

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

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x  
IN THE MATTER OF: : Project Number  
AMES HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT : 400-043  
- - - - - x

Tellurid Conference Center  
580 Mountain Village Boulevard  
Telluride, Colorado

Thursday, August 11, 2005

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping  
meeting, pursuant to notice at 7:15 p.m.

MODERATOR: DAVID TURNER, FERC

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2  
3 MR. TURNER: All right. Well, welcome to the  
4 scoping meetings for the Tacoma-Ames -- the Ames development  
5 part of this proceeding, anyway. We've had meetings so far  
6 for the Tacoma scoping meetings we held yesterday and the  
7 evening before. Now tonight we want to talk about some of  
8 the issues surrounding the Ames facilities.

9 Before we get underway I'd like to introduce  
10 myself. As most of you probably already know -- we met  
11 already at this morning's site visit -- but I'm David  
12 Turner. I am the coordinator for the Commission -- the  
13 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission here on this  
14 relicensing effort.

15 To my right is Nick Jayjack. He is our fisheries  
16 biologist assigned to this proceeding.

17 To his right is Patti Leppert, who is going to be  
18 dealing with land use and recreation and cultural resources  
19 issues.

20 To her right is Elizabeth Molloy. She is our  
21 Officer of General Counsel representative.

22 And to her right is John Scott, who is in our  
23 Division of Dam Safety and Inspections.

24 This is being recorded for the record. I hope  
25 people won't be shy just because it's recording; but it's

1 just a way of maintaining our record. So please feel free.  
2 We do have some protocols here for dealing with the -- well,  
3 let me back up a little bit and go on the objectives of the  
4 things that we want to talk about tonight.

5 First off, scoping is really where we initiate  
6 our National Environmental Policy Act requirements. We're  
7 here to discuss the issues that may be faced and what we're  
8 going to be analyzing in our environmental document around  
9 the relicensing of this project.

10 I'm going to give a very brief -- I'm going to  
11 ask Alfred to give a very brief review of the Ames Project  
12 and how it operates and how -- where things are in the  
13 proceedings just for the record, and how things have  
14 developed over the last couple of days. All of you  
15 obviously have been involved in the resource work groups, so  
16 this is probably very redundant. But I just want to make  
17 sure it's on the record for the proceeding.

18 After that I'll talk a little bit about the  
19 integrated licensing process in a very general way. I  
20 understand that the Company as well as their representatives  
21 -- consulting representatives have been hammering home the  
22 integrated licensing process procedures and time frames at  
23 almost every meeting. So I won't burden everybody with a  
24 lengthy discussion of that. There are a few points I do  
25 want to hit just to make sure everybody knows what's going

1 to be coming up over the next several months, as well as  
2 next couple of years.

3 But if there are any other questions after that,  
4 after we adjourn through discussion of the resource issues,  
5 we can talk about the steps in particular, if anybody has  
6 any questions about the integrated licensing process.

7 I hope everybody signed in at the registration  
8 out front, just for the record. And again, we are giving --  
9 it is being recorded so I'm going to ask you to talk into  
10 the microphone so that the court reporter can hear your  
11 comments clearly and get it on the record, as well as state  
12 your name before making your comments, and affiliations.

13 Again, really briefly, tonight we want to talk  
14 about the issues that we've identified from reviewing the  
15 preapplication document that was filed and from what we've  
16 heard in earlier proceedings. We want to talk about the  
17 available information and where there may be gaps in that  
18 information and how you're proceeding to fill those gaps,  
19 and how you're proposing to proceed to fill those gaps. And  
20 we want to talk about the process plan, at least in terms of  
21 some future steps in trying to integrate those steps with  
22 our procedures. And what I'm talking about here is things  
23 like Endangered Special Act consultations and 401 Water  
24 Quality Certifications.

25 Alfred, do you want to give a very brief review?

1                   MR. HUGHES: And actually, David, if it's okay, I  
2 don't see any new faces in the audience tonight.  
3 Essentially everybody who's here has heard project  
4 operations' description probably numerous times from me.  
5 But if somebody is interested in hearing it again or has  
6 some specific questions about the operation, I'd be glad to  
7 go through it all again or just answer the questions.

8                   MR. TURNER: I'd like to get just really short.

9                   MR. HUGHES: Okay.

10                  MR. TURNER: Patti wasn't able to go to the site  
11 visit today. And basically get it on the record.

12                  MR. HUGHES: Oh, sure.

13                  MR. TURNER: Really short.

14                  MR. HUGHES: Most certainly for Patti, then.

15                  (Laughter.)

16                  MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

17                  MR. HUGHES: The Ames Hydroproject consists of  
18 two reservoirs, Hope Lake, which is an above-timberline  
19 reservoir, and the Trout Lake Reservoir. The way Lake Hope  
20 is operated is essentially we close the discharge valves on  
21 that lake in the early spring and spend all summer catching  
22 whatever runoff water we can to fill that reservoir. The  
23 valves are opened in the fall to augment the generation  
24 through the winter and actually help keep Trout Lake charged  
25 for winter operations.

1           As I've described the same on the Tacoma Project,  
2           the goal in the spring is to essentially keep your reservoir  
3           empty. So we try to get Trout Lake down to a minimum  
4           operating level some time in April and try to keep it that  
5           way. Of course, you can't because inflows far exceed the  
6           hydraulic capacity of the plant. So Trout Lake will fill  
7           regardless, generally reaching capacity some time in early  
8           June. And from that point on we essentially operate  
9           throughout the summer trying to maintain close to full  
10          capacity in the storage reservoir, leaving a couple feet of  
11          free board just in the event we have some heavy rains or  
12          something.

13                 There are two siphon valves are Trout Lake that  
14                 will operate as lake levels come up and inflows reach the  
15                 point where we need to discharge some of the water. Only  
16                 one siphon has ever operated, at least in the years that  
17                 we've been experienced with this project, and the second  
18                 valve has never really been needed.

19                 Trout Lake, about two and a half miles of  
20                 penstock down to the power house. There is a second  
21                 diversion with no storage, a straight run of the river  
22                 diversion on the Howards Ford diversion dam and pipe, and  
23                 actually two turbines and one generator at Tacoma.

24                 There's a generating capacity of 850 kilowatts on  
25                 Howards Fork and about three megawatts off of the lake fork

1 at full load.

