UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Joint Meeting With

CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

Rugraw, LLC Project No. 12496-002

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

LASSEN LODGE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT - Evening Meeting

Holiday Inn Express Hotel

2810 Main Street

Red Bluff, California

Wednesday, November 5, 2014

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

MICHELLE LOBO, California State Water Resources Control Board

ADAM BEECO, Project Coordinator, FERC

CLAIRE McGRATH, FERC

RYAN HANSEN, FERC

ALAN MITCHNICK, FERC

STEVE CRAMER, Cramer Fish Sciences

with:

CHARLIE KUFFNER, Rugraw, LLC

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7 p.m.)

MR. BEECO: We will be getting started in one minute but I did want to remind everybody we have a sign-in sheet and some materials in the back if you have not signed in, please do and feel free to grab any of the materials.

We are going to go ahead and get started. Thanks everybody for coming out this evening. As you can see on the side here, this is a joint scoping meeting for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as well as the California State Water Resources Control Board for the Lassen Lodge Hydroelectric project. For folks who may not be familiar, FERC is the federal agency who is in charge of hydroelectric power and then the California Water Board has a role within that licensing process so this evening what we will be doing is we will start off with going through FERC and FERC's licensing process and then the Water Board will have a presentation after that about the Water Board and the state regulations and CEQA and how their process works. These processes are done in parallel. The first thing we want to do tonight is we want to go through some introductions and since we have a real small audience we will just have everybody introduce themselves so again my name is Adam Beeco and I am with FERC. We will start here with Ryan.

MR. HANSEN: Ryan Hansen, also with FERC.

MS. MCGRATH: I am Claire McGrath also with FERC.

MS. LOBO: Michelle Lobo, State Water Resources Control Board.

MS. MONHEIT: Susan Monheit, State Water Resources Control Board.

MR. FOSTER: Bill Foster, National Marine and Fishery Service.

MR. MOORE: Sean Moore, Director of Planning and Accounting.

MR. ANTONE: Gary Antone, Tehama County Public Works.

MR. GARDEN: Dennis Garden, Supervisor District 3, Tehama County.

MR. GUSSING: Steve Gussing, Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy.

MR. MARKS: Robert Marks, resident.

MR. MICHNICK: Alan Michnick FERC.

MS. HOWELL: Virginia Howell, Tetra Tech.

MR. LEAPLEY: Phil Leapley, Tetra Tech.

MR. THOMPKINS: Jim Thompkins, Rugraw, LLC.

MR. CRAMER: Steve Cramer, Cramer Fish Sciences.

MR. KUFFNER: Charlie Kuffner with Rugraw, LLC, the applicant.

MR. BEECO: All right, excellent. The rest of

the meeting we will talk about why we are here, what scoping is and how that works under FERC as well as the California Water Board. We will talk about the project history, our licensing process, which this project is using the TLP which stands for Traditional Licensing Process. We will have the applicant briefly speak about the proposed project and then we will talk about some of the issues that we have identified and we will take comments and discussion on any of your comments about the project, about our scoping document or any issues that we may not have identified.

So why are we here? FERC is the agency responsible for oversight of non-federally operated hydroelectric projects. Rugraw, LLC filed an application with FERC for a hydropower license to construct, operate and maintain the Lassen Lodge Hydroelectric Project. We have reviewed the application and identified specific resources that may be affected by the proposed project and we are holding this scoping meeting to hear your comments on the proposed project and to identify any issues or resource impacts that may be caused by the granting of a license that we have not yet identified. That is FERC's role and that is the primary purpose of this scoping meeting.

The project history: Originally the project was under a different project number and the original application was filed in 1994. That application was later

dismissed in 1999. The project was reconfigured and redesigned and the licensing process began again in 2001. They were using a different licensing process up until about 2007 when FERC decided to have the licensee use the traditional licensing process instead and now they filed an application on April 21, 2014. So, the project does have some history but what FERC is evaluating is the license application that was filed on April 21, 2014. Some of the studies from the prior project are still applicable but the application and the project designs what we are evaluating is based off of what was filed April 21, 2014.

The TLP process, so any time somebody wants a license we have different processes for evaluating that license and how that may affect specific resources and so the traditional licensing process is what we will be using for this. So how does this work and where are we at in the process? The application was filed, again like I said, and that starts the process for a TLP. What happens after that is we have a study plan development and then after some of the study plans are developed we go through scoping which is what we are going through now and then after scoping we can reassess if there are any new needs to do additional studies and then after those studies are completed, the applicant will file study reports. So at this time after the study reports we will assess everything and make sure FERC has all

the information we need to evaluate the project and the resource impacts that it may have. Once we have all the information we need, we will issue an REA notice.

In each of these steps through here, the public has an opportunity to comment. This is where we are at in the process. After all the study reports are filed and we issue an REA there will be another opportunity to comment. Then once we have all the information we need we will begin to write our analysis. For this project we are doing both a draft EA as well as a final EA. After the draft, again, the public will have an opportunity to comment on how we see the project and how we have evaluated it. Then after the final you will have another opportunity to comment about what we believe within our analysis. After your final comments are taken we will be writing an order. The order is essentially the action item that we as a federal entity are given the licensee permission or not giving permission to build a project and operate it in that capacity. So we will have an analysis, an analysis then the final order which will --.

Okay, so just a brief history on where we are at and the initial steps. Again, the application was filed April 21, 2014. FERC issued a need for additional studies on October 3, 2014. The study plans that we are requiring are temperature modeling and sediment transport modeling. The study plans for these, not the results of the reports,

but just the plans on how the studies will be conducted are due from the applicant to FERC December 2, 2014. here was also a request by California Fish and Wildlife for the Foothill yellow-legged frog and I do not think they are in attendance tonight, but we will discuss some of their proposal and take comments on that as well.

Scoping, we issued our SD-1 which I think most of you have in your hand or at least are aware of or have already read on October 3, 2014. We are holding scoping meetings today. I think that most of you are aware we had one earlier today in Sacramento and the comments, any verbal comments you make tonight will go on the record and if you would like to file written comments as well they just have to be filed with us by December 5, 2014. Again, in your packets and in the notice of the scoping meeting, those dates and how to file those comments are there. Tomorrow, we have a site visit to where the proposed project is located. We will talk a little bit more about that at the end of the presentation.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, we have an REA notice and we will not issue the REA notice until we believe there is enough information for us to evaluate the effects of the project.

At this time, we will have the licensee step up and give a presentation on where they are at in their

process and some of the proposed facilities for the project.

AUDIENCE: Can I ask you a quick question?

MR. BEECO: Yes, absolutely.

AUDIENCE: The study plans, are they in a document, are they written up in a document?

MR. BEECO: The study plans? Yes the study plans are due to us December 2, 2014.

AUDIENCE: Oh, okay.

MR. BEECO: The study request can be found on the record and we will chat about e-library at the end of the presentation and if you need any help with that.

MR. HANSEN: When those study plans are filed with FERC they are available for everyone to see in the public.

AUDIENCE: Yes, I went on and registered with FERC and I found it extremely -- all I could find was what they handed out to our community to the property owners. I did not really find any documents.

MR. HANSEN: Is that right? Okay.

AUDIENCE: It did go to that so you guys told me to register, I did all of that but I went over that thing for I think an hour and a half and I am pretty savvy at it. All of that stuff, I have never seen.

MR. HANSEN: Okay, well I am sorry to hear that. Perhaps we can bring my computer down after the meeting and

we can do it. AUDIENCE: No it's fine. I have the documents now. Maybe you can explain how to use the site a little better.

MR. HANSEN: Yea, I would be glad to help.

AUDIENCE: First, I had to answer, then I had to log in, look up the project by the number. I did all of that, nothing really came up except the three-page you have.

MR. HANSEN: Okay.

AUDIENCE: And I was not the only one, by the way.

MR. HANSEN: Well, thank you.

AUDIENCE: There were quite a few people who tried.

MS. McGRATH: Yes, there are little quirks, like you have to put the P- and not just the number in so I think taking Ryan up on just the operative, running through it might help.

AUDIENCE: Well, that really does not help me as a citizen.

MR. BEECO: And some of the stuff that you picked up, the notice that has a phone number to call for specific help. I know you called me and I have been out of town, but yeah there is a number in there, a help line that you can call and will help walk you through it as well.

AUDIENCE: I just want you to understand that the

average citizen would have a really had time with your site.

MR. CRAMER: Okay, I am Steve Cramer. I am a fishery scientist working on the team for the project, for Rugraw. My firm is Cramer Fish Sciences. So because I am a fish scientist, I am going to give you an orientation but I will probably slant a little bit more toward the aquatic resources and the fish. I find that part fascinating. Just so you know, the project team I will be introducing here I will also give us an orientation as to where the facilities are, talk a little bit about the studies we have already completed and about the study planning that is ongoing so some stuff you can expect in the near future.

At first, I will give you a couple of quick landmarks that we kind of think of as bookends to where the action is within this project area. So the operand Angel Falls, this is the certain upper limit of anatomy where you could have Steelhead or Chinook or anything like that that swims from the ocean all the way up, that is far as they can get. This is on River Mile 22, the actual Diversion site, but this is 22.2 and at River Mile 23 so 8/10th of a mile upstream is the actual diversion where it is proposed so it would be just upstream of Angel Falls.

Our firm did stream surveys that terminated at this point, so this is a picture taken by our staff on July 4, 2013 and the flow at that time was measured at 13 cfs at

the gauge above the falls, 13 cfs so keep that in mind because that will be kind of a frame of reference as we talk about other things here. So that is at the upper end and the water would be diverted at that point above that point and then this is down below the project but it is another mark point kind of in the project area.

