

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. HOCKING: My name is Steve Hocking. I'm an Environmental Protection Specialist with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. I'd like to welcome everybody to FERC's Scoping Meeting for Hook Canyon Energy's proposed project, the Hook Canyon Pump Storage Project.

This is the evening scoping meeting that we are holding tonight from 7:00 to 10:00. We can extend that a little bit, if we need to.

What I'd like to do, is go over some introductions and then our agenda, first of all. Next slide, next slide, please.

(Slide.)

MR. HOCKING: Okay, here's our agenda for tonight's meeting. We'll go over some introductions and some meeting procedures.

I'd like to talk about the purpose of this meeting, the purpose of scoping. I'd like to talk briefly about the ILP process and some major milestones. ILP stands for the Integrated Licensing Process. That is FERC's licensing process that's being used for this proposed project.

Hook Canyon Energy is going to talk about their

1 proposed project. They've got a short PowerPoint
2 presentation that they're going to give.

3 Then we'll go pretty much right into accepting
4 comments for the Commission's record, and any resource
5 issues that we can discuss.

6 Hopefully, later on, we can talk about proposed
7 studies, and the Commission study request criteria, which
8 relates to the information that has to be filed in order to
9 request a study be conducted by Hook Canyon Energy.

10 All right, let me go ahead and introduce two of
11 my colleagues. Jim Puglisi, right here, he is a Civil
12 Engineer and he's also with FERC. He is in my group with
13 the Office of Energy Projects, and he's going to be taking a
14 look at Hook Canyon Energy's proposed project, in terms of
15 engineering aspects.

16 Also, there is Gerry Maloney in the back there.
17 He is a Civil Engineer, as well. He's with the Federal
18 Energy Regulatory Commission's San Francisco Office, and
19 he's going to give us a hand, too.

20 Does anybody have any questions about the agenda
21 for tonight? Any quick questions?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. HOCKING: All right, let's have the next
24 slide, please.

25 (Slide.)

1 MR. HOCKING: Just a couple of housekeeping
2 things: Hopefully, everyone has already registered. That's
3 this green sheet right here.

4 This helps us keep track of how many people
5 showed up, and helps us just make sure that we have the
6 mailing list straight for the project and for the
7 transcripts, that we know who is speaking and the spelling
8 of everybody's name.

9 So, if you haven't already filled out one of
10 these, if you can take a minute when you get a chance, to
11 fill one out, they're collecting them in the back. Okay?

12 As you can see -- well, you can't see, because
13 the Court Reporter is usually up front, but our Court
14 Reporter is in the back. This meeting is being recorded by
15 a Court Reporter, and everything you say, will be put into
16 the Commission's official record for this project.

17 When you do get up to speak, I'm going to ask
18 that folks state their name clearly and who they represent,
19 if you're representing anyone. Transcripts for the project
20 will be available in about ten days on the Commission's E-
21 Library system. We'll talk about the E-Library system
22 shortly.

23 If anybody has any written comments that they
24 want to provide to the Commission tonight, that they have in
25 hand, you can go ahead and hand them to Jim, and Jim will

1 make sure that they get filed with the Commission.

2 If you intend to provide written comments later,
3 you can file them with the Commission, either in paper or
4 electronically. If you take a look at page 22 of this
5 document, which is Commission Staff's Scoping Document 1, it
6 will tell you how to file comments, electronically or
7 written. Okay, it's on page 22.

8 As you came in, you should have picked up four
9 handouts. You should have this document, Commission Staff's
10 Scoping Document 1; you should have -- this document, this
11 is the current proposed licensing schedule for the project.
12 It is the current schedule.

13 It will change, so you need to keep an eye on any
14 changes to the dates in this document. We'll be talking
15 about that shortly. We have -- there's a map of Hook Canyon
16 Energy's proposed project right here, and then another
17 handout is a guidance document that the Commission has,
18 called Understanding the Study Criteria, which, again,
19 relates to study requests. Later on, we'll talk briefly
20 about this, as well.

21 Hook Canyon Energy did have an additional two
22 handouts, so there were two other handouts for that were
23 provided by the development company, okay?

24 At the end of Scoping Document 1, again, which is
25 this document right here, we have a mailing list, which is

1 the Commission's official mailing list for the project. If
2 you can take a quick look at that when you get a chance, and
3 if your name is on there and if any of the information
4 needs to be corrected, you know, please let me know.

5 Otherwise, what we'll be doing, is taking names
6 from these sheets and adding them to the mailing list, so
7 that everybody gets copies of documents that are issued for
8 this project.

9 All right, next slide.

10 (Slide.)

11 MR. HOCKING: A couple other resources that are
12 available for you to get more information on FERC hydropower
13 projects, in general, or this project, specifically.

14 We have a website, www.ferc.gov. On our
15 website, we have some guidance information, guidance
16 documents. We have a flow chart that shows the ILP or the
17 Integrated Licensing Process.

18 We have other information for other FERC
19 projects, and then we have information on this project,
20 specifically.

21 Two things that I'd like to point out that I
22 think are pretty valuable for folks to know about, are E-
23 Subscription and our E-Library Service.

24 E-Subscription, if you have e-mail, you can sign
25 up on E-Subscription and you can get an e-mail every time

1 somebody files something with the Commission, that pertains
2 to this project, or the Commission issues a document that
3 pertains to this project.

4 What you have to do, is, on our website, you have
5 to log on, you create a user name and a password, and using
6 the project number P-12707, you're able to sign up for that
7 service.

8 It's something that's very valuable. I
9 recommend that everybody sign up for that E-Subscription
10 Service.

11 The other resource that's available, is E-
12 Library. That's a web-based, Internet-based database, and
13 on that system, anybody can pull up and view and print any
14 document that has been filed with the Commission pertaining
15 to this project.

16 Basically, it houses the Commission's official
17 record for the project, and you're able to access all the
18 documents that pertain to this project that Hook Canyon
19 Energy is proposing.

20 You can also get those documents through the E-
21 Subscription Service, because when you get an e-mail, there
22 will be a link directly in that e-mail to the document that
23 was just either filed or issued by the Commission.

24 So, take a look at our website. There are a lot
25 of resources available on the website, and I recommend that

1 you sign up for the E-Subscription Service. That would be
2 great.

3 All right, next slide.

4 (Slide.)

5 MR. HOCKING: All right, I'd like to read a
6 couple things and go ahead and summarize this for you.

7 Under the Federal Power Act, FERC has a
8 responsibility to issue licenses for non-federal hydropower
9 projects. Again, you can read more about FERC's mission at
10 our website.

11 The National Environmental Policy Act requires
12 FERC to analyze the environmental effects of proposed
13 hydropower projects that are filed for Commission approval.

14 For the proposed Hook Canyon Pump Storage
15 Project, Commission Staff are -- we intend to issue an
16 Environmental Impact Statement for the Project, or an EIS,
17 which is required under the National Environmental Policy
18 Act.

19 Last month, Commission Staff issued Scoping
20 Document 1, which, again, is this document right here, and
21 in that document, we have listed -- we've put together a
22 preliminary list of issues that we think need to be looked
23 at and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement that
24 we're going to be eventually writing.

25 That document also has a short description of the

1 project, proposed studies by Hook Canyon Energy, studies
2 that they intend consider doing, and major milestones that
3 we're going to go over shortly, as well as some other
4 information.

5 The main purpose of our meeting tonight and the
6 purpose of the meeting that we had just a couple hours ago
7 down in Fish Haven, is to get your input on the proposed
8 project. We're seeking comments from federal, state, and
9 local agencies, the public, and from interested tribes,
10 NGOs, anybody who is interested in the project, as to what
11 you think Commission Staff should be looking at in our
12 Environmental Impact Statement, and what Commission Staff
13 should be looking at in terms of studies that may be
14 required of the Applicant.

15 So, basically, in a nutshell, the meeting tonight
16 is to get from you, what you think the significant issues
17 are for the project, what the depth of analysis is that
18 Commission Staff needs to look at for those issues.

19 We're going to be doing a cumulative effects
20 analysis, so we're interested in any other information of
21 other actions that are happening in the Bear Lake Basin or
22 the Bear River Basin, so that we can do that cumulative
23 effects analysis.

24 We'll be looking at reasonable alternatives to
25 the project, and then protection, mitigation, and

1 enhancement measures that the Commission -- you think the
2 Commission should consider in our review of this project.

3 So, that's -- I apologize because my voice is
4 starting to run out -- so that is the main purpose of
5 tonight's meeting, and the meeting that we had during the
6 day down in Fish Haven.

7 Does anybody have any questions about the meeting
8 tonight, any questions about scoping or the overall purpose
9 of tonight's meeting?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. HOCKING: No? No questions? Yes? If you
12 can speak as loud as you can, please.

13 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

14 MR. HOCKING: Well, in a minute -- do you want to
15 go to the next slide? We're going to talk briefly about the
16 ILP process, and we're actually in the very beginning of
17 this process.

18 It's a long -- it's a five-year process from
19 start to finish, and we're in the very beginning stages of
20 it.

21 What I'd like to do, is, I'd like to just briefly
22 go over this, the ILP, so that folks get oriented towards
23 how this process works.

24 There is a lot more information on the specific
25 steps and the Commission's regulations, and what Hook Canyon

1 Energy's responsibilities are, and what Commission Staff's
2 responsibilities are, and comment due dates and things like
3 that, on our website, but I definitely want to make sure
4 that people are, overall, familiar with how this process
5 works.

6 And as you pointed out, we are in the very
7 beginning stages of this process. All right, so let's take
8 a minute to go through this.

9 If you'd take a look at the top row, the far left
10 box where it says NOI and PAD, NOI stands for Notice of
11 Intent to file a license application, and PAD stands for
12 Pre-Application Document.

13 Hook Canyon Energy filed those two documents with
14 the Commission on September 10, 2007. Basically, at that
15 point, they are telling the Commission, hey, we intend to
16 file a license application or seek an application to build a
17 project.

18 And that starts the ILP, the Integrated License
19 Process. The next step that's marked Scoping and Process
20 Plan, that's where we are right now, where we're holding our
21 scoping meetings and we're trying to get an idea of what
22 people think of the project and what issues should be looked
23 at in any environmental document that we do, as well as
24 what studies need to be conducted by the applicant.

25 The step after that, Study Plan Development, that

1 involves an Applicant for a hydropower project, coming in
2 with a proposed study plan, a study request being filed with
3 the Commission and with the Applicant; the Applicant coming
4 in with a proposed study plan, and then an opportunity to
5 comment on that; and then a revised study plan and then
6 another opportunity to comment on that; and then,
7 ultimately, the Director of my Office will make a decision
8 as to whether the study plan should be approved, and, if so,
9 with what modifications.

10 And that's the study development phase that we
11 will go into next. That's the next phase.

12 After that, at the very end, there are two years
13 for the Applicant to conduct their studies, and then to
14 actually develop a final license application.

15 And as you can see from the time that NOI and PAD
16 is filed, until the study plan and development phase is
17 completed, it takes about one year.

18 Then after that, there's two years for the
19 Applicant to conduct the studies that have been required and
20 to develop a license application.

21 Once an application is filed, which is this step
22 down at the bottom, Commission Staff, we have an opportunity
23 to ask for more information.

24 We take a look at the application for adequacy.
25 We've got to make sure that it meets all of our regulations,

1 and then once we have all the information that we need in
2 order to do an Environmental Impact Statement, we'll issue
3 what we call our REA Notice or Ready for Environmental
4 Assessment Notice.

5 That leads to the next step, where we actually
6 prepare the EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement, and at
7 the very end, we make a recommendation to the Commission for
8 a decision, and the Commission makes the decision as to
9 whether to issue a license for the project, whether the
10 project should be built, and, if so, under what conditions
11 should the project be built?

12 So, from start to finish, it takes about five
13 years. There are more detailed milestones and due dates on
14 the sheet that I handed out.

15 This one right here, it gives all the various
16 steps in the whole process, and so, as you can see, we're
17 right in the beginning of that. Okay?

18 Do people have any quick questions about the ILP
19 process? Yes?

20 PARTICIPANT: I want to make sure that when
21 anyone has a question, to speak into the microphone, because
22 the Reporter has to get your name, and he can only hear it
23 through the microphone.

24 MR. EGBERT: My name is I. J. Egbert, and I'm a
25 property owner on the south end of Bear Lake and I live in

1 Bountiful, Utah.

2 My question is, is this strictly a federal
3 process, or does the state and county have a say in it? And
4 if it's strictly federal, what branch of the Federal
5 Government is in charge of FERC?

6 MR. HOCKING: Okay, the decision whether to issue
7 a license or not, is a federal decision. That falls --
8 Congress gave that authority to the Federal Energy
9 Regulatory Commission, so that is FERC's job, to decide
10 whether to issue a license for the project or not.

11 Now, there are other permits and authorizations
12 that are required, typically, for just about any hydropower
13 project built in the country. For instance, Applicants
14 usually have to get a Water Quality Certificate from the
15 state, from the states in which the project is located.

16 They have to get other permits, like, maybe a
17 Section 404 permit from the Corps of Engineers. There are
18 other authorizations that are required, depending on where
19 the project is located and what issues come up with the
20 development of the project or the construction of the
21 project.

22 So, usually, there are other authorizations that
23 are needed. The Applicant has to apply to the State of Utah
24 for a Water Quality Certificate, so they will be involved in
25 that, in that sense.

1 But the ILP process and the decision on
2 authorizing the license or not, does fall to FERC. Now,
3 FERC is an independent Commission. There's five members
4 that are appointed by the President, and it's under the
5 Executive Branch, but it is an independent Commission.

6 Hopefully that answers your question. Another
7 one?

8 MS. HIRSCHI: My name is Bonnie Hirschi, and I'm
9 from Logan. So, it is our best bet now to write directly
10 already to our Congressmen and our Senators, to have them go
11 into the national headquarters and start fighting for us?
12 Is that the place we should start?

13 MR. HOCKING: Well --

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. HIRSCHI: I'm dead serious. I want to know.

16 MR. HOCKING: I mean, anybody is free at any
17 time, to contact their representatives.

18 MS. HIRSCHI: (Off microphone and inaudible.)

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. HOCKING: Well, I can't give you that type of
21 advice.

22 MS. HIRSCHI: (Off microphone and inaudible.)

23 MR. HOCKING: I mean, we're here -- you know,
24 FERC has a very long process. There are a lot of steps
25 involved. We have to do an environmental document. In this

1 case, we're going to do an Environmental Impact Statement,
2 and, you know, we have to make sure that there's a complete
3 record for the Commission to make a decision upon.

4 You're free to go to, you know, to any of your
5 representatives, as you see fit. I would never say anything
6 to the contrary, because that would be a bad thing to say.

7 Okay, so let's -- we do have a lot of people here
8 tonight, and we have less time than we had today, so I want
9 to keep moving, because, again, Hook Canyon Energy has a
10 proposal to make, and -- they have a presentation to make,
11 another PowerPoint presentation, and I want to make sure
12 that we have enough time tonight to get everybody's
13 comments in.

14 We did run over time today, and we had fewer
15 people, and we had a much longer period of time, so we have
16 to keep things moving, because, as I explained, today, our
17 main goal is to make sure that everybody gets a chance to
18 speak to the Commission in terms of what they think should
19 be done with the project, okay?

20 So, next slide?

21 (Slide.)

22 MR. HOCKING: These are just a couple of major
23 milestones I want to make sure we're clear on, that
24 everybody is aware of. Comments on Commission Staff's
25 Scoping Document 1, this document, and comments on the PAD,

1 Hook Canyon Energy's PAD, as well as study requests, are due
2 by May 13th, so that's just about a month, and that date
3 will come up pretty quick.

