

 ORIGINAL

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

FERC Project Nos. 2662-009 & P-12968-000  
Scotland Hydroelectric Project

Continued Scoping Meeting held at  
Windham Town Hall, 979 Main Street,  
Willimantic, Connecticut, on November 20,  
2007, beginning at 8:49 a.m.

Department of Energy  
Washington, D.C. 20585

2008 JAN -2 A 10:12

FILED  
OFFICE OF THE  
SECRETARY



**UNITED  
REPORTERS**

UNITED REPORTERS, INC., 43 Woodland Street, Suite 200, Hartford, Connecticut 06105  
Toll-free Phone 866-534-3383, Toll-free Fax 877-534-3383 info@unitedreporters.com www.unitedreporters.com

1 A p p e a r a n c e s :

2 For Federal Energy Regulatory

3 Commission:

4 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY

5 COMMISSION

6 888 First Street, N.E., Room 63-11

7 Washington, D.C. 20426

8 By: ALLAN E. CREAMER

9 SARAH FLORENTINO

10

11 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

12 888 First Street, N.E.

13 Washington, D.C. 20426

14 By: MICHAEL R. PINCUS, ESQ.

15

16 For Norwich Public Utilities:

17 NORWICH PUBLIC UTILITIES

18 16 South Golden Street

19 Norwich, Connecticut 06360

20 By: JOHN F. BILDA

21

22 ALBANY ENGINEERING CORPORATION

23 5 Washington Square

24 Albany, New York 12205

25 By: JAMES A. BESHA

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

[www.unitedreporters.com](http://www.unitedreporters.com)

Nationwide - 866-534-3383 - Toll Free

1 A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.):

2 For First Light:

3 ROBERT GATES

4

5 Also present:

6 JAMES GIBSON

7 THOMAS MACLURE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. FLORENTINO: Let's go  
2 ahead and get started. I know some of you  
3 are filling out the sign-up sheet. I would  
4 like to have a record of everyone who is  
5 here. Welcome everyone to the Scotland  
6 scoping meeting number two.

7 So first I'd like to introduce  
8 myself for those of you who don't know me  
9 yet. My name is Sarah Florentino. I'm an  
10 environmental biologist with FERC, or the  
11 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. And  
12 I'd like to introduce my associates here from  
13 FERC. Today we have Allan Creamer, who's in  
14 the back helping with the sign-up sheet, and  
15 also Michael Pincus. Allan specializes in  
16 fisheries and aquatic resources, and he also  
17 serves as senior technical expert. And  
18 Michael is one of the attorneys assigned to  
19 the Scotland Hydroelectric Project.

20 As we begin, I'd like to take  
21 care of a few administrative items. First,  
22 again, I'd like to make sure everyone signs  
23 in. Also on the table over here by the door  
24 you'll find copies of the scoping document,  
25 if you don't already have one. It was mailed

1 out last month so some of you may have gotten  
2 it in the mail. There's also some other  
3 information, including the agenda for the  
4 meeting, a guide book to the Commission's  
5 integrated licensing process. It's called  
6 "Ideas for Implementing and Participating in  
7 the ILP," and a few copies also of the Final  
8 Rule and Tribal Policy Statement for July 23,  
9 2003. There's also a brochure with  
10 instructions on accessing filings for the  
11 record and also submitting documents for the  
12 record for this proceeding. All of the  
13 handouts are also available on our web site,  
14 which is [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov). I think we have  
15 plenty of copies, so I'm not worried if you  
16 want to take an extra along with you. It  
17 will lighten our suitcases on the way home.

18 Second, we have a Court  
19 Reporter here to record your input. The  
20 transcript of this meeting will become part  
21 of the record upon which the Commission will  
22 rely to make its decisions on the  
23 application. So in order to develop an  
24 accurate record of this meeting, please  
25 clearly identify yourself if you plan to make

1 any statements. If you have any written  
2 comments, you may submit them to the Court  
3 Reporter for inclusion in the record.

4 As you are aware, there are  
5 two applicants for the Scotland project. In  
6 the interest of clarity when commenting  
7 during the scoping meetings or providing  
8 written comments, please specify if your  
9 comments refer exclusively to either  
10 FirstLight or Norwich Public Utilities'  
11 proposals or if your comments pertain to both  
12 proposals.

13 In addition, at this stage in  
14 the process we are not discussing the merits  
15 of the applicants' proposals. Instead, we  
16 will focus our discussion on understanding  
17 the applicants' proposals and any potential  
18 effects of the proposed actions and any  
19 potential information or study needs.

20 Finally in the interest of  
21 keeping the meeting moving along, we will  
22 maintain a list of issues that we might need  
23 to bring up in a meeting in the future,  
24 perhaps a study plan meeting. However, I  
25 will stop for quick question and answer

1 breaks if there's any questions people have  
2 to clarify the points that were raised.

3 So, why we are here today.

4 The Commission's staff conducts scoping to  
5 identify potential environmental effects,  
6 issues, concerns and opportunities associated  
7 with the proposed action and alternatives.  
8 We elaborate on this purpose in Section 2.1  
9 of the scoping document. Additionally, the  
10 stakeholders in an ILP or integrated  
11 licensing process, including the Commission  
12 staff, will use scoping to help identify  
13 information and study needs that ultimately  
14 will be used to develop operational and  
15 environmental recommendations. If any of you  
16 are familiar with licensing of other hydro  
17 power projects and the traditional scoping  
18 needs, you will know that Commission staff  
19 usually stand up at the front and go through  
20 the resource issues and then ask for comments  
21 then we all go home.

22 The scoping needs of the ILP  
23 is designed to be more interactive. The ILP  
24 regulations outline certain purposes for  
25 scoping which include initiate scoping of

1 issues; review and discuss existing  
2 conditions and resource management  
3 objectives; review and discuss existing  
4 information and make a preliminary  
5 determination of information and study needs;  
6 review, discuss and finalize the process plan  
7 and discuss cooperating with agency staff.

8           So as you may know, we  
9 established the integrated licensing process  
10 in July of 2003. FirstLight and Norwich  
11 Public Utilities are among about 30 other  
12 applicants who use the integrating licensing  
13 process to date. As part of the new ILPs,  
14 license applicants must file a preapplication  
15 document, or PAD, when they file their notice  
16 of intent, or NOI. Both applicants from the  
17 Scotland project submitted their PADs on  
18 August 30, 2007.

19           The PAD provides the starting  
20 point for the ILPs. It summarizes the  
21 available environmental information and known  
22 project impacts sufficiently enough to enable  
23 the license participants to define issues and  
24 study needs very early in the process. It  
25 also serves as the basis for our scoping

1 document and forms the foundation of the  
2 environmental analysis.