This is Panther Grade, just for point of reference that is actually me standing there the day that I got to see it for the first time. This one, you can see standing up here was June 14th, the flow at that time was about 19 cfs up at the gauge, so the flow had been dropping a little bit between that and the time of the actual survey. In that survey, we did not start at Panther Grade, we started 1.7 miles upstream where the proposed powerhouse would be and that would be the point where all water returns. So there would be no change in flow, no impact on water for a whole 1.7 miles upstream at this point until you get to the powerhouse where all the water comes back. So this is a novel feature we will talk about a little bit more because the findings show that a whole lot of spring water comes in here and downstream from here.

Okay, just to give you an orientation on the map. First of all, this is the upstream end of the map to get the diversion intake up here at mile 23 and here is the Angel Falls. There is a whole bunch of gauge data at the old

Highway Bridge that has flow data and some temperature data from up there. So here we are, the red line shows you where the actual project area would be. The powerhouse is where all water returns, goes to the powerhouse and returns to the stream and then we will talk about, well we won't talk a whole lot about the bypass but there would be flow left in the stream as well. Down here, no alteration in flow at the Panther Grade but we will go see tomorrow Ponderosa Bridge right down below that and cover this stretch here as a good view of what the place looks like.

I wanted to point out too, I am not going to talk a whole lot about design features, facilities or roads or anything. There are maps posted on the wall that has it in great detail and it is a lot easier to look at it on a big picture like that. There are handouts in the back that have some of that detail and then the full packet that is the FERC license application is back there as well so you can get more detail on those. We have people in the audience here, a lot of project teams right here that could answer your questions.

I apologize for some of this white stuff we realize after we got it up it does not show, but I will guide you through this. So the president of Rugraw, Charlie Kuffner and Charlie is right here, Jim Thompkins, right behind my left is the project engineer. Then on the

consultant team, independent from the hard-to-do studies, Tetra Tech and Virginia Howell back here is the project manager, Phil Leapley is the coordinator of the whole process, the licensing process and then we have some experts in different stuff. Karen Brunacome is the Terrestrial and Botanical, Jenna Farrell - Historical and Archeological, Socioeconomics is Rachael Katz; she gets recreation, resources, land use, that kind of thing.

I and our team, our staff provides fishery science and when we got started with this we, as was mentioned already in the presentation by FERC, they identified and so did all the fishery agencies with that first license application, that we needed to do temperature studies and sediment transport studies. So at that time a buddy who I have worked with a long time, Dr. Mike Diaz is in watercourse engineering. He has modeled temperatures all up and down California and even in Oregon and beyond. Anyway, he is a great guy so we got him on the team to do that modeling and he has been working on the proposal which is soon to be submitted and has been run by some of the agencies and they will go through review before its final plan. We will adapt it to their recommendations. Then it goes out for your review.

I skipped Bob McCarthy. His firm, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants really well known on lots of

geomorphic and hydrology work around so he is going to do the sun modeling and the synthetic water flow, the hydrology stuff. Doug Parkinson, you will see one picture of him, he is the guy who has done lots of the field work in the past so for years and years he has been the guy in the field measuring all kinds of things. He has done measurements at Panther Grade, he collected a whole variety of data that will be sighted. Then down here we have our archeologist Doug Brewer. He is the guy in charge of terrestrial, wildlife, frogs. So that is the team and these are all too-notch folks and independent of Rugraw for this project.

So for now I thought I would highlight just a couple of things, our key little features you get to see tomorrow but one of the elements we had to deal with addressing at the time of the license so some of the science studies went in, was are anadromous able to get into the project area. Remember this one is 1.7 miles downstream from the powerhouse which means that all flows return and so the whole project while upstream of here but anadromous fish would have to get by here to get up there. So in 2000, Cal Fish and Game made an appropriate policy decision. They were just going to say it is passable at some flow, we don't know what it is but we are not going to call it impassable.

After that, for that reason, we had Doug Parkinson who is a fish biologist and has done lots of

different surveys. He came up and did measurements at multiple flows. This is a picture of him standing out there when the flow is at, he said about 200, later when we got all the measurements lined up it is about 180 is the actual time he was there. That is actually higher than the highest monthly flow that you would see during the season, 146 cfs is the peak month that is May, so it is mainly spring raw stream. At any rate, you go out and measure the depths of the plunge pools and you get the height that they have to jump, and the rule of thumb that all the agencies use in determining passages is that you would have to have depth of 1.25 feet for each one foot that they have got to jump, so if it is 6 feet they would have to jump, they need 8 feet of depth to get the speed to jump that high and then they would be able to do it. The depths are quite shallow here at the base of the falls so he found not even close, they cannot get over any of these routes over the falls at 180 cfs and that is the highest. We also measured 24 and 100 and it does not work then either.

Okay, so just a couple simple things we got on the fish. We did survey every single pool riffle and every channel unit from the powerhouse all the way to the falls, measured the dimensions that we know have demonstrated a relationship from science studies to fish production. So this is a pool and one thing we found at the pools is it is

very steep and as you can see, boulders are everywhere. Only 15 percent of the channel area between the powerhouse and Angel Falls is pools. That is really important because that is where the fish have to go in the summer.

That was measured right there, that picture, in July 4, 2014. The flow was 13 cfs above the other way. Here is what happened this year. In October, the stream went dry earlier in the summer, up above Angel Falls and we sent a survey up in October and here we are even actually down below the powerhouse. This is not even up to the project yet, there is only about 0.5 cfs flowing through it. This is a riffle, but what happens when the riffles get that low is there is just a few inches of water and anything to try and stick out there would be a sitting duck for birds and for raccoons. Fish do very strongly avoid 6 inches deep or shallower and you don't get it in riffles. So the riffles become not very effective for rearing fish and those pools are everything when you get down to low flows in the summer. It is pretty limited for rearing.

Now a bunch of that information is posted in the application that Rugraw filed for the FERC license. These are a couple of studies that are in progress and so you can expect soon will be coming out that temperature simulation. Now, that is the one that has to have the plan approved before the simulation is done but that is very

well-developed now and so we should see that plan get through the approval process very soon and out for review.

Synthetic flow, that means there is some years of flow but we need to create a longer term and it is being correlated to a whole bunch of other streams around that. The proposal is also about ready for review as is the sediment transport. So these are in development for review by FERC and Fisheries Agencies and then it comes to you all. When that is done, those pieces feed into the fish simulation model where we will then simulate, well given the way things are and the way the project would operate, what would happen to the fish and we could do a whole variety of simulations with that. So those will be coming in the future. Interesting findings today I think is my concluding point.

The springs that come into the stream below Panther Grade and between there and Panther Creek which we will see tomorrow was really a dramatic change. They contributed almost 20 cfs. So the water was bone-dry, nothing coming over Angel Falls. By the time you get to the Ponderosa Bridge, below Panther Creek, you are 28 cfs and the springs are all coming in at 49 so that is very ideal for trout. You have got a really nice spring-fed stream below the Ponderosa Bridge in keeping with kind of our picture of what Battle Creek has to offer.

Above the project, you have mostly dry stream bed or about a 0.5 cfs to no cfs under this severe drought. It would be more than that in other years but nevertheless it would be limiting above and the main spring flows come in at Panther Grade to Panther Creek and you will see that tomorrow. Summer temperatures and flows are substantially more favorable to some lines below Panther Grade than above. I have already mentioned Panther Grade is not passable at 180. That is a recent finding.

Then fish-rearing habitat in that bypass reach back up higher is strongly limited by the low-flow season and that would be a problem and especially because of the sparse pools in the depths in the riffles. Then habitat in the bypass reach is a poor fit for Spring Chinook and we covered some of that because Spring Chinook would arrive in the spring and would have to hold all summer. They would certainly have 100 percent mortality this year, they would have high mortality many years if warmer water up there and there is very limited places for them to hold. They do not spawn until the fall so they would have to make it all the way up through the summer and then the lowest season of flow is when they spawn.

AUDIENCE: Steve, what did you say was the temperature this year? Up there, say where Angel Falls is?

MR. CRAMER: We will have that data out. I have

not reviewed it. Jim, do you remember?

MR. THOMPKINS: Steve, we have some temperature data that has not been published to everybody yet that the agencies are looking at as part of the study process that has been going on. But this summer, the stream dried up right below Highway 36 Bridge. There was no flow at Angel Falls for like 3 months so we could not get any water temperatures there. We do have water temperatures for this summer above the old Highway 36 Bridge and we took some above the project at Mineral Bridge.

MR. CRAMER: Did you see the pool at Angel Falls dry up?

MR. THOMPKINS: Completely, and we have some images here that actually we had published.

MR. CRAMER: You can see the photos.

AUDIENCE: Then I would say the water temperature is pretty high. (Laughter).

MR. CRAMER: Real close.

AUDIENCE: All right, thank you.

MR. THOMPKINS: Incidentally, that temperature study and data, just the base-flow study, it didn't have any temperature in it.

MR. CRAMER: No, it was just flows.

MR. THOMPKINS: So there is a brand new document out of real interest to you that just got posted on the low

flows.

MR. BEECO: So actually at this time FERC staff will go through issue by issue and hear your comments on any particular issue. So, the purpose of scoping again is to identify issues, identify reasonable alternatives, identify available information and study needs and identify all cumulative issues in scope as well as the site visit.

In our scoping document you will see we identified cumulative effects. These are effects that not just the project may have but the project with other projects or other developments on the stream may cumulatively affect something where each individual one may not have a significant impact. So the resource we have identified that may be cumulatively affected is aquatic resources and the geographic scope that we put for the project to look at things from a cumulative perspective is South Fork Battle Creek from the project to the confluence with the North Fork of Battle Creek.

