

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
Office of Energy Projects
Division of Hydropower Licensing

- - - - -x
PacifiCorp Energy : Project No. 2337-076-Oregon
- - - - -x

PROSPECT NO. 3 HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, P-2337

Ramada Medford & Cnf Center
Rogue Conference Room
2250 Biddle Road
Medford, Oregon 97504
Tuesday, September 24, 2013

The public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened
at 9 a.m., before a Staff Panel:

DIANNE RODMAN, Project Coordinator, FERC

with:

STEVE ALBERTELLI, Pacificorp

1 A T T E N D E E S

2 Dianne Rodman, FERC

3 Sean W. O'Neill, FERC

4 Kelly Wolcott, FERC

5 Matt Cutlip, FERC

6 John Matkowski, FERC

7 Michael Tust, FERC

8 Carolyn Clarkin, FERC

9

10 Steve Albertelli, PacifiCorp

11 Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp

12 Peter Sukraw, PacifiCorp

13 Bob Roach, PacifiCorp

14 Kaylea Foster, PacifiCorp

15

16 Mary Graineey, OWRD

17 Ann Reece, OWRD

18 Peter Samarin, ODFW

19 Dan Van Dyke, ODFW

20 David Harris, ODFW

21 Ken Homolka, ODFW

22 Chris Stine, ODEQ

23

24 Brian R. Barr, GEOS Institute

25 John Ward, Rogue Flyfishers

26

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

2 MS. RODMAN: It is 9 o'clock. I'd like to
3 welcome you all to the scoping meeting for Prospect 3,
4 Project 2337. This is a relicensing of the project, and
5 PacifiCorp, the licensee, has elected to use the Integrated
6 Licensing Process, which we'll probably frequently refer to
7 as ILP.

8 I am Dianne Rodman, the Coordinator of the
9 relicensing effort for the Commission. I'm a terrestrial
10 biologist.

11 I've got a number of people with me, many of whom
12 are actually relatively new staff who are attending mainly
13 as a training exercise. However, somebody who is not on
14 training is Matt Cutlip, our senior fishery biologist. He's
15 based out of our Portland regional office; however,
16 everybody else including myself come from Washington, D.C.

17 Then we have Kelly Wolcott, a terrestrial
18 biologist. Mike Tust, a fishery biologist. Carolyn
19 Clarkin, an attorney. Don't get excited, we're not thinking
20 of any horrible legal issues; Carolyn is just, also
21 training. John Matkowski, the project's fishery biologist.
22 And Sean O'Neill, a civil engineer?

23 MR. O'NEILL: Yes.

24 MS. RODMAN: Civil engineer, okay.

25 Also we have somebody very important; we have Mr.

26

1 Dan Hawkins, our court reporter. Because Dan is making a
2 transcript, it will help him a lot if you identify yourself
3 before you speak. He has also warned me that if there is
4 cross-talk, that will be a mess for him, and he will -- I've
5 authorized him to stop everything and get it under control
6 so that we have a decent transcript.

7 Also, we have representatives from PacifiCorp
8 here. Steve?

9 MR. ALBERTELLI: I'm Steve Albertelli, the
10 Project Relicensing Manager and terrestrial scientist.

11 MR. SUKRAW: Pete Sukraw, the Director of Hydro
12 South, which includes Rogue River operations.

13 MR. GARRETT: I'm Monte Garrett, I'm a program
14 manager for compliance out of Portland.

15 MS. RODMAN: Okay, great. Could we have the
16 other participants, starting with this end, identify
17 themselves?

18 MR. BARR: Sure. Brian Barr with the Geos
19 Institute, which is a conservation group based in Ashland,
20 Oregon.

21 MR. SAMARIN: Peter Samarin, Oregon Department of
22 Fish & Wildlife, the assistant district fish biologist.

23 MR. STINE: Chris Stine, Oregon Department of
24 Environmental Quality.

25 MS. REECE: Ann Reece, Oregon Water Resources
26

1 Department.

2 MS. GRAINEY: Mary Graineey, Oregon Water
3 Resources Department.

4 MR. BURNS: Rob Burns with the U.S. Fish &
5 Wildlife Service, out of the Roseburg field office.

6 MR. HARRIS: David Harris, Oregon Department of
7 Fish & Wildlife.

8 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Department of
9 Fish & Wildlife. I'm the hydropower program leader in
10 Salem.

11 MS. RODMAN: Okay, that's it, then.

12 I think we're all pretty savvy, so you know that
13 there's a sign-up sheet by the door, and we have extra
14 copies of the scoping document if you didn't bring some of
15 if you want to take more back to the office.

16 [People entering conference room.]

17 We were just going through introductions. Okay,
18 and here's some more people.

19 MR. VAN DYKE: Dan Van Dyke, Oregon Fish &
20 Wildlife, district fish biologist.

21 MS. RODMAN: Great.

22 MR. ROACH: I'm Bob Roach, I'm with PacifiCorp
23 Energy.

24 MS. RODMAN: All right. Thank you.

25 The transcript of this meeting and the evening
26

1 meeting will be available on the FERC website in two weeks,
2 something like that. However, if for some reason you're
3 deeply interested in this transcript and you want it
4 immediately, you can talk with Dan after the meeting and he
5 will tell you how to do it. Of course there will be a per
6 page charge, whereas our website, there's no charge. But if
7 for some reason you really, really care, that's a
8 possibility.

9 The other thing is, if you received a copy of the
10 scoping document through the mail and you're not in the
11 mailing list in the back of the document, then that means
12 that the hard copy scoping document that you received is the
13 only one you will receive, unless you affirmatively request
14 being put on the Commission's mailing list.

15 In particular, in a few years you would not
16 receive a hard copy of the environmental assessment, or EA.
17 So to be placed on the mailing list, follow the instructions
18 on the second page of the cover memo, the scoping document.
19 And if for some reason that becomes onerous, if you find
20 yourself received more paper from the Commission than you
21 want, there's also a way to get off the mailing list.

22 The best way to stay informed, however, is
23 eSubscribe, which I suspect most of you know about. The
24 process for eSubscribing is on page 18. You would get all
25 correspondence relating to this project, both incoming and
26

1 outgoing. It's a very good way to keep your finger on the
2 pulse of this process of preparing the application and
3 eventually processing it for the Commission to make its
4 decision.

5 You will receive a lot of strange correspondence
6 back and forth between PacifiCorp and our Division of Dam
7 Safety and Inspections; but that's the problem, you're
8 receiving everything.

9 Sign-up sheet, copy of the scoping document.

10 Could you identify yourself, please?

11 MS. FOSTER: Kaylea Foster of PacifiCorp.

12 MS. RODMAN: Great. Thank you.

13 Now, we are going on a site visit today. At 1
14 o'clock we're meeting in Prospect, and hopefully we'll
15 survive without getting too terribly drenched. We are
16 having a second meeting tonight at 7 o'clock, which you're
17 welcome to attend. It's a more convenient time for people
18 whose job is not a hydroelectric project; but anyone is
19 allowed to attend one, both, whatever.

20 The scoping document lists the purposes of
21 scoping on page 3. Basically what we're hoping to do today
22 is find out if we missed any resource issues that we should
23 have included, get a sense for which ones are really
24 important and which ones are kind of a minor distraction
25 that, once we get to analysis we can deal with in like a
26

1 short paragraph or something.

2 Also, if there's any information that PacifiCorp
3 did not know about, did not include in their preapplication
4 document, and -- I just said pre application document, but
5 the common abbreviation for that is P A D, or PAD. If that
6 information is available, then please inform PacifiCorp and
7 us about it so that we can do a really good resource
8 analysis.

9 At this point I'd like to have Steve give a
10 description of the PacifiCorp project, and we have a couple
11 of questions that you may or may not find interesting; these
12 are just Commission things.

13 So, Steve.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: We have a short PowerPoint here
15 to show you the project facilities, what our current
16 proposal is in the PAD for how you would plan to operate the
17 project under a new license, and then any studies that we
18 had proposed over the plan, we'll just touch on briefly.

19 MS. RODMAN: Steve, could you hold off on the
20 proposed studies until after we've done the resource issues?

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: I sure can, yes.

22 MS. RODMAN: Okay, thank you.

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: I thought we'd provide a little
24 context first just by going over where the project is in
25 relation to some things that you may be familiar with. The
26

1 large red line on the left of the frame is Highway 62. The
2 Town of Prospect is about 45 miles from Medford and about 30
3 miles from the South Gate of Crater Lake National Park.

4 You can see the interface with federal lands
5 there. The project area under the current license is the
6 gray polygon in the middle. The red ring or red polygon
7 around that is the project vicinity that we identified in
8 the pad, which is any lands within two miles of the project
9 area.

