

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

---

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
SCOPING FOR THE PROPOSED OLD HARBOR  
HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

---

October 22, 2009

Taken at:  
Alaska Village Electric Cooperative  
4831 Eagle Street  
Anchorage, Alaska

Reported by: Leslie J. Knisley  
Shorthand Reporter

1           PARTICIPANTS:

2                   John Mudre, FERC

3                   Carolyn Templeton, FERC

4                   Daniel Hertrich, polarconsult

5                   Matt Metcalf, AVEC

6                   Amy Sparck Dobmeier, AVEC

7                   Robin Reich, Solstice Environmental

8                   John Trawicki, USFW

9                   Ivars Stolcers, USFW

10                  Mikel Haase, USFW

11                  Cynthia Berns, Old Harbor Native Corporation

12                  Stella Krumrey, Old Harbor Native Corporation

13                  Al Cratty, Old Harbor Native Corporation

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   MR. MUDRE: My name is John Mudre,  
2                   and I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory  
3                   Commission. I want to thank everyone for coming  
4                   to our scoping meeting for the proposed Old  
5                   Harbor Hydroelectric Project. With me today,  
6                   also from FERC, is Carolyn Templeton in the  
7                   front.

8                   How familiar are people with our  
9                   licensing processes and things? Probably not too  
10                  much. I'm going to go through it, not in great  
11                  detail, but hopefully in enough detail that you  
12                  can understand what's going on.

13                  The Federal Energy Regulatory  
14                  Commission is authorized by the Federal Power Act  
15                  to license nonfederal hydroelectric projects and  
16                  to regulate that industry. When we have all of  
17                  our commissioners, there are five of them. Right  
18                  now I think we have four and one just retired, so  
19                  they haven't been replaced yet. So the  
20                  commissioners are appointed by the President and  
21                  confirmed by the Senate and the chairman is  
22                  designated by the President.

23                  In addition to hydropower, FERC  
24                  also regulates some aspects of electric power,  
25                  natural gas and oil pipelines. But we're in the

1 hydroelectric group meeting.

2           Our hydropower program, there are  
3 three components: Licensing, dam safety, to make  
4 sure that the projects we do license are operated  
5 safely and stay where they're supposed to be. We  
6 also have a License Administration and Compliance  
7 Division that manages and oversees the operations  
8 of the projects once they are licensed to make  
9 sure that they are operating in accordance with  
10 the various conditions of the license. All along  
11 the way the licensees, the resource agencies,  
12 tribes, NGOs and local stakeholders become  
13 involved in the processes and make things better.  
14 So, again, we're glad people are here today.

15           This project is being licensed  
16 under our integrated licensing process, which is  
17 our newest one, 2003, and that's the default  
18 process. It differs from the older processes by  
19 trying to identify issues earlier in the process,  
20 and with regard to study plans, we have formal  
21 study plans that are approved, so the right  
22 studies get done to inform the licensing  
23 decision. There are established time frames for  
24 various components of the process.

25           So we're here today to identify

1 potential environmental effects, issues, concerns  
2 of the people, and also opportunities associated  
3 with the relicensing of the Old Harbor Project.  
4 We also want to identify information and study  
5 needs that will ultimately be used to develop  
6 operational and environmental recommendations,  
7 which eventually could be put into a new license  
8 for the project.

9           So we want to talk about existing  
10 conditions in the project area, resource  
11 management objectives, existing information that  
12 we don't know about and we want to learn about  
13 it. We want to learn about what people think the  
14 study needs are or what needs to be done  
15 studywise. We want to talk a little bit about  
16 the process plan, which is sort of the schedule  
17 of what happens when. If there's any interest in  
18 an agency cooperating with us on our NEPA  
19 document, there will be time to mention that or  
20 at least talk about how that might work.

21           Just in a nutshell, the licensing  
22 process starts when the applicant files their  
23 Notice of Intent and the PAD, which is the  
24 preapplication document, copies of which are over  
25 there. Then we have a scoping process, which

1 we're doing today. Study plan development comes  
2 along later. It's like the next step. And then  
3 following the setting of the study plans, the  
4 studies are conducted and the licensee/applicant  
5 prepares the application to be filed with FERC.

6           Once the application is filed with  
7 FERC, we review it and if everything is there  
8 that should be there, we issue what's called an  
9 REA notice, which is ready for environmental  
10 analysis. At that point we ask for  
11 recommendations of the various agencies as to  
12 what conditions should be placed in the license  
13 and that sort of thing.

14           Once we have those recommended  
15 measures from the agencies and the application,  
16 then we do an EA or an EIS. In this case we  
17 think an environmental assessment will be  
18 sufficient, but if it turns out that we find out  
19 it isn't, then we would prepare an environmental  
20 impact statement. Then that document is used to  
21 inform the Commission's licensing decision as to  
22 whether and under what conditions a license  
23 should be issued for the project.

24           Again, the initial steps. We want  
25 to identify and contact potential stakeholders.

1 That's what the applicant has done in building  
2 their PAD. They gather and put into the PAD all  
3 the available information they can find. There  
4 may be more information that they don't know  
5 about. Again, that's something we want to hear  
6 about today. They file their notice of intent  
7 and PAD. These steps have already been done.  
8 Again, the purpose of the PAD is it brings  
9 together all reasonably available information,  
10 provides a basis for identifying issues, data  
11 gaps and study needs, and it sort of resembles a  
12 NEPA document, so that it can serve as a  
13 foundation for future documents.

14 Again, scoping under NEPA. This is  
15 one of the differences with the ILP. We hold  
16 scoping early in the process. We used to do  
17 scoping after the REA notice and as we were  
18 starting the REA or EIS. Now we do it early to  
19 get the issues fleshed out so that we can  
20 identify what studies need to be done.

21 Again, we refine the schedule and  
22 things as necessary to try to integrate. If  
23 other agencies have processes that they need to  
24 do, like a 401 cert in some states, talk about  
25 how we can integrate these time-linewise and make

1 things work smoother. Scoping, we want to  
2 identify significant issues for analysis,  
3 identify cumulatively affected resources,  
4 reasonable alternatives for analysis, and  
5 identify any issues and resources that may be in  
6 one particular case don't require detailed  
7 analysis. So we don't spend a lot of time  
8 analyzing something that turns out to be not  
9 really an issue to begin with.

10 The applicant will be preparing  
11 study plans that lay out what they think -- how  
12 the studies should look, but there's a process  
13 back and forth, as we'll see, that the agencies  
14 can have input into the studies or request  
15 studies that the applicant hasn't proposed. So  
16 once they prepare their proposed study plan,  
17 stakeholders, agencies meet and discuss the  
18 studies that were proposed.

