

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING
FOR DORENA LAKE DAM PROJECT

Docket No. 11945-001

The Public Comment Meeting was taken before Jea H. Oh, a Professional Shorthand Reporter, and a Notary Public for the State of Oregon, on May 5, 2005, commencing at the hour of 7:00 p.m., the proceedings being reported at Lane Community College, Building 17, Room 308, 4000 East 30th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

1 APPEARANCES

2 DIANNE RODMAN - Federal Regulatory Commission

3 EDWARD PEREZ - Federal Regulatory Commission

4 PAT WESLOWSKI - Federal Regulatory Commission

5 VINCE LAMARRA - Symbiotics, LLC

6 KEITH LAWRENCE - Ecosystems Research Institute

7 DANI FRISBIE - Ecosystems Research Institute

8 MARCELL LYND - Ecosystems Research Institute

9 ERIC GINNEY - Ecosystems Research Institute

10 ERIK STEIMLE - Ecosystems Research Institute

11 TONY LAMARRA - Ecosystems Research Institute

12 RONALD KOHASEK - Oregon Water Resources Department

13 MARY GRAINEY - Oregon Water Resources Department

14 DEB SCHMIDT - Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Council

15 DUSTIN BENGTON - USACE

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 EUGENE, OREGON; THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2005

2 7:00 P.M.

3 PROCEEDINGS

4 MS. RODMAN: Let's get started. The
5 applicant, and FERC contractors, and the agencies
6 were here this afternoon, so really it's just the two
7 of you that are new here; everybody else already has
8 a feel on it. So it's kind of your choice. Do you
9 want to do a smaller version of it? How do you
10 really want to handle it? I mean, when you could be
11 doing something else. It's strictly up to you.

12 MS. SCHMIDT: Well, you gave me your
13 presentation, so I can read through this and try and
14 get a Reader's Digest version.

15 MS. RODMAN: I'm Dianne Rodman from FERC
16 from Washington, D.C., our headquarters. Behind you
17 is Ed Perez. He is an engineer out of our Portland
18 regional office. He's one of the folks who goes
19 around and looks at our dams and make sure they're
20 safe and they've been maintained adequately. We also
21 have the contractors that our agency has hired to do
22 the environmental assessment. They're from Louis
23 Berger Group. Pat Weslowski, who is their team
24 leader and who's doing cultural resources; Dani
25 Frisbie who is doing water resources; Marcelle

1 Lynd -- yes, Lynd, who's doing fisheries; Ken Hodge
2 who's doing engineering; and Eric Ginney who is doing
3 geomorphology. We also have representatives from the
4 company that's proposing this project, Symbiotics, so
5 Dr. Vince Lamarra from Ecosystems Research Institute.

6 DR. LAMARRA: Yes.

7 MS. RODMAN: Okay. And Erik --

8 MR. STEIMLE: Steimle.

9 MS. RODMAN: Steimle, yes. You're doing
10 terrestrial stuff?

11 MR. STEIMLE: I'm the field biologist for
12 Ecosystems Research Institute.

13 MS. FRISBIE: Dani Frisbie, water quality.

14 MR. LAWRENCE: Keith Lawrence, fish
15 biologist for Ecosystems Research Institute.

16 MS. RODMAN: And you are?

17 MR. T. LAMARRA: I'm Tony Lamarra. I'm also
18 a field biologist with Louis Berger Group.

19 MS. RODMAN: All right. And our court
20 reporter, Jea.

21 So have you had a chance to look at the
22 materials? Or if you haven't had a chance, maybe we
23 should have a little bit of a kind of a Reader's
24 Digest version.

