



## ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

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

### Verbatim Transcript

(From Audio Recording)

---

### Carriger Solar Special Council Meeting v.

---

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

**Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR**  
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™  
PDF transcript bundle contains:

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

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

Carriger Special Council Meeting

October 21, 2025

---

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

---

APPEARANCES:

KURT BECKETT  
Chair

BLAKE NELSON  
Ecology

NATE PAMPLIN  
Fish and Wildlife

MAVERICK RYAN  
Natural Resources

STACEY BREWSTER  
Utilities & Transportation Commission

MATT CHILES  
Carriger Solar - Klickitat County

JON THOMPSON  
TALIA THUET  
Assistant Attorneys General

SONIA BUMPUS  
AMI HAFKEMEYER  
JOAN OWENS

ANDREA GRANTHAM  
SEAN GREENE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

JOANNE SNARSKI  
ALEX SHIRLEY  
Council Staff  
SARAH REYNEVELD  
Counsel for the Environment

1 TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2025; OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

2 KURT BECKETT: This is Kurt Beckett, chair  
3 of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, calling at  
4 9:01 A.M. to order our special council meeting for the  
5 Carriger Solar project.

6 And, Ms. Grantham, would you call the role please?

7 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Of course.

8 Department of Commerce.

9 Department of Ecology.

10 BLAKE NELSON: Blake Nelson, present.

11 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Department of Fish and  
12 Wildlife.

13 NATE PAMPLIN: Nate Pamplin, present.

14 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Department of Natural  
15 Resources.

16 MAVERICK RYAN: Maverick Ryan, present.

17 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Utilities & Transportation  
18 Commission.

19 STACEY BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, present.

20 ANDREA GRANTHAM: For local government and  
21 optional state agency for Carriger Solar, Matt Chiles.

22 MATT CHILES: Matt Chiles, present.

23 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Assistant Attorney  
24 General, Jon Thompson.

25 JON THOMPSON: Present.

1                   ANDREA GRANTHAM: For Council staff, Sonia  
2 Bumpus.

3                   SONIA BUMPUS: Present.

4                   ANDREA GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer.

5                   AMI HAFKEMEYER: Present.

6                   ANDREA GRANTHAM: Sean Greene.

7                   SEAN GREENE: Present.

8                   ANDREA GRANTHAM: And Joanne Snarski.

9                   JOANNE SNARSKI: Present.

10                  ANDREA GRANTHAM: Do we have anyone here for  
11 the Counsel for the Environment?

12                  SARAH REYNEVELD: Sarah Reyneveld is  
13 present.

14                  ANDREA GRANTHAM: Thank you.

15                  Chair, there is a quorum.

16                  KURT BECKETT: Thank you very much.

17                  I will share, for the benefit of the group, that my  
18 computer has had a cold restart for the second time in real  
19 time. So I'll do my best to play along here with  
20 Ms. Grantham's assistance.

21                  So, as I believe we all know, we are here today to  
22 consider the revised draft site certification agreement for  
23 the Carriger Solar project as well as Resolution 360.

24                  So, with that, we are going to begin with the staff  
25 presentation. I'll be happy to take comments and questions

1 from the Council on that presentation first, and then, if  
2 it's the will of the Council, we'll proceed to consider the  
3 action of both those documents that I have mentioned. So,  
4 with that, I believe Ami Hafkemeyer will lead the staff  
5 briefing this morning.

6 AMI HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair Beckett.  
7 And good morning, Council. I appreciate everybody joining  
8 us here at 9:00 A.M.

9 So today we are here to talk about the activity that's  
10 been going on for the Carriger Solar project. And I would  
11 like to hand this presentation over to Ms. Snarski.

12 JOANNE SNARSKI: Thank you, Ami.

13 Well, let's go ahead and forward to the next slide.  
14 Well, given that we have -- I'm sorry. I should say this  
15 is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist for Carriger  
16 Solar.

