



## ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

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

### Transcript of Proceedings

*November 17, 2025*

---

### EFSEC CRT informational meetings v.

---

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

**Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR**  
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™  
PDF transcript bundle contains:

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

---

WASHINGTON STATE

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

CASCADE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

LAND-USE CONSISTENCY HEARING

---

November 17, 2025

Washougal, Washington

Reporter: John M. S. Botelho, CCR, RPR

1 APPEARANCES

2 STATE AGENCY MEMBERS:

3 Kurt Beckett, Chair

4 Elizabeth Osborne, Department of Commerce

5 Blake Nelson, Department of Ecology

6 Nate Pamplin, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

7 Maverick Ryan, Department of Natural Resources

8 Brian Rybarik,  
9 Utilities & Transportation Commission

10  
11 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:

12 Jon Thompson

13  
14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

15 Courtney Beebe

16  
17 COUNCIL STAFF:

18 Sonia Bumpus

Alex Shiley

19 Ami Hafkemeyer

Karl Holappa

20 Joan Owens

Maria Belkina

21 Andrea Grantham

Lisa McLean

22 Lance Caputo

APPEARANCES (Continuing)

IN ATTENDANCE:

For Cascade Renewable Transmission, LLC:

Chris Hocker

Malia Bassett

Tim McMahan

Stoel Rives, LLP

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

HEARING INDEX

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

EVENT:	PAGE NO.
Roll call	6
Remarks by Judge Beebe	9
Presentation by applicant	10
Public comments	15
Council member comments	20
Adjournment	21

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Monday,  
2 November 17, 2025, at 56 South First Street,  
3 Washougal, Washington, at 6:40 p.m., the following  
4 land-use consistency hearing of the Washington State  
5 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was held, to  
6 wit:

7  
8 <<<<<< >>>>>>

9  
10 CHAIR BECKETT: So I will call this  
11 land-use consistency hearing to order. Again, Kurt  
12 Beckett, chair of the Energy Facility Site Evaluation  
13 Council. And this hearing is required by  
14 RCW 80.50.090(2) and the Washington Administrative  
15 Code 463-26-305.

16 During this hearing, we will have testimony  
17 regarding the proposed project's consistency and  
18 compliance with land-use plans and zoning ordinances.  
19 That is the only subject that will be allowed during  
20 this hearing, given we've taken general comments  
21 previously.

22 And this hearing is now very specifically in  
23 order for the Council to create the record and make a  
24 determination on land-use consistency and compliance  
25 with land-use plans and zoning ordinances. Comments

1 and other topics will be asked to be directed --  
2 directing their comments online or with staff  
3 separately.

4 So with that, I'm going to ask Ms. Grantham to  
5 call the roll again as is required.

6 MS. GRANTHAM: Certainly, Chair  
7 Beckett.

8 Department of commerce.

9 MS. OSBORNE: Elizabeth Osborne,  
10 present.

11 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of  
12 Ecology.

13 MR. NELSON: Blake Nelson, present.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Fish  
15 and Wildlife.

16 MR. PAMPLIN: Nate Pamplin,  
17 present.

18 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of  
19 Natural Resources.

20 MR. RYAN: Maverick Ryan, present.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities and  
22 Transportation Commission.

23 MR. RYBARIK: Brian Rybarik,  
24 present.

25 MS. GRANTHAM: Assistant Attorney

1 General Jon Thompson.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Present.

3 MS. GRANTHAM: Administrative Law

4 Judge Courtney Beebe.

5 JUDGE BEEBE: I am present.

6 MS. GRANTHAM: The Council staff

7 that are present.

8 Sonia Bumpus.

9 MS. BUMPUS: Present.

10 MS. GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer.

11 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Present.

12 MS. GRANTHAM: Lance Caputo.

13 MR. CAPUTO: Present.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Karl Holappa.

15 MR. HOLAPPA: Present.

16 MS. GRANTHAM: Maria Belkina.

17 MS. BELKINA: Present.

18 MS. GRANTHAM: And Lisa McLean.

19 MS. McLEAN: Present.

20 MS. GRANTHAM: And did we have  
21 anyone for the counsel for the environment show up  
22 yet?

23 Chair, there is a quorum.

24 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you.

25 Soon I will be asking Judge Beebe to actually

1 take over this portion of the meeting. But if I may,  
2 first, Judge, let me note for the public who are  
3 still here that both the full application can be  
4 found on the EFSEC website under our "Projects"  
5 section as well as, as that process, you know,  
6 proceeds, you can always look there for supportive  
7 studies. I know there's a question of where that  
8 might be accessed. That may not necessarily be true  
9 today, but over the course of time, those are the  
10 materials that are present on the EFSEC website and  
11 transparent for the public's access.