3 Part of the scoping process is  
4 to get agency input regarding the adequacy of  
5 the applicants' PADs. Both FirstLight's and  
6 Norwich Public Utilities' PADs must stand  
7 alone. If stakeholders feel that there are  
8 gaps in information in either PAD, please so  
9 state during the comment period at the end of  
10 my presentation or file written comments with  
11 the Commission.

12 The key to the ILP process is  
13 early participation by all. Unlike the  
14 traditional process used to license projects,  
15 FERC staff is involved from the very  
16 beginning. We scope the projects within 90  
17 days of receiving the NOI, and the study plan  
18 is developed within the first six to eight  
19 months. Because the ILP is a schedule-driven  
20 process, the first six months to a year is  
21 busy for the stakeholders. Scoping comments,  
22 study requests and study plan development are  
23 all required to be completed within the first  
24 year after the NOIs. To keep on track there  
25 is a process plan and a schedule established

1 by and for all parties, including FERC staff,  
2 with a time frame for each step in the pre  
3 and postfiling stages. The prefiling stage  
4 represents the time prior to FirstLight and  
5 Norwich Public Utilities submitting license  
6 applications, which are due on August 31,  
7 2010.

8 This slide provides a very  
9 broad overview of the ILP. The ILP is very  
10 structured, and there's a lot to do in the  
11 first year. Activities include developing a  
12 PAD, conducting the scoping and refining the  
13 process plan and working out studies. This  
14 is followed by one or two years of  
15 Commission-approved studies, reporting on  
16 those studies, and developing a license  
17 application. All these efforts are designed  
18 to develop a sufficient record such that the  
19 Commission can complete its licensing process  
20 before license expiration.

21 Before I discuss the process  
22 plan for the Scotland project, does anyone  
23 have any questions to help clarify the  
24 process of scoping or background information  
25 on the integrated licensing process? Again,

1 we have a guidebook over here on the table.  
2 If you're not really sure what the integrated  
3 licensing process is, this would be a good  
4 one to pick out. It's very reader friendly.

5 So the process plan is  
6 essentially a schedule. It details for  
7 everyone when information is needed. To  
8 represent the process plan we have developed  
9 a schematic time line that shows the  
10 activities that occur before the filing of  
11 license applications. The activities include  
12 scoping, study plan development, conducting  
13 of studies and developing environmental  
14 protection measures. One thing I cannot  
15 stress enough is that the first year of the  
16 process plan is very busy for all  
17 stakeholders, and the dates by which the  
18 information is needed come up fast. The key  
19 to the ILP is early participation.

20 Today's scoping meeting is  
21 very important because it is designed to  
22 provide insight into any information gaps and  
23 to review, discuss and finalize the process  
24 plan and schedule. The process plan, which  
25 will be described further in the following

1 slides, is also available in Appendix A of  
2 the scoping document. During the comment  
3 period you will have an opportunity to  
4 comment on the process plan. Comments on the  
5 scoping document, the Applicants' PADs as  
6 well as request for studies must be filed by  
7 the participants, including Commission staff,  
8 by December 31, 2007. Study requests should  
9 address each of the criteria set out in the  
10 regulations which I will present momentarily.

11 So here again is my schematic  
12 of the Scotland project process plan focusing  
13 on just the initial steps. Prior to filing  
14 their NOI and PAD, the applicants identified  
15 and contacted potential stakeholders. The  
16 applicants also gathered all recently  
17 available information about the existing  
18 project facilities' operation and the  
19 existing environmental conditions. The  
20 applicants then compiled the information and  
21 incorporated it into their PADs. Applicants  
22 then filed their PADs and NOIs with the  
23 Commission.

24 To reiterate, if anyone knows  
25 of relevant information to this project that

1 hasn't been identified, please point it out  
2 when I open the floor for stakeholder  
3 comments or submit the information to the  
4 Commission in written format. I will be  
5 providing instructions on filing written  
6 comments at the end of the presentation.

7           During the scoping process  
8 Commission staff conducts scoping meetings to  
9 identify issues of concern. Typically the  
10 applicants consult with other parties to  
11 define the process plan and schedule. In  
12 this case there were two process plans, one  
13 from FirstLight and one from Norwich Public  
14 Utilities. Some of the activity deadlines  
15 did not match up. So the FERC staff needs to  
16 process these applications together. We  
17 developed our own process plan for the  
18 stakeholders for the Scotland project that  
19 meets the requirements of our regulations.  
20 So again by December 31, 2007, stakeholders  
21 will need to submit their comments on the  
22 applicants' NOIs and PADs, the Commission  
23 scoping document and any study requests.

24           So, this slide shows the study  
25 request criteria. In order to focus the

1 study requests, we have these criteria which  
2 reflect input from all the participants in  
3 the developmental process. The study  
4 criteria are outlined also in Section 5.9 of  
5 the Commission's regulations. Each study  
6 request must define the goals and objectives  
7 of the study and the information to be  
8 obtained; and, if applicable, explain the  
9 relevant resource management goals of the  
10 agency or tribe with jurisdictional  
11 authority; explain any relevant public  
12 interest considerations, if the requester is  
13 not a public agency; describe any existing  
14 information concerning the subject of the  
15 study proposal and why the additional  
16 information is needed to fill any information  
17 gaps; explain the nexus between the study and  
18 the project effects and how the information  
19 obtained will be used to develop license  
20 recommendations; demonstrate that the  
21 proposed study and its methodology is  
22 consistent with accepted scientific practice  
23 or will address tribal concerns; and describe  
24 the costs and level of effort associated with  
25 the proposed study including an explanation

1 as to why any proposed alternative studies  
2 would not suffice.

3 After the comment period  
4 closes for the NOIs and PADs and scoping  
5 document, applicants will prepare their  
6 proposed study plans. The filing deadline  
7 for FirstLight and Norwich Public Utilities'  
8 proposed study plans is February 12, 2008.  
9 The stakeholders will then participate in  
10 their study plan meetings to discuss  
11 potential studies and resolve issues. The  
12 applicants' revised study plans must be filed  
13 with the Commission by June 11, 2008, and  
14 FERC staff will issue a study plan  
15 determination on July 11, 2008.

16 After FERC staff issues the  
17 study plan determination, the applicants will  
18 begin to conduct their studies. Applicants  
19 will file study reports and parties will  
20 review the studies each year. Upon  
21 completion of the studies, the applicants  
22 will prepare their preliminary licensing  
23 proposals or PLPs. The filing deadline for  
24 FirstLight and Norwich Public Utilities' PLPs  
25 is April 5, 2010. Stakeholders will have an

1 opportunity to comment on the applicants'  
2 PLPs before their license applications are  
3 due to the Commission.

