1 BEFORE THE

2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

3

4

5 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

6 IN THE MATTER OF : PROJECT NO.

7 BOUNDARY HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT : 2144-35

8 SEATTLE CITY LIGHT : WASHINGTON

9 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

10

11

12

13 Cutter Theater

14 302 Park Street

15 Metaline Falls, Washington

16

17 Tuesday, July 19, 2006

18

19

20 The above-entitled matter came on for public

21 scoping meeting, pursuant to notice at 7:00 p.m.

22

23

24 MODERATOR: DAVID TURNER, FERC

1 P R O C E E D I N G

2 MR. TURNER: Again, my name is David Turner
3 with the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission. We are out of
4 Washington, D.C. We license hydro-electric projects. In
5 particular, those such as Boundary, and it's coming up on its
6 time that it has to renew its license.
7 Also with the Commission here is Nicholas
8 Jayjack. He is our fisheries biologist who will be assigned
9 to the project and will be doing assessments on the fishery
10 impacts of the project.
11 My specialty is in wildlife. I am also the team
12 lead for this project for the Commission.
13 What I was going to go over tonight is a brief
14 introduction of what this is all about; give us a quick
15 overview of the integrated licensing process, the process
16 that the licensee is following to seek a new license; the
17 purposes of tonight's meeting.
18 Then I was going to turn it over to Barbara to
19 talk about the project's operations. But given your
20 understanding, I think we're just going to skip that portion
21 of it.
22 Then we're going to get into the issues that
23 we've identified, based on the existing information that
24 we've included in the pre-application document that was filed
25 with the Commission in May of this year.

1 Then we will go over some important dates that
2 are coming up, and how that fits into the process. And then
3 we'll open it up for questions and comments.
4 Let's keep this informal. If you guys have got
5 questions about the process, or anything in particular,
6 please interrupt, and we'll be glad to answer them.
7 I want to make sure everybody signed in. We're
8 recording this. This is a court reporter over here. It will
9 be part of the Commission's record that we will consider when
10 we are making our decision on the new license and the
11 conditions of that new license.
12 Before you speak and make any comments, I would
13 request that you identify yourself clearly so that the court
14 reporter can make sure he can attribute the comments to you.
15 You can file written comments. They are due
16 September 1st. And on page 25 of the scoping document, and I
17 have copies here, hopefully everybody picked it up, we will
18 be talking from that, as well as the slide presentation, is
19 the address to mail your comments. So, if you don't have a
20 copy, I can give you one.
21 In the back of that document is a mailing list,
22 the Commission's official mailing list that we have for this
23 project. If your name is not on that mailing list, please
24 send a letter to the Commission that's also on page 25,
25 identifying your desire to be placed on the mailing list for

1 the project. That will ensure that any issuances that the
2 Commission issues will be provided to you.
3 We can't just, from your interest here tonight,
4 add you to the mailing list. I've been told by our IT
5 folks, that it's easier for them to import the names based
6 upon a filing, and put down the information.
7 So, if you want to be on it, please mail in a
8 letter.
9 Now, I warn you that your name is on there until
10 you ultimately ask us to remove your name. So, you'll be
11 getting everything the Commission issues regarding this
12 project on a formal basis until you ask us to remove your
13 name.
14 This is an overview, a very quick overview of the
15 integrated licensing process that the Seattle City Light will
16 be following. We are kind of in the second box there. The
17 process began May 5th, 2005 when they filed their Notice of
18 Intent to seek a new license. With that they filed their
19 pre-application document, which is a fairly thick document,
20 notebook size, or couple notebooks actually, that explained,
21 where they pulled together all the relevant information about
22 the project and the impacts and resources.
23 What we're doing tonight is our scoping process
24 for our responsibilities under the National Environmental
25 Policy Act. We're required under NEPA to disclose the