The primary resources that we will go through, and we will go through these one by one and again as we go through these slides if you have any questions about any specific resource or something that we may be looking at, feel free to ask. Just raise your hand or just let me know and ask your question.

So geology and soils, one of the things we are going to be

looking at in our analysis is the effects of project construction on erosion and sedimentation of project lands.

AUDIENCE: There was a lot of people that wanted to come here tonight but because we had a fire two and a half years ago, all of a sudden all of the sediment, even the Department of Forestry was supposed to monitor that and it all decided to come down in the last rain. So people are actually up here in town and three different water sources are clogged. So the whole town of Manton has no water tonight. They are working with lights to try to restore the water over something that was supposed to be done 2 years ago. Now it is just a fire which relates to power lines. He has to comment on each.

Audience 2: The fire that he is talking about also went up that canyon above where this project site is.

MR. BEECO: Thank you. I do not think we were aware of that.

AUDIENCE: It went all the way, almost to 14 road.

MR. MARKS: That was because the DC tenants put it out. If they hadn't --

AUDIENCE: If they hadn't, it would have lost Mineral.

AUDIENCE: We would have lost probably half of Western farm for forest fires.

MR. MARKS: That was two and a half years, that was not -- AUDIENCE: They could not get a fire truck across Ponderosa Way.

MR. MARKS: Where the site is proposed is extremely even more remote than where the fire was.

MR. BEECO: All right, thank you gentleman.

MS. McGRATH: I just wanted to know if your court reporter was able to catch people's names.

MR. MARKS: Robert Marks, I am a resident.

MR. GARDEN:: District 3 Supervisor for the County, that is my district.

MR. BEECO: I apologize, that is my fault. So whenever you say anything for the court reporter just reiterate your name and affiliation. Sorry about that, that is my fault. I apologize. All right, aquatic resources. I am going to have Claire, our fisheries biologist run through these points.

MS. McGRATH: These are some of the issues that have been identified as important to the project. First off, the effects of project construction activities, for example project construction would include in-water work or excavation of soil or sediment on water quality. That includes temperature, dissolved oxygen and turbidity levels around the project construction site. Effects of project construction activities on the potential release of

contaminants.

For example: Fuel, lubricants or other wastes into project waters and the effects of project construction activities on fisheries and aquatic habitat downstream of the project site. Other issues that have been identified is potentially important including the effects of the project operations. For example, on water quality in the South Fork Battle Creek area, the effects of project operation including ramping during start-up and shut-down of minimum flow releases, on fisheries and aquatic resources in the South Fork of Battle Creek and affects of project operation of facilities on upstream and downstream fish passage including entrainment and turbine mortality. We are taking questions at this point.

MR. MARKS: Robert Marks, Manton again. So it is my understanding that us taxpayers have spent over $100 million today which the last phase is going up South Fork to restore the salmon and Steelhead runs. So we are paying for that, $100 million, which has phases which are going up where this project is going. We are also subsidizing PG&E I think until the year 2020 Pacific gas and Electric Company in California for the loss of water flow. So their generators are not producing the power that they did, because we are trying to redirect that water without the fish. So you are going to look at those effects of the

Federal Restoration project in accordance with the loss of water, I guess that is what you are saying? Because I did not hear you say you are going to look at the Federal Restoration project too.

MS. McGRATH: Right, so they would be considered as part of the cumulative effects analysis on South Park.

MR. MARKS: That would be cumulative effects, right? To me that is a major cumulative effect.

MS. McGRATH: Right.

MR. HANSEN: That is the main reason we identified the park resources to be cumulatively affected because in the foreseeable future, when some of these anadromous fish will be up in the project area.

MR. MARKS: That is what I am saying and instead of $50 million to move a boulder then these guys get to -- you see what I am saying?

MR. HANSEN: We will definitely deal with, our analysis will include future conditions that will contribute along with the effects of this project so we will, that is one of the things that we will be looking at.

MR. GARDEN:: Dennis Garden, Supervisor District 3. The question in regards to the South Fork Battle Creek Project, we just had a FERC meeting at a sister hotel right up the street last month. Is that information going to get to this report also?

MS. McGRATH: What was that meeting? Which project?

MR. GARDEN:: It was for licensing for PG&E on the South Fork. It was the restoration project on the South Fork, they were for phase II of their licensing process as the gentleman just spoke on that project.

MR. HANSEN: it was a relicensing done on a PG&E project.

MR. GARDEN:: It was phase II, they did phase I and phase IA and now they were going for phase II licensing.

MR. FOSTER: Bill Foster, National Marine and Fishery service. In the distant past, when there was a relicensing process done for that series of projects, the band and everything on that, what PG&E elected to do at that time they made a management decision to work with the Bureau of Reclamation to restore habitat and work it into this rather large long-term kind of restoration project while still being able to generate power and things like that. So what's germane to this particular project is that on the South Fork by, and this comes from the Reclamation website as far as I know, that by 2019 they are supposed to have, below the project here on the South Fork if you go downstream there is a South Diversion Dam, there is an Inskip Diversion Dam and then there is the Coleman Diversion Dam. They are going to improve the passage of Inskip Okay

and there are going to take out the other two dams by 2019. Once those dams are out like you were stating, so long as it can potentially have access up into the project of Bypass Reach. The bypass reach is the reach that where the water is diverted out of and it comes back in.

MR. MARKS: That was in your documents, right? That you had put from 4 years ago.

MR. FOSTER: Well, yeah, the restoration project has the other.

MR. MARKS: Right, because I read a document from you that says that it is very possible they could get to the surface.

MR. FOSTER: Right. We actually have fish passage engineers that still believe that there could be direct effects of the project based on what amount of water at different times of the year is let into Bypass Reach because we feel that fish could still potentially get into the bypass reach in certain wet water years. So at the same time we are not trying, we are looking at it because it is such a small area, as an opportunistic kind of area, that if it is available to the fish to use for whatever way they see fit, they should be able to move within there. Obviously there are times of the year in the summer where the flow is still too low, the project may not operate if the flows go too low to begin with. So there may be times when you are

not operating, you are not affecting anything because there is not enough water in the system to do that. It is worse in drier years than it is in wetter years obviously. But like I said, we do not necessarily agree that the Panther Grade barrier is a complete barrier. That is where we are at. That is what my fish engineers are telling me.

Mr. GUSSING: My name is Steve Gussing for Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy. Relative to assessing the effects on fish passage, is there some kind of study being proposed to further assess the Panther Grade, the passability of the Panther Grade site.

MS. McGRATH: Right. Now there has not been a request from FERC for them to do further passage studies so I think that is a point for discussion and comment if NMFS is feeling that it really is passable, we need to address this issue.

MR. MARKS: You might not want to speak to this but I believe one of the Applicants proposals is a monitoring plan at the powerhouse for the presence of anadromous fish for a certain number of years and if they are identified to have been present in the area then to consult with NMFS on some sort of passage solution at that point. You might want to clarify that, is that correct?

Audience 2: That is a problem because they know, the Federal Government knows that there is not fish here that

they will be there soon. So how can you say that?

MR. FOSTER: This is Bill Foster from National Marine and Fishery Service.

Audience 2: Do you understand what I am saying?

MR. FOSTER: Not exactly, could you

Audience 2: They know that there is blockage and we are paying lots of money as taxpayers to restore this, but there are some main blocks right now. So to say that they can monitor it right now for the next years before the next phase of the restoration project where the fish can get through is kind of

MR. FOSTER: Understood. I think, I do not believe the monitoring effort is meant to be undertaken during the years when the other dams are still in place, because as you were saying, that is pointless. If they can't pass the downstream dams there is no point in

Audience 2: But they are already passing because there are already fish ladders.

MR. FOSTER: Bill Foster National Marine and Fishery service. The weird thing is that in the path through what we call a final rule, we designate a critical habitat from Angel Falls down. Now that habitat was still designated that way, even though there were dams downstream in existence.

MR. MARKS: Right, I got that.

MR. FOSTER: And it is kind of a strange kind of thing. Because one has to deal with the presence of critical habitat whether it is occupied of not, okay, and the way the restoration project is going in terms of its funding and playing, over a 30-50 year birth license, this is the horizon we have to look out into, we are assuming that those dams are going to come out on some sort of schedule and that kind of access will be potentially open to anadromous fish that are coming in through the entire system.

MR. MARKS: I just went to a huge meeting that he is the Chair of basically and it was very enlightening. We had Federal, we had State, we had all kinds of people there and they explained for an hour and a half how they had put fish ladders in, what is going on with the dams and the main problem now on the next phase was boulders that were in the way. Then the fish could float freely all the way up.

MR. FOSTER: Well, right and then as far as there is a whole bunch of moving parts to that restoration as you are probably aware of and the only things that are germane to this particular project is what particular impediments there are on the South Fork leading up to the project which are primarily the two dams that are going to be removed and the improvement of the one in the middle. So that has not happened yet and it is supposed to happen in 2019 and that

may or may not stay as a fixed day, it is hard to estimate exactly how long that is supposed to take. We are going to go with that for now until they tell us otherwise.

So because of that, that is like you said one of the reasons we feel there might be, in the future, of potential direct effect because the fish get into the Bypass Reach and there is not enough water in there for them to travel back and forth. They have proposed a 13 cfs minimum flow but in some parts of that system they have also noted that 30-40 or 50 cfs is needed in some areas to get past some critical riffles and stuff like that. The point being is that we are not looking at this as you know, we want to establish and recover a population of fish within the entire drainage of the Battle Creek area. It is not all depending on this one 1.7-mile section. It is more like we would like fish to have the opportunity to utilize that if they can, really understanding that in some years they can and other years they might not be able to. That is what they do, they go up, they go down. They don't sit around and wait for a pool to dry up, they get the hell out of there if they can.