4 Hook Canyon Energy, I guess, will be talking
5 about this, as well, but they have filed a -- today, they
6 told me that they filed a preliminary study plan. That's
7 something that is due a little bit later in the process, but
8 they have filed it early, because they want folks to take a
9 look at the studies that they are proposing, a little bit
10 earlier.

11 What I'm suggesting is that for this project, for
12 this proceeding, that everybody take a look at that, and
13 then by May 13th, they also file comments on that document,
14 as well.

15 That document won't be on our E-Library system,
16 so everybody, it will probably be available, maybe within
17 about two days, so, by the end of the week or the first part
18 of next week, you should be able to pull up that document
19 and print it out, take a look at it.

20 For this project, this proceeding, what I'm
21 recommending, is that everybody include comments on that
22 preliminary study plan, along with their May 13 comments,
23 okay? That way, we can just get that much quicker in terms
24 of a study request and final study plan.

25 After that date, Hook Canyon Energy should be

1 coming in with a proposed -- the regular proposed study
2 plan, by 6/27/08, then a revised study plan by 10/27/08,
3 then the first study season for this proposed project, would
4 be the Summer of 09.

5 The second study season would be the Summer of
6 2010, and then Hook Canyon Energy would be coming in with a
7 preliminary licensing proposal, which is kind of like a
8 draft license application, by about April of 2011, and then
9 a final license application in September of 2011.

10 So those are the major milestones that will be
11 occurring, up to the point at which Hook Canyon Energy files
12 any license application with the Commission.

13 The more specific detailed milestones, again,
14 that folks should be looking at and keeping track of, are on
15 this sheet, and, hopefully I mentioned it, but Hook Canyon
16 Energy is going to be maintaining this process plan on their
17 website. They're going to keep the latest version of that
18 on their website, so if you go to their website, you can
19 download that and that way, you have any changes to the
20 schedule, okay?

21 Any questions about these milestones? I mean, I
22 know this is a tremendous amount of information. Let me
23 just make sure that everybody knows that I'm available to
24 answer questions.

25 My contact information is on page 2 of the

1 Scoping Document 1. It's got my phone number and e-mail.

2 If you have any questions about Hook Canyon
3 Energy's responsibilities, or the study requests, or the
4 study plan, the process, you know, feel free to give me a
5 call or send me an e-mail, and I can get back to you. I'll
6 try to get back to you to answer any questions that you may
7 have.

8 It is a -- the ILP is a long process, and it
9 takes a little while to get up to speed on it. So, any
10 questions at this time? Yes?

11 MS. LANGFREE (Ph.): My name is Eula Lee
12 Langfree, and I'm with Love Bare Lake. I would like to
13 know, on what dates and what newspapers, were the intentions
14 to file, advertised?

15 MR. HOCKING: The Notice of Intent to File, the
16 original notice? Well, they filed it with the Commission on
17 September 10th, and we went out with our notice, 60 days
18 later. I think that was put in two or three newspapers.

19 There's one newspaper -- I'd have to look it up.
20 There's one newspaper in Salt Lake City. There was one
21 newspaper in Garden City, I believe.

22 I could check that for you, but what we do, what
23 FERC will do, is, we'll issue a Notice in the Federal
24 Register, and then we put notices in the newspaper that an
25 application has been filed.

1 In addition to that, Hook Canyon Energy has --
2 well, maybe you guys can explain exactly what you did in
3 terms of notices?

4 Why don't we hold that until he's -- Hook Canyon
5 Energy has a presentation. I'll ask them to address that
6 when they come up here in just a minute, okay?

7 Any other questions?

8 MR. YARMAN: John Yarman, a property owner in
9 Garden City. You say that Hook Canyon accelerated the pre-
10 study, and you're asking us to comment on it by the 5/13
11 date?

12 I'm just wondering if they are going to drive the
13 rest of the schedule.

14 MR. HOCKING: The schedule is driven by the ILP
15 process, which is in the Commission's regulations. It's
16 really not up to them to decide. You know, they don't set
17 the schedule, once they file a Notice of Intent and a Pre-
18 Application document.

19 For this particular project, we did have an issue
20 with state lands, because the proposed project would cross
21 state parklands, Utah State parklands, so we did put the
22 project on hold. We put it in abeyance, temporarily, until
23 Hook Canyon Energy could demonstrate that the State of Utah
24 would at least be willing to talk to them about an easement
25 or a lease or some sort of property rights that they would

1 need in order to cross those state parklands.

2 So we did put it on hold and they were able to
3 show to the Commission, that they could at least work with
4 the State of Utah, in terms of possibly acquiring those
5 rights. The State of Utah didn't make any definitive
6 statement that they would grant rights at this point, but
7 they said that they would be willing to work with the
8 company and talk about it.

9 So then we were able to restart the process.
10 There was a delay, but no an acceleration. There was some
11 additional delay for this particular project, but there was
12 no acceleration.

13 All these milestones, if you take a look at the
14 ILP process, they basically follow the regulations. And,
15 again, that's my role, that's part of my role, is to make
16 sure that Hook Canyon Energy does follow the Commission's
17 regulations and that this proceeding is conducted fairly and
18 that we end up with a record and Environmental Impact
19 Statement that the Commission can make a decision upon.

20 Yes?

21 MR. MILLER: Wayne Miller. Of all these
22 processes in the U.S. that go through, what's your
23 percentage when someone files an application, what's the
24 success rate, generally?

25 MR. HOCKING: You mean, of an application being

1 accepted or denied?

2 MR. MILLER: Yes, by FERC, for the whole
3 process.

4 MR. HOCKING: I got the same question earlier
5 today, and I don't know what the percentage is. I mean, we
6 have -- recently, most of our projects have been relicenses,
7 which means there's an existing project and the license has
8 expired, and it's coming up for a new license, and,
9 generally, those are reauthorized.

10 There are usually a lot of conditions put on the
11 license, because some of these projects are 50 years old,
12 and, you know, we try to bring them up to current
13 environmental standards, and usually a license will go out -
14 - not all the time, but, generally.

15 As far as new, original projects being granted or
16 denied or being denied, I don't know that. I'd have to
17 check that for you, okay? I'll do that.

18 MR. WINTERS: I'm Dick Winters, and this may be a
19 crazy question, but once this type of a thing is launched,
20 does it acquire a life of its own and go on through that, or
21 is there some way someone can have an attack of smarts and
22 drive a spear in this thing, before it goes any farther?

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. HOCKING: We had a number of those comments
25 today, earlier.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. HOCKING: That's not the first time I've
3 heard that.

4 MR. WINTERS: Did you get that much applause?
5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. HOCKING: Just about. It was pretty close to
7 that.

8 Again, the same response: We have to -- the
9 Commission has to make a decision on whether to license the
10 project or not, and, if so, what conditions the project
11 should be licensed under.

12 They can only do that, if they have a complete
13 record in front of them, and part of that complete record,
14 is developing a NEPA document, and either an EA or an
15 Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

16 So we have to go through the process and take a
17 look at all the issues and take a look at, you know, the
18 economics of it and the environmental impacts, and put that
19 altogether, in order for the Commission to make a decision
20 as to whether to actually authorize the project or not.

21 MR. WINTERS: Another question that comes up --
22 and I'm not saying that I understand all of this stuff --
23 but it is the utilization of inexpensive power to create the
24 waterhead that is then, when the time for the peak power
25 need comes, you produce power that can be sold at a higher

1 price.

2 What kind of a guarantee is there that that less
3 expensive power will always be available, or is this
4 something that, in time, there might be a major shift in
5 this thing that would take out of the equation, what is
6 making sense now to some people?

7 MR. HOCKING: Hook Canyon Energy -- you know,
8 this has to be -- for any Applicant for a FERC license, the
9 project has to be economically viable, so they have to take
10 a look at, you know, the assumptions of what will happen in
11 the future, and the risk of those assumptions not coming
12 true.

13 If it doesn't come true, you know, then they've
14 got a problem. We will be -- FERC Staff will be asking for
15 certain economic information, because we do have to include
16 in our analysis, a level of -- we have to take a look at the
17 economics of the project in terms of the construction costs,
18 the operation costs, what the value of the power would be,
19 and whether the project would be economically viable.

20 So we will be looking at that, asking for
21 information, so that we can consider that in the EIS, in the
22 environmental document.

23 MR. WINTERS: Well, my final smart-ass remark.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. WINTERS: It seems to me, as I look at this

1 thing, that it -- well, there's a certain level of insanity
2 that you just have to admire.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. WINTERS: And this, I think, is getting very
5 close to that.

6 MR. HOCKING: Okay, all right, on that note, why
7 don't we go ahead -- I'm going to go ahead and ask Hook
8 Canyon Energy to come on up.

9 Okay, one more question and then we'll have to go
10 ahead and keep going.

11 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm John Williams. I live in St.
12 Charles, Idaho.

13 This thing is going to use more power, energy to
14 pump the water up there, than what it's going to generate
15 coming down.

16 You add that to the amount of fish that you've
17 lost between the motor and the generators, this thing should
18 be dead before it ever started.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. HOCKING: Pump storage projects are always
21 net energy users. When you take a look at the scoping
22 document, we've estimated that, I think, the project would
23 produce 3.2 million megawatt hours per year, but would
24 consume 4.0 million megawatt hours per year.

25 So, it would be a net energy user, that is

1 correct.

2 Okay, I'm going to go ahead --

3 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

4 MR. HOCKING: Okay, sure, that was a question
5 about the site visit. We did have a site visit scheduled
6 for Tuesday. We're hoping to be able to get up to the
7 project area. We did have to cancel the visit, because it
8 was just too difficult to get up there, too much snow on the
9 road.

10 I would like to have -- we do want to have an
11 official site visit. The next time I'm going to be back for
12 this project, will be in July, July 22nd. That week, we'll
13 be having proposed study plan meetings. The regulations
14 require that Hook Canyon Energy have at least one meeting to
15 talk about the proposed study plan.

16 They're planning on having more than one
17 meeting, and so what I'd like to do, is, sometime that week,
18 set up an official site visit for the project, because we
19 need to get up there and take a look at it.

20 So, what I'll do, is, we'll go out with some
21 notices and e-mails to make sure that everybody knows what
22 that date is. I forget what day the 22nd is. It could be a
23 Tuesday or Wednesday, but we'll try and make it, you know,
24 one of the days during that week.

25 PARTICIPANT: Maybe then we can get that water

1 (inaudible).

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. HOCKING: All right, so let me go ahead and
4 allow Hook Canyon Energy to give their presentation on the
5 project that they are proposing to construct. They are
6 going to do some introductions, and then after that, we'll
7 probably take a short break, and then we'll go to starting
8 to allow people to give their comments.

9 MR. STEIMLE: My name is Erik Steimle, and I do
10 have a short presentation prepare this evening, about our
11 proposed project in Hook Canyon.

12 To start with, I'd like to explain that Hook
13 Canyon Energy, LLC, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of
14 Symbiotics Energy. Symbiotics is a hydroelectric
15 development company that initiated in 2001, and is based out
16 of Logan, Utah.

17 I'd like to start with some introductions. With
18 us tonight, with Symbiotics, is our Chief Operating Officer,
19 Mr. Brent Smith; in Government Relations, we have Brian
20 Cole; our Fish Biologist is Keith Lawrence; Justin Barker is
21 the Project Manager for the Hook Canyon Project; and our
22 Aquatic Ecologist is Kai Steimle.

23 Also with us this evening, we have engineering
24 staff from Sunrise Engineering, and I can start with Charlie
25 Rhen here, and he'll introduce his staff.

1 MR. RHEN: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

2 MR. STEIMLE: Could we start off with the next
3 slide?

4 (Slide.)

5 MR. STEIMLE: There we go. So, I've divided the
6 presentation up this evening, into a few different
7 categories:

8 First, I'd like to talk specifically about Utah's
9 electricity needs, so you have a better understanding of why
10 we're even proposing this project at all.

11 Then I would like to transition and talk about
12 our current electricity in Utah, where it comes from, and
13 then I'll move on and talk specifically about the Hook
14 Canyon Pump Storage Project.

15 I'll talk about specific features and project
16 operation. I'll also talk about where this project fits
17 into Utah's electricity portfolio.

18 I'll move on then and talk about the preliminary
19 application document that Steve talked about earlier, I'll
20 outline some of the impacts that were addressed in that
21 document itself, and, finally, I will close the presentation
22 by outlining some of the benefits of the project, that we
23 have identified at this time. Next slide, please.

24 (Slide.)

25 MR. STEIMLE: So, most people really started to

1 become aware of Utah's growing need for electricity, after
2 the rolling blackouts and brownouts in California that
3 happened in 2004.

4 Growing electricity needs in Utah are highly
5 correlated with both our growth in population and state GDP.
6 As many of you know, the State of Utah has had some of the
7 highest growth rates for both population and economic
8 growth, of any of the other states in the U.S. over the past
9 ten years.

10 These are just a few of the examples here of
11 articles that have been in some of the local papers about
12 Utah's growing electricity needs. Next slide.

13 (Slide.)

14 MR. STEIMLE: So, as I talk about electricity and
15 our needs here in Utah this evening, I'm going to first go
16 over a couple of terms that I'm going to refer to quite a
17 bit. The first is "peak power." When I refer to that,
18 that's when electricity demand is at or near its highest
19 point.

20 "Baseload power," if you can read along the
21 bottom here, is the average hourly use for a region in a
22 given year.

23 These two graphs that you see here, illustrate
24 differences in demand for electricity in the State of Utah.
25 They are taken from PacifiCorp's 2007 IRP report, and most

1 of you know that Pacifi corp here operates as Rocky Mountain
2 Power.

3 The graph that you see on the left, has hours of
4 the day along the X axis. You can see that electrici ty
5 demands are fairly low during the early morning hours here,
6 or what will often be given as the middle of the night, and
7 they peak in the late afternoon and early evening hours.

8 The peak period of time is often associated with
9 the period in which people come home from work, they turn on
10 their air conditioners, but yet people are still working at
11 some of their offices, and, as well, retail is still open.

12 The graph that you see on the right-hand side of
13 your screen here, illustrates weeks of the entire year,
14 along the X axis, and electrici ty demand there, spikes in
15 the late summer months, and it's probably -- you are
16 probably well aware that the demands for peak electrici ty in
17 the State of Utah, are highly correlated with the increase
18 in both residential and commercial air conditioning in the
19 state. Next slide, please.

20 (Slide.)

21 MR. STEIMLE: This is a graph that illustrates
22 both the growing demand for base load and peak electrici ty
23 in the State of Utah. You have the years 2001, 2006, and
24 2015, along the X axis, and then demand is illustrated here
25 along the Y axis, in megawatts.

1 Now, baseload demand is fairly easy to predict.
2 As I mentioned earlier, it's closely tied with increases in
3 economic and population growth.

4 But peak demands for electricity are a little
5 harder to predict, as they are tied closely with individual
6 behavior. What I mean by that, is that a utility can fairly
7 easily figure out how many loads of laundry an average Utah
8 family will do during the week, but it's not very easy for
9 them to figure out when everyone will do those loads of
10 laundry.

11 The growing trend in Utah has been that the
12 demand for peak electricity is growing at twice the rate as
13 the demand for baseload electricity.

14 And what this means, is that as our use of
15 electricity, our increased use of electricity is increasing
16 at a fairly steady rate, the amount of time that we're using
17 -- or the period of time that we're using that electricity,
18 is becoming more concentrated in time.