1 environmental effects of our federal action. And in that
2 document ultimately, which will occur down in that lower box
3 down there, that's where we'll issue an Environmental
4 Assessment describing our recommendations for new license and
5 benefits and affects of that action, along with some of the
6 resources from fisheries to wildlife to socio-economics.
7 Again, we are in the scoping process and study
8 plan development, where we are looking at the information
9 gaps that we need to fill, our need to develop the
10 information necessary to do that analysis.
11 After we get to the approved study plan,
12 Commission approved study plan, Seattle City Light will go
13 forward and conduct those studies and prepare their license
14 application.
15 And then they are expected to file their
16 application, or they are required to file their application
17 two years prior to their license expiring, which should be
18 September 30th of 2009.
19 So, we're way out in the process. We're way
20 early in the process. We'll be getting under way soon.
21 Once that application's filed, we determine it's
22 complete, we'll issue a notice, asking for additional
23 comments and recommendations on how that license should be
24 structured for the future.
25 We'll do an Environmental Assessment, again

1 describing the recommendations for what that license should
2 look like and the environmental affects associated with that
3 action, and ultimately the Commission will issue a decision
4 on that license and how the project should be operated in the
5 future.
6 As I said, this is the scoping process, our NEPA
7 responsibilities. What we're trying to do tonight is talk to
8 you and describe to you some of the resources, issues that
9 we've identified, based on the information we have at hand,
10 make sure that we get some feedback, make sure that we've
11 covered your issues, make sure we haven't missed anything, or
12 if we mischaracterized some of the issues based upon that, or
13 maybe some of the issues that we've identified aren't issues
14 and they should be deleted and not considered.
15 This was the project description portion of this,
16 and I think we'll just gloss over it, unless anybody needs
17 again to hear about how the Seattle City Light operates this
18 project.
19 Does anybody want to hear about that?
20 (Pause in the proceedings).
21 MR. TURNER: I'll take that as a no.
22 Okay. We've identified a number of issues,
23 resource issues associated with this project that run the
24 gambit from geology and soils, to things like soil erosion,
25 aquatics, terrestrial resources, all the way down to the

1 socioeconomics and developmental resources associated with
2 the project.
3 Geology and soils, if everybody would like to
4 turn to page 15 in their scoping document, I'll talk from
5 there mostly. The asterisks that are beside the issues that
6 we've described, we've identified where there might be
7 cumulative affects associated with this project, where the
8 project may be interacting with other actions that are taking
9 place in the Basin on those resources. So we will be
10 considering the effects from a cumulative as well as a site
11 specific point of view. And this one is just really how is
12 the project being operated and what effects do any
13 project-related recreation have on soil erosion.
14 MR. McKENZIE: Karl McKenzie. Metaline,
15 Washington. I'd like to talk later on or whatever about
16 erosion.
17 MR. TURNER: Well, go ahead now, if you have
18 a particular question, please feel free.
19 MR. McKENZIE: I have a whole bunch of them.
20 MR. TURNER: Sure. Go ahead.
21 MR. McKENZIE: In 1972 and 1974 at Boundary
22 Dam we had flood waters. And in 1974 the flood waters came
23 up within about five foot of the bottom of my floor in my
24 bedroom.
25 And they held the water up. Boundary Dam said

1 they didn't have to lower it, they could keep their 1990
2 elevation, which kept it higher at Metaline.
3 And due to the fact that soil was saturated then
4 with water, the whole back of my place caved in. I had to
5 move my trailer in the middle of the night.
6 The next day the water went down five foot.
7 Now, the river, I've watched it all my life, and
8 it don't drop five foot unless they open the gates up.
9 I put a claim in to Seattle. Seattle denied it.
10 Seattle said that there was a restriction in the flow of the
11 river, and that restriction holds the water back at Metaline.
12 And I'm not no geologist or engineer, but if
13 you've got a small restriction in the bottom of the stream,
14 and lower it down on the other side, then the water goes
15 through faster.
16 And that was in 1972. And they denied my claim.
17 And then in 1996 it happened again. And it took
18 the whole bank out.
19 The Plant Manager said, well, you know, this
20 restriction's in there, and Seattle took me up on a
21 helicopter, flew me over the river and everything, and I put
22 a claim in then. They denied it.
23 They said their license that you people issued to
24 them says that they can hold their reservoir at their dam at
25 1990 regardless of what the river is flowing.