17 Just a quick reminder for a couple of our new council  
18 members that we're reviewing the Carriger Solar project  
19 which is 160-megawatt solar voltaic electric generating  
20 facility in Klickitat County. It also has an adjoining  
21 63-megawatt battery storage. The acreage of the site on  
22 private land is approximately 2,108 acres, but only 1,326  
23 of those will include the project components.

24 So this map shows you the general location within  
25 Washington. It also narrows down into the county and gives

1 you a little further detail on the bottom-lower left of how  
2 it looks within that area.

3 Go ahead to the next slide.

4 So the current status, and to give a little bit of  
5 background. On June 25th, 2025, the EFSEC Council voted to  
6 approve a recommendation to the Governor for the facility.  
7 After the Governor's consideration, he remanded that back  
8 to EFSEC on August 22nd. At that point, he indicated what  
9 he wanted us to take further action on. And I'll go into  
10 detail on that next.

11 But the next action that was taken after the remand was  
12 for Chair Beckett to send a letter to the Yakama Nation  
13 Council Chairman. And that was sent on August 26 asking  
14 for their response to a few of the items we'll go over.  
15 They then responded in September on September 25th to the  
16 EFSEC Council. At that point EFSEC reviewed the  
17 information they provided and developed draft Resolution  
18 360 and revised the site certification agreement on October  
19 3rd.

20 We then put that out to public comment on October 6th  
21 through the 19th. And it is those two items that we are  
22 here to evaluate for your consideration.

23 Next slide, please.

24 So, in the Governor's remand, he directed Chair Beckett  
25 to allow the Yakama Nation the opportunity to provide input

1 on Chair Beckett's confidential summary memo of the  
2 consultation he and staff held with the tribe on June 4th,  
3 2025. The other direction -- I'm sorry. The other  
4 direction was to give the Yakama Nation the opportunity to  
5 provide additional input on five mitigation measures that  
6 we identified in our mitigated determination of  
7 non-significance.

8 Those included the setbacks from solar panels and the  
9 fencing to the road. And I'll show more detail on what  
10 those mitigation measures look like. But it also includes  
11 some measures, such as traffic control plans, allowed for  
12 their review as well as site restoration, evaluation of  
13 those plans.

14 Next slide, please.

15 So in the Yakama Nation's response, they expressed two  
16 primary concerns, and they also provided some suggestions  
17 that they would like to see. But I'll go over the concerns  
18 that they provided.

19 In the Chair Beckett's consultation memo, they  
20 expressed that the memo did not capture the depth of their  
21 concerns regarding TCPs. They also prefer an adjudicative  
22 process. And, without an adjudicative process, EFSEC  
23 council cannot interpret fully, and their interpretation is  
24 flawed and inaccurate without that process.

25 That last point (indecipherable) part of the summary

1 memo. It was one other major area that they disagreed  
2 with. And in it, essentially, they disagreed with EFSEC's  
3 finding of the decision for the mitigated determination of  
4 non-significance.

5 Next slide, please.

6 Their suggestions to remedy that, in this case, would  
7 be, first, they prefer to deny the approval for placement  
8 of solar panels in the northern portion of the project.  
9 And, on these in this portion, they would like to have seen  
10 conservation leases on those parcels be entered into.

11 Next, if that could not be done, they would prefer the  
12 Council withdraw the mitigated determination of  
13 non-significance and the draft recommendation, and perform  
14 a full environmental-impact statement and an adjudication  
15 process.

16 Next slide, please.

17 So, after that response, we had redrafted -- or we  
18 evaluated that information, but we were also required under  
19 the OPMA to provide public comments on the two documents  
20 that we drafted from that response. In that public comment  
21 that recently closed, we received 12 comments. Six of the  
22 comments reflected environmental impacts or process  
23 concerns by EFSEC.

24 The environmental impacts that were expressed were with  
25 regards to land use, visual aesthetics, wildfire, wildlife,

1 and cultural resources. The EFSEC process concerns  
2 included review and approval of our process, the timing of  
3 our meetings, and the length of the comment period.  
4 However, no comments provided new information or justified  
5 changes to the draft resolution that was up for comment.