25 MS. SCHMIDT: Okay.

1 MS. RODMAN: All right. The purpose of
2 scoping is to, early on in the assessment of the
3 application, get an idea of what the problems are,
4 kind of a --

5 MS. SCHMIDT: I think you can probably
6 dispense with the NEPA compliance since I'm a federal
7 employee.

8 MS. RODMAN: Excellent. Okay.

9 DR. LAMARRA: There went half an hour.

10 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Request for information.
11 As I was saying, if anybody has any fish sites or
12 something like that hidden in the back of the file
13 cabinet, we'll sure appreciate them, or local
14 information, like you were mentioning the Cottage
15 Grove water intake; particularly, information about
16 cumulative impacts. Like if there's things happening
17 upstream in the watershed, it's difficult for an
18 agency which is based out of town to know these
19 things, so we want really, you know, to get an
20 accurate analysis, most people to do, to kind of help
21 us a little bit.

22 MS. SCHMIDT: I can help you there. I'm the
23 district ranger with the Forest Service upstream from
24 all this.

25 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Great. Yeah.

1 MS. SCHMIDT: We do tend to do things that
2 tend to affect things in downstream areas.

3 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Great. Okay. The
4 description of project features. I think we'll let
5 the Symbiotics people do that.

6 DR. LAMARRA: Sure. You know where Dorena
7 Dam is at, obviously, but there are five discharges
8 of Dorena Dam of which all of them are what we call
9 isolometric (phonetic), they come off the bottom of
10 the reservoir. Symbiotics has looked at the
11 hydrology as it exists at the site, the pressure, and
12 seen that water quality data -- or hydrology data.
13 Based on that hydrology data, we have generated
14 what's called a flow-exceed curve, and what we do is
15 we try to match the hydrologic head as it flows in
16 through the system and ask an equipment manufacturer
17 to tell us what is the best hydrogeneration equipment
18 to put in there. We've done that.

19 And so our flow range that will
20 theoretically run through the project is from 260
21 cubic feet per second to 810 or 812 cubic feet per
22 second. There was no way for us to gather up that
23 water out of the five separate discharges, so what
24 we've elected to do is put a separate discharge into
25 the structure by coring the right abutment --

1 right -- I mean, looking downstream will be the north
2 abutment, to put a -- basically core a 10-foot
3 diameter hole through the rock substraight, through
4 the concrete abutment, and then insert a 9-foot
5 diameter penstock through that whole, grout it, seal
6 it, put valves in it, and then we would have an
7 independent outlet to the reservoir.

8 The penstock is 600 feet into the
9 reservoir, and bend, and then its intake will be
10 pretty close to where the current outlets are right
11 now in terms of elevation. The downstream penstock
12 would be about 250 feet long, and it would exit the
13 powerhouse that sits at the base of the wing wall
14 that's currently at the facility. And in that wing
15 wall, and you can see the diagram up there, it's
16 north the top side, there would be a tailrace that
17 would -- that would bend and return water to the
18 river.

19 Now, the flow rate of 260 to 800 cfs will
20 be the flow range that comes through the project.
21 The remaining flows, if they're lower than that, in
22 other words, if the flow of the river is less than
23 260 cfs, the plant would not run, water would exit
24 the reservoir as it does right now. Any flows above
25 812 cfs would be discharged from the reservoir as it

1 is right now. So we would only take what the
2 engineers like to call the "sweet spot". They would
3 only take that portion of the flow through the
4 project. In essence, that's pretty much the overall
5 design of the hydroelectric facility.

6 In addition, there will be a short
7 transmission line that will run up to the north.
8 We're looking at various options on how to get that
9 line up the -- above that to the north, and then
10 we'll tie into an existing distribution system pretty
11 close to the trail, the rail trails part of the
12 walkway that exists there right now. We're looking
13 at -- our intent is to bury this transmission line so
14 that there's no visual effect. How we do that will
15 be under the direction from the Corp or just find an
16 easement down up through the abutment; we're not
17 quite sure yet. The contractor will help us make
18 that decision. The intent is to bury them.

19 There is also a valve house that will sit
20 right at the base of the dam. In terms of -- you
21 know, we've looked at the assessment of the site and
22 have made a determination that will use whatever
23 construction materials that are best suited for --
24 one that would take, you know, the sounding
25 environment -- the building's not going to be pink,

1 you know; it's going to be a, you know, tan, brown,
2 greenish color. I think that's dependent upon what
3 the Corp would like to see, and the aesthetics
4 resources people are telling us that we're blending
5 in pretty well. You won't hardly see the power
6 plant.