1 And I've read through your license, in fact I've
2 got a copy of your license here, and I don't see where it
3 says that.
4 But we were flooded out, which cost me a
5 considerable amount of money to redo my banks and loss of
6 trees and stuff.
7 And then in 1997, it was within eight inches or a
8 foot of going into my crawl space in my home. And I talked
9 to the manager at Seattle City Light.
10 They said, well, we'll do a test, we'll lower it
11 five feet to see what it does. And they lowered it five
12 feet, and it dropped the water eight inches. And then the
13 next day they raised it back up five feet, because they said
14 they had to raise it up because the people that they hired to
15 clean the trash couldn't reach the trash, so they had to
16 raise it back up.
17 Now, I wonder if they they've got the right to
18 flood me out. And also Metaline. There's other people that
19 have to pump their basements. The city park is flooded
20 tremendously, and we rebuilt the park, which I was Mayor
21 then, we knew it was going to be flooded, so we built it with
22 the fact that if it is going to be flooded, it don't hurt
23 much.
24 But the people that have to pump out their
25 basements or the people that lose their banks, I feel that

1 Seattle should help them out.
2 I know PUD does. They had a big erosion up there
3 on Graham Road, and they came in and redid some of the bank.
4 Right?
5 MS. ASHTON: Uh-huh.
6 MR. McKENZIE: Where Seattle said, no, we're
7 not going to do anything. And I've got letters from Seattle
8 stating that.
9 MR. TURNER: Is that it?
10 Well, we do look at flood issues. But we
11 actually look at those more in terms of particular needs on a
12 regular basis.
13 I assume that you did not file any of those
14 claims with the Commission necessarily.
15 MR. McKENZIE: No. It was with Seattle.
16 MR. TURNER: So, I would encourage you to
17 write our regional office and raise those concerns. Because
18 we'd like to deal with flood issues, we look at those on a
19 regular basis. We'll consider those in the licensing as
20 well.
21 But it sounds like those kind of issues are dealt
22 with on a regular basis under our Part 12 regulations.
23 So, if you have some concerns, I encourage you to
24 write the regional office and raise those concerns at this
25 time, rather then trying to deal with it through relicensing.

1 MR. McKENZIE: In other words, what you're
2 telling me is talking with you people here isn't going to do
3 me any good?
4 MR. TURNER: I wouldn't say do you any good.
5 You have elevated it to the Commission's knowledge. I mean,
6 it was something we weren't aware of personally. And I'll
7 talk to our regional folks.
8 But it usually gets quicker attention if you
9 would do that with our dam safety folks as opposed to our
10 licensing actions. But we will also be considering it.
11 But this is a fairly long process, and I'm
12 getting the feeling that you're talking about things that
13 need to be taken care of potentially quicker than what we
14 might be facing here in terms of the licensing process.
15 MR. McKENZIE: Well, it could be, if we had
16 high water next year.
17 MR. TURNER: Right. We'll definitely add
18 that as an issue to consider.
19 Again, we like to focus our efforts in licensing
20 in terms of the bigger picture, in terms of the operations.
21 MR. McKENZIE: Talking for the whole
22 Metaline, in 1972 we had to pump water, we pumped water from
23 the river into the lagoons in 1972 to keep the elevation the
24 same, where it wouldn't cave the banks in.
25 There again, in 1974 we had to pump the sewer, we

1 blocked off the manholes and pumped the sewer out into the
2 river, raw sewage. These are things that we had to do to
3 maintain the town of Metaline.
4 And I maintain that if they would have lowered
5 the river enough at the dam, we wouldn't have had that much.
6 I was here in 1948 when we had the big flood. And it didn't
7 do the erosion, because the water went up, it flooded, it
8 went down. When water goes up, and Seattle holds the water
9 up, then it's a problem.
10 MR. JAYJACK: This is Nick Jayjack from
11 FERC. I think there's two parts to this.
12 One is the issue of flooding. And I think what
13 we can do is we'll go back and talk to our compliance folks
14 and our dam safety folks like David had mentioned, and see
15 how this issue might work into the licensing. We can do that
16 and go from there.
17 What I'm also hearing is you suspect that there
18 could have been a compliance issue, that perhaps the license
19 didn't allow them to operate a certain way and as a result
20 there was a flooding problem.
21 We have a Compliance Division that you can call,
22 or we can alert them, you know, and he can ask them what
23 number you could call and if in the future you suspect a
24 problem like this, that you might want to call them up and
25 then they can investigate it further. Or you could write to

