FEDERAL ENERGY

REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAN ONOFRE

ELECTRICITY FARM

PROJECT

P-13679

SCOPING MEETING

JANUARY 24, 2012

7:00 p.m.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Welcome, everybody, to the evening scoping meeting for the San Onofre Electricity Farm Project. My name is Carolyn Templeton. I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission out of Washington, DC, and I will be running the meeting for us tonight. Just a few housekeeping items before we get into the actual project and the process. If you need to use the restroom -- I don't know if you saw them on your way in but outside and make a right. You'll go past a bank of elevators, and just past those elevators are both the men's and women's facilities. So they are there. If you need to get up at any point and go use them, please feel free to.

We have some water in the back of the room, and our applicant also provided some refreshments. So, if you want some fruit or cookies, they are back there as well.

At one point in this evening, we will, sort of, have an open-forum discussion where you will be able to provide any comments or input that you have regarding the project, regarding any resource issues that you might be thinking of, and when you do that, I'd like you to please state your name and your affiliation before each time you speak, and that's because we have a court reporter here with us tonight.

She is dictating everything that is being said so that we have a complete and accurate record for this project. She'll prepare transcripts, and those transcripts will appear on FERC's Web site in about two weeks. So, again, please, each time before you speak -- I know it might seem a little bit repetitive, but it's good for the record, and it's good for her to make sure that she's captured the proper person with the proper comments.

As I said, my name is Carolyn Templeton, and I'm working on this project as a team member. I will be looking at terrestrial resources and threatened and endangered species. If you've been following this project in the past, you probably are more familiar with the name Ken Hogan. He is also with FERC in our Washington, DC, offices, our office, but because of some schedule conflicts and workload that he's currently under, he was not able to physically be here. He was participating via telephone on the earlier meeting that we had today, but, on East Coast time, it's about 10:00 right now. So I don't think Ken is going to be participating in this meeting.

But with me also from FERC, I have two other team members. I have Joe Hassell here towards the back. For this project, he will be looking at

developmental resources, socioeconomics, engineering, and some water-quality issues. We also have Mary Greene up here in the front, and she will be analyzing recreation, land use, aesthetics, as well as cultural resources.

So I did some introductions. The agenda that the meeting is going to follow tonight will include a brief overview of the ILP process, Integrated Licensing Process. That is the licensing process that the applicant has chosen to pursue for this project. We will discuss the proposed action that is before us. We'll take some time to, as I said, have an open discussion or open forum of the scoping of issues. There will be some time, if you'd like, to provide formal verbal comments that you may do so at that time, and then we'll finish up the meeting with just some administrative items that we'll be talking about.

As I said, I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as is Joe and Mary. We are located in Washington, DC. We also have five regional offices. They are located in Portland, Oregon; San Francisco; Chicago; New York City; and Atlanta. And once I get to the next slide, I will explain a little bit more about which staff of FERC are housed in those regional offices.

The Commission is run by a five-member commission. They are all appointed by the President of the United States, and then one person is appointed by the President to serve as the chairperson, chairman or chairwoman, of the Commission. Our major duties that we've been tasked with include regulating various energy infrastructure. These include natural gas, oil pipelines, the electric power, electric rates, as well as hydropower, which is why we are here this evening.

So what does the Hydropower Program look like at FERC? Joe, Mary, myself, and Ken are all in the division of licensing, which you see on the left-hand side here of the triangle. And all of us are members of what's called the "West Branch" where our focus is mainly on the states of California, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii. We don't get too many projects in Hawaii, unfortunately.

We also have two other divisions in the Hydropower Program at FERC. The one is called "Dam Safety & Inspections," and these are the staff that are tasked with making sure that the nonfederal dams that we regulate are up to snuff in terms of their safety requirements as well as that they are meeting the needs for public safety. And when I mentioned before that we have five regional offices, most of those regional

offices are staffed with members of this division, "Dam Safety & Inspections," because those are mainly engineers. They have to go out at various times during the year to inspect these projects. So it makes sense to have some offices that are central and geographically located closer to those projects to make it easier to get to.

At the bottom of the triangle, you see another division, "Administration & Compliance." This is the division at FERC that, after we in licensing issue a license for any project, these staff members ensure that all of the conditions and requirements that we put forth in a license are met with and complied with appropriately.

And then you see in the middle of the triangle "licensees," "resource agencies," "tribes," "NGOs," and "local stakeholders." And that just means that pretty much in any process that any of these three divisions go through, we like to have the input from all of our licensees, the resource agencies that may be affected, any tribes that may be in the area, local nongovernmental organizations as well as the local stakeholders and the members of the public. We value your input. We value your knowledge of the area that you bring to the project because, as I said, we are out

of D.C. So we don't have a very local knowledge of certain areas or what's important economically to make a community thrive. So we value the input from all of these people to make our processes more successful.

Any questions about who FERC is? What we do?

Okay. I'm going to move on to the next part of the meeting and describe to you the ILP process. "ILP" stands for "Integrated Licensing Process." It's one of the three licensing processes that the division of licensing offers to potential applicants to go through. And Dr. Kim, who is a representative of JD Products, the applicant, has chosen to use the ILP process for his San Onofre Electricity Farm Project.

Whenever you came in, in the back, hopefully, you were able to pick up some of the various pieces of information that we have. There's copies of the scoping document, which I'll be referring to many times throughout this evening. There's also a single page that looks like this. It has a flow chart on it, and this describes the ILP process that I'm going to be talking about. And sometimes it's just helpful to refer to this so that you know at what point in the process we are currently at and at what point in the process I am referring to as I go through my talk.

The initial steps of the ILP involve what's

called the applicant, JD Products, filing an NOI, which stands for "Notice of Intent," and a PAD, which stands for "Pre-Application Document." This is when the applicant has identified and contacted any potential stakeholder that might have an interest in the project or that may have pertinent information that could be useful to Dr. Kim to use as he goes through this process. He contacts them -- he contacted them, I should say, and was able to get some information as well as do a literature search and find other pieces of information that he put together into a package. And this package, which is called the "PAD," essentially has the best information that Dr. Kim could find concerning various resource areas. So he put that together. He provided that to FERC as well as to the stakeholders that have shown interest in his project, and that occurred last October 2011.