6 Next slide, please.

7 So, with regards to the mitigation that the Governor  
8 requested that we provide the Yakama Nation with additional  
9 time to review. Once we received their information back,  
10 we really had to review and reflect on what actions we had  
11 taken through our mitigated determination and  
12 non-significance that was completed here on April 7th in  
13 2025.

14 We reviewed what actions we took and that were -- how  
15 they addressed the traditional and cultural properties that  
16 the Yakama Nation have concerns with.

17 What we did was to include substantial setbacks  
18 established to the TCPs and the transportation routes in  
19 that area.

20 We also provided supplemental fencing layout and design  
21 to support wildlife movement that was consistent with the  
22 Department of Fish and Wildlife's input and requests.

23 We also added some enhanced visual screening to  
24 incorporate natural features. That was done in the revised  
25 MDNS later in the process.

1 We also provided the Yakama Nation -- I believe, per  
2 their request -- to review the site restoration plans.  
3 There's two plans that they will participate in: the  
4 initial plan as well as the final plan for decommissioning.

5 And, finally, the developer also is going to provide  
6 financial support to the Yakama Nation for supplemental  
7 studies on TCPs in the project area.

8 So, with regards to the mitigation that we requested --  
9 next slide, please -- we have a few graphics and  
10 simulations that I think will be helpful to understand the  
11 actions that EFSEC has included in our determination.

12 So this slide shows the increased setbacks from State  
13 Route 142, which is along the southern portion of the  
14 project -- that small red dot on the bottom of the  
15 right-hand graphic shows you where this graphic is showing.  
16 The original setback is on the left. The revised layout is  
17 on the right, demonstrating an additional setback of the  
18 fencing in that area.

19 Next slide, please.

20 And this is the simulation that was provided to us by  
21 the developer through our discussions and requests from  
22 them. It shows the existing condition on the left, the  
23 original setback on the top right, and then the increased  
24 setbacks and how that will look on the lower right. Again,  
25 that's from State Route 142.

1 Next slide, please.

2 So these are the increased setbacks along Night Road.  
3 Again, you can see the area that this is depicting in the  
4 right hand graphic where the red dot is. It's  
5 demonstrating that there are additional setbacks that were  
6 provided. And it equates to about 50 to 70 feet along that  
7 road.

8 Next slide please.

9 Again, these are the actual simulations of that along  
10 Night Road from the existing, to the original setbacks, and  
11 then the increased setbacks on the lower right.

12 Just trying to provide enough time to let folks kind of  
13 take that in -- absorb it.

14 But next slide, please.

15 So this graphic shows the increased setbacks that we  
16 added from the DNR parcel, which were particular to the  
17 issues that the Yakama had expressed their concerns from  
18 viewing along the or on the DNR parcel -- which is this  
19 particular parcel.

20 So what you're looking at, at that blue shaded area, is  
21 the actual DNR parcel itself. The upper portion is showing  
22 the solar panel of the original layout. And then the  
23 bottom portion is showing the increased setbacks shown from  
24 that area.

25 And the next slide shows what that simulation would

1 look like. From the existing condition, again, to the  
2 original in the upper right. And the increased setback in  
3 the lower right.

4 The next slide actually shows a depiction of from the  
5 DNR parcel. Really from the center, I think you can see,  
6 again, that red dot on the lower-left graphic side is  
7 demonstrating where this simulation was captured from. And  
8 I think this shows a lot more of the setting of the area  
9 along with the existing infrastructure. In that case, the  
10 BPA line transmission lines up there along that area. And,  
11 of course, this section in the north sits right adjacent  
12 and beneath that transmission line.

13 So you see the original setbacks that are depicted and,  
14 again, the revised with the setbacks we added into that.

15 Next slide please.

16 So EFSEC's recommendation -- staff recommendation to  
17 the Council is that EFSEC's determination of  
18 non-significance is based on effective mitigation  
19 identified in the draft site certification agreement. It  
20 reduces impacts to the traditional and cultural properties,  
21 visual aesthetics, the sense of place, the access, the  
22 quality of experience, and traditional hunting practices to  
23 moderate or below magnitude.