2 We don't always operate at full load; in fact,  
3 infrequently. Generally just through the springs months is  
4 where we get enough available water for that type of  
5 operation.

6 In the fall, some time in November, we return to  
7 a peaking operation at the project. Essentially trying to  
8 maximize the generation value of the project by generating  
9 during peak hours of ten to ten during weekdays, and then  
10 maintaining a base load off-peak hours and on weekends. We  
11 operate like that throughout the winter months again, with  
12 the goal of having the reservoir empty by the time runoff  
13 comes again.

14 And, Patti, obviously you are aware but didn't  
15 hear my spiel on the history of the project. It's obviously  
16 a very historic project, being the first AC generated  
17 transmitted used and sold for industrial purposes in the  
18 world. 1891 was the original project. There was a second  
19 plant built immediately after that experiment proved  
20 successful. And then they immediately realized the need for  
21 an even larger generating plant. And the current  
22 installation was built and in operation in 1906. And it has  
23 pretty much been in continuous operation since then.

24 As far as the ILP process, everybody here really  
25 is very familiar with that. But I'll let John Devine of

1 Devine Tarbo & Associates again just cover where we are  
2 today as far as the resource work groups and where we're  
3 going from here.

4 MR. TURNER: Thank you, Al.

5 MR. HUGHES: Thank you.

6 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

7 MR. DEVINE: It's hard to do it justice in just a  
8 few minutes. But similar to what we've tried to do over on  
9 the other side of the mountain about a little over a year  
10 ago, PSCO developed a list of some 80-plus stakeholders that  
11 -- of folks who might and groups that might have an interest  
12 in the project, in relicensing the project, invited those  
13 folks to an initial relicensing -- initial information  
14 meeting about relicensing. David was kind enough to come  
15 and talk about the integrated licensing process and scare  
16 the heck out of everybody. So that provided a good list of

17 -- MR. TURNER: That's not supposed to get on the  
18 record.

19 MR. DEVINE: It's okay. Let me rephrase that.

20 That provided a springboard for trying to get a  
21 head start on the process because it was a new process and  
22 many of the folks involved in the names had not gone through  
23 relicensing. So we invited folks at that initial meeting to  
24 join one of four what we called resource work groups. And  
25 at the time the initial ones were the water, terrestrial --

1 water group resource work group, terrestrial resource work  
2 group, cultural resource work group and the recreation, land  
3 use and aesthetics resource work group.

4 We later, after the first meeting, I think,  
5 consolidated water and terrestrial into the water-  
6 terrestrial resource work group because many of the  
7 interested parties were the same and the group thought it  
8 most efficient to consolidate those.

9 We've had six meetings since that time and have  
10 really gotten excellent participation. There's been some  
11 real die hards at the meetings, and we really appreciate  
12 everybody's efforts to stick it out through those meetings.  
13 But we've come a long way.

14 Our approach was kind of very systematically  
15 through those meetings first to deal with what the issues  
16 might be and just get them listed up on a board and start to  
17 go through them and start to define them, and then make sure  
18 we understood what that issue was -- the issues were in each  
19 of the resource work groups. And then we tried to define  
20 the project's relationship to that issue and what we call  
21 project effects. We would write that up as drafts and --  
22 PSCO would -- and get those back to the resource work group  
23 participants; go over them; modify them as appropriate. And  
24 then move on to what additional information might be needed  
25 to areas where studies might be required.

1           Some of the issues were judged to be not relevant  
2 to relicensing. Some were judged to be relevant to  
3 relicensing but to have enough information to deal with it.  
4 And some were judged to be relevant to relicensing and  
5 needing additional information.

6           We worked through all of those within the  
7 resource work groups. And those needing additional  
8 information, we started on the path of developing some study  
9 plans. We drafted some of those up and have gotten them to  
10 the resource work groups. Some we've -- we've gone through  
11 some -- one set of revisions on; and we've got another set  
12 out there undergoing review right now by the resource work  
13 groups.

14           So I think we're getting close to having a set of  
15 study plans that we're going to be in substantial agreement  
16 on. But there are still some of those to work through.

17           And again, PSCO has -- sends its appreciation out  
18 to all the people who have participated in those resource  
19 work groups. It's been a big commitment and we've come a  
20 long way.

21           MR. TURNER: Thanks, Larry.

22           Again, I just want to hit very briefly on where  
23 we are and where we're going over the next couple of months  
24 and years. The Notice of Intent and Pre-Application  
25 document was filed May 20th. We're now in the scoping

1 process. Scoping comments are due September 20th. And  
2 those comments should include anything in terms of if you  
3 want to make any comments on what is in the scoping document  
4 one, which we issued, any of the information in the PAD that  
5 needs to be added or corrected.

6 But probably most importantly is also any study  
7 requests, any information gaps that have been identified and  
8 you believe need to be filled. And we'll talk a little bit  
9 more about those study requests in a few minutes. But that  
10 also is due by September 20th.

11 So there's a lot to think about and a lot to pull  
12 together in a short bit of time. So allow some time for  
13 that.

14 PSCO will take those -- the information from the  
15 scoping and those study requests and develop a proposed  
16 study plan. As John talked about, you're already well  
17 underway in that. And I think that's admirable and  
18 everybody should be very commended for that effort and  
19 trying to resolve those information gaps.

20 As we get into that, I think as -- The integrated  
21 license process is a very defined time period to resolve  
22 differences in study needs. There will be a 90-day period  
23 basically to discuss and come to a conclusion about studies  
24 and for the company to file a revised study plan. That  
25 revised study plan will reflect the agreements that might be

1 reached in that 90-day period and/or at least address any --  
2 addressing their beliefs in terms of any disagreements that  
3 still outstand.

4 You'll have a few days -- 15 days to comment on  
5 that. And then the Commission will make a decision on  
6 whether or not the revised study plan that's filed by SPCO  
7 should be approved, and, if not, modified. And they will be  
8 required to undertake those studies to fill the information  
9 gaps that have been identified.

10 So we're really into -- The first part of this  
11 year has got a lot to be done and a lot to accomplish as  
12 part of the integrated licensing process to make sure that  
13 it's structured enough that we come to these conclusions.

14 After that -- after we get to a pre-study plan,  
15 the company will implement that study plan and start  
16 developing its license application. During that next couple  
17 of years as that information is gathered and the application  
18 is developed, we will revisit those studies and information  
19 needs to make sure that the things are moving as  
20 anticipated, modify the studies if necessary, and issue any  
21 -- the Commission will issue any additional determinations  
22 as to whether or not the studies should be modified or new  
23 studies added.