10 You can see on the right of the frame where the
11 diversion dam is identified at River Mile 10.5, that the
12 diversion dam and the upper portion of the waterway are on
13 Forest Service land. The Rogue River-Siskiyou National
14 Forest. Where the powerhouse is, it's identified there with
15 the arrow, and the project penstock -- in the scoping
16 document they're identified as being on Forest Service land,
17 but those are actually on PacifiCorp property. You can see
18 in that section of the upper right hand corner of Township
19 33 South, Range 3 East, that there's kind of a strange call-
20 out; the Forest Service probably owned all of that at one
21 point, but now it's just a portion of that section.

22 From the powerhouse, the rest of the project
23 boundary is the transmission line, which runs mainly east-
24 west. Across the plateau between Middle Fork and North Fork
25 through the town of Prospect, over the 62 and back over the
26

1 62 again to the Prospect central substation. There's also a
2 red blanket substation that it ties into to the west of Wed
3 Blanket Creek, but its terminus as far as the project is
4 concerned is there at the Prospect central substation. And
5 we'll be able to see that both in the slides coming up and
6 at the site visit you'll see the substation directly across
7 the street from where we're meeting at the project
8 warehouse.

9 I find it's also a little bit -- or provides more
10 context to look at an aerial here. It's hard to see the
11 project boundary there, but is identified in black. The
12 vast majority of the project, as we saw in the last slide,
13 is on private land, most of it owned by PacifiCorp. And you
14 can see the other surrounding private lands are dominated by
15 timber operations. It's pretty easy to pick out where water
16 courses are because it's where riparian buffers have been
17 left around the water courses; and you can also see that the
18 project boundary itself, especially the upper portion of the
19 waterway, remains intact as far as native vegetation and has
20 kind of a hard edge of habitat up against where there's
21 timber operations on both sides of it.

22 And you can also clearly see the demarcation of
23 the Forest Service lands there as well; those straight lines
24 along the section lines.

25 So we'll take a look at the project from top to
26

1 bottom, going downstream, but first a quick project
2 overview. It was originally constructed in 1931. There's a
3 couple of original construction photos there on the right.
4 The first one is of the saddles for the flow line. So this
5 is immediately downstream of the diversion before the water
6 goes up onto the plateau be the South Fork and the Middle
7 Fork. The vast majority of the waterway is on relatively
8 flat ground on that plateau be those two forks in the road.

9 It was placed in service on the 22nd of April,
10 1932. We maintain a water right of 152 cfs; that's diverted
11 from the South Fork by the South Fork Diversion Dam. And it
12 is a run-of-river project, so there is no significant
13 storage capacity here; the impoundment above the dam is
14 about an acre, and has a capacity of about 10 acre-feet.
15 And the forebay ahead of the penstock is very limited; it's
16 essentially just an expanded canal section.

17 The waterway itself, once the water is diverted,
18 is about 16,000 feet long, and again traverses that plateau
19 mainly. Once the water enters the penstock and goes down to
20 the powerhouse, it's meeting a 47-inch diameter, 10,000
21 horsepower vertical-shaft Francis turbine, under 693 feet of
22 net head.

23 It is a 7200 kW facility. There was some
24 confusion in both the PAD --

25 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

26

1 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes. Want me to address that?

2 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

3 MR. ALBERTELLI: In the PAD and the scoping
4 document, we identified that the hydraulic capacity is 7300
5 kW because of some upgrades that were made, but because the
6 generator capacity still limits the overall output of the
7 facility to 7200 kW or 7.2 Megawatts.

8 Does that address the question?

9 MS. RODMAN: Yes. We were wondering why it was
10 7,300 kW dependable capacity.

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes. So there was one point
12 where we identified 7300 hydraulic capacity, and then that
13 number got carried over to a later paragraph. We will
14 identify that and correct it in our comments to the scoping
15 document.

16 MS. RODMAN: Great. Thank you.

17 MR. ALBERTELLI: From the powerhouse, the
18 transmission line that we identified in the maps is about
19 seven miles long, it's a 69 kV line. And our current
20 license was issued January 30, 1989. It was made effective
21 the first day of the month, so it expires December 31st,
22 2018. And here we are involved in the Integrated Licensing
23 Process.

24 So from the top down, here we are looking at the
25 Diversion Dam. The Diversion Dam itself is concrete, it's
26

1 172 feet long, 24 feet high. On the upper right hand corner
2 of this slide you can see a look at the impoundment from
3 above. There is a Forest Service trail that traverses a
4 bluff up above, so this is looking downstream at the South
5 Fork Rogue, and Imnaha Creek is coming in on the right hand
6 side of that frame. The confluence of the Imnaha with South
7 Fork Rogue is immediately above the intake in the Diversion
8 Dam.

9 You can see the bluff that the picture was taken
10 from in both of those lower pictures; there's kind of an
11 exposed scarp right in the middle of the frame above the dam
12 on the lower right hand photo.

13 It is a 98-foot long, uncontrolled ogee, and as I
14 mentioned before, it's about a one acre impoundment. And
15 the Diversion Dam crest is at 3,375 foot elevation.

16 The photo on the lower left, you can see the
17 beginning of where the entrance to the fish ladder is taken
18 from the fish ladder gantry looking back at the dam itself.

19 The fish passage facilities, there's both
20 upstream and downstream facilities. The ladder is 86 feet
21 long, 15 pools, concrete ladder. Makes one switchback. If
22 you look at the right hand photo you can see the entrance.
23 There are six pools, then the switchback, enters the Upper
24 South Fork Road immediately below where that picture was
25 taken.

26

1 The downstream facility, you can see in the lower
2 left hand -- once it goes through our intake structure,
3 there is an open canal segment. That open canal segment
4 leads to the fish screen; that's in the lower right, which
5 is a quarter inch wedgewire inclined plane screen that has
6 about 200 square feet of surface area.

7 Once fish make it through that fish screen, you
8 can see they're funneled to a return pipe. In the lower
9 right hand picture just beyond, and to the left of the canal
10 you can see the return pipe; it's buried below surface
11 there. And there's a grading to the left where you can see,
12 they can be serviced and you can see the flow going through.

13 And then if you look in the lower left, I identified that
14 there are six pools before the switchback. You can see the
15 pipe; that's the fish return pipe, the bypass pipe, emptying
16 into pool six at the ladder.

17 Just beyond that open canal segment, and beyond
18 the fish screen, the project waters enter a woodstave
19 pipeline. We saw the saddles for that in that earlier
20 construction photo. It's a 66-inch diameter pipeline. It's
21 about a mile long, and it runs along the north side of the
22 South Fork canyon. The first several hundred feet is very
23 close to the water, but because of the way the canyon is
24 aligned and leading up to that plateau for the rest of the
25 waterway, it quickly ascends and you're up above the canyon.

26

1 That's somewhat expressed in that lower right hand photo,
2 although you just have the giant black shadow. Anybody that
3 works out here in the Cascades knows it's difficult to take
4 photos and represent both light and dark.

5 There are two wildlife underpasses that provide
6 habitat connectivity under the woodstave flow line. At the
7 terminus of the flow line, you can see that on the lower
8 left photo, it ends and there is a concrete transition
9 structure that opens up to the open concrete portion of the
10 waterway.

11 So this section is again a little over a mile
12 long. The open canal is fenced on both sides; at some
13 points it's very close to the canal; others, there is more
14 of a buffer zone and there are both shrubs and trees inside
15 that fence line. You can see the fence line very close to
16 the canal on the upper right hand photo on the right side of
17 the frame.

18 There are six wildlife crossings existing, that
19 are six feet wide. You can see on in the lower right. The
20 amount of funnel fencing there depends really on how close
21 the fence line is to the crossing itself. They are heavily
22 used; we do have a maintenance plan for those as a part of
23 the existing license. We check the fence line each year and
24 make sure that the crossings are in working order as well as
25 walking the entire flow line to make sure that that's in
26

1 order and those wildlife crossings are okay.

2 As I mentioned earlier, this portion of the
3 waterway is on that upper plateau between the two forks. In
4 the lower left, you can see where the open canal transitions
5 to the tunnel structure. The best picture of that -- well,
6 the best picture of that was really that first construction
7 photo that we saw, except in times of complete maintenance
8 shutdown and dewatering; you don't get in there, get a
9 picture of it very often. It's five feet wide by six and a
10 half feet high, and about 700 feet long.

11 From that tunnel, water exists to another open
12 canal section. The upper right hand photo is looking
13 upstream, looking back at the tunnel exit, which is just
14 around the corner in that upper right hand photo. From
15 there there is an overflow spillway, a side channel
16 spillway. You can see it in the left of the frame, on the
17 upper right. It is concrete lined there at the very
18 beginning where the overflow is, but the main spillway is
19 not concrete lined.

20 It is rock reinforced; there have been landslides
21 there in the past, and there's a significant amount of large
22 boulders that have been placed there to reinforce it. And
23 ultimately it discharges to Daniel Creek. The side channel
24 spillway is approximately 2,400 feet long.