19 And this poses a problem for our infrastructure
20 and for utilities, as you have to plan for that peak. If
21 you don't meet that peak, then you risk having rolling
22 brownouts and blackouts.

23 And this will be an issue that continues to be
24 brought up in Utah, as the gap between our baseload demands
25 and our peak demands, continues to widen, and the State of

1 Utah will have to have more flexible of electricity to meet
2 that gap. Next slide, please.

3 (Slide.)

4 MR. STEIMLE: This idea of flexible electricity
5 sources, is an important one, as we talk about where Utah
6 currently gets its electricity from.

7 Right now, 83 percent of our electricity in Utah,
8 comes from coal-fired power plants. Now, coal is a great
9 resource for the State of Utah, in that it's local and it
10 provides inexpensive electricity for average demands.

11 The problem with coal-fired power plants, is that
12 they cannot rapidly ramp up to meet sudden changes in
13 consumer demand for electricity. So, what this means, is
14 that our power plants, our coal-fired power plants, continue
15 to operate at the same rate, often regardless of changes in
16 demand.

17 So, during periods of time during the early
18 morning hours, as you saw on those previous slides, or on
19 weekends, we continue to burn coal in these power plants,
20 and, if electricity is not needed, that coal is burned at no
21 added advantage for the consumer. The steam is just let
22 off; it doesn't produce electricity.

23 Conversely, during periods of time where there
24 are those peak demands for electricity that you saw on the
25 previous slides, these coal-fired power plants can not ramp

1 up to meet those short-term demands for peak electricity.

2 Next slide, please.

3 (Slide.)

4 MR. STEIMLE: You saw those previous graphs
5 showed peak electricity demands in 2001, growing demands in
6 2006, increasing demands projected in 2015. We haven't had
7 rolling brownouts and blackouts in Utah, so where are we
8 getting our peak electricity from right now?

9 The short-term answer to that is that we're
10 building new natural gas-fired power plants. Natural gas is
11 a great resource for peak electricity, in that it can be
12 turned on for short periods of time to meet those peak
13 electricity demands.

14 The down side of natural gas-fired power plants,
15 is that they do use a fairly expensive fuel source, and
16 those costs are passed on to the consumer. In addition,
17 they increase our reliance of fossil fuels and emit carbon
18 dioxide into the atmosphere.

19 Now, this chart that you see on the right-hand
20 side here, shows the amount that natural gas played as part
21 of Utah's overall electricity portfolio in 2007. The
22 increase in the amount of use of natural gas-fired power
23 plants, is far as the overall electricity portfolio, has
24 been fairly dramatic in the near term, whereas in 2007, it
25 made up 15 percent, natural gas-fired power plants made up

1 just seven percent of the total portfolio, just 12 months
2 earlier in 2006. Next slide, please.

3 (Slide.)

4 MR. STEIMLE: So, short-term, to this question,
5 we have additional generation to meet our peak demands, from
6 gas-fired power plants, but what are some alternatives?

7 Well, the first alternative is energy
8 conservation. Energy conservation is the easiest and most
9 efficient way to curb demands for peak power.

10 As I mentioned earlier, peak electricity demand
11 is correlated with individual behavior, so if people were
12 willing to change their behavior, such as turning their air
13 conditioning units off during those peak times in the
14 summer, or using their appliances primarily on Sundays, you
15 could curb this demand for peak electricity in the state.

16 Closely related to this, is Governor Huntsman's
17 Utah Energy Efficiency Policy, which proposes to increase
18 overall efficiency in the state by 20 percent by no later
19 than 2015.

20 Another alternative to conservation and new
21 generation, is energy storage, and this is effectively what
22 the Hook Canyon Pump Storage Project proposes to do. It
23 proposes to store power from excess capacity from our coal-
24 fired power plants here in Utah, in the form of water, in a
25 new reservoir above Bear Lake, and then when peak

1 electricity demands were high, that water would be released
2 and electricity would be generated in the project's
3 turbines.

4 Pump storage hydropower is the most widely used
5 of energy storage right now in the world, for peak
6 electricity needs, and, right now, there are over 30
7 projects that are currently in use for this purpose here in
8 the United States.

9 Next slide, please.

10 (Slide.)

11 MR. STEIMLE: You've got to excuse me. I, too,
12 am losing my voice a little bit this evening. I apologize.

13 This is the graph that you saw in the earlier
14 slide. The difference here, is that we have illustrated
15 what the demand for peak electricity would be in 2015, if
16 Governor Huntsman's Energy Efficiency Policies were in place
17 and the Hook Canyon Pump Storage Project was online.

18 Those two, working together, would meet 85
19 percent of Utah's peak electricity demands, as they are
20 projected to be in 2015.

21 And, again, this information is taken from
22 PacifiCorp's 2007 IRP report. Next slide.

23 (Slide.)

24 MR. STEIMLE: So, at this point, I hope you have
25 a general sense of why we're proposing the project. I'd

1 I like to start talking about some of the specific features.

2 Most of you are well aware that it would require
3 building a new dam and an associated 225-acre reservoir,
4 which would be located in Hook Canyon, on the east side of
5 Bear Lake.

6 There would be a new underground shaft
7 connecting the upper reservoir and the powerhouse itself,
8 and the powerhouse itself, would be buried, although there
9 would be above-ground access.

10 There would be 14 reversible pump turbine units
11 in the powerhouse itself, and a new tail race tunnel that
12 would connect the powerhouse and Bear Lake. There would be
13 two, eight-acre surface switchyards and substations; nine
14 miles of new transmission lines, which would tie in with
15 Rocky Mountain Power's existing transmission line corridor.

16 Then, finally, there would be 3.8 miles of access
17 roads that would be upgraded, along with 2.2 miles of new
18 access roads. Next slide, please.

19 (Slide.)

20 MR. STEIMLE: This is a map that you probably are
21 all very familiar with. It has some of the features that I
22 identified on that previous slide, outlined here.

23 You have -- I'll go over just a few of them. You
24 have the reservoir here in Hook Canyon, with the head --
25 excuse me, the dam at the head of it there.

1 The dotted line here, would be that underground
2 shaft connecting the reservoir to the area where the
3 powerhouse would be. This area here, identifies where the
4 buried powerhouse would be.

5 And then the dotted line that extends out into
6 Bear Lake, would be that new tail race tunnel, which would
7 serve as the intake/output structure into Bear Lake.

8 Another item to note is this black line that
9 moves off the right-hand side of your screen, which is the
10 primary access road, and, again, right here, this is the
11 transmission line corridor that's proposed at this point in
12 time. Next slide, please.

13 (Slide.)

14 MR. STEIMLE: This is an artist's illustration of
15 the proposed project. It is not to scale, nor does it
16 graphically represent all of the pump turbine units here,
17 but it does help illustrate some of these underground
18 features and how the project would operate.

19 Again, the project proposes to use excess
20 capacity from our coal-fired power plants, to pump water
21 uphill into the upper reservoir, and then store energy in
22 the upper reservoir in the form of water.

23 Then during times of peak demand, water would be
24 released and power would be generated in the power plant
25 itself.

1 The maximum daily exchange of water from this
2 project, would be dictated by demand, of course, but it
3 would be 15,400 acre-feet of water, and at this maximum
4 daily exchange, the project could cause Bear Lake to
5 fluctuate as much as 2.6 inches per day at full pool.

6 The project itself would have an 1120 megawatt
7 capacity, and the maximum exchange rate of water, would be
8 18,636 cubic feet per second. Now, I know that sounds like
9 quite a bit of water, but right now, that intake/output
10 structure that you saw in the last slide, is being designed
11 in a manner so that the exchange velocity with the water in
12 Bear Lake, will not exceed one foot per second.

13 Now, this is being done for a variety of
14 reasons: First, the first reason is to ensure that we
15 preserve recreational resources on the top of the Lake, that
16 they stay consistent with what they are now; to protect
17 fishes in the water column, but also to make sure that this
18 project does not disturb sediments along the bottom of Bear
19 Lake.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. STEIMLE: We'll get to the Q&A flogging
22 later.

23 So, it was mentioned earlier that this project
24 would use more power than it generates, and that's actually
25 the first reaction that we get when people see this slide,

1 is, they want to know how can this be a good new clean
2 energy project for the State of Utah, when you're going to
3 use more power to pump water uphill, than you'll actually
4 generate?

5 And it is true that the project would use more
6 power. In fact, we estimate at this point in time, that it
7 would use 25 percent more power than it would generate.

8 But, right now, 100 percent of the excess
9 capacity that we have from our coal-fired power plants, is
10 lost. We could use that excess capacity to pump water
11 uphill and store energy in the reservoir to provide for peak
12 electricity needs during periods of peak power demand.

13 And we feel that this project is a better
14 alternative than to building new additional natural gas-
15 fired power plants in the State of Utah, to meet those
16 projected peak electricity needs. Next slide, please.

17 (Slide.)

18 MR. STEIMLE: So, I'd like to transition now and
19 talk just a little bit about the preliminary application
20 document.

21 This is the list of resources that were reviewed
22 in that document. Again, it serves as a baseline assessment
23 of what the worst-case scenario project effects could be on
24 these resources.

25 But as Steve mentioned earlier, the purpose of

1 tonight's meeting, is to gain additional information about
2 these resources, but, more importantly, how the project
3 might affect these resources, and information that may not
4 have been included in the PAD.

5 Resources that were reviewed in the Application
6 document, include the area's unique geology and the need to
7 conduct extensive geotechnical surveys to address seismicity
8 in the area, the need to protect Bear Lake's endemic
9 fishes, as well as protect sensitive wildlife and
10 vegetation on the bench, but, most importantly, to protect
11 the area's recreational and aesthetic resources, which make
12 this place a regional tourist destination.

13 Now, in the interest of time, I'm not going to go
14 through each of these resources and describe the information
15 that's already in the preliminary application document, as
16 most of you have come here this evening to make sure that
17 your comments are incorporated into the official record for
18 FERC.

19 But what I would like to do, is to talk about one
20 specific issue that's been brought up a number of times, and
21 how we are approaching this issue at this point in time.

22 Next slide, please.

23 (Slide.)

24 MR. STEIMLE: It has been said that if this
25 project was built, the operation of this project, would

1 blast sediments along the bottom of Bear Lake, and those
2 sediments would be stirred up into the water column, and
3 that would permanently alter the color of Bear Lake and give
4 it a muddy-like color, similar to some of the colors
5 explained today, that come in from the Bear River.

6 Here's what we know about this particular issue
7 at this point in time: We know that we'll be taking water
8 in and out of Bear Lake, from this blue source. We also
9 know that that water has connectivity with the Bear River,
10 but we feel that, ultimately, that most of the water
11 associated with where the intake structure will be, will be
12 from this general facility right here.

13 We also know that calcium carbonate is the source
14 of Bear Lake's turquoise color. We also know that calcium
15 carbonate builds up on the bottom of the Lake, that that
16 makes up a mud-like substrate that's often referred to as
17 marl. It's this marl substrate that's been said would be
18 stirred up by our project and cause the Lake to change its
19 color.

20 We also know at this point in time, based on
21 published literature, that over 50 percent of the suspended
22 calcium carbonate, which aids in giving Bear Lake its unique
23 color, is formed or put into the water column by marl that's
24 stirred up by natural wave action.

25 We also know at this point in time, that wave

1 action is three times more powerful than the currents
2 associated with the exchange from this pump storage project.

3 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible) information on that
4 last point?

5 MR. STEIMLE: It's a published study.

6 PARTICIPANT: Who published it?

7 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

8 (Participants discussing among themselves, off
9 microphone; inaudible.)

10 MR. STEIMLE: I'm sorry, which --

11 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

12 (Participants discussing among themselves, off
13 microphone; inaudible.)

14 PARTICIPANT: If the waves are on the bottom, you
15 might have a point.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. HOCKING: If I can interrupt for just a
18 second, why don't you proceed and finish with your
19 presentation, and then we'll have a short question-and-
20 answer session directly afterwards, okay?

21 MR. STEIMLE: Okay.

22 The reason that we can use this information and
23 say that it's three times more powerful than these wave
24 currents that have been published, is that we are, again,
25 designing the intake/put structure, so that exchange

1 velocities don't exceed one foot per second.

2 Now, I realize that this is just one issue that I
3 brought up. There will be a number of issues that will be
4 brought up tonight. A number of them have been brought up
5 earlier today, but we are committed to addressing every
6 issue, whether it is brought up here tonight or at any point
7 in the process, using sound science, coming up with
8 creative solutions, and doing so in a transparent manner
9 with the local community.

10 We are a local company and we want to design this
11 project, construct it, and operate it in a responsible
12 manner.

13 We also understand that any new development at
14 Bear Lake, should be viewed with skepticism. Far too often,
15 recreational and environmental resources, are displaced in
16 the name of economic benefit, but we do feel that this
17 project can be built in an environmentally benign manner,
18 and it will be a valued source of peak electricity for the
19 state of Utah. Next slide.

20 (Slide.)

21 MR. STEIMLE: So, I talked quite a bit earlier
22 about potential benefits this project would have as a new
23 source of peak electricity for the state.

24 Some additional benefits that we have outlined at
25 this point in time, include direct benefits to both Rich and

1 Bear Lake Counties, associated with the construction of the
2 project itself. We estimate that there would be 60
3 permanent employees associated with the operation of the
4 project.

5 There would be additional property taxes to Rich
6 County, as well as revenue to the state of Utah, associated
7 with the lease from SITLA (ph.), as the majority of the
8 project sits on SITLA lands.

9 And, finally, there are enhancement measures for
10 aquatic and recreational resources, which would be realized
11 as a component of the federal license. Next slide, please.

12 (Slide.)

13 MR. STEIMLE: So, that brings you to the end of
14 my presentation. Again, as Steve mentioned, this is a long
15 process that starts with scoping tonight.

16 We are very interested in hearing all of your
17 comments this evening, about our proposed project, and,
18 again, we are committed to being a good partner and a good
19 neighbor, both as we start this project tonight and as we
20 continue through the licensing process. Thank you for your
21 time.

22 PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

23 MR. HOCKING: Yes. We have a lot of people to
24 speak tonight, but I would like folks -- I would like to
25 give folks the chance to ask at least a couple questions at

1 this time, and what we'll do, is, we'll take a short break
2 and then we'll come back.

3 Then we need to get started giving folks a chance
4 to provide their comments into the record. All right, how
5 about just a couple of questions at this point, so we can
6 keep moving?

7 MR. SPUHLER: My name is John Spuhler. I'm a
8 Garden City resident, and for the sake of transparency --
9 and you guys mentioned that you want to be transparent,
10 however, I notice a lot of discrepancies.

11 On your website, specifically, there's a whole
12 site on misconceptions. The misconceptions part -- and we
13 can go to your PAD document, and this is where I have a real
14 problem. Your slide is also about Utah, Utah, Utah, but can
15 you guarantee us 100 percent, that all that power stays in
16 Utah, once it hits the grid? That's question one.

17 But if you go to your PAD document -- can you
18 guarantee that, that all that power stays in Utah?

19 MR. STEIMLE: Well, we know right now that Rocky
20 Mountain Power has an RFP out for additional generation for
21 the State of Utah.

22 MR. SPUHLER: So it's an assumption that it could
23 stay in Utah?

24 MR. SPUHLER: Well, we intend to sell our power
25 to them.

1 MR. SPUHLER: So they could sell it anywhere,
2 because they sell it all over the place, correct?

3 MR. STEIMLE: In that RFP, if I can clarify --
4 and perhaps I can't convince you this evening. In that RFP,
5 you need to compare your project to -- to have it be looked
6 at by Pacifi corp, to two types of projects in Utah, and
7 they're both peaking natural gas-fired power plants, okay?