7 We had a site visit earlier in the day and
8 looked at it. That wing wall sticks 8 to 10 feet
9 above the current ground level. It will be about 2
10 feet higher than that. Looking from the south to the
11 north, you shouldn't be able to see anything but only
12 a small portion of the wall; everything else will be
13 behind that.

14 The operations of the project are intended
15 to be run-of-the-river. We had some discussion
16 earlier today about what that means. You know,
17 reservoir discharge or however you want to say it,
18 the Army Corps of Engineers has flood rules. They
19 have basically elevation by common targets they try
20 to hit in the reservoir, and they discharge according
21 to that for flood control. Our intent is to use the
22 water that's released by the Corp under their flood
23 rules. There will be no daily peaking, there will be
24 no annual peaking. We -- essentially, whatever the
25 flows as described by the Corps, we will use. That's

1 what our hydrology is based on in our energy
2 calculations. So, in essence, if you were to park
3 downriver, and you had been there in the past and you
4 are now there because the project is there, you will
5 not see a difference in flow. It will be identical
6 now and in the future. In terms of whatever those
7 flood rules are, we will follow those and only use
8 those flows that are described by the Corp of
9 Engineers. That's the bottom line.

10 We had a pretty lively discussion about --
11 and I've said it, we're committed not to go -- we
12 don't want to discuss anything relative to the flood
13 rules of the Corps. It's their agreement, not ours.
14 We're simply using that water. So we'll be what we
15 call the run-of-the-river project. Our annual
16 average production is about 17.5 gigawatt hours
17 annually, which is not a lot of generation, but based
18 on the equipment that we have in there, it's
19 reasonable.

20 There are -- there are two -- when we wrote
21 the state and -- did the initial state-run
22 consultations, the field studies, the draft license
23 applications, the finalized license application, and
24 the addendums, we essentially have focused on two
25 areas of possible impact. The first area of possible

1 impact is construction, and those tend to be
2 short-term, but can be extensive depending on how
3 well they're managed. And so we have conducted
4 studies and done research and tried to estimate what
5 we think the construction impacts are, and much of
6 the environmental data that we've collected is to
7 establish baseline conditions so that if a problem
8 occurs down the road, that -- in construction, that
9 we have a measure of what that impact is as best we
10 can. We really don't -- and we're committed not to
11 cause an environmental impact, i.e., primarily, a
12 potential for sediment disturbance either in the
13 reservoir or in the construction area. But that's --
14 that's something we're cognizant of and work really
15 hard to try to come up with a plan to minimize that.

16 The second is operation. And operational
17 is for the life of the project we might have some
18 impacts out there that are currently not occurring,
19 and one of the most logical to think of is the
20 imminent entrainment issue with the fish that come
21 into that reservoir. If we put a hydroelectric
22 facility on that outlet, some of those fish are going
23 to -- which are currently exiting the reservoir
24 anyway, will exit the reservoir and die because of
25 the impacts from the turbine, and Keith has done an

1 excellent job of reviewing the literature and trying
2 to estimate what that will be. In that case, we've
3 also provided mitigation. We try to protect those
4 sizes of fish that we think are most vulnerable. And
5 so what you see in this discussion that we'll have
6 here are those issues that, through our analysis, are
7 probably worth FERC looking at a second time and
8 making sure that we've got our bases covered.

9 There's a lot of issues that we've talked
10 about that don't show up in the scoping document
11 because they're not issues. We've acknowledged that
12 there's data out there that needs to be addressed,
13 things like aesthetic resources, or cultural
14 resources, or economic and socioeconomic resources.
15 These are things that we looked at, spent a lot of
16 time collecting information, and we've addressed
17 those in the three or four documents that we put
18 together.