24 But it's critical that we talk about this now.  
25 And again, I commend everybody's hard work up to this point

1 to try to get to an agreed-to study plan because as we get  
2 further into the process the bar for adding and modifying  
3 studies becomes a little harder-- a little higher. We're  
4 trying to get people to stay focused very early on in the  
5 proceedings so that we get a good study plan.

6 The Company must file their application two years  
7 prior to the license expiration, which is in June 2008. Did  
8 I get it right or wrong? Once that gets filed the  
9 Commission will review to make sure the application is  
10 adequate and complete. We will issue a notice requesting  
11 terms and conditions and comments on what that new license  
12 should look like.

13 And we'll take that information and prepare an  
14 environmental assessment to complete our National  
15 Environmental Policy Act or NEPA responsibilities. And with  
16 that, make recommendations to the Commission in terms of how  
17 to license the project or not.

18 Any questions? Anybody want to -- have any  
19 questions about the integrated licensing process? I know  
20 that was a quick overview. But, as I understood, everybody  
21 understands it.

22 (No response.)

23 Some key dates to keep in mind again is, as I  
24 said, study requests are due September 20th. The Company  
25 will be issuing their proposed study plan by November 4th.

1 We'll kick off that informal dispute resolution where we  
2 talk about and work as a group to resolve differences on  
3 studies. The first study plan meetings should -- need to  
4 take place by December 4th.

5 And I would encourage you guys to talk among  
6 yourselves in the resource work groups and set some future  
7 dates. You're in a better position to know where we might  
8 be standing as you move along and where those disagreements  
9 may still lie. But keep in mind we have 90 days to resolve  
10 those differences.

11 And a lot of the seven pioneers so far, where  
12 they've been working together, have at this point tried to  
13 set out dates for meetings to discuss those. You may not  
14 actually end up needing those dates, but it's good to go  
15 ahead and get them on your calendar now to talk about it so  
16 that you're not scrambling at the last minute to try to  
17 accomplish that. So in your next resource work group  
18 meetings I would encourage you to talk about that element of  
19 the schedule and let us know about it.

20 At the end of that 90 day period, again the  
21 Company will submit a revised study plan that addresses any  
22 of the accommodations and agreements that might be reached  
23 during the informal dispute resolution and/or addressing any  
24 disagreements. We'll take that information, consider it,  
25 and the office director will issue a study plan

1 determination letter by April of '06.

2 I've got the study request criteria up here just  
3 as a reminder that when you're putting together your study  
4 request you need to be cognizant of each of these seven  
5 criteria. Address them thoroughly. This lays out your  
6 reasonings for and need for the information.

7 You need to talk about the study goals and  
8 objectives of the study. You need to relate it to your  
9 resource management goals, if you're like an agency. If  
10 you're a nongovernmental organization, say like American  
11 Whitewater or some others that have public interest  
12 considerations like flows for whitewater recreation, you  
13 don't have a mandate like a state or federal agency, then  
14 you want to talk about the public interest consideration of  
15 your recommendation.

16 You need to consider what's known, explain that  
17 you've thought about what is available in terms of the  
18 information and what there is still an information gap that  
19 needs to be filled. Probably the key -- the very key  
20 element here is drawing a nexus to the project and its  
21 operation and effects.

22 You need to talk about the methodology that you  
23 would want to see implemented to fill that data gap and you  
24 need to talk about the level of effort and cost associated  
25 with that.

1           And here is -- And this one I think gives some  
2 people a lot of -- we're finding in our seven pioneers --  
3 some of the biggest concerns: What are you looking for  
4 here; how much is it going to cost; or is it just a level of  
5 effort.

6           Ideally it would be the cost. But it's really to  
7 give the Company a good understanding of the scope of effort  
8 that you think would be required to fill that data gap. Are  
9 we talking about a Cadillac version relative to what the  
10 Company might be proposing to do, or is it a Volkswagen.  
11 The Commission will consider that kind of information in  
12 making a decision and in the quality of the data that might  
13 be required relative to the cost of that information. So  
14 that's the key here, so that we understand just about the  
15 level of effort that's being requested versus the kind of  
16 information that might be gathered from that effort.

17           I've got this slide here as a reminder to talk  
18 about any other processes. I don't see anybody here that  
19 really has any issues. If there is, let me know. Again I'm  
20 thinking mostly of things like endangered species  
21 consultations, trying to integrate that into our process so  
22 that we get a more timely licensing decision. Or water  
23 quality certification. I don't think there is any other  
24 processes out there. But -- Am I missing anything, John or  
25 Alfred?

1           Section 106 is an element itself in terms of  
2 fulfilling requirements, but it doesn't have, as an agency  
3 itself, certain procedures that I'm aware of.

4           The meat of tonight's discussion is the resource  
5 issues. We've put out a scoping document one -- we gathered  
6 -- that information in the scoping document one is a summary  
7 of what we understood the issues to be based on what's in  
8 the preapplication document and the issue assessments that  
9 were included in the appendix. We want to make sure that we  
10 have adequately characterized and captured those issues,  
11 that we've -- if we've left something out, it may have been  
12 intentional or unintentional. So if there's something there  
13 you want to make sure we considered, let's talk about that.

14           The way this is going to work is we're going to  
15 run down through the issue descriptions. And if you turn to  
16 page 22 in the scoping document we'll work through these  
17 resource by resource.

18           By the way, there's four handouts in the back I  
19 hope everybody picked up. One is an extra copy of the  
20 scoping document if you don't have one or weren't included  
21 in the mailing list. And if you weren't, let me know and  
22 we'll make sure you get on that.

23           The other one is a flowchart to the integrated  
24 licensing process. I use that on a regular basis just to  
25 remind me of what's coming up. Some key things in that flow

1 chart that you should be aware of is that there's really two  
2 sets of text: One is some prefiling application element and  
3 some postfiling application elements. And they define the  
4 time frames between the steps.

5 In those boxes there is some text there that's  
6 red. Those are the places that you're going to be providing  
7 input to the Licensee and/or the Commission. The text in  
8 the black is items that the Commission and/or the Company  
9 will be developing and issuing. So that I think is a key in  
10 terms of keeping things as a reminder.

