

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

Before the
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

-----X
In RE)
ROBERT C. BYRD)
HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT)
-----X

March 28th, 2012

Quality Inn
577 State Route 7
Gallipolis, OH
45631-1953

1:00 p.m.

Reported by
CHARLES D. HOFFMAN

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (1:04 p.m.)

3 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay, it's past 1:00
4 o'clock. I think we can get started as soon as
5 everybody is ready. Again, my name is Eileen
6 McLanahan. I am with the contractor team that is
7 helping the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
8 with preparing an Environmental Assessment for the
9 Robert C. Byrd Hydroelectric Project. And I would
10 like to welcome you to the scoping meeting this
11 afternoon.

12 We have about 10 items on the agenda, and we'll
13 try to keep the presentation pretty short, so we can
14 get through all of them and leave time for the most
15 important part, which will be your comments. We'll
16 make some introductions of the people who are with
17 FERC and the contractor team and ask the Corps to
18 introduce themselves and also ask any federal or
19 state agencies to introduce themselves as well. And
20 I would encourage everyone to make sure that they
21 have signed in at the registration table. Ken
22 brought around a sign in sheet so that we know who
23 all is here.

24 We'll talk about the purpose of scoping, we'll
25 talk about the anticipated schedule for the

1 environmental assessment, and things could always
2 change a little bit, but we'll tell you about how
3 it's looking right now. We'll describe the
4 information that we're looking for that will be
5 helpful to us in preparing the EA, then I'll turn
6 the floor over to Phillip Meier from AMP Ohio. AMP
7 Ohio is the agent for the City of Wadsworth, who is
8 the applicant for the project, and he has a
9 presentation to make that will take about the
10 project features and facilities and how the project
11 is going to operate.

12 Then when he is finished, I'll talk about the
13 environmental measures that AMP Ohio has proposed to
14 implement and that we'll be analyzing in the
15 environmental assessment. We'll talk a little bit
16 about the scope, the cumulative effects and the
17 resource issues. But most of what I have put on to
18 slides was taken from the scoping document. I moved
19 all those slides to the end of the presentation.
20 We'll bring them back if those are things that would
21 be helpful to talk about at the end. But in the
22 interest of saving a little time and moving on, they
23 won't be part of this first part of the
24 presentation.

25 Then we come to the comments from the

1 participants, and we'll finish up by providing an
2 address for filing any written comments that you
3 might have.

4 The ground rules, pretty self-explanatory.
5 Please sign in if you would like to make oral
6 comments today. The sign in sheets, if you wanted
7 to speak, are back on the registration table. I
8 don't think we are going to need to set time limits
9 today, but please keep your comments focused on the
10 project. It looks like we'll have plenty of time
11 for comments though, and if you change your mind in
12 the middle and haven't signed up to comment, that's
13 fine too. If you're not seated where the
14 stenographer can easily hear you, we'll ask you to
15 come up to the microphone here to make any oral
16 comments that you have.

17 We have a stenographer here today, who is going
18 to be recording everything that's said. The
19 transcripts are usually available within a couple of
20 weeks on the FERC website.

21 Before you speak, please say your name. I
22 think that the court reporter has the spelling of
23 everybody's name, but if it's complicated or you
24 haven't already given him the spelling of your name,
25 please do that, so we can make sure we get

1 everybody's name right.

2 So for introductions, I'm Eileen McLanahan, I'm
3 coordinating with FERC on producing this
4 environmental assessment, and I'll also be
5 responsible for addressing terrestrial resources.
6 That's wildlife and vegetation, botanical resources
7 and that sort of thing. And then to my left, Jot?

8 MR. SLENDAS: Jot Splenda, with the Lewis
9 Berger Group, contractor to the FERC team. I'll be
10 handling the recreation resources.

11 MR. CHIANESI: Domenico Chianesi, I'm with
12 the Corps of Engineers, and I am the operations
13 manager.

14 MR. HUFFMAN: Ron Huffman, I'm with the
15 Army Corps of Engineers.

16 MS. NAPIER: Raynell Napier, I'm a
17 geologist with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

18 MR. MOORE: My name is Brandon Moore, I
19 work in the Operations Division. I'm an engineer,
20 I'm with the Corps of Engineers.

21 MS. WEIKLE: I'm with Belinda Weikle, I'm
22 also with the Corps of Engineers. I'm in the Hydro
23 Projects. I am the lead. I am a technical engineer
24 as well as the hydrology, hydraulics person.

25 MS. BLACK: I am Rebecca Black, Corps of

1 Engineers. I work in the Environmental Analysis
2 Section.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Andy Johnson, Corps of
4 Engineers, biologist.

5 MR. BLEDSOE: Kerry Bledsoe, Fisheries
6 Biologist with the Wildlife Resources Section of the
7 West Virginia Division of Natural Resources and
8 Statewide Hydropower Coordinator.

9 MR. FRANTZ: David Frantz, Project Manager
10 for Hydro, Corps of Engineers.

11 MR. AYAAAY: I'm Jay Ayaay, I'm the Manager
12 of the Environmental Branch of the Corps of
13 Engineers.

14 MR. KMEN: Wyatt Kmen, Environmental
15 Remediation and Construction, Army Corps of
16 Engineers.

17 MS. STAFFORD: Susan Stafford,
18 archeologist, Corps of Engineers.

19 MS. FIELDS: Susan Fields, I work in our
20 Regulatory Permits with the Corps.

21 MR. SMITH: John Smith, I'm a fish
22 biologist at FERC and also the Branch Chief of the
23 Mid-Atlantic Branch and will be handling this
24 project.

25 MR. GILMOUR: I'm George Gilmour, fish

1 biologist and I'm a FERC contractor. I'll be
2 writing the fish stuff for the EA.

3 MR. BOYCE: Jeff Boyce, I'm with Meridian
4 Environmental, the FERC contractor and I'll be
5 working with land use.

6 MR. BERNICK: Andy Bernick, I'm a
7 biologist at FERC.

8 MR. HOISINGTON: Gaylord Hoisington, I'll
9 be the project coordinator on this particular
10 project.

11 MS. MCLANAHAN: Is there anybody else from
12 the Corps out there or from the federal and state
13 agencies who would like to introduce themselves?

14 MR. COLLINS: Yes. I'm Brian Collins, I'm
15 with the Waterways and Dredging section of the
16 Corps.

17 MR. STYLES: Justin Styles, Waterway
18 Section.

19 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay, I guess that's
20 everybody. Thank you very much. And getting to the
21 purpose of scoping. Scoping is part of the National
22 Environmental Policy Act requirements for federally
23 authorized projects, including hydropower
24 facilities. Public participation is one of the
25 cornerstones of NEPA. And so the purpose of scoping

1 is to provide an opportunity to make sure that all
2 the issues are identified, all the concerns are
3 heard, so that the environmental assessment we do
4 will be thorough and accurate. So, scoping is part
5 of what FERC does. Scoping is also important for
6 the Corps NEPA process and for this project, the
7 Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency. FERC
8 will be the lead agency; the Corps is a cooperating
9 agency, and the environmental assessment that we
10 complete should be adequate to serve the purposes of
11 both of the agencies.

12 So the Scoping Document 1, SD1 was issued in
13 February. If it's not something that you already
14 received a copy of and had a chance to read, we have
15 extra copies back there on the registration table
16 where you came in.

17 Scoping comments can be given orally today.
18 There is a sign in sheet for whether you would like
19 to speak or not. There is also a comment block,
20 where if you have comments that you would like to
21 submit today to us to take back and enter into the
22 record, you can do that. But we would strongly
23 encourage that any comments you make be filed
24 electronically if they are not made orally today.

25 Section 5 of the scoping document explains how

1 to file the comments electronically, and Section 9
2 talks about how you can get yourself on the list if
3 you are already not on the official mailing list, so
4 that you can be sure to get an additional scoping
5 materials that come out and to be sure and get
6 copies of the draft and final environmental
7 assessments.

8 So, the anticipated preparation schedule. The
9 city of Wadsworth filed their license application in
10 March of last year. Since then, FERC asked for a
11 couple of other pieces of additional information.
12 Some of that was filed in December, and some will be
13 filed in May.

14 Then we go on to the draft environmental
15 assessment. We expect that to be completed in
16 January of 2013. Then we'll send that out for
17 public review and comment. So, we'll get your
18 comments back, incorporate them into the final and
19 then try and get that out in July of 2013.

20 When we talk about request for information, I
21 want to clarify that we are not asking for new
22 studies, and this isn't opening it up just to say
23 what else hasn't been done yet. This is more to
24 focus on whether you know of additional information
25 that we should incorporate into our environment

1 analysis. Many of you have already probably had a
2 chance to read the license application. It relies a
3 lot on a compilation and review of literature from
4 the region, from the agencies, from published
5 documents, from talking to staff biologists with
6 federal and state agencies. So, it's got a good
7 representation of information that is readily
8 available, plus the results of studies that AMP Ohio
9 and the City of Wadsworth have done.

10 But what we are looking for here is if you know
11 of anything else that we ought to be considering,
12 we would very much appreciate you directing us to
13 it. So that can be pretty broad, but again, try to
14 focus on what this project looks like and what the
15 potential is for environmental effects of this
16 project.

17 And next, I'd like to turn it over to Phil
18 Meier. He has a presentation to talk more about the
19 project. In the meantime, I can show you a map of
20 where we are.

21 MR. MEIER: There's somewhere around 67
22 slides here. I promise I will go through this on a
23 slide by slide basis.

24 MS. MCLANAHAN: I only have 27.

25 MR. MEIER: A lot of these were in

1 development of the PAD, and so they are a little
2 repetitious. We have seen many of them before, and
3 we will make all of the slides available to FERC, so
4 that they will be available to everybody here.