25 The photo on the lower right is taken from the
26

1 opposite perspective of the upper right; so this is looking
2 downstream towards the intake structure that you can see
3 there, and the trash rack. From the intake structure,
4 project waters enter the penstock. The upper picture is
5 taken from the top, from the block at the top; and the lower
6 picture is taken a little closer to the powerhouse which you
7 can see there.

8 The steel pipe is approximately 66 to 68 inches
9 in diameter, 3,254 feet long, and this portion of the
10 project, so we've now traversed the plateau between the two
11 forks; and the penstock is on the south side of the Middle
12 Fork canyon, the Middle Fork Road. There are an additional
13 five wildlife underpasses at this penstock that provide
14 habitat connectivity and are again checked to see that
15 they're providing that connectivity each year.

16 Water from the penstock then enters the
17 powerhouse, goes under the road before it enters the
18 powerhouse. As we mentioned earlier, there's one generating
19 unit with a capacity of 7200 kW. The average annual energy
20 output is 37,000 megawatt hours. You can see the generating
21 unit there in the lower right, inside the brick building of
22 the powerhouse.

23 On the left is the tailrace structure. It's a
24 20x20x5 concrete structure; it's essentially a small pool at
25 the tailrace, and there is just to the right of that frame,
26

1 a 172-foot long overflow spillway; it's essentially just a
2 small ditch that again outlets to Daniel Creek, which at
3 this point is very close to the close to powerhouse and the
4 road, as you can see by that 172 foot length identified
5 there.

6 Although this provides some confusion to those
7 that aren't familiar with the project, the powerhouse is on
8 the south bank of the Middle Fork Road, but project waters
9 generally do not discharge to the Middle Fork of the road.
10 They are contained from the tailrace into a siphon. So
11 except in the case of unit trips or regular maintenance
12 outages where water may go either through the tailrace
13 overflow spillway or the side channel spillway at the top of
14 the forebay; water does not discharge to the Middle Fork
15 Rogue dam.

16 MS. RODMAN: We were a little confused about the
17 siphon. It is included as a structure of Prospect 1, 2 and
18 4.

19 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

20 MS. RODMAN: However, your documents are also
21 listing it as a project facility of Prospect No. 3.

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: So we could probably use some
23 clarification on that. We saw that it was in Prospect 1, 2,
24 4 in the project area, and identified on the maps, but not a
25 listed structure.

26

1 MS. RODMAN: Ah, yes it is.

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: Is it?

3 MS. RODMAN: Uh-huh. We brought the licenses.

4 (Pause)

5 MS. RODMAN: Okay, excuse me. I might have been
6 mistaken.

7 MR. ALBERTELLI: But there definitely is some --
8 it could use clarification.

9 MS. RODMAN: Oh, what about this? Okay. An
10 inverted siphon from the Prospect No. 3 powerhouse under the
11 Middle Fork Rogue River. That's in the ordering paragraph
12 B3.

13 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

14 MS. RODMAN: B2.

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: But it's not listed under the
16 section where the other facilities are identified?

17 MS. RODMAN: It's not listed earlier in the
18 order, right.

19 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

20 MS. RODMAN: And I believe it is shown on the
21 drawings for Prospect No. 1, 2, 4?

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: Definitely is shown on the
23 drawings.

24 MS. RODMAN: Right. So Carolyn, from our
25 discussion last week, is it possible to have that structure
26

1 in both licenses?

2 MS. CLARKIN: Yes.

3 MS. RODMAN: Aha, right.

4 MS. CLARKIN: As long as it's a project feature.

5 MS. RODMAN: And the question would be, what does
6 that siphon do for either project? Because it is within the
7 realm of possibility, even though not probability, that at
8 some point you may want to surrender the license for one of
9 those projects.

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay. So what it does for --
11 let's start with P3, since we're already talking about --
12 identified in these pictures; 66 inches diameter, it's 887
13 feet long. It's primarily woodstave, but there is a steel
14 section that goes immediately over the Middle Fork.

15 What it does for P3 is it routes the flows from
16 that project to P 1, 2, 4 without having discharge to that
17 river. That's in the Middle Fork Rogue, I should clarify.

18 The advantage to Prospect 1,2,4 is that these are
19 additional project waters that are then be used to generate
20 on that project. They are discharged to the North Fork Road
21 at our North Fork Reservoir, so that is the ultimate point
22 of return to the river system which, those flows can again
23 be utilized in our North Fork Canal which then goes to the
24 flow lines and penstocks for P 1, 2, 4.

25 MS. RODMAN: If you for some reason were to
26

1 decommission Prospect 1, 2 and 4, where would the water go?

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: The water would then -- there
3 would have to be some kind of attenuation structure or
4 discharge structure to the Middle Fork Road.

5 MS. RODMAN: And then conversely, if for some
6 reason you wanted to decommission Prospect 3, what would
7 happen? Would that be a significant effect on the other
8 projects' generation?

9 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes. Yes, it would.

10 MS. RODMAN: All right. Okay.

11 We're not making any decisions; we're gathering
12 information.

13 MR. ALBERTELLI: Sure.

14 Any more questions about that? Adequately
15 describe how they interface? I know there is some confusion
16 about that.

17 MR. MATKOWSKI: I've got a question.

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes, Matt.

19 MR. MATKOWSKI: Under the description of project
20 operations on page 9, is that last sentence of the first
21 paragraph accurate? Or are we missing something there.

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: Well, we do have clarification
23 there; and you led me into a later slide. We don't plan any
24 new facilities. We plan to operate it as is. But both the
25 flow line that we showed at the beginning, that wood stave
26

1 and this siphon are proposed to be replaced; they've been on
2 schedule to be replaced. They are old, leaky wood staves,
3 and they're scheduled to be replaced in 2020.

4 So no, that would be another comment that we
5 would make in our comments to the scoping document; that
6 would probably be considered an upgrade of a facility, that
7 those are being replaced. At the very least, a replacement.
8 No additional capacity, same footprint; it's a maintenance
9 action.

10 MR. MATKOWSKI: Sorry, I was talking under the
11 project operations, the first paragraph. The last sentence
12 of the first paragraph: At the powerhouse close or
13 discharge to the Middle Fork Canal.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: That is incorrect.

15 MR. MATKOWSKI: That's incorrect?

16 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

17 MS. RODMAN: It's discharged into the siphon that
18 goes to the Middle Fork Canal.

19 MR. ALBERTELLI: Correct.

20 MS. RODMAN: Okay, yes.

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: Only in the case of like
22 unitrip, or a maintenance shutdown where flows weren't
23 perfectly balanced, as we know that's not always achievable;
24 it would go through that small ditch, the tailrace structure
25 overflow channel, to Daniel Creek and then to the Middle
26

1 Fork.

2 MR. MATKOWSKI: Okay.

3 MR. ALBERTELLI: No water is ever discharged
4 directly to Middle Fork from the powerhouse.

5 Does that answer it? Clarify?

6 MR. MATKOWSKI: Yes. We'll be able to look at
7 that today?

8 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes, absolutely.

9 MS. RODMAN: FERC Staff, do you have any other
10 questions?

11 All right.

12 MR. ALBERTELLI: So from the powerhouse, again
13 the lower right hand photo, you're looking across the Middle
14 Fork channel. You can see the low spot there. The siphon
15 is elevated across the channel, and on the end, the terminus
16 of that is the Middle Fork Canal of P 1,2,4.

17 From the powerhouse the transmission line as we
18 mentioned earlier runs about seven miles, 69 kilovolts, and
19 it overlaps significantly with the project area, FERC
20 project boundary of Prospect 1,2,4.

21 The picture on the upper right is taken from the
22 powerhouse, so this is up above the siphon, the same span;
23 just higher up. That's the first transmission span going
24 across. The lower right hand photo, you can see some
25 fencing in the right of frame; that's the canal fencing of

26

1 Prospect 1,2,4. So the transmission line is either
2 immediately adjacent to or overlapping the Prospect 1,2,4
3 boundary.

4 Looking at the GIS, it's about 40 percent
5 overlap. If we count the P3 boundary, just the transmission
6 line, it's about 40 percent overlap with P 1,2,4.

7 The lower left hand photo, those are the flow
8 lines coming from the P 2 forebay towards the Prospect 1,2,4
9 generating units, and you can see the transmission line
10 immediately adjacent there on the right hand side. You will
11 see the transmission line and those flow lines when we drive
12 up to the project. When you cross those flow lines then you
13 know you make the next right, if you're concerned about
14 directions. So you can't miss those.

