PACIFIC MARINE ENERGY CENTER

SOUTH ENERGY TEST SITE

PROJECT NUMBER P-14616

SCOPING MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DATE: July 9, 2014

TIME: 7:00 - 7:55 p.m.

LOCATION: Hatfield Marine Science Center
2030 SE Marine Science Drive
Visitor Center Auditorium Library
Newport, Oregon 97365

REPORTED BY:
ANNE M. DUFFEY
OREGON CSR NO. 07-0405

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

NEWPORT, OREGON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014, 7:00 P.M.

MR. HASTREITER: Welcome, everyone. Good evening. Thank you for joining us for the scoping meeting for the licensing process for the Pacific Marine Energy Center South Energy Test Site, FERC Number P-14616. We call it PMEC-SETS.

My name is Jim Hastreiter and I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and my office is in Portland, Oregon. Our headquarters office is in Washington D.C. I'm a fishery biologist, and I'm also the Coordinator for the licensing process for PMEC-SETS. Also conducting this scoping meeting with me this evening is Oregon State University folks, the applicant for the PMEC-SETS Project, their consultants, Pacific Energy Ventures.

I'd like to also point out this evening there's a court reporter here, Anne Duffey. Anne is making a transcript of the meeting. As long as we have a flag, I think we'll all stand and indulge me and we'll say the Pledge of Allegiance.

(All stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. HASTREITER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Play ball.

MR. HASTREITER: So I'm just going to quickly

say a little bit about who FERC is and what we do even though most of you are familiar with it. I'll just keep it short.

FERC regulates non-federal hydropower projects including marine and hydrokinetic projects. The Federal Power Act requires hydropower projects to have licenses to operate. A license consists of articles and conditions that direct how a licensee constructs and operates a project.

These conditions are typically used to protect, mitigate, and enhance environmental resources that are affected by the projects. These resources can be fisheries, marine mammals, recreational and cultural resources, or other resource issues that we'll talk about tonight. So that's basically a general overview of hydro licensing at FERC.

I'd next like to introduce Dan. Dan's with Oregon State University, and he's going to go over the meeting agenda.

MR. HELLIN: I'm Dan Hellin. I'm the Environmental Compliance Manager with the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center at OSU and we're the applicant for this Project. And with me here is Justin Klure from PEV who's basically the Project Manager for the regulatory process.

I'm just going to go through -- over the -- I'm

going to go over the agenda and then I know we did this earlier to most of the same people but I'll get everyone to introduce themselves.

For the agenda, first, we're going to go over the Alternative Licensing Process. We're going to briefly review the proposed action. We're going to discuss the scoping of issues. We'll then open up the floor to comment and discussion, and then there'll be a couple of administrative issues that we'll go over.

And if we could, Justin, you can introduce yourself and then --

MR. KLURE: Okay. Justin Klure, Pacific Energy Ventures.

MS. HOFFORD: Anna Hofford, Pacific Energy Ventures.

MR. WILLIAMS: Rick Williams, Leidos Maritime. I'm here representing the Oregon Military Department from Camp Rilea. And in the spirit of full disclosure, I was the Systems Engineer on the WaveConnect project for Pacific Gas & Electric, and I'm Systems Engineer for CalWave with Cal Poly.

MR. SANDERS: Greg Sanders, S-a-n-d-e-r-s, with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management in our Pacific region.

MR. BROWNE: Peter Browne with HDR.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Matt Hutchinson with HDR.

MS. MOON: I'm Ruby Moon with Oregon Sea Grant.

MS. KRAMER: And I'm Sharon Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r, with H.T. Harvey & Associates.

MR. BUSCH: I'm Jason Busch for the Oregon Wave Energy Trust. B-u-s-c-h like the beer not the ex-president.

MR. McMURRAY: Greg McMurray, M-c-M-u-r-r-a-y, and I'm an Environmental Advisor to Oregon State.

MR. FAUNT: Matt Faunt with Sapere Consulting.

MR. KYTOLA: Kevin Kytola, Sapere Consulting, K-y-t-o-l-a.