4 To bridge the gap between the  
5 burden of developing in a complete draft  
6 application and providing sufficient  
7 information for agencies and participants to  
8 evaluate the merits of the applicants'  
9 proposal, the ILP requires that applicants  
10 prepare a preliminary licensing proposal that  
11 explains the existing and proposed  
12 operations, describes any proposed  
13 environmental measures and includes a draft  
14 environmental analysis of those measures.  
15 The development of a complete draft license  
16 application is optional. FirstLight and  
17 Norwich Public Utilities are encouraged to  
18 file drafts of any required biological  
19 assessment and/or historic properties  
20 management plans. Participants will have  
21 until July 2, 2010 to file comments on the  
22 applicants' draft proposals, including any  
23 additional studies with the showing of  
24 extraordinary cause.

25 The license applications must

1 be filed by August 31, 2010, which is two  
2 years before license expiration. The  
3 contents of the applications, as outlined in  
4 Section 5.18B of the Commission's  
5 regulations, must address the environmental  
6 resources identified in the PAD and must  
7 follow the Commission's guidelines for  
8 preparing environmental assessments. The  
9 guidelines are entitled "Preparing  
10 Environmental Assessments Guidelines for  
11 Applicants, Contractors and Staff." A  
12 tendering notice is issued no more than 14  
13 days after the applications are filed with  
14 the Commission. The tendering notice will  
15 include a schedule for processing the  
16 applications and any modification to the  
17 process plan and the schedule. The  
18 Commission will also resolve any requests for  
19 additional studies that may have been found  
20 in response to the preliminary licensing  
21 proposals. Each application will be examined  
22 for completeness.

23                   Once the Commission has  
24 determined that the record is complete,  
25 including completion of the

1 Commission-approved study plans, it will  
2 issue a notice accepting the applications for  
3 filing and the finding that it is ready for  
4 environmental analysis. We expect that a  
5 notice of acceptance and ready for  
6 environmental analysis, or REA, will be  
7 issued in November of 2010. The REA notice  
8 requests that comments, interventions and  
9 preliminary terms and conditions be filed by  
10 December 2010. The applicants' reply  
11 comments are due 45 days later.

12 Commission regulations require  
13 that an applicant file with the Commission  
14 proof that it has applied for a Section 401  
15 water quality certificate no later than 60  
16 days from the Commission's REA notice.  
17 Requests for 401 water quality certificates  
18 can be applied for sooner. Under Federal law  
19 and the Commission regulations, the  
20 permitting agency has one year to take action  
21 on the application.

22 Commission staff plans to  
23 issue an EA in June of 2011. Public comments  
24 on the EA and the 10J determinations are due  
25 45 days later. The modified mandatory

1 conditions are due no later than September  
2 2011. At this time we do not anticipate the  
3 need to prepare a draft EA. As stated in the  
4 scoping document, we will prepare a single EA  
5 for this project which will be sent to all  
6 entities on the Commission's service and  
7 mailing list for the Scotland project. The  
8 EA will include our recommendations for  
9 operating procedures as well as any  
10 environmental protection and enhancement  
11 measures that should be part of any license  
12 issued by the Commission. Recipients will  
13 then have 30 days to review the EA and submit  
14 any written comments to the Commission. All  
15 comments filed on the EA will be considered  
16 in the order taking final action on these  
17 license applications. Should substantive  
18 comments be received requiring further  
19 analysis or evidence that a change may be  
20 warranted, we will consider preparing a  
21 subsequent EA. And the final stage in the  
22 process would be Commission staff issuing an  
23 order taking final action, which we plan to  
24 do in February of 2012.

25 So before we advance to the

1 next section of the meeting, does anyone have  
2 any clarifying questions on the process plan  
3 for the Scotland project?

4 Well, at this time then I would like to allow  
5 representatives from both FirstLight and  
6 Norwich Public Utilities to describe their  
7 proposals. We're going to start with  
8 FirstLight describing the existing  
9 facilities, and then they will go right into  
10 the discussion of their particular proposal.

11 MR. GATES: Good morning, I'm  
12 Robert Gates, station manager for FirstLight  
13 Power Resources for the Scotland hydro  
14 project. It's G-a-t-e-s. I'm here today to  
15 first give a project overview of the existing  
16 facilities.

17 The Scotland project is a  
18 small hydroelectric project, part of our  
19 eastern Hydro Division, where we have three  
20 plants. All of them are two megawatts each  
21 interspersed with the NPU facilities. It's  
22 at the headwater of the facilities for NPU  
23 and ourselves below the Mansfield Hollow, and  
24 it's on the Shetucket River, as you can see.  
25 You can also see that there is very little

1 development around the shoreline. There  
2 aren't homes or businesses around there. We  
3 do have other mapping that shows that there  
4 are some gravel operations interspersed  
5 upstream of the facility, which the  
6 impoundment here runs about three and a half  
7 miles and downstream. The project boundary,  
8 which is very tight to the river, is  
9 approximately 900 feet. The surface area is  
10 134 acres of a full pond full impoundment.  
11 The current operation is a peaking operation;  
12 therefore, there is a 2-foot draw-down that  
13 occurs sporadically throughout time depending  
14 on the inflow. Our usable storage is 268  
15 acre feet or 3243 cfs hours, that's cubic  
16 feet per second, per hour. That equates to  
17 around three hours of generation with minimal  
18 inflow.

19 Here's an aerial shot of the  
20 facility looking upstream. You can see there  
21 are three sections of the dam. The first on  
22 the left is a 183-foot long earthen dike.  
23 Then we have a center section which is  
24 concrete and five 20-foot wide retainer  
25 gates, which are flood gates, that are

1 operated whenever the unit is out of service  
2 to pass water or whenever there is high flow.  
3 There is a concrete spillway called an  
4 Amberson type dam. It's an ungated spillway.  
5 There are no gates on the top of it.  
6 However, since it's an Amberson type, it's a  
7 hollowed out dam and a ballast has been  
8 provided to the dam section to make it safe  
9 and to lower the hazard classification from  
10 high hazard to low hazard.

11 To the right side of the photo  
12 is a brick building. That's our powerhouse  
13 structure, and our entrance road is to the  
14 right. There's a railroad track that follows  
15 along parallel to the river to the right. As  
16 far as land ownership, we don't own very much  
17 land at all, especially with this project.  
18 The only impoundment itself -- and we don't  
19 extend -- we have no tracts of land that are  
20 contiguous to the property.

21 Here's another closer  
22 photograph of the dam itself with some spill  
23 going over the spillway section. This is our  
24 intake. It's been modified since this  
25 photograph. We have put in an automatic

1 trash raker on the front. The intake,  
2 there's a set of 21-foot high screens, and  
3 those screens have metal bars, and the bars  
4 are 7/16ths inch wide with a space of 3 and a  
5 quarter inches.

