

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

PRIEST RAPIDS PROJECT

PROJECT NUMBER P-2114-116

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

APRIL 19, 2006

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3 FERC Commission Members

4 Charles Hall

5 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

6 888 First Street, NE

7 Washington, DC 20426

8 Phone (202)502-8771

9 Fax (202)206-0119

10

11 Robert Easton

12 888 First Street, NE

13 Washington, DC 20426

14 Phone (202)502-8771

15 Fax (202)206-0119

16

17 John Clements

18 888 First Street, NE

19 Washington, DC 20426

20 Phone (202)502-8771

21 Fax (202)206-0119

22

23

24

25

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2

3

4 Frank Winchell

5 888 First Street, NE

6 Washington, DC 20426

7 Phone (202)502-8771

8 Fax (202)206-0119

9

10 Patti Leppert

11 888 First Street, NE

12 Washington, DC 20426

13 Phone (202)502-8771

14 Fax (202)206-0119

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 CHARLES HALL: Okay. I think with that, we
3 should start. Let's see a show of hands, maybe. How many
4 people want to speak? Six of seven people. Does anybody
5 want to go first?

6 NEW SPEAKER: I've got a 120-boat bass tournament
7 I've got to go help set up this evening, so if I may, I'd
8 like to go first.

9 CHARLES HALL: Sounds like you need help with
10 that?

11 SPEAKER (cont.): Yes, sir.

12 CHARLES HALL: Okay. I'll just ask you--would
13 you mind coming up here, maybe so everybody can hear better
14 because we don't have a mike to come around the room. I
15 might just ask you to project your voice as best you can.
16 And Valerie, I'm sorry, I didn't introduce--Valerie is our
17 court reporter. And you can let us know if someone is not
18 speaking up, or you need some clarification.

19 SPEAKER (cont.): May I?

20 CHARLES HALL: Yes, sir. Oh, that's another
21 thing. You can give us written testimony tonight or verbal
22 or both.

23 MICHAEL MESEBERG: Hello, members of the
24 Commission, and thank your for allowing me to address you
25 today.

1 CHARLES HALL: Mike, what was your last name?

2 MICHAEL MESEBERG: My name is Michael Meseberg.
3 And I would like to offer the following comments, if I may.

4 I understand that the decision has been made in
5 regards to the mitigation monies, and I would like to
6 suggest other options for consideration. The choice that I
7 heavily support involves enhancing the quality of fishing
8 for all of Grant County. I feel that the mitigation funds
9 would best be used to modernize the Columbia Basin Hatchery
10 and provide yearly operation and maintenance budget.

11 As I understand it, the Columbia Basin Hatchery
12 was originally constructed about 45 years ago with these
13 same mitigation monies. And also, as I understand the
14 re-licensing process, the mitigation monies are dedicated
15 to specific projects due to the loss of resident fish and
16 wildlife displaced as a result of the construction of
17 Wanapum and Priest Rapids Dam. I do not believe the
18 proposal of directing mitigation monies to the lower Crab
19 Creek area, Burkett Lake, and the pools behind Wanapum and
20 Priest Rapids Dam is the correct place to allocate these
21 monies.

22 The citizens of Washington State deserve a more
23 logical dedication of these funds, to provide more
24 recreational opportunities for the vast majority of outdoor
25 enthusiasts that enjoy recreating in the 140 lakes in Grant

1 County. More freshwater fishing licenses are sold to
2 Washington residents and non-residents to fish the lowland
3 lakes in Grant County than any other region in Washington
4 State. We need to retrofit this Columbia Basin Hatchery to
5 produce more fish and provide an improved recreational
6 fishery for all Grant County. All the waters of Grant
7 County would benefit from this. This would greatly enhance
8 the quality of life as well in Grant County.

9 The County is growing at an unprecedented rate.
10 If these monies were diverted to enhance recreational
11 fishing, the only effect that I perceive, would be a
12 positive economic input. Not only would available quality
13 fishing help the motels, hotels, restaurants and gas
14 stations, good fishing would also would bring new,
15 permanent residents to Grant County; hence, a larger
16 customer base for our power supplier.

17 My family has been at MarDon Resort on Potholes
18 Reservoir for 36 years as of April 2, 2006. We spend most
19 of each day explaining to our customers fishing options in
20 Grant County. And regretfully, our fishing in the lowland
21 lakes has needed help since the late 1970's.

22 Please, I implore you to reconsider the use of
23 these mitigation monies. If we could only redirect these
24 available funds into the hatchery, we could enhance and
25 improve all of the recreational opportunities for fishing

1 in Grant County.

2 Thank you for letting me speak to you today.

3 CHARLES HALL: Thank you.

4 MICHAEL MESEBERG: And thanks for letting me to
5 first.

6 CHARLES HALL. You're welcome. I hope you catch
7 some. Who else do we have? I'm sorry, I forgot your name.

8 NEW SPEAKER: That all right.

9 CHARLES HALL: I apologize for that.

10 MIKE CONNLEY: I'm Mike Connley. I going to be
11 up here more than once. I'll do the short one first.
12 Okay?

13 CHARLES HALL: Okay.

14 MIKE CONNLEY: I'm the manager from the Port of
15 Warden. We've had a chance to review the draft EIS. In
16 our comprehensive plan that we adopted in June of '05, we
17 support fully the re-licensing of this project. We serve
18 about 4700 people in the southeast corner of Grant County,
19 and we're highly dependent upon an agriculture economy. We
20 have two potato-processing plants that employ 350 workers.
21 The supply of these potatoes comes primarily from
22 circle-irrigated lands in our area. It is dependent upon
23 affordable electricity that these circles are operated
24 efficiently. Based on our 2004 data, we had an
25 unemployment rate of 14.8 percent, which is pretty hard to

1 believe. And the future of our growth is dependent upon
2 stable and affordable electric rates.

3 One of our main concerns, even though we think
4 the EIS and the PUD's proposal is balanced and adequate, we
5 think that there's too much money in it for fish. And
6 we're especially concerned about the Crab Creek issue. We
7 see the building of salmon and steelhead in Crab Creek
8 could have some major impacts on the Columbia Basin
9 Irrigation Project. And that would put a big, big hurt on
10 our ability to compete in the international economy for our
11 ag products. So that's a major issue for us.
12 Historically, Crab Creek, before the Columbia Basin Project
13 was started, was a dry stream for most of the year. So
14 we're thinking that we need to look at that history of that
15 creek versus what's happening today.

16 I'll give my one copy to this lady, and I'll sit
17 down.

18 CHARLES HALL: Okay. Thank you. We have David
19 Bowmen and Mike Meseberg. Which one--that was my comment.
20 This is another Mike. David?

21 DAVID BOWEN: For the record, David Bowen.
22 B-o-w-e-n. And I'm Kittitas County Commissioner and
23 Chairman this year. And I appreciate the opportunity to
24 speak in front of you and thank you for coming to our
25 region to hold these hearings rather than running to

1 Olympia, or Portland, or Boise, Idaho, which some of the
2 other issues that have come before us have ended up at.

3 I went through the draft EIS, had staff from
4 Public Works go through it with me. We red-tagged some
5 things that were of interest to us, and I'm going to focus
6 my comments on recreation measures based on the Vantage
7 boat launch. I'm focusing there because Kittitas County
8 currently is responsible for maintaining and operating that
9 particular launch. We put forward eight issues and got
10 responses from Grant County PUD, which we appreciated. And
11 I'll briefly go through it and try and keep my comments
12 short, because I've sat in your seat many times and know
13 how it can get.