MR. KIRKENDALL: Keith Kirkendall, National Marine Fisheries Service.

MS. HATFIELD: Kim Hatfield, National Marine Fisheries Service.

MR. HOMOLKA: Ken Homolka, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife.

MS. KELLY: Delia Kelly, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife.

MR. HASTREITER: All right. Thank you, everybody. So for the FERC licensing process, the general process has two time periods; pre-filing and post-filing. In pre-filing, the applicant develops the license application; in post-filing, FERC acts on the license application.

Oregon State University selected the

Alternative Licensing Process to license the PMEC-SETS Project. The basic tenet of the ALP is collaboration. Through collaboration with interested stakeholders, the applicant resolves major issues as they prepare the license application.

Early in pre-filing, the applicant starts to build consensus by forming working groups of stakeholders, developing a communications protocol and process plan, and preparing a Preliminary Application Document, and requests to use the ALP to FERC.

The PAD, the Preliminary Application Document, is a collection of available information about the Project; Project -- proposed Project design, environmental issues, environmental background information. The communications protocol establishes the ground rules for how the applicant and the stakeholders will operate together while the license application is being developed. And the process plan sets the general schedule for meeting the milestones of the pre-filing process.

Once FERC approves the use of the ALP, the applicant provides Scoping Document 1 to all the parties and files it with FERC. Scoping Document 1 includes a preliminary list of resource issues to be analyzed in the NEPA document. We'll hold scoping meetings like we're here today. Then the applicant issues Scoping Document 2 to

address any important issues that we received comments on that we didn't address or consider in Scoping Document 1.

The next step is studies. Through collaboration with the stakeholders, the applicant identifies studies to inform the license application. Typically, there are two years of studies. After the studies are complete, the applicant prepares the license application and a preliminary draft environmental document, again, in collaboration with the stakeholders because it is an ALP.

The ALP allows the applicant to provide the draft environmental document along with the license application as opposed to other FERC processes. The applicant files the application and the draft environmental document with the FERC, and at this point, the post-filing part of the process begins.

So the first step in post-filing is FERC notices filing of the application, staff reviews the application and the preliminary draft environmental document. Once we find that the application is adequate and we have sufficient -- or that we have sufficient information to do our NEPA analysis, we issue a notice requesting interventions, recommendations, and conditions. The agencies then file their recommendations and conditions. Staff prepares the Environmental Document using those

recommendations and conditions.

At this time for the PMEC-SETS, we plan on issuing and developing an EA, Environmental Assessment. While the goal is to have the applicant's preliminary draft environmental document act as the base for our environmental document, because it is going to be developed collaboratively with the stakeholders, we still may need to resolve some outstanding issues that weren't resolved during the pre-filing process.

In some cases where a settlement agreement is filed or in this case where I'm hoping the collaborative process resolves all or most of the issues, we can issue a single EA rather than doing a draft and a final. But again, that remains to be seen depending on how well the collaborative effort resolves issues.

The licensing decision is the last step in post-filing is the Commission makes a decision on the application. So that's just a brief synopsis of pre-filing and post-filing.

So at this point, I'll turn it over to Dan.

MR. HELLIN: Thanks, Jim. I'm just going to give a brief overview of the proposed action for PMEC-SETS.

What we're looking to develop is an integrated test center for the testing of wave energy conversion devices or WECs. And really the idea is this SETS will

allow people to evaluate the performance and the survivability of devices and also the environmental interactions associated with the devices themselves and the mooring systems.

The facility is -- the site that we're looking at is six nautical miles offshore so it's entirely within the Outer Continental Shelf and its final site itself will cover two square nautical miles. The area that we're looking at was -- was identified through a sort of community siting teams and in particular FINE, Fisherman Involved in Natural Energy. And they were the ones who identified approximately six square nautical miles to the southwest of Newport which they felt was a site that was most acceptable to them as a site for us to develop our facility.