19 The applicant can submit a revised  
20 study plan that incorporates some of the comments  
21 that they received on the study plan. Then it's  
22 submitted to FERC for approval, and we have the  
23 authority to make any changes that we think are  
24 needed to the plans or if they didn't adopt some  
25 of the agency's recommendations, we can put those

1 in if we think it's something that needs to be  
2 done.

3           There's a list of criteria set out  
4 in our regulations as to what the study requests,  
5 study proposals should look like. They need to  
6 state the goals and objectives of the study,  
7 identify the relevant resource management goals,  
8 what are the public interest considerations,  
9 information needed. Is there existing  
10 information or why do we need more information on  
11 a particular subject. How the proposed or the  
12 requested study -- what's the nexus between that  
13 and the project, and how would the results help.  
14 What could we do with the results of the study to  
15 inform -- you know, make the license conditions  
16 or something like that.

17           You have to specify the method the  
18 study will be conducted with and how it's  
19 consistent with accepted practice. Then identify  
20 study effort, cost and need, if it's an  
21 alternative study that hasn't been proposed by  
22 the licensee to get a feel for what you're  
23 looking for and how much it's going to cost. The  
24 applicant conducts the studies and they file a  
25 study report for the stakeholders to review, and

1       they comment on the study report.  There's a  
2       study meeting after that to talk about the  
3       studies and whether or not second-year studies in  
4       some cases may be needed.  Then the applicant  
5       prepares their preliminary licensing proposal,  
6       which is what's filed with FERC and then we  
7       review that application.

8                   The REA notice, like I said, we ask  
9       for comments, recommendations and conditions for  
10      the license from the agencies.  The agencies file  
11      these with us.  Some of these conditions are  
12      mandatory.  We don't have any authority to change  
13      them.  Forest Service comes to mind, fishway  
14      restrictions, National Fisheries Service, or  
15      water quality.  They're going to prepare an  
16      environmental document.  In this case, again, we  
17      preliminarily identified we're going to do an EA,  
18      but if need be, we will do an EIS.  That contains  
19      our recommendations that the Commission looks at  
20      to decide whether and under what conditions to  
21      issue a license for the project.  The  
22      Commission's decision is based on the entire  
23      project record that's been established since the  
24      beginning.  Again, it's the Commission that makes  
25      the decision.

1                   The way this is set up -- and we're  
2 going to talk about the schedule a little more  
3 later. Our study plan determination will be made  
4 in February of 2009. First-year studies will be  
5 done in the 2009 study season and if an  
6 additional year of studies are needed, it would  
7 occur in 2010. They're going to file the  
8 preliminary license proposal in December of 2010  
9 and the license application by 2011, April 30.  
10 These dates will all -- they're in the PAD.  
11 There's a revised schedule in the SD1, which is  
12 our current schedule, because we needed to make  
13 some adjustments to meet those specific time  
14 lines that I talked about.

15                   In this instance, the applicant has  
16 proposed a shortened, abbreviated time schedule  
17 because they would like to get this thing started  
18 sooner rather than later and we're going to try  
19 to accommodate that. So, again, we'll look at --  
20 right now the current version is the one that's  
21 in SD1, but after this meeting, if we talk about  
22 the schedule and need to make some changes, then  
23 they'll issue an updated process schedule that  
24 will have all the dates for people.

25                   With respect to the license

1 application, we are now looking for detailed  
2 plans for implementing any proposed environmental  
3 or other measures. In the past people would  
4 propose to do a plan or the license would say, do  
5 this plan or do this study and come back. Right  
6 now we want an application that has plans that we  
7 can just approve the plans so they can get  
8 started sooner.

9 This would be things like water  
10 quality monitoring -- if there was going to be a  
11 water quality monitoring plan or recreation plans  
12 or home and property community plan. We'd like  
13 to see those plans with the application so they  
14 can be approved at the start and not two years  
15 down the road. So this ensures timely  
16 implementation of needed measures and reduces  
17 workload following the license issuance.

18 That's the introduction. What  
19 we're going to do next is Dan Hertrich is going  
20 to give a brief description of the project that  
21 AVEC is proposing and sort of where they are,  
22 what types of things happen next. And then we'll  
23 open the floor for comments from people on,  
24 again, the things we talked about, what they see  
25 as issues or needs in terms of studies. Then,

1       any other issues we need to discuss or people  
2       want to discuss. We'll break the resource issue  
3       down to things like geology and soils, water  
4       resources, aquatic resources, terrestrial  
5       resources, Native species, recreation, land use,  
6       esthetic resources, socioeconomic resources,  
7       cultural and developmental. These are the  
8       resources that we typically look at in a  
9       proceeding. Again, in any particular proceeding  
10      maybe not every single one of them is important  
11      and will be used but, again, that's what we're  
12      here to find out, if there are any of those that  
13      don't need to be looked at.

14                The applicant's preliminary -- in  
15      the PAD they had a preliminary identification of  
16      what they see as the issues. In SD1 we looked at  
17      those and we also added a few that we thought  
18      needed to be looked at as well. Both of those  
19      lists can be found in the SD1, and there's more  
20      detail in the PAD on what they're proposing. The  
21      PAD also contains some of the studies that  
22      they're proposing that they think need to be done  
23      to inform the licensing decision. Again, we look  
24      at those. If you think other studies need to be  
25      done, let us know.

1                   I hope everyone signed in. I think  
2 they have. We do have a court reporter here  
3 today, so she's making the record for this.  
4 She's writing down everything that people say.  
5 This is important because we want to make sure  
6 that we accurately capture what was said, what  
7 people said. The other good news from this is  
8 that there will be transcripts available so  
9 people can look at what people said and  
10 everything. They will be available on our web  
11 site in a couple of weeks or so. If you'd like  
12 something sooner, see the court reporter and get  
13 copies sooner. That's the good thing about the  
14 court reporter.

15                   A little bad thing about them  
16 sometimes is that you need to make -- well,  
17 before you talk you're going to need to identify  
18 yourself so she can associate the right comments  
19 with the right people. If your name is hard to  
20 spell, spell it for her at least the first time,  
21 and that way she can accurately get the  
22 information in there. Some people tend to talk  
23 too fast. I might be one of them, but she hasn't  
24 complained yet. We want to make sure that she  
25 hears what you have to say so she can get it

1 down.

