

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
26

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
) Project No.
PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY) 2079-061
)
_____)

RELICENSING OF THE
MIDDLE FORK AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT

Auburn Recreation District
Canyon View Community Center
471 Maidu Drive
Auburn, California

Tuesday, March 4, 2008

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

1 APPEARANCES

2 Jim Fargo

3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

4

5 John M. Mudre

6 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

7 Carolyn Templeton

8 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

9

10 Mal Toy, Project Manager

11 Placer County Water Agency

12 Andy Fecko

13 Placer County Water Agency

14

15 Ed Bianchi, Consultant

16 Entrix

17 Placer County Water Agency

18

19 Forrest Sullivan, Project Manager

20 French Meadows Transmission Line Project

21 Pacific Gas and Electric Company

22

23 Devin R. Malkin, Consultant Project Manager

24 Devine Tarbell & Associates, Inc.

25 Pacific Gas and Electric Company

26

1 APPERANCEX (CONTINUED):

2

3 ALSO PRESENT

4 Paul Sanders

5 Eldorado National Forest

6

7 Craig Addley

8 Entrix

9 Brett Storey

10 Placer County Executive Office

11

12 Russ Kanz

13 State Water Resources Control Board

14 Tony LaBouff, County Counsel

15 Placer County

16 Dean Tibbs, Consultant

17 Placer County

18

19 ALSO PRESENT

20 Robert Hughes

21 California Department of Fish and Game

22

23

24

25

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

2

3 Bill Deitchman

4 California State Parks

5 Mo Tebbe

6 U.S. Forest Service

7

8 Gene Freeland

9 Western States Trail Foundation

10 Marie Davis, Consultant

11 Placer County Water Agency

12

13 Einar Maisch

14 Placer County Water Agency

15 Janet Goldsmith, Attorney

16 Kronick, Moskowitz, Tiedemann, Girard

17 on behalf of Placer County Water Agency

18

19 Stephen Bowes

20 National Park Service

21

22 Tom Jackson, Consultant to PCWA

23 Pacific Legacy

24

25 Tom Jones

26

1	PUBLIC SPEAKERS	
2		Page
3	Gary Estes, Board Member	
4	Protect American River Canyons	58
5		
6	Nathan Rangel, Representative	
7	California Outdoors Trade Association	61
8		
9	Russ Kanz	
10	State Water Resources Control Board	70
11		
12	Tom Christoff, Air Pollution Control Officer	
13	Placer County	
14	President, Western States Trail Foundation	76
15		
16	Donna Williams	79
17		
18	Adjournment	85
19		
20	Reporter's Certificate	86
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

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

2 9:10 a.m.

3 MR. FARGO: As I say, I'm Jim Fargo; I'm
4 here from the Federal Energy Regulatory
5 Commission. With me today is Carolyn Templeton
6 and John Mudre, two of the staff who are going to
7 be working on this project.

8 We certainly don't have -- I mean we've
9 got enough people here, I guess not too many
10 people here. Why don't we pass the mike around
11 and just do some introductions of the people who
12 came here. And then I'll get started with more of
13 the slides and overheads that we brought, just to
14 describe the process and describe the project a
15 little bit.

16 Beverly, could you --

17 MS. BELL: Yeah, --

18 MR. FARGO: Okay.

19 MS. BELL: Pass this around.

20 MR. FARGO: All right, that's the live
21 one?

22 MS. BELL: Yeah.

23 MR. ADDLEY: Craig Addley; I work for
24 Entrix and we're helping PCWA do the relicensing.
25 I work on aquatics. I don't really think this is

26

1 working.

2 MS. BELL: It just plugs straight into
3 her machine so you don't hear it.

4 MR. ADDLEY: All right. Okay.

5 MR. FARGO: Yeah, you have to speak loud
6 enough to carry the room sort of.

7 MR. MAISCH: My name's Einar Maisch; I'm
8 the Director of Strategic Affairs for Placer
9 County Water Agency.

10 MR. SANDERS: Paul Sanders; I'm the road
11 manager, Eldorado National Forest.

12 MS. GOLDSMITH: Janet Goldsmith from
13 Kronick, Moskowitz, Tiedemann and Girard. I'm one
14 of the attorneys for Placer County Water Agency.

15 MS. DAVIS: Marie Davis, consulting
16 earth scientist, consultant to Placer County Water
17 Agency.

18 MR. FARGO: Have we just run out of
19 cord?

20 MS. BELL: Yes.

21 MR. HUGHES: Robert Hughes with the
22 California Department of Fish and Game.

23 MR. TIBBS: Dean Tibbs, Consultant to
24 Placer County.

25 MR. LaBOUFF: Tony LaBouff, County
26

1 Counsel, Placer County.

2 MR. CHRISTOFF: Thank you. My name is
3 Tom Christoff. I'm double-hatting. I'm the Air
4 Pollution Control Officer of Placer County. I'm
5 also the President of Western States Trail
6 Foundation.

7 MR. STOREY: Brett Storey, Placer County
8 Executive Office working the PCWA/FERC relicensing
9 project.

10 MR. FREELAND: Gene Freeland
11 representing Western States Trail Foundation.

12 MR. KANZ: Russ Kanz with the State
13 Water Resources Control Board.

14 MR. JONES: I'm Tom Jones; I live in
15 Auburn and I'm a member of the public.

16 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Donna Williams
17 and I'm also a member of the public and long-time
18 resident of Placer County. And would like to see
19 what's happening.