6 This is the downstream side of  
7 the powerhouse. We have a turbine discharge  
8 which is submerged to the left, and we have a  
9 minimum flow discharge of 84 cfs. Whenever  
10 the unit is not operating and passing water,  
11 we will have a continuous environmental flow  
12 of 84 cfs. That was determined at our last  
13 license, the quantity required, to protect  
14 downstream habitat.

15 Inside we have one generator,  
16 a fixed propeller-type unit, 2,000 kilowatts.  
17 Its most efficient point is around 1,100 cfs.  
18 Its full gate or maximum output during times  
19 of high flow is somewhere in the 1,300 cfs  
20 range. This is an on-demand facility  
21 normally. It runs off a flow system. When  
22 the impoundment is full, it will begin to  
23 operate and it will draw it down to 2 feet.  
24 When it reaches that point it will go off  
25 line and will pick back up when the flow gets

1 up to the maximum amount and it will turn  
2 itself on and operate. So this is called a  
3 pulsing type of flow. We do have maintenance  
4 forces downstream at another one of our  
5 facilities. We have three facilities in the  
6 area and we have three individuals that  
7 operate and maintain these units.

8 This is a view looking  
9 downstream. Again, we own 900 feet  
10 downstream to the town border. The only  
11 recreation facilities associated with the  
12 project are there's a canoe portage. You  
13 take out on river right, looking downstream  
14 to the right side, and climb up over the  
15 earthen dike, go down a path and then go over  
16 the rocks into a foot-in area.

17 As I said, the current project  
18 operation is a pulsing flow, a 2-foot  
19 impoundment fluctuation. When the flows are  
20 below the turbine hydraulic capacity, 2 foot  
21 of storage to use to operate at best gate.  
22 When flows are above the turbine hydraulic  
23 capacity, we operate at full capacity.  
24 During refill periods a minimum flow of 84  
25 cfs is provided. The average annual

1 generation is 7,383 megawatt hours.  
2 The current turbine is a fixed propeller.  
3 And when they selected this turbine back in  
4 the 1937/38 time frame they were looking at a  
5 ponding, a peaking operation. They knew they  
6 could store water and generate it out at a  
7 higher amount than what the inflow was at  
8 that time, and by doing so they could operate  
9 at a more efficient point most of the time.  
10 If we were to try to follow a Run-of-River  
11 operation with this particular unit, you'd be  
12 operating at a very inefficient point during  
13 lower flows. The average flow is somewhere  
14 in the 500 cfs range. So if you look at this  
15 chart, we'd be somewhere around 30 percent  
16 efficiency which is terrible efficiency for a  
17 hydro electric company; therefore, we operate  
18 in a peaking mode today.

19 The environmental conditions  
20 at the site, there's limited development  
21 along the shoreline. There's limited to  
22 minimal erosion taking place. There's a  
23 fishway reservation in the current license,  
24 meaning that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife has  
25 prescribed an option to be able to install

1 fish passage at the site that we would  
2 install a fish passage at the site. There is  
3 a brood stock salmon area downstream that is  
4 very popular.

5                   Endangered threatened species  
6 at the site, there's a thread foot plant and  
7 wood turtles downstream of the project.  
8 There are thermal refuges at the confluence  
9 of at least two tributaries that we're aware  
10 of, and these thermal refuges are for trout  
11 during the summer months that are seeking  
12 shelter from the warm river waters.  
13 So any questions on the operation of the  
14 existing facility or any features of the  
15 existing facility?

16                   THOMAS MACLURE: A question on  
17 your high water. You said you run the  
18 turbine maximum when the water stays high.  
19 What happens upstream when you start flooding  
20 some of the properties up there also? Is  
21 there any way to prevent those properties  
22 from getting flooded?

23                   MR. GATES: Our load draw-down  
24 is a 2 foot draw-down at this time.

25                   MR. MACLURE: I'm saying

1 maximum water. Your turbine can't handle it.  
2 You're running the turbine wide open and  
3 water keeps coming up and keeps coming up.

4 MR. GATES: It will. And  
5 there's nothing we can do about it. The most  
6 we can do about it would be to draw it down  
7 in anticipation of a flood. So you draw it  
8 down, but it's such a small volume it would  
9 fill up rapidly and then you'd end up in a  
10 state where it's a natural flow and there  
11 would be a natural backwater.

12 MR. MACLURE: Okay.

13 MR. GATES: Any other  
14 questions?

15 Okay. Now I'm talking about  
16 our proposed action. This is FirstLight  
17 Power Resources, FirstLight Hydro Generating  
18 Company, proposed action. We are currently  
19 evaluating the options under a Run-of-River  
20 scenario. We know what it does currently  
21 under peaking, and we're evaluating what type  
22 of turbine could be used and what would be  
23 best suited at this site. Our propeller unit  
24 operates inefficiently below the 1,100 cfs  
25 range, so as the inflow -- the average flow

1 being 500, if the inflow were to drop below  
2 the 1,100 we're basically wasting water.  
3 We're not operating efficiency. And not only  
4 that, it stops operating at the 500 cfs  
5 level. We need 500 cfs to operate this  
6 machine.

7                   So, that being said, for the  
8 majority of the summertime the unit would be  
9 off. We have to have a peak. So what we're  
10 looking at is an adjustable propeller unit, a  
11 Kaplan unit, to replace the existing turbine.  
12 All that would be involved would be to change  
13 out the turbine mechanism itself. There  
14 would be no civil work or any other impacts.  
15 This is a rendering of a Kaplan turbine.  
16 This is much larger than what would be in the  
17 site. You see the man on the left there.  
18 But it's the same principle. You have a boat  
19 propeller looking type of thing on the  
20 bottom, and the blades itself on the  
21 propeller would adjust depending on the  
22 inflow to the site. And what that does for  
23 you it allows you to have a high efficiency  
24 point throughout a whole range of flows.

25                   This is a curve that shows

1 that. The top curve -- I'll go up there and  
2 just point to it -- as you can see with this  
3 curve, we could use flows at about a 76  
4 percent level 180 cfs. Before we were  
5 looking at 30 percent efficiency. So even at  
6 the lowest point we're a lot more efficient  
7 than we are with the existing turbine. And  
8 then you can see high efficiency levels here  
9 throughout the range of flows from 180 to  
10 over 1,400. So this new turbine would pick  
11 up over 3,000 megawatt hours by just  
12 replacing the Kaplan turbine to bring our  
13 total to somewhere around 10,300.

14 Now, our anticipated study  
15 needs, we looked at it two ways since we  
16 hadn't made the decision as to whether we're  
17 going to continue with a peaking operation or  
18 go a Run-of-River type of flow regime. So,  
19 for a peaking operation we felt that we  
20 needed to look at the shoreline, do an  
21 official investigation into erosion, and also  
22 look at the wetlands that are involved and in  
23 the littoral zone. That's the zone that was  
24 flooded and drained. So that 2-foot zone  
25 throughout the impoundment we would look at

1 for any impacts to species, including mussels  
2 and fisheries habitat and the like. We also  
3 do an aquatic habitat below the dam since  
4 we're pulsing the flow. Both have dramatic  
5 differences in the wetted parameter of the  
6 river downstream, so we'd look at that and  
7 the substrate.