We are currently in the stage of the ILP known as "scoping." In December of last year, the Commission issued what's called Coping Document 1, which is the document that I referred to in the back of the room. And in this document, we tried to identify, preliminarily, the issues of concern that we found based on the information that Dr. Kim provided in his PAD as well as letters that were provided to Dr. Kim

that sort of showed -- from various resource agencies, NGOs, et cetera, that showed what their initial concerns were, what their initial comments were, any additional information that they could provide. So we incorporated that all into a scoping document to outline an initial list of issues of concern.

In that scoping document, towards the back, there's also a process plan and schedule, which sets out specific dates and milestones that you'll be seeing as we go through this process that will be coming down the line. So it just helps you understand how long this process takes and the various steps that are included within that.

What will happen is we are having this public meeting right now. As I said, everything is being recorded by a stenographer so that it will become part of the public record. After this meeting is over, all of you and people that were here earlier during the meeting as well as people that weren't able to attend will have an opportunity to submit comments and study requests, and they will need to do that by February 21st of this year.

Now, depending upon the scope of comments that we get and how far different they are from what we listed in Scoping Document 1, we may be issuing

Scoping Document 2, which will be structured very similarly to Scoping Document 1 but will just be a little bit more detailed and tailored for this project.

So, as I said, after we provide comments to Dr. Kim, some of those comments may be in the form of a study request, and per the Integrated Licensing Process, the commission has put forth seven study-request criteria that people need to make sure their study meets in order to have it be fully considered by the commission, and these are listed up here on the slide. They are also included as part of the scoping document that you got tonight.

One of the ones that I want to bring your attention to that is of extreme importance is No. 5, "Nexus to project operations and effects and how study results would inform development of license requirements." Oftentimes we'll have study requests that will meet all of these other bullets, but there really won't be a nexus to the particular project or that particular geographic location. So if you are going to be putting forth study requests, I encourage you, of course, to meet all seven of them, but really describe No. 5, and show how your request has a specific nexus to this project.

After Dr. Kim receives all of our comments and

our study requests, he'll be required to prepare what's called a "Proposed Study Plan," and that will be a document that outlines, based on information that he does already have, regarding the environmental area as well as it will focus on information that we don't yet have. And based on comments that are received, he might need to tailor certain Study Plans in order to accomplish the goal of getting that information.

Once he submits that to the Commission as well as to the other stakeholders that are involved in this process, everybody will get together to discuss those Proposed Study Plans and resolve any issues or discuss any disconnects that might be between Dr. Kim and the stakeholders.

At that point, Dr. Kim will be able to provide what's called a "Revised Study Plan," which is very similar to the Proposed Study Plans, but as the name implies, it's revised based on these meetings that he will have with the various stakeholders.

At that point, FERC staff will issue a "Study Plan Determination," which is a document that very succinctly outlines what studies Dr. Kim, as part of JD Products, will be responsible for conducting in order to obtain the necessary information to move forth with his project.

There might be some agencies that have what's called "mandatory conditioning authority." That means that because of their role in this process as well as their role in NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, they are able to impose conditions in any FERC license issued, and we are obligated to include those conditions even if we don't necessarily agree with them.

But those agencies that have that authority can go through a process called "dispute resolution." So if they don't agree with what our director in the office of energy projects at FERC determines are appropriate plans for JD Products to pursue, they can file a dispute with whatever plan they don't have an agreement with. They go through a dispute process, and we have a method of having panel members and technical meetings to try to work out those disputes.

After that, we'll have what's called "studies." This is when Dr. Kim will spend about two years -- in our case, it's around 2013 to 2014 -- conducting all of these studies that were put forth in the Revised Study Plans and that were determined to be appropriate by the Commission.

After each year, the applicant will file Study Reports with the Commission as well as all of the

stakeholders, and they will have an opportunity to review those studies, see if they are getting the results that they thought they would. If not, there's an opportunity to submit requests for modifications to a current study, to try to get some different information, or if you find that that particular study is not meeting your needs at all, stakeholders could actually submit a request for a brand-new study, again, going back to those seven study criteria that we listed, making sure that you address all of those and also indicate why this new study is important and why any of the past studies that have been completed didn't meet those needs.

At that point, the applicant will prepare what's called a "Preliminary Licensing Proposal." These are documents that pretty much -- whenever we get to the post-filing activity of the Integrated Licensing Process. So, on this flow chart, it's the bottom portion. This is post-filing activity. This is prefiling activity up above. When we talk about filing, we are talking about the filing of a license application. So, in a FERC license application, there are certain exhibits that are related to an initial statement, costs, an environmental report, et cetera, that must be included per the Commission's regulations.

So a Preliminary Licensing Proposal is sort of just the nuts and bolts of that environmental license application. It just has Exhibit E, which is just the environmental report.

The applicant may also choose to file what's called a "Draft License Application," and just as the name implies, it's a draft of this very document down here that we are talking about, a license application. This type of document is more robust. It includes all of the exhibits that are required. It can include a draft biological assessment, BA, if necessary. It can include an Historic Properties Management Plan, any other type of management plans that might be necessary for this project. So it's just a little bit more involved. But both of these are options for the licensee to pursue, a Preliminary Licensing Proposal or a Draft License Application.

Both of those documents are provided a 90-day comment period where FERC staff, agencies, other stakeholders can take the time, review those documents, and provide valid comments back to Dr. Kim that he can then incorporate into a license application, which is what we would want here in the initial part of the post-filing activity.

And then these next couple of slides apply to

what I've been referring to as the "post-filing activity." And I'm just going to go through these briefly because they were forecasted pretty far down the road. So I'll just touch on them in a brief overview. So a license application will be filed. Once we feel, the Commission, that we have all of the information that we need to move forward, we'll issue what's called an "REA Notice," "ready for environmental analysis." It's at that time that we'll spend several months preparing an environmental document. This could be in the form of either an environmental assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement. It will probably have a draft and final version of that document where the draft will be open for comments, and we'll address all of those comments in a final environmental document.

And then the final step in this process would be issuing an order to the applicant. I want you to keep in mind that, from the very beginning of this flow chart down to the very bottom, this is about a span of about five and a half years. So it's a very lengthy process. There's a lot of steps involved, but throughout it, commission staff tries to keep updated schedules and process plans before all of you so that you know what's coming down the pike.

Are there any questions about the Integrated Licensing Process and what milestones have already been completed, what milestones we are doing now, and, in general, what lies in the future?

Okay.

LARRY RANNALS: One question. The initial environmental --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Would you state your name, please.

LARRY RANNALS: I'm sorry. Larry Rannals. The initial environmental study is intended to be an EA for this project or --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Not necessarily.

