****

**MINUTES**

**Wednesday, July 24, 2013**

**10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

**Idaho State Capitol Auditorium – Garden Level, West Wing**

 **(700 W. Jefferson, Boise, Idaho)**

**Commission Members in Attendance**

Chairman Jeff Sayer, Dept. of Commerce Mike Virtue, City of Blackfoot

Dr. Steven Aumeier, CAES

Senator Larry Craig

Senator Bart Davis, Idaho State Senate *Ad Hoc Members*

Jeff Feeler, U.S. Ecology Tom Perry, Office of the Governor

Dr. Howard Grimes, Idaho State University John Revier, Office of Congressman Mike Simpson

John Grossenbacher, Idaho National Laboratory Brian Whitlock, Idaho National Laboratory

John Kotek, Gallatin Public Affairs

Steve Laflin, International Isotopes

Jeff Thompson, Idaho House of Representatives

**Welcome and Introductions**

Chairman Jeff Sayer welcomed the returning and new members of the LINE Commission to this first meeting of LINE 2.0. As new members were added, we sought technical expertise, seasoned experience and a regional representation for the Commission. We were able to do that without making the body too large to manage. Additional ex officio announcements may be coming soon.

**Review of LINE 1.0 Body of Work and Recommendations**

Chairman Sayer reviewed the LINE 1.0 body of work and recommendations. He paid tribute to Governor Otter for his vision and foresight and paying attention to a number of conversations that were occurring around the state and nation. In Idaho, there was an intense conversation about the environment 20 years ago. That hasn’t changed, but what is different is that today it is also about the economy. LINE 2.0 is to grapple with all of those aspects and recommend the right path for Idaho to take with its future.

LINE 1.0 identified INL as a significant state asset. ATR, TREAT, AMWTP, NRF, Industrial Cyber Security, Hybrid Energy Systems, Wireless Testbed, and work on the Energy Grid are all part of that asset for the state and the nation. Safety and Environment are non-negotiable as we go forward. LINE 1.0 recognized a distinct and dramatic difference between waste and storage. The cleanup has been a resounding success. There are still some elements of cleanup that need attention, but LINE 1.0 and Idaho recognize that fuel storage and management is completely different than disposal of waste in 55-gallon drums.

Things have also changed nationally. Chairman Sayer referenced the Federal fiscal challenges, Yucca Mountain uncertainty, and the recent DOE policy announcement on waste management. He indicated that a number of states are reacting to that new policy.

Waste management presents significant industrial opportunities. Existing nuclear industry, new nuclear industry, nuclear related industry, and interim storage pilot will create a “Gigantic Industrial Opportunity.”

LINE 1.0 focused on six overarching recommendations: 1) Cleanup needs to get finished, 2) Idaho should be at the table and have a voice in what’s happening nationally, 3) build our infrastructure in the state, 4) invest in universities, 5) invest in CAES, and, 6) workforce development.

The 1995 Settlement Agreement is one of the most important documents in our state’s history. Three original tenets are paramount and non-negotiable: 1) Initiated cleanup of legacy waste; 2) Established environment and Snake River Aquifer as the highest priority; 3) Established provisions to hold federal government accountable. But the realities of today need to be acknowledged. The Yucca Mountain application withdrawal completely changes the landscape. Idaho’s nuclear waste is not going anywhere in 2035, and we in essence will become a de facto storage site with no meaningful reward. Remember, the fines in the Settlement Agreement are subject to caveats; they are not automatic. The fine is not adjusted for inflation and therefore, may become an incentive for inaction, not a deterrent.

How do we protect the environment, strengthen our hand and our reward? LINE 2.0 needs to advocate for new research missions.

One of the biggest topics of discussions around the state – on both sides – is the question of whether Idaho should engage in the interim storage discussion. LINE 1.0 determined it is premature. They made specific recommendations that a federal policy is needed, and Idaho citizens need to understand the burdens and benefits as a result of a new conversation. LINE 1.0 recommended that we need to be at the table.