14 The Vantage boat launch much be upgraded to
15 handle the increase in use. Some ADA guidelines and ADA
16 improvements have been proposed within the project. I
17 appreciate the effort put into there. And I'll cover some
18 additional improvements in other comments.

19 The Vantage boat launch must be dredged and
20 lengthened in order to allow boats the opportunity to
21 launch year round. I was reading through the comments. It
22 appears they selected four different launches within the
23 reservoir, the one at Huntzinger and the one that's at Park
24 had been chosen to be the ones to improve. I guess I would
25 look at this launch. It's right next to the freeway, and

1 it's very visible. Those folks, who maybe aren't local,
2 wouldn't realize the other two launches are there. Maybe
3 they'd would be more inclined to pull into this launch, and
4 certainly at the low water, at times, may not be able to
5 launch their boat in a safe manner. I guess I would like
6 to consider--reconsider the Vantage boat launch being
7 upgraded a little more for the low water level times to
8 launch boats into the reservoir.

9 There was some discussion about the Vantage boat
10 launch parking lot and that it must be expanded. There's
11 currently, by my last count, 60 current spaces there. I
12 believe the draft EIS refers to 100. I don't see the 100.
13 I see currently 60 spaces there. Those are on Grant County
14 PUD property. Kittitas County owns the next piece of
15 property next to it, which the road goes through to get
16 down to that parking spot and the boat launch. We are open
17 and available to talk about how we might expand down into
18 that area and make more parking spaces. If we do do that
19 though, our property is not currently within the project
20 boundaries. And I would suggest it would be a good idea to
21 include that area in the project boundary. I don't know
22 what's all involved with that. You folks would have to put
23 that out. I haven't had a chance to dig that deeply into
24 it. It seems to me, if the parking lot is going to be
25 included as part of the launch, it should probably be

1 within the project boundary.

2 We asked that the boat launch needs a swim area
3 as well as a picnic area. The picnic area was picked up
4 and agreed to the swimming area. I think I will actually
5 have to say it probably wasn't a great idea to put a swim
6 area here to mix with the boat activities coming in and out
7 of there because of the safety of that. So we are
8 currently withdrawing the swim area request and the
9 information around that.

10 We talked about an additional boat ramp with a
11 dock to be constructed to handle the increase use. I still
12 think that's a good idea. I think that basically it looks
13 like the response was good. If we could provide any
14 information to support that request. Public Works has
15 been, average daily traffic settings there. In 2004, it
16 was 120 a day. In 2005, it's up to 167. If I'm thinking
17 about it intuitively, in driving passed today, there were
18 two cars there today having a picnic; but I can tell you on
19 Friday, Saturday and Sunday, it's packed. The spaces are
20 full, and all around it is full. So if I'm doing some
21 estimates, I'd say it went from about 220 average daily
22 traffic on Friday through Sunday, up to about 300 now on
23 Friday through Sunday. So there's a lot of activity going
24 on at that particular site. An additional boat dock and
25 launch would be used and would probably reach full capacity

1 on those three days.

2 The next item is for Grant County PUD to take
3 over operation and maintenance responsibility for existing
4 and new recreational infrastructure at that site. It came
5 back with a proposal that says, it proposed the development
6 and new operations and maintenance agreement between Grant
7 County PUD and Kittitas County. They proposed to
8 contribute \$15,000 per year for operations and maintenance
9 of the boat launch. It goes on to say that this is a
10 significant amount, and it's projected to cover 100 percent
11 of annual operations and maintenance costs.

12 I had my public works staff go back and give me
13 their financials. In 2004, our cost to take care of that
14 launch was \$13,703. In 2005, it was \$14,896. Currently,
15 it's costing us \$15,000 to maintain and operate that
16 particular launch. I don't see how that's going to be
17 continued for 50 more years at that level. So I don't
18 believe the \$15,000 is a significant amount to pay for the
19 ongoing maintenance and operations for that launch. The
20 main, most expensive portions are the garbage. In 2004,
21 there's almost \$7,100 in garbage hauled out of there. In
22 2005, \$7,741 worth of garbage hauled out of there.

23 The other items are sewer, electric, water, that
24 type of thing. We do understand we get a discounted rate
25 for our power there. And the other part would be

1 maintenance is the other major expense, the cleaning up and
2 keeping those restrooms up to code and keeping the area
3 clean itself.

4 The last item was about the law enforcement.
5 Grant County shall fund two FTE sheriff deputies and vessel
6 for approximately six months, May through October was our
7 request. And Grant County basically met us half way. When
8 you extrapolate that out, that's one FTE a year. They
9 suggested one FTE a year split between Grant and Kittitas
10 County. My main issues here are public safety and
11 maintenance and operations expenses. On public safety
12 situations, the recreation that happens down there, that
13 place is packed every weekend, especially as the weather
14 warms up. I still believe that our first request for the
15 equivalent of one FTE is a very reasonable request. We
16 generally will send two to four deputies down there on
17 different weekends. We have, you know, we have from
18 Snoqualmie Summit to Vantage is what our coverage area is
19 and if we could have some folks dedicated down there, that
20 would be very helpful for us. That, I believe, would cover
21 my main points of concern.

22 I would want to say a couple of good things. I
23 saw, first of all, the ADA accessibility conditions. We
24 really appreciate that. And the inclusion of that 9.2
25 miles of trail connecting the state park with the town of

1 Vantage is a great idea, and we're very appreciative of
2 that as well. As you know, we have some Kittitas County
3 folks here who will probably touch on a few more additional
4 items. That would be what I've got here today. If you
5 have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

6 CHARLES HALL: Thank you. I appreciate that very
7 much. How about Pat Kelleher? Are you available?

8 PAT KELLEHER: Thank you for the opportunity to
9 comment today on the Priest Rapids Hydroelectric Project.
10 My name is Pat Kelleher, and I am here representing myself.
11 The recreational values of the entire project should be
12 protected and used for the benefit of all of the people
13 rather than for a privileged few, or wasted and lost
14 through unplanned, undesirable private and commercial
15 development. I wish I had written that, I didn't.
16 L. Keith Hellstrom wrote it in the opening to the 1960
17 Recreational Resources Plan for the Priest Rapids Project
18 of which you have a copy.

19 In 2002, the Washington State Interagency
20 Committee for outdoor recreation stated, the public views
21 lack of recreational physical access to land and water as
22 more critical than lack of supply. Public recreational
23 physical access is the issue I would like to address today.

24 Every FERC major hydroelectric project license
25 clearly states the licensee shall allow the public free

1 access to a reasonable extent to Project waters and
2 adjacent lands owned by the licensee for the purpose of
3 full public utilization of such lands and waters for
4 navigation, outdoor recreational purposes, including
5 hunting and fishing. For the Priest Rapids Project, only a
6 third of the over 12 thousand acres of Project lands and
7 only about a third of the 174 miles of Project shorelines
8 are covered under the license requirement for reasonable
9 public free access.

10 When I was ten years old, my family went on
11 vacation to Crescent Bar Island and camped in the public
12 campground. When I returned to Crescent Bar Island thirty
13 years later with my ten-year-old daughter, I found that the
14 public campground on the Island no longer existed but had
15 been transformed, under Grant PUD's watchful eye, into a
16 true residential community for the privileged few. In less
17 than thirty years, the public had lost public recreational
18 physical access to camp on Crescent Bar Island. The
19 shoreline I once freely walked as a ten year old was now
20 fenced far into the navigable waters and posted with
21 private and no-trespassing signs.