LARRY RANNALS: -- too early to tell?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. It depends on the types of comments and the studies that we get. And you'll see, once we start talking about the resource issues and the scope, we are looking to have input from everybody as to what the geographic scope might be for cumulative impact. So it could be fairly large. We don't know at this point because we are not too familiar, but that can --

I mean, we typically start out by saying that things would be an environmental assessment, but that's not set in stone. It very well could be an

Environmental Impact Statement. It's a little bit too early to determine which route we might take on that.

LARRY RANNALS: Okay. Thank you.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Any other questions about the ILP process? Okay. So I'm going to describe to you now JD Products represented here tonight by Dr. Kim.

I didn't really introduce, Dr. Kim. So maybe just wave your hands around.

DR. CHONG KIM: It's me.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: This is our applicant here, Dr. Kim. He provided, in the back of the room also next to the scoping documents, his proposal. It has several pictures in there of the devices that he's thinking of testing and deploying, and it has some background information in there for you to look at. I'm going to just briefly describe his proposal so that you all have an understanding of what we are talking about here tonight.

Dr. Kim is proposing a three-phase project, and for reasons that I'll explain, really, the intent of tonight's scoping meeting is to focus on Phase 3 -- I'm sorry -- Phase 2. Phase 1 of Dr. Kim's proposal is a prototype fabrication and testing. So this phase essentially is going to involve taking two types of

devices: one of them is called an RFEG, which stands for "River Flow Electricity Generator," as well as an "Ocean Wave Electricity Generator," OWEG, which you may also hear us refer to here as "OWEG." Those will be placed in the ocean to test and see how they work with the waters, what types of impacts they may have. So it's more just a study phase for these two particular types of devices.

Phase 2, which is what we are focusing on for the purposes of tonight's meeting, is the production, installation, and operation of 766 of the OWEG generators. So that's more of a larger build-out of these devices. He is proposing to install these about 2,000 feet off of the coastline in the Pacific Ocean just down near San Onofre State Park. I think it's also called "State Beach." So that will be the approximate location of that.

He is also proposing, in order to deploy these OWEGs, putting in an access road.

And, Dr. Kim, the access road you are proposing will be down near SONGS? Is that correct?

DR. CHONG KIM: Just south of SONGS.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: South of SONGS. SONGS is the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. I'm sure you are all familiar with that. So that's the

location, approximately, of where an access road would be. And down near the beach area, there also has to be sort of an assembly line, manufacturing setup in order to have these devices deployed and put into the waters.

Phase 3 of Dr. Kim's proposal is dependent upon the decommissioning of SONGS, and so because we are not necessarily sure if the decommissioning is going to occur and that action is more speculative in nature, we are not focusing the scoping tonight on that phase of his proposal. But that phase would essentially include even a further build-out to bring the total number of OWEGs to 2,677. And, again, I said that -- as I said, that's based on the decommissioning of SONGS.

But, as I said, in Dr. Kim's proposal that he provided as well as in our scoping document -- if you want to take a look at -- it starts on page 7 under "Applicant's Proposal." It talks about the three phases that I mentioned, and later on, for your future reference, it has project-location figures. It has figures that show you what an OWEG looks like, what Dr. Kim is proposing, that each of these OWEGs would be anchored to the bottom of the ocean floor by --

What will the anchors be made out of? Are they wires, or are they more like poles?

DR. CHONG KIM: Not wires. It's basically a pole, yeah.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: A pole?

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: There will be approximately eight poles on each device.

DR. CHONG KIM: Not -- the eight poles, at the bottom of the eight poles, there's some spikes.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: A spike?

DR. CHONG KIM: Yes, a spike.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: That will hold it to the bottom of the ocean floor?

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah, yeah. The baseline is very heavy, and the center of gravity is way down.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: So there are figures in here that show you what these devices look like. It shows you a figure of what the entire array -- how it would be arranged, all of these OWEGs together. Dr. Kim estimates that the 766 units would produce about 450 megawatts of electricity.

So I know that was a very short overview of the project. Are there any particular design questions at this point or configuration questions that you all have that Dr. Kim could go into more specifically about how something would be arranged or how it would be

built?

BILL WHITTENBERG: Bill Whittenberg. Is FERC going to license the transmission as well as the generation?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. The transmission -- once these OWEGs are installed, there would have to be a way for that electricity to come on shore and connect to the grid. So, as part of the project, the transmission of that would also be included.

BILL WHITTENBERG: And that would be part of the studies?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. Not necessarily the study of the transmission line, but any resources that could be affected by a transmission line coming onto the shore, coming on ground, so, yes, any --

If there's not pertinent information out there that could address the impacts of the transmission line, any studies that you might think of could be developed to address the transmission as well.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Thank you.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Bill?

BILL TOMAN: Hi. Bill Toman, SAIC. Has Southern California Edison filed any comments in this docket on their plans for the SONGS unit vis-a-vis relicensing?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: You know, I can't honestly answer that question. I don't think so. From what I can recall seeing in the record, I don't remember seeing anything that showed specific proposals as to what might happen with that.

JOSEPH HASSELL: They did --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: But I can't answer you with 100 percent confidence.

BILL TOMAN: I wonder if they -- this is an NRC question. I wonder if they actually filed with the NRC for relicensing.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: That, I don't know. I'm not sure. I thought maybe we'd have somebody here from that --

JOSEPH HASSELL: She was here earlier.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Oh, she was here in the daytime meeting?

JOSEPH HASSELL: Somebody from Southern California Edison was here.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

JOSEPH HASSELL: They did file a letter, a comment letter, you know, expressing, of course, their interest in the project because of this potential effect on SONGS, but --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: But I don't think we had

information as to whether or not SONGS is or is not going to re-up their application or be decommissioned.

LARRY RANNALS: I don't think they have filed their relicensing application yet.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay. And your name again?

LARRY RANNALS: Larry Rannals, Camp Pendleton.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

JOSEPH HASSELL: When you speak of relicensing, are you speaking of the NRC?

LARRY RANNALS: Yes. Yes, sir, relicensing with the NRC.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: NRC is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Are there any other questions specific to the prototype, the way the array will be set up? Yes, you in the back.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Andrea Swayne, the Dana Point Times. I previously wrote a story about this, and one of the things that came up in comments following the story were environmentalists concerned about turbines. They've seen some prototypes online that include OWEGs that include turbines and the concern being that turbines would essentially create a bunch of chopped-up fish.