2 I think that's it for me. If  
3 anyone has any questions right now, I can try to  
4 answer them or we can go on to Dan and his  
5 presentation on the project.

6 All right. We'll do that.

7 MR. HERTRICH: My name is Daniel  
8 Hertrich, and I'm working for AVEC on the Old  
9 Harbor proposal. I'm sure everybody that's here  
10 has thoroughly reviewed the PAD and probably  
11 doesn't need me to describe the project. I'll go  
12 through it anyway.

13 Any time you have any questions,  
14 just stop me and ask. I'd kind of like to do a  
15 more interactive presentation. I don't really  
16 have any kind of presentation set. I'm just  
17 simply going through the information that I put  
18 out and what I have on the project.

19 Everybody, I think, knows where Old  
20 Harbor is and Kodiak Island. That's the vicinity  
21 map there. Looking quickly at the USGS map.  
22 This is pretty complicated with a lot of line  
23 work, but one thing I wanted to show is our  
24 intake site is up here. One thing you'll notice  
25 is that we are removing water out of the Barlin

1 Bay Basin and discharging it into an alternative  
2 basin. Under the past licensing process we  
3 looked at this section that's near Barlin Bay.  
4 What we found is that it typically is dry from  
5 mid to late summer. All the water goes  
6 subsurface right out of it and all that fish  
7 habitat that's actually shown is really not  
8 habitable because there's simply no water in that  
9 section of the creek.

10 You can see where the discharge is  
11 right at the mouth of the very significant Barlin  
12 Bay Creek that does support a lot of salmon and  
13 goes up quite a bit. Barlin Bay Creek -- correct  
14 me if I'm wrong -- is similar to Big Creek, I  
15 imagine, in quantities of salmon. Big Creek is  
16 shown over here on the right. It's actually over  
17 here. It's a large basin. We'll see that better  
18 on the aerial.

19 So this is a basin diversion, but  
20 we're taking the water out of a drainage that  
21 really doesn't support fish because it's just  
22 subsurface flow. The amount of water that we're  
23 removing is 7 cfs, so we're looking at a  
24 percentage of diversion that's not a big quantity  
25 either.

1                   Moving on to a more detailed  
2 project map. This map you can see the Big Creek  
3 basin quite well. We can start off looking at  
4 the intake a little closer. The intake is up at  
5 an elevation of about 800 feet, and we traverse  
6 along the creek with a potential bridge crossing  
7 or we may go around the gully there and bring the  
8 water down to a powerhouse that's situated  
9 between Lagoon Creek and Big Creek. Now, this is  
10 slightly different than the previous licensing  
11 proposal that we did five years ago, and I will  
12 show what that layout looked like.

13                   The main reason for that is so that  
14 we have the option of discharging the tailrace  
15 waters into either of the basins, the Lagoon  
16 Creek basin or the Big Creek basin. Well, I  
17 guess I can't pull that up. The old project  
18 actually went -- I'll just draw it in. The  
19 powerhouse was located around here and it went in  
20 this area and up this way back to where the new  
21 project is. So that's kind of hard to see, but  
22 that's the old project. They're kind of similar.  
23 The main difference on this project is we  
24 situated the powerhouse and access road more on  
25 high ground and also the ability to divert

1 tailrace waters into either basin.

2 One of the other aspects is that  
3 there's less of the project on conservation  
4 easement land and Fish and Wildlife land. I can  
5 show the property. There's the property  
6 boundaries. This area is the limit of the Old  
7 Harbor Native Corporation land, so that's where  
8 the project begins to enter the refuge. The  
9 powerhouse is still situated in the conservation  
10 easement which is shown on the left half of the  
11 screen here, whereas the old project had the  
12 powerhouse well within the easement. So that's  
13 the main difference on that.

14 Now, to get a sense of maybe what  
15 this kind of looks like a little bit better, I  
16 have a 3D kind of visual and it's a little  
17 exaggerated. It's a three-to-one exaggeration.  
18 As you can see the project, the blue line is the  
19 access road and the power line. As you can see,  
20 I've kind of taken the high ground, and here we  
21 are in the basin divide right in this area. This  
22 is pretty crude topographic data. We're going to  
23 get a LIDAR for the whole area so we have much  
24 more detailed data.

25 So the old project actually went to

1 the left side of this ridge, had the powerhouse  
2 down here in the Lagoon Creek area, but the  
3 remainder from the intake is very similar. One  
4 of the advantages of this project is that  
5 we're -- this stretch of the pipeline, which is  
6 the high-pressure section has quite a bit better  
7 topography, so we have less bends and anchors in  
8 the pipe, whereas the old project had a lot of  
9 undulations in this area and would require  
10 expensive bends and anchors. So what we did is  
11 we're looking at a route that does have more  
12 bends and gullies up high, but that's in the  
13 low-pressure section of the pipe where we can  
14 easily accommodate bends and terrain differences.

15 Now, one of the difficulties with  
16 this alternate layout is the gullies are fairly  
17 significant in this saddle area and leading up  
18 towards the intake. While we will be able to  
19 have an access road follow along the pipeline out  
20 and coming up in this area to have equipment  
21 access, we're probably going to need to do some  
22 cut and fill and basically build a construction  
23 road that's going to be minimal width to support  
24 construction equipment. After the project is  
25 completed, we'll have it probably narrowed up a

1 bit so that it's mostly just for four-wheelers.

2 Are there any questions?

3 MS. REICH: Can you show where  
4 Corporation land ends and refuge land begins on  
5 there?

6 MR. HERTRICH: I think so.

7 MS. REICH: Or just sort of point  
8 it out.

9 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah. We'll go back  
10 to this view. But the Corporation land is this  
11 section right in here, this whole section here.  
12 So it ends right there. That's the northern  
13 boundary. So looking back at this view, it's in  
14 the top of this ridge area.

15 MR. TRAWICKI: That's corporation  
16 land?

17 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah, this section  
18 in here is the National Wildlife Refuge. Then  
19 you have this strip that is a conservation  
20 easement, which is really just part of the  
21 refuge. It's just that we need to work with the  
22 trustee council to get this project enabled.