22 At that time, I believed that my daughter and I
23 had a right to public recreational physical access along
24 the shoreline up to the apparent high water mark, based on
25 Washington State law. What I have since learned is because

1 the shoreline was created from inundated Project lands, I
2 have the right to reasonable public free access wherever
3 Grant owns the shoreline and adjacent lands. For example,
4 at the airstrip site, a 150-acre site with the highest
5 rating for recreational suitability, Grant PUD has
6 permitted recreational facilities of a boat ramp, marina,
7 RV camping, and airstrip to be enjoyed only by the
8 privileged few who have access rights through adjacent
9 property. Public recreational physical access is possible
10 only from Project waters. But since the area is not signed
11 for public access, the public perceives this area to be
12 under private ownership and dares not enter.

13 At Columbia River Siding, one mile of Grant PUD
14 owned shoreline remains unsigned for public recreational
15 physical access while Grant PUD permitted development of a
16 feedlot adjacent to the shoreline for commercial, economic
17 benefit of the privileged few.

18 At Apricot Orchards, a boat ramp and over four
19 miles of Grant PUD owned shoreline remains unsigned for
20 public recreational physical access. This recreational
21 facility remains so well-hidden that the recreational
22 consultants could not find it during the Project
23 recreational inventory. Grant PUD does not list Apricot
24 Orchards on any FERC Form 80 recreational reports. Grant
25 PUD does not list Apricot Orchards on any project signage

1 of boat ramps available at the Project for the public. And
2 Grant PUD does not list Apricot Orchards in the brochure,
3 main public-use areas for the public. In Grant PUD's
4 License Application, Apricot Orchard boat launch is
5 scheduled for renovation.

6 At Sentenal Gap, two miles of Grant PUD
7 shoreline, Grant displaced public camping while leasing
8 Project lands for a commercial orchard to benefit the
9 privileged few. Grant PUD permits the Army to conduct
10 intensive military river-crossing exercises, but limits the
11 public use to conservation recreational standards at the
12 exact same location.

13 At Black Sand Beach, Grant PUD fenced and signed
14 Grant PUD owned land outside the Project boundary. The
15 public must now park on the shoulder of the road for public
16 recreational physical access to the shoreline. An unsafe
17 condition that Grant PUD is fully in its right to create.

18 At Sand Hollow North, Grant PUD fenced and signed
19 more reclamation land outside the project boundary to
20 create the similar unsafe parking conditions for the public
21 like Black Sand Beach, but this time along a major state
22 highway.

23 Below Wanapum Dam, Grant PUD attempted to close
24 down the only public recreational physical access to the
25 Priest Rapids Reservoir from Kittitas County while still

1 maintaining their collocated barge landing for Project
2 operations. At Crab Creek, Grant PUD attempted to close
3 down the one of the few ORV parks located in the State of
4 Washington.

5 At Sunland, a residential community adjacent
6 to the Project, concerning a parcel that could provide
7 public recreational physical access to the Project
8 shoreline. In the draft license application, Grant PUD
9 specifically stated, "Although Grant PUD does own this
10 parcel in fee, that land is not contained within the Priest
11 Rapids Project Boundary and is not the subject of this
12 proceeding." So we have Grant land adjacent to the Project
13 that can provide public access very similar to Black Sand
14 Beach, yet Grant PUD insists it's not part of this
15 proceeding. Currently, Grant PUD permits a community park,
16 a private marina to operate for the exclusive use of the
17 privileged few of the Sunland community along the same
18 shoreline.

19 At the Project Shoreline Community of Vantage,
20 the public is charged an access fee to walk along the Grant
21 PUD-owned Project shoreline. At the Project Shoreline
22 community of Beverly, Grant PUD owns 14 city lots that are
23 inside the Project boundary yet they remain unsigned for
24 public recreational physical access. At the Project
25 Shoreline Community of Desert Aires, Washington State

1 Department of Wildlife commented on a locked gate
2 restricting public recreation, physical access to the boat
3 launch and swim beach. Again, Grant PUD permitted
4 recreational access only for the privileged few of the
5 Desert Aire Community.

6 In the Crab Creek area, the entrance to Burkett
7 Lake remains unsigned for public recreational access. At
8 the Trailrace of Priest Rapids Dam, the public park and the
9 boat ramp were closed to the public and the Trailrace was
10 fenced and gated and restrictions placed on public
11 recreational physical access.

12 The recreational values of the Project have been
13 used for the benefit of the privileged few, wasted and lost
14 through unplanned, undesirable private and commercial
15 development. The conditions of the current license could
16 easily address many of my concerns of public recreational
17 physical access. Today, the public recreational physical
18 access concerns need to be addressed to protect the
19 recreational values for the benefit of all people and
20 future generations. Thank you.

21 CHARLES HALL: Are you going to provide a written
22 version of that?

23 PAT KELLEHER: Yeah.

24 CHARLES HALL: Other speakers? Ken Jacobs?
25 Jesse Palacios?

1 JESSE PALACIOS: Am I next?

2 CHARLES HALL: You're the first on the list here.
3 I didn't organize the speakers very well, I'll have to
4 admit.

5 JESSE PALACIOS: Okay. Thank you very much for
6 being here today. You picked a really, really nice day to
7 be in Eastern Washington. We've had rain and a lot wind
8 lately.

9 The comments I'm going to make are in the spirit
10 of cooperation. I've got two people here from Grant County
11 PUD and we've got a good relationship.

12 Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment
13 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Priest
14 Rapids Project. Specifically, Yakima county submits this
15 as part of its comments pertaining to the socio-economic
16 impacts. The County's position is that the Priest Rapids
17 Projects, collocated in Yakima County, benefits the entire
18 Northwest. And like other regional communities, Grant
19 County PUD has a community responsibility to provide
20 beneficial purposes. Yakima County has not received any
21 particularized benefits as a result of the federal
22 hydropower licenses for the Priest Rapids Dam,
23 notwithstanding that the Dam's presence in Yakima County
24 and the impacts of the Dam on the loss of habitat and
25 development opportunities in those counties.

1 The following are some examples from Washington
2 public power projects that have been supportive of local
3 communities. According to the Chelan County PUD fact
4 sheet, from 1978-1995 that district has spent \$67 million
5 in quality-of-life projects in it's communities. That is
6 in addition to paying its share of annual privilege taxes.
7 Meanwhile, Douglas County PUD has entered into an agreement
8 with the Colville Confederated Tribes for the purposes of
9 addressing socioeconomic impacts to the Tribes. Finally,
10 Tacoma Power has an agreement with Lewis County resulting
11 from the re-licensing process, whereby Tacoma Power
12 contributes annually for beneficial purposes in Lewis
13 County. These are just some of public utilities/government
14 partnerships that have been created for the mutual benefit
15 of the citizenry.

16 Yakima County appreciates that Grant County, as a
17 host community, has enjoyed benefits from Grant PUD.
18 Yakima County is also a significant contributor to Grant
19 County PUD's successful Priest Rapids hydro project. More
20 than one-half of Priest Rapids dam is located in Yakima
21 County; more than half of the reservoir is located in
22 Yakima County; and half of the raw materials, that being
23 water, that provide benefits enjoyed throughout the
24 Northwest flow through Yakima County. This has been a
25 reality for every single minute, every single day for

1 almost 50 years. Yet in spite of this, Yakima County finds
2 itself treated like just another power customer--we get
3 power supplied by PacifiCorp--rather than as a host
4 community, especially compared to the benefits that are
5 described for other communities, counties and entities in
6 the EIS. Yakima County is a significant partner in this
7 project, and we urge both FERC and Grant County PUD
8 commissioners to consider addressing impacts and providing
9 the beneficial support to Yakima County as other PUDs have
10 done with their communities.