**Review of LINE 2.0 Charter**

Chairman Sayer read from the Executive Order establishing LINE 2.0 to help members understand the charter of this new commission:

1. Monitor and provide counsel on implementation of the recommendations and actions submitted by LINE I to ensure the unique research capabilities of the INL continue to play an important role in Idaho’s economic growth and the nation’s energy security;
2. Track and assess the activities of the U.S. Congress, DOE and other states with significant nuclear energy research and operations interests to advance and preserve Idaho’s and the INL’s interests;
3. Identify and recommend appropriate pre-emptive/preparatory actions relative to looming federal budget and policy decisions that could have negative implications for long-term INL operations, including advising on the propriety of partnering with other states for mutual benefit;
4. Identify additional opportunities and investments that can be made in the Center for Advanced Energy Studies, Idaho’s universities and general research, transportation and communications infrastructure in furtherance of the mission of the INL;
5. Provide a means or mechanism to enable a continued robust and open dialogue with the public on the INL, Idaho’s broader nuclear industries sector and Commission activities; and
6. Evaluate policy options for strengthening the broader nuclear industries sector in Idaho.

**Update on National Nuclear Energy Issues**

John Grossenbacher walked the Commission through the federal budget challenges. INL is seeing a downward trend in funding. Business volume has declined from $928 million in FY11 to an estimated $800 million in FY13. INL has had to do workforce restructuring, reduce personnel costs, reduce ownership costs, and start eliminating some discretionary services and activities – while still investing in the future. By the end of the year, we will have reduced the Lab to its functional minimum. Cleanup contractors’ budget information was also discussed. The impacts of sequestration on the Lab include a $5 million reduction to ATR and the Safeguards and Security budget was reduced $9 million with $4 million of that restored. Sequestration has established 2014 baselines. 2023 budget projections under various plans were discussed. Discretionary spending is only about 1/6th of the budget but is absorbing the bulk of reductions due to a lack of agreement on restructuring entitlements and taxes. Discretionary spending such as defense and R&D account for about 30 percent of the Federal budget but will shoulder close to 90% of the reductions. In the President’s budget request for 2014 will have a significant impact on nuclear energy, and yet EERE was recommended for nearly a 56 percent increase. The House and the Senate are far apart on a budget resolution. We probably will start the year with a continuing resolution, and the next issue will probably come this Fall when the debt ceiling requires congressional budget action.

The SMR program is a government funded cost-share and partnership with industry to help them get through the licensing process. Of the $452 million identified for SMR design, B&W has received $150 million and other vendors are competing for the remainder of the funds. INL doesn’t advocate for any particular design or technology. Occasionally, someone will say we want to build an SMR at INL. That is a decision the government has to make.

On the commercial nuclear front, we are down to 100 operating reactors in 31 states. There are five new plants that are under construction, and since mid-2007, 16 license applications have been submitted. 73 reactors have license extensions and 32 are pending. The power up rates have been approved by NRC totaling about 6,800 MW of power. Four plants have been announced for closure. San Onofre went through a steam generator replacement, and when they installed and started them up, there was material failure, which became an insurmountable problem to solve. At Florida’s Crystal River, the concrete and steel containment for that plant had to be cut for a generator replacement which created a very expensive problem to fix. Wisconsin’s Kewaunee closure was an economic decision.

John Grossenbacher reviewed the response to the Fukushima disaster. 48 of the 50 Japanese reactors were shut down following the tsunami. Two have been restarted, and four utilities have requested permission to restart 10 more reactors. Japan’s Nuclear Regulation Authority is reviewing the restart applications. Fukushima created a focus for NRC priorities:

* Maintain cooling and containment integrity in a severe event
* Enhance spent fuel pool instrumentation
* Re-evaluate potential seismic and flooding hazards
* Ensure reliable and accessible hardened vents
* Re-evaluate emergency communications systems and staffing levels
* Rulemaking is underway on station blackout and emergency preparedness.

Industry’s response to Fukushima includes:

* FLEX is a system of comprehensive, tailored safety measures to respond to extreme events
* 67 sites around the country maintain backup portable safety equipment. Equipment is staged in Memphis and Phoenix