Dr. Kim's design last time I spoke with him

did not include a turbine. Is this still correct?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yes.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Dr. Kim will not be testing any turbines?

DR. CHONG KIM: No turbine, no prop- --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: No turbine, no propeller. It's more of a --

JOSEPH HASSELL: Conveyor belt.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: -- conveyor belt of sorts that uses the movement of the waves to generate. There's no internal mechanisms going around. Yes. Your name?

RICK WILLIAMS: Rick Williams, SAIC. Are there any videos of the prototype working in a simulated water wave so we could understand more about the device?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I'll have to refer to Dr. Kim.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah, we tried to fabricate it. We are in the process of writing it. We are writing the application to get some funds from the DOE. If we get a grant, then we have to fabricate and test it. So we don't have any video thing to explain how it works for that, and we haven't disclosed what's going

on inside because, honestly, the patent is very simple, and exposing this idea could cause -- could -- I mean, of course, you know, many people are interested, including Japan, Korea, and China. So if they find how it works, they are going to try it, they are going to test it, and they are going to find if it works or not. Then they might get ahead of us because it will take five and a half years for us to get it licensed as long as it's for. But the decision is -- within a year, I believe, they can get something going. So I tried to hide it to kind of -- yeah, that's why.

RICK WILLIAMS: Protect it?

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah, yeah.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Dr. Kim expressed this concern in the earlier meeting that we had. As he said, they have a patent filed for their device, and they want to try to ensure that they alone are the ones that can develop this device. But we did have some comments from agency folks that said, "Well, in order for us to fully be able to understand what environmental, what developmental impacts this device could have, we need to have a little bit of an understanding as to how the device is going to be built, shaped, et cetera."

So I think, in the future, we are going to try

to work with Dr. Kim to try to get a little bit more detail in terms of the design without disclosing everything so that -- you know, the design of his project, of this in jeopardy with other countries, but just to get a little bit more information on the dimensions of some of the specs so that the people reviewing this project can get a better understanding of what the impacts might be -- does that sound right, what we talked about? -- to try to just see what information we could release.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah. Of course, as I said, I try not to say anything at all. I'm not going to say anything because, first of all, we have to test that thing to see whether it works or not. After the testing is done, it's going to take about maybe a year or so to be able to test actually how it works. After that, the idea is to get an investor, show it works. Then the investor is interested. That's the prime objective of the testing is getting an investor. So we've got to have the money to build the thing. Of course, if we fail, then that's it.

But, until then, I'm not going to say anything because the company decided it's kind of a confidential document. So we are not going to say anything. But a few people like Mr. Kenneth Hogan, he knows about it

because I sent everything, the basic concept of it.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Just a reminder, Ken Hogan is also with the FERC team.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah. He's kind of heading the whole project. Anything, he should know because there is one person who should know what's going on. So I sent him a document, and I explained this whole concept, so he and Mr. Christman.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah, he knows. Those are two persons who know. He's -- they are the only two persons I have to tell, but the other people -- as you said, I like to talk about it. Really, I talk about it, but the particular newspaper comment, they will find it. They are going to publish most likely. That's my concern. So I kind of -- that's my position. I will answer the question. I hate to say I'm hiding anything, but this is my position to this day.

BILL WHITTENBERG. Again, Bill Whittenberg. This looks like unique technology. Has it been piloted or a demonstration project conducted?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Not this particular device from what I understand. We have had, at FERC, other applications for what we call "hydrokinetic projects," but those have typically used some sort of turbine or

paddle wheel or propeller. I don't believe we have ever seen this type of device before.

BILL WHITTENBERG: So is Phase 2 going to be a demonstration project?

DR. CHONG KIM: Phase what?

BILL WHITTENBERG: Phase 2, as it is presented.

DR. CHONG KIM: Oh, Phase 2, yeah.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Is there a demonstration project?

DR. CHONG KIM: Phase 2, we have actually hardware. Phase 2 means that we already have hardware and are building it and putting it in the water. So then people know about it, I guess.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I think Phase 1 would be more of the demonstration.

DR. CHONG KIM: After Phase 1, we know it works. We know now it theoretically works, right now. But, actually, hardware will be -- we will verify hardwarewise in the first phase, Phase 1.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Bill Whittenberg again. Another question is why is this particular site -- does it have any advantages over other sites along the coastline.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah. The transmitter line,

that's basically it. That's a key element.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Well, I'm aware of other generating sites along the coastline, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, other locations. Why is this one so preferred over those others?

DR. CHONG KIM: Yeah. The one thing is, as we talked about here, SONGS is going to be decommissioned in 2022. So, after that, after they are gone, then the transmission line is sitting there doing nothing. So we cannot do that. We have to use this transmission line. That's basically the idea that I came up with. So we started looking at this thing.

But the other thing is this area is actually inside Camp Pendleton -- I mean the Marine camp. Do you know what? I thought that case -- we cannot go in there, I thought. So fishermen cannot go in there, and it's just an excluded area, I thought. So this must be the right area we can do something because it's not going to bother -- I mean, interfere with other human -- I mean civilian life because they are not going to go in there. That's what I thought.

But I understand -- later on, I found out that people still go in there. But, earlier, I thought that this was excluded area. So that was going to be an advantage to us because people are not going to

complain, but that is not the case. But, anyway, the transmission line is basically why I have it there. The other area, I haven't investigated for.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Andrea Swayne, The Dana Point Times. Has FERC received any comments from Camp Pendleton regarding -- anything new regarding whether or not they are opposed or okay with allowing this?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: We have received correspondence from folks at Camp Pendleton. I don't think their comments necessarily said they are for or against this project, but I think they clarified that more information is going to be needed in terms of how the project would interact with actions going on at the base, if any potential security threats might happen because of any sort of noise or impacts that these devices might have by being in the water. So I wouldn't say any opposition or support specifically, but we are definitely in contact with them.

We have people here tonight from the base. We had people here earlier this afternoon representing Camp Pendleton, and I think the consensus was that they are going to be involved, more information is needed, and, you know, if this project moves forward, we will

definitely need to be in close consultation with them because this is a unique situation. We don't often have FERC projects that involve Department of Defense lands or waters.

ANDREA SWAYNE: I know of one ocean-water, generating test going on at a military base in Hawaii. Have -- are there any -- has there been any talk about that being a model for it?