1 our Portland regional office. But I've been told from our
2 Compliance Division that a simple phone call to them would be
3 enough to start them investigating any kind of problem that
4 there might be, as far as compliance with the license.
5 MR. McKENZIE: Do you have that information
6 with you here?
7 MR. TURNER: We can get it to you, or you
8 can go to our web page, if you have access to internet, you
9 can get it off of there.
10 MR. JAYJACK: Or you could see us after the
11 meeting, give us your phone number, we could talk to the
12 right folks and try to get back to you with more information
13 on who to call in the future.
14 I don't have that information. I don't think we
15 have that information with us today.
16 MR. McKENZIE: I am listed on your list.
17 MR. JAYJACK: Good. I don't know if David
18 mentioned this, we are within the Office of Energy Projects
19 with FERC, so we handle the hydropower. And within the
20 Office of Energy Projects, we have basically three divisions.
21 We have a Licensing Division, and that's where David and I
22 work in. We have a Compliance Division, which is a whole
23 different set of folks. And we have a Dam Safety Division.
24 And each of those three divisions have different duties with
25 regard to these hydro-electric projects.

1 So, we're in charge of licensing. So, we're not
2 as well versed on the compliance side of things and the dam
3 safety side of things. So that's why we need to look into
4 this a little bit more and alert those folks to --
5 MR. McKENZIE: The bottom line is, with the
6 relicensing, which you are for, are they allowed to be able
7 to cause these type of erosion and flooding and hold it at
8 1990 at the dam?
9 MR. JAYJACK: I don't know the answer to
10 that question. It's just a matter of, at this point we're
11 just trying to understand what the issues are, and then the
12 next step would be, you know, looking at the information we
13 do have and see if the information we do have is enough for
14 us to be able to assess the issue. And if not, then we may
15 request them to do additional studies, which remember the
16 slide with the steps, different steps, that would be, that's
17 the next step after this, deciding what information we need.
18 So, at this point we just don't know enough about
19 the situation to be able to answer that question.
20 From what I know in general, though, we do try to
21 deal with those types of problems within our jurisdiction, as
22 far as, you know, flooding and damages.
23 I do know, I can say this, I know in general the
24 Federal Power Act does not give us the jurisdiction to impose
25 or assess damages on a licensee. What the Commission has

1 said in the past is the affected party should go and handle
2 it within the state, or the local courts, if that's the case.
3 So, that's why I'm not sure how this is all going to play
4 out, you know, what the different responsibilities are. But
5 I do know that we're not able to deal with damages per se, as
6 far as compensation and that, based on what the Commission
7 has said in the past.
8 Does everybody here know who the Commission is,
9 by the way? Are you all familiar with our agency? Should we
10 maybe just -- I can give a real quick overview.
11 MR. TURNER: Okay.
12 MR. JAYJACK: We're an independent
13 Commission. We were created by an Act of Congress, the
14 Federal Power Act, back in 1930. And the Commission, you
15 know, a very basic explanation of who we are, the Commission
16 consists of five Presidentially appointed members, and they
17 are approved by the Senate.
18 Right now we have three Commissioners who are
19 active, and we have two open seats, because Congress is
20 working, or I'm sorry, the Senate is working on approving two
21 others. But typically we consist of five Commissioners.
22 And David and I are their staff, so we are two
23 out of roughly a thousand staff members that help the
24 Commission in its regulatory responsibilities.
25 Hydropower is just one of the many