John Kotek updated the Commission on Federal nuclear waste legislation and Yucca Mountain lawsuits. A bipartisan group of Senators worked together to develop legislation to implement recommendations of the BRC. That legislation builds on what Sen. Bingeman embarked on last year. A draft was released in April, and the Senators received thousands of comments on the bill that they used to help draft a new version that was introduced a few weeks ago. It differs somewhat from the BRC recommendations, but follows the major themes of getting management out of DOE and into a new government entity. It establishes a consent based process for siting. There should be a hearing in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee (July 30) to take testimony and hopefully advance that bill later this year. The House is less interested in legislation and more interested in the getting the licensing process for Yucca resurrected. The House is planning a hearing or oversight session to focus on their perspective. Even if there is success in getting a bill through the Senate this year, the prospects in the House are uncertain. The Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit has a case to consider the question of whether the Yucca Licensing process should be continued. The NRC still has about $10 million left to review the license application that DOE withdrew. We are still waiting to see how the Court rules on that. DOE has issued its strategy that indicates Yucca is not an option. In light of that, several states have taken it on themselves to consider siting an interim storage facility and, possibly, a repository. New Mexico is leading that effort, but other states are dipping their toes in the water. There is no framework established by legislation, so there’s no certainty at all on what the ultimate legislative framework would look like. LINE 1.0 reviewed that and indicated that it isn’t mature yet. Mississippi and Texas have both expressed interest along with New Mexico and are engaging in that conversation. If states are going to be asked to consider consolidate storage or disposal, and asked to do so under a consent-based process. Amy Lientz has been engaged with what is going on around the country.

Amy Lientz presented an overview of what’s being discussed around the country with regard to a consent-based process. DOE’s new strategy for nuclear waste management is an opportunity for a new national dialogue among stakeholders to lead a statewide discussion on not only siting opportunities for nuclear waste management interests, but also an overall discussion on a process that could be considered for siting other nuclear industry activities. The following are common questions and considerations on this process and how Idaho may want to engage in a broader discussion.

**Q. The term used by DOE is “consent-based” when referencing siting activities. What does this mean?**

A. The BRC addressed the nature of consent only in general terms, considering the specific processes to be part of the negotiations with potential host communities. Although no formal definition was recommended, the Commission essentially considered consent a function of willingness on the part of authorized entities to enter into legal agreements (BRC, 2012, p. 57).

**Q. How will a state or host community know whether it has achieved consent?**

A. DOE has publically stated that whether a host community has achieved consent may vary from state to state and it should be up to the state and host communities to determine the process for achieving consent. For example, one state may determine a legally binding agreement signed by all entities involved is necessary. Another state might determine that a vote by its legislature is adequate, or still, another state could decide a vote of the people through a ballot initiative or referendum is required.

**Q. What would be some example considerations in developing a consent-based process for Idaho?**

A. A consent-based process does not replace the requirements of the law that must be followed. For example, environmental laws such as NEPA and RCRA have strict public involvement processes and follow a rigid process before decisions are made. However, a consent based process may be initiated even before a state or hosting community agrees they want to be considered as a location for a particular project or facility.

The BRC recommended an approach to site nuclear facilities that is consent-based, transparent, phased, adaptive, standards- and science-based, and governed by legally-binding agreements between the federal government and a jurisdiction willing to host such facilities. Indeed, promising experiences in other countries indicate that a consent-based process, developed through engagement with states, (or their equivalent governmental jurisdiction), tribes, local governments, key stakeholders, and the public, offers a greater probability of success than previous efforts undertaken in the U.S.

**Q. What are some considerations for a comprehensive process that engages the public?**

 Recognize there are many partners that need to be involved: state and local government, tribal governments, utilities, numerous stakeholder organizations, and the general public who have questions or concerns.

 Information must be readily available and come from trusted and valid sources so the best decisions can be made.

 A team should be dedicated to lead and facilitate dialogue, collect and disseminate information, and record results.

 An agreement should be codified as to what defines success. What will your state and host community determine meets the intent of having consent?

**Q. What, if anything, are other states doing to define what Consent means to them?**

A. New Mexico has drafted discussion points which were presented to the Energy Community Alliance at a meeting held in Idaho Falls in June 2013. The state and hosting community in New Mexico have not formalized their process of decision making.

The entity of the LINE Commission has the appropriate charter and infrastructure to begin the discussion with all Idahoans and potentially formalize what it believes forms the basis of a process to be considered for future nuclear interests.

**Q. What is an example of a process established by a government entity that now leads to a process to determine if there is an agreement to go forward with considerations for a particular site?**

A. The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) leads the facility siting effort in Canada. During the initial year, NWMO conducted a series of multi-party dialogues that brought together a cross-section of opinion leaders for full-day sessions focused on the document, Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site, which presented an initial framework of objectives and principles, as well as key issues and questions.