MR. MARKS: I am 5th generation California tonight. I fished Marin County all the way up the coast and there were salmon everywhere. There was always little dams and everything and all of a sudden they disappeared one day. You know, you had to fight the people to get those dams

broke and obviously we knew what we were doing but the one point I want to make to you is that it is a good thing to bring them back, but too I want you to understand Battle Creek South Fork has a unique purpose. That purpose is that man can't get in there.

You are talking to one of the few -- they call it a stream but it is really a river because my definition of a river is water that you can't walk across so to me it is a river it is not a creek Okay. So when you guys do your thing, if it happens and they come back and they run up there, people are not going to be able to go on nature hikes up there.

MR. HANSEN: No, I know it is not a place to exactly go picnic.

MR. MARKS: So this is one opportunity that you know.

MR. HANSEN: I know, it is very --

MR. MARKS: It's not going to be messed up by people, you know and that is kind of cool in a way. Thank you.

MR. CRAMER: If I could make a comment. Steve Cramer. Just so you understand the proposal, in case that happens, that is what Ryan was just telling us is that the monitoring that was proposed is to determine if they arrive and if the monitoring would happen obviously after the dams

are allowing passage up there. There would not be any point in doing monitoring. So the monitoring purpose is to make sure that they in fact are not accumulating there in the project area and if they are observed then that monitoring leads to action so we consult with NMFS and figure out what to do and there would be a plan to adapt to it. So us locals already know how many fish are in that creek, okay. So you know, you are talking kind of

MR. CRAMER: Well, I am talking about a mass of fish.

MR. MARKS: Well us locals, we live out there and we know how many fish come by. We see them. You know, so my point is that you know it is, I am not talking about dams, you know we just installed fish ladders. We are talking about blockages that the Federal Government, $100 million is not cheap. I don't know if you saw the other day but the federal deficit is now at of a million to pay it back. That is 175 thousand per person whether it is your son, daughter, a two-year old or a fresh born. So to spend $100 million on a project to do something good is not something to take lightly.

MR. FOSTER: And I would like to clarify, Bill Foster again. They have you know proposals in there inside the case. At some point we will come to the point where FERC will ask for Ready for Environmental Analysis and that

REA thing is what that means is that everybody, you guys, me, everybody can put in what we think terms and conditions should be for the operation of that project including certain levels of monitoring and it may be totally different from what they are proposing, they maybe like what they are proposing and if we don't know yet we are not that far along in that.

MR. MARKS: So they will be required to do an EIS is what you are saying?

MR. FOSTER: I personally feel that they may need to do something like that because of the potential presence in the future of a threatened fish. The Steelhead are threatened.

MR. MARKS: Who pays for the EIS, I would like to know that?

MR. FOSTER: Hmm?

MR. MARKS: Who pays for that EIS.

MR. FOSTER: Well that is the applicant usually. The EIS, actually FERC is the one that has

MR. MARKS: So in California if the developer wants to do something there is not a government entity, it comes out of your pocket. So he does not even need to do his California Environmental Quality Act Report. Again, us taxpayers are paying for this application.

MR. FOSTER: Let's move forward.

MR. MARKS: I am sorry there, sir.

MR. FOSTER: But again, that is not something that is not something that we would even come up with in terms of terms and conditions that we are still formulating, that we are still trying to figure it out.

MR. MARKS: I understand the rules.

MS. McGRATH: Are there any other questions regarding issues surrounding the Aquatic Fisheries Environment. Okay, great. Thank you. Appreciate the conversation.

MR. BEECO: Yea,, let me look at that air real quick. Alan, you want to take over for Terrestrial Resources?

MR. MICHNICK: Okay, we have identified 5 terrestrial resource issues for the project. The first one deals with habitat effects and we will be looking at the effects of project construction operation and maintenance on vegetation from habitat laws, habitat degradation, habitat fragmentation and the associated effects to local wildlife population.

The second issue deals with invasive species, we will be looking at the effects of private construction, operation and maintenance and recreational use on the spread of invasive plant species. We will be looking at special habitats and particularly the effects of construction

activities and project operation on wetland and riparian vegetation. We will be looking at stress to wildlife populations from noise, construction activity, human presence, vehicle use, helicopter use. We will be looking at the effect of the project on special status species and we have identified Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog as a species that we will be looking at. We will be looking at construction, operation and maintenance.

We did have a study request from California Fish and Wildlife to do a survey of breeding Yellow-Legged Frogs. We did want a little more information before we made a decision on that. We had a discussion this morning, a little bit and the applicant provided a little more information on the issue but Cal Fish and Wildlife wasn't available then and they are not here today so we probably still need to have some discussions with them. I will open it up now if anybody, I don't need to repeat what anybody said for the record, but if anybody in the audience has some information that may help us decide whether frog surveys are needed, we would like to hear from you.

MR. MARKS: I would like to point out that canyon where we live has an abundance of American and Golden Eagles so I do not know what type of distribution lines are going to run and safety, but the once I have seen so far from PE&G Gas and Electric Company have no assurance that they are not

going to be electrocuted when they hit the falls. As a matter of fact, you can see the delineators are only this tall and it is just a real beautiful site when you go up into those canyons and you see the eagles all over.

MR. MICHNICK: Yes, we definitely will look at the transmission line, look at electrocution and collision. I am not exactly sure why it did not include that as an issue. It typically is a standard issue that we address and we will make sure that the line meets the current raptor protection standards that are available. Any other questions on terrestrial resources or Yellow-Legged Frogs?

MR. MOORE: I have a question, Sean Moore, Director of Planning. Is this process the EA because that is different than CEQA? Is this just the environmental assessment to determine the level, specific type of NEPA document or as you guys just doing environmental assessment?

MR. MICHNICK: At the moment, we plan on doing an environmental assessment. Certainly that is the purpose of scoping to make sure that we make a right decision so this is an opportunity to provide comments if you disagree with our decision to do an environmental assessment instead of an Environmental Impact Statement. That is our current plans but certainly scoping will help inform that final decision.

MR. MOORE: Another question I have is on the CEQA, we have the State Resources Michelle sitting here. I

have talked to her so many times. Hi Michelle. Great people. Are you guys running joint documents? Is the state requiring an EIR or what type of level of CEQA are we talking about and how are you guys, typically when you do an EA with an EIR or if there is potential for that I mean it is hard to meld those two documents and we had discussions about that. So I was wondering what type of level specific on the NEPA side and CEQA side are we looking at.

MS. LOBO: Michelle over at State Level. I will answer. We are not doing any joint NEPA/CEQA document.

MR. MOORE: So you are not?

MS. LOBO: We are not and I will present after them on the CEQA.

MR. GARDEN:: Dennis Garden, supervisor District 3, on the slide just prior to this one we talked about heavy equipment operation and so forth. Any consideration for what it is going to do to our roads, both county roads and state highway for getting this equipment to and from the proposed site?

MR. MICHNICK: I will pass that question to our recreational land use person.

MR. BEECO: It has not currently been brought up as an issue but if that is something that you feel should be evaluated we will consider that.

MR. MARKS: You should see those canyons. It

will be fun.

MR. MICHNICK: That was addressed in the license application. Any other questions before we move on from terrestrial? And again, any comment you have we would certainly like to hear from you in your comments on the scoping documents.

MR. MOORE: I have one more question, sorry. Sean Moore, Director of Planning. So, on the yellow-Legged Frog because the county has worked with the resource agencies and drafting letters and we have a coordination committee with Tehama County, so we know this is a big issue with the Yellow-Legged Frog. What kind of feedback have you gotten from California Department of Fish and Wildlife in terms of -- have they submitted a comment letter. I have talked to them on the Yellow-Legged Frog issue. I was just wondering what kind of comments you received and the potential impact.

MR. MICHNICK: Yes, the application does include measures to deal with the construction period that they will survey the stream reach and if they find any frogs they will relocate them and they will work that out with California Fish and Wildlife. Subsequent to that discussion, Cal Fish and wildlife has come in with a recommendation to do surveys, actually do surveys in the Bypass Reach and that is what we are in the process of evaluating the need for those

additional surveys. So that decision will be made pretty shortly on that.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. MICHNICK: Rarest and threatened endangered species. We will look at the potential effects of the project, construction, operation and maintenance on the Red-Legged Frog. As we mentioned this morning, we will also look at Spring Chinook, Steelhead and designated critical habitat for those species.

MR. FOSTER: I would also like to mention, Bill Foster, Northwest Marine and Fishery Service, the other species of concern would be Fall Run Chinook Salmon and there is also potential for Winter Run. At least to get into the Battle Creek System. We are not sure exactly how far they will go because Winter Run require colder water during periods and obviously that runs a little differently than the Spring Run but those are at least the Spring Run, the Winter Run and the Steelhead are a threatened and endangered species and of course you said you want to include that now but your original document kind of left them out of it. They were really in that section.

But I am glad you are considering them because again we have to look at the long-term horizon and there could possibly be direct effects and it is probably going to go with some sort of not necessarily mitigation but some

sort of level of monitoring or something like that to be worked out in the future when we get more information together and we put our terms and conditions together you will have more information of that.

MR. MOORE: The species that we will deal with are threatened and endangered, they are never, they are usually listed and finalized by the time of scoping. That is also part of the scoping process, finding what new species that we have not learned about so in this case we will definitely take a look at the Fall Run and the Winter Chinook and consult you underneath it. Again, with the effects on this fish.