11 We'd like to extend an invitation to FERC
12 officials to visit Yakima County to consider this County's
13 role in this successful partnership that we have with Grant
14 County PUD before you reach your October decision.

15 Thank you for your consideration. Please note
16 that Yakima County will also be submitting additional
17 comments prior to the May 2nd deadline. Thank you so much
18 for being here. And this is signed by myself and
19 Commissioners Mike Leita and Mr. Ron Gamanche.

20 CHARLES HALL: Thank you. Well, do we have
21 anybody else who would like to give a statement?

22 NEW SPEAKER: Good afternoon and thank you very
23 much for allowing me to make a couple of comments. I'll be
24 as brief as I can.

25 CHARLES HALL: Will you give us your name?

1 KEN JACOBSON: My name is Ken Jacobson. I'm a
2 developer in Vantage, Washington. I'm developing a motel,
3 and I'm developing a 300-lot recreational second-home
4 development which borders the airstrip site. So the
5 airstrip site is what I have the most concern with.

6 Commissioner Bowen recently explained what was
7 going on over at the boat ramp--with what's going on with
8 the activities that I'm involved with. I think the
9 timeline, which for the airstrip is some 20 years out to do
10 anything with it, and the excuse that's been used as to not
11 put it in a faster or more rapid development process, is
12 that the use wasn't there. Vantage, as a city, has been
13 sitting dormant for the last 20, 30 years. I've always why
14 more activity wasn't happening there.

15 The typical process of permits and zoning, etc,
16 etc. I think I have overcome most of them. We're at the
17 point where, in the next month, we're going to be filing
18 for planning and development. I have the Motel 6 franchise
19 now. The Motel 6, which is quite close to the boat ramp
20 will be up and running, hopefully by April 1st of next
21 year. A fellow by the name of Brian Sockdale, who is a
22 major property owner in Vantage, is also planning on
23 building a 60-unit motel in Vantage. He put a \$2,500
24 deposit with the sewer facility. One of the problems that
25 both Brian and I have as developers of the land is that the

1 sewer capacity there at Vantage is pretty much at capacity
2 during the summer months, when there's high usage, as the
3 Commissioner was talking about. We're going to be looking
4 at increasing the capacity in that sewer facility.

5 But clearly, Vantage is going to come alive with
6 a tremendous amount of people. The use factor will still
7 probably be pretty much a summer usage; but it's very
8 likely with 300 potential homes on the property that I'm
9 going to be selling, that given the Internet connections,
10 the whole computerization of things, that there will be
11 more year-round use in the area. So I think that putting
12 the airstrip properties out some 20 years with
13 approximately a \$9 million price tag, 20 years from now, I
14 don't know what the cost of doing that particular property
15 is going to be. I've already made the presentation, which
16 I'm withdrawing right now, to do a joint but separate
17 venture as far as access to the airstrip site. I have to
18 go on with my project and identify, what I can, as far as
19 what the future of the airstrip is. I've chosen, right
20 now, to withdraw my offer to Grant County PUD to do a joint
21 but separate access, water, sewer, etc., to that site.

22 The single thing that I would like to get out of
23 this hearing is, this is a map--and I've already sent
24 everything that I'm saying before, but I'll go ahead and
25 resubmit it. The plans to develop is clearly using the

1 property that Grant County PUD doesn't own. There was no
2 talk to the previous owner about the access points or
3 easements and that. So, in my view, it's clearly
4 encroachment, this airstrip plan that is in the proposed
5 plan.

6 I've written to both FERC and Grant County PUD,
7 and Grant County PUD does not see it as encroachment. I
8 don't see how else you could identify it; but clearly, I
9 would like to have this particular air-site plan
10 re-evaluated and changed in the final draft. Thank you
11 very much.

12 CHARLES HALL: Thank you.

13 PATTI LEPPERT: My name is Patti Leppert. May I
14 have a copy of that draft?

15 CHARLES HALL: That's the plan that's in the
16 application for that site.

17 PATTIE LEPPERT: Oh, I have this.

18 KEN JACOBSON: You have this. All's I'm showing
19 here is where my property is and where Grant County is
20 planning on using access across my property I'm also
21 putting sites on. It's clear encroachment.

22 CHARLES HALL: So part of that's in the Project
23 boundaries and part is not; is that what you're saying?

24 KEN JACOBSON: Yes.

25 CHARLES HALL: So that the proposed development

1 is partially within the Project boundary and partially
2 outside?

3 KEN JACOBSON: NO, no. I'm clearly on my own
4 side.

5 CHARLES HALL: Okay. Does anybody else care to
6 get on the record at this point in time? Sir?

7 MIKE CONNLEY: I'll do my other half.

8 CHARLES HALL: Okay.

9 MIKE CONNLEY: I'm Mike Connely. I manage the
10 Port of Mattawa. For those of you who have never heard of
11 Mattawa, it's an old Indian word that means, "Where is
12 it?". It's the best...in town. But all I can tell you is
13 drink more Washington wine, because we have a lot of grapes
14 down there.

15 The Port of Mattawa is located in South Grant
16 County and is adjacent to the Columbia River and to the
17 Priest Rapids Project. Here again, we're primarily an
18 ag-based community, with a high Hispanic population. In
19 2004, our unemployment rate was 13.3 percent with over 42
20 percent of the households having income of less than
21 \$30,000. Our area is really dependent upon the successful
22 relicensing of this project. We think that the affordable
23 and stable electric rates will allow our farmers to compete
24 in a worldwide market. These rates also allow us to
25 attract new industries--

1 CHARLES HALL: Do you want to speak up just a
2 little bit?

3 MIKE CONNLEY: --that will offer year-round jobs
4 there. We're looking forward to seeing the industry
5 spread. We think the recreation plan does a lot of things
6 for our part of the area. We look forward to seeing the
7 trail system developed and some of the expansions for
8 recreation purposes which would add a big economic boost
9 to our community.

10 And lastly, what few people have ever talked
11 about is the Wanapum People. The Wanapum people are a
12 valued part of our community. Most of their kids go to
13 school in Mattawa. The area is rich in their heritage.
14 And we really support the PUD's effort in letting them keep
15 their culture alive. We think that's important.

16 Here again, we do question some of the fish
17 dollars, but we do think the PUD has had a good history of
18 river stewardship, and we know it will continue with the
19 new license. We look forward to FERC completing their
20 process here and granting a new license. Thank you.

21 CHARLES HALL: Thank you. Anybody else though of
22 something they would like to add at this point? And if
23 you're really hungry for this type of thing, come back at
24 five o'clock, and we'll see if there's anybody else who
25 didn't make it to today's meeting that would like to come

1 back. Oh--seven o'clock. I got my times mixed. We'll
2 come back at seven o'clock.

3 NEW SPEAKER: You're still on east coast--

4 CHARLES HALL. Yes. Well, we thank you for
5 stopping by and for your comments.

6 (Meeting adjourned until 7 p.m.)

7 CHARLES HALL: Just to open the meeting, our
8 reporter is Valerie. If you would like to make a verbal
9 statement this evening, speak up, give her your name before
10 you speak. My name is Charles Hall, and I'm a civil
11 engineer with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
12 I'm a coordinator of the licensing for the Priest Rapids
13 Project. And this meeting is to solicit comments from the
14 public, interested parties, on the Draft Environmental
15 Impact Statement that we issued in February. The last time
16 we were here, it was two years ago almost to the day, and
17 it was for the purpose of defining the scope of the
18 Environmental Impact Statement and the issues. And we
19 attempted to cover those in this draft document.