15 MS. RODMAN: Steve?

16 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

17 MS. RODMAN: We did talk about the overlap of the
18 two project facilities, and we're happy with that.

19 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

20 MS. RODMAN: But we would, when you eventually
21 file formal Exhibit Gs for the project, we'd like to make
22 sure that the overlap is clearly indicated so that if for
23 some reason in the future we need to trace that back, we'd
24 be able to.

25 MR. ALBERTELLI: Certainly. Okay, we can do
26

1 that.

2 I'll just make that note.

3 Okay. That is the end of the project features.
4 I can address quickly before we discuss the resource issues
5 -- yes, Dianne.

6 MS. RODMAN: When you were talking about the
7 penstock and powerhouse, you said that they are currently on
8 PacifiCorp land, but at some point they may have been on
9 Forest Service land.

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: Correct.

11 MS. RODMAN: Could you find out, either consult
12 with the Forest Service or check your records and find out
13 if any of your lands have ever been federal lands?

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: Sure.

15 MS. RODMAN: That may be important late on in the
16 process.

17 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

18 MS. RODMAN: It won't matter to you, but it will
19 matter to our agency.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Certainly. Okay.

21 MS. RODMAN: And does anybody from the other
22 agencies have questions about all this?

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: Ken?

24 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Fish &
25 Wildlife.

26

1 You said the fish ladder has 15 pools.

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

3 MR. HOMOLKA: Do you know the difference in
4 elevation between the entrance versus the exit?

5 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes; I might have that here.

6 I don't have it with me, Ken. We can definitely
7 identify it for you and get you the original plans as well,
8 the as-builts.

9 Yes?

10 MS. GRAINEY: At what points do you have flow
11 meters on this part of the project. I'm Mary Graineey.

12 MR. ALBERTELLI: Kaylea, do you want to speak to
13 that?

14 MS. FOSTER: Sure.

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: Kaylea is our aquatic scientist.

16 MS. FOSTER: We have, there is a USGS gauge in
17 the bypass reach immediately below the dam, which we use to
18 ensure compliance with the current minimum flow. As to flow
19 meters within the project itself, maybe Pete can better
20 speak to that.

21 MR. SUKRAW: We have flow meters in the steel
22 portion of the penstock as it goes into the power plant. We
23 want to know the penstock flow there, which is --

24 MR. ALBERTELLI: And they're brand new, right?
25 They were installed this year.

26

1 MR. SUKRAW: Yes, they were installed last year
2 and commissioned last year. So we use that.

3 MS. RODMAN: Remember to identify yourself for
4 Dan's transcript.

5 MR. SUKRAW: Oh, I'm sorry. Pete Sukraw with
6 PacifiCorp.

7 MR. ALBERTELLI: And that the was identified in
8 the PAD; we discuss that in the outflow tables, that it was
9 based on a turbine rating curve and that the flow meters
10 were just installed within the last year.

11 Others? Yes. Brian.

12 MR. BARR: Brian Barr with the GEOS Institute.

13 Fish ladder was constructed at the time that the
14 dam was constructed?

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: You probably know better than I
16 would. The original construction --

17 MR. BARR: No, I don't know. I can't remember.

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: -- the fish ladder saga, for
19 lack of a better word, from the last license, it was finally
20 constructed in 1996.

21 MR. BARR: The screen was --

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: The screen and modifications to
23 the ladder -- happened in 1996. As we mentioned earlier,
24 the license was issued in 1989, ODFW was working on coming
25 up with the statewide criteria for fish passage. So we kept
26

1 holding off, waiting for the criteria, and then we all
2 finally agreed it was time to go ahead. And changes to some
3 of the weir heights and pool bottoms were made at that time,
4 in 1996, and the screen was constructed in '96.

5 Original construction of the ladder, I may have
6 in my notes (pause). I do not. I do not know the original
7 construction date.

8 MR. BARR: I can't remember. I was hoping.
9 Thanks.

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: You know, when we stretch back
11 to FPA records from 1930, it's difficult to dig those up,
12 even within our own archives.

13 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: Other questions?

15 Yes, Ken. woodstave

16 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka. How high is the
17 wildlife fencing?

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: The fencing is -- I think in
19 general it's six foot, and has -- it's kind of our standard
20 fencing out there; it has two barbed wire tops and the a
21 single top wire over the top of that that's not barbed. We
22 can check when we're out there.

23 MR. HOMOLKA: And that top wire would be the six
24 foot level?

25 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

26

1 MR. HOMOLKA: Also, how much of Daniel Creek is
2 used for the project on the spill?

3 MR. ALBERTELLI: Looking back at our records and
4 estimating from our operations folks, they think that
5 there's either a unit trip or an overflow or a maintenance
6 shutdown where they don't balance perfectly; about five
7 times a year.

8 MR. HOMOLKA: Five times a year, but the distance
9 of effect from the spill say out of the canal down Daniel
10 Creek, how much --?

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: It's about 2,300 feet, I think.
12 2,400 feet.

13 Well, we should back that up because that's the
14 entire side channel spillway, and it is, you know, the line
15 before the spillway itself discharges to Daniel Creek. So
16 we'd have to take a look at the GIS to get that exact
17 number. Where the discharge from the spillway, between
18 there and Middle Fork would be a good distance.

19 MR. HOMOLKA: Is Daniel Creek a perennial stream?

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes, it is.

21 When we saw it, Kaylea and I were there last
22 week; it was definitely still running. And there will be a
23 bit more water in it today for sure.

24 Other questions about facilities?

25 MR. CUTLIP: I had a question about Daniel Creek.

26

1 It's Matt Cutlip.

2 Is that a natural stream channel where the
3 spillway discharges? Or was that just water pushed through
4 the forest?

5 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes, water pushed through the
6 forest. There was a channel created in the beginning, then
7 it was identified that it was a historic landslide area.
8 There was a lot of work done to reinforce it. It is
9 monitored; there are survey points established; it is
10 monitored regularly for movement. And there hasn't been any
11 significant maintenance, because it was reinforced heavily
12 in -- it's in the PAD, I can't quite recall, but the early
13 nineties. There may have been swale there, but --
14 definitely goes over the side of the plateau before it meets
15 the creek.

16 MR. CUTLIP: Okay.

17 MR. ALBERTELLI: Through upland trees, conifers.

18 MR. HARRIS: Dave Harris, ODFW. Trips about five
19 times per year --

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

21 MR. HARRIS: -- assume springtime. Is that the
22 bulk of them, or? It's spread out?

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: No, not necessarily.
24 Maintenance -- so it's full trips and maintenance actions
25 where they're not able to balance flows. Obviously
26

1 maintenance actions would generally be late summer. Our
2 maintenance is usually late August out there. It was going
3 to be right this week because we had other maintenance, but
4 is now going to start tomorrow.

5 And trips -- most of the trips out there would
6 happen during storms, wouldn't you agree?

7 MR. SUKRAW: Correct, yes. Most of our trips, if
8 you look at the history, are caused by lightning strikes or
9 some sort of system disturbance external to the hydro
10 project.

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: So I think springtime. Summer
12 would be the lowest incidence. Or at least early summer.
13 Spring probably second and winter -- fall and winter are
14 probably the highest incidence, if we had to guess. We do
15 keep logs; we could go back through the history and try to
16 identify that.

17 Other facility questions? Yes, Ken.

18 MR. HOMOLKA: Do you ever, when you do
19 maintenance on Prospect 1,2,4 do you have to shut the whole
20 project down?

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: P3.

22 MR. HOMOLKA: Well, the actual 1,2,4. So what
23 I'm asking actually is, is there coordination on the
24 maintenance? Can you still operate P3, run water in the P
25 1, 2 and 4 while it's undergoing maintenance?

26

1 MR. ALBERTELLI: Depending on which sections of
2 P1,2,4 are being maintained, because there are -- it is kind
3 of a spider system where you have the Middle Fork Canal, you
4 have red blanket canal going into the Middle Fork Canal
5 downstream. Then you have the North Fork Reservoir and
6 North Fork Canal. So it would depend on where the
7 maintenance is.

8 Do you have a better answer for that?

9 MR. SUKRAW: Pete Sukraw with PacifiCorp.

10 If we're passed the North Fork and we're into the
11 P2 power canal that provides P1, P2 -- P1 and P4 projects,
12 then it won't affect any of the maintenance. If we are in
13 the Middle Fork canal, though, we're getting that
14 maintenance stuff, then it would affect us.

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: Unless it's dead stream of red
16 blanket, correct? Because you could back up water in the
17 sag pipe?

18 MR. SUKRAW: No, we can isolate the sag pipe with
19 top block, so.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: So you could still, downstream
21 of red blanket canal, confluence of the Middle Fork?

22 MR. SUKRAW: I'd say yes.

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: Does that make sense? It's hard
24 to see, to imagine the layout.

25 MR. HOMOLKA: It is. I guess you could still
26

1 take that water, run it through the P3 powerhouse and then
2 run it through the siphon into the 1,2,4 project even though
3 it might not be operating, for generation.