5 Again, this is a little bit about AMP and the
6 City of Wadsworth. The City of Wadsworth is one of
7 AMP's members. We are 129 members with 128
8 municipalities in the Delaware Municipal Electric
9 Corporation, about 150 employees in Columbus.

10 This is just a map of the Ohio River that shows
11 some of the sites. Willow Island, Meldahl,
12 Cannelton and Smithland are all under construction.
13 R. C. Byrd is proposed here in terms of designation
14 of where the projects are.

15 This the furthest along, Cannelton, an aerial
16 picture of it. This is Smithland. This project was
17 flooded actually last May, with the high floods we
18 had on the Mississippi and Ohio. And then a picture
19 of Willow Island, which is probably closest to where
20 we are. A little more up close shot.

21 In terms of coffer dam structures that I talked
22 about earlier, it would be very similar to Willow
23 Island as is shown here. Circular sheet pile filled
24 with sand interconnected. More boring background,
25 it goes back for a long ways.

1 So, let me jump to that. This is an aerial
2 picture provided by the Corps, I believe, of the
3 existing locks and dam. This was one of the sites
4 that was initially looked at, was in these abandoned
5 lock chambers. But after looking at Geotech
6 information and the Corps desire to have a dry dock
7 facility, it was eliminated, because in a de-watered
8 condition, there's a lot of things that you have to
9 do to make this area structurally stable. So
10 because of the costs associated with doing that,
11 that area was negated, and that's what brought us to
12 the Ohio bank.

13 More information on the Corps. And as I said,
14 I'm going to go through these. This is just a
15 downstream view of where we were today, looking
16 upstream.

17 Another location that's probably extremely
18 difficult to see. An aerial that shows Route, this
19 is the existing Route 7, which we're talking about
20 relocating, and we'll pick that up.

21 Again, this was an earlier picture from the
22 pre-application document. The purpose of this was
23 to show the two possible sites. This one has been
24 eliminated, and the transmission line section here
25 now is going to this substation. So, the plan is to

1 locate a tower somewhere here and then crossover and
2 then land somewhere here, just beyond the Corps
3 site, and then cross. I think there's three or four
4 properties here to get to the substation. It's
5 right here, in terms of the arrow.

6 This was a picture I showed earlier. I know
7 this is difficult to see. If you want a closer look
8 you can certainly come up after and see. The
9 highway relocation starts right here. It comes
10 around, and then it comes in just before the bridge
11 here. So, we've had a lot of meetings with
12 landowners here, trying to inform them of the
13 process that we go through, the FERC process,
14 getting past that, what happens in the post
15 licensing process and permitting process and then
16 the process of working with the State Department of
17 Transportation.

18 And then after we get that far, we can get to
19 the point of talking with landowners, which has been
20 somewhat of a challenge, because they feel in limbo.
21 Because they know a project may be coming, but it's
22 years away, so it's kind of hard to know whether you
23 put carpet down in your house or whether you put
24 hardwood flooring down.

25 So, it's those types of things that we

1 certainly empathize with, and as soon as we get to
2 that point, to where we can make those decisions and
3 know for sure that the project is a go among our
4 members - - we're going through that process now.

5 We mentioned earlier, it's a run of the river
6 type project. It doesn't affect upstream or
7 downstream pools. It takes the existing river and
8 takes water that is flowing through the gates and
9 passes them through the hydroplant.

10 That was an earlier schedule affected. About
11 the next 40 slides are all the environmental slides
12 that tell you all the things that we did in the
13 license application. I am by no means saying that
14 this is a comprehensive list. We may have missed a
15 few. But if they're not in the license application
16 and you don't hear them, or there's something that
17 you haven't heard or haven't seen that we should
18 consider, as Eileen mentioned, please bring it up
19 today. Let us know, and we will certainly give it
20 consideration.

21 Water quality and quantity, aquatic resources,
22 wildlife, and I'm breezing through this because this
23 is in the license application. Botanical, wetlands,
24 rare, threatened, endangered species, more of that.
25 Recreation, a lot on recreation; visual resources.

1 Visual aesthetics are obviously a big part.
2 Historical, cultural and archaeological resources,
3 socioeconomics, tribal resources, all the other
4 summary environmental effects, more fisheries and
5 aquatic.

6 As I said, I will give you this because it's a
7 lot to try to grasp in a short period of time. And
8 I'm going to buzz right down through these to get to
9 a couple of pictures here. I think that probably
10 the most significant impacts that we see are dealing
11 with the highway relocation and the effect that it
12 has on residences. Let's get back to that slide.

13 The highway here is largely driven. And the
14 reason we have to go through the process of a
15 highway relocation is because when we excavate down
16 somewhere at the depth of the about a 10 story
17 building, over 100 feet, anywhere between 100 to 150
18 feet, when we go that deep with the excavation, and
19 for the slopes to be stable on each side of the
20 project, and what you have to do is you have to cut
21 back gradual slopes to be able to get to the bottom.
22 So, what that does is that pushes the - - you can't
23 just dig a straight down vertical hole. You have to
24 dig slowly, gentle slopes, so that the slopes don't
25 create instability issues.

1 So, what that does is when we do deep
2 excavations here for the plant, it pushes these
3 slopes out in this area around it. So, our
4 footprint of the excavation gets much larger, and
5 the result of that, if I can - - I'll show you a
6 picture of a project that was very similar. This is
7 the Belleville project that was constructed in the
8 middle 90's and completed in 1999. You can see the
9 plant footprint is relatively small, but when you
10 look at the entire construction area, it's a much
11 larger footprint. So, R. C. Byrd would look very
12 similar to the powerhouse structure. Likely, the
13 box itself would probably be the same exact size as
14 the existing plant and the same size as Willow
15 Island.

16 But the intent, again, in moving the road is
17 that it has to be relocated to allow us to be able
18 to dig the hole to build the powerhouse structure
19 coming up. And then after that's done, there is
20 backfill placed around it and gentle slopes. And
21 then the slopes that are on the river get riprap
22 protected. That's kind of what drives the
23 relocation. I think somebody pointed out to me it's
24 a 50 mile an hour speedway. The State Department of
25 Transportation does not want to reduce that speed

1 any. They want to make sure, since it's considered
2 a state highway, they want to make sure that it
3 remains a 50 mile an hour speed limit. A large
4 portion of it elsewhere is 55. There is a slight
5 decrease as you come in to Eureka. So, that's part
6 of the reason this curvature is so long. It's
7 because of the speed and the DOT standard. So,
8 that's about all I have.

9 MS. MCLANAHAN: Did you have a picture of
10 recreational facilities at one of the other
11 projects?

12 MR. MEIER: Yes I do, and I can quickly
13 get to that. This is completed, pretty much what
14 you would see. Similar to R. C. Byrd, but probably
15 without this section of gravity dam here. It's kind
16 of dark and hard to see here, but there's paved
17 parking down here. There are several structures
18 here. If I can, I might have a closer picture here.

19 So, some of the recreation facilities are here.
20 There's a shore line and undulations that were added
21 by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the West Virginia
22 Department of Natural Resources. And then there is
23 existing men's and women's restrooms. There's
24 covered picnic facilities. This is lighted, this
25 entire section is lit at night. There's a handicap

1 accessible ramp that allows access all the way down
2 to the river bed. And then, there's walkways all
3 along the shore, graveled walkways that allow people
4 to walk down the gravel to get to the area.

5 Since a large majority of the flow is diverted
6 through the turbines, in some of the better fishing
7 area they tend to follow the flow. And so in this
8 case, this is a relatively popular fishing area at
9 this time. So, that's kind of-

10 MS. MCLANAHAN: What are those little juts
11 out on the edge of the water there?

12 MR. MEIER: These right here?

13 MS. MCLANAHAN: Yeah.

14 MR. MEIER: These were modeled, Kerry, I
15 think were modeled back in the 90s. And they are
16 basically, like a dumped load of rock to make an
17 undulation in the shore. Because currents come
18 along the West Virginia bank here, they are pressed
19 along here. And so what does it does is it provides
20 a place for fish to kind of get out of the current
21 and then move back into it, back and forth into it.
22 And they're pretty popular among the fisherman.

23 MR. SPLENDIA: So, most of the fishing
24 happens right, not on the walkway, but they'll walk
25 down right to the edge of the water and off of the

1 gravel?

2 MR. MEIER: Yeah, let me go back and
3 enlarge it here. You can see the walkways here and
4 walkways going down to the shore here. And that's
5 what's pictured here. And it's seasonal. It tends
6 to be driven by the runs and the fish that are
7 running at that time.

8 And then we have, there is, if I zoom out I
9 think, I actually have some other closer up pictures
10 of - - so these are just some of the recreation
11 pictures. This is some of the picnic facilities at
12 Belleville and similar structures. The structures
13 are built to be kind of vandalism proof. So
14 unfortunately, they look a little institutional, but
15 they serve a decent purpose.

16 MR. FRANTZ: Phil, are those built on the
17 Corps property, outside of your all's footprint?

18 MR. MEIER: At Belleville, they are built
19 on the Corps property outside the powerhouse
20 footprint but within the FERC boundary. Here they
21 would be built within the FERC boundary, but
22 probably, just outside of the Corps footprint. I
23 think I gauged that correctly.

24 This is some of the walkways, so you would see
25 something very similar. And then, that's one of the

1 fishing piers that was constructed at Belleville.

2 MR. COLLINS: The bendway weirs you showed
3 a little while ago, are those strictly for
4 recreational use or are they for flow control also?

