

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

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x
IN THE MATTER OF: : Project Number
AMES HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT : 400-043
- - - - - x

Tellurid Conference Center
580 Mountain Village Boulevard
Telluride, Colorado

Friday, August 12, 2005

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping
meeting, pursuant to notice at 9:10 p.m.

MODERATOR: DAVID TURNER, FERC

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

2 (9:10 a.m.)

3 MR. JAYJACK: Good morning, everyone. We're
4 going to get started right now. So please come on in; have
5 a seat.

6 I'd first off like to welcome everyone to this
7 scoping meeting for the Ames project, a project owned by
8 Colorado Public Service Company.

9 With me here today is Patti Leppert, a recreation
10 specialist from FERC.

11 Next to her is -- We're going from left -- or
12 your right to left -- is Liz Molloy from our Office of
13 General Counsel

14 And from our San Francisco regional office is
15 John Scott.

16 Someone this morning is noticeably missing, and
17 that's David Turner, the team leader for the project. He
18 had to attend to some last minute business from FERC. It's
19 the marvels of technology today. So he's working on the
20 Internet trying to correct some stuff there. So he should
21 be joining us some time later this morning.

22 The agenda for this morning is to first go over
23 the objectives of this meeting and the purpose of scoping.
24 We'll give a very brief overview and status report regarding
25 the project for those who need it. And when that time comes

1 I'll see who would like to have us go through that overview
2 and we'll go from there.

3 Next I'll very briefly give you a short
4 discussion of the integrated licensing process and give you
5 an update regarding that. And then we'll move forward to
6 discuss the resource issues associated with the Ames
7 project.

8 Again, I think -- it appeared to me that
9 everybody had registered that's here. If you haven't,
10 please do so at some point.

11 With me here today is a Court Reporter. This
12 gentleman will be recording the conversations that take
13 place. It's for the Commission records, a record for the
14 project proceeding. It's a fairly standard thing that we do
15 to maintain our record for the project.

16 Okay. The purpose of the meeting here today is -
17 - well, there are a number of reasons why we do this. One
18 is we are basically required to do so by the National
19 Environmental Policy Act, more commonly known as NEPA. And
20 NEPA requires us to hold this type of meeting in order for
21 us to get a better understanding of what the issues are for
22 environmental analysis and the issues associated with a
23 government action in this case, the potential for
24 relicensing this project.

25 At this point I recognize most of the faces in

1 the crowd. And I know you are familiar with the project as
2 well as the integrated licensing process.

3 Is there anybody here that is not familiar with
4 the project and its operation and would like a very brief
5 overview of that? Please raise your hand if that is the
6 case.

7 (No response)

8 MR. JAYJACK: Okay. For the record, I'm seeing
9 nobody raised their hand. So I think Alfred will appreciate
10 this: We'll move forward and skip the project description.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. JAYJACK: I think what I'll do is I'll give a
13 very, very quick description of the ILP and then we'll move
14 forward from there.

15 Basically the ILP is divided into two stages,
16 represented by the two rows you see there. The first stage
17 is the prelicense application stage, which is where we're at
18 now. One quick thing I'd like to point out regarding this
19 stage is that we have the scoping process up front at this
20 early part of the entire licensing process. For those
21 familiar with the more traditional licensing process, this
22 is a major change where we didn't hold this meeting until
23 after a license application would be filed. So I'd just
24 like to point that out to you.

25 We are in the scoping phase right now. And then

1 we are, after this period, we're going to move on to our
2 study plan development phase and actually get into trying to
3 design studies to fill any information gaps that we may
4 have. And then -- this is a very brief description of this
5 first phase, but ultimately this will lead to the
6 preparation of a license application which will be filed
7 with us. So we're looking at a two to three year schedule
8 here, total.

9 Once the application is filed the process looks
10 pretty much like it did prior, with the TLP issue. Once we
11 have assessed the application and find it to be adequate and
12 consisting of all the information that's required by
13 regulations and we've made a determination that we have the
14 information we need to prepare our environmental analysis,
15 we'll issue a notice stating basically that the application
16 is ready for environmental analysis. That is the trigger or
17 the notification to the agencies, NGOs and others to file
18 comments, additional comments, and file their terms and
19 conditions, recommendations for measures to be included,
20 potentially, in a license.