20 MR. ESTES: I'm Gary Estes; I'm on the
21 Board of Protect American River Canyons.

22 MR. RANGEL: Nate Rangel; I'm a river
23 outfitter. I represent our trade association,
24 that's California Outdoors.

25 MR. DEITCHMAN: I'm Bill Deitchman,

26

1 California State Parks, the Auburn State
2 Recreation Area.

3 MR. JACKSON: Tom Jackson, Pacific
4 Legacy, cultural resources Consultant to PCWA.

5 MR. BOWES: Steve Bowes, National Park
6 Service.

7 MS. BELL: Thanks, everybody.

8 MR. FARGO: Thank you. Thank you all
9 for coming. Before I get started with a couple
10 comments about the process, I'd like the two
11 licensees to introduce themselves and the staff
12 they brought with them.

13 MR. TOY: I'll start. My name is Mal
14 Toy. I'm the Project Manager for the relicensing
15 of our Middle Fork project.

16 Just to let you know that the Placer
17 County Water Agency is a countywide water and
18 energy agency. Even though we are Placer County,
19 we are not a county agency. We have an
20 independent board. The boys in blue are the
21 County guys.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. FECKO: Andy Fecko, Placer County
24 Water Agency. I work for Mal and help with the
25 relicensing process.

26

1 MR. BIANCHI: Ed Bianchi, Entrix,
2 consultant to PCWA.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm Forrest Sullivan with
4 PG&E, and I'm the Project Manager for the French
5 Meadows Transmission Line Project.

6 And Devin Malkin is the Consultant
7 Project Manager with Devine Tarbell & Associates.

8 MR. FARGO: Okay, I'd like to do kind of
9 two things today before we open it up and hear
10 from you. The first thing I'd like to do is just
11 go through a little bit of the ILP process. I'm
12 sure nothing could be more interesting on a
13 beautiful sunny day than hearing about process-
14 type stuff.

15 But I do this for two reasons. One is
16 just again to reacquaint everybody with how this
17 process operates because it is the newest process
18 we use. And secondly to remind myself how the ILP
19 process works because this is the first ILP
20 process I'm going to be managing.

21 The last three or four that I've done in
22 California have been with the ALP process. And
23 there are some significant differences as to how
24 FERC gets involved, when it gets involved, and
25 some of the timelines that I'm going to have to be
26

1 facing and passing on to the collaborative group
2 here.

3 After I do some of that, the two
4 licensees here who are applying for new licenses,
5 Mal and Forrest, are going to give kind of a brief
6 description of their two projects. I know the
7 people here who have been working in the
8 collaborative are very familiar with them.

9 And after that the FERC Staff here is
10 just going to go through the scoping document that
11 we put out and just highlight some of the main
12 issues that we see.

13 During the time that I'm going through
14 the process here I'll be covering some of the
15 things that we tend to look at in scoping on the
16 ILP process. It does differ a little bit from the
17 scoping that we used to do on the TLP in that
18 there's a little bit more interaction on some of
19 the study plans and how the issues and the
20 information that exists fits into the study plans.

21 I think we have a real great start here
22 on the project so far for the Middle Fork in that
23 there has been a collaborative and there has been
24 a lot of work on the study plans. In fact, the
25 PAD includes study plans that the collaborative

26

1 has been working on for the last two years as part
2 of the considerations that we're looking at
3 upfront, which is a great start, and making our
4 job real easy here.

5 That's not the way the ILP always goes.
6 A lot of times those study plans get developed
7 during the first year after the PAD gets filed.

8 So let me start off and just go through
9 some of this information. I'm not going to spend
10 a lot of time unless somebody really has a
11 question about any of the elements here. Then you
12 can just kind of raise your hand, slow me down,
13 and I'll be happy to try to go through them the
14 best I can.

15 Just to sort of give you some general
16 background. Of course, we're the FERC and we're
17 an independent regulatory commission. We're the
18 five-member commission that makes decisions on
19 contested projects.

20 And we deal with a number of resources,
21 hydro being one of them. And then within hydro
22 there are three separate divisions. There's the
23 licensing. And then the licensing administrative
24 and compliance. That's a very important division
25 because a lot of the times when we get very fancy
26

1 with settlements or get fancy with license
2 conditions that call for a lot to be done
3 afterwards, licensing administration compliance
4 has to pick it up and try to interpret what was
5 meant during the licensing process or the
6 settlement process. And then we also have a dam
7 safety division.

8 Okay, getting back to this ILP process
9 it was created in 2003. Now it's a default
10 process which just means that any applicant who
11 wants to use something other than the ILP, like
12 the TLP or the ALP, has to apply for a waiver.

13 So why are we here? Again, for scoping.
14 It's a little different than it used to be.
15 Again, we're trying to identify potential
16 environmental effects and issues, and information
17 and study needs that ultimately will be used for
18 protection, mitigation and enhancement conditions.