A range of other mechanisms for obtaining public views, including several surveys and e-dialogues, complemented these meetings. Based on the results of these activities and consideration of both foreign and Canadian siting experiences, NWMO developed a proposed siting process, which was issued in May 2009 for public review and comment. Dialogues and other interactions with the public during 2009 were focused on questions concerning the appropriateness of the proposed process. After considering the inputs obtained during this phase, NWMO issued a siting plan in May 2010. This plan involves nine steps:

1. The NWMO initiates the siting process with a broad program to provide information, answer questions and build awareness among Canadians about the project and the siting process.
2. Communities identify their interest in learning more, and the NWMO provides detailed briefings. An initial screening is conducted of communities that continue to be interested.
3. A preliminary assessment of potential suitability is conducted.
4. For interested communities, potentially affected surrounding communities are engaged if they have not been already and detailed site evaluations are completed.
5. Communities with confirmed suitable sites decide whether they are willing to accept the project and propose the terms and conditions on which they would have the project proceed.
6. The NWMO and the community with the preferred site enter into a formal agreement to host the project.
7. Regulatory authorities review the safety of the project through an independent, formal and public process and, if all requirements are satisfied, give their approvals to proceed.
8. Construction and operation of an underground demonstration facility proceeds.
9. Construction and operation of the facility begins.

The NWMO proceeded to the first step in the siting process in 2010, and by the end of 2011, 12 communities had expressed an interest in learning more about the project.

The main features of the Canadian process include clearly defined program principles, extensive public involvement over two years to establish the process for developing the program, multiple ways to obtain information (internet-based information material, public meetings), solicitation of volunteer host communities with grants, continuing public involvement throughout the siting process with special attention to Indigenous People and tradition, a specific and phased schedule with clear decision points, and opportunity for public review and comment throughout each program phase.

John Kotek added that having gone through the BRC process, they thought that any effort to define what consent meant would be difficult. It will be different things in different states. Leave that to them and the Nuclear Waste Management entity. When you look at what other nations have done, BRC learned a lot from Canada, Sweden, France and other nations that have gone down this road. Canada has done a good job of not trying to go too far, too fast, but has spent several years to just provide information to interested communities and local government entities. It all started with a nation-wide dialogue. That process has been on-going for the past eight years. In 2010, a siting plan was issued that kicked off a nine-step process by which they would engage communities and provincial governments. They released an expression of interest, and they have had at least a dozen communities step up and say they have an interest in learning more about this. We started that discussion in Idaho with LINE 1.0 and we can continue that through the life of LINE 2.0. Amy added that consent-based is a good process to go through with other projects – not just interim storage – like SMRs. John Kotek said one of the biggest questions is, “When does a state or local government no longer have an option to opt out?” There is a long time between when the conversation starts and signing on the dotted line.

John Grossenbacher referenced the last Energy Communities Alliance was about how to get the resources to do what John Kotek talked about – having the conversation. What he heard was that it was premature – because Yucca is the law of the land. There is only so much they could do to help provide resources on a state-specific siting process.

Amy explained that ECA is an organization that was established by communities that host DOE sites in their backyards. Those delegations include local elected officials and other leaders. The Idaho Falls meeting in June did include a request for funding from those interested communities, but John is right, there is nothing until there is legislation that changes the law of the land. Other communities are not putting things on hold though. They are starting dialogues in their own states.

John Grossenbacher indicated that a lot has happened. We have some action by one of the houses of Congress. When will Yucca cease to be a barrier? That issue delays substantially to the extent federal resources for knowledge building that John Kotek talked about can occur? Well, what about the mid-term election next year, what if it breaks free? Then it will get community specific, and to be done right, it will have to be a measured way in the kind of public involvement that John Kotek talked about.

Amy Lientz said it makes sense to have the dialogue in the state now. Anything like this can and should take time because there is a lot to it.

Jeff Sayer said the reason for this update is to provide a window or glimpse into what is happening. You have this energetic activity; communities have awakened, amidst chaos at the federal level and no indication of what direction this will all go. You have states and communities that are being very collaborative. We have a responsibility in our LINE 2.0 to move this forward on behalf of the state, we have a chance to do it correctly, and to be patient and careful. This conversation is occurring and we can define the framework for how this moves forward in our state.

A comment was made by one of the Commissioners that the 1995 Settlement Agreement was specific to the Governor’s agreement. This state has not by any stretch of the measure gone through a consent-based process. That’s why there is a valuable role for LINE 2.0

The question was asked as to what the ultimate fate is for this material. At the federal level, what’s on the table? Pilot smacks of an interim interim storage.