12 So, with that, let me turn this to Judge Beebe,  
13 who, again, will be taking any testimony. It's my  
14 understanding we may not have any this evening.

15 I should also note that we'll be conducting these  
16 hearings, both Part A and Part B, both tonight as  
17 well as tomorrow night in Skamania County and  
18 followed by the third night in Klickitat County.  
19 That is part of the underlying statute that EFSEC  
20 operates in, that after an application is received,  
21 within 60 days we would start that process in the  
22 communities in which the project will be -- will be  
23 housed.

24 So apologies for not making that part of my  
25 earlier opening comment, but perhaps as a close.

1           So, with that, Judge Beebe, let me turn this to  
2 you. And we will see if we have any further comments  
3 to be presented on land use. Judge Beebe.

4                         JUDGE BEEBE: Thank you. Just a  
5 brief introduction regarding the role of the Office  
6 of Administrative Hearings in your public meeting.

7           The Office of Administrative Hearings is an  
8 independent agency. My role here today is to ensure  
9 that there is a complete record of public comment.  
10 We will only be taking public comment on how the site  
11 is or is not consistent or is or is not in compliance  
12 with applicable land-use plans and zoning ordinances.

13           Public comment is limited to three minutes per  
14 person. We will not be allowing the asking of  
15 questions or any information exchange. The purpose  
16 of this portion is to allow comments. These comments  
17 may prompt a need for answers. But the purpose of  
18 this portion of the hearing is only to allow the  
19 comments and to create the record.

20           Following this land-use consistency hearing, I  
21 shall draft an order, including findings of fact,  
22 appropriate portions of relevant law and code,  
23 proposed conclusions of law regarding whether the  
24 proposed site is consistent and in compliance with  
25 applicable land-use plans and zoning ordinances.

1 For the record, the applicable law is  
2 RCW 80.50.090, Subsection 2, and Washington  
3 Administrative Code Chapter 463-26. I shall provide  
4 a draft order to the EFSEC assigned AAG and staff for  
5 any revisions and review prior to them proposing  
6 order to the Council with a recommendation.

7 So, with that, if there is a first person on the  
8 list, I'll defer to you, Ms. Grantham, regarding  
9 calling the person to speak.

10 MS. GRANTHAM: Thank you.

11 I would like to direct that the applicant  
12 actually has a presentation for the land-use  
13 consistency hearing first.

14 CHAIR BECKETT: Apologies for  
15 missing that piece, so...

16 JUDGE BEEBE: If the applicant  
17 would like to begin with their presentation, and then  
18 we can begin with public comment.

19 MS. BASSETT: All right. Hi,  
20 everyone. I'm Malia Bassett. I'm a senior  
21 environmental planner, and I'm on the CRT team. And  
22 I'm going to talk about land-use consistency in Clark  
23 County.

24 Let's go ahead and go to the next slide.

25 So, Chris, do you want to give just a quick

1 overview again, if folks weren't here?

2 MR. HOCKER: Yeah.

3 This is basically a repeat of my previous  
4 presentation. But the project, of course, is about a  
5 hundred miles underwater and underground. It's -- 80  
6 of that is in the river. The green line up at the  
7 top. The land portions include about five miles in  
8 the Portland area, about five miles in The Dalles  
9 area, and about seven and a half miles to bypass the  
10 Bonneville Dam. And that's what the yellow lines  
11 are. Those are the buried underground portions.

12 MS. BASSETT: So as you can see in  
13 the center there, the on-land portion starts  
14 around -- comes out of the Columbia River and goes on  
15 land in Stevenson and then goes west and then goes  
16 back into the Columbia River after the Bonneville  
17 Dam.

18 So -- next slide, please -- there actually isn't  
19 any on -- next slide -- on-land portions in Clark  
20 County, but I will be going through the in-water  
21 portions that are in the Columbia River adjacent to  
22 Clark County.

23 So there are seven. We're referring to them as  
24 segments. That's because the center of the Columbia  
25 River is the border between Washington State and

1 Oregon State, and the line maneuvers in and out of  
2 the state. So there's seven segments of the line  
3 that come into Washington and then exit between the  
4 boundaries of Clark County.

5 And that's about eight miles total. So going to  
6 walk through those so you can see where the line  
7 enters Washington, exits, so those seven segments.

8 Next slide please.

9 So the yellow highlight is highlighting the line  
10 which is represented with a -- with the red dashes.  
11 You can see that around River Mile 177, the line just  
12 barely crosses over to Washington and then exits back  
13 into Oregon. Same thing you're seeing as we go down  
14 the river. 117? Oh. Yeah, I can barely see that.  
15 Sorry. 117 river mile and then going east to River  
16 Mile 121. So we have three segments -- right? --  
17 that we're looking at where the line enters and exits  
18 Washington State.