21 And then, of course, we prepare our EA based on
22 those -- that information and the recommendations, comments,
23 et cetera. And ultimately we end with a Commission order or
24 decision as to whether to license the project, and, if so,
25 what to put in that license as far as environmental

1 measures.

2 Okay. I just wanted to talk very briefly about
3 the schedule, where we're going to go from here after this
4 meeting.

5 As you can see, the next milestone is for study
6 requests to be filed. And these are study requests that are
7 to be developed by you all, to fill those information gaps.
8 And the Commission Staff will be potentially filing study
9 requests as well as to their needs.

10 At that point Colorado Public Service Company
11 will put forth a proposed study plan, which by regulations
12 is required by November 4th of this year. And then we'll
13 move forward to study plan meetings to discuss what's in
14 that plan and try, if there are any disagreements as to the
15 studies that are needed, to try to work out those
16 disagreements and come to a solution.

17 And then based on those meetings and what comes
18 out of that, Public Service Company will file a revised
19 study plan which is due March 5th of next year. And then
20 that gets filed with us, with the Commission, for a
21 determination and essentially approval of the study plan,
22 and we would do that by April 4 of next year.

23 Any questions at this point?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. JAYJACK: Okay.

1 When making a study request, when filing a study
2 request, our regulations require that you address some
3 certain criteria that, of course, are specified in the regs.
4 This is new to the ILP process. Somewhat -- it's at least
5 more extensive than what we had in the past. But, anyway,
6 these criteria are listed before you. They are fairly
7 intuitive.

8 Of course, you want to identify what your study
9 goals and objectives are and state the study needs. For
10 resource agencies, when you submit your study request it's
11 important that you basically state what your resource
12 management goals are and what the nexus is between the study
13 and those goals and how the study and the information to be
14 gained by the study will help you to meet your management
15 goals.

16 For those who are not agencies but submit study
17 requests, you don't have to, of course, consider your
18 resource management goals. But instead the regs spell out
19 they should consider the public interest that would be
20 gained by doing the study and gaining the information.

21 The study request should also consider existing
22 information that's available and why that information is not
23 suitable to address the issues and why more is needed.

24 The next criteria to consider is nexus to project
25 operations and effects. Basically the study has to tie to a

1 project effect on the resource and that which is to be
2 studied. So you want to address how the project operation
3 effects relate to what you're studying and why you're
4 studying on that particular area.

5 The regs would prefer that the methodology -- or
6 require the methodology be consistent with accepted
7 practice. And that's pretty much self-explanatory.

8 And, finally, we need to consider the level of
9 effort and cost of your study request so that we can -- if
10 there are multiple study requests we can consider kind of a
11 sort of balancing: consider what is to be gained by the
12 study and the information through the study in consideration
13 of the effort that would be expended, or the cost.

14 And as part of that, a study requester would need
15 to explain why other studies that are being requested by
16 other parties or alternative methods would not be suitable
17 and why -- you know, give a justification for -- if the cost
18 is more and the effort is more, give the justification for
19 going with the greater effort and cost that's involved.

20 Any questions?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. JAYJACK: These are kind of important, so
23 please address these when you did give your -- put forth
24 your study requests, if you do. We're really paying a lot
25 of attention to this. So, anyway, I'll leave it at that.

1 MR. TURNER: This is David Turner.

2 Sorry, guys. I hate coming in late like that but
3 the boss, Mark Robinson, needed something for a Congressman.
4 So

5 There is a handout that we put together that kind
6 of explains the criteria, at least from our perspective. It
7 gives you a broad understanding. So make sure you pick up
8 the four handouts in the back.

9 There is a flowchart that shows the IOP process
10 in detail. In particular on that chart is some colored
11 text. Red text denotes where agencies and the public will
12 be commenting or providing input. The other handout, as I
13 mentioned earlier, is the study criteria, developing an
14 understanding of those criteria. So it will help you put
15 some of the context around these study criteria.

16 As Nick said, these are extremely important and
17 we're paying a lot of attention to them. And they go a long
18 way to help us understand what you need and why.