19 As I said, on the project for the Middle
20 Fork they got a good head start. They already got
21 some study plans put together and presented to us.
22 We're going to, on the French Meadows project, be
23 working on study plans there so that when we
24 finally make decisions on both projects we'll be
25 issuing a memo that says which study plans FERC is
26

1 approving to be undertaken.

2 So the types of things that in the ILP
3 scoping are free game to talk about are the
4 existing conditions at the projects, objectives of
5 agencies, what information exists and is shown in
6 the PADs that have been filed with the Commission.

7 Forrest, you filed yours --

8 MR. SULLIVAN: February 21st.

9 MR. FARGO: The 21st, okay. Study
10 needs, and then the process plan. As I say, this
11 thing's pretty heavy with deadlines and process
12 that really wasn't there in the ALP. The ALP had
13 a lot of flexibility and it could go off in lots
14 of different directions. This one is more
15 streamlined and, as I said earlier, it's got a lot
16 more FERC Staff involvement at certain places.

17 And then cooperating agency status.
18 This is a place people could say they're either
19 interested, or they might be interested in
20 cooperating with the us on the NEPA document.

21 Okay. Again, just an overview of the
22 process. The PADs have been filed for both
23 licensees. Typically it takes a year for FERC to
24 put out the study plan development memo that says,
25 okay, here's the study plans that have been filed

26

1 by both licensees.

2 We've worked with the collaboratives and
3 interested agencies to see whether they need to be
4 tweaked, what our thoughts about them are. A year
5 or two for study, and then the application is
6 filed.

7 Once the application is filed this
8 process is the same as the other two processes.
9 We just go out for a notice asking for agency
10 terms and conditions. Write an EA or an EIS, as
11 appropriate. Here it would probably be an EIS.
12 And then go to the order.

13 Sometimes at this juncture -- I won't
14 even put a timeframe here because there's a lot of
15 things out of our control that can dictate how
16 long it takes to go from the EIS to the order. We
17 need a lot of permits from other agencies.

18 The PADs, those, as I said, have both
19 been filed. In the PAD you identify the
20 stakeholders. You'll see the information that's
21 available on the projects. Here's just an outline
22 of some of the stuff that you'll see in the PAD.
23 The one that is here, as I say, I haven't even
24 gotten ahold of the whole PAD yet for PG&E's
25 project. Got a little glitch in the mailroom from
26

1 some of the stuff kind of stacked up before it was
2 distributed before I left for California.

3 The Middle Fork PAD I got hard copies
4 and disks. Hopefully there is disks for the
5 French Meadows project in the back. And also
6 disks available for the Middle Fork. So hopefully
7 everybody's got that information available to
8 them.

9 Scoping, that's today. We're here.
10 Again I earlier covered some of the things that we
11 could talk about scoping. Study plan development.
12 Typically that's done the first year. Here we got
13 some study plans that have been proposed.

14 Forrest, were there study plans outlined
15 in the -- no, not yet. So we're going to go
16 through that process for your project.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.

18 MR. FARGO: Okay. So within the first
19 year or so FERC's going to determine studies that
20 should be done for both projects. And we're going
21 to be more interactive with the PG&E transmission
22 line project. And we're also going to be
23 interacting, looking at what's been filed on the
24 Middle Fork; and getting comments from you about
25 whether there's anything additional or any way to
26

1 clarify those study plans so we're all sure what
2 we're going to get for output.

3 And then, again, we do the studies. At
4 this point, Mal, you've done some studies on the
5 Middle Fork project already, is that correct?

6 MR. TOY: Yes. Well, we've started some
7 of the studies.

8 MR. FARGO: You've started some, okay.
9 This I won't spend a lot of time on because it
10 is -- there's a lot to this. This is when
11 somebody wants to propose a study that, at this
12 point, hasn't been proposed by an applicant.

13 There are certain criteria that are
14 outlined in the ILP regulations that dictate the
15 kind of information that we need. It's something
16 that you kind of have to follow because when FERC
17 reviews these plans they look for each one of
18 these criteria, these seven criteria.

19 And pretty much all it's saying is that
20 you need to identify what the goals and objectives
21 of the study are; how it fits in with the other
22 studies that have been proposed and any other
23 studies being proposed. And gathers similar
24 information, how much effort it would take, or an
25 estimate of cost. And kind of why it's needed and
26

1 the nexus to the project.

2 So these seven things you'll see all
3 through the ILP regulations. And whenever any
4 agency or private individual is getting ready to
5 write a study, please keep these things in mind.
6 If you've got questions about them or how we
7 interpret them I'll have my name and number. You
8 can call me anytime. We can just talk about
9 processwise, just what these things are, kind of
10 how they've been interpreted, what you need to put
11 on your proposed study plans.

12 Again, the two licensees do the studies
13 within a year or two; file the application. The
14 rest of the project the REA notice, in this case
15 EIS. Go back to REA for a second just so you can
16 kind of -- FERC Staff asks for the comments,
17 recommendations and conditions. And then agencies
18 file these. Some are mandatory. Those agencies
19 that have mandatory authority here would be the
20 two forests that are affected. As far as I know,
21 I don't know any other federal agencies that would
22 have mandatory conditions they'd be filing.