8 Also for fish passage we'd be  
9 looking into what is appropriate for the  
10 site. We have had preliminary discussions in  
11 the past with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and  
12 they had felt that an eel ladder was the  
13 appropriate mechanism here, not a fish lift,  
14 but their official position at this point is  
15 not known. For a run-of-the-river type  
16 operation we felt that the water quality  
17 standard type water quality testing would be  
18 necessary as well as fish passage again.  
19 That's it for us. Thank you.

20 MS. FLORENTINO: Does anyone  
21 have any further questions for Mr. Gates  
22 before he sits down regarding the current  
23 operations or the proposal? Okay. If there  
24 are no questions right now, then we'll hand  
25 over the floor to a representative from

1 Norwich Public Utilities.

2           JOHN BILDA: Thank you, Sarah.  
3 I'm John Bilda, general manager of Norwich  
4 Public Utilities. We're one of the State of  
5 Connecticut's six municipally owned and  
6 operated electric distribution companies. We  
7 provide electricity, natural gas, water and  
8 sewer service to the City of Norwich along  
9 with some surrounding communities also.

10           The Shetucket River is a  
11 natural resource that flows directly through  
12 our community. We currently own and operate  
13 three other hydroelectric units located on  
14 that river. Also, those units are licensed,  
15 operate as run-of-the-river and have fish  
16 passages installed on them already. We  
17 believe that if we're issued the license for  
18 the Scotland project we can manage and  
19 operate that project in a more efficient way,  
20 improve the fisheries and provide for better  
21 recreational opportunities and most  
22 important, provide southeastern Connecticut  
23 with a lower cost electricity. And I'd like  
24 to introduce Jim Besha with Albany  
25 Engineering to better describe in better

1 detail what our plans include.

2 MR. BESHA: I'm Jim Besha with  
3 Albany Engineering. We're the consulting  
4 engineers for NPU. I'll be going through the  
5 project overview basically describing the  
6 existing conditions as well as what's  
7 proposed by NPU. As Mr. Gates has already  
8 explained, the project dam is across the  
9 river here. There's several sections of the  
10 dam, an earth dam, a gates section, an  
11 Amberson section, the powerhouse itself.  
12 It's bounded on this side of the river by a  
13 railroad track, and it has an intake  
14 structure where the water comes in.

15 Again, a different view, an  
16 aerial view, showing the river flowing north  
17 to south here. The location of the power  
18 house is on the east side of the river. And  
19 what is there now is a powerhouse with a  
20 single unit, 2,000 kilowatts, and as he  
21 described earlier an existing reservoir,  
22 about three and a half miles long, 134 acres.  
23 What NPU is proposing is a Run-of-River  
24 operation so that the water coming into the  
25 reservoir, natural flow on the river, would

1 automatically be sent back out of the  
2 reservoir through the units. There would not  
3 be any storing or ponding or peaking. There  
4 would not be any changes in the reservoir  
5 level during normal operation and would be  
6 maintained at a constant level. That does  
7 not change flood conditions during the spring  
8 when the reservoir would normally go high and  
9 would still go high.

10 We're proposing to add a  
11 minimum-flow new unit, a new unit, a new  
12 Kaplan unit of about 1,200 cfs capacity which  
13 is an additional 2,400 kilowatts, and that is  
14 a unit, as was previously described, that is  
15 adjustable to a wide range of flows. We  
16 basically, when we design these, set these  
17 units very low. We excavate quite deep so we  
18 can operate these Kaplan units down to a very  
19 very low percentage of flow, sometimes as low  
20 as 5 percent of gradient flow. That unit  
21 plus the existing units should greatly  
22 increase the production. I'll explain that  
23 in a second.

24 We believe there may be some  
25 dam structural issues that should be

1 remediated. There's been work done on the  
2 dam. The dam safety standards are  
3 continually evolving and becoming more  
4 stringent. We expect there will be some  
5 remedial measures required on the dam to  
6 maintain its integrity for another 50 years.

7 And we're proposing upstream  
8 and downstream fish passage along the  
9 powerhouse or within the powerhouse area, and  
10 that would be operated in conjunction with  
11 NPU's existing facilities. Immediately  
12 downstream is the Occum facility and then  
13 further down the Greenville and Tenth Street  
14 projects. We are proposing either an eel  
15 ladder or an elevator, we're not certain  
16 which at this point, but in this general  
17 location along this side of the river.

18 This is a flow duration curve.  
19 It illustrates the flows available in the  
20 river, depending upon the percentage of time  
21 they are available. In this particular case  
22 you can see that over 50 percent of the time  
23 there's at least 500 cubic feet per second  
24 available, and then 20 percent of the time  
25 there's 1,200 cubic feet per second

1 available. It's a typical small river in New  
2 England or in the northeastern United States.  
3 It has more flow in the springtime and the  
4 fall sometimes, not as much flow, very little  
5 flow sometimes, in the summer and in the  
6 middle of the winter.

7 This is the normal kind of  
8 operation of a river where it goes up in the  
9 spring and comes back down in the summer.

10 The current capacity of the  
11 station is about 1,200 cfs. There is also an  
12 84 cfs minimum flow that's released through  
13 the station when the main unit is off. That  
14 would be maintained at at least that level  
15 and may require more than that depending upon  
16 the requirements of the fish. We would add a  
17 new unit which would add to the hydraulic  
18 capacity and provide for a total through  
19 capacity of the plant of a little over 2,400  
20 cubic feet per second. It's utilizing most  
21 of the available water in the river and hence  
22 it's developing as much energy as is  
23 possible. This is a conservative estimation.  
24 We know right now the existing plant makes  
25 about 7,400 megawatt hours per year. The

1 proposed configuration will make at least 10  
2 million kilowatt hours. This is, I think, a  
3 conservative estimate. The addition of the  
4 new unit will provide a full range of  
5 operation at high efficiencies and be able to  
6 utilize most of the flows, about 95 percent  
7 of the flows, on an average basis. Sometimes  
8 you'll have years that are better than  
9 others. During an exceptionally wet year a  
10 project like this may make 12 million  
11 kilowatt hours and a drier year may make a  
12 little less.

13                   The issues that we've  
14 identified as being germane to the  
15 relicensing are water quality issues relating  
16 to the fishery resource in the river, any  
17 minimum flow conditions required, although  
18 we're proposing Run-of-River, and so the  
19 minimum flow issues kind of disappear once  
20 the station is being operated in a  
21 river-of-river condition, and provision for  
22 upstream and downstream fish passage at this  
23 site, as is already existing at some of the  
24 other NPU sites.