19 MR. JAYJACK: Do you want me to continue?

20 Along with the license application process there
21 are also parallel processes that will be taking place.
22 These include Section 7, the Endangered Species Act
23 consultation, as well as water quality certification.

24 If there are any others that folks can think of
25 The reason we bring this up is that, you know, part of the

1 goal of this new integrated licensing process is to get all
2 of these processes on a parallel track with regard to
3 collecting information that's needed to make decisions on
4 each of these processes. So at this point we've identified
5 endangered species, the Section 7 consultation, water
6 quality certification. We're going to be paying a lot of
7 attention to those two areas there as far as the processing
8 of our application goes.

9 If there are any others you can mention them now.
10 Or if you have identified any others that we need to be
11 aware of, you can file written comments during the comment
12 period for scoping. And I guess we'll explain that a little
13 bit later as far as filing written comments later on in the
14 meeting. I'll go over that briefly.

15 Okay. Any questions or additions to this list
16 that folks would like to bring up right now?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. JAYJACK: Okay. For the record, I'm seeing
19 no hands being raised so I'll move forward.

20 With that we're going to move into the heart of
21 the meeting, a discussion of the resource issues, and in
22 particular the issues that we have identified to date based
23 on the information that has been filed with us, as well as a
24 little bit of information that we have acquired through the
25 Internet, for instance, or in reviewing comprehensive plans

1 that are available at the Commission that apply to the
2 project.

3 David Turner is going to start with the first
4 issue. It's one issue under the geology and soils section.

5 If you have your scoping document with you it
6 would be helpful if you were to open to those pages that
7 we'll be discussing. I believe they start on page 22. And
8 you can follow along.

9 David.

10 MR. TURNER: The first issue that was raised
11 based on the resource work group meetings was some
12 rehabilitation work that needs to go on near Highway 145.
13 Based on some input from last night, we recognize we
14 probably need to tweak this a little bit because there's not
15 an ongoing operational impact, but just the effects of some
16 issues that -- historical issues from erosion that was
17 associated. And we understand that, as part of the work
18 group, that site is being evaluated for rehabilitation.

19 So are there any other soils erosion issues that
20 we missed or that somebody wants to raise?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. TURNER: All right.

23 With that we'll go to aquatics.

24 MR. JAYJACK: Okay.

25 The aquatic and fisheries resources. We're going

1 to be looking at two areas of effects, one of those being
2 cumulative effects -- that is, actions on the resources that
3 go beyond just the hydro project but that include other
4 activities in the area. The geographic scope of that area
5 that we're going to look at is the Upper Colorado River
6 Basin. It's a very large area and it's going to be
7 difficult for us to get a handle on everything that's going
8 on there in the Upper Colorado River. So what we're going
9 to do is basically focus our efforts on the San Miguel River
10 sub-basin.

11 The resource we'll be looking at as part of that
12 cumulative effects analysis will be the four federally
13 listed species that occur in the Upper Colorado.

14 As far as the issues that we've identified, again
15 based on information that has been filed with us by Public
16 Service Company, there are two areas. One has to do with
17 ice accumulation associated -- potentially associated with
18 project operations, and the others have to do with flow.

19 On page 22 of Section 5.2.2 I have the two
20 bullets listed there that identify the resource -- fishery
21 resource issues. We put these in the form of a question, as
22 is fairly standard with our scoping documents. And I'll
23 read the first one for you:

24 What effect would
25 project operations have on ice

1 accumulation and ice release
2 downstream of the Ames Power House and
3 what measures could be implemented to
4 lessen or eliminate the accumulation
5 and release of ice?

6 There are some smaller or more specific issues
7 associated with the ice accumulation, but what we've tried
8 to do here is try to capture each one of those, you know,
9 smaller issues into one larger issue or area that we'll be
10 looking at.

11 Does anybody have any questions on that first
12 issue there? And in particular, does anybody notice
13 anything about that issue that perhaps is not included in
14 that broad area that needs to be included?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. JAYJACK: Okay. I'll move to the next issue
17 then.