1 responsibilities that the Commission has. The Commission
2 also regulates pipelines, natural gas pipelines in the U.S.,
3 electric transmission -- or electric rates, and to some
4 extent, although that's changed somewhat as far as
5 deregulation goes. But we basically handle a lot of the
6 approval of various sources of energy in the country. Not
7 all, but many of those.
8 That's kind of just a bare bones explanation of
9 who we are. We are based in Washington, D.C. We're required
10 to be there actually by the Federal Power Act, our
11 headquarters must be in Washington, D.C.
12 MS. LOTZE: I am Nancy Lotze, Superintendent
13 of the Selkirk School District.
14 Your Commission does have the right to impose
15 restrictions or terms on the license?
16 MR. JAYJACK: That is true.
17 MS. LOTZE: So if you find that 1990 is too
18 high for the city of Metaline in your study, you can demand
19 that it be lowered, is that not right?
20 MR. JAYJACK: Right.
21 MR. TURNER: We can define the operational
22 limits.
23 MR. JAYJACK: Right. We would do a benefit
24 versus cost, public interest analysis, and they could
25 require, yes, a change in operation.

1 MR. TURNER: Any more questions, comments?
2 These slides are structured to give some of the
3 studies that Seattle City Light is proposing to do to fill
4 information gaps associated with these resources.
5 In particular, under the water quality, we are
6 looking at a number of the parameters, water temperature,
7 toxic compound concentrations, macrophytes, pH levels, things
8 like that. We are also going to be looking at a number of
9 fisheries resources such as the effects of load-following
10 operations on water quality, macroinvertebrates, and fish,
11 and the effects downstream.
12 We have also identified an issue on what effects
13 the project is having in terms of fish passage and in
14 particular things like bull trout, as well as how the
15 operation of the project might be limiting or not woody
16 debris and sediment transport in the system, as well as the
17 abundance of aquatic vegetation.
18 The terrestrial resources, we're also going to be
19 looking very much at the operations of the project on a
20 number of parameters, on riparian and wetland habitat and
21 associated wildlife, number of species of waterfowl nesting
22 and foraging habitat and productivity, the effects the
23 project may have on deer and elk migration, and how the
24 project, including its maintenance activities, might be
25 affecting wildlife habitat, including the establishment of

1 various species.
2 The last one we had identified is what effects do
3 project reservoir fluctuations and project-related recreation
4 have on the availability and use of bat roosting sites and
5 hibernacula?
6 Threatened and endangered species. The
7 Commission has responsibility to ensure that its actions
8 don't result in the adverse modification or adverse affect of
9 ultimately the -- I just drew a blank --
10 Anyway, we have to look at the potential affects
11 on federally threatened and endangered species. In
12 particular, in this case, in consultation with the fish and
13 wildlife services, we have identified a number of species
14 that we are going to have to look at, including bull trout,
15 Ute ladies'-tresses, bald eagle, grey wolf, grizzly bear and
16 Canada lynx. And there are a number of other species that
17 the Forest Service and state keep track of, and we will also
18 be looking at those.
19 Recreation is a big part of the Commission's
20 analysis. Licensee is required to provide recreational
21 access, ensure that recreation is being provided at adequate
22 levels at the project.
23 So we're going to be looking at what existing
24 use, demands of the existing facilities are, and what might
25 need to be done in the future to meet these future demands.

1 From an aesthetics point of view, they are also
2 going to be gathering data on viewpoints and seeing how the
3 project fits within the goals of who's viewing it, what kind
4 of setting, what kind of activities they are involved in, and
5 if there's anything that would be done to better blend the
6 project in with the existing environment.
7 MR. MYERS: Dave Myers, Metaline Falls.
8 Could we go back to the last slide. Could you explain the
9 Seven Mile Reservoir and Boundary tailrace?
10 MR. TURNER: What we are looking at is
11 potential movement of bull trout from down the Salmo River,
12 where they have a good population of bull trout, whether or
13 not they are moving into the tailrace of Boundary, how
14 project operations might be influencing available habitat.
15 MR. MYERS: Tailrace is my question.
16 MR. TURNER: Where the project discharges
17 from the turbines into the river channel downstream.
18 MR. MYERS: Okay.
19 MR. TURNER: I mean, from Seven Mile
20 Reservoir, depending on the elevation, all of that becomes
21 part of the area that is being investigated.
22 MR. MYERS: And then the next slide, I had a
23 question on that, too.
24 MR. TURNER: This one?
25 MR. MYERS: Yes. In the shoreline area