23 MR. TRAWICKI: And then there will  
24 be a road supporting the entire pipeline?

25 MR. HERTRICH: What we would like

1 to do is have a construction road for the  
2 pipeline. It's mainly to have the equipment to  
3 get up there to build the project, to get  
4 construction workers to the intake, to stage the  
5 materials, and then when we back out of the  
6 construction, as we complete it, the road becomes  
7 much less important and it can be narrowed or  
8 allowed to -- we can revegetate even portions of  
9 the road. Mainly it's just going to have to  
10 allow for ATV access for occasional inspection of  
11 the intake or maintenance that's occasionally  
12 required under, you know, extreme scenarios where  
13 if a flood does any kind of damage to the intake,  
14 then you'd probably have to get back up there  
15 with equipment. So it would just remain adequate  
16 for equipment, but mostly just support for  
17 inspection.

18 Now, the road from the powerhouse  
19 back to the tie-in along this ridge area here,  
20 now that road actually is going to be a more  
21 significant road. The traffic to the powerhouse  
22 will be basically by passenger vehicle on a  
23 fairly regular basis for maintenance and  
24 inspection. There will be controls at the  
25 powerhouse and it will be remotely accessible,

1 but still will require fairly frequent access.  
2 We're talking probably once a week or more often  
3 or less often. It really depends on the  
4 performance of the project and the maintenance  
5 personnel.

6 MS. BERNES: And that will be on  
7 Corporation land?

8 MR. HERTRICH: It is mostly on  
9 Corporation land, but there is a good section  
10 that is on refuge. You can note that the  
11 powerhouse is still actually on the conservation  
12 easement.

13 MR. TRAWICKI: Will that road be  
14 open to the public, then?

15 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah, this road --  
16 what I'm envisioning -- this is in our proposal,  
17 I believe -- is that the section of road up to  
18 the powerhouse would be open to the public.  
19 Right now there is a -- I have shown on here the  
20 ATV trails, and actually they're red. The ATV  
21 trails that are in use currently are shown here.  
22 The road would actually hopefully replace the ATV  
23 use that's occurring down in the Lagoon Creek  
24 area.

25 MS. BERNES: That lake there is used

1 for recreational use. A lot of people go  
2 swimming in that lake.

3 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah. The trail  
4 back to this lake was fairly recently used. I  
5 mean, all the vegetation is knocked down. The  
6 trail going up the hill here looked like it  
7 hadn't been used for quite some time. Vegetation  
8 had been growing back. So most of the traffic is  
9 going directly to the lake. And that's where  
10 having this road open to the public, I think,  
11 would cut down on use along the flats here.

12 There's a creek crossing where  
13 four-wheelers just go right through the creek,  
14 and having this road up high on the ridge would  
15 reduce any kind of erosion or issues with  
16 interaction with wildlife that frequent the creek  
17 area, I think much more than this ridge area. I  
18 guess if you wanted to, you can stop the public  
19 access right at the boundary of the Old Harbor  
20 Native Corporation, or the Corporation may choose  
21 to stop access all the way back at the tie-in.  
22 That's certainly an issue that we can look at.

23 MR. CRATTY: Could I say something?  
24 That trail is also used as a subsistence. You go  
25 to Big Creek to get silvers and walk or go by

1 four-wheeler.

2 MR. HERTRICH: Actually Gary did  
3 mention that, that there was allowed uses on  
4 these trails for subsistence.

5 MR. METCALF: Matt Metcalf, AVEC.  
6 We talked about that and we thought having a road  
7 designated for that use, subsistence use, as well  
8 and leave it open. The power plant will be gated  
9 off and when we get into a certain portion, Gary  
10 made a comment that as long as there's a  
11 maintained road useable for traffic, the refuge  
12 doesn't really have a problem with that. It's  
13 just when you start traveling with four-wheelers  
14 on areas that are not -- roads -- that have  
15 designated roads on it. If there's areas that we  
16 need to put a line where no one can go across,  
17 then we'll put like little barriers out there  
18 with a fence with a padlock, so when someone  
19 really needs to get up there with a vehicle for  
20 maintenance issues, they still have access to it,  
21 but for the general public it would be closed  
22 off.

23 MR. HERTRICH: The last point I  
24 wanted to make is the amount of power from this  
25 project. I have a graph here that shows the --

1       this is right out of the PAD that we put  
2       together. Showing the top line here, the very  
3       light one is the expected hydroelectric output.  
4       The pink line is the 15-minute maximum demand for  
5       the day in Old Harbor. Then we have the average  
6       demand below that.

7                   As you can see, this hydroelectric  
8       project has a significant benefit for the  
9       community. With the hydrology data that we have  
10      that's been collected by myself and DNR over the  
11      years, we're showing that there's 100 percent  
12      displacement of the diesel fuel. I hope to  
13      have -- actually I'm going to get the LIDAR  
14      information and overlay the satellite imagery and  
15      have a web viewer so that everybody can access  
16      all of this information and see where the project  
17      layout is. Hopefully some of this fly-by ability  
18      will help visualize the project.

19                   MS. REICH: Dan, can you tell us  
20      what sort of studies were done for the -- can you  
21      just give a history of this project? What  
22      happened in the past and what studies were done  
23      in the past.

24                   MR. HERTRICH: This project has  
25      been looked at for many, many years. There was

1 options that looked at picking up both forks of  
2 the creek, bringing it down here to the  
3 powerhouse location that we had permitted for the  
4 old project. There was, I think, even just a  
5 small project proposal in Lagoon Creek.

6 We've looked at this option with  
7 this high intake location. In '95 we did a  
8 feasibility study and then undertook permitting,  
9 I believe, in '97 or '98. We commenced some  
10 terrestrial studies that were for birds and  
11 wildlife. We did a lot of fisheries work in  
12 Lagoon Creek and the Barlin Bay tributaries, the  
13 one that I mentioned that actually is dry most of  
14 the summer. We also did a cultural assessment  
15 along the project footprint.

16 We obtained a license, but did not  
17 go to construction for a number of reasons. AVEC  
18 had just had a bulk fuel farm constructed, and  
19 the delivery price of fuel at the time was about  
20 90 cents a gallon, I believe. We had a fair  
21 amount of monitoring requirements at the end of  
22 the licensing, and the estimation for those was  
23 about \$55,000 a year over five years, which  
24 completely -- that was as much as they were  
25 spending on fuel, and then they still would have

1 had to fund the capital cost of the project. The  
2 economics were so unfavorable AVEC just could not  
3 pursue the construction at that time.

4 I think things are a little bit  
5 different. We have much more focus on renewable  
6 energy, some grant programs, and hopefully we can  
7 keep this project so it's low maintenance cost.

8 MR. MUDRE: Was that pretty much  
9 what you had for now? If anyone has questions on  
10 that, maybe it's time to get to some public  
11 comment and hear what you guys have.