18 The next issue, again, has to do with project
19 operations, and particular with effects on flows. The
20 effects on flows kind of cover two areas. One of them is
21 creation of what we commonly call bypass reaches due to
22 diversion of water away from the reach into a penstock or
23 flume. Thereby the reach is bypassed.

24 The second area has to do with storage of water
25 in reservoirs, and so kind of -- thereby changing the timing

1 Before you speak, we're going to hand you a
2 microphone. I would like for you to identify yourself for
3 the Court Reporter for the record.

4 MR. STOB: My name is Greg Stob. I'm from Lizard
5 Head Land Company. We own 21 acres surrounding Trout Lake.

6 The question would be on ice accumulation on the
7 lake and public access once the lake starts to break up a
8 little bit because of letting water out of the dam, and
9 where would that fit in this.

10 MR. JAYJACK: So as I'm understanding your
11 question, apparently there is ice accumulation occurring on
12 the lake during certain periods -- during the thaw there
13 could be -- Is it a safety or an access issue associated
14 with that?

15 MR. STOB: It would be a little bit of both.

16 What we have is probably four to five feet of
17 solid ice. And then when you let the water out the ice
18 starts to break up along the perimeter of the lake. And
19 there's no signage right now, but the public still has
20 access to that. And they also cross over Lizard Head land
21 to get on there. And they're doing it with snowmobiles, ice
22 fishing, and so on.

23 MR. JAYJACK: Okay.

24 MR. STOB: So I'm wondering if that's something
25 that we should be taking into consideration.

1 MR. JAYJACK: Yes, that is something we could
2 look at. We would probably put it under the recreation
3 section or the list of recreation issues to be looked at.
4 And it sounds like perhaps the issue might go something
5 like, 'Is signage or warning signs -- or are there enough
6 warning signs to give the public, you know, notice of the
7 potential danger that would exist around the perimeter of
8 the lake.' Would that somewhat cover it?

9 MR. STOB: I think that would suffice.

10 MR. JAYJACK: Thank you.

11 Any other questions or comments?

12 John.

13 MR. DEVINE: John Devine, Devine Tarbo &
14 Associates, consultant to PSCO.

15 That issue and several similar issues came up in
16 resource work groups and they were kind of placed under
17 issue assessment number six, shoreline management plan for
18 Trout Lake. And there are other related issues that came up
19 as well, but access and private property being very close to
20 the project boundary there and trespass, those kinds of
21 things, safety. So I think we've talked about that through
22 the -- or several of those issues through the resource work
23 groups.

24 MR. JAYJACK: Great. Thanks, John.

25 Anyone else?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. JAYJACK: Okay.

3 I'm going to turn it over to David now and he's
4 going to discuss the terrestrial resource issues that we
5 have identified, as well as the threatened and endangered
6 species issues.

7 MR. TURNER: As Nick was talking about in terms
8 of aquatic resources, we're going to look at project
9 operations, not only flow fluctuations in Trout Lake and
10 releases on riparian communities, wildlife in general down
11 below Ames, and in the various tributaries of Howard Fork
12 and Lake Fork.

13 That pretty much covers the first two bullets in
14 the scoping document. The first one primarily deals with
15 the issues downstream and its associations with ice and ice
16 scour and the effects on the riparian community, and the
17 second one is that broader in-stream flow requirements for a
18 healthy community.

19 The third bullet is focusing on management and
20 operation effects and how that results into -- or may or may
21 not result in the spread of noxious weeds and if there's any
22 changes in management practices that might be considered to
23 help reduce those spreads of noxious weeds.

24 Did we miss anything? Or does anybody want to
25 add anything to those in regard to the terrestrial resources

1 before we move on to threatened and endangered species?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. TURNER: By the silence, I assume we captured
4 it all.

5 We have -- Let's talk about endangered species a
6 bit. The Commission has responsibility to ensure that its
7 actions don't jeopardize the continued existence of any
8 federally listed species. We have designated the Company to
9 serve as our federally designated representative for ESA
10 consultation. That means that they're going to be preparing
11 a biological assessment associated with their license
12 application, working closely with the Fish & Wildlife
13 Service to ensure they get the information they may need to
14 address endangered species.