4 MR. ALBERTELLI: Depending on where the
5 maintenance is.

6 MR. SUKRAW: Right, as it goes into Middle Fork -
7 - that goes into the North Fork --

8 MR. ALBERTELLI: Reservoir.

9 MR. SUKRAW: -- and that's the key point there.

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

11 MS. RODMAN: I do have the Exhibit Gs for P 1,2
12 and 4 after the meeting if you'd like to sit down and point
13 at drawings and figure out what they're saying.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: And much of it can be identified
15 on the PAD as well, because I did include the P 1,2,4 FERC
16 boundary on the PAD maps as well, if that helps.

17 MS. GRAINEY: So what you're saying is that you
18 keep running P3 as long as you can, you take the water -- if
19 you have to, you spill it from North Fork Reservoir?

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Right.

21 MS. GRAINEY: Rather than putting it back.

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: Right.

23 MS. GRAINEY: Okay.

24 MR. STINE: Chris Stine, DEQ.

25 To what extent are the projects controlled by the
26

1 recent upgrades to the water management system at 1,2,4? Is
2 there communication with head gate control at P3 integrated
3 with that system, or are there plans to integrate that?

4 MR. SUKRAW: It's integrated at this point,
5 Chris. At this time, yes. The controls for P3 and the
6 1,2,4 project.

7 MR. ALBERTELLI: So P3 can be controlled from the
8 warehouse, from North Fork, and from our hydro control
9 center in Ariel, Washington.

10 This is referring to recent automation upgrades
11 that were made as part of the P 1,2,4 license.

12 Other facilities questions?

13 Okay. We have a single slide there to refer to
14 the project proposal, which is not much to speak of, because
15 the proposal essentially is to continue to operate the
16 project as sit's been operated -- obviously with
17 implementation of the environmental need and the detection,
18 mitigation and enhancement measures.

19 As we discussed, and Matt clarified earlier,
20 there are no new facilities proposed, but replacement of the
21 woodstave pipeline and the siphon are scheduled. They're in
22 the budget, and we're looking ahead to that. So immediately
23 after the potential issuance of a new license.

24 There are a number of PM&Es identified in the
25 existing license that we are currently implementing,

26

1 including the -- there's a range of things from a flow
2 monitoring plan to a terrestrial connectivity plan
3 monitoring the wildlife crossings; we already enacted a fish
4 facilities, fish passage facilities monitoring plan; and
5 there are all the other standard plans from hazardous waste
6 to spill control, erosion control, and we would expect
7 obviously to continue to implement those in addition to any
8 others that are deemed necessary during the process.

9 MS. RODMAN: Okay. The next section I'd like to
10 go to is --

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: Dave has a question.

12 MS. RODMAN: Oh, sorry.

13 MR. HARRIS: A little slow on the uptake this
14 morning.

15 Going back to the -- Dave Harris, ODFW.

16 Going back to the fish ladder, is there a control
17 gate on the fish ladder to control the amount of water that
18 goes -- I was looking at the slides, looks like a lot of
19 water running through that ladder.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

21 MR. HARRIS: Is there any way to control that?

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: There is.

23 MR. HARRIS: There is, so there's a gate that you
24 can adjust to control flow?

25 MR. ALBERTELLI: There's actually two. There are
26

1 two gates there.

2 Looking at the plans, I believe there are two.
3 There's two slots right there at the dam.

4 MR. HARRIS: And that includes the diversion
5 pipe, too? You can control that? That drops into Pool 6
6 from the screens?

7 MR. ALBERTELLI: Oh, oh. I believe so, because
8 the minimum flow in general, in low flow times of the year,
9 is maintained through the ladder.

10 MR. HARRIS: Right.

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: So there's a certain amount of
12 control there. Brian might know more about that as well.

13 MR. BARR: I don't think the water coming
14 -- the bypass water coming out the fishery is
15 controllable. But it's sized so that -- it's calculatable,
16 depending on how much water is coming down the canal, you'll
17 know about how much will be bypassed and then dumped into
18 the ladder - pool system.

19 Brian Barr with the GEOS Institute.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Does that answer --

21 MR. HARRIS: Did you take any measurements on how
22 much cfs is actually going through that ladder?

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: We have, and that was definitely
24 a part of the monitoring plan; and Brian was with PacifiCorp
25 at that time, and enacted that plan. That's why I keep

26

1 referring to him. He has intimate knowledge of those
2 facilities.

3 MR. HARRIS: Do you check it annually? Is it
4 something that you do? Did you do it in 2002 and haven't
5 done it since?

6 MR. ALBERTELLI: I don't know.
7 Kaylea, do you know about that?

8 MS. FOSTER: No, I don't.

9 MR. ALBERTELLI: I believe it's a part of the
10 maintenance plan. You know, they have a schedule for
11 cleaning the screens and for checking the flow in there, and
12 I assume when they go out, often the operators go out once a
13 week, twice a week?

14 MR. HARRIS: Yes.

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: When the operators go out that
16 they're checking that, since it is a compliance point
17 they're aware of how important it is to maintain the 10 cfs.
18 When there's no --

19 MR. HARRIS: Do they measure it, or do they just
20 eyeball it?

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: I would think they eyeball it.

22 MR. HARRIS: Eyeball it.

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: Of course, we always have the
24 gauge downstream. In low flow times we definitely know what
25 was going through there, but --

26

1 MR. HARRIS: Sure. Just trying to go back --

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: That's understandable.

3 MR. HARRIS: -- fish trying to get through, and
4 flow-wise. Okay.

5 MR. ALBERTELLI: If our operations personnel are
6 at the warehouse when we arrive, we can definitely ask
7 Kelly. He would know all about it.

8 MR. HARRIS: Okay, thanks.

9 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yep.

10 MS. RODMAN: Anybody else?

11 Okay, I wanted to go back to the scoping
12 document, to the section on cumulative effect. It starts on
13 page 12.

14 We identified fisheries resources and terrestrial
15 resources as those resources that could be cumulatively
16 affected by relicensing Prospect No. 3.

17 Does anybody have any comments about that?

18 (No response.)

19 Well, that's good. How about our geographic
20 scope? In both cases we were looking at the Upper Rogue
21 Basin above the William L. Jess Dam, which I think is Lost-
22 something lake?

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: Lost Creek Lake, yes.

24 MS. RODMAN: Lost Creek Lake, yes.

25 Does that seem reasonable?

26

1 Excellent. Okay.

2 So then we'd like to go through the resource
3 issues that we identified. This is very preliminary. We
4 didn't have much information other than PacifiCorp's PAD.

5 Sean, would you like to do geology and soils?

6 MR. O'NEILL: Sure. Sean O'Neill, FERC.

7 From the PAD, we identified that there could be
8 resource issues originating from effects of ground-
9 disturbing maintenance around the project, and also from
10 possible erosion resulting from breakage of the woodstave
11 penstock from rock falls.

12 MS. RODMAN: Does anybody have any additions,
13 amendments, anything like that?

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: I would just question the, I
15 just noticed it now in the first sentence of the first
16 bullet, that effects of ground-disturbing maintenance
17 activities and project-related recreation. What recreation
18 impacts would affect geology and soils in the area.

19 MS. RODMAN: Possibly hiking, if anybody is
20 cutting trees or vegetation for fire, anything like that. I
21 know that the project has very little potential for
22 recreation; however, we thought that as population increased
23 that the project might get a little more recreation load
24 than it does now.

25 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

26

1 MS. RODMAN: And since you don't have developed
2 recreational facilities, you don't really have any way to
3 channel that hypothetical recreation.

4 MR. ALBERTELLI: Understood.

5 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Does anybody have any
6 comments about that?

7 MS. FOSTER: I am a little bit curious -- this is
8 Kaylea Foster with PacifiCorp -- you said as population
9 increased. Are you looking at any long term trends, or is
10 that an assumption?

11 MS. RODMAN: An assumption.

12 MS. FOSTER: Okay.

13 MS. RODMAN: John, would you like to do water
14 resources and fisheries resources?

15 MR. MATKOWSKI: Sure. John Matkowski, FERC.

16 For water resources we had effects of project
17 operations on water quality, including water temperature and
18 dissolved oxygen, and I'm not sure if that should just be
19 for South Fork Rogue River or we should leave it general,
20 like that.

21 Does anyone have any questions about water
22 resources? Or want to add anything?

23 MR. BARR: Brian Barr, GEOS Institute.

24 It seems to me like there could be an effect to
25 Daniel Creek and Middle Fork in the instances where the

26

1 water is being routed that direction instead of through the
2 penstock. So I guess I'd encourage a broader look. And
3 when there is maintenance going on, if water is being routed
4 that way, you need to look at it.