19 What FERC has done is taken those issues
20 and distilled them down to things that they think --
21 well, you know, we still think this ought to be
22 talked about. Some things are slam dunks, they're
23 not issues. So I think the things that you're going
24 to see now, in this presentation, primarily focus on
25 those issues that FERC, after looking at all our

1 documents, has bulleted as saying, you know what,
2 they've raised this issue, we need to at least
3 discuss it in a public forum to make sure everybody's
4 on the same page. So much of the information that
5 you'll see talked about, at least from these two guys
6 in front of me, are issues that they've constructed
7 over time and how they've developed studies or
8 mitigation packages trying to offset whatever that
9 may be.

10 MS. RODMAN: Our two new people, what else
11 do you want to hear? We can go through the rest of
12 your presentation, but what is your focus of -- well,
13 the Corps and yours? We can do the whole thing or we
14 can tailor it to your particular needs.

15 MR. STEIMLE: Or I can talk about
16 terrestrial stuff and veg. issues. He can talk about
17 fisheries and water quality.

18 MS. SCHMIDT: Yeah. I was going to say that
19 this is an issue where I really don't have a dog in
20 this fight. But my frustration is that there were a
21 number of people who were -- who are interested in
22 this who were notified too late and already had
23 conflicts and couldn't come to hear this
24 presentation. And that's where I have -- that's my
25 biggest concern, that we want to have that community

1 and those people in the community on the same page,
2 the city counsel and those kind of folks and that,
3 and I think they do -- because they weren't available
4 to come, and that --

5 DR. LAMARRA: Well, Tim -- is it Tim?

6 MS. SCHMIDT: Flowerday?

7 DR. LAMARRA: Tim who was here earlier this
8 morning.

9 MS. SCHMIDT: From the Chamber?

10 DR. LAMARRA: Yeah. And, you know, we're
11 going to be out there in three weeks doing a fishing
12 survey at the end of May, and I will be willing to
13 come out, and whatever dog and pony show that we
14 have, to describe from day one everything that we
15 have done. If you would like to set up a public
16 meeting or private meeting with concerned citizens, I
17 will be willing to sit down with you all evening.

18 MS. SCHMIDT: Okay. I think our city
19 counsel would love to do that.

20 DR. LAMARRA: Great.

21 MS. SCHMIDT: Sure.

22 DR. LAMARRA: You know, I -- we need to be
23 given -- well, three years ago we started this
24 process, and we held a public meeting in Cottage
25 Grove for our state-run consultation, and we had

1 three people. And then we provided, you know -- so I
2 understand the frustration that's out there. We want
3 to expediate the process. We've been in this three
4 years. I totally agree that people that might
5 ultimately benefit from this project is the City of
6 Cottage Grove. They're -- that's where the power's
7 ultimately going to be used.

8 MS. SCHMIDT: I agree.

9 DR. LAMARRA: And so if that is really what
10 you're after, is just being totally informed of the
11 whole process, if it's okay with the FERC, I will be
12 happy to come out. We can give you our web page.
13 Every presentation, public presentation, that we've
14 given is on our web page, and you can download that
15 PowerPoint presentation. I would be more than happy
16 to come in and start with the very first one and
17 spend all evening with you guys and just say this is
18 the issues were, these are the studies that we did to
19 try and address those.

20 I know Water Resources is going to be
21 holding a series of public meetings as well because
22 they now have a parallel process for water right that
23 they have to go through, and we're making ourselves
24 available to them. She's already talked to our staff
25 in Idaho to try and arrange, you know, our staff to

1 come out and help provide presentations.

2 You know, we're not trying to dodge the
3 bullet by any means. We would like the opportunity
4 to educate you as to what the process is, and adding
5 to that process, and what the issues are. We think
6 we've done a good job of addressing the concept.

7 MR. BENGTON: And I agree with Debbie.
8 That will be time well spent if you could come out to
9 the City of Cottage Grove early. I think a lot of us
10 are just not sure where you are in the process.

11 DR. LAMARRA: Sure.

12 MR. BENGTON: So coming out three weeks
13 ago, understanding that the local community group
14 that works on watershed issues gave you an
15 opportunity to tell us where you are in the process,
16 just let you explain so far, I think it will
17 alleviate a lot of the concerns that are out there
18 and probably can understand that.