20 We'll be issuing a final Environmental Impact
21 Statement later on this summer. After that, the Commission
22 will take action on the application, at a time that is yet
23 unscheduled and there are a number of other things that
24 have to occur and get resolved before the Commission can
25 act on the license application. We're not exactly saying

1 when that will be, but it will be after the final EIS is
2 issued.

3 Again, if you picked up a little brochure at the
4 desk, it has in it information about how to file additional
5 information with us. The comment period ends May 2nd.
6 There's not a long time remaining in the comment period to
7 file written comments, but you can still file written
8 comments on this document, as well as whatever you want to
9 say here this evening.

10 With that--did I leave out anything of
11 importance?

12 ROBERT EASTON: Tell them what we did this
13 morning.

14 CHARLES HALL: We had a meeting like this, of
15 course, this afternoon and before that, we met with the
16 fish management agencies and wildlife management agencies
17 to discuss some differences of opinion, you might say, that
18 we found with some of their recommendations and our
19 recommendations. And so we had a good, I think,
20 constructive meeting this morning and a little bit this
21 afternoon, to discuss those issues, and we'll be issuing a
22 summary of that meeting. That was not recorded verbatim as
23 this testimony will be, but we'll be issuing a summary of
24 that. And we will take into account what was discussed at
25 that meeting in the preparation of our final document.

1 Anybody else? Can you think of anything that I haven't
2 mentioned before we start the testimony here?

3 I think we've all, probably at this point, just
4 about met. I said my name is Chuck Hall. That's Patti
5 Leppert, at the end of the table. She handled the
6 recreation resources and director of resources and
7 socio-economic resources. And then all of you met Frank
8 Winchell. Dr. Winchell is the archeologist on the
9 project. Next to him is Bob Easton. He's the fisheries
10 biologist, and he really handled the meeting this morning,
11 try to resolve these differences with the fish agencies.
12 John Clements is the attorney. He's assigned to this
13 project, and he's very familiar with the project. We're
14 not here to really get involved with a back-and-forth type
15 of exchange but if we do see an opportunity to maybe
16 clarify something, we may attempt to do that. But, other
17 than that, we want to hear from you at this point.

18 And so, with that I will--I'm looking at the
19 wrong list. Is there anybody who would like to go first,
20 that wants to get out of here, not that we'll be here very
21 long with the few speakers that we have; but if there's
22 anybody who has the need or desire to go first we would,
23 you know, just raise your hand. Anybody in particular
24 have, otherwise, I'll just take them as they're on the
25 list. If I do that, I come to Rex Buck, representing the

1 Wanapum. Are you ready, Rex?

2 REX BUCK: Yes.

3 CHARLES HALL: Okay. Come on up.

4 REX BUCK: Speak up there?

5 CHARLES HALL: Yes. You know, if you're more
6 comfortable, because you're so close, whatever you want to
7 do. We've have to sure of the speaker here so--

8 REX BUCK: Is that what this is for?

9 COURT REPORTER: Yes.

10 REX BUCK: Pretty large crowd tonight. My name
11 is Rex Buck, Junior. I'm with the Priest Rapids. I live
12 at Priest Rapids, and I'm with the Wanapum. Tonight, I
13 just want to come to the meeting here. And I thank the
14 staff of the Commission from the Federal Energy Regulatory
15 Commission that they could come here and listen to our
16 concerns and thoughts to the Draft Environmental Impact
17 Statement that was issued here recently.

18 The Wanapum--I'd just like to maybe go through a
19 little history for the record. The Wanapum have been here
20 for hundreds and thousands of years. This is our land, all
21 of this land here where the Priest Rapids Project and the
22 area is that surrounds it and has what's referred to today,
23 also has the area for potential effect for the Project.
24 All of these areas are Wanapum land, have been, is, and
25 will always be in our hearts and in our minds. There's

1 much oral history, much oral knowledge that we hold to our
2 traditional teachings of the way we live, the way we
3 conduct ourselves as being a part of the land, but also a
4 part of the river and the resources that we use for
5 day-to-day living as well as our lifetime, from one
6 generation to the next.

7 Today, back when David Thompson came up the
8 river, he met Wanapum at Priest Rapids, and it's recorded
9 in his journals. That was probably some of the earliest
10 documentation of meeting some of the people from this
11 particular area known as Priest Rapids today. And later
12 on, Lewis and Clark came up the river from the Snake, and
13 they also met Wanapum down by the Yakima River. They
14 didn't come all the way up the Priest Rapids, but they came
15 up the Yakima. And they recorded, they were known as
16 S'Koulk, they recorded in the journals of Lewis and Clark.

17 At that time, because of the desolation of this
18 land here, what we're talking about, there was nobody that
19 was really interested in this land. But the Wanapum took
20 care of this land, survived on this land because we had for
21 centuries and generation upon generation. So everything is
22 here for us. Everything that we needed. Whatever we
23 needed was here, provided to us by what is to our beliefs
24 and that's how we take care of it. We use what we need
25 without taking more than what we need. We only use what we

1 need so that we can survive on.

2 During all that time, as time has come forward,
3 there was many impacts to the Wanapum. There was--some of
4 the main ones was some of the big ranches that came in, you
5 know, but yet the Wanapum got along with the ranchers that
6 came in, big sheep ranches, and cattle, and other things,
7 big farmers, and got along with them. And there was enough
8 land that they allowed them to continue to live there
9 because by then, it had came down to a handful of Wanapum
10 that maintained their lives at Priest Rapids because of the
11 importance and sacredness of this land.

12 Today, as we moved in to what I call "today",
13 which is really my grandfather's time, my father's time,
14 and my time, there was the Manhattan Project that came,
15 which was the Hanford Atomic Energy Commission Project,
16 which took away some of our area that we fished in and
17 hunted in and gathered our food and medicine. In addition
18 to that, there was the Yakima Training Center, which is a
19 big Army facility that came on to train. And they took
20 away some more of our horse-grazing areas and other areas.
21 And then it came down to where we were basically in corner.
22 You might say, as I stand here, I'm kind of in a corner
23 here, and that would have been all our land out there. But
24 we kind of ended up in the corner, which was present day
25 Priest Rapids.

1 And at that time, the Federal Power Commission
2 authorized licensee to explore putting up a project here
3 after the federal dam--federal, excuse me, put up a project
4 here. So it went out, and I believe through Congressional
5 action and other actions, they allowed exploratory, to do a
6 license for a licensee, in this case being Grant County
7 Public Utility District. And that license moved forward.
8 It was the last homesite of the Wanapum. It was the last
9 place that they had left where they could still maintain
10 and perpetuate the culture, the traditions, the beliefs of
11 all the people.

12 And because the Wanapum has a long history of not
13 being a war with anybody, the United States, to say that
14 they were at war. They didn't sign the Treaty of 1855 of
15 Governor Issac Stevens, I believe, which is referred to as
16 the Steven's Treaty, which didn't allow them to
17 participate. Today, it's called the Treaties of Those
18 Times because they never believed they were at war with the
19 United States. They didn't believe they were at war with
20 anybody. And they didn't want any kind of trouble. They
21 didn't want any kind of hard feelings because our strong
22 belief to where we live is very sacred. Where we conduct
23 our ceremonies and the things that we do, the sounds that
24 we make through our speech and language, the sounds that we
25 make through the songs that we sing interpret many things

1 of this land and the river and the resources that are here.