When the facility is developed, there will be four test berths and each of those berths will have the ability to test either an individual device or a small array of devices. And the maximum capacity for the whole site ever in its entirety is going to be 20 devices at any one time. There'll never be more than 20 devices and the maximum power output will be 20 megawatts.

The power generated at the sites will be transmitted back to shore through four subsea cables which will be buried and then run through conduits when it gets nearer to shore. The lifespan of those cables and therefore

of the Project itself is expected to be 25 years.

I have a few very much illustrative diagrams of what the sort of layout might look like. There's a series of cables running into the test site, one cable running to each berth and reaching a subsea connector to which developers can connect their device or array of devices. In this scenario, there are six wave energy conversion devices; in this scenario, there are 10; in this scenario, there's 15; and, finally, this scenario is the maximum buildout so there's potential that we have for the site with 20 WECs.

The site that was identified by FINE, as I said, is six square nautical miles. And our test site is going to be approximately two square nautical miles and you can see down on the bottom right-hand side what two square nautical miles would look like. As you can see, the area's to the southwest approximately six miles offshore.

Justin.

MR. KLURE: Thanks, Dan. So I'm going to spend a few minutes walking us through the regulatory process and in particular the scoping process that we are currently engaged in, do a quick review of the Scoping Document and then some of the issues that we are focused on with regards to scoping, how we get from where we are today to a revised Scoping Document in the next couple months.

Just to do a quick overview of the regulatory

process, we have two federal agencies that are on point; Bureau of Ocean Energy Management with regards to the lease, and FERC, as Jim described, with regards to the license. We also, obviously, have other federal resource agencies and state resource agencies as part of our overall process.

With regards to the BOEM process, a lease request was submitted about a year ago today. They engaged in a comment period a few months back and came to the conclusion or determination of no competitive interests for the site. Basically, what they do is they submit the application or the location and determine if there's any interest in that location for a similar project, and it was determined that there was not. Therefore, the Project goes down the path of non-competitive lease rules compared to a competitive process which is a much different process.

With regards to FERC, we filed our NOI PAD, Notice of Intent, Preliminary Application Document that Jim mentioned. That document was filed on April 15th. Approximately a month or so later, FERC approved the request to use the Alternative Licensing Process which we are using to move forward; also, acknowledged as what we feel is the most collaborative way to develop the Project.

With regards to NEPA, which is intended to accommodate not only the BOEM and FERC process but also the Army Corps of Engineers' NEPA process and potentially the

Department of Energy, if there is a potential future funding action on behalf of a federal -- fellow federal agency. And we are in that mode right now with regards to NEPA and specifically the scoping process and developing study plans.

Future steps include the applicant prepared EA and our goal, as Jim mentioned as well, is to prepare a single document that meets the needs of the regulatory agencies as well as the resource agencies that are required to do various consultation throughout the Project.

Up on the slide there, you can see a quick snapshot of our pre-filing schedule. Again, this is leading up to the process where the applicant actually files the license application. You can see along that green line is kind of about where we are today with regards to this process. We have filed our NOI PAD. We have made our request to use ALP. We filed a communications protocol, and now we're engaged in our scoping meetings.

We initiated that scoping meeting with a document filed about a month ago referred to as Scoping Document 1. Copies of that are out on the front table. Based on information we receive throughout our meeting today and comments filed, we will then revise this document and develop Scoping Document 2.

We are currently targeting first quarter 2015 to file our draft license application of which is shortly

followed by preliminary recommendations and conditions. A study report is filed towards the end of 2015, and our anticipated goal at this stage is to have a final license application compete at the end of 2015, about a year and a half from today.

Zooming in a little more specifically on the scoping process, you can see where we're focused in the near term in these next few months in working through the meetings. We'll be having a site visit tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. at Ona Beach State Park which is approximately six or seven miles south of Newport. We take comments and study requests at the middle part or towards the beginning part of August, and then we are currently scheduled to file Scoping Document 2 mid-September as a revised document from the one that we have available today.