25                   The studies and really data

1 collection that we're suggesting at this  
2 point, they fall into two categories. Most  
3 of it's data collection. There are some  
4 studies as well. One of the studies that we  
5 believe is required is the geotechnical  
6 analysis of shoreline slopes. Right now the  
7 shoreline reservoir has fluctuated during  
8 peaking operations. We would propose to look  
9 at that shoreline and make sure there's  
10 nothing that requires structural measures to  
11 improve the shoreline stability to minimize  
12 erosion. The operation simply as  
13 Run-of-River will minimize some of that  
14 automatically, but we're proposing a study to  
15 look at any particular areas that may require  
16 structural improvement.

17 Water quality is really a data  
18 collection study, I guess you would call it.  
19 We propose to look at the existing data as  
20 far as fisheries in the river, provide some  
21 new field sampling for certain water quality  
22 parameters, dissolved oxygen, temperature  
23 turbidity and then follow up with any  
24 additional data collection depending upon  
25 what the data shows. The river is, I think,

1 pretty well documented from a fishery  
2 standpoint what's there, but we would collect  
3 that data and present it.

4           The biological and -- or  
5 botanical and wildlife data that we would  
6 collect would involve detailed recognizance  
7 by specialized mapping of any species that  
8 are there, review any existing data that's  
9 available and compile that into a species  
10 inventory, again, more data collection, some  
11 analysis, but until you know what's there  
12 from a baseline standpoint, speculating as to  
13 what studies are required might be difficult.

14           Similarly we propose to  
15 delineate the wetlands that are on the site,  
16 both upstream and downstream, do some field  
17 recognizance, identify any species that are  
18 peculiar to the wetlands in that area and  
19 verify the delineation of boundaries of the  
20 wetlands and determine whether there will be  
21 any impacts from the change of operation to  
22 Run-of-River.

23           Recreation is really data  
24 collection and some survey analysis as well.  
25 We would look at the -- propose to look at

1 the existing recreational opportunities in  
2 the area, assess whether additional  
3 recreational facilities might be required  
4 depending upon the population and the use of  
5 the existing facilities and provide some  
6 survey data looking at existing recreational  
7 use, both fisherman as well as any contact  
8 recreation such as canoeing to determine how  
9 much is being used and whether there's some  
10 additional facilities that would be  
11 warranted.

12                   Historic, archeological and  
13 really just includes cultural as well. We're  
14 proposing to do a phase one literature  
15 review. What that involves is looking at  
16 data that's already been collected in the  
17 proximity of the project area some distance  
18 back from the reservoir perhaps a half a mile  
19 to a mile, reviewing really any historic and  
20 archeological sites that are known to exist  
21 and any sites that previously had been done.  
22 And this is really done as sort of a scoping  
23 review to determine whether there's any  
24 likelihood of any sites on the project site  
25 itself.

1                   If it's determined that there  
2 are sites within the project area, a phase 1B  
3 field survey which is a test of this would be  
4 conducted. This, however, normally would not  
5 be done during this phase of the project  
6 during the licensing phase. It could very  
7 well be done post licensing depending upon  
8 what is found in the phase 1A. That's pretty  
9 much the presentation.

10                   Any questions?

11                   MR. MACLURE: I have a  
12 question. This goes to both of the people  
13 here. That river is filling in with silt.  
14 Is there anything that's going to be done  
15 with that?

16                   MR. BESHA: From NPU's  
17 prospective, siltation occurs in rivers.  
18 It's a pretty natural process. There's not  
19 much you can do about erosion upstream. For  
20 instance, if there's a watershed where  
21 there's erosion already occurring ten miles  
22 upstream, that's going to continue. I think  
23 as a general practice, however, a lot of  
24 communities are really looking at erosion and  
25 trying to minimize sediment coming into

1 streams. There's nothing specific to the  
2 project that could remedy that, speaking from  
3 NPU's standpoint. Perhaps Bob can do it.

4 MR. GATES: It's a very  
5 similar response from us. We are aware and  
6 certain of how that siltation is occurring,  
7 but it is occurring from storm drains and the  
8 like.

9 MR. MACLURE: What happens  
10 when that dam is shut off on the far side  
11 which would be where you've got the dirt berm  
12 area, that's where the water comes down where  
13 the dam is stopped. It turns around and goes  
14 back up the other shore and forms a dead spot  
15 in the middle. In the summer if anybody went  
16 down there it's sand bars. The river was so  
17 low you could see everything.

18 MR. GATES: Downstream of the  
19 station.

20 MR. MACLURE: Upstream of the  
21 station.

22 MR. GATES: Upstream of the  
23 station.

24 MR. MACLURE: Right. So  
25 you're getting a lot of sediment that's -- I

1 don't think you can do anything about it.

2 MR. GATES: Especially a lot  
3 of sediments contain heavy metals and the  
4 like, but that's interesting. That's  
5 historic from other industries.

6 MR. MACLURE: And on the  
7 Scotland project, can that band be raised any  
8 more, more footage? I thought legally you  
9 could go up one more foot?

10 MR. BESHA: Our proposal is  
11 not to increase the permanent elevation at  
12 all. The gates may be -- there's slight  
13 additional head, but it's not significant  
14 from our perspective.

15 MR. MACLURE: Okay, I didn't  
16 know.

17 MS. FLORENTINO: Were there  
18 any further questions from the stakeholders  
19 regarding either Norwich or FirstLight's  
20 proposals?

21 Don't forget to state your  
22 name for the record.

23 JAMES GIBSON: Good morning,  
24 Jim Gibson. I had a series of questions  
25 really I guess geared mostly towards Norwich,

1 but some of these about the process FERC may  
2 be able to answer. The first question deals  
3 with the studies. We saw in the PADs and in  
4 the scoping document a list of studies.  
5 Sarah, I think you mentioned a study  
6 determination letter that's going to come  
7 out. Will there be one study determination  
8 letter for both parties, or will they  
9 automatically do the same studies or  
10 different studies?

11 MS. FLORENTINO: There will be  
12 one study plan determination for both  
13 projects. Now, since the proposals are not  
14 the same, one applicant might have to do  
15 certain studies particular to their proposal  
16 and the other applicant might be doing  
17 different ones. If the proposals were  
18 exactly the same, I imagine the studies would  
19 be the same for both. Since we have one  
20 applicant proposing a little different  
21 action, they might have to do different  
22 studies.