5 MR. MEIER: The shoreline undulations
6 where the rock goes out?

7 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, the bendway weirs.

8 MR. MEIER: They are simply for fisheries;
9 they serve no other purpose.

10 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'm just asking
11 because the primary concern is the currents below
12 the dam are critical to our dredging maintenance,
13 and any alteration of that could pose positive or
14 negative impacts to our disposal area and
15 potentially affect some of the mussels downstream.

16 MR. MEIER: Sure. Well, that's something
17 that, as part of the hydraulic model study, that's
18 done after license is issued. The Corps is a
19 participant in that. It goes to model study,
20 wherever it's performed and currents and velocities
21 and sediment deposition, all of that gets looked at
22 in that model study. And then recommendations are
23 made on how the powerhouse currents, where the
24 currents are directed and what the velocities are
25 and how that's addressed. That's usually done post

1 license but preconstruction, and pre-permit.

2 So again, just more pictures, again there's
3 another picture of the fishing pier. There are two
4 at Belleville.

5 MR. SPLENDIA: How many proposed here?

6 MR. MEIER. I think there's two proposed
7 here as well. And that's just a picture of the
8 graveled walkway. And again, the lighting, the
9 facilities. That's the significant piece, at least
10 at the moment.

11 MS. MCLANAHAN: Thank you.

12 MR. MEIER: Any other questions from
13 anybody, at least on project features? Same two
14 unit powerhouse at Belleville. So if you wanted to
15 see what a two unit powerhouse looks like, you can
16 contact us, and we will arrange a tour, and you can
17 visit that facility because it would look very
18 similar, if not exactly the same. Just contact me,
19 and I'll set that up if that helps. Okay, thank you
20 very much.

21 MS. MCLANAHAN. Okay, this is Eileen
22 McLanahan again. Phil had some slides that he went
23 through pretty quickly that talk about what the
24 environmental measures are that they're proposing to
25 implement for the project. And I'll go through them

1 pretty quickly too. We all may have some more
2 questions for Phil, but we'll see.

3 The first resource area: geology and soils.
4 Phil mentioned that they are planning to conduct
5 detailed geotechnical studies before they go ahead
6 with finalizing project design and then with
7 construction, will develop and implement a sediment
8 erosion control plan. And we always put that under
9 geology and soils, but the real potential for
10 effects is on water quality, but we'll leave it
11 there for now.

12 The next one is aquatic resources and they have
13 several measures that are proposed for aquatic
14 resources. First, to develop and implement a
15 groundwater and surface control plan, a spill
16 prevention, containment and countermeasures plan,
17 and then a water quality monitoring plan that would
18 include a piece that happens before construction to
19 serve as a baseline, one year during construction
20 and then a year following the project startup.

21 They are planning to relocate mussels in areas
22 that would potentially be affected by dredging and
23 excavation for the project and then monitor for two
24 years following their relocation to see how they're
25 doing and if anything else needs to be done.

1 And they would use the results of the physical
2 hydraulic model that Phil mentioned to design the
3 project so that it would minimize tail water effects
4 on aquatic habitat. This is one issue that we may
5 want to talk a little bit after this presentation is
6 finished. Talk about what the model is and what
7 kind of information it would provide.

8 For terrestrial resources, the plan is to
9 conduct additional surveys for rare plants along the
10 transmission line route and avoid any impacts, if
11 possible minimize them, and if not possible, to
12 really minimize them entirely, to mitigate them by
13 possibly relocating plant populations also.

14 The next one is to site the transmission line
15 to avoid or minimize effects on the bottom land
16 hardwood forests. And that's one of the resources
17 that we had identified as being possibly a
18 cumulative effect since there were a lot of other
19 things going on in the Ohio River Basin that affect
20 bottom land hardwood forest.

21 The third one on this slide has to do with
22 wetlands. And again, the approach would be to
23 develop and implement mitigation plans for wetland
24 impacts that can't be avoided.

25 The last terrestrial resource measure would be

1 to design the transmission line to minimize risks of
2 raptor electrocution and also to site it to minimize
3 risks of collision where possible. And that would
4 be done according to pretty, I think, common
5 state-of-the-art standard transmission line design
6 these days.

7 For threatened and endangered species, the
8 proposal is to survey the transmission line route
9 prior to construction to evaluate the presence of
10 roosting sites for Indiana bats. And although the
11 application didn't say it, our assumption is that if
12 there are suitable roosting sites then those would
13 also would be avoided to the extent possible.

14 One item that is not on this list for
15 threatened and endangered species has to do with
16 mussels. There is a recent listing of one mussel
17 species that has been found in the project area, so
18 we may need to treat that a little bit differently
19 then maybe we originally thought would be the plan.

20 So for recreation and land use, I'm not sure if
21 Phil mentioned the proposal is to provide temporary
22 recreation facilities during the construction
23 period. And if you were out there on the site
24 visit, we talked a little bit about that and had
25 some drawings to look at, where we could see that

1 the temporary facilities are not quite as extensive
2 as the permanent facilities would be. There is a
3 similar location, not exactly identical, but in the
4 same general vicinity along the water there.

5 The next one on this list is to develop and
6 implement a recreation plan that would include
7 maintenance and monitoring for the life of the
8 project. The last one is to develop permanent
9 recreation facilities, and it sounds like the idea
10 is to make those pretty similar to what you saw for
11 the Belleville project.

12 Also for recreation and land use, AMP Ohio and
13 Wadsworth would be consulting with the Ohio
14 Department of Transportation regarding traffic
15 management during relocation of Ohio State Route 7.
16 And although it doesn't say this on there, I think
17 that might be a little bit more long-term also, as
18 to coordinate with them about how the road would be
19 managed for safety. And I think that would be up to
20 the Ohio Department of Transportation, but I think
21 there's likely to be some consultation between the
22 applicant and the Department of Transportation.

23 And for cultural resources, the applicant has
24 proposed to perform a viewshed analysis, structures
25 inventory and evaluation of National Register of

1 Historic Properties and the effects assessment of
2 the locks and dam. They would also perform deep
3 testing of areas that are slated for excavation and
4 develop a management plan for avoiding or mitigating
5 impacts on historic and archaeological resources.

6 For aesthetics, the cleared areas would be
7 designed to soften the visual impacts. Project
8 features would be designed to resemble the existing
9 locks and dams and piers in color and texture.

10 And lastly, they would develop and implement a
11 site restoration and aesthetics plan that would
12 identify native plants and planting schemes to
13 revegetate cleared areas. And it wasn't clear in
14 the license application what the end plan was for
15 the sediment disposal or the excavation spoils
16 disposal area. But it sounds like the idea is to
17 stabilize that and to replant it with seeds and
18 trees and shrubs, a mix, so that it blends in with
19 the existing landscape.

20 Those are all the proposed environmental
21 measures.

22 The scope of the cumulative effects analysis.
23 We followed pretty much what was in the license
24 application, but we identified a few more resources
25 that might be cumulatively affected. And those

1 include water quality, fisheries, native mussels,
2 bottom land hardwood forests and riparian habitat.
3 The riparian habitat, we might think about a little
4 bit differently, seeing what existing conditions
5 look like in the project area. A lot of it looks
6 like riprap, but there is still riparian habitat
7 along Teen's Creek Slew or Teen's Run Slew? Correct
8 me if I go back and forth between the terms. I'm
9 not sure which is most correct. And riparian
10 habitat that might occur along the little streams
11 that would be a under the disposal pile.

12 For the geographic scope, it's generally the
13 Ohio River mainstem from Racine, which is at the top
14 of the R. C. Byrd Pool, downstream to the Greenup
15 locks and dam. But as we get into the environmental
16 assessment, sometimes we modify those a little bit
17 from resource area to resource area, depending on
18 what makes the most sense for that resource area.
19 So, the cumulative effects of the geographic scope
20 for terrestrial resources might be different than it
21 is for aquatic resources.

22 The temporal scope includes past, present and
23 foreseeable actions going 50 years into the future
24 because that's the longest that a license would be
25 issued.

1 MR. HOISINGTON: Can we just say one
2 thing?

3 MS. MCLANAHAN: Yes, please.

4 MR. HOISINGTON: This is a Corps project.

5 MS. MCLANAHAN: This is Gaylord
6 Hoisington.

7 MR. HOISINGTON: Gaylord Hoisington. If
8 the Commission issued a license for this project, it
9 would be 50 years. There is no 30 or 40 year
10 license; this would be 50 years.

11 MS. MCLANAHAN. Okay. The resource issues
12 that we had identified to be evaluated in the
13 environmental assessment are listed right here, and
14 I don't need to read them for you.

15 Socioeconomics is one that we might have a
16 little bit of question for, for the Corps when we
17 get into the comment period to help us understand
18 better what it is needed for community impact, which
19 we sort of have lumped under socio-economic
20 resources and to make sure that we get that right.

21 And as I mentioned, we have several slides that
22 go into the specific potential project effects for
23 each of these resource areas that we can look at
24 later if we want to. But for now, I will just leave
25 that there.

1 And that brings us to the part of the scoping
2 where we hear comments from participants. And we
3 really appreciate the participation of everyone who
4 is here today and look forward to hearing what you
5 have to say about the project. Oral scoping
6 comments can be given today. If you haven't already
7 provided your name and the spelling for the
8 stenographer, we would like to have you do that
9 before making oral comments.

10 Written scoping comments may be filed with the
11 Commission until April 27th. That's when they are
12 most useful to us, when we will be gearing up to
13 start writing a Scoping Document 2, if we need to
14 revise Scoping Document 1. And then to be getting
15 ready for thinking about how to analyze all the
16 resources and start writing the environmental
17 assessment.