So I know it's happened. So I know that the military is open to letting this happen, but has that been talked about yet?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I don't think -- I'm not familiar with the one that you are referring to. So I'm guessing that using that as an example has not been brought up. But, as I said, we at FERC are -- we are not necessarily for or against a particular project, but we are definitely open to making projects -- helping them to work within our processes, and our processes include the involvement of other agencies. So we are definitely open to creative ways of making projects work or interacting with other agencies that may be involved when unique situations arise like this.

JOSEPH HASSELL: The Marines pointed out to us this afternoon that the location of the proposed project is in front of San Onofre State Beach, but that

is under a lease to the state --

ANDREA SWAYNE: The state parks.

JOSEPH HASSELL: -- department and parks, which expires in -- I forget what they said.

LARRY RANNALS: 2021.

JOSEPH HASSELL: They also pointed out that they are -- in their letter, this was -- they are responsible for training Marines in amphibious operations. And you can obviously make the connection there between those types of operations and having the wave farm in front of their facility, in front of their land.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Just lots of different intricacies to consider as we move forward with this project to see how it will interact with not only environmental resources, but other operations that are going on: SONGS, Camp Pendleton, et cetera.

ANDREA SWAYNE: With the lease expiring in -- was it 2021? --

JOSEPH HASSELL: I think that's right.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I think that's what they said.

ANDREA SWAYNE: -- 2021, has there been any talk of taking it back from the state park? Nobody has said anything definitively?

LARRY RANNALS: It's too early to determine that.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I think it was raised earlier this afternoon that that could be a possibility.

LARRY RANNALS: That's a possibility.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: But it has not yet been determined.

LARRY RANNALS: It has not been determined.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Bill?

BILL TOMAN: Bill Toman. Just a point of information. The test facility in Hawaii -- Oahu, Kaneohe Bay -- is offshore of a Marine base there. It's a Marine/Navy facility. So it's a federal facility that's testing a single-buoy --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

BILL TOMAN: -- generator there for the New Jersey ocean power technology, and, therefore, it's not a FERC jurisdiction as of yet.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: As of yet, yeah. Great. Thank you for that clarification.

RICK WILLIAMS: Rick Williams, SAIC. For Dr. Kim's information, the Kaneohe Marine Base is part of an initiative by the University of Hawaii with the Department of Energy on National Marine -- Hawaiian

National Marine Renewable Energy Center, and its mission is to test devices such as your concept in the early phase. So it is intended to be a place to test and answer many of the questions that you are being asked.

DR. CHONG KIM: Okay. We are trying to test, actually, our prototype. Then we will get more -- I think the data coming from the prototype will be more valuable than the other area. That's what I tried to do. And, of course, you know, the test procedure, the commission for testing is not that complicated to undergo right now. So we might be able to get that one easy. This one has been a tough one.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Are there any other questions regarding JD Products' proposed project in terms of where it's going to be sited and what facilities would be associated with that? Okay.

ANDREW SWAYNE: I have one thing I'd like to clarify. Andrea Swayne. Many people are under the impression -- now, certainly, in my story, I was careful not to give the impression that the initial -- your initial -- now I'm losing the word in my head.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Proposal?

ANDREA SWAYNE: I'm sorry.

RICK WILLIAMS: PAD?

ANDREA SWAYNE: Yeah, that the PAD doesn't mean that this thing is going to be tested tomorrow or next month, you know. It had been reported -- I think the thing that got a lot of people around here a little up in arms was a report that said that Dr. Kim had been granted -- I'm sorry.

JOSEPH HASSELL: A preliminary permit?

ANDREA SWAYNE: No. I'm sorry. I've been out all day. Permission to -- what is the first process, an initial --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Integrated Licensing Process?

ANDREA SWAYNE: No.

JOSEPH HASSELL: I think it's the preliminary permit.

DR. CHONG KIM: Preliminary permit.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Are you talking --

JOSEPH HASSELL: He's received a preliminary permit.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Yeah, the permit, that's the thing that got -- that's the thing that got everybody up in arms was the word "permit," that he had been issued a permit. And I think people had more of a misconception that "permit" meant that he was approved to start testing this thing.

Exactly what does, in layman's terms, the permit allow? It just allows him, in layman's terms, like, dibs on the area, basically?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. You are exactly right.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Okay.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: A permit does not authorize any construction, any operation, et cetera. It solely gives JD Products first rights to study the feasibility of a project being developed at a specific site. It does not authorize any action other than a study.

ANDREA SWAYNE: So it gives JD Products authorization to -- I'm sorry -- what? -- to initiate a --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: It gives JD Products the authorization to study the feasibility of a project at a specific location.

JOSEPH HASSELL: For three years.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: And it lasts for three years.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Okay. That's what I was trying to get at. Sorry, I couldn't pull that word out of my head.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: That's okay.

ANDREA SWAYNE: That happens sometimes.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Any other questions about the project or the process? Yes.

LARRY RANNALS: Larry Rannals again. Did I understand that our next opportunity to comment on this is up until the 21st of February?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Correct. We are currently in a scoping phase --

LARRY RANNALS: Right.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: -- which includes --

LARRY RANNALS: To submit comments related to the scoping?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: -- comments on Scoping Document 1 as well as comments in general on the project, particular study requests that -- because existing information is not already out there, specific needs that will need to be addressed pertaining to the project. So that will be up until the 21st.

LARRY RANNALS: Okay.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: But that's not to say that that is the only time --

LARRY RANNALS: I understand.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: -- it would be open for comments, but it's the time that we are in right now. Okay. I think we are about ready to move on to the

next part of the meeting, which is the identification of issues as well as alternatives, what available information is out there already, what study needs might need to be developed and looked at, and then identifying cumulative issues and the scope of this project.

If you all have the scoping document, I encourage you to turn to page -- so it starts on page -- the bottom of page 15, and it goes to the next couple of pages, but is where commission staff initially --

Based on information included in JD Products' PAD as well as comments that were included in the PAD from various entities, we tried to identify a list of issues per resource section that we felt needed to be evaluated further for this project.

One thing that we take a look at is cumulative effects. So that could mean based on all kinds of operations that might be going on in the area, other facilities, other plants. All of these things working together might have cumulative impacts on various environmental resources. So, in our document, when you get to the section on "Resource Areas," we have asterisks next to certain bulleted points that identifies that we think there would be a cumulative

impact associated with that particular area under a resource.

So, right now, initially, we identified cumulative effects to geology and soils, threatened and endangered species, aquatic resources and marine mammals, reptiles, birds, and we also look at the geographic scope, as I mentioned earlier. And because we are a staff at FERC or from Washington, DC, we are not exactly real familiar with the local region, we are looking for input from all of you as to what geographic scope we should be looking at whenever we are looking at this project's impact. So if you do decide to provide comments, whether verbally tonight or in written format and you have some input as to what the geographic scope should be, we would value that input from you.