11 There is also a handout back there on our study  
12 criteria. It kind of gives some background again in terms  
13 of what we're looking for and some explanation behind that.  
14 So hopefully that will be a good tool.

15 With that background, I guess we'll turn to some  
16 of the resource issues. Each one of the resource  
17 specialists is going to kind of run down through the issues  
18 that we identified. We do have some questions -- or at  
19 least I have some questions for you guys in terms of the  
20 issues.

21 But, again, we want this to be interactive. Let  
22 us know if we've missed something or if we've  
23 mischaracterized something or if something isn't -- and in  
24 particular if we've included an issue that as a group you've  
25 resolved, let us know that and we can extract it. So this

1 is not only a scoping meeting to identify new issues, but to  
2 refine and eliminate those issues that aren't issues.

3 So with that I'm going to turn it over to Nick to  
4 talk about aquatic and fisheries resources.

5 MR. JAYJACK: Thank you, David.

6 For aquatics and fisheries there are two effects  
7 we're going to look at. We're going to look at cumulative  
8 effects and site-specific effects. For the cumulative  
9 effects we're going to be concentrating on the federally  
10 listed Upper Colorado River Basin fish species. There are  
11 four of them.

12 And our geographic scope for that analysis we've  
13 selected based on information that was provided in the PAD  
14 as well as other outside source of information regarding the  
15 species that we have looked at. It is going to encompass  
16 the Upper Colorado River Basin. It's a very large area.  
17 And so we are going to primarily focus within that larger  
18 area on the San Miguel River Basin. So that's where the  
19 focus of the analysis will be regarding cumulative effects.

20 As far as site specific effects go for aquatic  
21 and fishery resources, there's two general issue areas that  
22 we've identified, again based on the preapplication document  
23 that was submitted in may by Public Service Company. The  
24 first of those issues has to deal with ice formation  
25 primarily in late December, early January below the Ames

1 Power House.

2 So if you have your scoping document, that issue  
3 is listed on page 22. And we've couched it in the form of a  
4 question, which is: What effect would project operations  
5 have on ice accumulation and ice release downstream of the  
6 Ames Power House and what measures could be implemented to  
7 lessen or eliminate the accumulation and release of ice?

8 So that broad issue area, basically what we've  
9 tried to do there is try to cover the issue of ice with that  
10 bulleted item.

11 The next issue area that we're going to deal with  
12 under aquatics and fishery resources has to do with bypass  
13 reaches below the project diversions. In particular we're  
14 going to look at the effect of project diversions at below  
15 Lake Fork -- or on Lake Fork below Trout Lake and below the  
16 diversion dam on Howards Fork.

17 Another element surrounding this issue has to  
18 deal with the storage of flow and the peaking operations  
19 that occur only during certain times of the year. And we're  
20 going to focus attention on the effects that has on --  
21 primarily on the South Fork San Miguel River and the San  
22 Miguel River. And that, of course, will relate not only to  
23 a resident fish species in the project area, but to the four  
24 federally listed species as well.

25 At this point I'd like to open the floor to any

1 questions regarding those issues, as well as any comments or  
2 suggestions for how we might recouch the issue. Also, if  
3 anyone has any additional issues that I have not listed here  
4 in the scoping document, this would be a good time to bring  
5 that up as well.

6 Thanks.

7 MR. WILLIS: Garrish Willis, Forest Service.

8 We think that you should include storage of water  
9 in Hope Lake and effect on the reach between Hope Lake and  
10 Trout Lake as an issue.

11 MR. JAYJACK: Okay. Thanks.

12 Are there any comments regarding that issue, by  
13 the way?

14 MR. KOWALSKI: Dan Kowalski with the Colorado  
15 Division of Wildlife.

16 We agree with the Forest Service. We think it  
17 would be a good idea to look at that bypass reach and effect  
18 of Hope Lake as well.

19 Thanks.

20 MR. MURPHY: Dennis Murphy, BLM.

21 I'd like to go back up to the ice issue and just  
22 -- it's not spelled out there, but the three kind of  
23 secondary impacts from the icing issue would be health and  
24 human safety, the aquatic biology of the river, including  
25 fisheries, and the health of the riparian environment.

1 They're the three kind of categories of issues we have from  
2 the icing. And I didn't know if that was implied in there  
3 or not.

4 MR. TURNER: Well, it is kind of in a sense of at  
5 least the terrestrial side of things. There were some  
6 discussions on riparian habitat down below.

7 So the safety issues, no. That's a new one that  
8 I didn't pick up on in that regard. And where is that  
9 coming from? I mean, can you talk a little bit more about  
10 your concern there?

11 MR. MURPHY: Well, you can talk with the County  
12 Sheriff's Department. But they have in the past -- have to  
13 go down the river during these ice events and basically pull  
14 people out of the river -- harm's way. They'll warn people  
15 with bull horns. I have even been called off the river.

16 And I don't' know firsthand, but I've been told  
17 it's taken a deck or two off the back of a couple homes down  
18 around Saltpit. There's a lot of homes going in down along  
19 the river there that weren't there before. The more homes  
20 that are along the river, the more of an issue that's  
21 becoming.

22 From the BLM's point of view, that's probably not  
23 our primary issue. But I'm sure the county would express  
24 that as an issue. And it has been expressed by them in the  
25 past as an issue.

1                   MR. TURNER:  What are they doing on the river at  
2                   that time of year?

3                   MR. WILLIS:  I just have a clarifying question.  
4                   Did this problem -- Has this problem persisted ever since  
5                   the project was first constructed, or is this something that  
6                   has happened as a result of a change in operation, maybe  
7                   since Public Service took over the operation?

8                   MR. MURPHY:  I guess -- We've looked and tried to  
9                   talk to some old timers in the area, and I guess we can  
10                  track it back into the '80s.  And I don't know before that.  
11                  I would suspect it probably has been going on for quite some  
12                  time.

13                  But as I just mentioned, if you drive from here  
14                  to Plasserville, if you did that 30 years ago you wouldn't  
15                  see three-quarters of the homes that are in there.  So  
16                  there's a heightened sense of awareness of that now because  
17                  there are people literally living feet from the river where  
18                  30, 40, 50 years ago it was just a non-issue  So I think the  
19                  fact that there are a lot of residences close to the river  
20                  downstream of Ames has made this a more important issue for  
21                  the county.