18 Filing written comments. This gives you some
19 information about how to do that. They need to be
20 identified by the project name and number. And
21 again, the instructions are provided in Section 5 of
22 Scoping Document 1.

23 To receive any documents and filings, it is a
24 great idea, it makes it very easy to subscribe on
25 FERC's website, using the docket number, so you can

1 be notified whenever anything on the project is
2 filed. And if you are going to file anything,
3 again, the FERC strongly encourages electronic
4 filings. It's just a lot more efficient to do
5 things that way.

6 So, those are the addresses, the website, where
7 you can find your way to electronic filings,
8 eFilings, eSubscription and eLibrary. And we can
9 come back to that slide for anybody who doesn't
10 already have that information. Again, it's in SD 1.

11 And that completes the presentation that we
12 had. And I'd like to turn it over to you. I don't
13 know if anyone signed up to make oral comments? No?
14 Okay, no one signed up-

15 MR. HOISINGTON: Don't everybody speak at
16 once now.

17 MS. MCLANAHAN: So, if you would like to
18 make whatever comments you would like to make for
19 the record or ask questions while we have the
20 opportunity to start some discussions. Yes.

21 MR. KMEN: Wyatt Kmen, Corps of Engineers.
22 When it comes to the EA, I realize that at this
23 phase of the project, you may not be doing a full
24 environmental site assessment phase 1 or phase 2.
25 If you are doing them, that's great. If you're not

1 doing them, we would like to see the language in
2 there when they will be done, at what phases. And I
3 don't know how much detail you want me to go into on
4 that. But anyway, we're looking at-

5 MS. MCLANAHAN: This is Eileen McLanahan.
6 More detail would be very helpful. As I understand
7 it, the license applicant has done Phase 1 site
8 assessment, already.

9 MR. KMEN: Okay.

10 MS. MCLANAHAN: And done testing of the
11 sediments, already.

12 MR. KMEN: That would be the Phase 2. So,
13 they have drilled like at the gas station, the
14 former gas station and all that kind of stuff?

15 MR. MEIER: That part, I don't think we
16 have done yet.

17 MR. KMEN: Right.

18 MR. MEIER: But that part will be done.

19 MR. KMEN: Okay, so, I guess I would say
20 not necessarily based on our experience with AMP,
21 but based on our experience in general with other
22 people, with other entities coming on to our
23 properties, they will often try to get - - "I just
24 want to do an abbreviated one. I just want to do a
25 limited Phase 2." And those will not wash in this

1 particular case or actually, they don't wash in any
2 case. It always ends up holding people up.

3 So we're looking at, you go by the ASTM and do
4 a real Phase 1 some time, whenever it is
5 appropriate. You will need Phase 2 out there,
6 because I saw stuff today that will require Phase 2.

7 MS. MCLANAHAN: And when you say, "At some
8 point," could you talk a little more about that?

9 MR. KMEN: Well, I'm a little foggy on
10 your whole process, so I can't say where in your
11 process this fits. A Phase 1 is historical document
12 search, this is how the land is, has been used. We
13 go out there and look at it. You go out there and
14 look at it and say this is how the land is being
15 used now. You say, "Oh, this used to be a gas
16 station; this used to be a place where they fixed
17 cars. We should do more work." That's the Phase 1.

18 The Phase 2 then is doing that more work. You
19 go out, and you sample through some acceptable
20 procedures. You sample at the old gas station. You
21 sample where the car garage was or whatever or if
22 you found other things that aren't visible in the
23 historical records as to where the fill came from at
24 some area or another that's now going to be
25 excavated.

1 And this also applies not only to the power
2 plant itself, but to the spoil areas and the borrow
3 area.

4 MR. MEIER: This is Phil Meier again.
5 There's usually an article we've seen in other
6 license called a Hazardous Radioactive Toxic Waste
7 Article, which requires post license sampling of
8 soils and sediment. And we would be fine with
9 doing Phase 2 surveys prior to construction and in
10 providing that information to the appropriate
11 agencies involved.

12 MS. MCLANAHAN: Ken.

13 MR. HODGE: Ken Hodge. Phil, I noticed
14 reference to the Phase 1-

15 COURT REPORTER: Sir, you're going to need
16 to come forward.

17 MS. MCLANAHAN: Keep coming.

18 COURT REPORTER: That's fine, just speak
19 up.

20 MR. HODGE: I've noticed that the Phase 1
21 site assistance were referenced in the license
22 document application, but I didn't see them included
23 anywhere. Do you know if those are available?

24 MR. MEIER: I believe they are available.
25 I think that the volume of them was, I think we said

1 we would make them available upon request because I
2 think there is a lot of paper associated with it.
3 But we can provide that if FERC so desires. Just
4 let us know, and we'll provide it.

5 MS. MCLANAHAN: Yes, please do.

6 MR. KMEN: I think the answer is yes,
7 thank you.

8 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay, this is Eileen
9 McLanahan. So, you're going to file the Phase 1
10 studies that have been completed, and you're
11 planning to do the Phase 2 studies within the next,
12 before license is issued? In time for us to-

13 MR. MEIER: What we suggested was doing
14 the Phase 2 evaluations post license but prior to
15 commencement of construction.

16 MS. MCLANAHAN: Prior to commencement of
17 construction. Okay, I see.

18 MR. HOISINGTON: For this project -
19 Gaylord Hoisington - we would hope, in consultation
20 with the Corps, that we would develop a cultural
21 resources or historic resources manual plan along
22 with a PA that would outline and guarantee that all
23 of the needed and necessary information would be,
24 that would be part of the whole process. You would
25 have a guarantee that work was going to be done and

1 MS. MCLANAHAN: Jay?

2 MR. AYAAAY: You first.

3 MR. COLLINS: I'm on to a different
4 subject; you go ahead.

5 MR. AYAAAY: Okay.

6 MR. MCLANAHAN: Who's speaking?

7 MR. COLLINS: This is Brian Collins.

8 MR. AYAAAY: This is Jay again. I guess
9 this is a good time to bring this discussion up.
10 And we've had several discussions with Gaylord and I
11 think John, you have been a part of some previous
12 discussions on this matter. But this issue of
13 timing. FERC has the ability to issue license
14 articles that require a lot of studies post-license,
15 and those are commitments that the applicant will
16 have to complete prior to construction.

17 However, its a little bit difficult for us, in
18 that our process requires these things to be done up
19 front, as a part of our NEPA valuation. I think our
20 intent is to do one document for both agencies. And
21 so, we require a lot of studies up front. We kind
22 of have a frontloaded process. We need to know what
23 the result - - for instance, the hydrologic study
24 that is being done. We need to know those results
25 before we can conclude in a FONSI, before we can

1 take our action of issuing a permit, the 404 permit,
2 or issuing a modification approval under 408.

3 So, if FERC includes these in license articles
4 or permits and defers those to post licensing, then
5 as Susan brought up here in a side-bar, that would
6 be something that we would have to go forward with a
7 supplemental NEPA document to supplement FERC's EA,
8 to incorporate those studies. We'll need those to
9 support our findings before we can issue a permit or
10 408 approval. So I'm not sure, I guess I'm just
11 bringing that up for discussion of what FERC can do
12 to bring those studies forward, possibly? What your
13 thoughts are on doing those prior or prelicensing?

14 MR. SMITH: This is John Smith at FERC. I
15 know in our newer process, which is our ILP process,
16 we do strive to get all of this up front in the
17 prefiling part of the whole, overall process. And
18 on some of the more recent original projects that
19 we've had, we've had these Phase 1 and Phase 2
20 requirements as part of the ILP studies.

21 They haven't come without some head butting,
22 and it's not something anybody wants to do up front.
23 But on the most recent examples, we have gotten that
24 early.

25 Now, I don't know this case what we're talking

1 about. I mean is it a very expensive study? Is it
2 very difficult to get? I don't know the details of
3 this one. It wasn't even on my radar coming down
4 here. I was more concerned about the modeling
5 aspect of it, the modeling study. But I guess we
6 should talk about what this entails for some of us
7 that aren't as familiar with this particular study,
8 this particular requirement.

9 MR. AYAAAY: Yeah, and I think this applies
10 to many resources. Why it's referring to the Phase
11 1 HTRW study, we'll have to discuss that. What's
12 required in terms of the studies needed to get us to
13 a FONSI, from that resource perspective, and then we
14 have the T and E mussel species that are downstream
15 of the dam. What hydrologic modeling, whether it be
16 3-D modeling, 2-D? And I think that will have to be
17 done in consultation with the resource agencies that
18 are responsible for protecting those species
19 involved. And it's unfortunate that we - we've got
20 Kerry here. But it's unfortunate that we don't have
21 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service here, who has
22 been in numerous discussions with us. And we've
23 spent a lot of resources and time avoiding impacts
24 to those species downstream, those T and E species.
25 We are committed to continuing to avoid those

1 species. But we are concerned that the hydropower
2 development is going to limit our ability to
3 continue to avoid impact.

4 So, that needs to be a more in-depth
5 discussion. Maybe it's not appropriate in this
6 forum, but as a cooperating agency, I would imagine
7 we want to get together and talk about the details
8 of what studies would actually be required and maybe
9 bring in the agencies as well.

10 MR. JOHNSON: This is Andy Johnson from
11 the Corps. We just got a letters from the U.S. Fish
12 and Wildlife Service this year stating that we need
13 to operate our projects - - due to the constant and
14 recent additions of more and more mussel species to
15 the threatened or endangered list, the Huntington
16 District, because of our mussel resources within the
17 district, needs to operate as though we've got
18 threatened or endangered mussels at any of our
19 downstream mussel beds.