John Kotek said DOE’s strategy is to have a pilot facility in 2021 for the nine reactor’s – and soon to be four more – orphaned fuel. By 2025, they intend to design an interim storage facility to take used fuel from other areas. By 2048, they want to have a repository up and running. Repository is permanent storage. In the past there have been questions about how long fuel should be retrievable. Even when it comes to disposal, it may not be disposal. Consolidated storage is a place to store until it can be sent to a centralized facility- and it may be decades.

The comment was made that we should draw from the best ideas nationally, so we can approach things like siting SMR. For interim storage, it’s premature.

Another Commissioner commented that the consent-based process came out of a discussion on waste management, but it would have helped DOE on many other things. We don’t want to have consent-based just limited to interim storage. The question was asked of John Grossenbacher if all the Labs were treated fairly equally in the budget recommendations? It was the understanding that Secretary Moniz announced the possibility of combining the Offices of Science and Energy.

John indicated that the cuts were not evenly distributed among EM, OS, NE, etc. It’s unclear whether it would become a combined pot of money if there is a combination of the Offices of Science and Energy.

The question was asked what the role of LINE 2.0 is relative to LINE 1.0 recommendations. Can we push, encourage? Is that part of our emphasis in LINE 2.0 or are we going to be taking more of an academic approach? We don’t want to lose sight of some very good recommendations.

Jeff Sayer cautioned against advocacy, but we do have an education responsibility. But, Chairman Sayer indicated that for example on CAES expansion, the Governor has already extended invitations to other region’s governors to come – maybe as early as this summer – to come to INL and CAES. About a month ago, we had Dr. Pete Lyons in town for other matters, and he lingered another day to meet with state legislators and other state leaders. We held a reception in Idaho Falls, and then he came to Boise to meet with legislators. They were grateful to have one-on-one time with him. Jeff also did send back formal comments on the Senate legislation and that response is available.

**LUNCH**

**Idaho’s 2013 Leadership on Nuclear Energy**

Erik Simpson from CWI presented an update on cleanup progress. He first focused on safety, and said that this year they have had two minor reportable injuries – which is exceptional for a company of 1100 employees undertaking radioactive remediation. Last year, the buried exhumation was halted because of the budget constraints. Governor Otter was insistent that they continue, and DOE gave direction last month to restart the exhumation as soon as practical. CWI began a new contract on October 1, 2012, and between that time and now, they’ve been able to save considerable money. DOE directed CWI to use those savings to restart exhumation. So far, 65 workers have been hired back, and exhumation should resume late summer or early fall. It’s rare that all parties benefit, but this is one of those rare occurrences, and the Snake River Plain Aquifer benefits as well. Erik Simpson also updated the Commission on the status of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit designed to treat 900,000 gallons of liquid sodium-bearing waste stored underground in three tanks. That liquid came from the latter stages of reprocessing work conducted through 1992. IWTU is a steam reforming process to convert liquid into a more stable, solid form that will be stored on site until a repository is available to accept that. In June 2012, there was a pressure event during testing that delayed the startup of the facility. CWI has worked with the State to be up and running and have that sodium-bearing waste treated by December 2014. It’s a one-of-a-kind facility and they are doing everything they can to get it on-line with safety as the priority. We have 6,000 drums of sludge waste from AMWTP and they are treating about 20 drums a day to ship out of Idaho. Premier Technology is helping in the distillation process for other waste. Once Premier has tested that, the equipment will be moved to INTEC and waste will be treated. Lead contaminated soil is also being treated. 2014 budget is $247 million which would allow them to meet their contract obligations.

Chairman Sayer recapped the Governor’s involvement in making sure that funding for exhumation was identified. He asked Erik to discuss the timeline for starting IWTU. Mr. Simpson said the plan is to heat up of the facility in early 2014 and run a surrogate material through the facility and make sure the process is working properly. If so, a decision to go “hot” and treat the sodium-bearing waste will be made.

Jeff Sayer mentioned that going “hot” means you are running radioactive waste through there, and if it doesn’t work, you have big problems. So, it’s best to make sure you have it right to begin with.

With the sludge, Erik indicated they are opening up drums with tele-handling and excavation equipment and adding absorbent to that waste. It is then no longer considered a liquid and qualifies for disposal at WIPP.

AMWTP sent a letter to update the commission on progress. Of the 65,000 cubic meters of waste, more than 50,000 cubic meters has been disposed of safely out of Idaho. Innovations by workers were highlighted in a Post-Register article on July 23.