8 MR. SPUHLER: Well, it says, for example, on your
9 website, under Misconceptions, Bear Lake is home to many
10 native fish, produces great fishing opportunities. Will the
11 project jeopardize this resource? Will it ruin fishing at
12 Cisco Beach?

13 Your answer is specific; it says no. Then you go
14 to your PAD document, and in your PAD document, I can cite
15 the reference, 3.3.2, you write, basically, that the impact
16 on the water, can basically affect the fishing, have effects
17 on the water quality, sediment; that the actual fish could
18 be entrapped, on 3.2.4, entrapment of fish species.

19 I mean, there is a whole list of things like
20 dewatering of fish eggs, so I'm wondering, what we're
21 getting, what's the real stuff, the misconceptions? And
22 there's four or five of them on there, that speak absolutely
23 the opposite of what's in your PAD document.

24 MR. STEIMLE: No.

25 MR. SPUHLER: So I'm wondering, what's the -- if

1 you're giving the Federal Government one thing, but you're
2 giving the public consumption something else, it sounds
3 almost like what we're sick of from the local politicians,
4 always telling us one thing and doing something else. It
5 sounds like a bait-and-switch to me.

6 MR. STEIMLE: Sure, no, that's completely
7 understandable.

8 MR. SPUHLER: Why is that? Why is there a
9 misconception?

10 MR. STEIMLE: No, I'll go over that. The
11 preliminary application document, as Steve mentioned
12 earlier, serves as a baseline assessment of the project, and
13 it has to assess every single one of those resources you saw
14 on the slide, but outline a worst-case scenario impact
15 associated with those resources.

16 Now, as far as fishes being entrained in the
17 project, we plan on screening the tail race, so that they
18 are not entrained, but if it wasn't screened, they could
19 become entrained, and so that would be a worst-case
20 scenario.

21 Blasting sediments against the bottom of the
22 Lake, that is a worst-case scenario assessment, but, again,
23 we're designing this project at this point in time, so that
24 those exchange velocities don't exceed one foot per second,
25 but if you didn't do that, would it displace those

1 sediments? Sure.

2 So, I guess to close with that, the preliminary
3 application document is just that; it's a preliminary
4 application. It meets the FERC's criteria, but it's just
5 the starting point for this project.

6 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

7 MR. STEIMLE: If it's not built properly, yes.

8 PARTICIPANT: But you say that it can be built
9 properly, so that there is no risk? (Inaudible.)

10 MR. STEIMLE: That is how we plan to design and
11 build this project, yes.

12 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

13 MR. HOCKING: Okay, we have to keep -- folks, you
14 do have to speak into the microphone, because that's the way
15 we get you recorded and on the record. Next question?

16 PARTICIPANT: If you are not on the microphone,
17 your comment will not be recorded.

18 MR. HOCKING: Right. We can't get you on the
19 record, if you're not on the microphone. All right, so
20 let's take another question.

21 MS. HODGES: My name is Lana Hodges and I live in
22 Garden City, and my question to you, is, why Bear Lake was
23 chosen for this project, where there are other waters within
24 the state that are not as pristine as Bear Lake, and why
25 Bear Lake was chosen?

1 MR. STEIMLE: One of the people on our Board, at
2 the earlier meeting today, described -- we had the same
3 question.

4 And, again, I'm the Director of Environmental
5 Compliance for Symbiotics. I cannot tell you exactly why
6 this area was chosen, although other areas that were looked
7 at in the State of Utah, were considered to not be
8 economically viable.

9 MR. HOCKING: Okay, how about one more question?

10 MR. NALDER: Lanny Nalder. You were there this
11 morning. I'm interested in how you're handling Dr. Roland
12 Jepson's (ph.) water research information that says that in
13 order to get one cubic foot per second out of the tail race,
14 you've got to have a tail race pipe that's 154 feet in
15 diameter.

16 I wouldn't doubt the wave action you've
17 presented, if it's one cubic foot per second on the
18 discharge, but if you have to have a tail race pipe at 154
19 feet in diameter to get one cubic foot, it means it will
20 stick above the water, 34 feet.

21 MR. STEIMLE: That's not what the engineers are
22 telling us at this point in time.

23 MR. NALDER: Well, that's what the water
24 research engineer told you this morning.

25 MR. STEIMLE: Well, that's a little out of my

1 element. Yeah, I may have one of our engineers try and
2 answer that question.

3 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

4 MR. RHEN: My name is Charlie Rhen, with Sunrise
5 Engineering. Again, there is a lot of engineering work yet
6 to be done, and that will be one thing that will be the
7 focus, is the size of the tail race, so it's a little early
8 to size components, when very, very little engineering has
9 been done to date.

10 But it will be studied extensively and results
11 will be published, of what is needed.

12 MR. STEIMLE: Thanks.

13 (Pause.)

14 MR. KERN: Hi, my name is Dale Kern, and I was at
15 the meeting this morning. I just have two quick questions
16 for you:

17 If you don't have enough details on this project
18 right now and much has to be designed, how do you know this
19 is economically feasible, compared to other areas you looked
20 at?

21 Secondly, we heard this morning, that, again in
22 your documents, misleading information or at least
23 preliminary that's now incorrect -- you are going to --
24 PacifiCorp is going to have to upgrade their transmission
25 lines, so your statement here that it won't, is not correct.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. STEIMLE: I don't think that I -- I
3 apologize if it sounded like I stated that Pacifi corp would
4 not, there would not have to be upgrades associated with
5 tying in with their existing corridor.

6 That's something that will have to be assessed,
7 as part of the transmission study, but we do intend to tie
8 in with that corridor, as far as where its placement is.
9 How that will look when it's done, I can't say at this point
10 in time.

11 MR. HOCKING: Okay, what I'd like to do, is just
12 take a short break. It's almost 8:20, so if we can take a
13 ten-minute break, and if everybody can be back by 8:30, and
14 then we'll go ahead and let people start providing comments
15 to the Commission.

16 If anybody does have a green sheet, a
17 registration sheet, if you could go ahead and turn that in
18 at this time?

19 (Recess.)

20 MR. HOCKING: Let's now have folks provide their
21 comments to the Commission. What I'm going to ask you all
22 to do, is to please limit your comments to about two or
23 three minutes. We want to make sure -- my primary goal
24 tonight, as with today's meeting, is to make sure that
25 everybody gets the chance to provide their comments to the

1 Commission.

2 And since we have so many people and we don't
3 have a lot of time left -- we went five and a half hours
4 earlier today -- we don't have a lot of time left.

5 What I'd like to do, is begin taking comments,
6 ask everybody to please keep their comments to about two to
7 three minutes, and then if we have time at the end, we could
8 have some questions and answers.

9 But if we get into a lot of questions and answers
10 at this point, we're going to run out of time and people
11 will not have the opportunity to speak and speak for the
12 record.

13 And that is the primary concern; I want to make
14 sure that everyone that has an opinion or thoughts about
15 what should be looked at for proposed studies and what the
16 Commission Staff should take a look at in our EIS, gets a
17 chance to speak.

18 So, we're going to go ahead and start passing the
19 mike. I think what we'll do, is just start with the front
20 row and move our way back.

21 Oh, that's right, thank you for reminding me.
22 I'd like to go ahead and invite any elected officials first,
23 to go ahead and speak. We had a number speak today.

24 If we have anybody, any mayors or county
25 commissioners or representatives of elected officials, if

1 you would like to speak first, I'd like to give you that
2 opportunity. So, is anybody here who would like to speak?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. HOCKING: Again, if everybody can, you know,
5 identify themselves. If your name is difficult to spell, if
6 you can spell your name and then say who you are with.

7 MR. LOERTSCHER: My name is Tom Loertscher.
8 That's spelled L-O-E-R-T-S-C-H-E-R.

9 I'm State Representative for this area of Idaho,
10 this being District 31. I can't speak for the State of
11 Idaho tonight, and won't try to do that, but what I will try
12 to do, is to tell you some of the things that I think that
13 the State of Idaho will be looking at, as you proceed down
14 this road.

15 The first and foremost for consideration, is the
16 effect that this project will have on the Bear River
17 Compact, a very time-tested agreement.

18 The other thing that we've done in recent years,
19 much more than in the distant past, is, we've given much
20 more attention to water rights and how that affects Lake
21 levels here at Bear Lake.

22 And as anyone who has worked with water knows,
23 the most critical time to be dealing with these kinds of
24 issues, are in drought years, and how what would affect how
25 this project would be of bigger concern in those drought

1 years.

2 Water quality has been talked about quite a bit,
3 and you've heard about that from others today, but the State
4 of Idaho is going to be very concerned about that issue, as
5 well.

6 And, finally, the issue that is going to be
7 studied very carefully by the State of Idaho, is, are the
8 risks to this project, balanced to the point that they can
9 be overcome.

10 A problem that's generated in something of this
11 fashion, the consequences and the effects of problems, how
12 would those be mitigated and how would you ever overcome
13 those problems?

14 They do occur, regardless of our best
15 engineering efforts, but the State of Idaho is going to be
16 very concerned about those issues.

17 MR. HOCKING: Okay, thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. HOCKING: Any other elected officials here
20 tonight who would like to go ahead and present comments?

21 MR. HOUSE: Brian House, Garden City Town
22 Council.

23 Prior to coming to the meeting tonight, I talked
24 to the Mayor of Garden City, and tomorrow night at the Town
25 Council, we'll be passing a resolution to oppose the

1 project.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. HOUSE: That being said, there was a comment
4 earlier about who to write to, and if you could write to
5 your representatives. I would encourage everyone in here to
6 not only write and get into the public document, but I would
7 encourage everyone to write to the Governor or your state,
8 and maybe even both states; also, your state
9 representatives and your federal representatives.

10 Anything that you feel is appropriate, I would
11 definitely encourage you. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. HOCKING: Sounds like those are all our
14 representatives. If there are any agencies here, any
15 resource agencies -- we had a number speak today, and I
16 don't know if any would like to speak again tonight, but I
17 want to go ahead and give them an opportunity, as well. Any
18 resource agencies?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. HOCKING: All right, then how about NGOs,
21 nongovernment organizations who would like to go ahead and
22 speak?

23 MS. COTTLE: I'm Claudia Cottle. I'm Executive
24 Director of Bear Lake Watch. Bear Lake Watch has over a
25 thousand members. That probably represents -- actually,

1 that number is probably doubled over the last two weeks,
2 maybe tripled.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MS. COTTLE: But each one of those members
5 represents possibly a hundred family members or group that
6 they come from.

7 Bear Lake Watch's job is to protect and preserve
8 Bear Lake. We've worked with the irrigators and the power
9 company to mitigate the use, the current use of Bear Lake,
10 and we're doing everything we can to try to make that use
11 for irrigation and power, to be better.

12 We are the ones that stood up in the '90s and
13 came up with, help author, or were signatories to the Bear
14 Lake Settlement Agreement that will help defend this water.

15 When it comes to the Hook Canyon, we have
16 examined the documents extensively. We have consulted with
17 experts in all fields. We have evaluated this proposal.

18 We have pages and pages -- and we won't go
19 through all those questions for you tonight -- that we will
20 submit to the FERC, with questions, conflicts in the PAD and
21 problems we see with this proposal and this project.

22 But in conclusion, the basis of this project is
23 to move large amounts of water, in and out of the Lake, at
24 whatever rate they choose to settle on, but it's still a
25 large amount of water.

1 Design as you may, this will be unnatural to the
2 Lake. It will alter the Lake environment. This poses a
3 great risk to the color and clarity of the Lake, and, yes,
4 we do know that water does not actually blue; it just
5 appears to be blue. We are that smart here in Bear Lake.

6 We do realize that there is a risk to the
7 resuspension of the marl sediment, that that, in itself,
8 threatens the rest of the biologic process, and the fish
9 communities; that it threatens our economy and our way of
10 life.

11 We are adamantly opposed to this project. We
12 will continue to work with all of the citizens and collect
13 your information. You can reach us at bearlakewatch.com.

14 We will continue to work with the state agencies
15 to define the issues and the studies. We will continue to
16 forward information onto the FERC, so that they also have
17 that information, anything that we have, and we will
18 continue to encourage all of our state officials to defend
19 our resources, as that is their job, and we will continue to
20 support our local leaders in their strong stand against
21 this project, and to defend our economy.

22 All the economic and energy arguments aside, one
23 thing remains, and to misquote a very famous Utah pioneer,
24 this is not the place.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. HARRISON: My name is Allen Harrison. I'm
2 the Executive Director of the Bear Lake Regional Commission.

3 Just to let you know, we have gone on record this
4 morning at the Bear Lake Regional Commission, as opposing
5 this project.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. HARRISON: And the signatories to that, are
8 the County Commissioner Chairmen from both Bear Lake and
9 Rich Counties, as well as the Mayor of Georgetown, the Mayor
10 of Montpelier, the Mayor of Paris, the Mayor of Laketown --
11 who else did we miss?

12 We have at-large member on the Irrigators, as
13 well as a Recreation representative. Who else did we miss?
14 Mayor of Garden City, he's already on record, as well, it
15 sounds like.

16 The Bear Lake Regional Commission filed their
17 resolution this morning, as well as the Rich County
18 Commissioners have filed a separate resolution against this
19 project, as well, and that involves Norm West, the County
20 Commission Chairman; Bill Cox, as a Commissioner; and Tom
21 Weston, who was there at the Commission this morning. They
22 were signatories to that resolution, so I want you to know
23 that just the lack of them not saying anything tonight, was
24 based on the fact that they filed -- we filed all those
25 papers this morning in the same hearing. Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. CORAY: My name is Chris Coray, and I live on
3 the Water Hill side, south of Garden City, and I've already
4 filed -- I may be the first one -- a request for additional
5 studies, with FERC, this evening.

6 But I have some comments that I would like to
7 make, and I won't take longer than two or three minutes.
8 When I read the -- I'll call it the PAD, the preliminary
9 application document -- I hunted for a description of the
10 intake/discharge structure and could not find it.

11 In Figure 7 of their document, they show a large
12 box, which is sitting on the bottom of the Lake, and
13 actually rises above the surface.

14 It is not possible to do any kind of real
15 scientific analysis of the hydrology of this pumping storage
16 system, until we know what that intake/discharge system
17 looks like.

18 And if we do, there's plenty of horsepower within
19 70 miles of this spot, to do a complete analysis at the Utah
20 Water Research Laboratory, and this is not going to be
21 really, really hard for them.

22 And the fact that it's not present, does not
23 allow us to do an early analysis of what it will do to the
24 water system of Bear Lake, with respect to sound science.

25 Second, I did not see in the PAD, anyway to

1 dissipate the kinetic energy of the water that's flowing
2 through that 700-foot vertical shaft. Maybe there's going
3 to be a surge tower or some other mechanism that's above
4 ground. I did not see it, and I wondered where -- what was
5 the mechanism for dissipating the energy of that huge stream
6 of water moving at very high velocity.

7 They make a point of it being underground, except
8 for the shed, but I don't know how they're going to
9 dissipate the energy.

10 Second, should the Lake's elevation get to within
11 three inches of that level which precludes pumping by the
12 pact we reached with Pacific Power, that's three inches, and
13 would that require them to stop pumping, even though Pacific
14 Power could still move water down the River? Would this
15 entity have to stop pumping because a three-inch elevation
16 change would take them below the legal limit for Bear Lake
17 to be drained?