12 Were you done?

13 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah, I'm done.  
14 Like I said, if you have any questions or want me  
15 to go through whatever information I have here,  
16 I'll do my best.

17 MR. MUDRE: Let me also mention a  
18 couple of things that should have been in my  
19 presentation but that weren't. I wanted to  
20 mention also that we had scheduled a site visit  
21 and scoping meeting in Old Harbor for yesterday.  
22 While we were able to get to Kodiak, it was too  
23 windy and they weren't flying into Old Harbor, so  
24 we were not able to have the scoping meeting  
25 there or the site visit.

1                   We did meet with the refuge manager  
2                   there, but what we're going to try to do is  
3                   reschedule maybe for June and have a scoping  
4                   meeting there so we can hear the local concerns  
5                   and issues and also to have a site visit then.  
6                   We should be able to pull it off, I'm told, in  
7                   June. We just got unlucky a little bit  
8                   yesterday. So I wanted to mention that.

9                   I also want to mention that while  
10                  we'll take verbal oral comments today, if you  
11                  don't want to comment orally or you want to  
12                  supplement whatever you say, we are also  
13                  accepting written comments. It says instructions  
14                  for how you do that are provided in the scoping  
15                  document 1, so you should get that. It tells you  
16                  everything you need to know. Those comments are  
17                  going to be due by November 20th, a month from  
18                  today or so.

19                  I also want to mention that I  
20                  talked about the record that we're going to be  
21                  establishing. On the Commission's web site,  
22                  which is [www dot FERC dot gov](http://www.ferc.gov), we have a feature  
23                  called e-library where everything, all the  
24                  letters that people send in are scanned and you  
25                  can access all of that, everything that's in

1       there, so you can look at the entire record.  
2       There's instructions on how to do that in scoping  
3       document 1. We also have a feature called  
4       e-subscription where you can sign up once if  
5       you're interested, say, in Old Harbor, in this  
6       particular relicensing proceeding, you can enter  
7       in the project number, which is P-13272, and you  
8       just have to do that once and then you'll  
9       automatically get e-mail notifications when  
10      something new comes in. Then you just click  
11      on -- if you're interested, you just click on a  
12      link and it will take you right to that document.

13                       That's pretty handy. You don't  
14      have to spend time searching when there's nothing  
15      that's come in, and you'll see things right when  
16      they do come in. It's a very useful feature, I  
17      think.

18                       Did I forget anything, Carolyn?

19                       MS. TEMPLETON: I don't think so.

20                       MS. BERNES: Can you repeat that  
21      number?

22                       MR. MUDRE: P-13272. So what we're  
23      going to do now is just -- yes, Carolyn.

24                       MS. TEMPLETON: Carolyn Templeton  
25      with FERC. Just as a note, the Commission is now

1 calling site visits environmental site reviews.  
2 So if you see that phrase, it's the same thing.  
3 It's going out and visiting the project  
4 facilities, but they're one and the same.

5 MR. MUDRE: We just like to confuse  
6 people now and then. So what we want to do now  
7 is see what people have to say, what they think  
8 about the proposed project, issues, concerns, any  
9 of that stuff.

10 Who would like to go first?  
11 Anyone?

12 MS. BERNIS: This is Cynthia Bernis.  
13 I'm originally from Old Harbor. I currently live  
14 in Anchorage, but I work for the Corporation and  
15 have really close ties with the community. Our  
16 community members definitely want to make sure  
17 that we're doing everything possible to make sure  
18 we're following rules and not bothering anything  
19 environmentally. But it's also a really big  
20 concern for us to get this project going because  
21 we do see residents paying a really high fuel  
22 surcharge, which is just about the same cost as  
23 their electric bill.

24 So, you know, it could potentially  
25 cause trouble for people to be able to stay in

1 the village because the cost of living down there  
2 is so extremely high. So we definitely want to  
3 work with all organizations to make sure that  
4 we're doing everything possible, but we also want  
5 to see this project move forward so we can really  
6 help our people stay in the community, to live  
7 there, because it is very important to us. It's  
8 our home. So, I thank you for coming. Hopefully  
9 we'll make it down there in June.

10 MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

11 MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty, Old Harbor.  
12 Born and raised in Old Harbor. Live there. The  
13 four-wheel trail, we used to use that growing up,  
14 my grandfather and others for bear hunting,  
15 subsistence use, ducks, fish, everything. And  
16 people still traditionally do. We have a  
17 subsistence bear hunt. I think putting in the  
18 road would not hurt very much if you close it off  
19 where you want to. People rely on it.

20 I just recently opened a smoked  
21 salmon plant there four years ago. It just --  
22 you know, trying to do the higher end of salmon  
23 with commercial fishermen. The price of  
24 electricity is so high that it'll kill you. We  
25 would like to put a seafood plant in there also,

1 and the price of electricity -- we're trying to  
2 look for a different way. We've been trying. I  
3 think it would really help the community. Thank  
4 you.

5 MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.  
6 Let me just ask: Have you had time -- this is  
7 for the agencies, I guess -- have you guys had  
8 time to look through the PAD and the issues and  
9 things like that? If you're not prepared today  
10 to state what your concerns and issues are,  
11 definitely feel free to send in written comments  
12 by the 20th. But if you have questions or don't  
13 understand parts of what's being proposed, now is  
14 the opportunity since everyone is here to maybe  
15 get through those issues and get you the  
16 information that you need.

17 MR. TRAWICKI: John Trawicki with  
18 Fish and Wildlife. I have read through the PAD  
19 just once, and I do actually have some questions.  
20 Part of it's the previous -- what were the  
21 previous monitoring requirements that were so  
22 expensive, or is there a report that lists those?

23 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah, I can  
24 certainly pull those up from the last license. I  
25 don't have them with me. But just a general

1 outline of them, we were required to do fish  
2 surveys about five or six times each year along  
3 with three complete Lagoon Creek geos, the  
4 morphology surveys, just for erosion assessment.  
5 We were required to maintain a stream gauge.

6 MR. TRAWICKI: Where was that?

7 MR. HERTRICH: At Lagoon Creek as  
8 well as of course the project flows and what was  
9 being bypassed at the intake, which those two  
10 locations really aren't difficult to do  
11 measurements. The Lagoon Creek was an additional  
12 expense generally because there were no project  
13 features other than the powerhouse. You know,  
14 the stream gauging, the fish monitoring and  
15 especially the geo morphology survey, I think  
16 pretty much required outside effort, you know,  
17 people from outside the community.