19 MS. RODMAN: And for the benefit of the
20 court reporter, you are?

21 MR. BENGTON: My name is Dustin Bengton.

22 MS. RODMAN: We certainly don't have any
23 objection to applicants meeting the world. It's fine
24 with us.

25 MS. SCHMIDT: If all you're going to cover

1 is what's in this, we don't need to spend a lot of
2 time on it. I've had a long day myself.

3 MS. RODMAN: Would you like me to go through
4 the process, our particular NEPA process, so the
5 opportunity is there to comment?

6 MS. SCHMIDT: That will be good, because I
7 know you do the 30-day process period and those types
8 of things.

9 MS. RODMAN: Right. We do have a deadline
10 for comments associated with the scoping meeting,
11 which is May 16th, and that's really only so that
12 we -- so that we get, "Here's the comment, okay. Do
13 we need to do a second scoping document or should we
14 just send out a letter to people saying we didn't get
15 anything that thrilling, we're not going to redo it."
16 However, that does not mean that people can't comment
17 after that. We are going to issue a notice we're
18 ready for environmental analysis, and that will be
19 soliciting comments, terms and conditions,
20 descriptions, things like that, and that will have a
21 60-day comment period? Sixty-day comment period.
22 We've got a tentative date for when that notice comes
23 out in the schedule there, so that's another
24 opportunity to comment. And, of course, after our EA
25 comes out, that will be a third opportunity to

1 comment.

2 And, actually, people could comment right
3 up until the point the commission issues its
4 decision. It could get really exciting in the last
5 few days. They're trying -- we're trying to do a
6 nice, legal document, and we get an important letter
7 in. So there are actually a lot of opportunities.
8 We have a very informative, although not completely
9 user friendly, website, www.ferc.gov. Okay. We've
10 got that there. One of the things it has on it is
11 all our correspondence, incoming and outgoing, for
12 the project. So you would use P-11945 on the
13 e-Library page to get all the correspondence for this
14 project, which is a good way to keep up on what's
15 happening. We also have a feature called
16 e-Subscribe, which again use the P-11945, and I think
17 I said before, that this is a lot -- to do
18 e-Subscribe is a lot like ordering from Amazon; you
19 know, you can basically kind of like set up an
20 account. And when you do that, every time something
21 comes in or goes out, you can e-mail with a hyperlink
22 that you can click on, and the document will come up,
23 so there's our official files available to the
24 public.

25 I think -- what am I missing?

1 MS. WESLOWSKI: Electronically submit
2 comments.

3 MS. RODMAN: Oh, yes, yes. As you know,
4 Washington, D.C., is still getting everything
5 irradiated for anthrax spores.

6 MAN: Until we stop them?

7 MS. RODMAN: Until we catch the guy, yeah.
8 So any copies that are mailed to us frequently have a
9 little bit of a delay. I think they go up to New
10 Jersey, and they get zapped, then they come back
11 down. So due dates are involved. They want to --
12 any citizens involved in this, they want to file
13 their comments electronically. That way you know
14 that it got there, we can see them in our website,
15 and there's no delay.

16 MS. WESLOWSKI: When scoping comments are
17 due. The deadline for scoping comments, we didn't do
18 that.

19 MS. RODMAN: Right. We are, of course,
20 going to comply with the Endangered Species Act,
21 wherever that leads us, and we have a suspiciously
22 long period in between the draft EA and the final
23 commission action, which works out to about 135 days,
24 just in case. We have -- I don't think we've made a
25 determination yet as to what the Endangered Species

1 Act requires us to do, but we will comply with it.

2 MS. SCHMIDT: Section 7?

3 MS. RODMAN: Yeah, yes, uh-huh, right. I'm
4 trying to think. The water quality certification,
5 where are you on that?

6 DR. LAMARRA: We can apply for the 401 Water
7 Quality Certificate at the same time that we create a
8 finalized application.