24 We do not recommend any additional mitigation. And,  
25 you know, this is -- per the governor's request, staff

1 provided the supplemental opportunity for the Yakama Nation  
2 to provide input on that mitigation. Upon our review of  
3 the information they provided -- the Yakama Nation, that  
4 is -- and our re-review of our SEPA analysis we performed,  
5 we determined our analysis supports that impacts are  
6 reduced to non-significance.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So, with that, most of -- well, all of this information  
9 is articulated in the draft resolution that has been  
10 available for your review as well as the public. What we  
11 are proposing is to add new language to the revised or  
12 amended site-certification agreement. And we're only  
13 making one suggested change -- and that is to Article 7,  
14 sub-paragraph H, and it's under the project operation.

15 Next slide please.

16 And this language was done at the request of ensuring  
17 that we were providing clear request and requirement by the  
18 developer to provide funding to the Confederated Tribes of  
19 the Yakama Nation for grant funds to do further analysis on  
20 traditional and cultural properties in the vicinity of the  
21 Carriger Energy project. That funding amount is for  
22 \$100,000. And the request will be for them to receive that  
23 money once the facility becomes commercially operational.

24 So next slide.

25 That concludes my presentation. And this is what we

1 would be requesting of the Council today -- providing this  
2 draft motion.

3 But we can have questions or discussion as needed.

4 KURT BECKETT: Thank you, Ms. Snarski.

5 So, as I stated at the outset, let's go ahead and take  
6 questions or comments from the Council on the staff  
7 presentation before we move to entertain any actions.

8 My computer is back and running.

9 So be free to raise your hand or speak up, and  
10 Ms. Grantham and I will call on you.

11 Councilman Pamplin.

12 NATE PAMPLIN: Great. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

13 And thanks for the presentation, Ms. Snarski. Very  
14 clear. And I'm tracking -- gone through all the materials,  
15 and appreciated the overview this morning.

16 I just wanted to explore a little bit further of Yakama  
17 Nation's request of not permitting solar panels in the  
18 northern portion of the project area. I believe that's  
19 also coupled with the suggestion of turning those parcels  
20 and requiring that the project proponent secure  
21 conservation easements on those.

22 I don't know if we could compel. I know we can't  
23 compel landowners to enter into conservation easements  
24 along the lines of suggestion, but I imagine it is within  
25 scope to not permit siting the solar array in that northern

1 area.

2 Now, we've already gone through the environmental  
3 analysis and shown that we think that, with the revised  
4 mitigated determination of non-significance, that that's  
5 resolved. But, just for the sake of kind of understanding  
6 the nature of the request, could you describe what that  
7 would entail and what would that mean to the overall power  
8 generating capacity of the project, please?

9 SEAN GREENE: Madam --

10 JOANNE SNARSKI: I think I'm going to look  
11 for a little help on this.

12 SEAN GREENE: Yeah. I can probably answer  
13 that.

14 This is Sean Greene, SEPA specialist for EFSEC.

15 We've had discussions with the applicant for this  
16 project about what imposing the Yakama Nation's  
17 recommendations would look like in terms of the viability  
18 of their project and the power generation.

19 They've suggested that it's about a reduction by half  
20 of the project's power generation. And their contention is  
21 that their project could not survive even a third  
22 reduction. So imposing a mitigation measure that would  
23 require removing all proposed panels from the northern  
24 portion of the project area would make the project  
25 non-viable.

1 KURT BECKETT: Great.

2 Ms. Snarski, Mr. Greene, thanks. Thanks for that  
3 response.

4 Were there other comments or questions from the  
5 council?

6 ANDREA GRANTHAM: This is Andrea Grantham.  
7 I just want to make sure that we're able to hear  
8 Councilmember Matt Chiles, if he is online, because I know  
9 sometimes we accidentally mute his phone number.

10 KURT BECKETT: Councilman Chiles, can you  
11 just confirm that we can hear your voice?

12 ANDREA GRANTHAM: Oh, I see his hand is  
13 raised. Perfect.

14 MATT CHILES: Yes.

15 Yeah. I can hear you guys just fine. Thank you.

16 I'm on the computer this time and not just on the  
17 phone. And thank you for double-checking. Appreciate  
18 that.