1 sites, does that mean when we have something like a byways,
2 that Seattle City Light should be involved in planning,
3 establishing byway sites, something like that, or am I
4 misreading that?
5 MR. TURNER: Planning and establishing? I
6 guess it's a question. From the byways, I'm not sure what
7 the scenic byways are. That would be something that would
8 need to be explained.
9 If boats are traveling the byways, I would think
10 it would be more of an aesthetic type of an issue. What
11 they're viewing, how does that affect their experience in
12 that. That is a legitimate issue.
13 Establishing part of the scenic byways? I guess
14 it could be. But we have to make a tie to between the
15 benefit to be deprived versus what the project's effect on
16 that resource would be.
17 MR. MYERS: Specifically, what I had in mind
18 is we have a scenic byways site in the planning stages in
19 Metaline Falls, looking at the dam -- excuse me, looking at
20 the falls, which disappears when the water level goes up.
21 But we have some needs for some development, some
22 rock, to prevent the stream from going on the sites and
23 stuff. I am just wondering if it would be appropriate for
24 Seattle City Light to help out with that.
25 MR. TURNER: It's conceivable. We have to

1 look at again what you're trying to accomplish, the goals,
2 what the benefit would be, how it would relate to the project
3 and its operation.
4 MR. MYERS: Thank you.
5 MR. TURNER: We also have responsibilities
6 under the National Historic Preservation Act to ensure that
7 we don't adversely affect cultural resources.
8 We'll be doing site assessments to identify
9 historic properties, working with the tribes to identify
10 traditional cultural properties, to consider the affects of
11 operations, project-related operations on those resources.
12 We'll also be looking at how the project and any
13 changes in those projects might be affecting the
14 socio-economic situation of the community.
15 And the Federal Power Act also requires us to
16 basically balance our decision. In other words, we have to
17 consider the benefits of any proposed action and operations
18 against the costs of those actions, both in terms of energy
19 as well as other, what we term developmental, you know, water
20 use or other values that typically, environmental values
21 versus energy, water use, some of those other uses of water.
22 And making sure that our decisions are what we've determined
23 the best comprehensive use of the waterways.
24 So what we'll be considering in there is looking
25 at the environmental costs of the various measures relative

1 to the cost or value of that power and alternative sources of
2 power. We'll lay that out and use that as our basis of
3 making decisions on the relevant measures that come out of
4 the proposed licenses. So we have to weigh those benefits
5 against the costs to make sure that we are coming up with a
6 reasoned decision about utilizing it.
7 MS. LOTZE: I have a question. Nancy Lotze
8 from the school district.
9 In the previous slide, though, you indicated that
10 there were no -- there was no information gap or no issues
11 identified in the socio-economic area.
12 MR. TURNER: No information gaps. In other
13 words, we have enough information to analyze the affects of
14 the continued operations on the socio-economic community,
15 socio-economic setting of the project.
16 MS. LOTZE: And if someone wanted to weigh
17 in on that, do we do that in writing?
18 MR. TURNER: Yes, you can, by September 1,
19 you can do it. If you want to talk about it here now, you
20 could.
21 MS. LOTZE: Well, specifically, the school
22 district is impacted. We are the only school district within
23 the seven mile reservoir, but I can address this in writing,
24 too.
25 MR. TURNER: Okay. Any other questions or