9 MS. RODMAN: So you're coming up within one
10 year?

11 DR. LAMARRA: Uh-huh.

12 MS. RODMAN: Okay, all right. So --

13 MR. SCHLEVINGER: Dave from Water Resources.
14 I'll put my two cents on this. I assume I might want
15 to check with DEQ to find out how they are as far as
16 processing the 401 and their -- the actions within.
17 It doesn't look like that one-year window's going to
18 be met, and you might withdraw and reapply, and
19 restart the clock.

20 MS. SCHMIDT: I didn't hear that.

21 MR. SCHLEVINGER: That's something nobody
22 here wants to hear, but it's pretty common practice.

23 MS. RODMAN: Are you aware of that game?
24 Take him aside out of the building and explain that
25 to him. Okay.

1 DR. LAMARRA: We can reapply. That's not a
2 big deal.

3 MS. RODMAN: That restarts the clock.

4 DR. LAMARRA: Dianne?

5 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

6 DR. LAMARRA: I have a file from our
7 computer from my -- or never mind, sorry. Never
8 mind. Strike that from the record. I should be a
9 judge.

10 MS. RODMAN: Is there anything more that you
11 think the community would be interested in?

12 MS. SCHMIDT: I think just have you -- if we
13 can have some sort of presentation to the community,
14 that would be great, you know, to make it clear. By
15 the time you have it, you'll be at your May 16th
16 date, but people will still have opportunities to
17 comment?

18 MS. RODMAN: Yes, yes. We don't ever --

19 MS. SCHMIDT: Close that option?

20 MS. RODMAN: -- close it, no. We have dates
21 for our internal convenience. Like there gets to a
22 point where you can't rewrite the EA, you've got to
23 issue the darn thing, so you kind of have to put
24 letters off.

25 MS. SCHMIDT: You've got to just do it.

1 MS. RODMAN: Right.

2 DR. LAMARRA: As I envision the
3 presentation, it would not be a summary after all the
4 issues are addressed. It would basically go back to
5 the very start, and we would go through each resource
6 and tell you what we've done for each resource, full
7 analysis, results of the investigations, and it will
8 be -- it may not be really long, but it will be
9 thorough. Maybe an hour and a half?

10 MS. SCHMIDT: Oh --

11 DR. LAMARRA: We're willing to -- you know,
12 it doesn't have to be necessarily part of the
13 watershed council meeting. We can hold it as just a
14 general public meeting.

15 MS. SCHMIDT: And I think it's good to hold
16 it -- for the watershed council to sponsor that for
17 you.

18 DR. LAMARRA: Sure. You have to understand
19 that we've worked on this river for three years.
20 These two guys have done an inordinate amount of
21 science, and I'd hate to short them on the time that
22 they would like to have to share those results with
23 you. You know, they've done a great job, and I think
24 they need to --

25 MR. BENGTON: Do you have a calendar? The

1 meeting is scheduled in about three weeks.

2 MR. STEIMLE: You know, another thing, too,
3 is that all the studies that we've conducted are
4 available online, the Symbiotics' website, so if you
5 feel the watershed council feels that there are
6 specific issues that you know people are going to be
7 much more concerned about, and I think you'd be the
8 best ones to decide that, we'll pull those together
9 after this, if you want, to outline those over
10 others. We can, obviously, shorten the presentation
11 and, you know, take comments in those areas that we
12 know exactly what the concerns are, at that level,
13 after some of those declarations.

14 DR. LAMARRA: You know, one of the things
15 that Tim brought up that actually we had not thought
16 of is this whole issue of the federal government
17 requiring new safety requirements in terms of
18 security on the facilities. You know, to be honest,
19 that never even occurred to me, and yet he had a
20 valuable point: Is this going to go ahead and cause
21 our law enforcement officials to have added
22 requirements? I hadn't thought of that. I think
23 that's food for discussion. You know, that's just an
24 example of something we really didn't cover, you
25 know. So --

1 MR. BENGTON: You know, I don't want to
2 speak for Deb, but I'm thinking about a typical
3 meeting is such a large hassle, and to do a meeting
4 for folks that lasts about an hour -- My suspicion is
5 that you're not going to get a lot of questions from
6 a technical point of view. They're interested in the
7 effects of this construction on the pool, on the
8 community, there may be some specific fish in
9 question. What you should look at is those actual
10 comments that you're willing to go look at
11 information and what we need in detail as well. So
12 in terms of a presentation, and I'm not speaking for
13 those folks, I think we should let them ask for what
14 they're wanting, from the community. I think that
15 would be the better way to do it. But I'm thinking
16 if an overly-technical, long presentation will be
17 necessarily necessary in this case.