AUDIENCE: Can I ask a question of Dr. Cramer? Would you say that springs that you said come in below Panther Grade, do you think that could support some habitat for Winter Chinook at those temperatures.

MR. CRAMER: Yes, it could. So Winter Run, the deal is that the optimal range for all of these species whether they be Winter Run, Spring Run or anything else is similar. The issue is their life cycle. When are they there so what do they have to withstand? When do they lay their eggs because eggs have a very different sensitivity than to the fish. So 59 degree steady water is the kind of situation that probably sustained Winter Run to start with because it means year round you have 49 degree. Here we had

the severest drought on record and we had 49 degree water below downstream we got 28 cfs that was below Panther Creek.

That is a nice little stream and they need holding water so there are more issues than just the temperature but any species of salmonid could inhabit that and a race could inhabit that if that was all they had to encounter. Next, it will be what they have got to get in and out of to get there along their life cycle because they go to the ocean and come back. So timing is a big issue but it was cold springs like that that really supported the strip of Winter Run Chinook.

We do not have them anywhere else on the West Coast that were going to springs like that. We have springs in other parts of the West Coast but because of the route to and from, they do not support Winter Run but they might support Spring Run. You got the Metolius, you got Spring Run on the McKinzy. Those are both spring-fed systems in Oregon. Anyway, so it depends but that is the right temperature and there is good flow, so if everything else could get in there and back, that could be Winter Run. The situation there and back is not easy. That is not likely to work out. It will lower itself before it gets warm. We will be evaluating that and so will our counterparts. Thank you.

MR. MICHNICK: Any other questions on rarest,

threatened and endangered species?

MR. BEECO: All right, so recreation land use, at this time we have not identified any recreation issues but we will be evaluating the effects of project construction of new, permanent and temporary roads on current land use practices. Aesthetics effects project construction operation and maintenance on the aesthetic resources in the vicinity of the project. Cultural resources effects cultural resources that are eligible or potentially eligible in the National Register of Historic Places. Socioeconomics: The effects on the local economy. Developmental resources: The effects of the proposed or recommended protection mitigation and enhancement measures on Lassen Lodge project Economics. Any questions on any of those last few resources?

MR. FOSTER: Actually, Bill Foster with National Marine and Fishery Service. That one slide where you mentioned obviously you have to consider the comprehensive plans, many of which are on a large list that you are producing. Not to mention that consideration has not been finished yet but after we file our Central Valley Recovery Plan for the three major species, Winter, Spring and Steelhead which covers a huge area. I mean it is the entire Central Valley and hundreds of potential places that it could apply to though we did file that under the docket to

considered as a comprehensive plan. But again, you know it is not officially on there yet because you are still looking at it.

MR. BEECO: Okay, thank you.

MR. FOSTER: But we did explain why we feel it is a comprehensive plan according to the criteria that you used to decide.

MR. GARDEN:: Dennis Garden, District 3 Supervisor. On your slide it talked about, trying to think now going backwards we talked about recreation. We have lots of people that park at the Old Highway and walk in to the Highway Bridge and fish that creek from top to bottom.

MR. BEECO: Al right, thank you for that. (To Court reporter) make sure you get that right.

MR. GARDEN:: Most any given day during the season, if you drive up 36 to the old road that goes into the Highway Bridge, there are cars there and people have walked in to fish.

MR. BEECO: Okay.

MR. MARKS: I think they are planting that.

MR. GARDEN: We got the church campus --

MR. MARKS: Because of the Metolius, of this area coming down Ponderosa toward Manton, there are numerous Indian sites that are not on the historical lists. We locals know that.

MR. BEECO: Okay.

MR. MARKS: That is just because it has really never been put down on the lists. Some of it was destroyed by the fire so potentially if it pops up, it pops up.

MR. BEECO: I know we sent letters out to the tribes an our Cultural Resource Specialist is not here.

MR. GARDEN:: There are no tribes in that general area but it is historically.

MR. MOORE: Sean Moore, Director of Planning Tehama County. I need you guys to look at the County's general plan that is on our website, so you need to look at the open space, our recreational elements and also our agritourism policies in the forest areas, that is important so we need to make sure that you guys look at those for policies because this is a recreational county and so those statements and policies are in our general plan that was recently adopted in 2009. So you need to make sure you guys review those for consistency with those policies.

MR. BEECO: Thank you. Ryan, got that as well?

Mr. Antone: Gary Antone, Public Works, Tehama County. A question in regard to your comment about the roads itself, not having seen the plans for the hole, we do not know at this point in time what your access routes are, what size vehicles are going to be over there, how many vehicles, what the effect of that is going to be as you had

mentioned earlier on the roads themselves but also if we can get the long-term maintenance of what size vehicle has to get up there to build this particular structure. You know, what the facilities are and then what is the end result of when that construction is done, what happens to the major damage of the curves on whatever route is put in place at that point in time. What is the long term maintenance of that particular route and how often are they going to have to be in there maintaining the site?

MR. BEECO: We will be evaluating all of that but there are some things in the plan and in the license application that say a temporary road, that they will do after that road is no longer going to be in use, you know, replanting or whatnot. They have that in their application. So we will definitely be evaluating those types of things. The one thing that you guys mentioned that was somewhat new would be evaluating roads kind of outside the project by bringing in new and heavy equipment on regular roads but that is something

Mr. Antone: We are going to take turns and monitor areas and that could be submitted and issued.

MR. MARKS: Us locals, because I hope you guys go look at those roads.

MR. BEECO: We will be up through there tomorrow.

MR. MARKS: We will 4-wheel drive, we will drive

our ATVs. I cannot imagine the type of work that will have to go on those canyons to get any equipment in there, let alone a truck.

MR. BEECO: We will be there tomorrow.

MR. MARKS: Mine is on one of those TV shows in Peru.

AUDIENCE: Could I ask Rugraw, I mean to you have any indication at this point as to what types of vehicles that you will use?

MR. THOMPKINS: Yes, we have included that in our license application. We have it broken down.

AUDIENCE: Maybe worth sharing with the crowd.

MR. THOMPKINS: Yes, we have the application here and we can go through our list of equipment. They are relatively small piece of equipment relative to what we would use to fight fire for example, and we were looking at you know D6 or smaller pieces of equipment. Not D9s or bigger pieces of equipment or big excavators. We only have one site where we are actually in the stream itself. The only place we are in the stream is at the diversion because the powerhouse and tower-raiser have been designed above the actual creek itself. It is the only place we are actually in the stream is there. We are essentially going to access off of Highway 36 and access everything from the South Side of Battle Creek with the exception of the transmission lines

which are essentially single pole sets that essentially go up to the Manton point of interconnection.

MR. MARKS: You can see that it is so steep that even if you knock a block off the road that it will run all the way to the river.

MR. THOMPKINS: That is one of the elements that we have to manage as part of the storm water pollution prevention, that is part of the construction of the project.

AUDIENCE: You know on the North Side there is a large rhyolitic formation process popping out that really has not consolidated with soil so mass wasting is a concern there. I mean the fires really

MR. THOMPKINS: Yes, well again we won't be affecting any of that stuff because we essentially span the whole canyon to get to the other side.

AUDIENCE: And then your transmission line is on our side, going across.

MR. THOMPKINS: Right, that is what I am saying. It essentially spans that.

MR. CRAMER: Yes, it goes across the canyon and then it runs parallel with South Fork and Battle Creek and that is where the rhyolitic formation is found.

MR. MARKS: No. It is in the ditch north of the creek. It goes up, crosses first upper South Fork then it crosses Battle Creek and then it gets on the ridge and it is

away from that.

MR. BEECO: Yes, okay.

AUDIENCE: And there are access roads existing, long roads and a lot of them were upgraded during the fire but they have been there forever and SPI maintains them, you know, for all the regulations and so forth. There is no new road construction that would go in any of that element from the powerpoint.

MR. CRAMER: Thanks for the picture.

MR. KUFFNER: Just to be clear, there are only two small extensions to the SPI roads where 110a pulls off just before the old bridge, there is an extension that is right on top of the Penstock that goes to the diversion and then there is an extension at the very bottom right at the powerhouse. Each of them are dimension but they are less than half a mile each. Everything else will be utilizing existing SPI roads on the side.

MR. MOORE: One other comment I want to add from planning, Sean Moore Director of Planning, Tehama County. On the land use plans in the zoning we need to document to acknowledge that Tehama County is still going to require, our review is still required and that conditional use permit will be required as the part. We will be dovetailing off the document created by Water Agency, the research agency so we are going to be working off of their document as the

responsible agency but we need some comments in the record and they still need to go to Tehama County for final approval with the conditional, discretional use permit and review of the CEQA document.

MR. BEECO: So the last one on the slide is the mailing list and the scoping document, section 9 is how you can get some instructions on how to get signed up on that mailing list and again we can work with some of you who are having trouble with the FERC website as well. Go ahead, Bob.

MR. MARKS: Robert Marks from Manton. This is a meeting that should have taken place in Manton since you are impacting our community. The only information since this project has been going around for 15 years or more was a public notice that in my opinion was flawed. Usually California CEQA or whatever requires that it goes to the tax assessment rolls. I can tell you there were numerous people that were notified, that were sent to the properties. The properties on the map were not even listed correctly. There was no notification in my community that you guys were even coming to town. Usually when a developer or an out-of-country corporation wants to do something, and I have worked for lots of developers, Dutra, Kaiser, you name it. They always invite the community.