18 Lastly, will FERC require all of the studies --
19 this is for FERC -- all of the studies that be done, be
20 conducted by arm's-length entities who are independent
21 completely from this project and itself?

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. CRITCHFIELD: My name is Wendy Critchfield,
24 and I read a statement this morning on behalf of the
25 Homeowner's Association, but, because of the time limit

1 tonight, I will just -- it has already been filed, and if
2 anyone is interested in further information, I can tell you
3 about it after, but I will read a summary.

4 And we strongly oppose the Hook Canyon
5 Hydroelectric Project, because of the following points:

6 Number one, it actually consumes net power;

7 Number two, it's based on uncertain economic
8 assumptions regarding future respective prices of daytime
9 and nighttime electricity;

10 Number three, it has an adverse impact on
11 recreational activities on the east side of Bear Lake;

12 Number four, it will harm the Lake's indigenous
13 fish and other wildlife;

14 Number five, it has a negative impact on
15 property values and tourism, from changes in color and
16 clarity of the Lake;

17 Number six, it risks serious discharge of
18 sediment into Bear Lake, during construction;

19 Number seven, it poses significant danger to
20 automotive and other traffic, due to inadequate capacity of
21 roads;

22 Number eight, it poses seismic safety and
23 security risks;

24 Number nine, it lacks a clear benefit to
25 citizens of Utah and Idaho, for access to its electrical

1 power;

2 Number ten, it was minimal impact on long-term
3 job creation;

4 Number eleven, it has uncertain funding to
5 complete the project;

6 Number twelve, it leads a leads a large number of
7 independent studies devoid of any conflicts of interest;

8 Thirteen, lacks a comprehensive monitoring plan,
9 and, the most important one, which I will read;

10 Number fourteen, there is no assurance that the
11 project will be completed. The negative environmental
12 consequences of a partially completed project, would require
13 a substantial bond, in order to completely restore the Lake
14 and its surrounding affected areas, to their pre-proposal
15 state.

16 The bond must be in place before any work on the
17 project at the proposed site, commences, including the first
18 shovel full turned.

19 We strongly oppose this project. Thank you very
20 much.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. WURTS: I'm Henry Wurts, last name, W-U-R-T-
23 S. I am a -- my wife and I are property owners and
24 taxpayers in the great state of Idaho, in Fish Haven, and
25 the great state of Utah, in Salt Lake City.

1 I have a Bachelor's Degree in Economics, a
2 Master's Degree in Statistics, and a Ph.D. in Financial
3 Economics and Risk Management, but my comments today
4 regarding economics, do not require a Ph.D.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. WURTS: I'd first like to address the issue
7 that is a phrase that I keep on hearing, "reasonable
8 alternative." We are fighting in Salt Lake City to keep the
9 Forest Service from taking some of our property and private
10 property from others, and it offends me that the onus is put
11 on us to come up with viable alternatives.

12 You have given us Option A; we reject it. I
13 would venture to say that the majority of the people here --
14 could I see a raise of hands of the people here that object
15 to this proposal?

16 (Show of hands.)

17 MR. WURTS: I'd like the Court Reporter to record
18 that there is a majority, at least 85 percent. It's 85.23,
19 if I'm exact.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. WURTS: So, let me explain just a little of
22 the logic of this: We reject Option Number One; we reject
23 an opportunity for you to make money, and now you're putting
24 the onus on us to propose another way for you to make more
25 money. That offends me.

1 Number two: Another thing that offends me, your
2 PowerPoint talks about reflecting Utah's electricity needs.

3 You are a private company. You will have private
4 investors. I'm not sure they will allow you to sell
5 electricity cheaply in Utah, when you can sell it
6 expensively in California.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. WURTS: Your PowerPoint -- and many of my
9 points were brought up already and I apologize, but it's my
10 -- I would like to voice it, too, and reinforce it.

11 Your PowerPoint really did not need to include
12 Bear Lake; it could be put almost any other place. Pick
13 another reservoir that exists, where they already have some
14 capacity to store above and below and use that. You don't
15 need to use Bear Lake.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. WURTS: Your project is based on four
18 economic concepts: One, a rate differential that was talked
19 about before, nighttime rates lower than daytime rates;
20 number two, excess capacity, capacity at night is higher
21 unused capacity.

22 The problem I'm concerned about and other people
23 have mentioned is, what happens in three years or five years
24 time, where those differentials don't exist and your company
25 goes bankrupt and you have construction out there and you

1 have damage out there?

2 I'm not concerned, necessarily, with the
3 economics of cost; I'm concerned about the damage, and if
4 the damage has to be repaired or restored, the onus now is
5 on us as taxpayers to bail out another group of investors.
6 Does this sound familiar? Has anybody been watching the
7 financial news?

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. WURTS: To bail out rich investors who took
10 the risk. You took the risk, but we bear the cost of that
11 risk.

12 Number two, getting on to the second group here,
13 so, point number three: Your project is based on the
14 existence of public goods that can be had, number one,
15 cheaply, i.e., the land, if you can buy the land from the
16 State of Utah, and, number two, for free; that is, using the
17 Lake as a reservoir.

18 Again, I want FERC, I want the EPA, I want the
19 State, I want the nation to know that it offends me that
20 this PAD refers to Bear Lake as merely only a reservoir. I
21 think that's part of the problem, that you only view it only
22 as a reservoir.

23 They don't realize that there's other economic
24 impacts besides being just a reservoir. There are many
25 other reservoirs in the great State of Utah, that you could

1 use, instead of converting a natural lake, which is a
2 reservoir for other things.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. HOCKING: Okay, if you can --

5 MR. WURTS: Let me -- I'll speak quickly here.

6 So --

7 PARTICIPANTS: Let him go on.

8 MR. HOCKING: That's fine. If you guys are okay
9 with allowing him to continue.

10 PARTICIPANTS: Yes, yeah.

11 MR. HOCKING: That's fine.

12 MR. WURTS: Thank you. The fourth one here is,
13 the Company will be required to pay for the water it uses;
14 that's good, but the Company does not want to, apparently,
15 pay for a lower reservoir and thinks that this natural lake
16 is suitable to be used as a reservoir.

17 And, again, there are other places where they can
18 do this. This is a classic economic problem of public good
19 versus private interest.

20 Another example of that is pollution. The
21 pollution -- the producer has not included the costs
22 necessary to ensure that the unwanted output is benign.
23 That cost should be borne by the profit margin, and if the
24 profit margin becomes negative, then the product should not
25 be produced.

1 The pollution analogy is this: If a product's
2 revenue cannot cover all costs, then it should not be
3 produced. Here, a project is being proposed that does not
4 include all costs, and we, as taxpayers, are expected to
5 pick up on those costs.

6 Again, there are many places to do this, et
7 cetera.

8 I think the main problem here, is that you don't
9 need Bear Lake; you need only a reservoir, and Bear Lake is
10 more than a reservoir, and it's safe to say that anyone who
11 thinks that Bear Lake is only a reservoir, is blind, perhaps
12 colorblind.

13 So, what kind of damage could construction and
14 operation cause? Well, unfortunately, as mentioned, Section
15 3.3.3 of the PAD, reminds us that many effects are not yet
16 known, but you are trying to convince us that the effects,
17 quote, "will be minimized," and you use words like, quote,
18 "prevent, reduce, and contain," but you fail to use words
19 like "eliminate repair, and restore."

20 Unfortunately, when these studies are going to be
21 done in the future, as was brought up earlier here, it may
22 be too late for us to have any legal standing in the sense
23 of replying to them, and I object to that.

24 You know, comments were made about the idea of
25 blue and blue cannot be measured. I think it does need to

1 be measured, because there is economic impact on that, and I
2 work on a letter to try to outline some of the impact on
3 that.

4 I'd like to close, believe it or not, with a
5 comment and analogy. This seems to be a very perverse
6 example of the stone soup fable that we all have learned as
7 children; that is, if everyone gives you just a little, then
8 you can profit, if the power company upgrades the power
9 grid where it has to, so that they can handle your excess
10 power, if you can buy land cheap from Utah, and then the
11 idea of being able to use Bear Lake only as a reservoir and
12 not having to pay for the damages, again, this is a very
13 perverse analogy of the stone soup fable.

14 If we give just a little, then you can profit. I
15 do not like that. Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. BARKER: My name is Garth Barker. I am just
18 a father. Maybe some of you read my (inaudible.) Maybe
19 some of you have been involved in some of our forest issues.
20 This gentleman just mentioned the forest and the processes
21 that we have to go through.

22 The NEPA process took nine years on the forest
23 plan, on the National Forest, and it took, what, eight years
24 on the Caribou up here, to get a forest plan done, and
25 through the process, we had to stay involved, and I stay

1 involved.

2 When I seen this project about a year and a half
3 ago, I told my son, you're nuts. I grew up on that Lake, he
4 grew up on that Lake. I ran around on North Beach at Uncle
5 Red's Hot Springs, and my family is from up here, Williams,
6 Passes, Bolsons (ph.)

7 And so, I mean, I love the Lake and I was against
8 this project, but after following them around for a year and
9 a half now, while they have been putting together the
10 concept and knowing full well that they had to go through a
11 NEPA proces and had to deal with FERC and go through that
12 process, I sit back and I say, I can't see that they're
13 going to do any harm, because they'll find the answers in
14 the studies.

15 And so your reaction shocked me, because most of
16 them have no education behind them. That's all I want to
17 say --

18 (Booi ng.)

19 MR. BARKER: Go ahead, throw rocks. Been here
20 before.

21 (Booi ng.)

22 MR. BARKER: It took me a year and a half to get
23 to where I am at.

24 (Off microphone, inaudi ble comments from
25 audi ence.)

1 MR. BARKER: This process -- sure.

2 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

3 MR. BARKER: Let me --

4 MR. HOCKING: Folks, can I interrupt for just a
5 second? We do need to be courteous in this meeting, okay?
6 If you can let him speak, and then we'll have to keep moving
7 on with other comments.

8 MR. BARKER: Let me just give you an example that
9 I've watched with this, when this hit the news back in
10 September, when it was noticed.

11 The first thing that the entire basin up here --
12 and most people are from Salt Lake; they're not natives
13 here. I mean, I found -- God bless the natives that live
14 here.

15 But most people were up in arms about the color
16 blue, and most of them didn't understand why it's blue.
17 That was the first cry for relief, that something was going
18 to happen.

19 Then they learned that the color blue wasn't --
20 the Lake's not blue; it's a reflection off the calcium
21 carbonate. It looks blue to us.

22 Then they stared whining on the outflow. You sit
23 down and look at the science, talk to a hydrologist that's
24 up to date, and one foot per second, you can walk up against
25 that.

1 So, yeah, it's taken me a year and a half. This
2 process is at least five years, and you get to comment all
3 the way through it.

4 Yeah, you do. How many times, Steve?

5 MR. HOCKING: Approximately seven times.

6 MR. BARKER: Just like a NEPA process, you have a
7 DEIS, you have an FEIS, you go through preliminaries, but
8 you people have to stay involved, you have to participate.

9 If you back off now, things will happen that you
10 won't like, my point being up here, is, quite flag-waving,
11 quite waving your arms, throwing out, you know -- you're
12 laughing and clapping and cheering -- for cryint loud,
13 get busy and do your job, sit down, follow the process.

14 It isn't that hard to sit down for a few minutes
15 each night and make sure that you're up to date. It's that
16 simple.

17 MR. HOCKING: Okay, thank you. Let's keep going.

18 MR. NALDER: I'm Lenny Nalder. My primary
19 residence is on Cisco Road.

20 MR. HOCKING: I'm sorry, your name, again?

21 MR. NALDER: Lanny Nalder. I have a prepared
22 document that I would like not to read, but I like to just
23 take a few excerpts from it, and I'll submit this to you at
24 the conclusion of the things I want to say.

25 I'm really concerned about the endemic fish

1 species in the lake, those four fish that we can't find
2 anywhere else in the world, and troubled because the PAD
3 doesn't adequately address the engineering processes that
4 are supposedly going to control the outflow of this water.

5 On my way up here tonight, I went past the site,
6 out on to see the water going into the Lake, which is a
7 small percentage of what we're told is going to come down
8 these pipes, and then, all of a sudden, it's just going to
9 magically -- the energy is just going to magically
10 disappear.

11 And it's not described in the PAD, how that
12 energy is going to be dissipated, as Chris has alluded to.
13 That's troubling.

14 How do we make an intelligent comment about it,
15 if we don't know the engineering processes that are going to
16 take place to control this? We can't do that, and so we're
17 locked into writing study requests due on the 13th, without
18 sufficient knowledge to be able to intelligently attack what
19 has been -- is being done.

20 It's like putting our hand behind our back and
21 walking into a fight. We aren't getting the information we
22 need to be able to say the things we need to say, to present
23 our positions appropriately.

24 So, what are we left with? I'm left with fishery
25 biologists who have stewardship for the protection and care

1 of the Lake, who have made statements and declared that the
2 project is eminently dangerous to those four endemic
3 species, in which case, I think, because they have been
4 there for years and have seen the ecosystem in a way no one
5 else in this room has -- nobody else in this room has seen
6 the ecosystem of the Lake, like our fishery biologists have,
7 and these men say it would be a disaster for the Lake.

8 I choose to support them. I believe they know
9 what's going on.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. NALDER: Finally, one final comment:

12 Everyone who wants the addresses, e-mail addresses of people
13 to have all your family members start e-mailing, you can get
14 those addresses by going to bearlakewatch.com. They are all
15 there and you can pull the off and start flooding these
16 agencies and organizations, including the Governor of Idaho,
17 with your perceptions on this Lake. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. CORT: I'm Bobbie Cort from the Rich County
20 Times. Those of you who take the paper, know that there's
21 been an editorial against this project by the Rich County
22 Times.

23 I would also like to take exception to the fact
24 that we are not educated enough to know what we're talking
25 about.

1 (Applause.)

2 MS. CORT: In this room, how many people have
3 Ph.D.s? I know Dr. Nalder does. These are the Ph.D.s here,
4 Dr. Coray does, all right.

5 Today, two civil engineers in hydraulics, Ph.D.s,
6 one from Stanford, talked about that the engineering quality
7 of this project and the lack of informatoin that they saw
8 and the lack of feasibility of this project -- now, I think
9 it is okay to have a divergent opinion, but I think it is
10 also rather wrong to think that just because we live in a
11 small town, we have small minds. Thank you very much.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. WESTON: My name is Hal Weston. I am from
14 Laketown, and I typed up a paper. I'm goign to not read all
15 of it, because a lot of it has already been mentioned.

16 I do want to publicly go on the record as being
17 completely opposed to this. I had several things that I
18 have questions on. One was mentioned earlier, calling the
19 Lake "a reservoir," when it is not a reservoir. I just want
20 to add to that, it's a living body of water.

21 You can go make an artificial reservoir that's a
22 dead body, another artificial reservoir, higher, that's a
23 dead body; you can't hurt it.

24 But you take a living body of water, which Bear
25 Lake is, you can kill it; anything that's living, can be

1 killed.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. WESTON: The second problem that I had with
4 it, was the fact that you're not building on your land, you
5 know. If you looked at the price of land here -- I own a
6 ranch. I'd love to buy more, I'd love to expand my ranch.
7 I'm working on that process, but the cost of buying an acre
8 of land -- and you guys want to come in and not buy your
9 land for your project, just use the state land, use our
10 Lake, use state lands.