2 And because we take care of those things, it's
3 not for us to shed blood or have a feeling, bad feeling, to
4 anybody or anything. We have to take care of them this
5 way. And that knowledge has been passed down from
6 generation to generation. And it's all unwritten, the
7 majority of it is unwritten. There is some written in some
8 books, one of them being Drummers and Dreamers by Click
9 Releanderin. And some of them in different areas, Dr.
10 Rubin Brown books, and a few of them in other books. But
11 the majority of it is all oral. It's taught directly from
12 grandfather to grandson, from father to son to grandson;
13 the same way on the ladies' side, from the women, from the
14 elders to the grandchildren. And to take care of it.

15 And we're standing here today to kind of think
16 about, what does that mean? What that means is that we
17 know that change is taking place, as our grandfather knew,
18 and as our parents knew. They couldn't speak, know the
19 English. They couldn't read or write when the Project was
20 conceived. They didn't know how to read. When someone
21 came to talk to them, they had to have interpreters. They
22 still lived in two-room mat houses. They still lived off
23 the land. They didn't live in wooden houses. They were
24 still living in mat houses at that time and travelling from
25 place to place to gather the things that they needed. So,

1 you know, they relied upon their friends. They relied upon
2 the general public, because they had no resources. They
3 didn't have monetary things, monetary--money to go out and
4 do anything.

5 But they had a strong belief in what they took
6 care of. And they had good friends, people that they could
7 go to and they could sit down and not talk with their
8 mouths and their minds, but they could talk with their
9 heart to one another to make them understand how sacred and
10 how important this land was, and why they must be a part of
11 his land and continue to be a part of it so that the
12 resources might be maintained and that the resources might
13 take care of themselves. Because there's many things, as
14 you know, that you don't understand, even scientifically,
15 how water affects things, how the natural things come the
16 way they are. But through the interpretation of the things
17 that we do, we believe that our existence at Priest Rapids
18 is one thing that has sustained some of the resources that
19 have dwindled and became extinct in other places.

20 If you think today about the Hanford region, a
21 prime example is the salmon, one of the last, strongest
22 stock of Fall Chinook salmon on the Columbia River. Why is
23 that Wanapum land still has the strongest genes and the
24 strongest stock? Because the Wanapum are here. The
25 Wanapum are doing their part in recognition to our

1 brothers, the salmon, still continuing to maintain that
2 cycle and that communication that we have with the salmon
3 through the things that we do so that salmon might be able
4 to sustain itself.

5 In addition to that, we know that it does require
6 science, it does require other things because of the
7 impacts that are taking place. And so, we believe that
8 because of our existence at Priest Rapids, they're what
9 makes it strong today. And as I'm standing here talking to
10 you, you guys, we see the change. We knew when there was
11 hardly nothing here in my grandfather's time. We knew it
12 in my father's time when they traveled by canoe, and they
13 fished, and they hunted and gathered their things.

14 In my time there was, there was--today, at Priest
15 Rapids, there was no Desert Aire. There was no farms out
16 there. There was no Royal Slope. There was hardly any
17 Royal City. It was just coming to be, gigantic farms.
18 Moses Lake was a small, smaller than it is today. So we've
19 seen change, and we know change is coming. But we believe
20 that you have to accept that change because our grandfather
21 had the wisdom to know and the knowledge to know through
22 our teaching that you and I must get along. You must come
23 to some understanding to one another. We must listen with
24 our hearts, and we must talk to one another with our
25 hearts. That way, we can work things out. Because you

1 have children, I have children, we have grandchildren, and
2 we'll have great grandchildren, and they'll be some yet
3 unborn that are still coming. We'll all be gone, and we
4 still must get along because that's important for each one
5 of us to live the way we need to live.

6 And that's what brings me to the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement, where we're at today. That
8 there needs to be something within the license that would
9 be granted to the licensee that would permit and perpetuate
10 the Wanapum to continue to be able to maintain and
11 perpetuate their culture, their traditions and their
12 beliefs. So that we would be able to stand with our voice
13 and our identity, not anybody else's, but our own as the
14 original license, I believe, Article 42, in the original
15 license, Article 43 and Article 11, I believe all are of
16 the original license--are all part of the concerns, direct
17 concerns and direct issues of the Wanapum. Because we were
18 the ones directly impacted. We were, are, and always will
19 be, because we still live here. We never left. We never
20 went to any reservation or anything. We stayed here
21 because this land is important to us. So with that, you
22 know, I could probably talk more; but I know that you know
23 there's things that we'll be sending through letter to the
24 staff, through the process here, to ask that the staff in
25 the final EIS and recommendations to the Commission for a

1 new license, to ask that through this letter that we will
2 be sending that they might reconsider and look at things in
3 the way that we can be comfortable and have a good heart
4 and have a good mind so that we know our children might not
5 have to worry about some of these things. Because things
6 are going to change.

7 I'm not always going to be here. All of you are
8 not always going to be here. And it needs to be clear
9 enough so that it's understood that you can, and the
10 realization that it needs to always be good so that things
11 can continue. And that's what's important to us, today.
12 And that's why I'm here to speak and let the Commission
13 staff know that we ask that we have something that we can
14 be comfortable with and that they can give that in a good
15 way.

16 So that's, I think, all I want to say here
17 tonight. And the rest, we'll be sending through written
18 comments by or before--I believe the application said May
19 2nd and that's what we'll do. So, I thank each one of you
20 guys for your time to listen, your time to come here
21 tonight. This is a very important issue for the Wanapums
22 of Priest Rapids, and I thank your Commission staff to come
23 out here and listen to the concerns, not only to us, but to
24 the other ones that are making comments. And as the
25 comments come in, that you look at that and consider in the

1 most positive way.

2 I believe that what my grandfather said in one of
3 his speeches when the license was originally issued, he
4 said I should not be troubled or mad over what is
5 happening. He says because we live today by the light,
6 which is the sun. And each one of us receives that light,
7 and each one of us has that light that warms our body and
8 takes care of this land and the resources that are here.
9 You must get along, and you must continue to get along.
10 And today, I want to be that way. I want my children to be
11 that way so we can always talk to one another and have a
12 way to communicate. So this is what's good for us. This
13 is what's good for each one of us.

14 I know there's a lot of hard work that went in to
15 get to the draft EIS, and I know there's more work that's
16 coming. And I just hope you listened to what I had to say
17 and consider some of the points as you move forward in the
18 Project. That's all I have. Thank you.

19 CHARLES HALL: Thank you very much. All right.
20 Mr. Culbertson?

21 TIM CULBERTSON: Rex, before I get started, I
22 want to say, thank you for your comments. Now you've got
23 your son and grandson here. You and I are about the same
24 age. But how is it your grandson is in the same class as
25 my son's in? I think there's something going on there. I

1 haven't figured it out.

2 Good evening. My name is Tim Culbertson. I am
3 the General Manager of Grant County PUD. Grant PUD built,
4 owns and operates the Priest Rapids. I'd like to express
5 our gratitude to FERC staff for this opportunity to
6 comment. Grant PUD recognizes that the challenge
7 relicensing is to address energy and resource issues for
8 the future. While I make general comments on the draft EIS
9 this evening, Grant PUD will submit its formal written
10 comments to FERC on or before May 2, 2005.