20 Otherwise, we need to prove that they are not
21 there, and that is a really difficult thing to do,
22 and it involves a lot of money and a lot of time to
23 do it. So, I just wanted everyone from FERC and the
24 AMP to be aware of that.

25 MR. SMITH: John again. I would like to

1 remind everyone that this project did come in under
2 the traditional licensing process. So, there was an
3 opportunity to request additional studies. I know
4 that West Virginia did. There was a letter in the
5 file from them. I think we also addressed Ohio DP?

6 MS. MCLANAHAN: DNR.

7 MR. SMITH: DNR? I don't know, did the
8 Corps file any requests or does anyone know if there
9 were? So, there is a little-

10 MR. AYAAAY: I think we had a chance to
11 review the other comments that came in. I think
12 Kerry, you copied us on your requests for studies.
13 And we felt like that pretty much encompassed our
14 concerns.

15 MR. MEIER: I might be able to help the
16 process here a little bit. AMP is not opposed to, I
17 think we already did the initial mussel studies
18 within the region. And based upon those studies, we
19 didn't discover any T and E species.

20 Now, we only go down so far. The limits of how
21 far you go down and the impacts of that is always
22 open to debate. But in the initial reach of the
23 hydropower impacts, we would say, within the study
24 area that we studied within the reach of the
25 hydropower plant, there were no endangered species

1 found.

2 Now, I suspect that we would go through that
3 process again post licensing, prior to construction,
4 in the process of relocating any mussels that may
5 have moved in since the time that the application
6 was filed until now. AMP is not opposed to doing
7 that.

8 We're also not opposed to doing a Phase 2
9 environmental assessment at the area of impact at
10 the project. Both of those are relatively
11 inexpensive studies that can be done.

12 MR. SMITH: I guess the question was what
13 about doing them before the license, so that those
14 issues can be just fully evaluated?

15 MR. MEIER: The threshold is usually
16 driven by cost. So for an example, a desktop
17 mathematical study to look at velocities of currents
18 is probably doable. A full hydraulic model study,
19 where it's a physical model, is a lot more expensive
20 and very difficult to do in the prelicensing stage,
21 because the design is still in flux.

22 So for those, if you list them, we will
23 certainly look at them and be frank whether we can
24 do those in the prelicense or we recommend those in
25 the post license. It just depends on the type of

1 study. But I haven't heard any that would be that
2 difficult to do in the prelicense time period.

3 MR. FRANTZ: This is David Frantz with the
4 Corps. I just have a statement to make. Phil, I'm
5 not sure if you're aware, when you were talking
6 about your studies of mussels within the zone for
7 the hydroelectric project. And what we're looking
8 at is just probably downstream of that we do have
9 mussel beds on both sides that do have T and E
10 species. And currently, the way we are running our
11 dredge operations in the low flow season, we are
12 operating our gates in such a manner that we are
13 steering currents that affect the disposal of the
14 plumes and directing them to avoid-

15 MR. MEIER: The mussel beds.

16 MR. FRANTZ: The mussel beds. And I guess
17 what our concern is, when you talk about the models
18 and the timing of the models, is that right now the
19 way we operate our dam during dredging, we're
20 avoiding impact with mussels. Your studies for your
21 hydro shows that there are no endangered mussels
22 that would be affected. I guess our concern is when
23 you mix both of those processes together and we have
24 our system, which is working. We have a no adverse
25 effect from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, which is saving

1 us millions of dollars in time and disposal costs
2 and dredging operations and considerations.
3 Layering your work on top of that and how does your
4 work affect out steering? That's kind of what we
5 were really concerned about. Especially, and that's
6 why we're looking at the modeling and the timing of
7 the modeling. And I just wanted to throw that out.
8 We are probably not going to resolve when we're
9 going to do all that now, but I didn't know if you
10 were aware of what our concerns on the dredging part
11 were.

12 MR. MEIER: I heard that for the first
13 time today, so now I am aware of it. Typically,
14 having gone through the process now for four other
15 projects, I can tell you that the vast majority of
16 the flows, by the time they reach the end of the
17 lock wall, are back to baseline conditions. And so
18 when we look at R. C. Byrd, that is going to be
19 monitored in hydraulic model study. There will be
20 baseline velocities and flows developed. And our
21 commitment is to get those as close as possible to
22 the existing way that you are operating your
23 structures now. That's what we have done on every
24 other project and when the physical hydraulic model
25 study is done postlicense, that is certainly one of

1 the concerns that can be evaluated. And there's
2 structures that can be put in place to make sure
3 that, that happens.

4 At Willow Island, the case is, or in
5 Belleville, the case is there was a hydraulic
6 grilling that was meant to divert flow away from the
7 locks. At our other projects, we've put in gravel
8 beds; we've put in shoreline undulations. You know
9 we are able to do things as part of that physical
10 hydraulic model study that's done to make sure that
11 there are no impacts associated with it.

12 So for those types of studies, because the
13 design and the footprint of the powerhouse isn't
14 known until after the geotech portion of the studies
15 is done, we'd recommend doing those in the post
16 license phase, because that design is still in
17 somewhat flux until the deep subsurface drilling is
18 done. But from my perspective, once you really, if
19 you are talking about mussel beds that are beyond
20 the reach of the lock wall, when there is no change
21 to dissolved oxygen and there is no change to water
22 temperature and there is no sediment transport in
23 lower flows. And at the extreme low flows, we're
24 actually shut down. I think the likelihood or
25 probability of affecting mussel beds beyond the lock

1 wall is pretty difficult for us to be able to do.
2 And we have at least 12 or 15 years of monitoring at
3 other sites with endangered species: Smithland and
4 Belleville, to where we know that, that is the case.

5 MR. COLLINS: This is Brian Collins at the
6 Corps. I appreciate what you've said. I'm glad you
7 are aware of what's going on. Our disposal area for
8 dredging extends well into the restricted area, and
9 the process is we dredge during the low flow
10 situations because of our material there.

11 Now, approximately 70 percent of that is
12 transferred to the bridge going downstream and
13 dissipating, at the same time we're dredging, so it
14 never stacks up on the bottom. Our heavy materials
15 of course, sand, gravels et cetera, pile up there
16 and then we rely on high flows later on to carry
17 those downstream. And those also are directed by
18 location and design into a straight line flow
19 downriver to minimize adverse impacts on the beds on
20 the right and left banks. As long we can keep the
21 flows that are positive for that process overlaying
22 with your activities, we are fine with that.

23 MR. MEIER: Instructionally, based upon
24 the previous models we've done, one of the things
25 that we modeled is first there is the baseline and

1 then there is the coffer dam and then there is the
2 powerhouse. And part of that powerhouse modeling is
3 for sediment transport. So, we would make that part
4 of the model study, evaluating sediment to make sure
5 that sediment is not, that we don't bury mussels in
6 eight feet of sand or eight feet of mud. That's
7 something that we would do as part of that model
8 study, is we verify that.

9 MR. COLLINS: I'm not saying that all the
10 impacts would be negative. I'm not sure that the
11 addition of the hydro would not help our process and
12 make it easier on us. So, as long as we partner
13 together to make everything good.

14 MR. MEIER: And we're certainly willing to
15 do those sediment transport studies as part of that
16 physical model. We found it to be the most accurate
17 way of modeling sediment transport and sediment
18 movement in the physical model. And that's the only
19 reason we wouldn't do it mathematically, is just
20 because it's the greatest predictor of where
21 material flows may go. And we do it over a wide
22 range of flows. We don't just do it for 25,000 CFS.
23 We take it all the way up to the hundred year flood,
24 and we can monitor sediment movement that way.

25 MR. FRANTZ: This is David with the Corps

1 again. And kind of switching back to what you guys
2 were talking about earlier, with the traditional
3 license process, where a lot of testing is done
4 after the license is issued. I guess I can see
5 where there are some instances where we will be able
6 to adopt your EA. I suspect there may still be
7 other resources such as this modeling and the Fish
8 and Wildlife concerns that it may still require a
9 supplement on our part if there is certain
10 information that we can't gather to make our
11 determination of effects until after you have issued
12 your FONSI, you have issued your license, and they
13 have done additional testing.

14 If we can minimize the number of instances
15 where that is required down to zero is great. If
16 it's only one or two resources then our supplement
17 would be focused on those isolated cases that we
18 would require additional information beyond what you
19 would require.

20 MS. BLACK: This is Rebecca Black. Can we
21 talk a little bit about just the timeline involved?
22 So, the EA is expected to be finalized in July of
23 2013. Ideally, when would a license be issued or
24 how soon after that would the license be issued?
25 And Phil, you talked earlier today that once the

1 license was issued, it would be anywhere from two to
2 four years before construction would actually start.
3 Just maybe broadly, I'm not committing anybody to a
4 date here.

5 MR. MEIER: I can only answer from the
6 knowledge of the FERC process. From the date they
7 issue the license, there is a requirement to start
8 construction within two years. That can be extended
9 one-time for an additional two years, provided there
10 is just cause. So from the date of license
11 issuance, it could be a max of four years and then
12 in that timeframe, there are a lot of things that
13 are done. Part of it is any post study requirements
14 that come out. They take time after the license is
15 issued. Some can only be done in certain seasons,
16 and so that factors into it. But from my
17 perspective, from the date to four years is really
18 from our perspective the drop dead date. If you
19 don't start construction within that fourth year,
20 you might as well surrender the license and be done
21 with it.

22 And I don't want to speak for FERC, but FERC
23 has taken a much more stronger stance on licensees
24 that don't advance projects in that timeframe.