So the scoping documents -- you know, this is a bit repetitive but really the idea with the Scoping Document is to develop a list of preliminary issues to be analyzed in the EA. We also have to include a list of proposed studies that will fill information needs associated with conducting the analysis in the EA.

We go through this scoping process, this comment period with meetings, site visit, and requests for additional information, and then Scoping Document 2 is where our final study plans are developed and filed along with the

resource issues to be analyzed in the EA.

I'll note, and Jim mentioned this earlier, that in addition to the PAD, the Scoping Document was developed based on existing information and knowledge of the existing environment and of the Project. And again, over the next month or two as we collect additional information, Scoping Document 2 will reflect new information discovered through the process.

So our Scoping Document covers a variety of things. The outline is there on the screen where we have to identify the overall purpose and schedule of the Project; our proposed action and alternatives; the scope of cumulative effects and resource issues; our proposed list of studies; requests for information and studies from -- from the general public and the agencies through our collaborative work group process; and also sets the stage essentially for the preparation of the EA by including an outline in the EA and again issues of which will be analyzed in that EA document.

At a very high level, the purpose of scoping is really to invite participation and garner as much information available as we can regarding the existing environment and resources as well as that of the Project; identify issues, concerns, and opportunities for both enhancement or mitigation regarding the Project; identify

reasonable alternatives to the Project; identify available information and study needs; and identify scope of resources to be analyzed in the EA.

On the screen is a summary of those issues of which I will touch on in -- each one individually briefly, but essentially, the document that will be prepared is intended to cover both cumulative effects; geology and soils; water resources; aquatic resources; terrestrial resources; threatened and endangered species, critical habitat and essential fish habitat; recreation and land use; cultural and tribal resources; aesthetic resources; and socioeconomic resources.

So a quick summary on cumulative effects: Really what we're trying to do is analyze both time and space associated with the geographic scope of the Project so we're really looking at the terrestrial portion of the Project site as it relates to the shoreline and the distance or the path from both the Project at the OCS and coming back to shore, and the temporal scope both past, present and reasonable foreseeable future actions. And as Dan mentioned, we're looking at a 25 year action. Therefore, we need to analyze these issues over that same time horizon.

Specifically, for geology and soils, we are looking at the potential effects of Project installation and removal activities on the local geology and soils as well as

those within the Project footprint. We're looking at potential effects of the presence of hard structures on the seabed as well as effects of the Project on sediments transportation processes; specifically, erosion and accretion.

I will note that as you see these asterisks over the next series of slides, these issues that are asterisked, we will analyze for both cumulative effects as well as site specific effects. Those issues not identified by an asterisk will look specifically at just Project specific or site specific effects.

So with regard to water resources, we need to understand the potential effects of operations and facilities with regards to total dissolved gases, water temperature, potential toxic compound concentrations; pH, et cetera. We also need to understand potential aquatic growths on the Project structures, anchoring and mooring lines, for example, with regards to water quality; effects on anchor and cable installation on water quality, including sediment suspension; potential effects of antifouling paint or coatings on water quality; and potential effects of accidental spills of any fuels or lubricants or any other hydraulic fluid for that matter on water quality in specifically.

Aquatic resources: We need to look at a

variety of things here; specifically that, changes in the presence of fouling organisms; alterations or distribution of abundance of predators or prey species; effect on species interactions as a result of attraction or avoidance of the Project site; and effect on underwater or noise vibration on marine mammals, seabirds, or other sea life.

Additional issues and resources we need to be focused on with regards to aquatic include risk of collision or entanglement with any Project structures on marine mammals, seabirds, or other species; effects of Project navigational lighting or -- specifically, navigational lighting with regards to seabirds; alteration of any benthic habitat from installation or removal activities; effects of changes in wave energy on both littoral as well as shoreline habitat; and effect of EMF or electromagnetic field emission on those species that may be sensitive to those emissions.