19 KURT BECKETT: Thanks for your participation  
20 throughout this process including today.

21 I believe Councilwoman Brewster has a question.

22 And, Mr. Chiles, if you also had one, let me come back  
23 to you after Ms. Brewster goes.

24 STACEY BREWSTER: Thanks.

25 I have a question about the setbacks that were

1 described around the DNR portion. In the MDNS and the site  
2 certification, there is mentioned of the vegetative and  
3 earthen berms for screening.

4 Seeing the picture, can you just describe would those  
5 structures be outside of the fencing area or within? Just  
6 to get an idea of what sort of screening that would allow?  
7 Thanks.

8 SEAN GREENE: Yes.

9 So the final design of that natural screening element  
10 is still in the works between EFSEC, the applicant, and  
11 WDFW. But it would involve a combination of screening  
12 vegetation, rocks, earthen berms, and it would be placed  
13 outside of the fence line of the project area in between  
14 that fence line and the northern boundary of the DNR  
15 parcel.

16 And though that natural screening is not reflected in  
17 those visual simulations, that's something that would be  
18 additive to the setbacks.

19 STACEY BREWSTER: Thank you.

20 KURT BECKETT: Councilman Chiles, let me  
21 just double-check again with you in case there's a comment  
22 or question you wish to make.

23 MATT CHILES: No, actually.

24 I did not, except I believe it's a little ironic that  
25 they want to disturb nature to put in natural screenings.

1 I would think leaving it as it is, in its fairly natural  
2 area, would be best. But, if everyone's happy with the  
3 screenings, I'm not going to complain about them.

4 KURT BECKETT: (Indecipherable). And  
5 certainly it sounds like there is some adaptivity that will  
6 happen as those are ultimately placed and deployed.

7 Councilman Ryan.

8 MAVERICK RYAN: Thank you, Chair Beckett.

9 Just wondering about, in reviewing the draft resolution  
10 in response to the Yakama Nation's identified concerns,  
11 EFSEC has committed to mitigation including the  
12 incorporation of the Yakama Nation in the review of all  
13 site restoration plans to ensure that the project area is  
14 fully restored following construction and decommissioning.

15 Taking that and then reviewing the MDNS, it looks like  
16 there was some language previously under "Historic and  
17 Cultural Resources" that would have, I think, broadened the  
18 Tribe's engagement in those mitigation measures over time.

19 Is staff able to expand on, you know, why the existing  
20 language is in place or what the conversation was like  
21 around that specific item in the MDNS?

22 And before staff answers, Councilor Ryan, can you  
23 clarify which page you're on in the resolution just so the  
24 other council members are following along your citation?

25 MAVERICK RYAN: Sure thing. Yeah.

1           That was at the top of Page 5 -- the end of Page 4  
2           leading into the top of Page 5.

3                   KURT BECKETT: Thank you.

4           And, if staff would provide a response.

5                   SEAN GREENE: Yeah.

6           So I know the language that you're referencing. There  
7           was some language in the initial MDNS -- the mitigated  
8           determination, non-significance -- that included things  
9           like providing the Tribe -- affected tribes the opportunity  
10          to identify cultural no-go zones and things like that.

11          That language was not intended to be included in the  
12          final version of the MDNS. It was deemed not really  
13          workable as mitigation because it was too open-ended. The  
14          discussions that we -- that Chair Beckett and staff had  
15          with the Yakama Nation included that further commitment to  
16          incorporate the Yakama Nation's review into the initial  
17          site restoration plan and the detailed sites restoration  
18          plans.

19          And the Yakama Nation at the time expressed an interest  
20          in being included in both of those and ensuring that that's  
21          a route where they can effectively engage with EFSEC and  
22          the applicant to ensure that site conditions are returned  
23          to a pre-project state following the completion of the  
24          project.