11 I'm offended by that; I'm really offended by
12 that.

13 The third question that I have, is about your
14 road accesses, and when you're putting in these roads up
15 into there, how can you guarantee that you're not going to
16 bring a higher impact into private lands that are up in that
17 area?

18 Part of that private land is mine. I don't want
19 higher impact by people who -- look, here it would obviously
20 be a nice paved road that's kept open all winter, so you
21 have access up to your area. Let's go up here.

22 Okay, they're going to be up on that road. How
23 do you keep them off my private land? How do you stop that
24 impact from hitting private landowners?

25 Also -- I'm sorry I've taken up a lot of time. I

1 could go on all night, because this upsets me, but I won't.

2 Along with ranching and farming, I have to
3 purchase irrigation rights. Now, I know you're pumping
4 water up and you're replacing it back, but with that second
5 reservoir, you've put another surface body that's going to
6 evaporate, so you've lost water.

7 Now, maybe you've covered this, but have you
8 purchased water rights for that? Do you own water rights
9 for water that will be lost in evaporation?

10 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone and inaudible.)

11 MR. WESTON: No? Okay. How come you can have
12 water rights and I have to purchase mine?

13 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone and inaudible.)

14 MR. WESTON: You would have to purchase it?
15 Okay.

16 And then another thing that's on my list back
17 here, beyond the chance of changing the colors in the Lake,
18 I mean, that's a big thing here, but we've covered that, and
19 I just don't believe you can say that it won't change the
20 color in the Lake. You'll never convince me of that.

21 But, beyond that, is also the resting
22 environment of the valley. I live here all year' round.
23 Okay, the Lake fluctuating that much, you've stated on your
24 website, that it may be one of the consequences that the Lake
25 would not freeze over.

1 Now, added, if that -- if the Lake didn't freeze
2 over, there's going to be fog, there's going to be
3 temperature fluctuations. Our temperature right now, the
4 reason -- if you live here year' round, you can watch Salt
5 Lake's forecasts and Salt Lake's forecasts are for this
6 high, subtract ten degrees and that's our temperature.

7 Right now, you can't do that, because we have an
8 ice pack right out here. Now, I love heat and I'm not
9 against being warmed up, but you remove that ice pack, and
10 you warm us up, and not only do you change the Lake's
11 environment, you change the whole valley's environment. You
12 affect every plant in this valley, you affect every animal
13 in this valley, you affect every person in this valley.

14 How can you compensate for that effect that
15 you're having? I don't know that you care. You say you're
16 locals. Where do you own property?

17 You're coming in and wanting to use state
18 property. Are you going to be here? We've talked about it
19 before, that when something's damaged, are you the one
20 that's going to be living right next to it every day?

21 My final thing -- and I'm sorry; I don't mean to
22 go on forever -- I drive cattle home out of those east hills
23 where you want to build this reservoir, down past the Lake
24 with my children.

25 I take my children to that Lake to go swimming.

1 I would hate to drive cattle down along that Lake, and
2 instead of looking out and saying, look at that beautiful
3 blue Lake, tomorrow, we'll go swimming, and say, you know, I
4 used to swim in that Lake. Don't do it now, but I used to
5 swim in that Lake.

6 And to say that that can't happen, is wrong,
7 because I also own a small lot down in California that's by
8 what is called the Salton Sea. And we take our children
9 there and it's warm.

10 Oh, in January, when it's really cold here, the -
11 -

12 MR. HOCKING: If you can bring it to a close?

13 MR. WESTON: Okay, I'll be really fast. The
14 temperature is really nice down there, and the sun sets over
15 that lake, nothing like the sunsets here, but they're okay,
16 but when you walk down to the beach, I tell my children,
17 don't get in it, don't get in it.

18 I don't want that here.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. HOCKING: Just a quick reminder that it is
21 after 9:00, and we are obviously going to be extending the
22 meeting, but we still have a lot of folks yet to go, so if
23 you can just keep your comments to maybe a minute or two at
24 this point.

25 I hate to cut people off, I really don't want to

1 do that, but I want to make sure that everybody gets a
2 chance to speak. So if you can really kind of bring your
3 comments quickly, bring them up, and then we can move on to
4 other folks, as well.

5 MR. COTTLE: I'm David Cottle with Bear Lake
6 Watch. I was asked to read a couple of statements, by
7 people who couldn't be here.

8 We had a meeting in Salt Lake City with about 150
9 people at it. A lot of them could not be here. Their
10 letter is:

11 "Dear FERC: We, the undersigned, are against the
12 Hook Canyon Project. We have read the documents, understand
13 the project, and discussed the pros and cons.

14 We believe the risks are not worth the reward.
15 Bear Lake is a unique natural resource that should be
16 protected, not experimented with."

17 It's signed by over 100 people. I'll submit this
18 electronically.

19 The second one is from the Bear Lake Underwater
20 Dive Team, dated yesterday, April 8th.

21 "To Whom It May Concern: My name is Bret
22 England. I am the Vice President for the Bear Lake
23 Underwater Dive Team.

24 A group of local residents of Garden City and
25 Laketown have organized a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization

1 functioning as a dive team for Bear Lake.

2 We did this on our own, with our own funding and
3 fundraisers. The purpose of our team is to be an asset to
4 the recreational use of the Lake.

5 If an event of the need for our skills is
6 requested by the local sheriff's department of Idaho or
7 Utah, we are trained to search, recover, and possibly
8 rescue.

9 If the quality of the Lake is hampered in any
10 way, such efforts will become in vain. Visibility is the
11 highest quality of the Lake that makes our skills useful.
12 Tampering with the visibility, only hinders and makes
13 impossible, our mission statement. Sincerely, Bret."

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. HOUSE: I'm Brian House, from Garden City.
16 Most of my concerns have been addressed, but I did want to
17 address two concerns:

18 One, in my other life, I worked for the
19 Department of Natural Resources, and our Department has not
20 taken a formal position, one way or the other. I believe
21 Bear Lake Watch has met with them and attempted to stop the
22 process, right at the get-go, but apparently they wanted to
23 go through the FERC process.

24 I'm kind of surprised at that. In the past,
25 there has been development that's been proposed for Snow

1 Canyon, Antelope Island, and additionally at Bear Lake, and
2 they have all been told no, we don't need development,
3 that's not within the scope of our resource management plan.

4 This is not in our resource management plan, but
5 yet we're going ahead with it. It will be State parklands
6 that will be used for a portion of this.

7 I'm almost insulted that I say that I work for
8 State Parks and I'm not here on State Park time. I have a
9 hard time with that. I would encourage, again, everyone to
10 let their local representatives and your Governors know that
11 this is not acceptable as a use for lands that are paid for
12 and used by taxpayers. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. SPUHLER: Again, my name is John Spuhler, I'm
15 a resident of Garden City. I just think it's very
16 interesting that you have so many different, diverse people,
17 super intelligent people from different backgrounds, from
18 Ph.D.s to environmentalists, from conservatives, liberals,
19 all the cities around the area; you have state
20 legislatures, all against this project.

21 We're not all dumb. You know, we read, we study,
22 and a lot of people have done the research. I think that
23 it's obvious -- and, frankly, I think this was kind of --
24 and this is for the record -- a stealthy operation, because
25 a year and a half ago, this gentleman heard about it.

1 I was out ice fishing with Brian, which I'd like
2 to do again. He caught an eight and a half pound fish. But
3 I'd like to do that again, and if there is no ice on the
4 Lake, that's tough.

5 That affects our economy. Bear Lake is actually
6 diversifying economically in the wintertime. There's a lot
7 of things going on in the region, economically, and if
8 there's no ice on the Lake, that is a massive detriment, but
9 I find it very curious that so many people from so many
10 diverse backgrounds -- where do you ever see that?

11 You can't get anybody to agree on anything, but
12 if you'll look at the vast majority of people here that
13 agree on this project, that should tell Symbiotics, it
14 should tell FERC, it should tell the people there, very,
15 very clearly, this is not the place; that is obvious.

16 Why would you risk a resource like this? I'm
17 very emotional about it, I live on the Lake, my family lives
18 on the Lake, my kids, and I want to live in Garden City the
19 rest of my life, and it scares the heck out of me that this
20 project could be proposed by people that say, hey, I care,
21 too.

22 Well, we all care, we all care. It's not -- you
23 know, that's why we're here, that's why we spent the time,
24 the energy, put in the late nights, and I would suggest you
25 forward all the information.

1 We started out a few weeks ago with just a
2 handful of e-mails. I've been doing this e-mail campaign
3 and we have over 500 e-mails today, from just a few weeks
4 ago, because people didn't know.

5 You know why they didn't know? Because this
6 information is getting out and the chickens are coming to
7 roost, and I guarantee you, if you'll keep that pressure on,
8 politicians will listen, and that's where we need to go, all
9 the way to the top, Governors, Legislators.

10 That's all I have to say. Obviously, I'm
11 emotionally charged about this issue. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. DuBOIS: My name is Mike DuBois. I spoke
14 earlier. My question was, how come we're so late in the
15 process?

16 Someone mentioned something about insanity. You
17 know, we're sitting here tonight, and I think all of you
18 feel the same way -- I do, and my crap detector is going
19 off.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. DuBOIS: And, you know, I've learned to
22 perceive when someone is trying to sell me something that I
23 don't need or don't want.

24 But I've also recognized that the system is
25 stacked against us, against the citizens. We can come and

1 vent, give our opinions, and talk tonight, but we'll go away
2 and the process will go forward.

3 Unless we're there every step of the way, in
4 unified opposition, this thing will happen.

5 I don't know why it's set up that way, but the
6 process will continue, and we've got to be vigilant that
7 we're there at every step, opposing it.

8 I'll just say to FERC and also to the
9 developers, this won't happen. We will cause it not to
10 happen.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. YARMAN: John Yarman. I'm a Garden City
13 resident and spoke a little bit earlier.

14 Hey, listen; I have a high school diploma, so --

15 (Cheers.)

16 MR. YARMAN: And with that high school diploma, I
17 know how big 30 feet is.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. YARMAN: It's about to that ceiling, and
20 that's a big damn pipe.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. YARMAN: That's all I have to say.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. BARNETT: My name is Kim Barnett, and I have
25 a Ph.D. in mothering.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. BARNETT: And I also represent the Rigby
3 Family Six, LLC, of which there are 72 members, and we are
4 all very much opposed to this, and that's what we want to
5 put on the record.

6 You can't put a price on tradition or family
7 memories, and that's what we've had for the last 45 years.
8 We love this Lake, and we object to this project. That's
9 all I want to say.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. BURDICK: My name is Gay Burdick, and I'm
12 Secretary/Treasurer of Love Bear Lake.

13 At our last meeting, we voted to file a Motion to
14 Intervene, and we were informed that we were too late to
15 file a Motion to Intervene.

16 And I also represent the Sadethwaite (ph.)
17 Sunshine, LLC, that represents almost a hundred or so, and
18 we absolutely oppose this project.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. HIRSCHI: I'm Sherwood Hirschi from Logan,
21 Utah.

22 Bear Lake is a very unique, pristine, and
23 beautiful Lake, and there's really nothing like it in any
24 other place. I'm not just another pretty face recruited to
25 present my opinion to the public officials on this proposal.

1 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone, inaudible.)

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. HIRSCHI: I was born in Dingle, I was raised
4 in Geneva, I was schooled in Montpelier, and I live in Logan
5 now. I've owned property in Bear Lake for 24 years. I
6 think I'm part of the culture.

7 I spend most of my weekends there, so I think I
8 am qualified to make a statement on it.

9 The only winners with this project, are the
10 project owners, the contractors that build it, those who use
11 the power -- and heaven knows who that is -- plus the school
12 trust lands that will get compensation for the use of the
13 land.

14 The project owners represent that they have had
15 experts review the project, and that the Lake will not
16 receive damage and we, as the locals, will have nothing to
17 worry about.

18 I'll bet that those are almost the same precise
19 assurances that were told to everyone that lived below the
20 Teton Dam.

21 The proposal states that the project, on an
22 annual basis, is a net power loss. That must mean then that
23 the only real product that this proposal is, are the dollars
24 that this creates for the owners of the project.

25 This proposal has to affect the Lake's layered

1 temperature, and could raise the entire temperature of the
2 Lake. With the three inches that will rise and fall, the
3 Lake is going to change the ice formation on the Lake, and
4 there those who suggest that it will never freeze over
5 again.

6 I also believe everyone will watch Bear Lake get
7 flushed daily like a big toilet, and probably be changed
8 forever.

9 The potential to harm the area, is far too large
10 to allow this type of an experiment to be continued. The
11 risks are too great.

12 I again agree with the modified words of Brigham
13 Young, this is not the place. Have the project taken to
14 Jordan Hill Dam. It's a manmade lake, and I'm sure that if
15 it as good a deal as has been proposed to us here, they'll
16 accept it.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. NEBEKER: My name is Nathan Nebeker, and I am
19 speaking as a representative of the Sidney J. Nebeker
20 family, and I'm going to read a letter that we've written
21 about this project. I apologize to those who were there
22 this morning, and to whoever ultimately transcribes this in
23 Washington, that it's redundant from what I said this
24 morning.

25 "Open Letter Regarding the Hook Canyon Pump

1 Storage Power Project, from the Sidney J. Nebeker Family:

2 As six generation landowners and residents of the
3 Bear Lake Valley, the Sidney J. Nebeker Family has a deep
4 history and spiritual connection with Bear Lake. We
5 unanimously and unequivocally oppose the Hook Canyon Pump
6 Storage Project.

7 Our ancestor, Ira Nebeker, homesteaded the South
8 Eden Ranch in 1886, ten years before Utah statehood. The
9 ranch has been owned and operated within this family
10 continuously since then.

11 We have been working with Utah Open Lands to put
12 the ranch within a conservation easement, which would
13 prevent development and preserve the ranch in its
14 agricultural state, indefinitely.

15 The Hook Canyon Project would significantly
16 disrupt the South Eden Ranch, as well as the construction
17 access, operations access, and emergency spillway for the
18 project, will all run through South Eden Canyon.

19 This will have an enormous negative effect on a
20 property that has been cherished and maintained for
21 generations, and would also significantly reduce the
22 conservation value of our work with Utah Open Lands.

23 For generations, we've enjoyed the magical azure
24 blue water of the pristine Lake and were all baptized within
25 its waters. Turning this water brown for the sake of power

1 generation, strikes us as a criminal affront to the unique
2 and precious natural resource of Bear Lake.

3 We understand the massive scale of the project
4 that aims to move five billion gallons of lake water in and
5 out daily. We believe that no one can predict the negative
6 effects of the ecosystem of the Lake, the quality of the
7 chemical balance of the water, and the health and viability
8 of the unique species that live there, and that no one could
9 put a price on such disruption.

10 This is not just an environmental argument, but
11 also an economic one. Destroying the unique beauty of the
12 Lake, will have a major negative and indefinite impact on
13 the rapidly growing tourist economy of the whole valley, and
14 there is no way the short-term economic boost from
15 constructoin jobs, could ever offset it.

16 We recognize there's a strong profit motive for
17 hte proponents of this project, and we strenously object to
18 destroying such a valuable public resource for private
19 profits.

20 But our arguments go beyond those of the not-in-
21 my-backyard nature. We are also a family with a strong
22 engineering influence and an almost religious affinity for
23 efficiency.

24 If this were a power project of truly renewable
25 energy, we would be all in favor of it. If these were

1 windmills or solar panels, or even true hydropower, we would
2 not only support it, but invite discussions where our land
3 could be involved.