Then you guys come in. This community up there

knows nothing. This should have happened up there. You are impacting a community up there that were not invited. As a matter of fact, you did not even invite our county to come here tonight. I placed phone calls. I am outraged with that. I have other problems with these lines that we cannot erase down Carhouse Road through our community because PG&E has that. Those people that were in the distribution lines will tie into are complaining they hum, they hum all the time. So now, because they bought two property owners out, two out of the whole community they have decided to run their power lines down the middle of the rest of the community. These are not just regular KV lines that run regular electricity, this is some big stuff that they are running across kids' bus stops, they are running it across drinking water sources.

One of the property owners that sold out, my neighbor decided to let these guys run the power lines down my property line, down my neighbor's property line, down the other property line. She let them put it all on the outside of her property. She did not care about the rest of the neighbors. I can guarantee that every one of them would have showed up tonight if it wasn't for that water issue and the ones that were older, I said "Don't worry, we have a lot of time".

This is going to start a very, very big thing in

this community. I guarantee it will be 99 to 1. Those property owners that sold out to these guys and it will be the rest of this community. Property values are not doing that great up there. We just got recognized as one of the Federal wine-growing places in the country. We are struggling up there. We do not need to have 10-foot or more high poles going across my kid's bus stop. I mean some of these lines are running right by these peoples' houses 50 feet away, 100 feet away. Tell me they don't hum, 5 megawatt in the middle of winter? And then you have a fire and don't tell me, I mean my son I read some of the rules, you cannot run it across kids' bus stops. I don't see any alternative, they tried to go around our community and that guy would not sell out. So you find two guys, you don't even talk to the community and then you jam the project down their throat? I am outraged. At least you could have come to my community and said "Hey I am going to do something good for you". I don't like this issue because you know what it is going to do, it is going to pulverize our community. Now we have to go out, organize, watch all this stuff so some people from out of town you know most of us moved up there to get away from this type of thing in life.

You don't know that? I would say about 90 percent of the people up there moved up from big cities you know. I can tell you every single one of my neighbors, as

soon as they hit Hayes and Rudd, every single one of them, where you follow those lines, no way. You are going to decrease our property values. So I don't know what. I hope that you guys I don't have time to learn all your rules. But if it does go across kids' bus stops and it does impact, I am counting on you guys to do your job and say no.

MR. GARDEN:: In regard to your distribution list, your main list. You have in here Bill Goodwin, Tehama County Department of Administration, 727 Oak Street. That is the physical address. The mailing address is P.O. Box 250, Red Bluff. William Murphy has not been our County Counsel for almost six years. Okay, so your information is flawed, which tells me that there must be some flaws in the original application.

MR. MARKS: Exactly. Start over.

MS. LOBO: So you were looking at the information that was the address.

MR. GARDEN:: Just hand it out to him. Back there in the back.

MS. LOBO: But I mean the mailing list. If it was Tehama County mailing list then that would be I actually gave the Federal Agency information that I got the other day.

MR. GARDEN:: Well, it's wrong. The only way the three of us from the County are here is this gentleman

called me today because he knew about it. We did not know anything about the meeting in Sacramento this morning otherwise I would have been there.

MS. LOBO: But I did put Sean's name down to get the notice. Okay, well I apologize.

MR. GARDEN:: There is a glitch someplace. I do not know where it is at, but we were not notified officially except a phone call from this gentleman and I rallied the troops and we are here to support our Manton residents.

MS. LOBO: I would like to get all of your contact information.

MR. GARDEN:: Not a problem. I have a business card ready for you.

MR. MARKS: My point also is that the developer has a duty under law to notify the property owners and that was not done.

MR. KUFFNER: Actually, it was done to the best of our ability and you should have gotten a certified letter for about.

MR. MARKS: I've got two maps, they are not even correct.

MR. KUFFNER: Well you obviously got the notice because you called me.

MR. MARKS: I got your notes but your maps were incorrect and you know what, I will bring lots of people in

that you did not notify.

MR. KUFFNER: Well, we made an attempt to notify everyone.

MR. MARKS: Prove it now.

MR. KUFFNER: Sean, you got the distribution letter, so I need to look to see if you got the letter.

MR. MOORE: I will have to go back to the office, you know, I do not know when it went out there.

MR. KUFFNER: Because what I have tried to do is in addition to FERC sending their notices out to the people that I have emails for on the distribution list, which we have maintained for some time, is to send stuff out directly as well. So we need to check to see if that has all happened and if we do not have the right email addresses, let us make sure we have the right addresses. We have issued the service list and the service list was just reposted on the FERC site when we issued our base-flow study and we have really made an attempt to make sure everyone was communicating. This meeting was set up by the State Water Resources Control Board who did the announcements on that and we did not.

MR. MOORE: Thanks for coming forward. We showed up so we put our comments in and we will just rectify the addresses.

MS. MONHEIT: This is Susan Monheit with the

State Water Board. So first of all I would like to clarify or reiterate. I hope it has been said that comments are being accepted by FERC and State Water Board, written comments until December 5, 2014 so there is opportunity to put that in. Michelle gives the presentation about the CEQA component apart from FERC's presentation. We have not gotten to that yet so I will give you a spoiler sneak preview on that. What the State Water Board is using this meeting to accomplish is two things. We are seeking -- information from agencies and interested parties on what kind of document, informal consultations.

So for the State Water Board, this meeting serves two purposes. It acts as an informal consultation for the public and agencies to give us feedback about what kind of environmental document under CEQA the State Water Board should pursue, whether that is going to be a negative DAc, a mitigated negative DAC or an EIR and then should we determine an EIR is appropriate we are seeking input on significant impacts and resource areas that would be impacted. This is not necessarily the only scoping meeting that would be held. If the public has interest and there are people who have not had an opportunity to come forward, we can hold another meeting. We are trying to work, the State Water Board is making and effort to work with FERC and we wanted to join them in their scoping meeting to

participate, we are trying to be more transparent and work together in more ways so that is why we are here at this point but this is not the only opportunity for the public.

MR. MARKS: I have seen this before, this is not a negative DC. Let's be serious, you use your NEPA document as your CEQA document. I have been to your regional water control meetings and they are about 99.9 percent high-powered lawyers from Sacramento so we are just a small community. You know that they are going to require a NEPA document so your CEQA document will be part of the NEPA document.

MS. MONHEIT: No, in this particular instance since the NEPA and CEQA are going to be developed concurrently, we are not going to tier off the NEPA.

MR. MARKS: But you guys always do that.

MS. MONHEIT: Always do which?

MR. MARKS: You guys always do that, when the Federal Government comes in under NEPA, you guys always do not have to require the developer to pay for the CEQA document.

MS. MONHEIT: We are. In this case, they are going to pay for a CEQA document and the two document processes are going to proceed at the same time. We are not going to wait not we, the applicant is not going to wait for NEPA to be completed and then pay for the CEQA. So the

CEQA cannot tier off the NEPA in this instance. They are both going to be developed fully, simultaneously.

MR. MARKS: At the same time.

MS. MONHEIT: Simultaneously.

MR. MARKS: That is my point.

But we are funding the CEQA.

MS. MONHEIT: But separately.

MR. MARKS: So it is a bifurcated process.

MR. BEECO: So in the past what has often happened is we have written the NEPA document and then after that, in this case we are not doing that. They are being written at the exact same time independently.

MR. MARKS: Well, that's different.

MR. BEECO: Different.

MR. MARKS: That is good, that is real good. I like that.

MR. BEECO: Well --

MR. MARKS: Because you know under California Law if there is one adverse impact on the environment, he also has to mitigate under California Law, not federal. He has to mitigate. There cannot be any inverse impacts. Any inverse impacts on the environment have to be mitigated, sometimes triple over or whatever decided. Two, he has to have alternatives. I once needed alternatives. Is there alternatives to running these power lines through the

community? Instead of subjecting us to what he wants?

MR. BEECO: Well, that could be evaluated.

MR. MARKS: Well, it should have been in his proposal. Anybody would have had plan B if you are going to go through CEQA and plan C.

MR. HANSEN: Under NEPA, the applicant is not required to submit multiple proposals, they just have to send us what they are proposing.

MR. MARKS: Right.

MR. HANSEN: If all the proposals come in from say the public or other agencies, we have to evaluate them and we will do so but they are not required to think "well, we will try route 1, 2, or 3. We really want them to say "we want to do route 1" so we can analyze.

MR. MARKS: It is hard to work in change.

MR. HANSEN: Depending on the comments from other folks, they can adjust their proposal or depending on the analysis that FERC does looking at other recommendations that come in. you know, we could require something different. A different transmission route, it could be any number of things.

MR. MARKS: I would rather see them put a solar plant down there and do solar. Give people jobs. You can make more KW, we get so much sun up there. If you know anybody that is the place to put is.

MR. HANSEN: That is not in our toolbox unfortunately. That is not something I can make them do.

MR. MARKS: They would make a lot more money in the long run, give some jobs to the community and have it right there. One of the property owners who has enough land. I don't know if the Germans from Germany would go for that. That is where the company is from, right?

MR. KUFFNER: They are. They have not been involved for years.

MR. MARKS: I apologize for being so unruly. But you are from Graham County where I was raised in Tibron, California?.

MR. KUFFNER: I currently have an office in Tibron.

MR. MARKS: That is one of the richest places in the United States.

MR. BEECO: Go ahead.

MR. FOSTER: Bill Foster with National Marine and Fishery Service. When the State and FERC develop their environmental document, they have to look at other alternatives or at least present some other alternatives, how the project might be operated or whether the project exists or not exists. There are various alternatives in a NEPA document and a CEQA document that you have to consider as part of that process.