18 But I guess the thing to do for us is to go
19 ahead and get those folks in contact with you and
20 just let the community kind of give you the
21 information on what their concerns are. I think
22 it'll get a better turnout for this. I think it was
23 the worry or concern that the comment period's come
24 to a close. And we've been down that road before,
25 comment periods closing, and that's it for the

1 opportunity, where we didn't actually have a say in
2 the process.

3 MS. RODMAN: Right, right. By the way,
4 what -- will you be able to file information on what
5 the Forest Service is doing upstream?

6 MS. SCHMIDT: File information? Well, you
7 need to be more specific.

8 MS. RODMAN: Well, would there be a letter
9 of comment from the Forest Service providing us with
10 information about upstream events that may be
11 affecting, say, water quality?

12 MR. GINNEY: Do you have any watershed
13 assessments or documents like that you have links to?

14 MS. SCHMIDT: We have watershed assessments
15 for all three of the bureaus. They are,
16 confidentially, more tied into the Bureau of Land
17 Management, and that's -- the bureau has their own
18 watershed assessments.

19 MS. RODMAN: Or we don't have to do it
20 necessarily that formally. We don't need to get a
21 letter on Forest Service letterhead.

22 MS. SCHMIDT: The Berger people who are --

23 MS. RODMAN: Like, talk to your people?

24 MS. SCHMIDT: Yeah. I think that's the best
25 way to do it, just -- yeah. Because I think we all

1 handle cumulative effects a little bit differently,
2 so it's better if we get specific questions, and then
3 we can answer that, rather than at me taking a stab
4 at what we think you want. Does that make sense?

5 MS. RODMAN: Yes.

6 MR. GINNEY: Are any of those --

7 MS. SCHMIDT: Pardon?

8 MR. GINNEY: Are any of those documents
9 available online?

10 MS. SCHMIDT: I'm not sure. I thought they
11 were in the past; I'm not sure they are anymore.
12 There was a big issue whether they were ADA
13 accessible, and we kind of had to hold off because
14 they were typed inappropriately, so -- but we might
15 have them on a CD and could get them to you that way.

16 MR. GINNEY: Okay. Great.

17 MS. SCHMIDT: But I can give you a card with
18 phone numbers, and you guys can get a hold of us.

19 MR. LAWRENCE: That would be helpful. One
20 of the things that the FERC is requesting that we do
21 is to make a more detailed assessment, I would say,
22 of those type of things; what is upstream, what the
23 upper watershed impacts are that are ongoing and that
24 have occurred in the past that contribute to the
25 current condition. And if you have a better

1 understanding of that than we do, then it will help
2 us to -- it can help them assess how the project adds
3 to that or how it affects it one way or the other,
4 positive or negative. It just gives us a better
5 idea. It's like all we see is what's going past the
6 dam. It's hard to get an appreciation of what it is
7 that's happening upstream. We might have a better
8 feel for that.

9 And it doesn't have to be in great
10 specificity, I don't think, just maybe some generals.
11 Depending on what the agencies and what the other
12 individuals want, so we understand, like, what is
13 happening -- what's happening that affects the
14 condition of the resource within the actual project
15 area. It would really be helpful. However we access
16 the information will be helpful to us.

17 MR. STEIMLE: In terms of the water
18 commission thus far, the watershed is going to appeal
19 them, so --

20 MS. RODMAN: Now, besides a more public
21 involvement and more outreach to the local community,
22 what other concerns do the Corps have? Are they
23 being met?