4 But we fully comprehend the fact that this
5 project is not renewable energy, but a net user of power,
6 that, inherent to its design, it must consume about 125
7 percent of the power that it will produce. This means it
8 will be a net contributor to greenhouse gases, contradicting
9 the sixth slide of your presentation, and that it is only
10 economically viable under the current structure of power
11 supply and demand, where there is excess power generated at
12 night and peak demand during the day.

13 We believe the market structure and physical
14 nature of power generation, will not look the same in the
15 next 50 years, as it has in the past 50 years. We don't
16 believe it will look the same in the next 20 years as it has
17 in the last 20.

18 There are two major imminent technological
19 developments we believe will alter the structure of power
20 generation and render this project nonviable.

21 The first is zero-emissions vehicles. Electric
22 and hydrogen cars are reaching a tipping point toward
23 viability in the economy. There are mandates from 11 states
24 that require a meaningful number of these zero-emission
25 vehicles be sold on the market.

1 All major car companies have an active
2 development project for zero-emission vehicles. The rising
3 price of gasoline has piqued consumer interest in them, and
4 a fully electric vehicle from a new, very well funded
5 company, will be available this year. The company is called
6 Tesla Motors. They have a very interesting website.

7 Both electric and hydrogen car technology will
8 significantly increase the demand for electrical power at
9 night, as that is when the batteries of electrics will be
10 charging and the hydrolyzing of water in the hydrogen cars,
11 will be occurring.

12 The second technology is improved solar cells.
13 There have been advances in nanotechnology-based solar cells,
14 that will improve the cost efficiency of this technology, by
15 a factor of 100. Massive venture capital resources are
16 behind commercializing this technology, including the
17 leading venture capital company in the world called
18 Kleiner, Perkins, Caufield, and Byers. You can look them up
19 on the web, too.

20 This means solar generation on a microscale, will
21 contribute significantly to meeting peak power demands.
22 Peak power demands typically occur in the Summer afternoons
23 when everyone is running their air conditioning.

24 This will also be the peak generation time for
25 solar cells, which will reduce the peak demand on the power

1 grid.

2 These are just two easily foreseeable factors
3 that will alter the power grid. We cannot predict others,
4 but there are powerful forces for change at work here.

5 The Hook Canyon Project is only viable under a
6 very particular power grid structure that is part of the
7 20th Century. If this project is approved and goes forward,
8 we fully expect that in a decade or less after its
9 completion, it will be economically nonviable, will have
10 ruined the quality of the Lake permanently, and will be
11 marked by a phantom dry eyesore of a dam that sits idle as a
12 stark and painful reminder of bad decisions of the past.

13 I have two quotes to close: "The land is mine,
14 and you are but aliens and my tenants. Throughout the
15 country that you hold as a possession, you must provide for
16 the redemption of the land." That's Leviticus, Chapter 25,
17 Verses 23 and 24.

18 And then: "As for you, my flock, is it not
19 enough for you to feed on good pasture? Must you also
20 trample the rest of your pasture with your feet? Is it not
21 enough for you to drink clear water? Must you also muddy
22 the rest with your feet?" That's Ezekiel, Chapter 34,
23 Verses 17 and 18.

24 So, I think, you know, there's a huge amount of
25 opposition. It seems like a crazy project, but the thing

1 that's not crazy, is the money. These people are
2 appropriating a public resource for private profit, and
3 they're doing it for the money.

4 I would like to ask the Chief Operating Officer,
5 who is sitting up there in the front row, if he has the
6 fortitude to stand up and tell this group how much money
7 this venture is expected to make, how much profit, and for
8 whom? Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 (Inaudible off-microphone conversation.)

11 MR. HOCKING: Hang on for just a second, okay? I
12 want to go ahead and allow Brent Smith to respond, if he has
13 a response.

14 MR. SMITH: Well, you know, I guess, if I knew
15 that exact answer for you tonight, I'd probably tell you.

16 But I don't have that information with me here
17 tonight.

18 PARTICIPANT: An order of magnitude?

19 MR. SMITH: An order of magnitude? You know, I
20 probably can't give you an order of magnitude tonight, and
21 it's not so much that I don't have it --

22 PARTICIPANT: (Off-microphone, inaudible.)

23 MR. SMITH: No, I don't think that's at all what
24 we're telling the investors.

25 PARTICIPANT: Well, you tell them some numbers.

1 Tell us the numbers. Don't claim that you don't know
2 anything.

3 MR. SMITH: Okay, the only thing that I can tell
4 you -- you know, I'd love to be able to tell you exactly
5 what the numbers are. We're still figuring with the
6 utility, PacifiCorp, to determine what the costs are of the
7 energy that we utilize at night.

8 We're still --

9 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone and inaudible.)

10 MR. SMITH: We anticipate that the cost of energy
11 utilized at night, is somewhere around two to two and a half
12 cents. That's what we think is -- per kilowatt hour.

13 Now, we think -- of course, avoided cost rates in
14 the State of Utah right now, are probably somewhere in the
15 order of about seven cents, and probably going to climb by
16 the time the project would ever get to a point to be
17 constructed.

18 Now, can I assure you that that's what's going to
19 happen? No, I can't. There are significant investments?
20 Absolutely. The project is going to cost somewhere around
21 \$1.2 billion to build.

22 But do we have all of those answers right now?
23 We don't have them secured down. Is there a concern about
24 future projects, whether the project will still be selling
25 power, buying, you know, inexpensive power at night, as

1 would call it, and selling it at a higher price in the day?
2 Well, obviously, in order to take on a project of this
3 magnitude, then we would be looking at contracting for a
4 long period of time for delivery of this power.

5 We wouldn't contract and sell power for a year at
6 a time. I mean, we're not going to build a project like
7 this, just to think that it's going to be nowhere to sell
8 the power in a year.

9 I mean, when we sell power out of a project like
10 this, we'll sell it for 20 to 30 years. We'll have a
11 commitment to buy that power.

12 We'll have a commitment to buy the power at
13 night. Do we have all the answers tonight? No, we don't,
14 but we're trying to meet here with you to make a proposal of
15 what the project is, get your input, and see if there's a
16 way to go down this road and do the studies to try to find
17 some of the answers to the questions that everybody has.

18 I mean, everybody's concerned that their late in
19 the process. This is the start of the process. This is how
20 FERC's process works. It's a lengthy process.

21 And, you know, it's going to take five years to
22 reach a conclusion and that conclusion may be that the
23 project shouldn't be built. Maybe the conclusion would be
24 that it should be built with certain conditions.

25 This is just the start of a process. That's what

1 we're here for. We don't know exactly what the value of
2 power is going to be in 2015.

3 We're still working on that. That's the whole
4 part of this process, is, it's not just the environmental
5 effects of the project; it's also the energy (inaudible).
6 It's also the cost of the investment.

7 We're early for engineering. When you look at a
8 project like this and start it, you look at it from a very
9 conceptual standpoint. That's where we're at right now.

10 We need to work through not only the
11 environmental studies, not only the socioeconomics, the
12 impacts, the potential impacts, but the design.

13 You know, we need to look at these things. We
14 agree that most of the concerns and the things that you feel
15 we need to look at, we agree we need to look at.

16 But you've got to understand, we're at the start.
17 We're trying to find out what those concerns are.

18 We do not have an exact value of what that energy
19 is going to be. It's not contracted for.

20 But, obviously, it will be contracted for a 20-
21 to 30-year period of time. This project is not going to be
22 built, and, five years down the road, just sit there. That
23 would not be the case.

24 But do we have all the answers for you tonight?
25 We don't.

1 PARTICIPANT: (Off-microphone, inaudible.)

2 MR. HOCKING: Okay, if we can go ahead and keep
3 moving with other folks?

4 MR. TENNANT: My name is Joe Tennant. I'm an
5 electrician, and all this talk about energy, got me thinking
6 about I spend all my time wiring up buildings and homes and
7 stuff like that, and I was, like, my goodness, I don't even
8 know where the power comes from and what's happening.

9 I got on the website and looked at other places
10 where they've built these pump storage facilities, and
11 they're building more of them. So you've got, like, the
12 Tennessee Valley Authority, they're building more of them.

13 New York is building more of them, or upsizing
14 what they have. They're all over the place.

15 You have to have a way to store electricity;
16 otherwise, what do you do with it? Where does it go? It
17 gets wasted.

18 That's what this is, it's just -- you can think
19 of it as a battery. It's just storing power when you can't
20 use it, and using it at a time when you can use it.

21 My next point is, is that there were some
22 economics mentioned, and I've dabbled a little bit into
23 economics, too, outside my electrical things.

24 I think that the concept that the power has to
25 stay here in Utah or in Idaho, to be beneficial, I think

1 that that -- I don't think that that's a correct
2 understanding of how supply and demand works.

3 California -- the power that California
4 generates, has just as much impact on the rates that we pay
5 here in Utah, as it does in New York and everywhere else.
6 It's the whole supply of electricity that determines our
7 rates.

8 We can't just isolate ourselves off into this
9 little world, and say, well, we'll just keep everything here
10 in Utah, because we're not isolated. That's not how the
11 power grid works.

12 It's all interconnected. What California does,
13 what Nevada does, what New York does, what Connecticut does,
14 it all affects what we have here.

15 I'm not -- and, don't get me wrong. I'm not
16 saying that I'm for the project or against it. My mind is
17 not made up.

18 But I think that there's a few things that -- I
19 mean, you're talking like we're just isolated in this world
20 of electricity use out there. That just isn't a fact. I
21 mean, that's so far from the truth.

22 What happens -- I mean, even in the thing, when
23 the power goes out in the East, it changes the whole
24 dynamics of things.

25 Energy costs are changing. That's why a lot of

1 these projects are more feasible now. The price of energy
2 is going up, and it will continue to go up, and a lot of
3 these projects that, in the past, in 2000 or 1990, that
4 weren't feasible, are feasible now, economically.

5 (Mild applause and laughter.)

6 MS. ADAMS: Hi, my name is Marty Adams. I'm from
7 Garden City, and I'm a full-time resident there.

8 I was really -- I can't remember the COO's name,
9 but I'm extremely offput by his response to an honest
10 question.

11 He's acting like this is all a brand new thing.
12 It isn't. You told us earlier that there are 30 of these
13 storage projects going on around the country.

14 I cannot believe that you would form a company,
15 without financial objectives in mind, and that you haven't
16 looked at the kinds of profits that are being made by these
17 other companies.

18 It just doesn't make sense. It would be just
19 poor business sense to do this.

20 You know what is the potential. You have a balk
21 park figure of what you expect to make and you're being
22 dishonest with us.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. ADAMS: This is the whole thing we're feeling
25 here as a community. You say you want to come and you want

1 to be a good neighbor. You want to do what's best for us.

2 You're not being honest with us. You're not
3 being straight. That was a completely evasive answer to a
4 straight-asked question, that was asked to you by three or
5 four people.

6 And if you want us to be open to any of your
7 suggestions, you have got to come across as being straight
8 up, instead of assuming, as this gentleman in the front row
9 does, that we're all, bless their hearts, the little Bear
10 Lake people, that we don't have any idea of what's going on
11 and that we can't learn.

12 We are not stupid, we want you to be straight to
13 us, we want you to give us information, and we want the
14 information to be as impartial as it can be. We want other
15 sources to come in.

16 I came to this and I was just going to listen,
17 and you've got me so riled up now. I'm with my husband, and
18 I think that the crap detector is going off all over this
19 place, and you better work to fix it, or you make more
20 problems than this project is worth to you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. ENGLAND: My name is Bill England. Our
23 family owns and operates three businesses in the Garden City
24 area: Bear Trapper Steakhouse, Bear Lake Pizza, and the
25 Chocolate Bear Gift Shop.

1 Our businesses are open year' round. Our gross
2 sales have been on a yearly increase, allowing us to grow
3 and employ approximately 50 individuals, residing from
4 Georgetown, Idaho, to Randolph, Utah.

5 Our businesses and our employees, are dependent
6 on the revenue that our customers and guests spend with us.
7 A loss in financial and economic stability, will not only
8 jeopardize our business, but also the income of 50 employees
9 and their families.

10 We are concerned that any alteration to the
11 physical properties of the Lake, will affect the popularity
12 of this recreational destination, negatively.

13 Financially, losses due to an decrease in sales,
14 will also cause a decrease in sales tax, tourism tax,
15 county, and city revenues. A decrease in sales will also
16 certainly deny us any future growth, making us unable to be
17 a benefit to our community.

18 We feel that a program whose intent is to
19 manipulate our surroundings to benefit others, will only, in
20 the end, cost us employees and our business as employers,
21 money, resulting in a negative unemployment for our
22 community. Is it worth taking the chance? Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. SECRIST: My name is Donrey Secrist, and I
25 live at Bear Lake Sands, on the east shore of the Lake. I'm

1 a city boy that's been transplanted.

2 Thirty-two years ago, I bought a piece of
3 property from Sid. Thanks.

4 We built a very nice home and we built a nice
5 little business over here.

6 I have some concerns and one that has not been
7 addressed. I've seen this Lake raised and lowered several
8 times, about three times and we're in the fourth now.

9 Each time, it affects the beach. Nobody's
10 talked about the beach. Down at Cisco Beach, in that area
11 down there, where you've got a shear dropoff, you're not
12 going to see that two to three inches.

13 Up at our place, when it drops three inches,
14 you're going to see 100 to 150 feet of new beach, daily.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. SECRIST: Now, the wave action that we get at
17 night when the wind blows -- and it does it once in awhile
18 here -- moves that sand. And on that bottom, there's about
19 an inch to two inches of sand.

20 As long as that sand is in place, you've got a
21 good place to drive a tractor so you can launch your boat.
22 But with that wave action, it's going to remove that.

23 There are not boat ramps, boat launchers,
24 anywhere on the north end of the Lake. This is going to
25 affect the private property and the quality of the beach.

1 It's going to affect the State Park and the quality of their
2 beach, and nobody's even thinking about that.

3 Now, I will put this in writing and send it
4 registered to be considered in your environmental study.

5 One other thing, is, being a federal retiree, it
6 isn't as lucrative as you might think. I'm on time-of-day
7 service. Now, you're going to use that power in the low-
8 usage timeframe. You're going to raise my bill, yep.

9 Do you have a subsidy program in mind? I can
10 sure use it.

11 You're talking about the tax revenue and income,
12 but it's all for Utah. I'm an ex-Utahan, but, you know,
13 anything you do down there in Utah, to that water, is going
14 to affect us up here at this end.

15 How about something for Idaho? We're taxpayers,
16 we have expenses, we need some of that there green.

17 And then you talk about the small pipe and the
18 movement of water. I am a certified scuba diver, I helped
19 organize the search-and-rescue team 35 or 40 years ago.

20 I have dove this lake, and if you want to go for
21 a little swim, I'm still certified. I'll take you down and
22 I'll flip my fins about a three times, and you won't be able
23 to see, because I will stir up the bottom.

24 Now, you're column of water coming out of that
25 pipe, is going to do a helluva lot more than my fins. Thank

1 you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. WALLACE: I'm Janet Wallace, from Richmond
4 Utah, and I also have a place over in Fish Haven. I have a
5 concern that's not been addressed, along with many that
6 have.

7 One of them is the amount of sediment that's
8 going to be coming from the storage facility into our Lake.
9 It's not going to be the same amount as normal runoff; it's
10 going to be a whole lot more, with the rate of speed that
11 you're talking about.

12 And what's that sediment going to do to the Lake
13 and to the chemical components of the water?

14 The second thing is, this seems to me like an
15 Energy Solutions situation, where the basic people, the
16 people that are involved, that don't have a high-up
17 connection with the government officials, aren't going to
18 get their way heard, because this is a good old boy company.