23 EIS the staff would prepare. And then
24 go into the order. If it's a contested project,
25 if there's people intervening who are contesting

26

1 against issuing new licenses to either one of
2 these projects, then the order would -- the
3 Commissioners would have to review the order and
4 make a decision. Otherwise it can be delegated to
5 our office director.

6 Just a couple of dates that I sketched
7 down. This process is just very very intensive in
8 dates because there's lots of things that have to
9 be done by different times. But the first study
10 plan should be out the end of October. And then
11 the first study years, full study years are going
12 to be 2009/2010.

13 And then license proposal. And I think
14 these dates are coming off of the Middle Fork
15 project. I don't know if these are the same exact
16 dates as for the transmission line project. But
17 you can clarify when you're describing your
18 project.

19 Okay, file the preliminary proposal by
20 October 2010, and the application by 2011. So,
21 we're still several years out. And, of course,
22 there's been some pretty intense effort to date.
23 So these relicenses are practically running
24 together. We'll get there with the next process
25 and just be continual.

26

1 So at that point I'd like to invite Mal
2 to talk about his project, and Forrest to describe
3 briefly his. And then we can just, as I say,
4 present some of these scoping bullets that FERC
5 Staff have in the document, and get your comments.

6 MR. TOY: Again, my name is Mal Toy. I
7 work for the Placer County Water Agency. And what
8 I have on the first slide is basically a flow of
9 the presentation. And I want to step back a
10 second and first note that in terms of the FERC
11 process we submitted our preapplication and filed
12 it with FERC on December 13th of 2007.

13 And that culminated about two years of
14 early work with our stakeholders. And I see a lot
15 of them here. And I'd like to thank them again
16 for the perseverance and the energy to work with
17 us so successfully.

18 When we submitted that preapplication we
19 had, with the help of our resource agencies, NGOs
20 and the whole broadband of stakeholders, 28 study
21 plans that were approved. And we're really very
22 proud of that.

23 In terms of our documents, we have a
24 hard copy of the document, more for a show-and-
25 tell, in the back bench. And to repeat, we have
26

1 some disks of our document.

2 But I'd also like to note that over in
3 our business office in Auburn we have a little
4 library set up so that for you that would like to
5 look at the hard copy you're surely welcome to
6 drop by the office.

7 We also have a website that you can get
8 onto. The easiest way is to just look for Placer
9 County Water Agency; and on our parent site you
10 can link over to our relicensing site. And we
11 have a relicensing site that stands alone, but
12 it's easy to get to.

13 So, if you have any questions on that do
14 talk to myself or any of our staff so that we'd be
15 more than helpful hopefully to have you navigate
16 successfully around our sites, both the agency
17 site and the relicensing site.

18 And so what I have here today is some
19 real brief extracts of the information that we've
20 developed in the PAD. And what you'll see is the
21 thrust is first a little bit of education. And
22 I'm going to be real brief because I think most of
23 you are familiar, but some of you who are not I'd
24 like to take just a couple of minutes and talk
25 about our project.

26

1 Some new considerations in capital
2 improvements in our project. And then some of the
3 environmental issues and our role in the CEQA
4 process. Just to keep in mind that Jim and his
5 group from FERC is doing NEPA, the National
6 Environmental process, quality process; PCWA and
7 the State Water Board is involved in the state,
8 California Environmental process.

9 So with that let me launch in here. And
10 I really want to just make a couple of points.
11 First, to locate the project and what I think are
12 some of the more interesting facets of the project
13 and the region.

14 First, in terms of orientation, this is
15 north. Auburn is over in this area. The map
16 essentially starts with Foresthill. And what you
17 have is the American River watershed. The major
18 river is the Middle Fork American River that comes
19 up this way. And branches off as the other major
20 river, that's the Rubicon River that comes up this
21 way.

22 The political boundary, essentially the
23 project is in Placer County. The county line
24 follows the American River Middle Fork and then it
25 branches off and it follows the Rubicon River
26

1 until it gets near Hell Hole and then it goes due
2 east.

3 So this side is Eldorado Forest and to
4 the north is Placer County. And this is Eldorado
5 County. Did I say that wrong? Eldorado Forest.

6 There's a little piece of the project in
7 Eldorado County, and it's down at this dam right
8 here, at Ralston Afterbay Dam. The county line
9 goes through the middle of the river and
10 essentially the southern portion of the dam
11 structure is in Eldorado County. That's the only
12 piece in Eldorado. All the rest is in Placer
13 County.

14 In terms of land management the project
15 is essentially on federal land. The colors don't
16 show up as well, but this is the Tahoe National
17 Forest; and the Eldorado National Forest is down
18 in this area. The white areas are checkerboard,
19 as we call it, and those are, by and large,
20 private property.

21 In terms of terrain, what we're looking
22 at is very rugged terrain, very deep canyons that
23 these rivers flow in. And as we get up in
24 elevation, here we're talking in terms of
25 elevation of about 5200 feet elevation. The lower
26

1 part of our project is around about 1700, 1800
2 feet elevation. So we have a pretty significant
3 drop.

4 In terms of road access, the main access
5 comes through the road corridor from Auburn
6 through Foresthill and it follows roads somewhat
7 akin to the way our project is situated. There's
8 also minor access from Eldorado County over
9 Alicost Bridge. But the main access to our
10 project and to the recreation is through the
11 corridor that comes through Auburn to Foresthill.