25 MR. SMITH: Yeah, this is John. I mean,

1 we have an awful lot of interest out there right now
2 in original projects, which hasn't been around in a
3 while. And we want to make sure that these are
4 projects that are committed to going forward and not
5 just kind of tying up a site for a while. So, that
6 was an accurate statement.

7 I guess the topic that we are struggling with
8 the most has to do with this modeling. When we sent
9 out our additional information and we addressed the
10 agency study requests, we really thought that the
11 proposal was to do some form of modeling prior to
12 getting the license. And that's why we didn't
13 require a specific tailwater study, a physical
14 habitat type study.

15 We did talk, a group of us were talking at the
16 site visit today, and it seemed like there was some
17 sort of agreement that it wouldn't be a big deal to
18 do a numerical analysis, a numerical model. A
19 desktop approach or something like, to give us - - I
20 know I'm not a modeler, but I know there is River
21 2D. There is even a 3-D version. There's various
22 models that are off the shelf out there that would
23 at least give us an idea of, do the velocities - -
24 how much do they change dramatically? Orders of
25 magnitude from what you've got out there now.

1 MR. MEIER: And when FERC's scoping
2 document came out we interpreted that to mean the
3 physical model-

4 MR. SMITH: Right, right.

5 MR. MEIER: Which was a much more
6 significant effort than doing a desktop type of
7 thing.

8 MR. GILMORE: This is George Gilmore. As
9 the fish biologist who is going to be preparing the
10 aquatic resources section, it's really important for
11 me to have an understanding, in some way, of how
12 these changes in flow are going to affect aquatic
13 resources: fish habitat, fish spawning, mussel
14 location, adverse effects associated with
15 sedimentation or scour. And again, it doesn't need
16 to be a physical model that costs a million dollars
17 to build. But it should be able to at least give us
18 a fairly good idea of what we can anticipate what is
19 going to occur associated with project construction,
20 so we can adequately address the issue in a NEPA
21 document.

22 MR. MEIER: I can commit to checking in
23 the next two weeks and finding out the parameters of
24 that and how soon it could be done in that detail
25 and share it with FERC in response.

1 MR. GILMORE: This is George Gilmore
2 again. I would definitely be interested in what
3 Kerry has to think about this too. I know,
4 originally, you've requested a study, a PF sim study
5 and then you agreed to the hydraulic modeling that
6 was going to be done post license, down the road.

7 MR. BLEDSOE: Yeah, that's exactly right.
8 We had the same concerns you had. We wanted to be
9 able to evaluate the effects of the project prior to
10 - this is Kerry Bledsoe - prior to giving our
11 approval 401 certification and other 40s that we
12 would have to issue.

13 But after we had requested those studies, we
14 had a meetings, subsequent meetings with AMP, as
15 this process calls for. And they made the case for
16 the physical modeling which we would be involved
17 with up at Willow Island, and so we tentatively
18 agreed to that. And so, it's kind of the way we
19 sort of left it at this point.

20 But I'm sensitive to what the Corps is saying
21 too about having some answers before the license is
22 issued itself. We're sort of struggling with that
23 problem too. But I'm not sure exactly how to answer
24 your question. We have the same concerns. I guess
25 what we would do is front load, under 10 J, any kind

1 of provisions that if we thought there were going to
2 be problems, they would have to be mitigated for or
3 corrected some way or another. We would say
4 something to the effect, if you wait until after
5 your license, just like the fish surveys at James -
6 you remember our conversations about that. We said,
7 "We'll let you do this afterwards, but if we find
8 there is a problem, then we are going to want more,
9 and we're going to want some corrections." That's
10 kind of how we approached this issue here to
11 accommodate the company, and we didn't think we were
12 going to lose too much.

13 I've been involved with one of these physical
14 modeling efforts, and they are pretty impressive.
15 It's an amazing thing to see and to work with. So
16 if it was like one or the other, I think we would
17 probably go with the physical. But I think if you
18 can get both, that would be even better.

19 And I think you are right. There are a lot of
20 Flow 3Ds. There are some off the shelf things that
21 are real impressive now. There's a company, I think
22 it's called 3-D flow or something like that. But it
23 models discharges from dams and from hydros.

24 So, I don't know what the cost associated with
25 those would be. There would be some advantages to

1 having that, I suppose up front. But if we don't
2 get that, if we would not get that, we would still
3 address any inevitabilities with licensing articles
4 that needs to be tried.

5 MR. MEIER: And our position is simply
6 this. We're not necessarily opposed to that, but I
7 haven't had a chance to see what those costs are.
8 But the second thing is any recommendations that
9 would come out of that, we would want to reserve
10 confirmation as to what those impacts are until we
11 see the actual effects of the hydraulic office
12 study, only because we feel that the actual,
13 physical model is the much better way of measuring
14 flows and velocities across a much wider gamut of
15 flows and headwaters and tailwaters as well as
16 sediment transport. So again, our feeling is okay,
17 you may gain some initial information out of a
18 mathematical or desktop model, but it's probably
19 going to just refine what you are going to do in the
20 actual, physical model later.

21 MR. GILMORE: But it's still a valuable
22 tool that will be part of the NEPA process and
23 provide information to the public what the potential
24 effects would be or the most likely effects are
25 going to be. It may not be exact; it may not really

1 be right on. It can be verified or refined down the
2 road. But it's something that we could use as part
3 of the process.

4 MR. BLEDSOE: That's what we did at James
5 Randolph, and there we just took the extremes. So,
6 we knew the maximum amount of impact that would
7 occur and just arbitrarily picked some flows in
8 between down to the absolute minimum.

9 MR. SMITH: This is John. You didn't
10 happen to do it on any of the other four, did you?

11 MR. MEIER: We did not.

12 MR. SMITH: Pre, like simulation, no?

13 MR. MEIER: No.

14 MS. MCLANAHAN: This is Eileen. When you
15 responded to the AIR, asking you to do the physical
16 hydraulic model now, you suggested, you described
17 some alternatives, and I would like to hear you talk
18 more about-

19 MR. MEIER: Yeah, our response was
20 thinking that you were asking us to do the physical
21 model. So, all those comments were associated with
22 doing the physical model now. But understanding
23 that you are looking for a mathematical type of
24 analysis now, that is something completely different
25 from what we understood the AIR document to mean.

1 MS. MCLANAHAN: Right, yes. So, it's good
2 we're having a chance to clear these things up.
3 What you meant, what we meant. But in that
4 response, you suggested that you had information
5 from other projects that you had on the Ohio that
6 would be useful. And if you could talk a little bit
7 more about what that information is that would be
8 helpful.

9 MR. MEIER: Okay, as it relates to?

10 MS. MCLANAHAN: Effect on fish.

11 MR. GILMORE: On velocity, effects
12 downstream, whether or not it could affect beds, et
13 cetera.

14 MR. MEIER: Well, I can tell you this.
15 That in terms of intake velocities, because these
16 are low head, large horizontal units, intake
17 velocities at the trash rack are generally less than
18 3 feet per second. So, we regularly observe it at
19 Belleville, fish swimming in and out, beyond the
20 trash rack and above the trash rack because the
21 velocities are so low.

22 So as we see intake, we don't really see fish
23 being sucked into the intake like you might see at a
24 large head hydro type project out West. Here the
25 velocities are much lower. And then when you go to

1 the downstream side where fish would try to swim up
2 into the water passageway, the closer they get to
3 the turbine, the velocities go up extremely higher.
4 So, it is difficult for them to be able to get to
5 the rotational parts from the upstream side.

6 And then, if I look at the last studies that
7 have been done with the EPRI studies, which were
8 sometime ago in March. Hydraulic bulb units, and I
9 think EDRI's conclusion that there was at most a six
10 percent mortality, of all the fish in the train,
11 there was a six percent mortality.

12 Having said that, I think the EPRI study was,
13 from my perspective, was high. And I think when you
14 look at the velocities - - we can provide this
15 velocity data from our other plants. When you look
16 at the velocities, and because the velocities are
17 low and the units have a low rotation speed, the
18 maximum rotation speed is about 64 RPMs per minute.
19 When you have a low rotational speed on the unit, it
20 tends to decrease mortality as well.

21 So, when I combine all those factors in there
22 and I look at that, to me, the best way to avoid
23 entrainment mortality is in the design of the plant
24 and not significantly changing the flows and
25 reducing the velocities at the intake, and then,

1 making sure that you don't affect habitat on the
2 downstream side. And I look at those factors and
3 that's, to me, the easiest way and perhaps the most
4 effective way of reducing mortality at the
5 individual sites. It's the most viable way.

6 MS. MCLANAHAN: But what about impacts at
7 the downstream side? What information do you have
8 from your other projects that would be helpful in
9 answering George's question about, we just need a
10 little more information about how the project is
11 going to affect fish habitat and especially spawning
12 habitat downstream of the dams.

13 MR. MEIER: Well-

14 MS. MCLANAHAN: I don't mean so much the
15 upstream effects of entrainment or impingement but
16 downstream flows.

17 MR. MEIER. Downstream flows from a short
18 distance, as I said, certainly by the time you get
19 to the end of the lock wall, the closer back to,
20 very close to the original. Are they exact? No, I
21 can't say those are exact, but they are very much to
22 the original. And part of the driver, historically,
23 for making sure they're back to the original has
24 been for navigation purposes.

25 So, AMP has tried to do that on all of our

1 projects. Once you get back to the end of the lock
2 wall, the flows are back to baseline conditions.