**INL Capabilities and Strategic Discussion**

Chairman Sayer went back to the question from the morning session about advocacy vs. education relative to the LINE 1.0 recommendations.

One Commission member made the comment that his fear is that commission recommendations often gather dust. The good news is the Governor is already acting on one – CAES expansion. As an extension of the Executive, we should provide some oversight, have a session during the Legislature to keep their knowledge level up, bring different interest groups before us from time to time. I would hate to see what we have done languish, and I sense some responsibility to push that.

It was suggested that maybe we bring in a member of the Legislature or someone from the Governor’s office to report on what has happened or what is happening with recommendations that are part of the Commission report. Just the review of the report periodically refreshes in our minds the prior work and helps the new commissioners gain a more enriched perspective of what the original intent was. And, it reminds all of Idaho of all the work that has been done, through the public conversation. Additionally, there is an accounting and reminder that we find value in the work that has been done and reinforces in the minds of our federal delegation and the executive and legislative branches here is about as good a way to keep the dust blown off, and have meaningful engagement.

Another Commission member said we don’t have to make a choice between advocacy and education; it’s not always an either/or choice. CAES is an easy case to say advocacy and we shouldn’t get wrapped around the axle because it can be both.

John Grossenbacher talked about the importance of an accounting – maybe off-line – of what are the germane sectors – state, federal, industry – and if there is a path forward, where does the responsibility lie? If there are resources needed, it obviously has to compete with other needs the state has. Education and public dialogue need to occur. Given the number of recommendations, we have to have some sense of priority. Invite them to come to the commission and ask them what they think it will take to move it forward.

The Commission should understand why the Governor or a germane committee didn’t find value in a particular recommendation. He would like to ensure the adoption of the modification of, the elimination of, or a better understanding of why we as a state have chosen to stand down on any issue there. How do we take possible next steps? How do you take a blue print, and go vertical with ideas on how to do it.

The comment was made that in looking at the Governor’s EO, there are other items beyond just the recommendations of LINE 1.0. Another action is to facilitate. Some recommendations we can act on; others are themes we can build on.

Another Commissioner said we need to be very careful about our CAES funding portfolio. There’s a recognized need to diversify our portfolio. Inherent in that is to expand so that we not only rely on DOE for funding. How do we put that in front of the state?

The comment was made that LINE facilitated some very important discussions in the public domain about cleanup, funding, and they were really healthy discussions to have. Some of those topics may not have taken place but for a LINE Commission. There will be other issues that need to be put in the public domain.

One Commissioner suggested a possible first step for LINE 2.0 is determine what issues we handle at the state level at the federal level, then the next step is that anything that has the Federal designation, we’ll have to figure out, but at the state level we can break them down into bite-sized pieces and then identify the things we can give to decision makers to help them implement either through financial or statutory means. At the state level, see if they concur, get their buy in and have them carry the water on behalf of the group or at least make decisions at that time.

**Future Meeting Schedule and Agenda Items**

Chairman Sayer suggested we meet quarterly. Sen. Craig said that will work itself out, but for now, yes, quarterly seems to work. During the legislative session, we might have pieces of the commission meet. State legislators need to be a part of advocacy. They have a high level of credibility.

Chairman Sayer said we will reach out and present a structure, mesh and blend that, with the charge of moving forward with LINE 1.0 recommendations. We will find the right configuration of topics and focus with the goal of the next time we meet having the structure in place, with tentative assignments, where you’d like to spend your time. Bring recommendations from LINE 1.0 as a starting point. We have a legislative session coming up in January. We need to have a meeting in the fall for any specific legislative recommendations that we might bring forward.

The Chairman anticipates two meetings between now and the end of the year. We’ll go to work on subcommittee framework and priorities and how we want to move forward.

**Public Comments**

Chairman Sayer asked for any public comments – even though no one signed up to testify.

Rebecca Casper of Idaho Falls responded and said she is grateful for LINE 1.0 and the product and the direction that we’re going. She mentioned a spreadsheet shown earlier in the day and said that is real at the local level. We don’t want to lose that asset, and the moment you decide you don’t’ want to lose that you slip into advocacy. She is looking forward to a robust public dialogue, but as the Commission talked about the Federal and State level, she asked that they not leave out the municipalities, for example as you work toward consent-based, you have to work at the local level. Seek out local participation as much as possible rather than think of this as just a state effort.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.