12 Now, in terms of our project I'll spend
13 just about a minute here. And what we have is two
14 main reservoirs. French Meadows Reservoir lies on
15 the Middle Fork of the American River; Hell Hole
16 Reservoir lies on the Rubicon River.

17 There's three stream diversions. The
18 highest one is off Duncan Creek. And that
19 diversion diverts water up to about July 1st each
20 year. And the water moves from the creek into
21 French Meadows.

22 We have two other diversions, one from
23 the North Fork Long Canyon and the South Fork Long
24 Canyon. It's about in this area. And those
25 diversions from those streams drop into our tunnel
26

1 system.

2 The way our project moves water is one
3 can picture that we are lucky, and maybe one can
4 say blessed, that we have very large storage, on
5 the order of 340,000 acrefeet, high in the system.
6 And what the intent is is to move water through
7 various powerhouses as we bring the water down in
8 elevation.

9 Our highest powerhouse is French Meadows
10 Powerhouse that takes water that's moved from
11 French Meadows, the high reservoir, down to Hell
12 Hole, the lower reservoir.

13 We also have a small powerhouse at the
14 base of Hell Hole Dam. And that basically takes
15 water that's released for environmental values
16 into the Rubicon and generates power there.

17 Another interesting feature of our
18 project is as we move water down elevation, it's
19 essentially moved through tunnels. The total
20 mileage of all the tunnels in the project is a
21 little over 20 miles of tunnels. A pretty
22 significant feat back in the '50s.

23 So as we have water that is now either a
24 combination of French Meadows or Hell Hole
25 Reservoir water, it now goes into a tunnel. A

26

1 little over ten miles down to the Middle Fork
2 Powerhouse where generation occurs right here.

3 The water moves a little bit in the
4 Middle Fork American River and is diverted again
5 to another tunnel down to the Ralston Powerhouse.
6 And again, power is generated.

7 The water is placed back into the river
8 and our last powerhouse is at Oxbow where we do
9 again run the water through a powerhouse. And
10 then it's back into the river for its journey
11 downstream.

12 The total amount of power generation of
13 this project is 224 megawatts. The project makes
14 about a million megawatt hours a year, and that's
15 on average. On a very wet year it could be about
16 1.8 million; and on a very very dry year it can be
17 as low as .2 million. So it very much responds,
18 obviously, to the precipitation, be it snow or
19 rain.

20 Another important facet of our project
21 besides power generation is that we have 120,000
22 acrefeet of water rights. And that was is held up
23 in this area in these two reservoirs. Right now
24 that usage is on the order of 40-, 45,000
25 acrefeet. And the place of use, by and large, is
26

1 within western Placer County.

2 We expect that in the next 30-odd years
3 or so that the full water right of 120,000
4 acrefeet will be released and sent down to the
5 lower of North Fork American River, either at
6 Auburn for diversion into western Placer County,
7 or down all the way into Folsom Reservoir for
8 diversion again to western Placer County.

9 So that's a brief rundown on the project
10 facilities and just the lay of the land.

11 So, let's talk just a brief moment on
12 our project's operations and maintenance. To
13 repeat, from the agency's point of view, it's a
14 multipurpose project dealing with water supply and
15 hydro generation.

16 I've mentioned the level of generation.
17 If one looks at the amount of water we store and
18 how much, if we could run it every day in the year
19 typically, we have enough water to run it a half a
20 year.

21 So that causes us to be very careful as
22 to how we release water that meets the
23 environmental obligations and needs; to meet our
24 water supply needs; and also to create hydropower
25 generation at the most economical timing to
26

1 maximize the value of the project.

2 Another important facet of our project
3 is maintenance. A lot of it can be ongoing, but
4 we do have a major maintenance outage in
5 September/October timeframe. And to a lesser
6 degree in the February or early spring timeframe
7 on our major powerhouses.

8 I'd like to talk about project
9 betterments. This is a term coined for three
10 projects that are described in our preapplication
11 document. They're potential in that they're under
12 consideration for inclusion and in our new
13 license.

14 The ultimate test of whether they will
15 be included in our draft license application is as
16 we learn more information through the
17 environmental process, and also the economic
18 evaluation, the projects, whether they remain or
19 they're dropped from our new license, will be a
20 point of consideration by our elected board. And
21 that decision will be made, I suspect, as we
22 submit our draft application for our new license.

23 So the three projects we have under
24 consideration is the Ralston Powerhouse Upgrade.
25 And here we're looking for increases in efficiency
26

1 and through-put for water on the order of 15 to 20
2 percent. And the goal here is to match the
3 through-put of water that's going through the
4 Middle Fork Powerhouse. And so that we can have a
5 matched operation between these two major
6 powerhouses.

7 Ralston and Middle Fork, power
8 generation is the heart of our system. When you
9 look at the generation of all our five
10 powerhouses, these two particular ones produce a
11 little bit over 90 percent of the total
12 generation.

13 Hell Hole seasonal storage increase is
14 another project that is in the hopper. Here we're
15 looking at a installation of an inflatable gate in
16 the spillway in Hell Hole. We're looking at a
17 seasonal storage increase from 8- to 12,000
18 acrefeet. And that block of water we picture not
19 exceeding the current high water mark in that
20 reservoir.