18 If we had local expertise that was  
19 doing those surveys, I don't think the cost would  
20 be nearly as high. But any time you're trying to  
21 get out to a remote village, you have a lot of  
22 air travel and experts and it makes it fairly  
23 costly.

24 MR. TRAWICKI: I've measured stream  
25 flow extensively over the south side in the last

1 six or seven years, and I visited the intake site  
2 when you guys were gauging it. I was there once.  
3 But I don't know what the main stem of Mountain  
4 Creek looks like. Can you describe that? It  
5 sounds like it flows year-round.

6 MR. HERTRICH: I have a video  
7 actually that will show it from a helicopter.  
8 You're looking at the intake site?

9 MR. TRAWICKI: No, of the main stem  
10 of -- what does the east fork dump into?

11 MR. HERTRICH: Okay. The Barlin  
12 Bay tributary.

13 MR. TRAWICKI: But not the  
14 tributary itself, what it's a tributary of. What  
15 percent of the flow --

16 MR. HERTRICH: I'll have to go to  
17 the big USGS map.

18 MR. MUDRE: While you're looking at  
19 that, let me just mention that all of the  
20 recommendations and costs and our analysis for  
21 the measures that you're asking about would be  
22 contained in the environmental assessment that  
23 was done for the original license, and they would  
24 also be contained as license articles with that  
25 license. So they would be pretty easy to find

1 those. You could get them right out of e-library  
2 if you wanted to. If you don't, give me a call  
3 and we can arrange to send it to you.

4 MR. STOLCERS: We currently have a  
5 copy of the original EA.

6 MR. HERTRICH: This basin on the  
7 right is the east fork. The west fork is here on  
8 the left. They come together here with the  
9 confluence. There's quite a bit of drainage area  
10 being picked up as it flows out of this canyon.  
11 This is the headwaters of the Barlin Bay  
12 tributary, from the canyon down to its mouth. I  
13 mean, we should maybe call it Mountain Creek. I  
14 think that's probably the more appropriate name.  
15 In the past I called it Barlin Bay tributary  
16 because that's what we started out calling it.

17 MR. TRAWICKI: From there  
18 downstream, how big is the Barlin Bay Creek? Not  
19 Mountain.

20 MR. HERTRICH: The Barlin Bay Creek  
21 being this one on the left here.

22 MR. TRAWICKI: Right, from the  
23 tributary down.

24 MR. HERTRICH: Oh, that little  
25 section right there? Is that what you mean?

1                   MR. TRAWICKI: All the way down.  
2           That's the bay right there?

3                   MR. HERTRICH: That's the bay,  
4           yeah. The mouth of Mountain Creek empties right  
5           into the tideline.

6                   MR. CRATTY: That goes up so high  
7           too and it dries out just like the other one.

8                   MR. TRAWICKI: So the intake  
9           structure will divert 7 cfs out of the east fork?

10                  MR. HERTRICH: Uh-huh. The past  
11           project we had designed for 13 cfs.

12                  MR. TRAWICKI: The license is for  
13           almost twice the design flow or significantly  
14           more than what the design flow is.

15                  MR. HERTRICH: Actually we have the  
16           license and 300 kw is what we're looking at for  
17           the project size. So that's what the 7 cfs  
18           equates to. The previous project was 13 cfs and  
19           about 500 kw.

20                  MR. TRAWICKI: It says dependable  
21           capacity is 130.

22                  MR. HERTRICH: That's the minimum  
23           flow output in the springtime. When the flow in  
24           the creek is less than 7 cfs, it's down as low as  
25           it flows. I'd have to look at our hydrograph.

1 It gets down to like 2 to 3 cfs.

2 MR. MUDRE: There's a couple of  
3 different definitions for dependable output. I'm  
4 not an engineer. I don't know them. But I think  
5 it's basically what could you produce under the  
6 most adverse conditions. Is that --

7 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah, that's the --  
8 dependable being the minimum output that we can  
9 rely on for the project. As you saw from that  
10 hydrograph, it's still quite a bit above the  
11 city's current demand.

12 MR. TRAWICKI: It's good you're  
13 looking for alternative energy for Old Harbor.  
14 Have you looked at like a hydrokinetic or wind or  
15 anything else out in that area?

16 MR. METCALF: We just did a wind  
17 study and the wind class was a Class 2, which is  
18 not a very strong wind class. It has seasonal  
19 gusts, but nothing steady, not where it would be  
20 efficient.

21 MR. MUDRE: Anyone else have  
22 questions or comments?

23 MS. BERNIS: Well, Stella and Al are  
24 on both the Corporation and the tribe and Stella  
25 you're also on the City Council. Would you all

1 concur that all organizations are for this  
2 project?

3 MS. KRUMREY: Yes.

4 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

5 MS. BERNES: So definitely as a  
6 community we'd like to see this project move  
7 forward and are here and willing and able to help  
8 in any manner that we can. We appreciate you all  
9 coming today.

10 MR. MUDRE: Anything else?

11 MR. TRAWICKI: I guess I have a  
12 couple questions on your duration curves and the  
13 7 cfs and also the east fork monthly flow data.  
14 If your median flow -- for more than five months  
15 if the median flow goes below 7 cfs, for half of  
16 that month you don't get 7 cfs, are you going to  
17 meet your generation?

18 MR. HERTRICH: We're not going to  
19 be able to produce a full 300 kw year-round.  
20 That's a given because of the hydrology. You're  
21 correct, we don't have 7 cfs all the time.

22 MR. TRAWICKI: And I'm assuming you  
23 can't capture 100 percent of the river either?

24 MR. HERTRICH: Right.

25 MR. TRAWICKI: And I don't know

1        what percent you can leave for January. Your  
2        median is 5. If you can capture half of that, so  
3        for half of the month you'll get two-and-a-half  
4        cfs.

5                    MR. HERTRICH: Well, here's the  
6        hydrograph -- not really a hydrograph, but a  
7        power graph. It's based on the hydrology work  
8        that's been done. As you see, the month of  
9        January your average output from the project  
10       looks like is about 225 kw.

11                   Now, the minimum months are in the  
12       spring. That's when the flow is always at its  
13       lowest, and that's where we're down -- getting  
14       down into that dependable capacity area of, you  
15       know. But when you look at the project output  
16       over the entire year, the capacity factor, you  
17       know, just guessing by this graph we'll well up  
18       into 85 percent probably of that 300 kw. I do  
19       have a monthly breakdown of the estimated  
20       generation.