3 So, the only area that we are talking about is
4 that area where there is fishery resources within
5 the restricted areas. So, if I focus specifically
6 on those areas then the impacts are due to changing
7 habitat. So, if I'm looking at changing habitat and
8 in my physical hydraulic study, I am looking at how
9 I'm disbursing flow and the velocity of the flow and
10 the vectors associated with the velocity and
11 sediment transport, then I am able to mitigate
12 impacts to fisheries as a result of what comes out
13 of the physical model.

14 Now, I am not saying that by doing mathematical
15 study, you couldn't get some of that information
16 sooner. I suspect you could. But what I am saying
17 is that I think that, based upon our operation of
18 the Belleville plant over the past 10 years and
19 doing 10 years of mussel monitoring, I don't think
20 hydros, as a whole, are the things that are
21 impacting the aquatic resources on the Ohio.

22 I look at other impacts that I see: an unnamed
23 chemical company dumping two gallons of zinc in the
24 Ohio River daily, the influx of zebra mussels and
25 how they have affected aquatic wildlife. I think

1 those are the bigger drivers. And understand I'm
2 giving you a utility perspective. I'm also giving
3 you a perspective of information that I have read.
4 The most information that's been provided to me. And
5 we will certainly be willing to share those opinions
6 or take anybody to the Belleville plant, where you
7 can watch fish swim in and out of the intake.

8 MS. FIELDS: This is Susan from before. I
9 have a question and comment about this. In the
10 absence of some sort of modeling, how would FERC
11 take into account the effects on aquatic resources,
12 whether they be mussels or fish? How could you
13 understand the effects if you don't know what the
14 effects of the project are?

15 MR. GILMORE: George Gilmore. That's kind
16 of my point exactly. Again, this doesn't need to be
17 a complicated million dollar study. It needs to be
18 something that is relatively robust but is adequate
19 for a NEPA document. And right now, we don't have
20 much to go on. What do we say? There's going to be
21 no effects because there's not a huge effect at the
22 Belleville project? Well.

23 MR. MEIER: And I'm not saying we are
24 opposed to doing that.

25 MR. GILMORE: Right, okay.

1 MR. MEIER: We're willing to do that.

2 MR. GILMORE: We're on the same page, it
3 sounds like.

4 MS. FIELDS: Well then, I have another
5 comment. If I understood Brian correctly, our
6 dredge disposal area is within the Corps
7 restriction, restricted area?

8 MR. COLLINS: It extends downstream also,
9 I believe. I saw the sign where the restricted zone
10 was today.

11 MS. STAFFORD: And we are careful with how
12 we dispose of our dredge material, knowing that
13 there are known mussel beds downstream that have
14 endangered species. Then, I hear Phil saying that
15 their studies have shown that the physical modeling,
16 the flow conditions are not affected downstream of
17 the lock wall. We are disposing in our restricted
18 area, which is within the lock wall, which I infer
19 from his comment that flows could change there,
20 which changes our whole process. Am I understanding
21 that correctly?

22 MR. MEIER: You are. And what I am
23 saying, Susan, is that during the physical model, if
24 there's areas that need to be protected in the
25 downstream channel, there is navigation features

1 that can be added to allow that to occur. If
2 there's mussel beds that need a certain amount of
3 flow, that can be done. I'll give you an example.
4 At our Smithland project right now, we have the
5 largest colony of fat pocketbook mussels found just
6 downstream of the project. And so, we went through
7 an endangered species consultation with U.S. Fish
8 and Wildlife Service. We established tubes to
9 ensure that we maintain the exact amount of water
10 that was flowing in that channel, that was flowing
11 in baseline and through construction and will be
12 flowing through at the completion of construction
13 and during operation phases to maintain that same
14 habitat for those mussels that were discovered
15 preconstruction.

16 So, again, AMP's not opposed to doing things
17 like that. We have done things like that, and it
18 just sounds like since this area is in a restricted
19 area, that's something that we have to look and make
20 sure that we are not impacting.

21 MS. FIELDS: Those navigational drawings,
22 are they in the restricted areas normally or are
23 they downstream?

24 MR. MEIER: Usually, they are in
25 restricted areas, and so the question comes in-

1 MS. FIELDS: That's our disposal site for
2 dredging materials?

3 MR. MEIER: Yeah, how do you accomplish
4 both? I think there's ways to do it, but I think
5 that's part of what has to be studied through the
6 physical hydraulic model. That's my take on it.

7 MS. FIELDS: I think the tricky part is
8 the Corps has got multifaceted concerns here,
9 because the navigation would probably be within our
10 restricted area, which is also where we could impact
11 our dredging operations. I think there has got to
12 be some additional dialogue here to figure out how
13 our existing navigation, maintenance operations
14 could be potentially impacted and how aquatic
15 resources could be impacted.

16 MR. AYAA: This is Jay. I think Section
17 7 consultation is going to be really important in
18 this process with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
19 Service. We are just now completing our Section 7
20 consultation for our dredging, our long-term
21 operations. We are on the verge of signing a, or
22 completing a biological assessment that includes
23 that we are not likely to have an adverse effect on
24 those threatened, endangered species downstream.
25 That's to be signed in the next couple months. And

1 so, that's the baseline condition for the FERC
2 project. We have a situation where we have been
3 able to avoid, by threading the needle if you will,
4 the two beds on each side of the stream, getting our
5 dredge material to go between the two mussel beds.
6 Both of which, we are assuming has T and E species.

7 So, the question is how does the FERC project,
8 the FERC license project affect our ability to avoid
9 those species? Or does it induce effects? And what
10 modeling is necessary to satisfactorily come to the
11 conclusion there? I'm not sure we know yet. I
12 mean, maybe that's a subject of further discussions.
13 I think the resource agencies would be a big help to
14 determining what models would work. But I think
15 that is the question. That's kind of the bottom
16 line, as it relates to the mussel species. Which I
17 think is a big one, one of our greatest concerns.

18 MR. GILMORE: This is George Gilmore
19 again. You guys can correct me if I'm wrong, but
20 because the sheep's nose was just recently listed,
21 it sounds to me like FERC is also going to need to
22 prepare a biological assessment on its proposed
23 action, which will go into quite a bit of detail
24 with the Fish and Wildlife Service obviously. And
25 we'll likely see some measures required by Fish and

1 Wildlife Service down the road that are going to be
2 designed to make sure that there are no adverse
3 effects on those species. So, there's going to be a
4 lot of scrutiny. Let's put it that way. A lot more
5 than we've seen presently.

6 MR. AYAAAY: There's been quite a bit of
7 scrutiny on our dredging operations. So, I assumed
8 that something that would affect our ability to
9 avoid those beds, those known beds, would also
10 receive equal scrutiny. So, I think it will all
11 play out in the process. But we're going to have to
12 meet. It's going to be subject to more meetings,
13 I'm sure, and discussions.

14 MS. MCLANAHAN: Well, I would imagine that
15 whatever methods you're using to prepare your BA
16 would be very informative as to what methods would
17 be useful for predicting the effects of the Byrd
18 project on mussels too. So, that one could build on
19 the other. Again, the timeline-

20 MR. AYAAAY: Yes, and we're open to sharing
21 whatever data and methodologies that we have. We're
22 actually even undertaking a hydrologic model, a
23 numerical model at our Waterways Experimentation
24 Station to kind of further support our conclusions
25 in the BA. So, we're willing to share that as well.

1 So maybe, that's something that we could take off of
2 for this project. We're cooperating with you.
3 We're willing to share whatever data we have to help
4 you along.

5 MR. JOHNSON: This is Andy Johnson from
6 the Corps. Our RPA is based off of Doppler mapping
7 of the area downstream of our project in which we
8 develop velocity vectors coming out of the rollers
9 of our dam when we operate individual gates. And
10 it's years of that data that are going into this BA
11 to show how our steering currents are avoiding
12 impacts to the mussels. And our BA really hinges on
13 that ability to steer those currents.

14 There are other things that we changed that
15 help us reach that no adverse effect determination.
16 But for the most part, I think it's recognized that
17 the only reason that we are able to continue in our
18 disposal downstream is because we are now able to
19 steer that plume and any impact at the hydropower
20 facility has, either positive or negative, would
21 have to be re-examined in another biological
22 assessment. And we would have to have that in order
23 to reach a finding of no significant impact.

24 MR. MEIER: Well again, we are not opposed
25 to doing a mathematical study. I can tell you that

1 most sediment transport happens at above 7 feet per
2 second, and by the time you get within 250 feet of
3 the hydro plant, your velocities are dropping to way
4 off by that timeframe. And we've got hydraulic
5 models at least from five different projects, that
6 show that. And so, if the concern is about sediment
7 transport, that is not a concern to me. If the
8 concern is about currents recutting channels then we
9 just need to know where, we need to know where those
10 are, so that we can incorporate that into the design
11 and avoid it.

12 MR. JOHNSON: This is Andy Johnson again.
13 Our biggest concern right now is that we are only
14 able to dredge and dispose using a hydraulic dredge
15 during the low flow season. So, we're there in late
16 August or September, October time frame. So, I
17 don't know what our operations run over the gates or
18 over the project at that point. But it's the low
19 flow time and the big concern is sometimes we go out
20 there and if we open two rollers up, we have
21 steering ability, but it sometimes is minimal.

22 Now the past few years, we've been lucky, and
23 we've had good steering currents. But we've been in
24 a situation before where there is low flow coming
25 out of those, and the worry now is that if you are

1 running your hydropower plant during those low flow
2 periods, when we are disposing, then the hydro
3 facility will rob us of our steering ability.

4 So, it's not that we are concerned under normal
5 operations about your hydropower affecting our
6 operations. It's just during that low flow, time
7 period which would not get modeled in your sediment
8 deposition hydraulic model.