21 And finally, the French Meadows
22 Powerhouse capacity. This is a facility that we
23 are looking at essentially putting in a twin of
24 the facility that's in there now. And where the
25 benefit would come to the agency is that it would
26

1 increase the through-put and hence the generation
2 from French Meadows Reservoir down to Hell Hole,
3 which allows us the opportunity of moving more
4 water in the high-value time for power generation.
5 Hence, the high value is translated into increased
6 revenue.

7 So, these are the three betterments that
8 are contained in our preapplication document.

9 Now, what I'd like to show is the
10 potential environmental issues. This is something
11 that we've gone through in the development of our
12 technical studies where we followed the FERC
13 process of asking our stakeholders and ourselves
14 as to arrive at a complete and efficient suite of
15 technical studies.

16 We wanted to start with what are
17 people's interests; what are the environmental
18 issues. And as we stepped through and we also
19 looked at the screening of the connection to the
20 project, and here in terms of project O&M,
21 operations and maintenance, we're involving these
22 issues of modifying flow regimes or reservoir
23 water levels or ground disturbance.

24 And given that mix and with the
25 discussion we came with these suites of BINs for
26

1 environmental issues. And you can probably read
2 them faster than I can say them. But this is
3 the -- gives you a sense as to how complete the
4 perspective was.

5 Now, let me step over to the
6 betterments. Again, it's the same thing in terms
7 of the betterments has the perspective; it's the
8 short-term and long-term construction and
9 operational changes due to these betterments. But
10 we have very much the same environmental issues.

11 But the intent of separating them on two
12 slides is to the degree that these betterments
13 stay in the preapplication what we are very
14 mindful at the agency is keeping some separation
15 as to if a betterment does not remain in our
16 application we want to make sure that the
17 environmental issues that were associated just
18 with that betterment are set aside.

19 So, it's our obligation to make sure
20 that we have good bookkeeping with our routine
21 operations and maintenance and with the
22 betterments so that the environmental analysis is
23 complete for whatever the combination that we
24 insert into our final or draft application.

25 Finally, we're getting down to the CEQA
26

1 process. PCWA, we do have a role in this. It's
2 our view that the CEQA, the environmental
3 assessment has to be done for essentially two
4 reasons. One, to support our application for
5 accepting a new license; and also for the Water
6 Board to issue a 401 water certification.

7 Now, we've talked to the Water Board
8 Staff and that's been a very productive
9 discussion. What's coming out of it is that our
10 agency will be the lead agency for compliance with
11 CEQA, and we will be preparing the required
12 documents. And the Water Board will be a
13 responsible agency.

14 So, hence we have a mission here today.
15 And that is to, we're also listening in this
16 dialogue of scoping of issues to see if there are
17 additional relevant issues, environmental issues,
18 that will help us to guide us through the CEQA
19 process.

20 And our CEQA process essentially will be
21 concluded in early 2010. And it's concurrent with
22 our submittal of our license.

23 So, I believe that's the end of my
24 presentation at this time.

25 MR. FARGO: Forrest, did you want to --

26

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Devin is going to make
2 the presentation.

3 MR. FARGO: Okay.

4 MR. MALKIN: I'm Devin Malkin; I'm with
5 Devine Tarbell and Associates. We're consultants
6 to PG&E. Forrest Sullivan at PG&E is Manager for
7 the French Meadows Transmission Line, which is
8 separately licensed. You're going to hear that a
9 number of times during my discussion.

10 But one thing we really want to
11 emphasize is that although the French Meadows Line
12 moves power generated by PCWA, it is separately
13 licensed by FERC and we're running a separate FERC
14 relicensing processes. So the discussions you're
15 going to hear, the dates you're going to hear in
16 terms of say deadlines for filing and along those
17 lines, they're going to differ at least somewhat
18 between PCWA and PG&E's projects. So if you're
19 looking to follow the French Meadows Line you
20 can't just follow one of them.

21 So, the process we're following, I
22 should say, it's reflective of what we view as a
23 relatively small footprint of the project. We
24 don't have any water associated with the project.
25 And it's a relatively small footprint.

26

1 So we haven't engaged in the multiyear
2 prefiling consultant that the PCWA has. We're
3 more or less going by the book in terms of the
4 FERC licensing regulations.

5 But having said that, we're very
6 interested in input from any party. And even
7 outside the information-gathering meetings that
8 we're holding and the information requests, even
9 outside that process we're definitely looking for
10 input from any agencies, member of the public.
11 And you can contact Forrest or myself directly to
12 do that.

13 So the French Meadows project, as I said
14 it operates primarily to move power from PCWA's
15 facilities. The license expires in 2013 on the
16 same day as PCWA's, which means we need to file a
17 new license application two years prior to that.

18 The project is in Placer County. It's
19 almost entirely on the Eldorado National Forest,
20 although one short section of the line is on the
21 Tahoe. So both forests -- we're in discussions
22 with both forests during this process.

23 It runs from around 1100 feet to around
24 4600 feet, which is primarily responsible for the
25 site we're getting moved to I think January 25th,
26

1 is that right? I'm sorry, June 25th, that's
2 right.