With regards to terrestrial resources, our focus is really specific to temporary displacement of and/or disturbance of wildlife on botanical resources in the immediate vicinity of the Project during construction as well as potential effect on habitat alteration or loss due to the presence of onshore structures. Looking at the terrestrial aspects, this would include power and conditioning facility as a -- and potentially a control building as well as any infrastructure required to bring the

power into the electrical grid system.

Regarding threatened and endangered species, it is our responsibility to understand potential effects on any federally listed species in the Project area including but not limited to marine mammals, fishery -- fishes, birds and sea turtles. And we need to understand the critical habitat and essential fish habitat looking specifically at effects of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Project on designated critical habitat; and again, effects of construction, operation, and maintenance on the Project with regards to essential fish habitat.

Recreation and land use: We need to understand the effect of potential navigation restrictions on recreational vessels. We need to understand if there's any effects with regards to wave attenuation with regards to surfing or other recreational activities. And we need to understand the effects of recreation -- excuse me -- of recovery and cleanup activities associated with any spills or other emergencies on coastal recreation.

Cultural and tribal resources: We need to understand the potential effects on -- of the Project with regards to history, archeological, traditional, cultural resources located within the Project area, and also the potential effects on -- of the Project regarding tribal re- -- or tribal uses of and/or resources located within the

Project area.

Aesthetic resources: We need to understand what the potential aesthetic impact or visual experience is from shore with regards to the structures and/or any navigational lighting associated with the Project.

And, finally, we need to understand the socioeconomic resources and any potential effects or restrictions on navigational issues, lost gear for recreational and commercial fishing; effects of potential navigational restrictions with regards to marine transportation; and the economics of the Project regarding effects of any recommended environmental measures on the Project -- overall Project economics.

So that's the essential overview of the issues identified in the Scoping Document, again, which we'll revise over the next month or so. I'd like to acknowledge the proposed studies that we have identified in our Scoping Document based on existing information and just touch on those briefly.

The first is the study regarding sedimentary habitat and infaunal invertebrates. The idea with this study is to characterize sediment characteristics and infaunal species in abundance, their abundances around the Project area, and to really get an understanding of the spatial and seasonal variability with the infaunal species

both in composition and abundance.

With regards to crabs, we are focused on determining if there's any spatial variability in the habitat utilized by crabs in the area, and we'll use this information to assess any potential changes associated with the Project in that same area.

Seabirds, marine mammals and sea turtles: We'll characterize the spacial and temporal patterns in species composition and abundance of birds and mammals in the Project area, and then again, we'll use this data to assess any likelihood of direct interactions between these animal groups and the Projects.

Ambient acoustics: We need to understand what the existing or ambient acoustic signature of the Project site is. So we'll be taking measurements there at the Project site regarding the current acoustic signature and use this data to establish a background acoustic field against which both sound and noise of the Project site and the associated equipment in the Project will be evaluated against.

Waves and currents: We'll measure ambient waves and currents in the PMEC-SETS study area to better characterize existing physical conditions. And, again, this data will help us establish both local and regional wave climates and currents that are important for ecological

evaluation and overall performance of the devices to be tested.

I think that's back to you, Jim.

MR. HASTREITER: All right. Thanks, Justin.

So we're at the point in the meeting where we'll take formal comment. No one signed up to provide comment, but we have one taker in front here. So, Rick, if you would, again, say your name.

MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Rick Williams, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s, Oregon City, Oregon. As a member of the general public, I'd like to speak in support of this Project. It's essential for the responsible development of wave energy. We need to be able to test projects in a responsible manner with the full protections provided by BOEM and FERC and the academic rigor of Oregon State so I'm fully in support.

One question: Can the PowerPoint presentation with the notes be included in e-library because they carry essential information from the scoping meeting?

MR. HASTREITER: I think we'll put the PowerPoint in. I can't tell you that it will include the notes but the PowerPoint --

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. On behalf of the Oregon Military Department, the PMEC-SETS is an -- is an essential part of what the Oregon Military Department hopes

to perform in Camp Rilea which is a complementary test site in shallow and mid-water and also a place for graduates from SETS to come and operate in deep water. Given the Astoria region, we would only want to use proven devices that are graduated from SETS to be used up at Camp Rilea, and where Mr. Klure is also on the team for Camp Rilea, we'd like to be as consistent in the format for applying for a permit up there so the results of this would be helpful.