MR. MARKS: You guys have to consider. You are just putting one plan up.

MR. FOSTER: Right, but what they propose and however they propose that, FERC takes their information as well as everybody else's proposal essentially and they evaluate it and see what potential environmental effects are and what other alternatives could be done. Alternatives are different from say, what they are proposing.

MR. MARKS: No disrespect sir, I have read a lot of CEQA documents and I have read a lot of NEPA documents in my life so I am well aware of it but thank you.

MR. FOSTER: No I just thought I would, sure, bring it out. I know it is a daunting task.

MR. BEECO: So again, comments are due December 5, 2014 FERC. So how to file, again we can go over this with some of you individually or help you through that. Or we can point it out to the help line as well and send some of the materials as well. In addition, just in summary, some online resources that we have and again this is basic. A lot of this is kind of run through the same system so if you are having trouble accessing it here, you are having trouble accessing all of it. So you can E-file which is once you have registered and everything else like that you can upload documents and comment. E-comments is a way to make your comments without going through the registration

process and all that, but then you can essentially only put in Text comments. E-subscription is where you can subscribe to the project. So anytime anything is filed on the record you will get an email notifying you saying something has been filed and it was filed through a link and you will just click that. You know we always recommend if anybody is interested in the project. E-subscribe. We all e-subscribed at FERC to the project so that when anything is filed we get notification about that and then e-library all which is the system that allows you to look through the history of the project and anything that has been filed on the project. So the site visit is taking place tomorrow, it is leaving out of Red Bluff and there is more specific information in the documents that you have about that meeting. If you are interested in going, notification was supposed to be given to Mr. Charlie Kuffner by October 21, 2014 but if you are interested in going and you did not register you can speak with him and see if space is available to go tomorrow. For FERC that is it at this time. We will take any questions and then we will pass it over to the Water Board.

MS. LOBO: Hello, my name is Michelle Lobo and I am with the State Water Resource Control Board. I am the Project Manager there at the State Water Board for the Lassen Lodge Hydroelectric project.

Today, I plan to discuss some background information about the Water Board's mission and role regarding the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA and the Water Quality Certification. I also will discuss the CEQA process, how the public can provide input, types of CEQA documents, environmental resources and the next steps and what to expect. Here is the State Water Board's Mission Statement, followed by the website. The State Water Board's Mission Statement is to preserve, enhance, restore the quality of California's water resources and ensure their proper allocation and efficient use for the benefit of present and future generations. The State Water Board has authority over water rights and water quality in California to protect California's waters. The state water board protects and enforces many water uses including in the needs of industry, agriculture, hydropower, municipal districts and the environment and must balance the various beneficial uses of water. The State Water Board has received an application on May 20, 2014 from the applicant Rugraw. The application was for a Water Quality Certification. The State Water Board regulates hydroelectric projects by issuing Water Quality Certifications under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Water Quality Certification focused on protecting water quality, balancing the beneficial uses of water and considering the existing water rates.

Now I will talk a little bit about CEQA and how it relates to the Water Quality Certification. Since the State Water Board would be making a discretionary decision about the Water Quality Certification, the State Water Board must comply with CEQA as Rugraw, LLC is not a public agency, the State Water Board is the lead agency for CEQA and will decide the type of CEQA document to prepare and the level of detail in that document. The State Water Board has independent judgment when approving or denying the issuance of Water Quality Certification.

So the State Water Board will use the CEQA document to develop an assessment of the project. The CEQA document will be used to support the action taken for the Water Quality Certification if it is issued, including any conditions in the certification. The Water Quality Certification applies to the construction at the project and the operation and maintenance of the project over the term of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission license.

MR. KUFFNER: Question. This is Charlie Kuffner with Rugraw. Can maybe you describe the joint agreement you have with the county as well for their participation in the CEQA process that you have executed together.

MS. LOBO: Yes, so the State Water Board and Tehama County had discussions about which agency would be the lead agency for the CEQA documents since Rugraw is not

able to be the lead agency for the CEQA document and both Tehama County and the State Water Board came to the agreement that the State Water Board would be the lead agency for the CEQA document. Does that sound right, Sean? I just want to make sure.

MR. MOORE: Yes, that is correct.

MS. LOBO: Okay. This answers your question?

MR. MOORE: Sean Moore, Director of Planning at Tehama County. Just to provide clarification for the residents and everyone in the room. The reason why we decided to go with making them the lead agency. I lead the project and the vast majority of that project is with generally may be under the jurisdiction of the Resource Board. The Planning Department worked with County Counsel's office and with the CEO's office and we came to the head of looking at the whole totality of the project. We decided it is best to go with the Resource Board and run the documents. Of course, we want to be part of the CEQA process as well as the FERC process at all stages of the game to make sure our comments as well.

MR. KUFFNER: This is Charlie Kuffner with Rugraw and we went to the County, we met with Sean and talked about having the County be the lead agency before we came around to the conclusion that it would be the State Water Resources Control Board. They made the decision. We were not

involved in that decision but we did the running. Just so you know, we have really tried to be very communicative with everyone and be open. So the fact that there are communication issues here is unfortunate because that has definitely not been our MO. We have been trying to be very open with everybody about everything we are doing here because we want this to be part of the community. To clarify, this is a private entity that I am the principal of and I have been involved in for several years.

MR. MARKS: It is not uncommon in California to have a lead agency be the Water Board or the Army Corps of Engineers. As a matter of fact, it is pretty uncommon to even see a County become the lead agency in such a large scale project but thanks for the comments.

MS. LOBO: So if the Water Quality Certification for the project is issued, the conditions in it become mandatory part of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission License. Nothing in the Water Quality Certification can prevent Federal Law. It is additive to any conditions or places on the project.

Okay, so today and throughout the comment period, the State Water Board is seeking comments on the type of CEQA document that should be prepared and the impacts that should be analyzed and project alternatives. The objectives of CEQA include disclose to decision makers and the public the

significant environmental effects of proposed activities, identify ways to avoid and reduce environmental damage, prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects, foster agency coordination in the review of projects and enhance public participation in the planning process. So our plan for the CEQA process is to collect written and verbal comments and then determine the type of CEQA document to be prepared, issue a draft CEQA document for public comment and issue a final CEQA document. There will be a public review and comment period for a draft CEQA document. The State Water Board plans on releasing a draft Water Quality Certification at the same time along with the draft CEQA document. So the State Water Board has decided the project is not exempt from CEQA so an exemption does not apply here. The State Water Board plans on preparing one of three documents, either a negative declaration, a mitigated negative declaration or an Environmental Impact Report which I will call an EIR. This meeting will serve as a CEQA scoping meeting. If the State Water Board determines an AIR is needed but I know that as Susan mentioned if an EIR is needed we can certainly have an additional scoping meeting for Manton for that community there.

Again, as part of the comments requested, as part of this meeting and part of this notice, the State Water Board is seeking input on a type of CEQA document to be prepared. If you recommend preparation of an EIR please provide an explanation of the significant effects that you think may occur.

At a minimum, the environmental document will evaluate the environmental resources listed on this slide as required by CEQA. If the State Water Board prepares an EIR the EIR would also have to address gross-inducing impacts, cumulative impacts and significant unavoidable impacts if there are any.

MR. MOORE: Michelle, real quick. Sean More Director of Planning, we talked to the applicant and we looked at the scope of this project. We have completed the initial study. Have you guys started the initial study?

MS. LOBO: No we have not.

MR. MOORE: The checklist to determine information?

MS. LOBO: No we have not.

MR. MOORE: We, you know internally staff, we were thinking this is more an EIR level and the applicant knows the County's feelings on that. We think that the level of this project, without doing an initial study, but just looking at how large it is, the genti-lines, the right

away need for the power lines, the impacts to the mountain area, potentially land use, recreation, open space; there are a litany of issues that we have discussed with the applicant and have a good consult in Tetra Tech. They are very good, well, statewide. So we have talked about potential EIR levels so I just wanted to put that in the comments because that is something we had talked already to them about.

MS. LOBO: Thank you.

Will you be submitting this in comment?

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MS. LOBO: Yes.

MR. MARKS: Rob Marks, I wanted to ask, who could ever answer this question, the way these power lines are run through Manton on easements owned by the County. They were given to PG&E, the gas and electric company.

MR. GARDNER: They are not subleased.

MR. MARKS: They are not subleased, so that is county property?

MR. GARDNER: Not subleased to PG&E and that is it, that is the only right of way.

MR. MARKS: So is PG&E here tonight since this project is running on PG&E easements?

MR. GARDEN: We don't know that yet.

MR. MARKS: Well that is what I am asking the

developer I guess. How did you come up running the powerlines through Manton on PG&E easements?

MR. KUFFNER: So we have been in communication with PG&E about you know, having an easement across the property so that is how the PG&E issue came through.

MR. MARKS: So I would like that part of the record right now, I think PG&E should have a representative here.

MR. MOORE: Michelle, I want to add some more comments, Sean Moore, Director of Planning Tehama County. So just so we are clear, potential impacts, biological, terrestrial. I mean I saw some from the FERC folks so there is some potential impacts. I have not looked at the initial study you guys are comparing and we have not commented yet but I am already thinking already at a higher level of CEQA analysis.

MS. LOBO: And that is what we want, we want input from everyone to get an idea.

MR. FOSTER: Can you click back to that slide with the -- that one there. Bill Foster. A lot of those resource issues or similar resource issues in FERC's scoping, I will be providing written comments to both of you but it will be much the same comments so you are going to get a joint letter (laughs) because it is easier for me to do it that way. Including what my ideas about what type of

environmental document you should have and my justifications for that.