Now, getting into individual resource issues, these are the ones that we identified in the scoping document. These are a fairly standard list that, per National Environmental Policy Act requirements, this is what we typically look at in our environmental documents that we prepare. So I did not put a slide down that listed each bullet under each resource. I'm going to, kind of, go over those with you verbally from the scoping document.

But we did identify resource issues related to geology soils, aquatic resources, terrestrial T and E, recreation, land use, aesthetics, cultural resources, as well as developmental resources.

So I'll go through these individually. As I said, this is just an initial list that we identified based on information that we got from JD Products' PAD as well as input that all of the stakeholders initially provided on the PAD. But this is a time where I'd like to have an open discussion, an open forum. If you think that there's items under here that we forgot to mention or if you think some of the bulleted items that we did include aren't necessarily applicable to this project or this particular area, we would like to hear your feedback.

So, for geology and soil resources, we identified the effects of changes in wave energy on sediment transport processes. We also identified the effects of geologic hazards. This could include seismic activity, ground-shaking, tsunamis, et cetera, on the proposed project's stability and structural integrity.

So I just want to open the floor. If you have any particular comments or input that you'd like to provide on geology and soil resources, we welcome your

comments. And, again, I want to emphasize, this is kind of a -- not meaning to put you on the spot type of meeting, but after you go back, when you have more time to digest the various materials that you may have received tonight, if there's something that comes to mind that you didn't verbally say tonight, towards the end of the meeting, I will describe in detail how you can file written comments, either on paper or electronically, with the Commission. And you'll, as I said, have up until February 21st to do that. So don't feel like, if you don't speak tonight, this is your last opportunity to comment because there is still about another month left for you to provide written comments.

If there's no comments on geology and soils, I will move on to the next resource which, in here, I sort of umbrellaed it under "Aquatic Resources," but it's going to include both water resources and aquatics. So I'll read through this list and let you think about that for a few moments. Under "Water Resources": "Effects of installation on water quality including sediment re-suspension; effects of antifouling paint or coatings on water quality"; and the "potential effects of spills of hydraulic/fuel oil on water quality."

Under "Aquatic Resources," we identified "electromagnetic effects on aquatic resources; attraction of predators and increased predation on fishes; effects on species composition/interactions as a result of attraction to project structures; alteration of seabed habitat and effects of installation; effects on invertebrate populations resulting from alteration of seabed habitat and project installation; effects of underwater noise or vibration on fish; potential entrainment of fish resulting in injury or mortality"; and, finally, "effects of changes in wave energy on littoral and shoreline aquatic habitat."

So I know that's a pretty lengthy list, lots to take in; but, again, I open up the floor for some open discussion if you have any added bullets that you want to provide or any added considerations that you'd like us to take into effect.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Bill Whittenberg. I'm just looking at the next item, 2, and it identifies cetacean impacts and entanglement, but wouldn't the noise and vibration issues apply there as well?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I'm sorry. Which bullet are you looking at?

BILL WHITTENBERG: Well, you have -- under

4.2.3, "Aquatic Resources," you identify "Effects of underwater noise/vibration on fish." Okay. Then, under 4.2.4, you identify effects on cetaceans. Wouldn't the noise impacts affect cetaceans as well?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. I mean, as I said, this list is not all-encompassing. So a lot of times the impacts will apply across resources. And even though we didn't list it specifically, I'm glad that you brought it up because that makes sure that we identify that particular impact as something that could happen across multi-resources.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Right.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: So thank you for pointing that out. Yes. Any other comments on water or aquatic resources?

Okay. The next section is sort of specific under "Terrestrial Resources," and this is marine mammals, reptiles, and birds. We initially identified these following impacts: Potential for whale and sea turtle injury or entanglement and migration effects; potential use of OWEG as haul-outs by sea lions and seals; potential for collisions with ocean/water vessels by marine mammals; acclimation, avoidance, disruption of foraging by marine mammals due to noise from vessels, construction, and devices; impacts on

behavior, orientation and navigation of marine mammals due to electric and magnetic fields from devices; attraction of marine mammals to artificial lighting on devices, making them more susceptible to prey; potential for offshore avian species to collide with OWEG; potential for use of above-surface structures for roosting and nesting sites by marine birds; effects of oils and other chemicals released on land or offshore to marine birds; potential for localized changes to food webs, potentially affecting prey availability for marine birds; potential for wave action changes along the shoreline, thus affecting both sandy beach habitat and the behavior of shorebirds using that habitat for foraging"; and, finally, "effects of siting the project near breeding colonies of marine birds."

Any thoughts or comments on that section?

Again, I want to emphasize that a lot of the information that we identify here initially as potential impacts we did glean from comments that were included as part of JD Products' PAD that were letters received from various stakeholders, agencies, NGOs, the public, et cetera. So we did look at all of those letters that were provided to Dr. Kim as comments on his PAD and used those to come up with some of these bullets that we have been discussing here tonight.

The next two sections I'm going to combine together. They are "Terrestrial Resources" and "T and E Species," "Threatened and Endangered Species." Under "Terrestrial Resources," we identified "Impacts to terrestrial vegetation, terrestrial wildlife, and ecological communities on the shore due to the installation of a transmission cable enclosed in an underground tunnel; impacts to terrestrial vegetation, terrestrial wildlife, and ecological communities on the shore due to the construction of an assembly line for fabricating the OWEG devices, a warehouse, a loading dock, and a parking lot."

And one thing I do want to point out on this particular bullet is, based on discussions we had at the earlier afternoon meeting, we remembered that JD Products is proposing to put in that access road that I mentioned that's going to be near SONGS. So we want to add after "parking lot" as well as the access-road impacts of putting that in.

Under "T and E Species," we said "Impacts to Endangered Species Act listed species due to noise, contaminants, artificial lighting, presence of the OWEG structures, entrainment, and exposure to electric and magnetic fields."

At the bottom of that page, we have a footnote

draught that identifies, based on Fish and Wildlife Service lists and NOAA Fisheries' lists the threatened and endangered species that might be present in the area of this project. There were a couple others mentioned earlier this afternoon that we need to consider.

And I also want to point out that we are aware that there are California species that are listed as state species of concern that are considered state-listed, and we are not excluding those. We typically analyze them under "Terrestrial Resources" and save the species that are federally listed to be discussed under a specific section that we call "Threatened and Endangered Species."