3 The project consists of three separate,
4 geographically separate transmission facilities.
5 One is the French Meadows to Middle Fork T line.
6 That's the most substantial part of the project.
7 There's a separate short tap line to the actual
8 powerhouse. I'll show you a map in just a sec.
9 And then there's the separate switch that's also
10 officially part of the French Meadows project
11 that's entirely contained within PCWA's
12 powerhouse, Ralston Powerhouse.

13 So, if you see, that's PCWA's French
14 Meadows Reservoir and Hell Hole Reservoir. So
15 this is the French Meadows line. It moves power
16 from PCWA's French Meadows and Hell Hole
17 Powerhouses down to the Middle Fork switchyard.

18 There's a little inset here that shows
19 the Oxbow Tap, that little red line moving from
20 the Oxbow Powerhouse; and then there's the Ralston
21 Powerhouse over there. We couldn't fit a red dot
22 showing the switch, but it's in there.

23 Of note, there's North Fork Long Canyon
24 Creek and South Fork Long Canyon Creek which are
25 the only water crossings associated with the
26

1 project. The project spans well above those.
2 There's no association with the reservoirs or the
3 Middle Fork of the American River proper. So, in
4 our view, the project has a pretty limited effect
5 on any sort of aquatic resources.

6 If you go through the PAD you'll see
7 that we took that approach in describing aquatic
8 resources, as well. And there's a fairly limited
9 discussion of those.

10 The French Meadows T line, it's a 60 kV
11 line. That's the long one that I showed in the
12 earlier slide. It's just over 13 miles. And as I
13 think I said, it moves power from French Meadows
14 and Hell Hole to the Middle Fork switchyard. The
15 right-of-way for the French Meadows line is 40
16 feet wide.

17 The Oxbow tap also has a 40-foot right-
18 of-way. It's .2 miles; also 60 kV. And that's
19 the Ralston -- I can't say where exactly the
20 switch is in that slide, but it is a 230 kV tap;
21 it's a switch connecting to a nonjurisdictional
22 230 kV line.

23 So before I talk about the routine
24 maintenance, the operations that PG&E goes through
25 on the French Meadows lines, I should note I think
26

1 this is about the point in Mal's presentation when
2 he discussed the project betterments. And I
3 should note that we don't propose any changes to
4 the French Meadows line right now, to
5 configuration or the set of operations. Except,
6 you know, as may come up during -- and proposed by
7 mandatory conditioning authority during the
8 process.

9 So, both the Oxbow tap and the French
10 Meadows line are all wood pole structures. So
11 those structures are tested and treated on a ten-
12 year cycle. There's a number of access roads
13 within the 40-foot right-of-ways.

14 Each one of those is maintained by PG&E
15 to Forest Service level 1 or 2. Level 1 being a
16 sort of road that would be closed for resource
17 considerations and not really accessible except by
18 foot traffic. Level 2 being high-clearance four-
19 wheel-drive vehicles only. So they're not
20 highways.

21 Every two years there's a ground
22 inspection of poles and the insulators and
23 associated structures. And then annually we do
24 inspections for compliance with Public Resources
25 Code 4292 and '93 to identify hazard trees and
26

1 vegetation that may pose a hazard. All that work
2 is done by hand.

3 So we're really at the beginning of the
4 licensing process. We filed our PAD on the 21st
5 of February. As Mal noted, they filed in
6 December, which means that there's going to be
7 separation in the various milestones during the
8 relicensing process.

9 Those come together in 2010 when the
10 preliminary licensing proposals for both projects
11 are due on the same date. I believe that's the
12 1st of October, is that right? Or do you have it
13 as --

14 MR. TOY: I'm not sure, I'll be able to
15 check on yours, but --

16 MR. MALKIN: Okay. FERC says it's going
17 to set the ultimate due dates for each one of
18 these. But preliminary licensing proposal's due
19 at 180 days before our final license application
20 which is due on the 28th, 2/28/2011 or two years
21 before the license expires.

22 Right now we're just after -- we've just
23 kicked off the process, our PAD, again, was filed
24 on the 21st. I'll talk a little bit about what
25 goes into the PAD in a sec, although I will note
26

1 that the next major milestone is PG&E's filing of
2 its study plan, which is going to happen --
3 proposed study plan, which is going to happen this
4 summer.

5 So at the end of this presentation I've
6 listed the studies that we're proposing between
7 now and the time we file our proposed study plan
8 study proposal package with FERC. We're very much
9 interested in hearing input from resource
10 agencies, members of the public or anyone else
11 concerned or with information about the project.

12 So, in our PAD filing on the 21st, the
13 PAD is mostly -- FERC regulations state that the
14 PAD is designed to provide agencies and members of
15 the public with information on the existing
16 environment, on potential resource impacts, so
17 that not only can they understand the project a
18 little bit better, but they can formulate study
19 requests and participate in the study plan
20 development process, which happens between now and
21 June.

22 So, our PAD collects all the available
23 information and presents it, so I'd encourage you
24 to review it. It's available back there. Also,
25 on FERC's website, a short version of what's

26

1 contained in the PAD in terms of the existing
2 environment, anyway. It's a truncated version.