15 The Service has identified a number of species,
16 and I won't go through them all. But there are two in
17 particular -- the Colorado pike minnow and razorback sucker
18 -- that they have specifically talked about some information
19 needs.

20 There's nobody from the Service here today,
21 right?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. TURNER: Okay.

24 We talked a little bit last night about the
25 Canada lynx. I did have some questions and noted for the

1 record that there is some information there regarding their
2 occurrence.

3 Other than that, are there any comments or
4 questions about how we might want to -- any information
5 about endangered species that we might need to consider for
6 the record, or is there anything anyone wants to talk about
7 in terms of endangered species?

8 Gerrish.

9 MR. WILLIS: Gerrish Willis, Forest Service.

10 I was just curious as to whether this list came
11 from the Fish & Wildlife Service or was this list generated
12 from a listing in the PAD?

13 MR. TURNER: The Service.

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. TURNER: Well, with that, I'm going to turn
16 the floor over to Patti to talk about recreation land use
17 and cultural resources.

18 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you, Dave.

19 I'd like to bring to your attention pages 23, c,
20 Section 5.2.5, and the Archeological and Historic Resources,
21 5.2.6. Based on our comments from our other scoping
22 meetings, as you can see here I've identified five issues
23 under the Recreation and Land Use and two issues under the
24 Archeological and Historic Resources.

25 As I was mentioning, where these resources will

1 intertwine with those identified by Nick and Dave, we do
2 have a coordinated effort among all these resources. So to
3 save going over some of these that you might have already
4 heard in our previous meetings, there were some comments for
5 those that did not attend last night. And under Recreation
6 and Land Use, the second bullet, here was a comment to add
7 Hope Lake in that. Under Archeological and Historic
8 Resources, in the first bullet there was a comment to insert
9 "proposed" in the first one, so it would read:

10 What effects would
11 continued project operation and any
12 proposed changes in project operation
13 or facilities have on historical
14 properties and archeological
15 resources?

16 There was also another comment that I received
17 earlier this morning, and I'll be working with the gentleman
18 on this. If you look at page 26 under the Archeological and
19 Historic Resources, the second bullet, in where we state:

20 "Define the area of
21 potential effect and conduct a phase
22 one inventory

23 It was brought to my attention that the phases
24 are more of an eastern terminology. So that will be changed
25 to "class" to more reflect west of the Mississippi River.

1 But we'll work with that terminology in that.

2 Other than those comments, as well as factoring
3 in the Forest Service plans and how the plans are in line,
4 if you will, with these projects, are there any other
5 comments or issues that would help me in my analysis for
6 this case? And I open it up now to the floor for comments,
7 suggestions, anything.

8 (No response.)

9 MS. LEPPERT: There must be something.

10 MR. TURNER: Yes, I've got a question for Gerrish
11 of the Forest Service.

12 Last night we talked about recreational
13 activities up at Hope Lake. Do we have a feel for what goes
14 on up there and what we might be needing to consider?

15 MR. WILLIS: I'm not sure that the Forest Service
16 has good inventory data on recreation use at this point in
17 time. I think it's important for us to recognize that one
18 of the measures that the Company has proposed is to
19 cooperate with the Forest Service on developing a better
20 trailhead facility, which to me indicates that there is --
21 the Company is recognizing some sort of project nexus. And
22 so we're feeling like some additional documentation as to
23 what that nexus is is appropriate.

24 But as far as existing data, I think it's rather
25 limited at this point. And I see you frowning like

1 something's not making sense.

2 MR. TURNER: No, that's fine. It's fine.

3 No, just when you said documentation of the
4 project nexus I was wondering who you were trying to -- what
5 responsible party was supposed to be drawing that nexus, the
6 Company or the Forest Service, who has raised the issue for
7 the need.

8 John.

9 MR. DEVINE: John Devine, Devine Tarbo and
10 Associates.

11 I'm not sure that -- Well, actually I'm pretty
12 sure that PSCO's feeling on that is that in through the
13 resource work groups that there really wasn't a project
14 nexus, and that we covered that, that it's a Forest Service
15 trail and would remain a Forest Service trail. The Forest
16 Service is actually very interested in making sure that
17 there were no additional structures or even lightning
18 shelters or anything placed up on the trail. It's a semi-
19 wilderness area.

