mitigation plans. The attorney notes that ODOE staff and Idaho Power’s contractor have been cooperative, but the overall process used by the PUC and EFSC has created significant challenges for landowners.

Because landowners were never voluntary participants and received no initial compensation or negotiated agreements—unlike typical energy development deals—they now struggle with unclear or incomplete information about how Idaho Power will access and use their property. Mitigation plans require coordination with landowners, yet those landowners have no obligation to facilitate the project and lack clear, practical details about road locations, gates, weed management, surveying accuracy, wildfire prevention, and noise requirements. Many landowners have also received inconsistent or incomplete surveys and environmental data. Specific concerns include:

- Reclamation and revegetation plans lacking definitiveness
- Noxious weed management plans with unclear responsibilities
- The agricultural mitigation plan not aligning with the compensation analyses used in court
- Road construction, access, and quality issues

---

<sup>11</sup> Audio/Video for Agenda Item E = 00:52:49– 2025-10-24-EFSC-Meeting-Audio/Video

- Survey discrepancies involving unrecognized corners
- Vegetation clearing and logging uncertainties
- Long-term access and crossing plans
- Communication gaps among Idaho Power and its subcontractors, leading to gate issues, off-road travel, and unfamiliar individuals entering private land

Mr. Smith emphasized that small adjustments and clear communication could greatly improve outcomes for landowners. They express appreciation for ongoing assistance from ODOE and Idaho Power's contractor and hope to resolve issues without filing formal complaints.

**F. Appointment of Hearing Officer for Future Contested Case Proceeding on Proposed Order on ASCs for Saddle Butte Energy Facility, Speedway Energy Facility and Well Springs Solar Project (Action Items)** – Sarah Esterson, Senior Policy Advisor. Council considered the appointment of Oregon Office of Administrative Hearings Senior Administrative Law Judges, in accordance with ORS 469.470, as the Hearing Officer for contested case proceedings associated with Saddle Butte Energy Facility, Speedway Energy Facility and Well Springs Solar Project.

**Council Member Devlin motioned the Council appoint Administrative Law Judge Jennifer Rackstraw from the Oregon Office of Administrative Hearings as the Hearing Officer for the contested case proceeding on the Application for Site Certificate for the Saddle Butte Energy Facility, as recommended by Staff.**

**Council Member Howe seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Council Member Howe motioned the Council appoint Administrative Law Judge Jennifer Rackstraw from the Oregon Office of Administrative Hearings as the Hearing Officer for the contested case proceeding on the Application for Site Certificate for the Speedway Energy Facility, as recommended by Staff.**

**Council Member Devlin seconded her motion.**

**The motion was carried unanimously.**

**Council Member Perry motioned the Council appoint Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth Jerry from the Oregon Office of Administrative Hearings as the Hearing Officer for the Draft Proposed Order public hearing and contested case proceedings for the Well Springs Solar Project, as recommended by Staff.**

**Council Member Howe seconded the motion.**

**The motion was carried unanimously.**

**G. Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Quarterly Construction Update (Information Item)** – Wally Adams, Senior Technical Expert with Haley and Aldrich.

*Vice Chair Beier questioned the blasting distance notice requirements for area landowners in the vicinity.*

*Mr. Adams stated the distance is definitely in the plan though he was unsure of the exact distance. He will provide the distance at a later date. There are noticing requirements as well as consultation with the landowners prior to blasting.*

*Council Member Howe questioned whether the issues of noncompliance being noted as closed were also closed by BLM.*

*Mr. Adams confirmed that is correct that BLM had closed all of those that were also issues of BLM non compliance.*

*Vice Chair Beier inquired how a member of the public can access the compliance reports.*

*Mr. Adams provided members of the public can submit a public records request to the Oregon Department of Energy.*

*Council Member Perry inquired what is the relationship between ODOE compliance standards and BLM compliance standards.*

*Mr. Adams provided a brief summary of the compliance measures for BLM, noting both ODOE and BLM require a root cause analysis for noncompliance issues in addition to the correction of the issue.*

*Vice Chair Beier noted, regarding the noxious weed plan, noxious weeds are an ongoing issue and applying the best practices learned from this project to other projects will be beneficial.*

**H. Compliance Program Update (Information Item)** – Compliance Officers Egan Bull, Brett Farman and Hannah Satein provided Council with a six-month update on compliance program activities.

*Vice Chair Beier questioned how the large workload is divided between the compliance team.*

*Mr. Farman stated the team divides the workload as equally as possible. Each officer has projects that are in the different project categories and phases. Each project will have a lead who is the primary contact for the facility. For annual reports, often the team will jump in and help each other get certain pieces done. Compliance requires a team effort.*

*Vice Chair Beier noted her appreciation for the introduction of compliance reporting “kick off meetings.” It will aid in providing clarity of the requirements for the reports as well as communication and follow up requirements for the yearly reports.*

*Vice Chair Beier questioned whether a repower of a wind facility requires decommissioning.*

*Secretary Cornett provided a repower does not include removing the tower, but usually it includes removing blades and the nacelle. If an entire wind turbine is removed, it would be a partial decommissioning, which he believes Council will see more of in the future.*

*Vice Chair Beier noting Council’s desire to be informed of any new trending risks in compliance, stated it is important for Council to adopt compliance conditions that are enforceable. The compliance reports provide useful feedback for Council’s ability to create future workable conditions.*

*Council Member Devlin stated it would be helpful to have reports of any issues of noncompliance at every other Council meeting, particularly if there is a pattern of non-compliance or any resistance with resolving a violation. He questioned whether Council has the ability to shut down a site if it deems a site is not operating safely.*

*Secretary Cornett stated while that has never been necessary, recent rule changes do include the provision to allow for partial decommissioning. He believes Council will increasingly see that process for various reasons, such as turbine fatigue.*

*Council Member Devlin added attempts to operate beyond the useful life of the equipment could create some significant issues.*

*Mr. Farman stated the compliance team would be examining the causes for equipment issues including possible trends, such as spatial temporal or a specific type of equipment. In response to Vice Chair Beier’s comment, he noted the compliance team is interested in understanding how the compliance reports and feedback are most informative in the context of what conditions are being put into new site certificates.*

*Secretary Cornett added the lessons learned on conditions take time as the siting process evolves. Connecting the compliance team with the siting analyst team to make sure that the conditions that are being created are clear and objective, and implementable as they can be is vital, especially as projects can take multiple years for construction to begin.*

**I. Radioactive Materials Enforcement Rulemaking Five-year review (Action Item)-Tom Jackman, Siting Policy Analyst & Rules Coordinator**

**Council Member Howe motioned the Council approve the Radioactive Materials Enforcement Rulemaking – 5 Year Review Report as presented and recommended by Staff in the staff report.**

**Council Member Devlin seconded the motion.**

**The motion was carried unanimously.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM.**

---

FINAL