5 MS. RODMAN: Do you think we should specify or
6 just leave it the way it is? Right now it's very vague; it
7 just says water quality. That way it kind of covers
8 everything in the world; but we could --

9 MR. BARR: I'm not suggesting necessarily that
10 the language be made more specific; I'm just -- to ensure
11 that those things at least things at least fall under --
12 within the scope here.

13 MR. STINE: Chris Stine with DEQ.

14 I think for now we can probably leave it as is.
15 There is very little -- there is limited water quality data
16 in that base, and we did -- we, PacifiCorp and DEQ,
17 collaborated on a study to broaden that knowledge base; but
18 I think the larger issue of water quality will be addressed
19 during the studies.

20 MS. RODMAN: Okay.

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: Speaking to what Chris has
22 identified there, Kaylea and Chris collaborated to collect a
23 significant amount of water quality data in order -- well,
24 in association with our application for low impact hydro
25 certification. And that was where most of the data came
26

1 from in the water quality section of the PAD.

2 And the specific bullet there, and what's
3 identified as far as water temperature and dissolved oxygen
4 is probably referencing our suggested study of collecting
5 more data on those two specific parameters between the area
6 downstream of the dam and upstream of groundwater influence.
7 We've got a lot of info right below the dam and we've got a
8 lot of info further down the stream, but not much in the
9 middle region between about 10.5 and 8.5 -- river mile 10.5
10 and 8.5.

11 Just a comment about that. So just to be clear,
12 at this point in time what we're saying is that the water
13 quality parameters of concern that are likely to be
14 addressed in the NEPA document are water temperature and
15 dissolved oxygen. So if there are more parameters that you
16 would think that need to be addressed, it would be nice to
17 get those down now, understanding that that list of course
18 could be refined throughout the study planning process, but
19 this is going to directly lead into the study planning
20 process, so if everybody already has an idea of potential
21 other parameters, it would be good if we could at least
22 discuss them or bring them up now.

23 If possible. If not, that's fine, but.

24 MR. STINE: I think as written -- Chris Stine,
25 DEQ. As written it says, effects of project operations on
26

1 water quality, including dissolved oxygen and temperature,
2 which are certainly principal water quality parameters; but
3 I don't think that limits our ability to address a broader
4 scope of water quality parameters later in the process,
5 which will be coming very, very shortly.

6 If we wanted to broaden this right now, I would
7 suggest pH and turbidity as well as principal components;
8 but again, that would not be a limiting list of water
9 quality parameters that DEQ or other resource agencies would
10 like to take a look at.

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: Anyone else?

12 I guess I'll move on to fisheries resources. We
13 had effects of minimum instream flow releases on aquatic
14 habitat in the bypass reach of the South Fork Rogue River.
15 Effects of project operations and facilities on upstream and
16 downstream fish passage, and the effects of project
17 operations on flow fluctuations in the bypass reach, and
18 Daniel Creek downstream of the powerhouse due to planned
19 maintenance events and emergency situations, which would be
20 when they trip off line during lightning, for instance.

21 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

22 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Fish &
23 Wildlife.

24 I think we should add in the Middle Fork, because
25 Daniel Creek discharges into the Middle Fork, and the
26

1 effects on Daniel Creek can be carried into the Middle Fork.

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

3 MS. RODMAN: Would that be for bullets 1 and 3?

4 MR. HOMOLKA: I was thinking primarily 3.

5 MS. RODMAN: Okay.

6 MS. FOSTER: Ken, would you repeat that?

7 MR. HOMOLKA: On the third bullet in this
8 section, add in the Middle Fork. Effects on the Middle Fork
9 as well as Daniel Creek.

10 MS. FOSTER: Thanks.

11 MR. ALBERTELLI: Anything else for fisheries?

12 MS. RODMAN: Nothing. Okay. I'll do the
13 remaining bullets since we don't have Suzanne Novak, our
14 recreation, land use and aesthetics and probably cultural
15 resources staff person here.

16 Terrestrial resources, which is a resource that,
17 as you can see from the asterisk, we do believe will be
18 cumulatively effected, or we'll analyze it, anyway.

19 The effects of the project on deer and elk
20 migration and movement, with the what, 16,000 feet of
21 various conduits. And effects of maintenance activities
22 such as road maintenance, transmission line maintenance, and
23 rights-of-way vegetation management, and project-related
24 recreation, such as it is, on wildlife habitat and wildlife,
25 including the establishment and spread of noxious weeds.

26

1 Do we have any comments about that?

2 Yes, Rob.

3 MR. BURNS: Rob Burns with the Fish & Wildlife
4 Service.

5 I'd recommend that you also add some analysis of
6 avian impacts associated with transmission lines.

7 MS. RODMAN: Steve, do you know if the entire
8 transmission line has been raptor-proofed sometime in the
9 future?

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: It's not -- we have a corporate-
11 wide bird management program, and PacifiCorp has been very
12 involved in developing the avian power line interaction
13 committee standards and guidelines.

14 In rural areas such as Prospect, poles and
15 facilities are retrofitted as there's a problem; so we have
16 a bird management program reporting system. If somebody
17 sees a bird under the line, whether it's an electrocution or
18 a collision, then that is reported and we have to correct
19 that within a certain period of time. It has to be within
20 the year, but it's generally within a couple weeks. And
21 then facilities are retrofitted at that time; and when
22 replacement occurs, whether that's pole replacement or
23 jumpers or whatever else is out there, it's replaced with
24 avian-safe equipment.

25 MR. CUTLIP: That's good; it would be helpful if
26

1 it's in the EA so we can see it.

2 MS. RODMAN: So in that case, probably some
3 information about just how much of that seven miles of poles
4 and lines have actually -- needed to be upgraded have been
5 done so would be a good thing for us to have for our
6 analysis.

7 Were you thinking primarily of electrocution? Or
8 you're also thinking of collision; I can't remember.

9 MR. BURNS: Collision is also a major issue.
10 Especially for the smaller of the waterfowl, any of the
11 migratory birds that are moving through.

12 MS. RODMAN: Okay, all right.

13 Yes.

14 MR. BARR: Brian Barr, GEOS Institute. This is a
15 question for you, Rob.

16 It looks like the canal and pipeline crossing
17 study is constrained to deer and elk here.

18 MR. BURNS: We would be interested in small
19 mammals, small game as well. Certainly.

20 MS. RODMAN: Okay, all right.

21 MR. BARR: And what about spotted owl? Are there
22 any spotted owl --

23 MR. BURNS: Well, we've got a T&E section she's
24 going to talk about next.

25 MR. BARR: Okay.

26

1 MS. RODMAN: Does anybody else have any other
2 questions about terrestrial resources?

3 Okay. And actually, we were carefully vague
4 about our bullet for threatened and endangered species. So
5 we have the effects of project operation on federally listed
6 species and U.S. Forest Service and State of Oregon rare and
7 sensitive species.

8 So Rob, at that point could you address the
9 spotted owl?

10 MR. BURNS: Well, I think that it was brought out
11 in the PAD that there is an active area of .48 miles away,
12 the high.

13 MS. RODMAN: Right.

14 MR. BURNS: Certainly you need to go through the
15 process of determining if there's going to be an effect or
16 not from project activities.

17 MS. RODMAN: Right, yes.

18 MR. BURNS: And I would think that surveys for
19 some of the sensitive species that the Forest Service may
20 want the same way, but some surveys for Oregon spotted frog
21 or Northwestern pond turtles, those are appropriate, also.

22 And you may not be aware of the fact that, coming
23 from Washington, D.C., that we have a locally famous wolf
24 that's hanging out in the vicinity.

25 MS. RODMAN: Is this the one wolf who's kind of
26

1 lovelorn and --

2 MR. BURNS: This is OR7, and he has been residing
3 in Jackson County now for sometime, and the Fish and
4 Wildlife Service considers any wolf west of the Cascades as
5 a listed species, and is protected; and so you'll need to
6 consult on him as well. He's in the project vicinity.

7 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Well, it may -- who knows
8 where he'll be in 2016?

9 (Laughter)

10 MR. BURNS: That's a good point, but we have to
11 go through the process because he's been here for a while.
12 He's no longer roaming, he's staying in the area.

13 MS. RODMAN: That's interesting. I wish that the
14 Forest Service were here, but I know that their comments on
15 the pre application document, the scoping document and the
16 study request will probably identify specifically what they
17 want us to look at. And we don't, at this stage, this is a
18 scoping meeting, we are going to have a meeting specifically
19 on study requests in January. So today we don't really need
20 to kind of show your hand about what you want to have
21 studied and how you want it to be studied. But this is
22 still good to know.

23 Recreation and Land Use. We do have an interest
24 in whitewater boating that has been expressed, and including
25 the feasibility of providing whitewater boating flows and
26

1 facilities in the project area. And we may have somebody
2 who attends the evening meeting starting at 7 tonight who
3 may be interested in that use of the project waters.