23 MR. GIBSON: So it's not a  
24 given under the ILP that both applicants  
25 would do the same exact studies?

1 MR. CREAMER: Allan Creamer  
2 with FERC. We haven't quite yet, because  
3 this is a competitive ILP, this is a new  
4 situation for us. This may be approached in  
5 a couple of different ways. Like Sarah said,  
6 there could be one letter that might have  
7 common studies that need to be done that both  
8 applicants may have proposed or agencies have  
9 recommended for both. And then there might  
10 be individual, depending upon what the  
11 proposal was, there might be individual  
12 studies that may need to be done for  
13 Run-of-River but not for ponding or for  
14 ponding and not Run-of-River type things. Or  
15 there might simply be two determination  
16 letters that are issued and they both go  
17 about their business.

18 Now, is there a possibility  
19 that there could be common studies?  
20 Absolutely. At this point we haven't seen a  
21 proposed study plan. We're still so early  
22 that everybody's got an opportunity to put  
23 those study requests out there and the study  
24 plans are being developed, so there is  
25 absolutely the possibility that there could

1 be some common studies that go between both.

2 MR. GIBSON: I guess that  
3 leaves with me with my next question then.  
4 Would both parties do the same studies, or  
5 would there be sharing of data between the  
6 two parties?

7 MR. CREAMER: I think the way  
8 we were going to look at this, not having a  
9 lot of experience with this, the competitive  
10 thing, we would hold both responsible for the  
11 study. Now, how that gets done is a  
12 different story. Certainly there are  
13 advantages to cooperating with the common  
14 studies, but we're not going to require, at  
15 least I don't believe that the Commission  
16 would require, any type of collaboration. It  
17 just simply would be here's the studies, the  
18 commonalities if there's common studies, if  
19 they want to do them separately that's their  
20 own business, but there certainly could be  
21 advantages to cooperating in whatever  
22 fashion.

23 MR. GIBSON: So kind of on  
24 that note then will there be -- Sarah had  
25 talked about a study meeting coming up. Will

1 that be a common meeting like this meeting?

2 MR. CREAMER: We're not sure  
3 yet. We're feeling our way through. There  
4 certainly could be a common meeting, but  
5 there might have to be different times  
6 depending upon study plans and how we  
7 approach it, or there could be one day we  
8 have one study meeting and the following day  
9 we have a study plan meeting for the other  
10 applicant. We just don't know yet how this  
11 may play out, so I can't commit to anything  
12 at this point.

13 MR. GIBSON: I think just one  
14 other question on studies. The actual  
15 sharing of results when we get to the end of  
16 that first season of studies, and correct me  
17 if I'm wrong, that's pretty public  
18 information at that point if you're a  
19 stakeholder involved in the studies. Would  
20 Norwich have to provide, not necessarily in  
21 writing, but will that be made available that  
22 FirstLight can have access to that?

23 MR. CREAMER: Whatever is in  
24 the public domain would be access for  
25 everybody. Now, we have had a situation in

1 the past where the only competitive project  
2 for relicensing that had gone through there  
3 was a situation where one of the applicants  
4 deemed their stuff proprietary, and that  
5 caused some problems. We basically had to  
6 deal with two sets of studies on a similar  
7 resource or something and applicants didn't  
8 share. It made everybody's life difficult.  
9 So, public domain information is just that,  
10 so it would be available among the parties, I  
11 would think.

12 MR. GIBSON: Also a question  
13 about the schedule just in general. Under  
14 the ILP there's obviously a number of time  
15 lines that Sarah referred to and how busy  
16 this first year is. And Sarah, I think you  
17 referred to a number of common dates that are  
18 coming up along the way, issuance of the  
19 study letter, filings. If one of the parties  
20 goes into dispute resolution, would you  
21 actually have the other party stop and wait  
22 for that party to catch up?

23 MR. CREAMER: You're asking  
24 some good questions. Because of the way  
25 we're processing these things, it would beg

1 the question that we would have to consider  
2 what we're going to do. To sit here and say  
3 how we would handle it right now I don't  
4 know, but I don't think that we would  
5 necessarily, me personally, I would be  
6 looking at if we're processing these things  
7 together, they should stay on the same time  
8 line, but that does introduce an interesting  
9 question of what would we do if one went that  
10 way and the other one didn't.

11 MR. GIBSON: I guess getting  
12 back to the time line, given all the time  
13 lines in the ILP and given this is a  
14 competitive situation, if say Norwich were to  
15 miss a time line, at that point would their  
16 process be kicked out?

17 MR. CREAMER: I don't think  
18 we've had it happen yet, so I don't know what  
19 the consequences of that is. I think all the  
20 ones that we've had so far have met the  
21 schedules. I'd have to go back and look at  
22 the preamble for the part 5 regs and see what  
23 it might say about missing dates, but our  
24 intent is to keep the thing on track and we  
25 would do everything that we can to make sure

1 that happens.

2 MR. GIBSON: Because I know  
3 there's been instances where there's been  
4 timeouts to let somebody catch up, but it  
5 seems like in a competitive situation I don't  
6 know if that's how FERC would respond to  
7 that.

8 MR. CREAMER: We're in new  
9 territory. I just don't know at this point.

10 MR. GIBSON: Just a couple  
11 other quick questions. The transparency of  
12 the ILP process, particularly with the draft  
13 license application with the PLP I assume  
14 that's out there for both parties to look at  
15 150 days before the application is due so  
16 both parties will have each other's PLP at  
17 that point?

18 MR. CREAMER: Yes, I believe  
19 that will be the case.

20 MR. GIBSON: Okay. The only  
21 other question really gets into -- it may go  
22 beyond the scope of today's meeting -- is the  
23 actual decision of the issuance of the  
24 license to Norwich to the degree that they  
25 have to prove like say, for example, we're

1 talking about generation. They say 2.4  
2 megawatts; they say they can generate down to  
3 5 percent. To what degree do they have to  
4 prove that in an application? It would be  
5 really easy for these guys that are -- I just  
6 use Norwich as an example here. It would be  
7 really easy to say we're going to double  
8 electricity coming out of the river, but they  
9 haven't built anything, they haven't done  
10 efficiency tests.

11 MR. CREAMER: It would be our  
12 expectation that if they could show in a  
13 reasonable fashion what they are proposing to  
14 do is workable, if there's just a conceptual  
15 plan to say okay this is what I think we can  
16 do, it's going to carry less weight than  
17 actual work that, okay, we know we have this  
18 much flow with this type of turbine and  
19 actual feasibility type of analysis to show  
20 this is a workable thing. That's going to go  
21 a lot, you know, a lot farther with the  
22 Commission than just some conceptual type of  
23 we believe this is workable, we've done some  
24 work and it's doable.

25 But yes, I mean, our

1 expectation is that if there's a proposal  
2 that's going to increase generation and  
3 completely reconfigure the site, we're going  
4 to want to know with some reasonable  
5 certainty that it is a workable, viable  
6 option. I don't think the Commission is  
7 going to want to give a license to somebody  
8 without knowing that.