In the Scoping Document -- in the Scoping Document there's a -- there's a comment about the cables will be bundled. As the Systems Engineer from the WaveConnect project, I'd recommend you seriously consider individual conduits as opposed to a bundle of cables through a conduit. We researched that in Humboldt and it turns out that's probably not the favorable alternative to bundle cables through a conduit. You probably want individual conduits.

From tours over at EMEC, a technical comment on the project safety which is part of the Scoping Document: Many devices have station power which is power coming from the shore that enable control and instrumentation on the devices. PGE found out in an -- unfortunately, on some wind energy projects that the breakers were not properly specified, and there was no way to isolate the station power out to the projects so that was a project safety hazard.

Technically speaking, it's called a rack-out position on your breakers. So, you know, for the benefit of the project, you may want to consider that as well. Thank you.

MR. HASTREITER: All right. Just to follow up on putting the PowerPoint on the Commission record and Dan said that they'll make it available on the PMEC website which I'll show the website here shortly.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you.

MR. BUSCH: My name's Jason Busch, the Executive Director of the Oregon Wave Energy Trust, OWET. On behalf of our organization, I want to say that we fully support the PMEC-SETS Project. I think it's probably the single-most important thing we can do to promote ocean renewable energy, wave energy in particular.

The State of Oregon has supported this industry for the last seven years through contribution of $12 million to OWET to promote the responsible development of ocean energy which is our mandate. We have done that through environmental studies and regulatory policy matters to promote the industry, clean reliable electricity, and the economic jobs and development that would occur as part of that industry so we fully support it.

In addition, I hope that through this process which has been, I think, the hallmark of the way a project should happen in Oregon through the professionalism and the

outreach, the stakeholder engagements regular basis often -- often and regular has been the exact way to do a project in Oregon. I hope it becomes the model for future projects.

I also hope that the tremendous amount of work, studies, and information that will be derived from this entire process will facilitate all future projects in Oregon so that we need not duplicate studies and work indefinitely. I think you'll provide an excellent model if we build on the work that you're doing through this process which I think is great work.

And, finally, I would ask that the agencies recognize as you're going through the process that we understand that you're working with imperfect information, and that's exactly what PMEC-SETS is intended to fix is to answer some of the questions we don't have, but be careful that imperfect information and risk aversion doesn't lock us into inactivity or the status quo.

We know what the effects of the fossil fuel energy infrastructures are and we've known them for a hundred years. They're catastrophic and are failing us. We have the opportunity to replace those, but over-analysis and too high of expectations and too great aversion to risk will delay the introduction of these new technologies and potentially lock us into a system that is currently

failing us. So thank you very much.

MR. HASTREITER: Thank you, Jason. Anybody else want to make a formal comment?

(No response.)

MR. HASTREITER: Does anybody have any general questions?

(No response.)

MR. HASTREITER: We had a fairly lively discussion at this afternoon's meeting on some questions so when the transcripts are available, you can catch up on that discussion we had then. All right. So we'll move on.

So as a reminder, August 4th next month is the due date for filing comments on the PAD, comments on the Scoping Document, comments on the studies, and for providing information to assist us and OSU in our Environmental Analysis.

Also, another important date is July 28th. It's the deadline for filing cooperating agency requests. At this point we have received one request to be a cooperator by the Army Corps of Engineers last Friday. We also have the anticipation that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management will be a cooperator as well.

So I'm just going to quickly go through a few administration items. In the Scoping Document, we have a list of comprehensive plans on Page 32. If you know of

any other comprehensive plans that you want the Commission or Oregon State University to consider as part of the PMEC-SETS licensing process, please file that with the Commission.

There's also a mailing list in the Scoping Document beginning on Page 36. For any changes to the mailing list, either additions or deletions, please follow the directions in the Scoping Document on Page 27.