22                  The county has actually helped us fund some of  
23                  the work in past years based on the safety issue.

24                  MR. TURNER:  Okay.  Thank you.

25                  Garrish.

1 MR. WILLIS: Thanks, Larry, for doing that.

2 Garrish Willis again.

3 I probably should be addressing questions to the  
4 Commission. But --

5 MR. TURNER: Well, we want this to be  
6 interactive, so --

7 MR. WILLIS: Okay.

8 MR. TURNER: It's fine.

9 MR. WILLIS: There has been some anecdotal  
10 discussion about the icing problem maybe being exacerbated  
11 by the peaking schedule in the wintertime. Is there any  
12 evidence that there's a relationship there? Does that need  
13 to be studied?

14 MR. MURPHY: There is going to be an icing  
15 situation no matter what the release is.

16 The ice accumulation is a result -- from our  
17 studies over the last six or seven years -- from the  
18 excessive heat in the outflow that's coming from the bottom  
19 of Trout Lake. The intake for the penstock is in the bottom  
20 of Trout Lake. In the wintertime the lakes are warmer on  
21 the bottom than the top. 39 degrees typically.

22 We're seeing 37.5 to 38 degree water coming  
23 through the penstock and being released, which leaves a  
24 large reach of the South Fork ice free in the winter. On  
25 cold nights frazzle ice forms in open water and that frazzle

1 ice that floats downriver accumulates on the bottom to  
2 create anchor ice, shore ice. And it basically chokes the  
3 river with ice.

4           Depending on the weather, the temperatures after  
5 -- depending again on how much ice is accumulating, there  
6 are different mechanisms that cause a release. Under flat  
7 flow releases we still see ice floes -- in fact, more ice  
8 floes than under a power peaking scenario. In the power  
9 peaking scenario we see ice accumulation. The river becomes  
10 so thick and comprehensive in the water column that the  
11 channel can actually be displaced because of the amounts of  
12 anchor ice that are forming. When the ice gets that massive  
13 it's hard to sustain an ice floe.

14           So the data I have goes all the way back to '96 -  
15 - or '97-'98, which was a year or two before they started  
16 power peaking. And we actually looked at some record before  
17 that. And the character of ice impact changes from flat  
18 flow to power peaking, but there is still an impact.

19           Under flat flow you see less direct ice  
20 accumulation impact; you see more ice floe impact. You have  
21 more ice floes throughout that mid-winter season, the  
22 December/January season.

23           Under the power peaking we see a few ice floes  
24 early on until the river becomes so choked with ice that it  
25 can't sustain them down through the river system. But then

1 the impact is -- Dan might be able to explain this better --  
2 but the ice becomes so built up in the channel that it  
3 basically displaces the fish that are trying to overwinter  
4 in the channel. So you have a direct impact on the  
5 fisheries, more so under a power peaking than you do under  
6 the flat flow.

7 So you don't really get rid of the ice problem  
8 with the flat flow or the power peaking; you change the  
9 character of the ice impact.

10 And I can explain that with -- given a lot more  
11 time. I could do that if we need to do that. But I don't  
12 want to take the whole meeting.

13 MR. TURNER: The only thing I would like to make  
14 sure is that that information and stuff is provided for the  
15 record at some point, whether it's in PSCO's application or  
16 in your study requests or something, and it's made available  
17 in some fashion, particularly if study disputes arise and we  
18 have to consider that.

19 MR. KOWALSKI: Dan Kowalski from the Division of  
20 Wildlife again.

21 I want to -- I think Dennis summed up some of the  
22 issues as far as the fisheries pretty well. And I think  
23 it's explained pretty well in your first bullet here.

24 One point that I think Nick made verbally but I  
25 would like to see stated explicitly in this is that there's

1 sort of two levels that we're worried about as far as effect  
2 on the fisheries. The ice accumulation and ice floe is one  
3 of them. But just the flow pattern, meaning the power  
4 peaking and the amount of water, is also another effect  
5 we're concerned with, you know, separate from the ice.

6 Basically there can be some impacts -- potential  
7 impacts to the fisheries even without ice floes. So, you  
8 know, the flow pattern of the river and how it's affected by  
9 the project is also affecting -- could also affect the  
10 fisheries in the river in the South Fork and the main stem  
11 of the San Miguel.

12 MR. TURNER: Any other questions, comments?  
13 Anything else?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. TURNER: All right.

16 Let me back up. The geology and -- I forgot we  
17 had somewhat of an issue raised on the slope stabilization  
18 issue near 145 associated with the surge tank. We've  
19 included that in there as an issue. As I understand it,  
20 you're looking at geotechnical data to figure out if the  
21 slope is stable or not. Is that still the current plan, or  
22 has that issue changed at all since your discussions of the  
23 PAD development?

24 Alfred?

25 MR. HUGHES: No. We're still planning, working

1 with the Forest Service engineer to have our geotech  
2 engineers actually out this fall to start the evaluation by  
3 agreement on what might be done or might be needed to be  
4 done or might not be needed to be done in there.

5 MR. TURNER: Garrish.

6 MR. WILLIS: Garrish Willis.

7 And I think the way that this issue is described,  
8 there's a good likelihood that the issue is going to go away  
9 because the uncontrolled releases from the project penstock,  
10 if the penstock is relocated away from that area then there  
11 would be no future uncontrolled releases at that location.

12 MR. TURNER: Are there still issues of  
13 uncontrolled releases? I thought they were basically  
14 stopped. This was just an historic issue. I mean, is it --

15 I want to make sure I understand where it is. Is it the  
16 hanging penstock right off 145 that we're talking about?

17 Okay. But it's still not an ongoing type thing.  
18 This was historic basically. Or is -- okay.

19 MR. DEVINE: John Devine.

20 I think the way the resource work group has  
21 characterized the issue is that it's not related necessarily  
22 to uncontrolled releases, but just -- there is a slope there  
23 that had been affected by uncontrolled releases in the past,  
24 and the question is what is the condition of that slope. Is  
25 it stable or is it likely to move on its own, whether

1           there's an uncontrolled release or not.

2                     MR. TURNER:  Okay.

3                     MR. DEVINE:  And so the geotechnical study that  
4           we're drafting up the study plan on has to do with just the  
5           slope stability itself.