21                   MR. TRAWICKI: Do you have the flow  
22       duration by month?

23                   MR. HERTRICH: Not the flow  
24       duration by month. I can easily pull that up at  
25       some point and e-mail that to you. There's a

1 table here that had -- here's the actual  
2 hydrograph for the east fork and here's our flows  
3 by month. With the minimum occurring -- now,  
4 this is from all the gauging data. So you can  
5 see that March and April are our lowest median,  
6 February as well, around 3 to 4 cfs. The minimum  
7 measured by our data was less than 1 cfs. In  
8 other words, the maximum flows were up in the 40  
9 cfs. Now, we may need more hydrology work. I  
10 don't know. If that's what you're getting at, we  
11 can certainly --

12 MR. TRAWICKI: Not necessarily for  
13 an environmental; I think for project  
14 feasibility. There's a lot of months here, a lot  
15 of time frames where you'll only be able to pull  
16 1 or 2 cfs out of the creek.

17 MR. HERTRICH: Fortunately this is  
18 a relatively high head project, almost 800 feet  
19 of -- so 1 or 2 cfs gives us a lot of power  
20 output. That's one of the reasons we looked at  
21 this alternative project over -- a lower head  
22 project. Not to mention it was the only really  
23 feasible project up there.

24 MR. METCALF: Old Harbor doesn't  
25 need 300 kw. One, it's seasonal and, two, I

1 think the demands are half of that right now.

2 MR. HERTRICH: We can go back and  
3 look at their demand chart that we have in here.  
4 The lower line is their daily average demand.  
5 It's pretty flat throughout the year. It's all  
6 under 100 kw. Now, of course I think once a  
7 project like this is put in, electrical demand  
8 will go up.

9 MR. TRAWICKI: And at one point you  
10 talked about pulling from two sources. Is that a  
11 potential in the future of expanding it for a  
12 second source and, if so, where would it come  
13 from?

14 MR. HERTRICH: If you were going to  
15 pull water from another source, it would be the  
16 west fork of Mountain Creek, but I think I've got  
17 a few alternative projects I've looked at. I  
18 don't know that one would want to go do that. I  
19 think there's an alternative project close to  
20 town. It's just kind of southwest of Old Harbor.  
21 It's a very small drainage. If you wanted to  
22 augment some low winter flows, you might be able  
23 to get some power out of there.

24 I think I looked at that project  
25 and I have a comparison of some of the

1 alternatives. The Old Town Project at 184 kw is  
2 what -- with a minimum output of 83 kw. So if  
3 you needed more power, that's probably the -- and  
4 you can almost see that project a little bit on  
5 the aerial photo. That's this drainage over  
6 here.

7                   You know, we don't have very much  
8 data on that one, but it's not going to be a  
9 terribly easy project either. Actually, talking  
10 about alternatives, the other one that was looked  
11 at was a project over on Midway Creek, which is  
12 just on the other side of Big Creek and that was,  
13 I believe, this one here. We don't have the  
14 aerial for it. You can see the contours, but --

15                   MR. TRAWICKI: In the PAD you  
16 talked about an adverse impact of the --  
17 indication of the adverse -- proposed by AVEC to  
18 lower potential impact via construction channel.  
19 I'm just curious what that is. I'm not, again,  
20 familiar with these creeks and am curious what  
21 that would look like or kind of what the  
22 footprint is or what the purpose of it is.

23                   MR. HERTRICH: I don't really have  
24 an answer for you on that. Part of our proposed  
25 study for this licensing is to figure out what

1       this tailrace is going to look like, how we're  
2       going to discharge the water and into where.  
3       We're taking water out of an area that doesn't  
4       support fisheries. Any time you remove water  
5       from a fishery habitat, you know, fish do need  
6       water, and you're going to likely cause some  
7       harm, but if there's no fish, the removal of  
8       water is not causing harm. So in my mind when we  
9       say that we're going to discharge extra water  
10      into a potential fish habitat or existing fish  
11      habitat, I think it's an enhancement to the fish  
12      because fish like water.

13                   MR. TRAWICKI: Can and can't be,  
14      but --

15                   MR. HERTRICH: That's really -- I  
16      don't know. I don't have an answer. I would  
17      like to see a tailrace that did create fish  
18      enhancement, and we could certainly discharge  
19      into a lake, this lake that is near the proposed  
20      powerhouse or we could head over to the wetland  
21      area towards Big Creek. The tailrace I've got  
22      shown on here does trace out a line along the  
23      wetlands and to ultimately Big Creek.

24                   MR. MUDRE: Let me follow up on  
25      that question, because I think my understanding

1 is that you would dig a channel from the tailrace  
2 into some receiving water body. That's basically  
3 what you're saying. I think the question is how  
4 long is it or where does it go, those sorts of  
5 things. That's what they're trying to figure  
6 out.

7 MR. HERTRICH: Or we could even  
8 just let a channel naturally form, so long as we  
9 know that we're not going to create any flooding  
10 problems with any of our infrastructure. That's  
11 where I've actually decided to situate our  
12 powerhouse and access road to where we can easily  
13 direct the tailrace waters into either basin. We  
14 could construct a channel, it could simply form  
15 naturally, or we could go look for a channel and  
16 direct the water to that channel with a culvert  
17 of some sort. There's several options.

18 If you have any input on that, we  
19 certainly would like to hear it.

20 MR. TRAWICKI: I haven't looked  
21 close enough at this. My comments are just  
22 pretty much reading through the PAD and things  
23 that brought up questions.

24 MR. HERTRICH: I don't have all the  
25 information, really, to make that determination.

1 This is where our LIDAR is going to help us out  
2 so we can say, this is where we expect the  
3 powerhouse to be, et cetera.

4 MR. MUDRE: Dan, I guess what I  
5 would recommend is when you do get that LIDAR and  
6 as you get information in, that you distribute it  
7 to the agencies, you know, quickly. Because as  
8 you point out, there's a fair amount of  
9 information that's missing and given that you  
10 want to have an abbreviated schedule, the sooner  
11 this information gets out and people can look at  
12 it, the better.

13 MR. HERTRICH: We have commissioned  
14 the LIDAR. They should be getting out this fall  
15 to do that. As soon as we get that data, we'll  
16 be finishing up a conceptual design and  
17 feasibility study and we'll have a more  
18 definitive project layout probably by early 2010.  
19 So before we get through our study request and I  
20 think we had talked also about another  
21 environmental site review or site visit next  
22 spring.