4 Does anybody who's here have any questions about
5 that, or any comments?

6 Yes.

7 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Fish &
8 Wildlife.

9 I think an issue that should be associated with
10 that would be the effects on the aquatic resources
11 associated with whitewater boating flows.

12 MS. RODMAN: Right. Effects of the flows on
13 whitewater boating? Effects of the boating flows on aquatic
14 resources.

15 MR. HOMOLKA: Uh-huh.

16 Does anybody have any further questions about
17 recreation in the project?

18 Okay. Cultural resources? This is a fairly
19 standard process for consultation on the effects of the
20 project on cultural resources pursuant to the National
21 Historic Preservation Act. And we don't have anybody here
22 who is a cultural resource specialist.

23 Does anybody have any comments about that?

24 (No response.)

25 Okay. Again, it would have been nice if the
26

1 Forest Service were here, but they may show up in the
2 evening.

3 Effects of the project on aesthetic resources
4 including consistency with the visual/aesthetic objective
5 standards and guidelines identified in the Rogue River-
6 Siskiyou National Forest land and resource management plan.

7 Okay. Does anybody have any comments about any
8 of the bullets that we've already gone over, that something
9 has suddenly popped into your mind?

10 No? Good. Since we're almost totally agencies
11 here, does anybody need me to go over the process of the
12 Integrated Licensing Process or ILP?

13 You don't want me to go into it.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: If I have a choice --

15 (Laughter)

16 MS. RODMAN: Yes. Well, I don't really want to,
17 but I am prepared.

18 This is the Integrated Licensing Process. It has
19 deadlines which are in I believe Appendix D of the Scoping
20 Document. Those deadlines are hard and fast. I would like
21 to point out that on page B-1 we say: If the due date falls
22 on a weekend or holiday, the due date is the following
23 business day. Early filings or issuances will not result in
24 changes to the established schedule.

25 For instance, this meeting is being held a few
26

1 days before the deadline. We're not recalculating the
2 schedule, okay? It is very important that everyone
3 including the Commission meets those deadlines.

4 MR. BURNS: So Dianne, are the PAD comments due
5 on October 29th or October 24th?

6 MS. RODMAN: October 29th.

7 MR. BURNS: So it's more than 30 days.

8 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

9 MR. ALBERTELLI: That's a perfect example of what
10 we're talking about. The date does not change because this
11 date changed.

12 MR. BURNS: Okay.

13 MS. RODMAN: Right. And yes, the due date that
14 the Commission and all of you need to meet is October 29th.
15 That will be comments on PacifiCorp's pre application
16 document, on our scoping document, and this is where you
17 provide your initial study requests.

18 Please remember Appendix A has the seven criteria
19 needed for filing study requests. Not all of them will be
20 applicable to you. Like for instance, a lot of them are not
21 applicable to the Commission. But please put sentence down
22 perhaps saying that they're not applicable. Don't skimp on
23 those seven criteria.

24 If we have to make a decision, one of the things
25 that we'll look at is exactly what you said, to meet the
26

1 information requirements of Appendix A.

2 Your study requests can be an elaboration on the
3 studies that PacifiCorp has already provided. Please
4 specify the detailed information you believe to be necessary
5 or the specific methodology appropriate to this situation,
6 or you can request studies that PacifiCorp has not at this
7 time proposed. The Commission staff might also ask for
8 studies or additional information, and if we do, our letter
9 will also address the seven items required in our own
10 regulations.

11 If we, the Commission, have no study needs
12 ourselves, we will issue a letter stating so.

13 Then we've the due date of December 13th in which
14 we issue Scoping Documents 2, which will include any --
15 well, we already have some bullets and changes to wording to
16 Scoping Document 1. And no later than December 13th,
17 PacifiCorp will file its proposed study plan or PSP.

18 So I think that's about as far forward as -- I
19 find that, Rob, that the ILP process is kind of boring to
20 discuss.

21 (Laughter)

22 MS. RODMAN: We do have another meeting coming
23 up, on or before January 12th to discuss the study plans.
24 So I think -- going back to the scoping document, we have a
25 list of comprehensive plans. If any agency has, since the
26

1 last time you thought about it, issued a plan that you
2 believe to be a comprehensive plan, remember to file it with
3 the Commission.

4 I know that -- the last time I worked on an
5 Oregon project, we had to add two plans that ODFW filed. So
6 the list is continually evolving. We redo the list every
7 six months for the entire country.

8 So I think that's kind of it. Does anybody have
9 any questions? Yes.

10 MR. HOMOLKA: I do. Ken Homolka.

11 I'm still unclear on the issue of the Forest
12 Service lands and the project boundary. Is that, it
13 formerly was on Forest lands, and --

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: Let me go back to the map at the
15 beginning. There is a definite, existing interface with
16 Forest Service lands at the diversion, and I think it's
17 4,000 feet worth of that flow. You can see there the sharp
18 line, too, but I guess this one is better.

19 It's right in the middle; 33 South 3 East in the
20 upper right hand corner, which would be Section 1. You see
21 how it abuts in the FERC boundary. I don't have a laser
22 pointer; I apologize.

23 So we do have this, definitely in these three
24 sections; when we're out there on the site visit, you'll see
25 that boundary and there is a -- there. It's this here. The
26

1 Commission had identified this as being Forest Service
2 property; but it's just this small portion of the section,
3 not the whole section.

4 MR. HOMOLKA: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. ALBERTELLI: So this expanded boundary here
6 actually is far beyond the side channel spillway; that kind
7 of demarcates our -- or not kind of; that does demarcate our
8 property.

9 MS. RODMAN: Steve?

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes.

11 MS. RODMAN: This is something that probably
12 nobody else but the Commission cares about. But former --
13 we need to know about land that was formerly federal.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

15 MS. RODMAN: Carolyn?

16 MS. CLARKIN: Yes. Former federal lands are
17 still considered Section 24 lands, so --

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay.

19 MS. RODMAN: Section 24 of the Federal Power Act.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: Got you.

21 MS. CLARKIN: Or power site reservation lands,
22 unless we or the Congress takes them out of power site.

23 So while we don't charge annual charges for
24 former federal lands, we still want to have that
25 information.

26

1 MR. ALBERTELLI: It's just conjecture at this
2 point. We'll definitely look it up and get you info. But
3 in the original license, we received two licenses for P3.

4 MS. RODMAN: Right.

5 MR. ALBERTELLI: And the first one was for this
6 part that was on federal land. So I would think, based on
7 that logic, that this whole stretch wasn't even at that
8 point. So we'd have to go back further than that. Because
9 from here down it was given its own license; and from here
10 up it had its own license.

11 MS. RODMAN: It's tricky in the West, because a
12 lot of, the situation can often arise that you think it was
13 private land, but at one point it was federal; and we need
14 to know that.

15 MR. ALBERTELLI: Sure.

16 MS. RODMAN: And we're really the only party that
17 needs to know that.

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: Okay. Makes sense.

19 MS. RODMAN: Any other questions?

20 You're sure there are no other questions?

21 MR. ALBERTELLI: Dianne, did you want me to go
22 over those few slides of our proposed studies?

23 MS. RODMAN: Oh, yes. I'm sorry, thank you.

24 MR. ALBERTELLI: It's brief, and we've touched on
25 it in general on the resource issues. And they were in the

26

1 PAD, but we can go over it as a group here as well.

2 So lumping water and fisheries together, we
3 already mention, we propose specifically temperature and DO
4 studies in that upper bypass reach. So above where
5 groundwater significantly influences the quality and
6 temperature of the water, and that's probably where that
7 modifying statement in that bullet comes from, that it's
8 temperature and DO.

9 Additionally, Kaylea will do a habit duration
10 analysis. There was one done in the last relicensing, but
11 it was a very broad scale, and Kaylea is proposing to look
12 at it in a finer scale and determine if different minimum
13 flow regimes during the year would be more protective for
14 aquatic resources and different life forms, life stages.

15 MR. BURNS: So Steve, those proposals will be run
16 through the resource agencies first, right? Coordinated
17 with us.

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: This will be all be part of the
19 study plan process. You'll have a chance to comment, there
20 will be several iterations through the ILP.

21 MR. BURNS: Thank you.

22 MR. ALBERTELLI: Absolutely.

23 The pictures there, several of us have talked
24 individually, but this bypass reach is difficult to access.
25 There are steep canyons, there are cataracts, large

26

1 waterfalls. The picture on the left of the frame is taken
2 from immediately below the dam, at probably middle of
3 September, about this time of year last year. And the
4 picture on the right is further down on the Butte Falls-
5 Prospect Highway; it's taken from the highway bridge. You
6 can see, the character is still a little consistent, it does
7 -- it is a little steeper in that section. And we can see
8 that as well if you'd like; see what it looks like today.