6                     MR. TURNER:  Okay.

7                     MR. DEVINE:  Not subject -- whether or not it's  
8           subject to uncontrolled releases.  So even if the penstock  
9           is moved, which is the plan, we still look at that slope  
10          from a slope stability point of view.

11                    MR. TURNER:  Okay.

12                    Any questions on the comments?  We haven't missed  
13          anything then from a geologist's point of view, recognizing  
14          the icing issue also has an erosion effect but kind of  
15          dealing with that as a separate kind of thing associated  
16          with the aquatics and terrestrial side of things.

17                    (No response.)

18                    MR. TURNER:  Okay.

19                    Based on the information there we've, on the  
20          terrestrial side of things, we've identified three major  
21          issues or three clumps of issues:

22                    Again, the effects of project operations,  
23          peakings and diversions associated with the riparian  
24          communities downstream of the Ames power house and the South  
25          Fork of the San Miguel and the San Miguel River; the effects

1 of continuing operations, basically in-stream flow levels  
2 and water fluctuations at Trout and Hope Lakes on any  
3 special status species -- and that is Forest Service or BLM  
4 sensitive indicator species -- or any special habitats that  
5 are tracked by the State of Colorado or other wildlife that  
6 may be of value or importance to the state that may depend  
7 on those waters. And again the last bullet is primarily  
8 looking at the effects of current management -- operation  
9 management on the spread of invasive or noxious weeds and if  
10 there's anything there that we might be considering to  
11 curtail that or ensure that the spread of a noxious weed  
12 isn't resulting from their management practices or  
13 operations.

14 Have we missed anything in particular? Any  
15 comments or questions?

16 (No response.)

17 I guess I do have a couple of questions. And it  
18 goes back to some of the issue assessments and what you're  
19 asking for in terms of the ecological health of the riparian  
20 systems on the South Fork and San Miguel.

21 In the issue assessments you're talking about  
22 undertaking a review of the riparian systems of the South  
23 Fork and San Miguel and doing a literature review and doing  
24 direct fill searches to evaluate that.

25 Is there an anticipation there is literature out

1       there that you didn't uncover in terms of developing the PAD  
2       that should be considered?  And what's being talked about in  
3       terms of looking at the direct surveys for those riparian  
4       habitats?  Can we talk about that just a little bit in terms  
5       of the scope of your studies and where you might be at this  
6       point?

7                   MR. DEVINE:  John Devine.

8                   The -- What we've developed so far is a  
9       description of that issue and the relationship to the  
10      project, and particularly to the potential for ice floes and  
11      what the project's relationship may be to that.  There is a  
12      potential for ecological impacts to the riparian system  
13      during these ice floe events.  Some of the areas are scour  
14      erosion, movement, introduction of invasive species.

15                  What we have drafted -- We have a first draft of  
16      a study plan that will look at pedestrian surveys and  
17      terrestrial resource surveys of the riparian system to  
18      document the conditions and examine whether those impacts  
19      are -- appear to be occurring.  That's -- The first draft of  
20      that study plan is out to the resource work group.  And I  
21      just don't recall some of the details in that at this point.  
22      But the first draft is out there for review.

23                  MR. TURNER:  Okay.  Thanks.  Well, then in  
24      delving into it we'll see what comes out of the studies.

25                  I think that basically covered the question I had

1 for wildlife at this point.

2           Again, we'll be talking -- and this could turn  
3 endangered species. We've designated the company as our  
4 representative for endangered species consultation. We'll  
5 expect them -- or hope that they will prepare a draft  
6 biological assessment for initiating consultation, if  
7 needed, with the services. The services it provided us with  
8 a -- or the company with a list of endangered species that  
9 should be considered here. They are the Colorado pike  
10 minnow, razorback sucker, bonytail chub, humpback chub, bald  
11 eagle, uncomphagre, the fritillary butterfly, southwestern  
12 willow flycatcher, Canada lynx, Mexican spotted owl,  
13 yellowbill cuckoo, boreal toad and the Gunnison Sage-grouse.

14           I had a question with regard to lynx. But are  
15 there any comments or questions about these species in  
16 general? I mean, the Forest Service probably knows. Are  
17 these really likely to be in the area to be affected by the  
18 project and what those project effects might be at this  
19 point?

20           In particularly I guess I was thinking about the  
21 Canada lynx. I know there's a lot of discussion these days  
22 about what kind of habitats that are there and they utilize.  
23 But are we in that range of habitat, or is this more of a  
24 broad list that the Service has just given us?

25           MR. KOWALSKI: Dan Kowalski. I guess I'll speak

1 up, but I'm not really a terrestrial guy.

2 There are lynx in the area. And we have had  
3 documented use of radio-collared lynx using not only the  
4 project area but crossing the river down below, and  
5 certainly using some of the areas as sort of a migration  
6 corridor.

7 MR. TURNER: The river down below the Ames power  
8 house, you mean, or where?

9 MR. KOWALSKI: The main stem of the San Miguel  
10 River.

11 MR. TURNER: Oh. Okay.

12 MR. KOWALSKI: As far as actually in the project  
13 area, I don't know.

14 MR. TURNER: Okay.

15 MR. KOWALSKI: But they are in the area.

16 (Pause.)

17 MR. TURNER: Well, with that, if there's no other  
18 comments, I'll turn it over to Patti to talk about  
19 recreation and land use, the culture stuff.

20 Oh. Garrish.

21 MR. WILLIS: Garrish Willis, Forest Service.

22 You'll see when you get the list of issues  
23 associated with studies coming from the terrestrial working  
24 group that the Forest Service-sensitive and management  
25 indicator species are also an issue.

1                   MR. TURNER: And I think we capture that in one  
2 of our bullets in terms of what we would be looking at.

3                   In the second bullet there, under Terrestrial.  
4 We didn't include it in the endangered species. Typically  
5 the Commission has dealt with that because of the focus of  
6 the endangered species requirements.

7                   MR. WILLIS: Yeah. Okay. I missed that.

8                   MR. TURNER: We try to keep it separate for a  
9 number of reasons. But the biological assessment  
10 requirements we often use RE8 to do that and it just keeps  
11 the Service's NMPs and interior focused on the requirements  
12 for consultation.

13                   MR. WILLIS: Okay.

14                   MR. TURNER: Okay.

15                   Patti.

16                   MS. LEPPERT: Thank you, David.

17                   For those that might have come in a little bit  
18 later, my name is Patti Leppert. I'm with the Federal  
19 Energy Regulatory Commission. And I will be looking at  
20 recreation land use and archaeological and historic  
21 resources for this case.