25          So the language that you're specifically discussing was

1 draft language that wasn't intended to be included in the  
2 MDNS. It was removed in the first revised MDNS.

3 MAVERICK RYAN: Thank you for that  
4 explanation. Appreciate it.

5 KURT BECKETT: Thanks for the question.

6 Are there other questions or comments from Council?

7 Well, I'll make a quick comment while just pausing in  
8 case there's any other thoughts that come to mind from the  
9 council members. Or we'll soon move on to entertaining  
10 actions here.

11 So, one, thank you for all the presentations and  
12 discussion. It's certainly been important for all of us --  
13 certainly, I'll speak for myself -- to review the full  
14 record -- which I believe I have, including the public  
15 comments.

16 And the key thing that I was also reflecting on in  
17 trying to respect the request of the Yakama Nation in  
18 particular as well as obviously be responsive to our  
19 governor, that, as noted in the resolution on Page 5,  
20 ultimately, it is the policy of the state of Washington to  
21 recognize the pressing need for increased energy facilities  
22 and to ensure through available and reasonable methods that  
23 the location and operation of all energy facilities will  
24 produce minimal adverse effects on the environment, the  
25 ecology of the land, its wildlife, and the ecology of state

1 waters and their aquatic life.

2 And I think, ultimately, this is one of the core kind  
3 of mission challenges for EFSEC -- to ultimately achieve as  
4 much balance as we can across that statement. But,  
5 ultimately, we do operate within the bounds of the  
6 Washington state law. And that it does include through  
7 available and reasonable methods. And so I appreciate the  
8 added questions there including from Council Pamplin.

9 In this regard, I just wanted you to know that was part  
10 of my reflection on how it would seem we should be  
11 approaching this issue.

12 So, with that, are there other comments or questions?  
13 Councilor Ryan.

14 MAVERICK RYAN: Thank you, Chair Beckett.

15 Do we have any sort of feedback or understanding of the  
16 Yakama Nation's perspective on the changed language or the  
17 updated SCA?

18 KURT BECKETT: I don't know if staff want to  
19 answer first. I can help with that one.

20 JOANNE SNARSKI: Well, I think it's -- this  
21 is Joanne.

22 I think it's fair to say that we have had no further  
23 contact since their September 25th letter to us. I think,  
24 you know, that information regarding the grant funding,  
25 that was actually incorporated into other parts. So I

1 think we're just pulling that out into the SCA to make it  
2 more prominent. I think that was the thought process  
3 there. But I think they continue to be agreeable to  
4 accepting that offer.

5 AMI HAFKEMEYER: If I could jump in. This  
6 is Ms. Hafkemeyer.

7 The grant funding is something that was agreed to and  
8 understood by, you know, EFSEC, the developer, and the  
9 Yakama Nation prior to the Governor's response back, and  
10 all parties were agreeable to that. So this edit is, as  
11 Ms. Snarski mentioned, just to make it more explicit and  
12 make more transparent that it is a requirement that we will  
13 be documenting completion of things like that.

14 So I hope that answers your question.

15 KURT BECKETT: And, if I may, let me add a  
16 word to that.

17 Councilman Ryan, I appreciate your question, for sure.

18 In plain speak, I think the Nation, the Yakama Nation,  
19 continues to be opposed to this project. And so I don't  
20 believe that, at the end of the day, that despite, I think,  
21 mutual efforts and good efforts to try and hear one  
22 another, that that has really changed that position  
23 fundamentally.

24 I think, clearly, as I reflect on this process and my  
25 own direct participation in it, clearly there are

1 procedural issues that I would encourage all of us to find  
2 a means to, you know, have a further dialogue on: what some  
3 of those procedural matters look like, what options we may  
4 have to better meet the Yakama Nation's request knowing  
5 that adjudication and its ability to engage the full  
6 Council is very important to them.

7 In this case, having received the recommendation of the  
8 SEPA official for mitigated determination of non-  
9 significance and, as a result, to not use adjudication --  
10 which certainly has its place.