So how to make your filing with the Commission: All correspondence must clearly show at the top of the page that you're commenting on the Pacific Marine Energy Center South Energy Test Site Project as well as the Docket Number P-14616-000. You can either file electronically at the FERC website here or you can file the old-fashioned way with a letter sent with the original and five copies to the secretary of the Commission at this address which is also in the Scoping Document.

So we have some online resources. I'll let Dan talk about the PMEC website and the NNMREC website.

MR. HELLIN: Yeah. The PMEC.us is a website set up largely as an informational portal for the general public and it gives information about upcoming meetings, upcoming public comment periods. It has a table showing where we are in the overall process. Most importantly, it

has links to all the documents that have been filed, both FERC and BOEM documents, so that you can get them all in one place rather than having to go to separate agencies.

There's also a mailing list that you can sign up to, an e-mail list so you can stay informed about upcoming events, and we will make sure that we put this presentation up on that site as soon as we can.

The NNMREC website itself is just a website for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center itself.

MR. HASTREITER: Thanks, Dan. And lastly, I wanted to mention at the table we have "Hydropower license; How to Get Involved." There's a lot of useful information for folks that haven't dealt with FERC before in the brochure. The brochure also describes the Commission's on-line system, and we encourage anyone that's involved in the Commission proceeding to use our on-line system rather than the mail. There's a lot of information at the FERC website FERC.gov.

I did want to mention two useful options for navigating the FERC website and, again, they're described in this pamphlet. The first is e-library. Essentially, you can go to FERC.gov and hit the e-library button, put in the docket number where it says docket number, and the docket number for PMEC-SETS is P-14616. And there's a date range

you can put in there. You can put for the past year, past two years, and it will give you all the documents that were either filed or issued by the Commission on the PMEC-SETS Project.

An easier way to keep track of things that were filed on -- or documents that have been filed on PMEC-SETS or documents that the Commission has issued is the e-subscription. You do have to sign up. It's not very involved. You just provide an e-mail address and whenever a document is either filed or issued by the Commission, you'll receive an e-mail saying so. And then it will include a link, and all you do is have to hit on that link and it'll take you right to the document. So there isn't -- it's sort of a fail-safe process for following the Project. It's very useful.

So I'll just ask one more time: Anybody have any questions? Rick.

MR. WILLIAMS: Speaking as the Oregon Wave Energy Trust Energy Advisory Group, there have been some changes with the Coast Guard and I'd be happy to go over 'em with Mr. Klure and Mr. Hellin.

Mr. Ken Lawrenson is the Marine Safety Unit Lead for Wave Energy at the Port -- at Columbia Sector at Portland. Mr. John Moriarty is at the 13th Naval District. Captain Travers is the new Captain of the Port and Columbia

Sector Commander. He is responsible for navigation safety for PMEC-SETS Oregon and Southwest Washington coast.

And I'm going to be giving a presentation on August 21st at the Coast Guard/Marine Industry breakfast and if OSU, PMEC-SETS would like to be part of that presentation on wave energy, that would be a way of getting the word out to the industry and the navigational community of what you have planned.

I was just at the Harbor Safety Committee and when the topic of wave energy came up, no one in the room said anything about Newport so we may want to raise the profile a little bit.

MR. HASTREITER: So you gave what? Three contacts for the Coast Guard?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. And I'll be happy to share 'em with -- with Mr. Hellin and Justin.

MR. HASTREITER: Okay. Is there one best contact out of those?

MR. WILLIAMS: John Moriarty at the 13th District. Captain Detweiler is, you know, retired. George Detweiler at headquarters, but John Moriarty in the Seattle 13th Naval District is the center of the point of contact there.

MR. HASTREITER: Thanks, Rick. All right. Anybody else have any questions?

(No response.)

MR. HASTREITER: All right. With that, we'll end our Scoping Meeting for the PMEC-SETS Project. Thank you very much for taking the time to participate in our scoping meeting. Have safe drives home.

(Meeting concluded at 7:55 p.m.)