So this doesn't mean that we are excluding the California special-status species and species of concern, but we will refer to those under the "Terrestrial Resources" section if and when we would get to an environmental document.

So were there any comments that you all would like to provide? Any particular study requests that you can think of that might be relevant for "Terrestrial Resources" and "T and E Species"?

BILL WHITTENBERG: Bill Whittenberg again. I haven't had the opportunity to look at this in detail,

but do the devices -- or will there be anything projecting above sea level?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes.

DR. CHONG KIM: Yes, a little bit, about eight feet.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Do they become a potential habitat for sea creatures?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: That is something that should be looked at for this project. In our experience with other hydrokinetic projects that have some sort of buoy or any projection sticking out of the water, they can become landing areas, roosting sites for many birds. Several marine mammals like to crawl out and sunbathe on them sometimes. So there is that potential, and that would definitely be something that should be looked at.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Okay.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

BILL WHITTENBERG: I'm not sure if it's in the next item, but would those protrusions become navigation hazards?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I know we -- this is kind of just me talking to myself. I know we have something in here about that.

LARRY RANNALS: That's what it is, science.

It would be --

DR. CHONG KIM: You and I have some sort of a beam. So you mean the navigation of fish or human -- fish or --

BILL WHITTENBERG: -- vessel navigation.

DR. CHONG KIM: We have plans to have a beam. So there's a warning. If you hit the beam, there's a warning there. So it will let the pilot know that you are coming into an area, there is something in there. So it will try to exclude the area that way.

BILL WHITTENBERG: I think it ought to be covered as part of the resources.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I don't see it listed under any specific resource here, but that's definitely an item of concern that should be looked at. So I don't know exactly what overarching category we would throw that under, maybe land use.

LARRY RANNALS: Ocean use, the next one.

JOSEPH HASSELL: Yeah.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: And I don't see that, but thank you for that comment, and we'll make sure that that's an item that's analyzed.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Because it seems to me that I've seen quite a few fishing vessels and, I'm sure, naval vessels go in that area as well.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Sure. Well, with that beautiful lead-in that he provided us, we will go to "Recreation, Ocean Use, and Land Use," and then I'll throw in "Aesthetics" on the next page as well. So we've identified "effects on recreational and commercial fishing, beach use, surfing and other recreational activities; effects on the U.S. Marine Corps training area and Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base; effects of surf swells and breaks utilized by the public for recreational activities; effects on public access to the state park and beaches." And under "Aesthetics": "Effects of sand movement including the potential displacement of sand on beaches affecting the natural scenery" and the "effect of the visibility of exposed OWEGs on the natural scenery of the ocean." Besides for the -- it's Bill, right?

BILL WHITTENBERG: Right.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Besides for the one that Bill mentioned in terms of adding potential navigational hazards imposed by the project, are there any other recreation, ocean use, land use, or aesthetic impacts that anyone wants to raise or discuss?

Okay. Next, "Cultural Resources." The "effects of the construction of an assembly line for fabricating the OWEG devices, a warehouse, a loading

dock, and a parking lot" -- I'm going to add in there "access road" -- "on previously undiscovered archeological remains that may be present."

While you are contemplating that one, I do want to point out that, in the earlier meeting, someone mentioned a good point where a lot of times it just says "effects of the construction of." And one thing that we are going to add in there for our consideration is "effects of the construction and operation of." So if this project would become operational, the operations are something that we would like to see how that would impact all of these resources.

Okay. And then the final point here, I'll combine these into two. We are going to look at "Socioeconomics" and "Developmental Resources." We've identified as an issue or potential issue "Effects of the project on the local economy of San Diego County and the nearby city of San Clemente."

I believe I mentioned earlier we should probably throw in Dana Point as well as some of the smaller communities. Bill?

BILL WHITTENBERG: You might just simply identify Orange County --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay.

BILL WHITTENBERG: -- as the affected area

because you identify San Diego County. If you just say "San Diego," Orange County is not going to be covered.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Okay. Great. Thank you for that. And then, under "Developmental Resources," "Effects of potential operational changes on the energy and capacity benefits of the project and effects of funding various protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures on the cost of project power."

Okay. On any of the resources that we talked about, is there anything that anybody wants to mention? And in particular, if you, off the top of your head, want to mention any study requests that you think would be needed to accomplish any of these identified issues, please feel free to share with us.

Okay. The next section is sort of a repeat of what we just did, but I do want to -- that last part was more of an open-discussion forum for us to have pertaining to the issues. But if anybody would like to make a more formal comment verbally, please feel free to come up, center, in the middle, for everyone to see and provide those comments. But, as I said, there's always that opportunity to do so in a written format as well, but we did want to give that public option tonight.

One thing that I wanted to mention to you

is -- one of the things that the Commission looks at and we've actually identified here in our scoping document are comprehensive plans that may be in existence for a particular area, a particular watershed, a particular river, any particular species, et cetera. So there are many different types of comprehensive plans out there. And if there's anything that you know of that pertains to your particular agency or a particular NGO group that you work with, any sort of state plan that may be of interest to this project, I'd ask you to submit that to FERC for consideration as a comprehensive plan.

We do have people at the Commission who review these plans to make sure they meet the requirements of what's considered a comprehensive plan, but if you have that, we want to make sure that any document that we prepare on environment issues would not conflict with any of the proposed managements of certain areas or certain species. So if you do have comprehensive plans that you would like to make official with FERC, please file those.

There are directions on our Web site, www.ferc.gov, that explains how to do this electronically if you so desire.

Also, I'd like to extend the invitation to be

part of the mailing list. I know many of you already are. A couple weeks ago, I tried to send out an email to as many people that we could identify as possible, people that we got through Dr. Kim, comment letters that we received where it was contact information. I tried to send out an email just clarifying with everybody who would like to be part of the mailing list for the project, and a good number of you responded back. So that's great. You should see, if you responded back affirmatively, that your name is at the back of this document.

If you know of other people that may have an interest in the project and aren't on the mailing list, Section 10.0 of the scoping document tells you how to submit a request to be part of the mailing list. And, also, you could send myself or Ken Hogan an email requesting to be added to the mailing list for this particular project, and we can make sure that you are included. And that way, anytime a document is issued by FERC or is filed by JD Products or any other entity, you are included as part of that mailing.