22                   I would also like to bring to your attention  
23 pages 25 and 26, and in particular Section 5.3, where the  
24 Licensee has developed initial study proposals to fill in  
25 some information gaps which David earlier spoke about

1 through this ILP process.

2 And most important, too, if you turn to page 26  
3 under Section 6, we Commission Staff do request if you have  
4 any information that will help us conduct our own  
5 independent analysis for this case, we would appreciate it.  
6 I talked with BLM earlier and we will be getting some  
7 information from them. So again, anything that can help us  
8 will help you, too.

9 Recreation land use, I have identified five  
10 issues. And some of these issues may overlap with those  
11 already identified by Nick and Dave. One in particular I'd  
12 like to look at is the second one, which reads:

13 What current and future  
14 need for public access to and use of  
15 project related lands for recreational  
16 opportunities exist, particularly with  
17 regard to public use and recreational  
18 needs for Trout Lake "

19 I won't go on. It's a rather lengthy bullet.

20 But I looked at issue number seven and issue  
21 number nine from your work group. And again, if there's any  
22 information that can help me with this assessment, I would  
23 really appreciate it.

24 The other point that I'd like to really focus on  
25 as well is really more land use. And it's the last bullet

1 with regard to federally administered lands. And just as I  
2 am requesting for the Tacoma project, I would appreciate it  
3 if the Licensee and/or Forest Service would help to identify  
4 the amount of acres of Forest Service lands located within  
5 the existing Ames project boundary, if there are. I don't  
6 know at this point. That would be a help to me, to clearly  
7 identify any federal lands located within the existing Ames  
8 project boundary.

9 Okay. Before I go on to the archeological and  
10 historic resources, I looked at the recreation land use and  
11 aesthetics work group. This was dated Thursday, May the  
12 19th. And under issue assessment number four it reads:

13 The issue of the Ames  
14 project operations being consistent  
15 with the U.S. Forest Service plan  
16 within the San Juan geographic area  
17 was raised.

18 Since I know there are some folks here from the  
19 Forest Service, could someone explain the San Juan  
20 geographic area to me?

21 MS. CLOSSON: I'm Dee Closson with the Forest  
22 Service.

23 The San Juan geographic area basically refers to  
24 the Telluride -- the mountain region around Telluride. It  
25 encompasses the San Miguel County and the San Juan County.

1 And it's basically all of the national forest south at  
2 Norwood and around the Telluride region.

3 I don't know if that -- Does that help you any?

4 MS. LEPPERT: A little bit.

5 How many acres are we talking about,  
6 approximately?

7 MS. CLOSSON: I don't have that with me tonight.  
8 It's hundreds of thousands.

9 MS. LEPPERT: Where it reads, though, "this issue  
10 was raised." Is it still an issue or is it something that  
11 is just information?

12 MS. CLOSSON: Which one were you looking at? I  
13 was still back on the--

14 MS. LEPPERT: Well, I'm in the issue assessment  
15 number four. And you may or may not have this. It's from  
16 the meeting summary of the recreation land use and  
17 aesthetics resources.

18 If the participants don't mind, I'll be glad to  
19 bring this around to you so you can take a look at it.

20 MS. CLOSSON: That would be great.

21 (Reviewing document.)

22 MR. TURNER: Can you go ahead and repeat the  
23 question again so she can answer it specifically?

24 MS. LEPPERT: Sure.

25 I was just curious why the San Juan geographic

1 area was identified as an issue in the recreation land use  
2 and aesthetics work group. I believe it's under issue  
3 assessment number seven. And what the area is, where it is  
4 in relation to the existing Ames project boundary, and if at  
5 all it is an issue any more.

6 MS. SCHUTZA: Judy Schutza, U.S. Forest Service.

7 My evaluation of that is that any issues, any  
8 projects related with Ames need to be consistent with the  
9 forest plan that guides the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and  
10 Gunnison National Forests. And we are in the process of  
11 revising that land management plan right now.

12 And I think it's just important that we are  
13 consistent -- that Ames is consistent with the forest plan  
14 revision and that we don't do anything that may not be  
15 applicable or within the current forest plan or anything  
16 that we know is going to change or could predict might  
17 change with the new forest plan.

18 MS. LEPPERT: Then am I to understand that the  
19 San Juan geographic area is contained within this plan?

20 MS. SCHUTZA: That's correct.

21 The national forest has been divided up into  
22 geographic areas. And this is just a category that's been  
23 developed to help facilitate with the forest plan revision.  
24 And both projects are located within the same geographic  
25 area.

1 MR. DEVINE: John Devine.

2 My suggestion would be to look at the actual  
3 issue assessment itself because that's evolved over time.  
4 And the latest draft of the issue assessment is resource  
5 plan compliances under recreation, land use and aesthetics.  
6 I think it's also under the water/terrestrial. But it's  
7 resource -- there is a specific issue assessment on resource  
8 plan compliance. And I think it's more specific now. It's  
9 specifically stated to one of the resource plans being the  
10 Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests.

11 MS. LEPPERT: Okay.

12 MR. DEVINE: I'd even go so far as to say that  
13 might even have been in the meeting notes. Reference to the  
14 San Juan might have been a hold over from the Tacoma meeting  
15 notes in the San Juan National Forest. And my only  
16 suggestion would be to look closely at the issue assessment  
17 as it currently stands versus the meeting notes.

18 MS. LEPPERT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very  
19 much.

20 The other area is archeological and historic  
21 resources. I have identified two issues.

22 I don't know whether or not there is anyone here  
23 from the state historic preservation office or if the Forest  
24 Service has any other comments -- or even the state, for  
25 that matter -- or any other comments on not only

1 archeological and historic resources, but also on recreation  
2 land use. We're here to listen. So I'll open up the floor.  
3 If there's any other issues or non-issues or comments, I  
4 welcome them.