19 You know, Energy Solutions are not going to do
20 anything to Utah, and what are they trying to do now? Bring
21 in waste from Italy, from out of the country.

22 These guys are doing damage to our Lake, there's
23 no way to mitigate it. They say there is, and Energy
24 Solutions did the same thing.

25 They're going to damage our resources for their

1 profit. That's all I'd like to say.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CASSELL: My name is Brad Cassell, and I,
4 too, am a property owner in Fish Haven, Idaho, and I just
5 want to first say that I take offense to the fact that I
6 have to take time out of my day where I am unpaid, to spend
7 eight hours sitting in meetings to listen to plans that you
8 have not fully provided us information on.

9 Why is that we as taxpayers and we as citizens,
10 have to spend our time to come up with studies and proposals
11 that you haven't adequately addressed in your documents? I
12 have asked questions today about the tail race design. I'm
13 sorry, sir, that's not designed.

14 I've asked questions today about why you went
15 from 60 megawatts in your initial proposal, to 1,120 in your
16 latest design. All I got was, oh, things change.

17 I asked, what is the financial information? All
18 I got was, we don't have that yet.

19 I asked today, who actually owns this company?
20 And we went around in circles this morning on who is
21 Symbiotics? Who is Hook Energy, LLC? Who is Eco Resources,
22 Incorporated? Who is West -- what's the other one?

23 We have yet to get a good resolution to any of
24 that. All we get are deceptions. We get things in the PAD
25 that don't make sense with what you said in your slides, we

1 get things in the slides where you say we're going to sell
2 this power to fill Utah's energy needs, yet, you know what?
3 Pacificorp was here this morning and they stated that you
4 haven't contacted them about buying their power.

5 They stated that you haven't got a water share
6 from -- they stated that the transmission line that they've
7 got, will not handle the power that you propose to provide.

8 All we get, are lies, that's basically what we
9 get. And then we get people telling us that we're not smart
10 enough to know the difference.

11 One of the other concerning problems, is, one of
12 the gentlemen who has spent the last 20 years trying to tell
13 each and every one of us that our Bear Lake resource is so
14 precious, it's such a piece of work that we can't really
15 understand it, yet he told us how beautiful and blue our
16 Lake was, and that it came from calcium carbonate.

17 But now I think the color of that Lake changed
18 from blue to green, because Mr. Lamarra (ph.) didn't even
19 come tonight to address the fact that four years ago, he
20 stated the fact that we can't really understand this Lake,
21 but now, four years later, since someone's putting green in
22 his pocket, he wants to come to us and say, we're not going
23 to hurt your Lake, we're just going to make a little money
24 while we do this.

25 Then I want to address the fact that I heard

1 Justin and Mr. Lamarra have a conversation this morning as
2 we walked out of the building during our first break. And I
3 believe it was Justin -- and you cannot deny this -- you
4 said to Mr. Lamarra, this is BS; these people are stupid,
5 they don't know what they're doing, they're just muddying up
6 the system.

7 So I think you've said a lot of lies today. I
8 think you tried to deceive a lot of people. I think you've
9 tried to withhold a lot of information from us, and then you
10 have the intent to stand there and tell us that we're stupid
11 and that all we're doing is muddying up the situation.

12 I think that's wrong. I hate the fact that I
13 have to waste my time and my energy, because you come up
14 with some half-cocked idea that you want to use my resource
15 to make money for yourself.

16 (Applause.)

17 (Off-microphone, inaudible discussion in
18 audience.)

19 MR. HOCKING: Let's keep moving on, please.

20 (Off-microphone, inaudible discussion in
21 audience.)

22 MR. HOCKING: Okay, all right, let's keep moving
23 on, please. Go ahead.

24 MR. MONICAL: Hi, I'm Earl Monical, President of
25 Love Bear Lake. Thanks, Gay, for your comments.

1 You know, as I look at this, you know, Idaho is
2 part of that Lake, too, and everything I saw tonight, seemed
3 to be geared to taking care of Utah's needs. Why should we
4 in Idaho, take care of their needs?

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. MONICAL: You know, how much of this has been
7 already discussed with the State of Idaho? We have a
8 stakeholders' share in that Lake, as well.

9 Has Utah considered nuclear plants, like Germany
10 and France? We've lived within 15 miles of a nuclear plant,
11 with no problem.

12 More specifically, as Gay said, our group
13 vehemently is against this project. I want to congratulate
14 you people. If you'd have been at my capital budget course
15 at the university, I would have failed you.

16 I heard you say that this will generate negative
17 revenue. Anyone with any common sense, would not undertake
18 anything of that nature.

19 If the gentleman down there with the tap dance he
20 gave us about not knowing the money amount, if I had given
21 my clients that answer in my strategic planning, I would
22 have been fired. I was not only a university professor, but
23 I was a practicing CPA, as well.

24 Your literature has failed to convince me that
25 damage will not occur to the Lake. You said it will not,

1 but you did not say how it will not damage.

2 That's an excellent use of words to convey -- I'm
3 going to use the term "hide information."

4 To the gentleman who was talking about economics
5 and supply and demand, having lived in different parts of
6 the country, having clients in different parts of the
7 country, I take exception to your words that the electricity
8 rates were set universally.

9 What economics were you talking about?
10 Keynesian, Malthus, Ricardo, Marx? Yeah, you did.

11 Okay, I'm not going to argue with you, but that's
12 what I heard.

13 I see no monetary projection on this. Stupid.

14 I'm concerned about any legal ramifications with
15 the water contract, and I think this is -- you know, if you
16 sell this to the area, I have a bridge for sale on I-35,
17 crossing the Mississippi River in Minnesota.

18 We cannot do this. We have not heard enough
19 positivity, identifying that the Lake will not be damaged.

20 We have not heard enough positivity as to the
21 increased economic growth that will impact on both sides of
22 the Lake.

23 All I'm hearing here, is dollars and cents to the
24 promoters and to the organizations who want and are going to
25 promote it and be involved in it.

1 You know, we're not stupid. We need to come to
2 grips that, yes, we do have a need for power, but this dam
3 here is not worth it. We need to look at other alternatives
4 to satisfy our needs, to provide an adequate rate of return
5 for the investors and to provide adequate low rates for the
6 consumers, all of which can be done.

7 So let us not do this project. Someone said, get
8 involved. I have been involved. I have written over 15
9 letters to various people who may have some impact on this,
10 and, you know, as I look at the comments that are going to
11 be raised and looked at in the EIS study, my gosh, those
12 comments are enough to scare me, not even to do the project.

13 And then when there was a comment about the
14 socioeconomic impact, no measurement. How stupid. Thank
15 you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. HOCKING: Folks, just a quick reminder that
18 we do need to keep the meeting courteous and be cordial, and
19 please, no personal attacks. It's not anything that we can
20 use here. It's certainly not useful to the Commission, so
21 this is just a reminder that, you know, we -- it's clear
22 that there's quite a bit of opposition, there's quite a bit
23 of frustration, but if you can keep your comments cordial,
24 that would really be appreciated. Thank you.

25 MR. DAVIS: My name is Brad Davis. I'm a

1 residential landowner in Garden City, married to one of the
2 founding families of Bear Lake, and I represent several of
3 those family members.

4 I wanted to rise and voice my opposition to this
5 project. Many people have brought up points that I've
6 thought about bringing up, long and hard, so rather than
7 belabor those, I just wanted to make two quick points:

8 Several people have talked about beach erosion in
9 Bear Lake and fluctuating water levels. This Lake has had a
10 hard time recovering from historic low water levels, because
11 of the drought in Utah. It was interesting to me, that
12 during the PowerPoint presentation, looking at the bar
13 graphs that were presented by the gentleman doing the
14 presentation, the yearly peak electricity requirements fall
15 almost squarely during the time when the historic levels of
16 Bear Lake are at their lowest.

17 Several people have pointed out that there's a
18 Bear River Compact, the Bear Lake Development Council has a
19 limit below which the Lake may not be used for power
20 generation. There's a lot of controversy about that, but
21 you have not given us any information that shows us that you
22 have the ability to pump water below that level, which
23 means, during the time of the year when the power is needed
24 the most, you will have potentially the least ability to
25 provide that power.

1 That kind of relates to one thing that I thought
2 of just sitting here listening to people talking about the
3 four endemic fish species. That's a very good point, but I
4 want to ask, when is the last time that anybody saw a
5 Crawdad on the shores of Bear Lake?

6 And that's because of problems with fluctuating
7 lake levels, due to drought conditions, and problems with
8 PacifiCorp pumping water out of the Lake for both power and
9 irrigation purposes.

10 So we've already seen ecological impacts that
11 have gone by the board, from companies who have assured us
12 that they're doing okay and they're not hurting the Lake.

13 The second point that I'd like to make -- and I'd
14 like to direct this to FERC -- is that many people have
15 already made the point that this project is a net power
16 user, and so this project, in effect, is power arbitrage.
17 You're speculating on the fact that you're going to be able
18 to buy power low and sell it high.

19 I think that's a great idea, if you can do it.
20 If I understood your COO correctly, you're standing to make
21 a 350 percent profit, if you can buy power at two cents and
22 sell it at seven. If you can do that, that's great.

23 The problem is that the Department of Energy's
24 own analysis done in 1998 and updated in 2002 -- it's
25 available on their website. I managed to Google it the

1 ohter day while I was doing research for this -- says, in
2 effect, that unless private power producers can produce a
3 project that runs at optimal efficiency and has power
4 availability year' round, that there is no way to recover
5 costs by arbi traging power during low demand and peak usage
6 periods.

7 So, as part of this process, I would like to see
8 the Department of Energy's own analysis applied to this
9 project, because, basically, what's on your websi te, says
10 this project has no financi al vi ability. Thank you.

11 (Appl ause.)

12 MR. HOCKING: Okay, folks, it's just about 10:00
13 and it looks like we are about winding down in terms of who
14 want to provide comments. So, we're in pretty good shape.

15 MR. FLORENCE: Casey Florence. For those of you
16 that were there this morning, you will know what I said, and
17 I'm not going to repeat that quote again. It's already in
18 the record and you can go look at it.

19 But I just have a couple of other quick
20 questions. One of them is -- and I, you know, basically
21 didn't say anything earlier, hoping somebody might come up
22 with this idea -- but I think in the proposal that you make,
23 you talk about having the public's ability to come and do
24 tours -- I guess that's the word I'm looking for -- of that
25 dam and the pumps, the -- you know, the whole project.

1 Anyway, my question is, have you thought about
2 what kind of an impact that will have, where you're going to
3 put this tourist facility and parking and all of that stuff?
4 And that kind of hit me as I was driving by that particular
5 location on the way up here tonight.

6 There's really no room on the side of that road
7 to put much of any kind of, you know, facility.

8 You also talk about the shed that will be the
9 access shed to the tunnel, to take these giant turbines in.
10 I'm kind of assuming that they will probably weigh 15 to 20
11 tons; I don't know. I don't see trucks, facilities,
12 whatever, going through some shed to get those things in and
13 out, so that's something I'd like you to address in future
14 studies.

15 And also, I just kind of quickly ran the math in
16 my head -- and I could be way wrong, but you're using about
17 3.5 billion kilowatts -- not, not using, but you're going to
18 generate about 3.5 billion kilowatts of power, and if you
19 make a nickel a kilowatt, that's about \$17.5 billion.

20 So, my math could be way wrong, but that's just
21 kind of an estimate.

22 You know, as far as the meter of baloney, it
23 should be ticking by all of us. And, you know, as I
24 mentioned, I read in this morning, some quotes from Vince
25 Lamarra earlier, three and a half years ago, that said he

1 cannot predict, all the predictions anyone has made on this
2 Lake, have been wrong, will be wrong in the future, and my
3 question is still the same, to Symbiotics and Vince
4 Lamarra: Can you answer that question properly, that you
5 can predict now, what you couldn't predict then, and
6 guarantee us you won't destroy this Lake?

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. DALLY: My name is Kirk Dally, and I'm a
9 Fisheries Biologist that worked with Trout Unlimited. Our
10 organization works to preserve and protect the nation's cold
11 water fisheries.

12 We are concerned with potential impacts of this
13 project for endemic fish of Bear Lake, as well as its unique
14 population of Cutthroat Trout.

15 We plan to work with various state and federal
16 agencies to ensure that proper study plans are developed,
17 that give the due caution that the unique resource deserves.
18 I'm just standing because there were some comments here that
19 people are concerned that the attention will be dropped
20 out.

21 There are groups that plan to see the FERC
22 process through to the end, and we are dedicated to that
23 notion. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. HOCKING: Okay, anybody else?

1 MS. WIGHT: I'm Kristen Wight, and I just want to
2 say that it's not a crime to make money, and so there's no
3 reason why you can't state it's good to make money; we all
4 know that. And if you're not making a helluva lot of money,
5 I sure wouldn't do it.

6 And the other thing I want to know, is -- and
7 it's a question to Symbiotics. If you have had talks with
8 the Governor, what his opinion is, because I think that's
9 something that, in the State of Utah, we need to know,
10 because the Governor doesn't always do what the people want
11 him to do.

12 And I think we need to know that, so do you have
13 an answer to that? We have heard rumors.
14 Unofficially, have you met with the Governor?

15 PARTICIPANT: No.

16 MS. WIGHT: Okay.

17 (Off-microphone discussion in audience,
18 inaudible.)

19 MR. HOCKING: Justin, why don't you come on up?
20 You can speak into the mike.

21 MR. BARKER: We met with the resource agencies to
22 propose the project, to give them a heads-up in the State of
23 Utah, so they could start looking at some of the possible
24 studies. We met with them again, and I think Bear Lake
25 Watch was there. That was at the State Capitol a couple of

1 weeks ago.

2 But that's been the extent of our involvement.

3 MS. WIGHT: Do you have the Governor's blessing
4 on this project?

5 MR. BARKER: I can't speak for the Governor.

6 MS. WIGHT: Okay, can somebody else speak for the
7 Governor?

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. HOCKING: Okay, a couple of things before we
10 go ahead and close the meeting: Again, if you do have one
11 of these registration sheets that you've filled out, if you
12 can go ahead and turn those into Jim over here. If you have
13 any written comments that you want to file with the
14 Commission at this time, you can hand them to Jim, as well.

15 Some important dates are still up on the screen,
16 that you have to keep in mind. Of course, the first one
17 coming up, will be May 13th, when those study requests or
18 any comments that you do have, are due, in written form, to
19 the Commission.

20 And then, again, if you have questions about the
21 ILP process or FERC's regulations, what the due dates are,
22 what Hook Canyon Energy's requirements are, feel free to
23 give me a call or send me an e-mail. My information is on
24 page 2 of that Scoping Document 1. It has my phone number,
25 my e-mail address, so you can go ahead and get in contact

with me, and I'll try and answer your questions.

We have one more question, the last question of the day.

PARTICIPANT: If you brought something to file with you today, now that you're here, you wanted to add something to that, so can I file more than once? Can I file something today and still electronically file another concern under my name, or am I allowed one filing?

MR. HOCKING: No, you can file as many times as you want. So, if you give us comments today, feel free to file again. Try to make that May 13th date, so that we have everything together at one time, but, no, there's no limits to how often you can file.

Okay, I want go ahead and thank everybody for coming tonight. We've heard a lot, so thanks again. I'm going to go ahead and close the meeting.

(Whereupon, at 10:10 p.m., the scoping meeting was concluded.)