11 I personally have some questions about the formality of  
12 adjudication after the formality of a thorough  
13 environmental review process, but I certainly respect the  
14 Yakama Nation's worldview and support for -- essentially, I  
15 interpreted it as almost exclusive use of the adjudication  
16 path in EFSEC processes. So, having acknowledged that, I  
17 believe for the reasons documented on the record and I  
18 think further reflected in the Governor's response to us  
19 that, ultimately, that basis of that recommendation has not  
20 been a further question around that, at least on the state  
21 side of that picture.

22 So certainly have great respect for the Yakama Nation,  
23 and I hope that we can find a means to work on some of  
24 those important process issues knowing that ultimately  
25 these are also about impacts and very deeply held beliefs

1 and values by Yakama Nation. And I certainly want to  
2 recognize that and will do my best to respect and support  
3 those outcomes despite probably what will still be  
4 dissatisfaction, potentially, with the Council, depending  
5 where you want to take this today.

6 So obviously I'm on the record on having supported the  
7 project before, and don't see, really, a reason to change  
8 that at this stage.

9 But, with that, if there are other comments or  
10 questions, let's hear those, and then move to the next  
11 portion of the meeting.

12 Councilman Chiles.

13 MATT CHILES: Thank you, Chair Beckett.

14 I wanted to thank the Council and staff for their work  
15 on addressing the Yakama's concerns. I think that we have  
16 done a good job above and beyond the requirements of the  
17 treaty with the Yakamas on the ceded lands. And I think  
18 I'm comfortable with the mitigations that are proposed.  
19 Thank you.

20 KURT BECKETT: Thank you, Councilman Chiles.

21 Last call for comments or questions.

22 Okay. Hearing none, if it's the will of the Council,  
23 then the Chair would entertain a motion to approve Council  
24 Resolution No. 360 and the draft site certification  
25 agreement as amended for transmittal to the Governor for

1 the Carriger solar project.

2 Is there said motion?

3 Councilman Pamplin.

4 NATE PAMPLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 Yes. I'll go ahead and just make that motion to  
6 approve Council Resolution No. 360 and the draft site  
7 certification agreement as amended for transmittal to the  
8 Governor for the Carriger Solar Project.

9 KURT BECKETT: Thank you.

10 Is there a second to the motion?

11 STACEY BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster, second.

12 KURT BECKETT: Second? Oh.

13 Thank you, Councilwoman Brewster.

14 Carriger Council, the motion has been moved and  
15 seconded.

16 Is there further discussion on the action before you?  
17 Seeing or hearing no discussion. All those in favor of the  
18 motion, please say aye.

19 BLAKE NELSON: Aye.

20 NATHAN PAMPLIN: Aye.

21 STACEY BREWSTER: Aye.

22 MATT CHILES: Aye.

23 KURT BECKETT: Aye.

24 Opposed.

25 MAVERICK RYAN: Nay.

1 KURT BECKETT: Did we capture the nay for  
2 the record? I thought I heard a nay.

3 MAVERICK RYAN: Yes. You did.

4 KURT BECKETT: I'm on screen. So, if  
5 someone can tell who's saying that. I didn't know it was  
6 Councilman Chiles or Ryan.

7 MAVERICK RYAN: Council Ryan. Sorry.

8 KURT BECKETT: Very well.

9 The ayes carry the motion. And the EFSEC Council for  
10 Carriger has adopted the motion to approve Council  
11 Resolution No. 360, and the draft site certification  
12 agreement is amended for transmittal to the Governor for  
13 the Carriger Solar project.

14 And I believe, Council Pamplin.

15 NATE PAMPLIN: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Mr. Chairman, you spoke to this in your remarks prior  
17 to our vote. I just wanted to call out in the governor's  
18 letter in the -- dated August 22nd on Page 5 in his closing  
19 paragraph, he requested that EFSEC provide his office with  
20 information regarding its tribal consultation policies and  
21 procedures, and he's willing to work with EFSEC to evaluate  
22 any changes in the manner of which the Council engages with  
23 the tribes.