20 What we agreed to is just that we have cooperated
21 in the past with the Forest Service, whether there's project
22 nexus or not. And we would continue to cooperate and try to
23 do what we can in cooperation with the Forest Service to
24 help out with that trailhead. I wouldn't presume that by
25 willingness to cooperate is equal to conceding a project

1 nexus.

2 MR. TURNER: Okay.

3 MR. OSBORNE: Hugh Osborne, National Park
4 Service.

5 I've been involved with the recreation resource
6 work group and we have discussed activities up there at Hope
7 Lake. Generally it's a day use area; people hiking up. And
8 there was some comment from people involved in some of those
9 meetings about putting up, as John was saying, hurricane --
10 or -- hurricane shelters; yeah, you don't want to get hit by
11 a hurricane up there.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. OSBORNE: Lightning shelters. And there was
14 discussion about that and, as Mr. Stob was saying, hesitancy
15 about putting more structures up there just to maintain the
16 quality of the experience up there but perhaps including the
17 trailhead with more information for people. But a
18 cooperative effort that's going to be primarily led by the
19 Forest Service as it is a Forest Service trail and facility.

20 MS. LEPPERT: Thank you.

21 MR. TURNER: All right. I'll pick it up from
22 here.

23 I guess the last issue that's there, and one that
24 we always have to consider, is the public interest
25 considerations. So we'll have to be looking at the overall

1 cost of these measures versus the value. And that's where
2 our developmental resources come in. How do we -- We'll do
3 an analysis of what these environmental measures may cost in
4 terms of generation, capital and O&M, and compare it to the
5 benefits. And we'll use that information in coming up with
6 a balancing decision, if you will, of what the new license
7 should look like.

8 That covers all the issues that we have been able
9 to identify, gleaning from our readings of the resource
10 assessments that were included in the PAD and what we could
11 find off the Internet and other sources. Is there anything
12 that we've missed or anything that anybody wants to talk
13 about in terms of resources? Questions on the integrated
14 licensing process; what's coming up next?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. TURNER: Silence is golden.

17 Okay. You've got one? Great.

18 MR. OSBORNE: Hugh Osborne, National Park Service
19 again.

20 We had in the past -- I was just looking at your
21 list of comprehensive plans -- worked with Telluride and San
22 Miguel County on a watershed management plan for this sub-
23 basin. And I'm not seeing it listed -- Oh. There it is.
24 Okay. Never mind. You've got it on the list.

25 MR. STOB: Greg Stob from Lizard Head Land

1 Company.

2 Question: Are there any commercial operations
3 being granted for Trout Lake on the waters there as far as
4 canoeing, fly fishing, snowmobiling, anything along those
5 lines?

6 MR. TURNER: Alfred, do you want to take that
7 one?

8 MR. HUGHES: Alfred Hughes, Public Service
9 Company.

10 No. None considered, none currently. And really
11 has not even been brought up for discussion. It's an
12 operational reservoir on a hydro project, obviously open for
13 public recreation, fishing, et cetera. But nothing
14 commercial that we'd be granting, no.

15 MR. TURNER: Anything else?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. TURNER: If you -- Well, just to back up.

18 Comments again, as a reminder, are due September
19 20th. You can file those with us at the Commission and
20 include the Public Service Company of Colorado, obviously.
21 There is information on page 27 of this scoping document in
22 terms of how to file that information. Please be sure to
23 note the docket number for Ames is Project 400.

24 I don't know if Nick talked about it, but the
25 Company is looking to separate the current licenses from the

1 Tacoma and Ames Facilities. We for administrative purposes
2 have assigned a new number to Tacoma; the Ames Project is
3 retaining 400. So when you file comments, file them
4 specific to the current developments.

5 John.

6 MR. DEVINE: I have a procedural question, David,
7 I meant to ask last night.

8 We do have a set of -- In anticipation of the
9 comments getting in on September 20th, we have already
10 arranged some resource work group meetings the week of
11 September 26th to get back together with the parties. And
12 I'm wondering about actually how to best get the comments
13 when they're filed with you or PSCO, how to best get the
14 comments. I noticed that you're also, of course, required
15 to file comments with PSCO and it's identified to send them
16 to Alfred Hughes.