11 Grant PUD submitted in Final License Application
12 to FERC in October 2003, seeking a new 50-year license to
13 continue operating the Priest Rapids Project. The measures
14 proposed by Grant PUD optimize the amount of low-cost power
15 produced at the dams, while expanding efforts to enhance
16 conditions for fish, other natural resources and
17 recreational opportunities along the river.

18 Grant PUD manages the Mid-Columbia Hourly
19 Coordination agreement to provide for moment-by-moment
20 coordination of the seven federal and nonfederal
21 hydroelectric projects on the mid-Columbia River. Much of
22 the power generated at the Priest Rapids Project and
23 coordinated by Grant PUD is sold to other Northwest
24 utilities, so the cost of the power from Grant PUD's dams
25 benefits millions of homes and businesses across the entire

1 region. The Priest Rapids Project alone generates enough
2 renewable power to power the city the size of Seattle. And
3 I think another thing to note is that these seven projects
4 provide all the flexibility for the entire Northwest
5 region.

6 And as you look forward to the future, one of the
7 generation sources of the future that people are looking to
8 is a renewable source, which is wind. If you look at the
9 capacity of a wind generator, it's about 30 percent. We
10 need a firming resource. Guess what resources are looked
11 at to firm that wind for the entire Northwest. It's these
12 seven projects that are looking for firm all of the wind
13 that's proposed for the Northwest.

14 Hydropower is a domestic source of renewable,
15 reliable, and affordable electricity with plays an
16 important role in our nation's energy strategy. With more
17 than 21,000 megawatts of hydroelectric capacity, Washington
18 State is the largest producer of hydropower in the nation.

19 For the people of Grant County, a rural,
20 predominately agricultural region, the Priest Rapids
21 Projects their greatest asset. Serving 76,400 people in a
22 2,700 square mile area, Grant PUD is the sole provider of
23 power to the people of the county. Power generation is
24 vitally important to Grant County where farmers produce
25 over 60 different crops, and four out of ten workers are

1 employed either directly or indirectly within our
2 agricultural industry. New industries are coming to Grant
3 county, diversifying our economy and providing job
4 opportunities in our communities. Affordable, reliable
5 energy is our local quality of life.

6 Public power is an important American
7 institution, and we at Grant County PUD are very proud to
8 be part of this heritage. From large cities to fields and
9 farms, wherever public power exists, it's an expression of
10 an American ideal that places citizens in control. Each
11 public power system is different, reflecting local
12 characteristics and values, but all have a common purpose,
13 to provide reliable and safe not-for-profit electricity at
14 a reasonable cost while protecting the environment.

15 In operating Priest Rapids and Wanapum dams,
16 Grant PUD continually works to minimize negative effects.
17 Underlying our effort is the ongoing pursuit of more
18 effective measures for the protection, mitigation and
19 enhancement of salmon, steelhead and other resources.
20 Grant PUD and others in the hydropower industry have, for
21 many years, pursued a variety of measures including new
22 technologies to further reduce hydropower's impacts. A
23 great example is the new advanced turbines currently being
24 installed at Wanapum Dam.

25 Over the last decade, Grant PUD has invested

1 nearly \$500 million in salmon protection efforts. These
2 efforts have paid off in solutions that, over the years,
3 have contributed to strong returns of Chinook salmon and
4 steelhead. The additional commitment represented in Grant
5 PUD'S Final License Application will increase the cost of
6 power generated at Wanapum and Priest Rapids, though it
7 will remain less costly than alternative sources of energy
8 in the region.

9 Making these protection and stewardship efforts
10 possible are Grant County PUD ratepayers and other utility
11 customers who buy power from the Priest Rapids Project.
12 Approximately 30 percent of the costs paid for electricity
13 by citizens throughout the Northwest can be traced back to
14 efforts to protect salmon and other fish. Programs at
15 Grant County PUD have been, and will continue to be based
16 on the best available science. We are proud of our
17 successes.

18 The measures contemplated in the new Priest
19 Rapids License Term will commit these ratepayers to
20 expenditures of nearly \$800 million for advanced design
21 turbines, natural resource protection and enhancement,
22 cultural resource management, and recreational improvements
23 over the next license term. These new programs are in
24 addition to the hundreds of millions spent over the last
25 decade, and the ongoing programs that will be continued.

1 In addition to protection and stewardship issues,
2 Grant PUD also places great emphasis on our cultural
3 resource issues at the Priest Rapids Project. The
4 relationship between Grant County PUD and the Wanapum
5 Indians has spanned more than a half century of change.
6 The Wanapum have remained true to their desire to occupy
7 their ancestral village site and to practice their religion
8 and traditional ways. Grant PUD has respected their wishes
9 to do so.

10 The relationship has grown and changed as the
11 Wanapum have shared their cultural values, their deep
12 appreciation of the land, water, and fish and cultural
13 resources that abound throughout the project area. In
14 response, Grant PUD managers, Commission and staff have
15 listened, learned and done what they believe to be right.
16 The benefits of this relationship unfold with each
17 generation and stand as an example for others to follow.
18 And when Rex says he speaks from his heart, I find that to
19 be true. I've developed my relationship with Rex over the
20 last couple of years, and I find that he does speak from
21 his heart as he says.

22 Grant PUD has a strong record of stewardship--the
23 river, the land, the environment and the public use it
24 supports. We will continue to work with agencies, tribes
25 and others to refine our resource management programs

1 during the new license term. As FERC moves towards its
2 final decisions on Priest Rapids Project relicensing,
3 future generations of Northwest citizens can be assured
4 that Grant PUD will continue to be a responsible manager of
5 the Priest Rapids Project resources while generating
6 low-cost hydroelectric power for decades to come.

7 Thank you very much for your time and for your
8 efforts to be here. We appreciate it. Thank you very
9 much.

10 CHARLES HALL: Pat Kelleher.

11 PAT KELLEHER: Thank you for the opportunity to
12 speak tonight. My name is Pat Kelleher. I'm representing
13 myself. And what I would like to share with the FERC staff
14 tonight is what I consider the ten--what I would write as
15 the ten recreational projects that I would do, if I had my
16 preference. The waiting that I'd put on them is, what
17 would give the public the greatest recreational benefit, be
18 most effective for Grant County's PUD's monies spent, lower
19 their operation and maintenance budget expenses in the
20 future, and let the public enjoy their work.

21 The issues at Crescent Bar will be resolved
22 elsewhere. The extension at the state park boat ramp has
23 happened. The Sunland boat ramp extension has happened.
24 So the number one that I always come back to as the number
25 one recreational improvement with the greatest effect would

1 be to resolve the vehicle access at the airport site and
2 turn that into--I would go in a different direction.
3 Instead of a camping, I would increase it to a high
4 recreational priority. It would be my number one priority.
5 And instead of a camping-type setup, I would gear it
6 towards a seasonal day-use park.

7 And in conjunction with that, would be the trail
8 from the airport to the Wanapum State Park. And I think
9 those two things in conjunction, would provide, at very low
10 cost, recreational improvements that would be unmatched as
11 to physical beauty. And you could pull people off I-90,
12 park their car, send their kids on the trail, go pick them
13 up at the Wanapum State Park and then go back on to grandpa
14 and grandma's house or wherever. It would be a stopping
15 point as the public transits Washington State.

16 The second recreational improvement I would do
17 would be the Huntzinger Road boat ramp improvement which is
18 below Wanapum dam. The high usage, I'm not a fisherman,
19 but I know a lot of fishermen. It's a high-usage area
20 throughout the season, and it really needs improving.