9 MR. MEIER: But it would be something I
10 assume the Corps would want us to model in a
11 physical model study. And then the extreme low
12 flows, when you talk less than 3,000 CFS, we are
13 off-line. Because of the low flow, it takes at
14 least that to operate one unit, and only one unit
15 gets operated up to about 20,000 CFS. And so, as
16 your flows drop off, then the amount of water we are
17 passing significantly drops off. So in those
18 months, I would tend to suspect if you are talking
19 about extreme low flows that would affect barges, I
20 would think that we're probably pretty close to
21 being off-line at that point anyway. I would have
22 to know the exact flows to be able to tell you that.

23 MR. JOHNSON: And one way to get to a
24 FONSI for that issue would be for the hydro facility
25 to go off-line during our dredge and disposal

1 operation. If we are under a certain-

2 MR. MEIER: How long is that operation?

3 MR. JOHNSON: It's usually between five
4 and ten days.

5 MR. MEIER: Okay.

6 MR. JOHNSON: And then, we have emergency
7 disposal. But that usually happens in the
8 springtime, and at that point, there is so much flow
9 coming over the dam that we don't believe you would
10 impact us, but during that low flow time is probably
11 five to ten days.

12 MR. MEIER: If you know an approximate
13 date and time?

14 MR. JOHNSON: It honestly depends on
15 other districts and other district's needs for that
16 hydraulic grid. But usually, it's the end of
17 August, September.

18 MR. MEIER: I'll tell you what. Let us
19 look at the historic river flows from that
20 timeframe, and I can tell you right off the bat
21 whether we are okay with that.

22 We do have a schedule of when flows are. My
23 point is if during that August timeframe the average
24 flows are really low, we may be off-line anyway.
25 There may no impact, but we need to know what the

1 flows are.

2 MR. HOISINGTON: This is Gaylord
3 Hoisington. With Corps projects, any applicant has
4 to coordinate anything they do with the Corps. The
5 Corps lets the project operate when the Corps wants
6 them to operate, basically. They still have full
7 control of the river and the water. And as of
8 licensing, they would have to sit down with the
9 Corps and come up with a whole operating plan of
10 what they would need to do for the next 50 years or
11 whatever, for that project.

12 MR. MEIER: And, Gaylord, the reason I'm
13 trying to draw out that time frame now is if the
14 Corps was going to tell me there was going to be
15 three months of time frame where I'm not going to
16 generate, right away, that would be something that
17 would cause us to probably abandon the license
18 today.

19 MR. HOISINGTON: Right, I'm not - - you
20 know.

21 MR. MEIER: We recognize that. There's an
22 MOU that gets signed, and an MO, memorandum of
23 operations, that gets signed after, that governs the
24 agreement between the Corps and the licensee and how
25 the project is operated. So, the quickest way for

1 us to get to that is to be able to see the
2 approximate dates and when that is. And if it's a
3 three to five day operation, I can't imagine that
4 would be an issue. A two to three months issue.

5 MR. CHIAMESI: This is Domenico Chiamesi
6 with the Corps. With these projects, we always
7 coordinate activities. The dredging operations,
8 like they said, normally springtime, just right
9 after the high flow season there is a short
10 emergency dredge. And that duration is three days,
11 four days max. The hydraulic dredge, it's probably
12 every few years at most, and it is late in the
13 season as well. But like I say, all of those
14 coordinations are identified.

15 MR. MEIER: I can't imagine they'd be a
16 problem. Three to five days, I'm not saying - -
17 it's factored into the overall energy capacity of
18 the unit, and it's not that significant.

19 MR. SMITH: We may have just resolved the
20 entire issue.

21 MR. FRANTZ: David Frantz with the Corps.
22 Getting back to your all's schedule and three to
23 five days, five to ten days may not have an effect,
24 But don't you also, the way you are set up, you have
25 commitments that you have to provide so much power

1 during certain time frames?

2 So I guess, I don't know how much flexibility
3 you have. From what I am hearing, when we do our
4 dredge, it's a 10 day operation in a two month
5 window. So, I don't know if you guys have that much
6 flexibility. Yeah, we can go off-line for 10 days
7 within that two month window also. Or if you say
8 our window of opportunity is much smaller, we can
9 still maybe do 10 days, but we can't float it over a
10 two month window. It has to be within 30 days.

11 MR. MEIER: Well, we have a tremendous
12 amount of flexibility within the operations to be
13 able to take the units off-line or a unit off-line
14 to do that. And I think typically in the MO, the
15 memorandum of operations, that we have with the
16 Corps - - I know the one at Belleville has it. - -
17 you guys can tell us to go off-line tomorrow, and we
18 have to be off-line until you tell us to come back
19 on. So, Gaylord's point is well taken. That is
20 established, as I'm hearing more about it, a three
21 to ten day probably maximum operation is probably
22 never an issue. That's my take on it.

23 MS. FIELDS: This is Susan with the Corps.
24 In FERC's NEPA process, how much opportunity do you
25 all have now to consider impacts on navigation like

1 we are discussing? I mean I think that's an
2 important resource consideration, considering our
3 authority and mandate to protect navigation on the
4 Ohio River, that should be a resource consideration
5 that FERC must, in my opinion, consider in their
6 license evaluation.

7 MS. MCLANAHAN: We will add that to the
8 list.

9 MR. SMITH: John Smith. I just want to,
10 I've just been trying to clean up at least the
11 little loophole, a procedural thing here. Is AMP,
12 feel they have heard enough to respond on this
13 modeling issue prior to the May due date of the AIR?
14 Or otherwise, you'll be getting a response from us,
15 and we would be telling you what, you would prefer
16 to-

17 MR. MEIER: We will respond, something
18 probably within 7 to 10 days, and tell you what we
19 can do and when we can do it.

20 MR. SMITH: And it sounds like, Kerry,
21 you're actually okay with what they originally were
22 proposing. But you are also okay with having
23 something up front? So, we don't necessarily have
24 to go back to West Virginia to get clear?

25 MR. BLEDSOE: I don't think they were

1 originally proposing that hydraulic study, just the
2 physical-

3 MR. SMITH: No, right, yeah, right.

4 MR. BLEDSOE: We asked for the physical
5 study up front, in our study requests. In a
6 subsequent meeting, we were convinced that we could
7 get the same information and accomplish the same
8 goals with waiting till the physical modeling came
9 out. This is Ohio's decision too; it wasn't just
10 West Virginia. Ohio and us, we both agree to this.

11 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay. It seems like that
12 one is kind of resolved. Yes.

13 MR. BLEDSOE: This is Kerry Bledsoe. I
14 want to make a disclaimer first. All of my comments
15 will be in writing. All of the DNR's official
16 comments will be in writing. My oral comments are
17 not official.

18 (Laughter.)

19 My boss will-

20 MR. HOISINGTON: Don't send us a nasty
21 letter.

22 MR. BLEDSOE: Anyway, I just wanted to
23 make a comment about the geographic scope. It's a
24 minor thing, I think, and I don't really have a
25 strong issue about this. But in the license itself,

1 the pool above R.C. Byrd includes the Kanawha River
2 to the Winfield Lock, yet your geographic scope only
3 stays within the Ohio River.

4 MS. MCLANAHAN: And I just wondered,
5 either you should explain why you're not going to
6 the Winfield Lock on the Kanawha or add it. One or
7 the other, just to clean that up.

8 MS. MCLANAHAN: Thank you.

9 MR. SMITH: Just curious, this is John at
10 FERC. I overheard you talking about the state line.
11 Where is West Virginia and Ohio on the Ohio?

12 MR. BLEDSOE: We would have to turn that
13 guy off.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. SMITH: So, it is a disputed state
16 line?

17 MR. BLEDSOE: Yeah, well, it depends on
18 how you look at it. I'll tell you, how about we
19 talk about it in the break.

20 MR. SMITH: I mean West Virginia intends
21 to issue a 401, or you don't know at this time?

22 MR. BLEDSOE: No, we do issue 401s.

23 MR. SMITH: You do issue 401s? Okay.

24 MR. HOISINGTON: The dotted line comes way
25 over here.

1 MR. BLEDSOE: It sure does.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay, are there any other
4 comments, questions, points of discussion? Things
5 we should clarify and wrap up?

6 MR. BLEDSOE: This is Kerry Bledsoe again.

7 MS. MCLANAHAN: Yes.

8 MR. BLEDSOE: I want to just make one
9 statement for the NEPA reviewers. If you haven't
10 looked at the water quality information, Phil and I
11 guess maybe check this real close. But on your
12 water quality table, A1, you've got dissolved oxygen
13 in the 80s and specific conductivity is less than
14 one at .5 or .4. There is no way you can have a DO
15 in the 80s.

16 MR. SMITH: That sounds like a bad probe.

17 MR. BLEDSOE: It sounds like a bad probe
18 or columns are mislabeled or something.

19 MR. MEIER: What page is that, Kerry?

20 MR. BLEDSOE: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5. I mean
21 specific conductivity that low would be distilled
22 water.

23 MR. HOISINGTON: He must be the one that
24 read it, right?

25 MR. MEIER: We will look at that and-

1 MR. BLEDSOE: You might want to just
2 correct that. The data, I don't know what's wrong.
3 I couldn't find any collaborating information to say
4 it should be this or that or whatever.

5 MS. MCLANAHAN: Okay, it is quarter to
6 3:00. I think we can bring things to a close then,
7 unless anybody has anything else? No? Thank you
8 all very much for coming and bringing up those
9 issues and helping us think our way through them.
10 (WHEREUPON, The proceedings were concluded at 2:45
11 p,m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24