1 comments?
2 If there were any information requirements that
3 you felt that the Seattle City Light were to need to further
4 address the particular issue that we've had, we are asking
5 folks to address these seven study criteria which are laid
6 out, spelled out in your handout there.
7 This information basically gives the Commission
8 staff enough information to analyze your recommended study,
9 determine whether or not there is a connection to the
10 project, and figure out whether or not we need that kind of
11 information to analyze, make a licensing decision. So, we'll
12 consider those requests and the information here.
13 A number of them from a public point of view
14 really needs to just talk about what your objectives are and
15 what the particular interests of that study is, what you feel
16 needs to be gathered to address the information or address
17 the issue you have in hand. And then making sure you tie
18 that to how the project is affecting that issue, so the
19 Commission can make a decision on whether or not we need to
20 do that information -- gather that additional information to
21 address the issue.
22 MS. LOTZE: How elaborate does that have to
23 be? We don't do this professionally, you know.
24 MR. TURNER: And the Commission recognizes
25 that. And in large part, this is structured around some of

1 the agency needs that really get very detailed in terms of
2 methods.
3 It needs to be detailed enough for the Commission
4 to understand what you're trying to accomplish and what you
5 want the applicant to do to address the issue. I mean, where
6 is the information missing? How do you feel that they should
7 go about gathering that particular information? What you
8 think it might cost to gather that information relative to
9 the project. But most importantly, is drawing that
10 connection between that information and the project.
11 MR. POLLOCK: Larry Pollock of Pend Oreille
12 County Fire District #2.
13 Under existing measures, I already am mentioned
14 in that document. And what is my needs in order to maintain
15 that existing measure? Is there a document I might need to
16 file with you by September to continue the existing document,
17 or is there a need for me to continue?
18 MR. TURNER: I'm afraid I'm not --
19 MR. POLLOCK: Well, under existing measures,
20 socio-economic resources, page 21. And I currently have a
21 contract with the Boundary that renews that I want to
22 maintain.
23 Is there documentation I provide to you to
24 continue that, or is that just a piece of business that
25 continues between myself, my district, and the Boundary

1 facility?
2 MR. TURNER: Oh. In terms of the license?
3 This is in terms of their existing license, and you want to
4 consider that?
5 MR. POLLOCK: I just want to continue this
6 relationship that we have.
7 MR. TURNER: Well, ultimately that may be a
8 recommendation that the Commission would consider when we
9 file that as part of the license. But I am also guessing
10 that that is a power sales agreement.
11 MS. ASHTON: No. It is for services.
12 MS. LOTZE: It is for services, fire
13 protection.
14 MR. TURNER: I was looking at the bullets.
15 MR. POLLOCK: No, no. I'm sorry. Fire
16 protection services.
17 MR. McKENZIE: Karl McKenzie. There is
18 money involved there from the county, too, in lieu of taxes.
19 Seattle pays the county in lieu of taxes, and they pay the
20 Fire District.
21 MR. TURNER: Oh. Okay.
22 MR. McKENZIE: That's where you're at.
23 MR. TURNER: That's one of those
24 jurisdictional type of questions that the Commission usually
25 don't get involved in.

1 MR. POLLOCK: Okay. That answers -- that
2 was what I was assuming, but because we go one-on-one with
3 them and to a contract, I just wanted to make sure that it
4 would still basically stay the same.
5 MR. TURNER: I think that's one of those
6 things, you are going to need to work with them outside of
7 the licensing.
8 MR. POLLOCK: Okay. Fine.
9 MR. TURNER: Important dates coming up.
10 Again, your comments on the issues and any study requests are
11 due by September 1.
12 The applicant will take those information needs,
13 develop a proposed study plan. It must be filed with the
14 Commission by October 16.
15 Between October 16th and February 14th, the
16 Commission, or the licensee is going to be working with the
17 parties to try to resolve any disagreements on study needs.
18 They are required to have at least one study plan meeting by
19 November 15th to start working those out. Depending on how
20 far apart the parties are, there may be more than one
21 meeting. They have 90 days to resolve those disputes.
22 File a revised study plan. Commission approval,
23 and we will be issuing a determination by March 16th on that
24 study plan determination.
25 This is not a new license decision. We are