21 The third thing I would do would be the Priest
22 Rapids Tailrace boat ramp. Now Grant has committed to
23 funding in the Bonita Bridge area. The Bonita Bridge area
24 is outside the project boundary, so really, not part of
25 this proceeding. If the consensus is to put the boat ramp

1 in that area, then I would strongly encourage FERC to put a
2 remote project out there year round to ensure the funding,
3 survivability, durability, the construction to FERC
4 recreational standards, which I consider to be of the
5 highest recreational standards anywhere.

6 The fourth, and this is where money for the
7 project, it's a huge project, the scale of the project is
8 unmatched. So millions of dollars, it's a lot of money,
9 but in context to the project, it doesn't increase the cost
10 of the kilowatt very much. And that would be the decking
11 of the Beverly Bridge. That would connect the John Wayne
12 Trail, which you can start in Green Lake in Seattle, and
13 walk all the way to the shores of the Columbia River. You
14 can cross the Columbia River on the bridge, and then
15 continue on the Milwaukee Road. The Milwaukee Road to the
16 border of Idaho isn't as contiguous, that have some issues,
17 but it get's that connection done. And the project is the
18 only viable source to fund this expenditure. I mean, there
19 has been a lot of talk, but when it comes down to having
20 the money to make it happen, the Project is the one to do
21 it. In conjunction with that would be a trail head in the
22 town of Beverly so people can park off the highway, get
23 their kids out of the car, walk across the bridge which
24 would be exciting thing, you know, to stop and do. Get
25 back in their car and go on. And it would also coordinate

1 the Crab Creek Trail improvements as kind of a focal point.
2 I think the Crab Creek/Beverly area potentially, with the
3 extensive fly fishing lakes, the ... Plant improvements at
4 Burkett, the RV park, the DNR lands really will make that
5 area a recreational gold mine for the town and not with
6 much dollars and cents.

7 My fifth thing that I would do would be the boat
8 extension and extension of the Vantage boat ramp. I would
9 extend the project boundary around Kittitas County land and
10 increase the parking there and also extension to all
11 reservoir levels.

12 The sixth would be the Desert Aire improvements
13 that are planned.

14 The seventh would be the Huntzinger Road fishing
15 pier.

16 The eighth and--I mean, it's state park's issue.
17 It's a Grant PUD issue. As a person from the public and
18 experienced the State giving back seven river front parks
19 in 2001. They gave them back to their owners. They
20 implemented, quite recently, a \$5 access fee but this year,
21 they suspended it. So now, they were used to the revenue
22 to take care of their parks. They had to give back parks
23 because they couldn't maintain them. And now, they've
24 taken the revenue stream away again. So to ensure that the
25 Wanapum State Park isn't on the chopping block and the

1 funding is assured, I think the Project should fund it.
2 And the best way to assure that for future generations is
3 to wrap the project boundary up to Huntzinger Road around
4 the park. And I would also include Black Sands Beach and
5 manage that area as one unit. And as demand--you start to
6 need more camping in the project, expand it there at
7 Wanapum where you've fixed costs, you already have your
8 ranger; to add 50 more sites, it's a marginal cost. You
9 have the capital costs, but the marginal operation costs
10 are negligible as compared to opening up another site.

11 My ninth recommendation would be the Apricot
12 Orchard boat launch and a nature trail along that
13 shoreline.

14 And my tenth, which personally for me is my
15 favorite place to take my family is Sand Hollow South. And
16 the reason I put it tenth instead of first is because I
17 think that Grant PUD has it on the right program right now.
18 There's a parking lot that at it's maximum can handle 200
19 cars. Currently, because of the Gorge concerts schedule,
20 they enjoy camping in that area in that format. Okay. And
21 the area can handle that. It just needs to be--the trails
22 need to be hardened. The sites need to be hardened. It
23 needs to be picked up. But as to, you know, one of the
24 truly outstanding areas of the project is Sand Hollow
25 South. If you get an opportunity, want to the end beach

1 and you'll know what I'm talking about. Thank you very
2 much.

3 CHARLES HALL: Thank you. That's all--another
4 speaker?

5 RON SAWYER: My name is Ron Sawyer. I own
6 Cascade marina. We have one store in Pasco, Washington and
7 one store in Moses Lake, Washington. My reason for being
8 here tonight is that I would like to speak in favor of
9 continuing the PUD's association with the fish hatchery,
10 Columbia Basin Hatchery. I noticed in the draft EIS, it
11 says something to the effect that there's nothing necessary
12 here, indicating perhaps that the Federal Energy Regulatory
13 Commission doesn't feel it's appropriate for the PUD to be
14 involved in that any more. And I just wanted to point out
15 a couple of things.

16 Number one, our association with the fishermen in
17 the Tri-Cities area, from that association I can tell you
18 that there's thousands of trips generated for salmon,
19 steelhead and sturgeon up to Priest Rapids dam. When you
20 get up above that, fishing opportunities in those two pools
21 above Priest and Wanapum are very limited. In the draft
22 EIS, it says that they feel the most appropriate
23 contribution from the PUD would be in Burkett Lake and the
24 lower Crab Creek area. That's a 74-acre lake, and I don't
25 see how anybody could possibly generate that kind of impact

1 that the Columbia Basin Hatchery has, which supplied trout
2 for actually three-quarters of Washington State, how that
3 much mitigation could occur just on a 74-acre lake in
4 Burkett. And, I've noticed also that the PUD has indicated
5 that they feel it's appropriate for them to support the
6 Columbia Basin Hatchery, and I appreciate that thought from
7 the PUD. Thank you.

8 CHARLES HALL: Thank you. Is there anyone else
9 who would like to make a statement?

10 CLAYTON BUCK: My name is Clayton Buck. I'm the
11 son of Rex Buck. And I just want to say the words that he
12 said are very true. And we do pass on our oral traditions.
13 And that the Wanapum and Priest Rapids dams are in areas
14 that we consider very sacred to us. My son over there, I
15 know I probably won't be around the next time we're sitting
16 in a setting like this, so that's why I brought my son
17 along, so that way he gets an early start.

18 But I just want to let you guys know that
19 everything he said is true. That we are Wanapum. We are
20 from Priest Rapids. We'll always be in Priest Rapids.
21 We've been there before I was born and before I was thought
22 of. We're here now. My son is going be here and his
23 children and his grandchildren will still be here. And
24 we'll still be practicing our ways, doing our ceremonies.

25 And I just want to appreciate the Grant PUD for

1 allowing me to work inside the dams, taking care of the
2 dams because that's part of our agreement, too. The dams
3 will take care of us as long as we take care of the dams.
4 And I just want to say that working along with the PUD and
5 the Wanapum, just like Tim said, is very, very true. We
6 work close. They're good stewards. They listen to us. We
7 listen to them. We talk with open minds and open hearts.
8 And I think we get along very well. And it's very
9 important that us as Wanapum people have a special place in
10 the license. And that's all I have to say.

11 CHARLES HALL: Thank you very much. I want to
12 thank you all for coming and--a small group, a few
13 speakers, but all heartfelt. And I think that aspect of it
14 makes it very helpful and useful to us. So we will--we've
15 got our work cut out for us now. We'll try and go back and
16 issue a final EIS here, within two or three months. If you
17 have any further comments you want to put on the record, we
18 invite you to do so; hopefully, between now and May 2nd.
19 If there's nothing else anybody wants to say, we'll adjourn
20 the meeting.

21 (Meeting adjourned at 7:50p.m.)

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

I, Valerie R. Allard, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 27th day of April, 2006.

Signature Expiration Date