24 MAN: I don't know if I'm in a position to
25 speak for the Corps on this particular subject. My

1 guy will make contact -- a local point of contact,
2 and I can better answer the questions in the local
3 community of where we are in the process. Physical
4 security is one, actually, I had considered before as
5 for the specific methodology for risk assessment on
6 the dams, and we've been working on that since 2001.
7 It's evolving a little bit, and that is something
8 that we can provide you with some background on. So
9 that would be something that we need to take into
10 consideration.

11 But, you know, I'm actually -- I'm not sure
12 I can provide you with any other Corps perspective.
13 I've actually said, well, if he wants a contact in
14 addition to it, my perception was that we're not very
15 involved in this process yet, and there will come a
16 time where we're much more in direct discussion over
17 project operations and concerns we have there. At
18 this point we're just trying to facilitate your
19 presence on the project, get you the information you
20 need so that you can do your assessments.

21 MS. RODMAN: Does anybody else have any
22 questions? Think of anything? State of Oregon?

23 MS. GRAINEY: Mary Graine, Oregon Water
24 Resources Department. No. I just -- I might mention
25 that the State of Oregon has a joint process through

1 the state agencies where we all coordinate on
2 application review teams within our department, and
3 we will be going through the process for this state
4 licensing and the state water right. So we are
5 required to hold a public meeting also, and we were
6 going to try to do that within the next month. We're
7 required to give four weeks' notice in the newspaper,
8 so -- and then we have to notify the officials in the
9 planning department and those kinds of folks, so
10 we've been trying to schedule a meeting also.

11 So if it doesn't work out with the
12 watershed council, then maybe a few weeks later we
13 can have a public meeting the state organizes. And
14 then they've offered to come and give us the whole
15 dog and pony show again, so we're willing to go and
16 coordinate that.

17 MS. SCHMIDT: So you intend to have that in
18 Cottage Grove or --

19 MS. GRAY: Yes, yes. We're reviewing the
20 community center. I've got a phone -- I got a phone
21 message into the gal, but I haven't actually
22 scheduled the date yet.

23 MS. RODMAN: Does Berger staff have any
24 questions?

25 MR. HODGE: I just have a -- this is Ken

1 Hodge. Ed may be able to be speak to this. I would
2 recommend that if the Corps has specific suggestions
3 regarding security, that they may want to treat that
4 as nonpublic information, for obvious reasons, and
5 then submit it to the commission stating that it
6 should not be disclosed to the public. Just for that
7 particular information as opposed to general
8 information that doesn't have that same sensitivity.

9 MS. RODMAN: Yeah. You may want to deal
10 with -- probably our regional office might be the
11 best point of contact for that because they would --
12 they're obviously the people on the grounds that deal
13 with that. And then the Washington Office of the
14 Division of Dam Safety and Inspections to which the
15 regional office is, I guess, a part are the ones that
16 are administrating our critical energy infrastructure
17 and information program, so I think if you go to the
18 regional office, they'll give you very good advice as
19 far as security purposes.

20 MR. PEREZ: Ed Perez. Dianne is right.
21 Security information is ECEI.

22 MS. RODMAN: CCIS.

23 MR. PEREZ: CCIS.

24 MS. RODMAN: CEIS, yes.

25 MR. PEREZ: And we treat it as such, stored

1 away in a safe actually.

2 MS. RODMAN: Do you have anything further to
3 say about this project or this application? No?
4 Okay. Thank you very much for coming. And for the
5 people showed up, I thank you for your tenacity and
6 your interest in the project, and I hope to be
7 working with you all in the future. Thank you.

8 I just remembered one thing we wanted to ask
9 Symbiotics. If you have outstanding studies, could
10 you file a schedule when those are going to be
11 completed? And when we'll get the information, we'll
12 go home and file that real fast.

13 DR. LAMARRA: Yes, yes.

14 MS. RODMAN: All your outstanding studies.

15 DR. LAMARRA: Yes.

16 MS. RODMAN: Okay. Thank you. Now we're
17 done.

18 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:55
19 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