19 Next slide.

20 Same thing here. There's a little carryover from  
21 the previous slide at River Mile 121 and then  
22 three -- well, two full segments coming in and out of  
23 Washington State and then one back in Washington  
24 State at 124 and a half. And then -- next slide.

25 Then there's the continuation of the segment in

1 the last slide around 125 to almost 127. And then  
2 you see the last segment there between 127 and 129.

3 And just to reiterate, these are the components  
4 on-land in Washington. Clark County is not listed  
5 there, so there's actually no on-land components.  
6 There's only in-water. And like it was said  
7 previously, we will be discussing the on-land  
8 components tomorrow and Wednesday. For now, that's  
9 it for Clark County.

10 Tim, did you want to say anything about  
11 consistency?

12 MR. McMAHAN: Tim McMahan here. I  
13 represent the applicant, and I'm a lawyer with Stoel  
14 Rives law firm in Portland. And so this is going to  
15 be a little bit boring, because we're in Clark  
16 County, which is an area with no terrestrial impacts  
17 from the project.

18 So as you've heard this evening, the land-use  
19 consistency hearing's purpose is to determine  
20 whether the project is -- these are very important  
21 words out of the statute -- whether the project is  
22 consistent and in compliance with local land-use  
23 plans and zoning ordinances. And EFSEC ultimately  
24 makes that -- ultimately makes that determination.

25 So the relevant inquiry for EFSEC's initial

1 land-use analysis is -- and I quote -- whether the  
2 pertinent land-use provisions prohibit the proposed  
3 project site, in quotes, expressly or by operation  
4 clearly, convincingly and unequivocally. So fairly  
5 strong words that frame the discussion here.

6 If a proposed project can be permitted either  
7 outright or conditionally, it is considered  
8 consistent and in compliance with local land-use  
9 provisions for purposes of RCW 80.50.090, Sub 2.

10 So for tonight's hearing, this is, in fact, a  
11 very limited inquiry. We emphasize that the Cascade  
12 Renewable Transmission Project proposed in Clark  
13 County is entirely underwater within Clark County.  
14 Neither the County's zoning code nor the County's  
15 comprehensive plan impose land-use restrictions on or  
16 in water uses in the river and on the river bottom  
17 within the Columbia River.

18 We anticipate additional discussions in the  
19 coming days to address locations where the  
20 transmission line is proposed in terrestrial  
21 locations, but that is not being proposed tonight,  
22 because this is entirely in the water.

23 So, sorry that that's kind of boring, but that's  
24 what it is at Clark County. We'll have a lot more to  
25 talk about tomorrow in Skamania County.

1 So thank you for your time.

2 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you for the  
3 presentation. It's helpful.

4 Members of the Council, are there comments or  
5 questions for our presenters?

6 Hearing none.

7 Judge Beebe, I think I would then turn this to  
8 you to seek any public comment at this time. I  
9 believe there was one.

10 JUDGE BEEBE: Certainly. And since  
11 I don't have the list, I'll just rely on  
12 Ms. Grantham, if she could call their name and ask  
13 them to come to the microphone.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Certainly will do.  
15 As of right now, we only have one speaker signed  
16 up, and that is Nathan Baker.

17 MR. BAKER: Good evening, Chair  
18 Beckett, members of the Council. My name is Nathan  
19 Baker. I'm the senior staff attorney with Friends of  
20 the Columbia Gorge. And I'd like to talk about three  
21 procedural issues tonight. You could consider them  
22 objections if necessary.

23 The first is that the deadline for written public  
24 comment is unclear at best. There's no deadline  
25 stated on any of the materials for submitting written

1 public comment.

2 I did hear Chair Beckett say tonight that comment  
3 will be accepted throughout the process, but it isn't  
4 clear whether that's for land-use consistency. If  
5 you look at the hearing notice, it really discourages  
6 written public comment. It says, if you are unable  
7 to attend the hearing, then submit comments in  
8 writing.

9 And I know that during this session, this segment  
10 of this hearing, you're not to be deliberating or  
11 responding to my points, but we would ask that  
12 tonight, before this hearing concludes, you keep the  
13 record open until a date/time and certain. And we  
14 would suggest 30 days from Wednesday for that. Keep  
15 the record open, and provide some clarity about when  
16 public comments can be submitted in writing.