1 making an approval, or a decision on what kind of information
2 we need to gather to complete their application. Ultimately,
3 if you remember back to that slide, they have to file their
4 license application by September of '09, and with that, the
5 Commission will use that information to make a licensing
6 decision.
7 Does anybody else have any other questions,
8 comments or anything they want to talk about tonight?
9 MR. MYERS: Dave Myers, Metaline Falls
10 again.
11 So, if we wanted to appeal for the funding this
12 1.2 million on page 21, to the county and the local towns, we
13 should be doing that not to your agency but to some other
14 agency?
15 MR. TURNER: Yes. I think this is the type
16 of issue that the Commission leaves to the counties to work
17 out.
18 MR. MYERS: Okay. Thank you.
19 MR. TURNER: Anything else?
20 Well, I appreciate your --
21 MR. JAYJACK: Dave, could I say something,
22 Nick Jayjack from FERC.
23 There was a question about the study criteria.
24 If folks have a question about, if they run into some
25 questions about the study criteria, they can call us, right,

1 or call you or I?
2 MR. TURNER: Sure.
3 MR. JAYJACK: So we can give you a phone
4 number to call, if you have some questions. Because the
5 study criteria can be a little bit confusing sometimes.
6 I'm thinking particularly, it was number 2 up
7 there that had something to the effect that state what the
8 resource agency goals are.
9 I would just say, I am not a resource agency,
10 under that one, and then move on to the next one. But if you
11 have any questions understanding what we're looking for
12 there, please call us.
13 MR. TURNER: Right.
14 MR. JAYJACK: Because this is your big shot,
15 your chance to get the information that you think we might
16 need.
17 MR. TURNER: And that's where I was going.
18 What's your objective, what kind of information do you need,
19 what kind of methods do you think need to be done to gather
20 that information.
21 MS. ASHTON: Judy Ashton from the Cutter
22 Theater.
23 Does FERC address any issues about Seattle City
24 Light's presence in the community, their support of the local
25 community in any way? Or is that dealt with the Mayor or

1 something of Seattle?
2 MR. TURNER: Again I guess it all depends on
3 the context you are raising.
4 Like I say, we do look at recreation and how that
5 might influence the community. We need to provide recreation
6 at the projects. It obviously has some influence on
7 infrastructure and demands.
8 But typically taxes, in lieu of taxes, other
9 support like that, we don't usually get into.
10 MS. ASHTON: Well, my issue of course is the
11 arts, because we are an art center here, a nonprofit
12 organization, and I just wondered if this was the avenue to
13 make any kind of comment about looking for support from
14 Seattle City Light, because they do not do anything
15 business-wise for, you know, giving funding to our
16 organization by donations and that sort of thing.
17 Not trying to force them to do that. I don't
18 mean that. I'm just wanting to have an avenue that they
19 would pay attention to our request.
20 MR. TURNER: The Commission again usually,
21 we need to have a tie from a benefits point of view of the
22 project to the issue of resource. Quite frankly, I'm not
23 sure. I could see, if you were having -- holding art
24 festivals in a park somewhere and the project was somehow
25 influencing, or you needed to have a venue associated with

that, and the project was somehow affecting that venue.

But in general, kind of an interest in terms of promoting the arts, there really is not a tie to the project and its operations, which really gets beyond the Commission's particular jurisdiction.

Does that make sense?

MS. ASHTON: Sure. Thank you.

MR. TURNER: Anything else?

Well, with that, I will thank you again for your attendance tonight, and your input, and again providing any comments by September 1, you need to file with the Commission and the Seattle City Light.

If you want to be on the mailing list, please send us a letter requesting that. If you know of anybody else that desires that, you can ask to be placed on the mailing list. You can also E subscribe if you have access to the internet and you will get notification of any filings or issuances by the Commission by e-mail. And there's instructions in the scoping document for that as well.

With that, I thank you, and we will adjourn the meeting.

(7:50 p.m.)

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
County of Spokane)

I, William J. Bridges, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for Washington; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 30 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Spokane, Washington, on this _____ day of July, 2006.

_____

William J. Bridges
CSR NO. 2421
Certified Shorthand Reporter
Notary Public for Washington
My Commission expires: 11-1-07