MS. LOBO: Okay, thank you. Yes, no that is really helpful.

MR. GARDEN:: Dennis Garden, District 3, now on that list there is nothing that speaks to economics.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Sean Moore Director of Planning. In our general plan we do have an economic element; it is recreation, I forgot to mention that.

MS. LOBO: Okay, recreation; general plan.

MR. MOORE: So it is in there, and I know NEPA has an economic section, so it is in our general plan, it is online.

MS. LOBO: I might need to check back with you on the general plan and make the connection.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MS. LOBO: Okay, okay. Thank you. So this is on here and a copy of this presentation is also back there if you did not get it. I would like everyone to get this so you can get my information to contact me. So we are accepting written comments until Friday December 5, 2014 and again, we are especially looking for comments about the type of CEQA document to prepare and impacts.

MS. MONHEIT: Susan Monheit, State Water Board. We are accepting comments until December 5, 2014 at 2 p.m.

Pacific Standard time in deference to FERC's deadline that ends at 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time. So if you are submitting comments at the last minute please note the time on that.

MR. MARKS: Well there will be a draft, won't there?

MS. LOBO: Oh, for the document? Yes, this is just to give me comments. No this is, yeah, we have not prepared a draft yet. No. So we are very early. I mean we have not prepared anything for the draft yet. So this is very early in the process.

MR. GARDEN:: So there will be a subsequent meeting before we can make any additional comments on your draft.

MS. MONHEIT: Or that may be by writing, do you plan on writing on the draft.

MS. LOBO: Well, I mean, the document will be publicly released.

MS. MONHEIT: The document will be released and you will be able to use this opportunity for comment.

MR. MOORE: So if it is a mitigated neg DAC or neg DAC, it is 30 days. So if it is draft EIR we have 45 days that we can comment during. There are two different levels of comment times.

MS. LOBO: Yes.

MS. MONHEIT: At least.

MS. LOBO: Let's see. Okay. So again, this presentation is at the back of the room. This presentation is also posted to the Lassen Lodge Hydroelectric Project webpage at the State Water Board's website. The State Water Board staff will work with a consultant to develop the draft CEQA document based on existing information and the comments collected. There will be a public comment period on that draft CEQA document.

So, additional information is available on the State Water Board's webpage for that Lassen Lodge Hydraulic Project and we also have a way for you to sign up to receive email updates so again, this information is in the presentation at the back of the room that you should have but I will go through it here so to receive email updates related to the project and the Water Quality Certification Program you can go to the web page noted on the slide, select State Water Resources Control Board and enter your name, email address. Under the categories on the same page, you select Water Rights and next you select the box for Water Rights, Water Quality Certification and that is the last box. Then click the subscribe button at the top and again, you can always contact me about that. Again, the comment period ends on Friday, December 5, 2014 at 2 p.m. Any more comments, questions?

MR. ANTONE: Gary Antone, Tehama County Public Works. It strikes me that there really should be, from the applicants through the current process and both of the resource agencies and the Department of CEQA and NEPA and the actions that are taking place, there should be a presentation brought to the boards since this is the county in which all of this is going to concur. So some presentation to the Board of Supervisors would certainly open up a true avenue of public comment and public review through the county.

AUDIENCE: Through the County, yes.

MR. FOSTER: This is Bill Foster, National Marine Fishery Service. I would like to suggest that right now the FERC has requested information to add to the existing application so as information is still being gathered and developed and assimilated and put together to make that package more complete and we, our comment letter in June of 2014 we felt that application was not sufficient for a variety of reasons that are outlined in the document. But the point I am getting at is that eventually, there will come a time in the FERC process where everybody gets to put in their terms and conditions, how they feel they want the operation of the project, mitigations for it, that sort of thing. At that point when FERC issues that notice that we are ready for environmental analysis, there are 60 days for

everybody to kind of come up with what they feel they want to say.

That information is then taken by FERC and they consider the applicant's information, they consider it on their own information, they come up with their own set essentially in terms and conditions of the project. At that point, it might be good to have a meeting outlining perhaps what everybody's conditions are, if people want to see what other people have or something like that. Or else, everybody can read it when it gets posted to FERC. You know, you can read everybody's terms and conditions and stuff like that.

The CEQA document and the 401 document certification comes after that part of the process where you can start developing and figuring out what you kind of want to do in that direction, but you will not really have all the information until everybody puts in their terms and conditions to consider. So that is the point I wanted to make is that down the road here, there will be not only plenty of opportunity to comment but there may be opportunity to discuss everybody else's ideas, formulations and positions and how they think they might want to be. There might be an opportunity to help describe and share that.

MR. MARKS: So you guys rely on Fish and Wildlife

and agencies for your approval or disapproval. You guys make the ultimate decision federally.

MR. HANSEN: Federally, yes.

MR. MARKS: Correct. But you do consider all of the other agencies?

MR. HANSEN: Yes, sir. Not only do we consider all and give greater deference to expert agencies that know about the area, there are a number of conditions that are submitted to the FERC. Under federal law, we have to include. We have no choice.

MR. MARKS: Right.

MR. HANSEN: She had talked about the 401 Water certificate for example so that is the chance where the state says we need to protect these waters and obviously we are local, we know these better than FERC, here is what is going into the license whether FERC likes it or not. We put it in the license unless it could cause us to violate some other federal law and in that case we would have some other discussion on how to fix that. But there are local resource agencies, both on the state and federal level that have a lot of areas where they can attach their condition to a FERC license.

MR. MARKS: Okay. It's just one of those situations where I have more trust, you know, dealing with some of these agencies in the past, than in the Federal

Government. (Laughs) I hate to say that.

Even the State Government, so.

MR. HANSEN: As being federal employees based out of DC we find it very important to have --

MR. MARKS: You have to have a role.

MR. HANSEN: Yes, we need state guidance, we need local guidance on this and that is one of the greater values of scoping and the entire process. We realize that we do not understand local issues anywhere near as anyone here. So that is why we like to you to be part of this process, we cannot do anything without it frankly.

MR. MOORE: I have a question, what is the State Water Board in terms of, I know we have not done the initial study, but what are we thinking in terms of levels. I mean, not relying on the County, what are you thinking on here now? So you are the lead agency, not Tehama County so what are you thinking for the level for review for CEQA. I forgot to ask that question of the FERC's folks but I know they are doing environmental assessment which is somewhat of an initial study, so what are you guys thinking?

MS. LOBO: We have not decided. We have not done an initial study and we are still waiting on more information from the applicant as well. So yeah, I do not know honestly. (laughs).

MS. MONHEIT: Susan Monheit, State Water Board,

and that is why one of the functions of this meeting is to seek input from agencies and stakeholders on what documents they think should be prepared and that will help inform our decision.

MR. MOORE: I understand that, but I mean you guys are the lead agency. By now, surely you have formed some kind of analysis on what level specific environmental reviews are required. I mean, I do it every day.

MS. LOBO: No we have not yet. We haven't. Are there any more comments? Okay.

MR. MARKS: There is one thing I wanted to ask you. Is the actual, your response that ready for environmental analysis terms and conditions is not necessarily your CEQA document nor your 401 certification, although it may consider some of those issues and things like that. Ultimately in the FERC process you come up with the mandatory terms and conditions that are in your 401 water quality certification that like you said goes on to what FERC has determined. The only other mandatory condition is any particular biological opinion that is done if there are threatened, endangered species involved.

MS. LOBO: Right, and that would be your agency.

MR. FOSTER: Right.

MS. LOBO: Ok, ok.

MR. MARKS: Well that might also be discovered in

the CEQA document bio-people going up there and checking out what is up there.

MR. HANSEN: I mean if, are you suggesting that during the preparation of the CEQA document they might discover the presence of additional species.

MR. MARKS: Well, Fish and Wildlife has.

MR. HANSEN: Well if that would be the case, the FERC would have to reinitiate consultation with the Fish and Wildlife service or NMFS depending on what kind of animal it is before we can do anything. If something else were to pop up, the FERC cannot move forward until we have consulted under the Endangered Species Act with those agencies.

MR. MARKS: Well, the whole point is to have a study. Find out what is going on before anybody makes a yes or no answer on that.

MS. LOBO: Any more comments? Well for me I do want to make sure I get everyone's information tonight. Thank you.

MR. BEECO: Yes, so that is it for FERC as well. Anything anybody wants help for anything identifying with the e-library and stuff like that we will be hanging around here for the next 30 minutes or so. Come by, ask questions, chat with us whatever you might need.

We have a copy of repeat application here in the back of the room if anybody wants to look at it for things

they could not find before, we have that out for everybody to look at.

MS. MONHEIT: I hope that all participants have found the sign in sheets.

Okay, good. Again, we apologize for any misguided mail deliveries.

MR. MARKS: One last question, is his transcript available?

MR. HANSEN: Yes, it will be. It usually takes a couple of weeks and then we post it on the E-Library FERC site, it will be available for everyone to read so yes it will.

MR. MARKS: Is that a tape?

MR. HANSEN: no sir, it will be a written document.

AUDIENCE: Transcript.

MR. BEECO: Transcript. Yes. So if you are interested in getting that immediately you can speak with the court reporter but otherwise like Ryan mentioned it would be posted on E-Library in the coming weeks.

MS. MONHEIT: I think State Water Board will probably post a transcript on the Lassen Lodge webpage as well. It might be easier to navigate.

MR. FOSTER: I subscribe to so many projects, whenever anything happens, it gets filed or gets posted, it

shows up in my inbox.

(Whereupon, at 9 p.m., the scoping meeting concluded.)