17 The second issue is the fact that the applicant  
18 has only submitted a draft application and the legal  
19 ramifications of that fact. It's very clearly a  
20 draft application. It's labeled as a draft on Page  
21 1, more than 200 times in the application. It's in  
22 the footers denoted as a draft application. It's  
23 described as a draft on the EFSEC website. There's  
24 even internal comments in the metadata in the  
25 document from the land-use planners and from the

1 applicant's attorney that are -- it's clearly still a  
2 draft with comments back and forth between them.

3 And so what does that mean? We think that EFSEC  
4 should not have accepted this and started the process  
5 and instead should have told the applicant, We'll  
6 wait until you submit a final application to start  
7 the process.

8 But either way, there will have to be a final  
9 application submitted. And there will,  
10 unfortunately, need to be another round of hearings  
11 when that -- the final application is submitted.  
12 That's under the statute. Whenever an application is  
13 submitted, it kicks off the requirement to hold the  
14 hearings.

15 And, finally, I've heard no mention of Clark  
16 County's appointee to the Council for this matter.  
17 That's required by the statute. That's required --  
18 every hearing where the site is considered, Clark  
19 County is to be appointing a member of the Council.  
20 And we've heard no mention of that. So all the more  
21 reason for another hearing, another informational  
22 hearing and land-use hearing, with the participation  
23 of Clark County's appointee for the project.

24 Thank you very much.

25 JUDGE BEEBE: Thank you.

1 MS. GRANTHAM: That is the only --

2 JUDGE BEEBE: And, Ms. Grantham --

3 MS. GRANTHAM: -- speaker that --

4 apologies. That is the only speaker that I have  
5 signed up for tonight.

6 JUDGE BEEBE: Okay. I'm looking  
7 online just very quickly to see if there is any --  
8 looks like we have Bryan Mattson has raised his hand.

9 So, Mr. Mattson, this is Judge Beebe. I will  
10 give you three minutes as well, which will begin now.  
11 And, again, just, again, this is just public comment  
12 on the land-use compliance.

13 MR. MATTSON: Thank you. Bryan  
14 Mattson. I won't need the full three minutes, so --  
15 but I wanted to remind the gentleman from Stoel Rives  
16 that Clark County still has a shoreline management  
17 program that's part of their zoning code. And  
18 anything in the water will be considered in Clark  
19 County's jurisdiction if it's under the water. It  
20 will be considered in the aquatic environment type.  
21 And the gentleman from Ecology probably has some  
22 insight into our shoreline management program,  
23 because I believe that Ecology has to approve it.

24 So that's all I had. Just wanted to make sure  
25 that that was included.

1 JUDGE BEEBE: Thank you,  
2 Mr. Mattson.

3 I don't see any other online hands up.

4 Any other on -- individuals who are attending  
5 online, if you want to use the hand-raise feature.

6 Okay. I don't see any individuals online. And  
7 no others have signed up. So I will defer to you,  
8 Chairperson Beckett, if you want to inquire further  
9 of additional public testimony.

10 CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you, Judge  
11 Beebe. Let me do one final call on land-use  
12 questions from those in attendance here in person  
13 tonight.

14 And seeing none, Judge. I'm going to close the  
15 meeting -- or the hearing here in just a moment, but  
16 let me double-check if there's any other closing  
17 business that you had.

18 JUDGE BEEBE: I will defer to you  
19 and to your legal counsel regarding the request to  
20 keep the record open. I would simply note that as it  
21 would depend -- it would impact the timeline for me  
22 drafting an order to propose to the Council.

23 CHAIR BECKETT: Appreciate that  
24 clarification.

25 I don't think we'll be in the position to do that

1 here live in the hearing tonight, but certainly  
2 appreciate the input and the questions and certainly  
3 on the public comment period. I'm sure we will have  
4 that answered this week.

5 So, with that, let me thank everyone who has  
6 taken their time to participate this evening, whether  
7 in listen-only mode or more active participation. We  
8 certainly appreciate you helping us begin this  
9 process.

10 And let me check with our Council members to see  
11 if there's any closing questions or comments.

12 And I believe Director Bumpus may have a couple  
13 items to add in, which is welcome. Director Bumpus.

14 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you, Chair  
15 Beckett.

16 I just wanted to note for the record just to  
17 clarify that, on the EFSEC website, for our hearing,  
18 specifically the informational hearing and the  
19 land-use hearing this evening for Clark County, the  
20 comment period shows it starts at 5:30 p.m., which  
21 was the timing that we started this meeting, and ends  
22 at 11:59 p.m.

23 So our online comment system -- even though we  
24 will be concluding this hearing tonight, the comment  
25 system will be available online until 11:59 tonight.

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

CHAIR BECKETT: Thank you for the  
additional clarification.

And, with that, we are then adjourned at  
7:01 p.m. Thank you very much.

(Hearing adjourned at  
7:01 p.m.)