

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
26

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x
Great Lakes Hydro America, LLC Docket No. P-2520-072
- - - - - x

Mattaceunk Hydroelectric Project

Gateway Inn
1963 Medway Road
Medway, Maine 04460
Wednesday, June 5, 2013

The evening scoping meeting, pursuant to notice,
convened at 7:05 p.m., before a Staff Panel:

- RACHEL McNAMARA, Project Coordinator, FERC
- THOMAS CHANDLER, Esq, OGC, FERC
- STEPHEN BOWLER, Aquatic Resources, FERC
- ADAM PEER, Threatened and Endangered Species,
FERC
- SEAN MURPHY, Terrestrial Resources, FERC
- MICHAEL SPENCER, Engineering, FERC

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
26

ATTENDEES

Great Lakes Hydro America/Brookfield

DENNIS ROSEBUSH

KEVIN BERNIER

JAMES COLE

HDR Engineering:

JIM GIBSON

KELLY MacVANE

PETER BROWNE

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MS. McNAMARA: This is the evening scoping
3 meeting for the Mattaceunk Hydroelectric Project No. 2520.
4 There aren't any new attendees here, so I think we just
5 wanted to summarize some of the information that we learned
6 at the site visit. And I didn't have anything, but you all
7 may have.

8 MR. PEER: I just wanted to go over a couple of
9 questions that I asked earlier today. One of them was
10 regarding the upstream fishway maintenance repair in terms
11 of what you all were planning on conducting in the upstream
12 fishway.

13 MR. BERNIER: Kevin Bernier, Great Lakes Hydro.
14 We plan to de-water the fishway tomorrow to
15 inspect it and take a closer look at where we need to focus
16 our efforts during this summer's drawdown. It will be
17 repairs to the timbers in the fishway and to the concrete
18 floors.

19 So we don't have the total scope right now, but
20 we'll have a better one after tomorrow; have to de-water it
21 and take a closer look. And the engineers are going to do
22 that tomorrow.

23 MR. PEER: The other question was regarding the
24 downstream fishway in terms of -- the PAD indicated that
25 there were concerns regarding the effectiveness of the
26

1 downstream fishway. I was wondering, what types of concerns
2 there were; and it also indicated that there were -- you
3 were going to look at some improvement opportunities for the
4 downstream fishway?

5 MR. BERNIER: Yes. We had a consultant look at
6 the fishway, and they are preparing a report. It was a
7 fishway expert, and they're going to prepare a report and
8 make recommendations for improvements. We haven't gotten
9 the report yet, but we have plans to improve the fishway in
10 our species protection plan that's in place right now
11 through the salmon endangered species listing.

12 So we've got plans to do that work, but again the
13 scope hasn't been defined yet on what we're going to do. On
14 the efficiency, there's a lot of information on bypass
15 efficiency, and it's generally been 40 to 60 percent,
16 somewhere in there, for smolts, for Atlantic salmon smolts.
17 And the agencies would like to see a higher percentage, so
18 that's what we're going to do, is to try and improve that
19 bypass efficiency.

20 MR. PEER: Okay. And then in terms of the
21 effectiveness of log sluice as a downstream bypass, have
22 there been any studies on that or are there any data on the
23 effectiveness of the log sluice?

24 MR. BERNIER: The previous licensee was Great
25 Northern Paper. They did some effectiveness studies on the
26

1 log sluice in the early Nineties; and my recollection is it
2 wasn't very effective at that time. So it wasn't used as a
3 downstream bypass. The studies were done before the
4 existing fishway was installed, and that was part of the
5 reason that the fishway was installed; because the log
6 sluice wasn't effective enough.

7 But when we have to spill water, we use the log
8 sluice as a first spill route, as a first way to discharge
9 water, because it's a better route for the fish to get
10 downstream than under the roll gate. And that's another
11 item that's in the species protection plan that we filed
12 with National Marine Fisheries Service.

13 MR. PEER: Okay. That might be it for me.

14 MR. BOWLER: I just wanted to ask whether there
15 is any -- this is Stephen Bowler with FERC -- any
16 relationship between the downstream salmon passage
17 settlement and your project, or if you're completely
18 separate from that agreement?

19 MR. BERNIER: You're talking about the Penobscot?

20 MR. BOWLER: The comprehensive --. Yes, the
21 Penobscot.

22 MR. BERNIER: Restoration project?

23 MR. BOWLER: Yes.

24 MR. BERNIER: Yes, we're completely separate from
25 that. The only slight link is that we are doing the
26

1 drawdown this summer to do the work on, the dam safety work
2 at the dam, and we were encouraged to do it this year
3 because of the downstream removal of Veazie Dam. So that
4 the water management for the river can accommodate both
5 projects in the same year.

6 But that's totally separate; what's going on down
7 below.

8 MR. BOWLER: Thank you.

9 MS. McNAMARA: I didn't have I needed to cover
10 this evening.

11 So we will leave the record open for a bit
12 longer, since no one else is here yet.

13 MR. BOWLER: Do you want to go off the record?

14 MS. McNAMARA: Sure.

15 MR. BOWLER: So we can chit-chat --

16 MS. McNAMARA: While we wait.

17 (Discussion off the record.)

18 MS. McNAMARA: We'll go ahead and close the
19 record for this evening, and just a reminder that you can
20 file comments by the 29th.

21 MR. BOWLER: Thank you for accommodating the site
22 visit today; it was very effective.

23 MS. McNAMARA: Yes, very, very helpful.

24 (Whereupon, at 7:16 p.m., the evening scoping
25 period concluded.)