17 And, by the way, Alfred, is that the right
18 address? You might just clarify that on the record, if we
19 could.

20 MR. HUGHES: Where are you at that I've got the
21 wrong address?

22 MR. DEVINE: H.

23 MR. TURNER: Oh, the notice.

24 MR. HUGHES: Oh, on the notice.

25 MR. DEVINE: What should we ask for there?

1 MR. TURNER: So we've been getting it all wrong
2 and you haven't told me yet?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. HUGHES: 240 Electra Lake Road East. And
5 it's still Durango 81301. They closed the contract post
6 office for a while, and consequently our PO Box. And now we
7 actually get delivery up at the lake. So it's a better
8 arrangement.

9 MR. TURNER: Okay. All right. When did that
10 occur?

11 MR. HUGHES: Oh, a couple of years ago, a year
12 ago.

13 MR. TURNER: Oh.

14 MR. HUGHES: Everybody else has got the current
15 information.

16 MR. TURNER: Somehow or other -- I got it off the
17 application, I thought. But, oh, well. Whatever. We'll
18 get it corrected.

19 MR. DEVINE: John Devine again.

20 Any advice for us, David, how best to get that
21 information up? When will it be available at the Commission
22 to get it electronically?

23 MR. TURNER: You've confused me. In terms of
24 getting that information for the public?

25 MS. MOLLOY: You're looking to receive the

1 comments that people filed with the Commission --

2 MR. DEVINE: As fast as we can.

3 MS. MOLLOY: -- as fast as possible.

4 MR. DEVINE: And they'll mail them to this
5 address to PSCO, and that might take a while. Some might
6 copy us electronically. But I'm just wondering how to
7 collect them all prior to -- as fast as we can so we can be
8 prepared for that meeting.

9 MS. MOLLOY: If comments are filed -- This is Liz
10 Molloy.

11 If comments are filed electronically -- and I
12 urge everyone to e-file because it really is the best way to
13 get this to the Commission. If they are e-filed they are
14 pretty much immediately available in e-library.

15 If they are filed in paper, once we receive them
16 they have to be sort of scanned in and then they are put on.
17 It takes a couple of days; it can take a little longer.

18 MR. JAYJACK: Yeah. If it's e-filed, Liz is
19 right, it's not immediately, but within 24 hours; typically
20 no longer than that. If there is a big slug of things
21 coming in it might take a little longer than that, but
22 generally in less than 24 hours it's available.

23 MS. MOLLOY: Now if you e-subscribe, you'll get
24 notice.

25 MR. TURNER: And don't use the US Mail. We're

1 still suffering the effects of 9/11 and radiation and delay.
2 So, if anything, if you want to file a hard copy, do it by
3 Federal Express or some other means. But e-filing is still
4 the best way to get things done timewise.

5 MR. WILLIS: I believe your regulations also
6 allow electronic service? In the case of sending comments
7 directly to Alfred would it be appropriate for those
8 comments to be filed or to be sent to him electronically?

9 MS. MOLLOY: If he'd like that -- the service --
10 The tricky part is the service rules take effect when there
11 are parties to a proceeding. And nobody has intervened --
12 We don't have interventions yet. So pretty much we mail it
13 to people.

14 But if he'd like it -- and I'm sure he would like
15 it electronically -- you know, that would be fine.

16 MR. TURNER: Thanks, John, for bringing that up.
17 Any other comments? Comments on procedures?
18 Anything at all?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. TURNER: Well, with that, I guess if there
21 are no other questions or comments, we'll adjourn the
22 meeting.

23 I appreciate your attendance and raising these
24 issues. This is an important step in the process for us.
25 It's making sure we understand what's going on. And again

1 you need to be commended, all of you, for your hard work so
2 far in pulling together the information on the issues and
3 trying to resolve things. I think it's going to go a long
4 way in making this proceeding move forward in the quick pace
5 that we have to get things accomplished.

6 So again, thanks very much for your hard work.
7 And thanks for coming. And with that, we'll adjourn.

8 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25