24 And just thought, you know, given the circumstances  
25 surrounding the Governor's direction relative to this

1 project and that invitation to work with him and his office  
2 and your remarks, Mr. Chairman, I just hope that we do take  
3 advantage of that window. And if there's a role for  
4 council participation in those conversations, I'm more than  
5 happy to assist.

6 KURT BECKETT: Thank you, Councilman  
7 Pamplin.

8 I certainly welcome any member of the council's  
9 presence, you know, on our various key issues with all of  
10 Washington tribes. And so certainly it's an item that --  
11 as appropriate knowing that there are some limitations on  
12 when the Governor's Office can be in touch directly with  
13 the Council. So soon, with today's action, hopefully that  
14 will pass, and we'll, you know, have a more robust  
15 conversation as the governor requests. We certainly  
16 welcome that.

17 I will note, as part of the coincidence of timing, that  
18 we will be, several of us, departing to go attend the  
19 Centennial Accord at the Cowlitz Tribe in Southwest  
20 Washington for several days, actually, with the Governor  
21 and the tribes of Washington. The Yakama Nation is not a  
22 signatory to the Centennial Accord, but I certainly believe  
23 that, you know, they are present there in at least one or  
24 more ways. And we'll look forward to that direct  
25 engagement, hopefully, with the Yakama Nation independent

1 of this week's Centennial Accord which again is the annual  
2 meeting between the Governor and his executives and tribal  
3 leaders throughout Washington.

4 So with that --

5 SONIA BUMPUS: Chair Beckett, if I may?

6 KURT BECKETT: You may. Director Bumpus.

7 SONIA BUMPUS: Apologies. My dog is  
8 barking.

9 I just wanted to note that there will be a cover letter  
10 accompanying the transmittal of the reconsideration packet  
11 back to Governor Ferguson. In the cover letter from the  
12 Chair, we will provide some information about our policies  
13 with respect to tribal engagement and consultation.

14 That's all I wanted to add. Thank you.

15 KURT BECKETT: Thanks for that. And I  
16 certainly actually should also acknowledge and thank the  
17 Governor's Office and the Governor's Office of Indian  
18 Affairs -- or GOIA, as it's known -- that supported EFSEC  
19 in a tribal outreach meeting in early June -- sent out to  
20 all tribes in Washington. And that's just, you know, one  
21 meeting. An important one, but hopefully reflective of our  
22 ongoing commitment to full tribal engagement and always  
23 looking for ways to clarify and improve that.

24 And I will note, you know, to the degree that whether  
25 individually, as is normally the case, or, if there was

1 reasons to do it on a more regional basis, you know, EFSEC  
2 is always open for an active conversation around how to  
3 establish tribal consultation, memorandums of understanding  
4 with each tribe, so that we have as much clarity as to what  
5 the purposes are for any individual tribe as we engage with  
6 them on our projects once we've received those  
7 applications.

8 I'd also like to note that I believe the staff  
9 presentation from today either is on the website or will  
10 soon be and certainly, I think, worthy of inclusion in the  
11 communication back to the Governor as well.

12 So, with that, any other closing comments from the  
13 Council?

14 Ms. Hafkemeyer did you have one last item or did I  
15 misread that?

16 AMI HAFKEMEYER: I just wanted to indicate  
17 that Councilmember Pamplin had raised his hand, but you saw  
18 that on your own. And so --

19 KURT BECKETT: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

20 Well, Council, thank you very much for your added time  
21 today. And, seeing no other hands raised for comments, I  
22 will adjourn today's meeting at 9:44 A.M.

23 Thank you all very much.

24 (End of recording.)

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Christopher Ponce, certify that the foregoing transcript is a full, true and accurate transcription of the proceedings and testimony taken in the matter of the above-entitled cause.

That the foregoing was transcribed from audio recording received from Joan Owens. The foregoing was transcribed to the best of my ability, taking into consideration poor sound quality, simultaneous speaking, background noise, quality of second-party telephone, audio, video recordings.

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on the 4th day of November, 2025.

/s/CHRISTOPHER L PONCE, CET

Certified Electronic Transcriber #4739

My CET certification expires on 08/25/2028