Again, I want to reiterate that, by February 21st of this year, any comments that you have on the PAD -- further comments on the PAD, comments on Scoping Document 1, any study requests that you have

identified, as well as if you have an interest in being a cooperating agency -- this is extended to our state agencies or our federal agencies that might be present tonight that would like to participate as a cooperating agency -- those requests and comments need to be filed with us by, as I said, February 21st, and you can do this a number of ways.

First of all, any correspondence that you prepare should clearly show at the top of each -- of the first page "San Onofre Electricity Farm Project" as well as the FERC project number, which, in this case, is P-13679-002. You can either file your comments electronically -- again, if you go to www.ferc.gov, there is a link you can click on that will take you to how to do things electronically, and eFiling is one of those. Or if you like to do it the postal way, you can file an original and seven copies with the secretary of our commission, and the address is provided here in this slide, 888 First Street Northeast, Washington, DC 20426.

Our online Web site has a plethora of information that you can use for this project and any other project. There are directions and methods of eFiling, eComments, eSubscription, which is a nice way to, sort of, sign up to be notified when certain things

happen on a project. So, as I said, if FERC issues a document, if JD Products files something, or if any other entity files something, you'll receive an email notification that a new record has been added to the file for this project so that you were kept up to date as to what's going on.

And the eLibrary site on FERC's Web site is sort of the whole library of every single record/document that's been provided for this project as well as others. So you can go in there and sort of see the history of what's been taking place. Again, our Web site is www.ferc.gov.

And at this time, I'd like to ask for any concluding comments, any other thoughts that you'd like to provide. Myself as well as Mary and Joe will be around. And I'm assuming Dr. Kim will hang out for a little bit as well. If there is anything you'd like to ask specifically about eFiling, about the Web site, comprehensive plans, we'll be here to answer your questions.

Again, any other comments or thoughts that you'd like to provide? Okay. I'd like to remind you, in the document, this information -- I'm sorry. In Scoping Document 1, this information is included. Tomorrow, at 9 a.m., Dr. Kim and FERC staff will be

hosting an environmental site review out at the proposed location or as close as we can get as possible. From what I understand -- I haven't been there yet, but there's some fairly high bluffs that we might not be able to navigate down. But if you are interested in participating in that site visit, we are asking everybody to meet at 9 a.m. at the parking area just inside San Onofre State Park -- State Beach. They described it as -- once you get in there, there's a $15 fee, but, for tomorrow's purposes, that will be waived for everybody that mentions that they are there for the site visit. And there's a Trail No. 1 that's sort of a central parking area or meeting location.

So that's where we will be tomorrow at 9 a.m. If you would like to come out and have some more fun with us, we'll be there. Yes.

ANDREA SWAYNE: Is that inside the campground gates or inside the San Onofre Surf Beach gate?

JOSEPH HASSELL: It's not the surf beach. It's the campground.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: It's the campground.

ANDREA SWAYNE: The campground?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. So, again, that's --

BILL WHITTENBERG: Is that the one off of Cristianitos?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: It's off of -- it's at the end of Basilone Road.

JOSEPH HASSELL: Go past SONGS.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I think the road dead-ends.

BILL WHITTENBERG: It's the off-ramp for SONGS:

LARRY RANNALS: It's the off-ramp for SONGS. You go past SONGS.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Yeah. You turn left and go through the national guard --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: If you picked up the document, the information is there. Take Exit 71 off of Interstate 5 for Basilone Road. Travel south. Go past SONGS, and the road will pretty much end at the entrance station to the state beach camping -- campground and parking.

BILL WHITTENBERG: Okay.

LARRY RANNALS: The general intention for the site visit? Just to look the area over?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Pretty much. I'm hoping that Dr. Kim will be able to point out "That's where I'm -- down there is where I'm proposing the access road. Here is where I'm thinking the assembly line for the manufacturing will go."

DR. CHONG KIM: Not that much. That's a really wide area. I mean, if you walk it, it's about a hundred feet down, and that's -- so all we could do is go there and look. Basically, I will say, "This area, we are interested in." That's all I can say.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I mean, usually, for --

DR. CHONG KIM: Where the road is going to be.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: We always do site visits for projects, and for conventional hydropower, we can walk and say, "Here is the power house, and here is the pen stock." But this is a little bit unique in its location. So it's pretty much, "There's the ocean."

DR. CHONG KIM: That's it, basically.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: "This is where, generally, these facilities will be located." So it's sort of just to kind of get -- I mean, we've never been there. So it's important for FERC staff to, kind of, see what area we are dealing with.

JOSEPH HASSELL: I went this morning, and I think the first impression you will get is, I guess, the impressions of some challenges that are --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Terrain challenges.

JOSEPH HASSELL: -- terrain challenges, and you also -- there will probably be people -- well, 9:00, they might not be out yet, but maybe so. There

will probably be some surfers out. The waves were very nice this morning. I guess you will see where the breaks are. Of course, the breaks are nowhere near -- I mean, the breaks are close to shore. And 2,000 feet, I guess people can see what 2,000 feet offshore is going to look like. It's going to look like -- there's not going to be anything breaking out there.

LARRY RANNALS: It's out there.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I mean, to be honest, Mary and I just want to go to the beach. So --

BILL WHITTENBERG: That wasn't on the record.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: I think it was. But, again, any concluding comments or questions about the resource areas that we talked about tonight or the agenda for tomorrow?

ANDREA SWAYNE: Will the transcripts be available for us to look over from the earlier meeting today?

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. They will take about two weeks for our court reporter to go back to her location that she's headquartered out of, review the tapes that -- she's also been taping the meetings just to make sure she's got everything -- and prepare the transcripts, and then they will be available on the FERC Web site. Again, if you go to that eLibrary, type

in "P-13679," they will be submitted as part of the record. So you will be able to refer to --

ANDREA SWAYNE: What was that again? P-1- --

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: P-13679. So if you enter in that criteria into the various search boxes, you'll be able to pull up the entire record for this project. And like I said, in about two weeks, the transcripts will be available.

BILL WHITTENBERG: The project number is on the document.

CAROLYN TEMPLETON: Yes. And the project number is on SD1 in the back here.

Okay. Well, I'd like to thank each and every one of you for coming out tonight and participating in the meeting. Again, we'll be hanging around afterwards if you have any other questions. I do have some business cards for myself and for Ken Hogan, which I'm graciously giving out. So, if you would like those, grab me, and I will get them to you. But, again, thank you for your participation, and we look forward to seeing you in the future. Have a good night.

(End of proceedings.)