23 MR. TRAWICKI: If you do your site  
24 visit in June, is that going to put your schedule  
25 behind potentially, or are you still going to

1 have a scoping meeting in Old Harbor to catch the  
2 folks there early?

3 MR. MUDRE: Yeah. I think what we  
4 were looking at was trying to get a meeting and a  
5 site visit in June. So as early as we can sort  
6 of predictably get there and meet with people.

7 MR. TRAWICKI: That's fairly late  
8 if some sort of field study is identified to get  
9 under way.

10 MR. MUDRE: Right. Well, I think  
11 that meeting is for us and for whoever else wants  
12 to go to it. But what I'm thinking is if people  
13 need to see things sooner, that Dan or whoever  
14 could make arrangements to visit the site before  
15 us if that needs to be done. You don't have to  
16 wait for our meeting. I would encourage you guys  
17 to work among yourself and get out there so you  
18 have the information when you need it.

19 MR. TRAWICKI: I would hate to see  
20 you guys get put back a year because of being so  
21 late and then you can't accomplish something that  
22 season.

23 Are you gauging still or not? You  
24 said you're done?

25 MR. HERTRICH: We haven't done any

1 gauging since -- I think 2000 is the last data we  
2 have.

3 MR. TRAWICKI: So the discharge  
4 record and flow duration stuff is based on two to  
5 three years. Pretty minimal.

6 MR. HERTRICH: Yeah.

7 MS. BERNIS: We generally don't have  
8 lack of water in Kodiak.

9 MR. MUDRE: Anyone else?

10 MR. TRAWICKI: I'll just keep going  
11 down my list here. This is from reviewing the  
12 PAD.

13 Under the resource management plan,  
14 the Kodiak CCP is not included in there. It  
15 probably needs to be. ANILCA, which established  
16 the refuge, has some primary purposes, which  
17 include water quantity and quality for refuge  
18 purposes and that probably needs to be addressed  
19 at some point in time. Pretty valuable resource.  
20 You're putting a hydroelectric facility in the  
21 middle of a National Wildlife Refuge and the bar  
22 is probably fairly high. This project doesn't  
23 have large environmental problems, but the bar is  
24 still high and the documentation should be high.

25 MR. HERTRICH: You're not referring

1 to the Kodiak Island Borough?

2 MR. TRAWICKI: No, it has a  
3 conservation plan. It was in one document and  
4 not in another. That should be identified.  
5 There's also, I think, a fisheries management  
6 plan. I can't recall the other management plans  
7 associated with the Kodiak refuge at this point.

8 MR. HAASE: There's also a public  
9 use management plan, and they're doing work  
10 currently on updating their fishery management  
11 plan, I believe, at least from the standpoint of  
12 setnet users and that kind of stuff.

13 MS. REICH: Are the plans available  
14 on line?

15 MR. HAASE: The CCP is available on  
16 line. I don't believe that -- the fisheries  
17 management plan is not, because it was done in  
18 the early '90s and basically I think everything  
19 in it is either has been accomplished or they're  
20 not going to be doing it. But they have people  
21 on the refuge staff that can give you a lot of  
22 information on that kind of stuff. But the CCP  
23 is on the Fish and Wildlife Service web site.

24 MR. HERTRICH: Okay.

25 MR. HAASE: And I can provide you

1 with a copy of that as well.

2 MR. HERTRICH: Actually a copy of  
3 the fisheries management plan and the other one  
4 that's not on the web site would be of concern.

5 MR. HAASE: I'm not sure if we've  
6 got extra copies of the fishery management plan  
7 because my division did not work on it. It's  
8 around.

9 MR. TRAWICKI: Call Gary and tell  
10 him you need it. He may have to make a  
11 pdf, but --

12 MR. HERTRICH: The other thing I  
13 was hoping to get worked out, I know that Fish  
14 and Wildlife was working on their own  
15 environmental assessment as part of the past  
16 licensing effort and a right-of-way permit that  
17 is issued from Fish and Wildlife Service. That  
18 was never completed, I don't believe, but it was  
19 close to completion. So I know there's going to  
20 be a lot of coordination required with Fish and  
21 Wildlife and things. We expect that we're  
22 certainly going to have to sit down and go over  
23 all the information we have and figure out what  
24 we need to do.

25 MR. TRAWICKI: I'm assuming Gary

1 will send some formal comments in. He'll  
2 probably get information from all of us.

3 MR. MUDRE: Great.

4 MR. TRAWICKI: I'll be quiet.

5 MR. MUDRE: Anyone else?

6 MS. BERNES: John, you said you're  
7 accepting written comments until November 20th.  
8 Are those to be uploaded on that web site or  
9 e-mailed directly to you?

10 MR. MUDRE: Those should be --  
11 that's another thing. They can be filed  
12 electronically.

13 MS. BERNES: If we want to submit?

14 MR. MUDRE: You can mail in  
15 comments. The comments should be addressed to  
16 the secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
17 Commission. If you put the project number on it,  
18 the P-13272, that one -- again, all these  
19 instructions are in the scoping document 1. But  
20 they will all get put into the e-library so  
21 people can see them and we can use them.

22 Some people find the electronic  
23 filing really easy, particularly if you're going  
24 to be commenting a lot, that's probably a good  
25 way to go. It takes a little bit of -- you have

1 to register -- and I've never done it -- but some  
2 people find it complicated. There's a help  
3 number where you can get help. That way you  
4 don't have to mail everything out and you can  
5 just zip it off to us and we can consider it in  
6 seconds. Okay.

7 If there's any questions from  
8 anyone here, feel free to give me a call. My  
9 phone number is 202-502-8902. I'll try to answer  
10 your questions or if I can't, I'll find someone  
11 who can.

12 MR. CRATTY: I'd like to also say,  
13 the tribe, we invite you down any time in  
14 November if you want to have a meeting. From  
15 Stella's B&B you can see where the whole thing is  
16 going to be right out her window.

17 MR. MUDRE: I'd like to take you up  
18 on that offer. Sounds like we won't be trying to  
19 get back until next spring sometime.

20 Anything else? Looks like maybe  
21 we're about ready to wrap things up. Again, I  
22 want to thank everyone for coming. I appreciate  
23 you taking out the time to be here and appreciate  
24 the comments that we've received and the ones  
25 we'll get in the mail. If you know other people

1       that you think should be interested in this  
2       proceeding, maybe just sort of nudge them and let  
3       them know what's going on. They can call me and  
4       we can try to catch them up with where things  
5       are. With that, I think we'll go ahead and end  
6       the meeting.

7                               (Concluded at 4:29 p.m.)

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25