9 MR. GIBSON: Okay. I  
10 appreciate your time. Thanks, Allan.

11 MS. FLORENTINO: Thank you for  
12 those questions. Was there anyone else that  
13 wanted to ask a question at this time? We  
14 still have time for further comments. If  
15 not, then I'll continue with our presentation  
16 on the resource issues here at the end.

17 MR. CREAMER: Sarah, before  
18 you do that. Jim, just to follow up, I would  
19 be remiss if FirstLight goes down the same  
20 path and propose to do something with their  
21 change, we would expect the same thing of  
22 them. So if there is some redevelopment  
23 plans on either side, we would expect both  
24 applicants to show us that what they are  
25 proposing to do is a viable, workable thing.

1 So I don't want to just simply talk about --  
2 we know FirstLight is considering a similar  
3 thing. It may be different, I don't know.  
4 But we would want to see the same thing if  
5 something like that were to happen.

6 MR. GIBSON: Thank you.

7 MS. FLORENTINO: So in  
8 reviewing the Applicant's PADs for the  
9 Scotland project, FERC staff have identified  
10 a variety of issues that fall into multiple  
11 resource areas. These resource areas are  
12 geology of the soil, water resources, aquatic  
13 resources, terrestrial resources, recreation,  
14 land use and aesthetics, cultural resources  
15 and developmental resources. I will briefly  
16 outline the issues we identified in Section  
17 4.2 of the scoping document and to remind  
18 everyone that the list of issues that I  
19 present today is not meant to be exhaustive  
20 but rather the list should be viewed as  
21 preliminary in nature. After scoping is  
22 completed we will review this list and  
23 determine the appropriate level of analysis  
24 needed to address each issue in the EA.

25 So under geology and soils we

1 can identify the effects of the project  
2 operation on shoreline erosion and the  
3 effects on geology and soils resources caused  
4 by any construction activities associated  
5 with a proposed installation of a second  
6 generating unit.

7 Under water resources. We  
8 have identified the effects of project  
9 operations on water quality, including  
10 temperature and dissolved oxygen in the  
11 Shetucket River, effects of any construction  
12 activities associated with the proposed  
13 installation of a second generating unit, the  
14 effects of project operations in conjunction  
15 with the operation of stream water projects  
16 and existing water withdrawals on water flow  
17 in the Shetucket River, the effects of  
18 project operation on existing water  
19 withdrawals from other sources along the  
20 river.

21 Under aquatic resources we had  
22 identified the effects of water level  
23 fluctuations on fish populations and other  
24 aquatic organisms that inhabit the draw-down  
25 zone in the project impoundment, fish passage

1 or the effects of the project operations on  
2 diadromous fish, the effects of the project  
3 operations on changes and impingement of  
4 resident fish, the effects of any  
5 construction activities on fishery and  
6 aquatic resource in the Scotland project  
7 area, the effects of project operations on  
8 native mussels and the effects of project  
9 operation and minimum flows on aquatic  
10 habitat and populations of fish and other  
11 aquatic organisms in the Shetucket River  
12 downstream from the Scotland dam.

13 Under terrestrial resources we  
14 have identified the effects of project  
15 operation on vegetation and wildlife  
16 resources, the effects of project operations  
17 on maintenance, on wetlands and riparian  
18 zones within the project area and the effects  
19 of any construction activities associated  
20 with the proposed installation of a second  
21 generating unit on vegetation and wildlife.

22 Under rare, threatened and  
23 endangered species, we have identified the  
24 effects of project operations and  
25 maintenance, on state and federally listed

1 rare and threatened and endangered species,  
2 including diadromous aquatic species that may  
3 occur within the project area.

4 Under recreation we have  
5 identified the adequacy of existing public  
6 access and recreational facilities in the  
7 project boundaries to meet current and future  
8 recreational demands and the effects of  
9 project operation on recreational  
10 opportunities within the project area as well  
11 as the effects on public access and  
12 recreational use caused by any construction  
13 activities associated with the proposed  
14 installation of a second generating unit.

15 Under land use and aesthetics  
16 we had identified the effects of the project  
17 operation on land use and aesthetic resources  
18 within the project area and the effects on  
19 land use and aesthetic resources caused by  
20 any construction activities associated with  
21 the proposed installation of a second  
22 generating unit.

23 Under cultural resources we  
24 had identified the effects of the proposed  
25 actions and alternatives on properties,

1 including project facilities, which are  
2 included in, eligible for listing or  
3 potentially eligible for inclusion in the  
4 National Register of Historic Places as well  
5 as the effects of any construction activities  
6 associated with the proposed installation of  
7 a second generating unit.

8 Under developmental resources  
9 we have identified the effects of potential  
10 operational changes on project energy and the  
11 capacity benefits and the funding of various  
12 environmental enhancement measures on the  
13 cost of project power.

14 In Section 4.3 of the scoping  
15 document we list potential studies and  
16 further information gathering activities that  
17 FirstLight and Norwich Public Utilities  
18 identified in their PADs as being appropriate  
19 for the Scotland project. During the scoping  
20 meeting we have talked about resource issues  
21 and the applicants have described their study  
22 needs they have anticipated to date.

23 So, at this time I'd like to  
24 invite people again to come up and tell us if  
25 there's any issues that we haven't included

1 in our scoping documents or issues that we  
2 have included that stakeholders think  
3 shouldn't be on the list to come up and let  
4 us know that right now, just specifically  
5 comments on the resource issues.

6 If you have one that occurs to  
7 you later, you can come up again at the end.  
8 So if you would like to file written  
9 comments, you can file them directly with the  
10 Commission's secretary. The necessary  
11 information is provided for you on the slide  
12 and is also available in Section 5 of the  
13 scoping document. If you have a study  
14 request, you will need to follow the same  
15 procedures you would use to file comments.  
16 However, please be reminded that you must  
17 address the study request criteria that was  
18 provided for you on an earlier slide and is  
19 part of the book entitled, "Ideas for  
20 Implementing and Participating in the ILP."  
21 So at this time I'm opening the floor for any  
22 further questions or comments. If you would  
23 like to make a comment just remember to state  
24 your name for the record.

25 If there's nothing further,

1 then we'll adjourn the meeting now and you  
2 may file written comments if something occurs  
3 to you later. Remember the deadline is  
4 December 31st of this year. Thank you all  
5 for coming and for your patience and I'm  
6 sorry we were a little late.

7 (Whereupon, above proceedings  
8 were adjourned at 10:02 a.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 hereby certify that the foregoing 58 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Continued Scoping Meeting in Re: FERC PROJECT NOS. 2662-009 & P-12968-000, SCOTLAND HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, which was held at the Windham Town Hall, 979 Main Street, Willimantic, Connecticut, on November 20, 2007.

*Lisa L. Warner*

-----  
Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R.  
Court Reporter  
UNITED REPORTERS, INC.  
43 Woodland Street, Suite 200  
Hartford, Connecticut 06105