9 As far as terrestrial resources, pretty standard
10 fare; we have proposed doing noxious weeds surveys and
11 sensitive plant surveys. As I mentioned, the project
12 boundary is a haven for a lot of plant species that don't
13 find refuge out there in the timberlands. And we'll pay
14 special attention to Forest Service special status species,
15 of which there are many, such as the lichen on the left.

16 MR. BURNS: Rob Burns, Fish and Wildlife Service.

17 You've got that under -- can you go back to that
18 slide, please?

19 MR. ALBERTELLI: Certainly.

20 MR. BURNS: You've got that kind of tabbed in
21 under Sensitive Plant Surveys, but that should also be for
22 wildlife.

23 MR. ALBERTELLI: Yes, as you've expressed. We
24 were not planning to do any wildlife surveys based on the
25 info that we had, the available info on the project area and
26

1 project vicinity; but I understand your comment, certainly.

2 Cultural resources, as Dianne already references,
3 is very standard fare. An inventory of historic buildings
4 and structures. It's very likely that structures such as
5 the woodstave flow line and siphon would be considered
6 Register-eligible properties. We would do a pedestrian
7 survey of archaeological sites within the area of potential
8 effect, in coordination with SHPO, and a traditional
9 cultural properties study as well. So just the general
10 suite of archaeological surveys.

11 And those are the seven studies that we had
12 listed in the PAD initially. And that was it.

13 MS. RODMAN: I'd like to point out that the ILP
14 process, the Integrated Licensing Process, calls for
15 PacifiCorp to file its proposed study plan for those studies
16 on or before September 13th. And we will meet to discuss
17 those study plans and any other studies that are felt
18 necessary in January, January 12th at the latest. And then
19 the parties will provide formal comments on PacifiCorp's
20 proposal by March 13th.

21 PacifiCorp will file a revised study plan, taking
22 into account everyone's comments. Then we will have a
23 chance to comment on PacifiCorp's revised plans April 27th.
24 The Commission, or actually the Director of the Office of
25 Energy Projects will issue his determination on what study
26

1 plans PacifiCorp will be required to do under the ILP May
2 12th, taking into account Commission Staff's analysis as
3 well as your comments. So you'll have two opportunities to
4 provide written comments on PacifiCorp's proposals as well
5 as the meeting in January in which we can argue and hash
6 things out informally.

7 Yes, Chris.

8 MR. STINE: Chris Stine, DEQ.

9 And I recognize that the schedule here is fixed,
10 and it's what we have to work with.

11 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

12 MR. STINE: But I have a little concern regarding
13 the date of the final study plan determination as it relates
14 to water quality studies, since the time -- these are time-
15 sensitive studies, and it would be to everyone's advantage
16 if we had agreement and were able to implement these studies
17 according to a schedule that captured the seasonal effects
18 that we were most interested in; and that is the summer.

19 And I'm wondering if there's any -- I just want
20 to put this out and ask the question: Is there a way we can
21 arrive at a, agree upon a water quality study according to a
22 schedule that will allow us to capture those seasonal
23 effects.

24 MS. RODMAN: Yes?

25 MR. GARRETT: This is Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp.

26

1 So Chris, are you talking about studies that may
2 need to be implemented for water quality purposes before
3 that May 12th date?

4 MR. STINE: I'm just putting that out as a
5 suggestion; but absolutely.

6 MR. ALBERTELLI: Because the intention with the
7 schedule would be that -- looking at the next page -- that
8 you would get April and early May right before the second
9 study here. So it's not a calendar year, it's a study year;
10 but I definitely understand what you're saying.

11 MR. STINE: Yes.

12 MS. RODMAN: Also, the schedule does provide for
13 two years of studies.

14 MR. ALBERTELLI: It does.

15 MS. RODMAN: Whether that's necessary for all
16 resources or not. The drop-dead date for PacifiCorp filing
17 their final license application is December 31, 2016.

18 MR. ALBERTELLI: That's a lot of time.

19 MS. RODMAN: It's a lot of time.

20 MR. ALBERTELLI: But the --

21 MR. STINE: So just to clarify on that, it would
22 be hard to, I think for PacifiCorp to agree to move forward
23 with implementing studies before the final determination, as
24 Dianne is pointing out; it seems like all seasons will be
25 covered in the study plan implementation process. So we
26

1 shouldn't be omitting any time period, I wouldn't think.

2 MR. ALBERTELLI: You might just get a -- you
3 might be cut in the middle of a water year.

4 MR. STINE: And actually, May 12 is still early
5 in the season, providing that we have ample time to take
6 that determination and actually implement it in the ground.
7 So I think if we have close coordination between PacifiCorp
8 and DEQ and other resource agencies, that would provide --

9 MS. RODMAN: To hit the ground running.

10 MR. ALBERTELLI: And we should have had plenty of
11 time to flesh out the plan and have the meat of it there so
12 that when May 12th hits we're ready to go once we receive
13 the determination. That's the hope.

14 And if I could, Dianne, another date that's kind
15 of interesting to point out, and why all of these iterations
16 and reviews are so important is that we are -- PacifiCorp is
17 required to file our proposed study plan on December 13th,
18 the same date that Scoping Document 2 comes out. So it's
19 very likely that we won't be addressing anything that's
20 revised or changes Scoping Document 2 at that point, and
21 that would come in later iterations of the study plans.
22 We'd be working mainly on the PAD and Study Document 1
23 comments and study requests from your agency. So it's
24 definitely a first blush, and then we work from there to
25 work out the details.

26

1 MS. RODMAN: Because we would have your agency
2 and the other agency's initial comments on October 29th.

3 Is there any confusion about the ILP schedule?

4 I can go through it --

5 (Laughter)

6 -- and it is very important that you understand it.

7 Also, you have my phone number and e-mail on all
8 these documents, so if you want to -- as you know, the
9 Commission gets kind of buggy about merits, but certainly
10 the ins and outs of the ILP process is something that I'm
11 completely free to discuss with any of you. If you go back
12 to your office and go "Uhh" -- or you're trying to explain
13 to your supervisor, and they're confused, please get in
14 touch with me, or Matt for that matter.

15 Okay, does anybody have any further comments?

16 MR. BURNS: This is Rob Burns, Fish and Wildlife
17 Service.

18 How involved is Portland going to be?

19 MS. RODMAN: Probably -- how much time do you
20 have, Matt?

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. CUTLIP: As far as I understand, I will be
23 just as involved as the rest of the team. So if you want a
24 local presence to call on just because of the time zone
25 issue or whatever, you're always welcome to call me.

26

1 MS. RODMAN: John is the fishery biologist
2 assigned to the project. However, he has less experience
3 than Matt does, so he'll be leaning on Matt a lot.

4 Do we have any other questions?

5 Okay. The next event today is going to be the
6 environmental site review at 1 o'clock. We'll be meeting at
7 the Prospect warehouse --

8 MR. ALBERTELLI: Correct.

9 MS. RODMAN: -- in Prospect, just beyond the flow
10 lines. We don't know how long that's going to be. I was
11 hoping, assuming it was a dry day, that the fish biologist
12 would be able to walk the bypassed reach, and I've been
13 informed by a lot of people that that's not at all feasible;
14 you'd break your neck.

15 So it's unfortunately going to be a kind of a
16 "greatest hits" sort of site visit. We park where we can
17 and we look at what we can see.

18 The FERC staff will be attending. How many of
19 you all will be able to make time to attend?

20 [Show of hands]

21 MS. RODMAN: Ah, we've got lots of people. Okay.

22 The Forest Service may be able to attend then.
23 Then the next event today will be the evening meeting, which
24 will largely be a replay of today. At 7 o'clock, in this
25 room. If we have members of the public we may go through
26

1 the entire ILP process. We may not go as deeply into
2 resource questions as we have this morning; it will also be
3 transcribed so that if you can't attend, you can get on line
4 or contact Ace Reporting to get a transcript and find out
5 what you missed.

6 Can anybody think of anything that I've
7 forgotten? Does anybody have any questions?

8 Yes.

9 MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Fish &
10 Wildlife.

11 Just thanks for the opportunity to be here today.
12 But recognize we will be filing written comments within the
13 deadline of maybe a few issues that we'll describe in more
14 detail, in those written comments than we've provided at
15 this meeting today.

16 MS. RODMAN: Right. This is a scoping meeting,
17 so the nuts and bolts of your comments are more
18 appropriately put on paper; and we'll definitely look
19 forward to reading them.

20 Does anybody else have questions?

21 Okay, I'd like to thank you all for showing up;
22 this is really a good sign that this is going to be a
23 productive process, and we're going to help PacifiCorp
24 provide us with the information we need to analyze the
25 proposed relicensing and come up with good decisions.

26

1 Thank you very much.

2 (Whereupon, at 10:32 a.m., the daytime scoping
3 meeting concluded.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25