5 MR. WILLIS: I would suggest that the issue under  
6 bullet --

7 MS. LEPPERT: Excuse me. Your name, please?

8 MR. WILLIS: Garrish Willis.

9 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

10 MR. WILLIS: Forest Service.

11 I'd suggest that the issue under the first  
12 bullet, say any -- where it talks about any changes to  
13 project operations --

14 MS. LEPPERT: Which one are you looking at?

15 MR. WILLIS: Archeological and historical  
16 resources --

17 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

18 MR. WILLIS: -- bullet number -- the first  
19 bullet.

20 I would suggest that that issue be clarified to  
21 say that any proposed changes to project operational  
22 facilities rather than "any changes" because if you evaluate  
23 any possible changes over a 30 to 50 year license would be a  
24 very difficult task.

25 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

1 Any other comments?

2 MR. TURNER: I guess I do have a question for  
3 you, Alfred.

4 And you guys are talking about developing a  
5 shoreline management plan for Trout Lake. What's driving  
6 the need for that in the sense of development or whatever?

7 MR. HUGHES: I believe the issue is -- because  
8 there is private property ownership around the lake, so I  
9 believe the issue was really originating primarily with the  
10 Lake Fork homeowners groups -- not Lake Fork, but the Trout  
11 Lake homeowners, and Lizardhead homeowners groups that  
12 actually own property up there. I believe it really just  
13 involved, you know, are there going to be boat docks, are  
14 there going to be piers, et cetera. What is the shoreline  
15 going to look like in the future.

16 MR. TURNER: Anticipating demand to increase in  
17 that regard?

18 MR. HUGHES: Well, demand most certainly as far  
19 as recreation, but maybe not necessarily in that regard.  
20 I'm not sure that anybody was saying that's what they desire  
21 to see in the future. But most certainly we wanted to cover  
22 it in this relicensing, whether there was a need for it or  
23 not a need for it, and really what the plan would be for the  
24 shoreline specifically.

25 MR. TURNER: Okay. Thanks.

1                   Well, I guess that gives us one last issue:  
2           Developmental resources. And that really is just our  
3           balancing requirements. We will look at the environmental  
4           effects, the cost of the environmental measures that would  
5           be in place both in terms of project operations as well as  
6           the capital costs that might be associated with those. And  
7           then just kind of -- we'll look at that and the cost-benefit  
8           ratios of those and try to figure out whether or not it's in  
9           the public interest and what the best balance of resources  
10          under the new license will be. And we'll disclose those in  
11          our environmental assessment.

12                   Any questions? Did we miss anything? Did  
13          anybody else want to add anything to the record in regard to  
14          issues?

15                   Garrish?

16                   MR. WILLIS: The Forest Service thinks that the  
17          second bullet under 5.2.5 Recreation and Land Use, to be  
18          specific, should also include Hope Lane, access to and any  
19          needed recreational development or considerations at Hope  
20          Lake.

21                   MR. TURNER: Is there a lot of demand at Hope  
22          Lake for recreational access at this point?

23                   MR. WILLIS: I'm not sure that we know. There  
24          was talk early on about doing some user survey work to  
25          determine what the -- not only the demand is but the type of

1 use.

2 And, John, I'm not sure if that's carried through  
3 at this point or not, through the recreation work group.

4 MR. DEVINE: John Devine.

5 The recreation work group felt -- I think the  
6 consensus of the group was -- through the evolution of  
7 talking about the different recreation areas -- was that the  
8 Hope Lake trailhead and Hope Lake trails and Hope Lake area,  
9 that the use there, absent the project, would still exist;  
10 that the Hope Lake trailhead is a system trail of the Forest  
11 Service and the work group didn't see it as an issue.

12 MR. TURNER: Did not see it as an issue?

13 MR. DEVINE: Yes. I think that's where the work  
14 group ended up with it.

15 MR. TURNER: And the Forest Service is part of  
16 that work group.

17 MR. WILLIS: We'll be commenting about this in  
18 our response to scoping document number one.

19 MR. TURNER: And, Alfred, in terms of your  
20 maintenance and operation up at Trout Lake, you don't  
21 utilize that trail for any of those kinds of operations,  
22 right -- I mean Hope Lake. I didn't mean to say Trout Lake;  
23 I meant Hope Lake.

24 MR. HUGHES: No. No, we don't. Well, actually  
25 my operator will occasionally hike up to Hope Lake just as

1 part of summer maintenance tour. But, no, primarily we  
2 access the reservoir by helicopter.

3 MR. TURNER: Okay.

4 Patti?

5 MS. LEPPERT: Yes. My name is Patti Leppert.

6 Just to go back to what Garrish was asking, could  
7 you explain your thoughts about Hope Lake and what you're  
8 looking for there? I'm not quite sure I understand your  
9 concern at potentially adding Hope Lake to the second bullet  
10 under recreation land use.

11 MR. WILLIS: Well, we haven't completely  
12 evaluated the situation there. There is a potential that  
13 internally we'll drop this as an issue. But we wanted to  
14 identify it as a potential issues now. And prior to the  
15 time when scoping document number two is issued you'll know  
16 what our position is.

17 Hope Lake was an artificially -- Hope Lake was --  
18 I think the term is a tarn. It was a lake formed in a  
19 glacial cirque. And prior to the current licensee the lake  
20 was augmented with a concrete dam. And the lake level is  
21 manipulated through project operations. It also has an  
22 undetermined amount of recreation demand associated with it.  
23 And it is a project feature.

24 The trailhead itself is probably not as big of an  
25 issue as the destination, which is the lake itself. And

1       there are people that do recreate on the lake. There are  
2       people that use the same trail that accesses the lake to  
3       access other areas.

4               MS. LEPPERT: So you're not sure what this  
5       particular concern is at this point, I guess? I'm just  
6       trying to get a better handle, I guess, on your issue.

7               MR. WILLIS: Well, I think the Forest Service  
8       needs to do some evaluation itself on what reasonable  
9       accommodations are for the public to access that trail and  
10      access that project feature. And we'll probably do that  
11      through the resource work group or simultaneous to the work  
12      that the resource work group is doing.

13              MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

14              MR. TURNER: Anything else that we missed? Any  
15      comments or additional stuff that you want to bring up?

16              (No response.)

17              MR. TURNER: Well, that kind of covers the issues  
18      that we've identified.

19              I want to thank you very much for attending  
20      tonight. We appreciate all your efforts so far. I think  
21      it's going to pay large dividends in what we need to  
22      accomplish over the next couple of years. And I encourage  
23      you to keep up the good work.

24              Again, just remember your comments and your study  
25      requests are due September 20th.

1                   And with that, I'm going to adjourn the meeting.

2                   And thank you very much for attending.

3                   (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25