3 Describes things like the habitat of
4 wildlife, botanical resources in the area. It's
5 primarily coniferous forest.

6 In the PAD we're defining project
7 vicinity as a five-mile boundary outside the
8 French Meadows project boundary. So you can see,
9 it's more or less what you're looking at. Once
10 you get up to the high elevations, a little bit of
11 white fir.

12 We have a description of potentially
13 occurring special status species also included in
14 the PAD. Again, this is potentially occurring
15 within about a five-mile boundary, based on
16 existing information.

17 We separate out species as listed under
18 the Endangered Species Act in California,
19 Endangered Species Act, and then other special set
20 of species which primarily consists of Forest
21 Service sensitive species. You see there's quite
22 a few. Each one of them is going to be addressed
23 during the study plan process.

24 There's also a discussion in the PAD on
25 cultural and tribal resources, as required by
26

1 FERC. Our project archeologist, Sandy Flynn, was
2 unable to join us today. I think she got hit with
3 the flu.

4 So I'm not going to go into this in
5 detail except to note that of the 37
6 investigations and studies that we documented
7 within the project vicinity, which is to say that
8 five-mile boundary around the official FERC
9 project boundary for the French Meadows project,
10 there have been -- we identified 37 sites -- 37
11 previous investigations or known cultural resource
12 sites, of which three are within the project
13 boundary in the identified APE, the section 106
14 APE, which is identified as 200 feet outside the
15 project boundary.

16 Again, on aquatic and wetland resources,
17 our view is that there's very limited effects.
18 Nevertheless, we're required to detail them to a
19 degree in the PAD. And we've done so at French
20 Meadows Line crosses, as I said, North and South
21 Forks along Canyon Creek. Included within the
22 project boundary is a little bit more than a tenth
23 of an acre of wetlands identified by the National
24 Wetlands Inventory. And we'll be evaluating those
25 during field studies.

26

1 On the recreation side, the take-home
2 message is that there are no developed
3 recreational facilities within the FERC project
4 boundary for the French Meadows line.

5 Nevertheless, within the project
6 vicinity, which is to say that five-mile boundary,
7 there are portions of the Pacific Crest Trail and
8 a number of others. And then, of course, there's
9 PCWA's reservoirs which have substantial
10 recreational use, as well. Neither of those are
11 directly associated with the French Meadows
12 Transmission Line.

13 So, the next step in our licensing
14 process is the filing of the applicant's proposed
15 study plan package. And we've identified an
16 initial set of studies we think, you know, at this
17 point we're going to be proposing. You know,
18 again, we're interested in hearing from others as
19 to this list of studies. And we're soliciting
20 input into the study plan development process.

21 But right now we're looking at forest
22 fuels inventory throughout the line. And within
23 the hazard tree removal zone, which is about 200
24 feet on either side of the line. At least
25 sections associated with Forest Service ownership.

26

1 We'll be doing a project road condition
2 survey and mapping associated with that. It will
3 be a full historic and prehistoric sites inventory
4 and a TCP inventory.

5 We're proposing a special -- a habitat
6 assessment for a special set of wildlife species;
7 a on-the-ground special set plant survey; and an
8 associated on-the-ground noxious weed survey.

9 So that's the early version of what you
10 can expect to see on the applicant's proposed
11 study plan package which is your next milestone.

12 And I don't think we're actually moving
13 into questions, because I think we're just going
14 to turn it over to FERC. But we are happy to
15 answer them.

16 MR. FARGO: Thanks, Devin. What I'd
17 like to do here is give you just a couple updates
18 that I probably should have gave early on. And
19 then take a break for maybe 10, 15 minutes.

20 And when we come back John and Carolyn
21 are going to highlight a couple of the -- fill in
22 a couple of the issues, give a little bit more
23 detail, the ones we have in our scoping document.
24 Hopefully there are scoping documents in the back
25 along with a couple other FERC publications. So

26

1 you can kind of follow along so that we don't have
2 to hit you with every one of those.

3 And then do the most important part of
4 the meeting, that's hear from you. And talk about
5 some of the thoughts you have on these. I'll put
6 the slide back up about some of the things we
7 typically talk about in an ILP scoping meeting.

8 So, that's the plan I have after this.
9 We can take advantage of all those good things in
10 the back of the room so they, you know, don't go
11 to waste. All that coffee and good pastries back
12 there.

13 The one thing Devin touched on is the
14 project visit because of the snow conditions.
15 We're going to combine that I think the week of --
16 it's June 25th is our tentative date. We hope
17 that some of you can come along and join us on
18 that.

19 The way we picked that date is because I
20 think there's a study plan meeting, Mal, that week
21 that kind of coincides with the site visit where
22 we're going to be going over final comments on the
23 Middle Fork, at least, study plans.

24 These two projects are going to be
25 processed together at FERC. Most of our process
26

1 takes place after the license applications are
2 filed, which are going to be in the same
3 timeframe.

4 And we're hoping to consolidate maybe
5 some of these dates, but we recognize that the two
6 projects are two separate places. And we'll just
7 have to see, I mean the way it's portrayed by
8 Devin probably will work out fine with us, too.
9 So, we'll just see when this evolves just what
10 we're doing with the dates.

11 But hopefully on June 25th when we have
12 the site visit it will coordinate with Forrest and
13 also with Mal and get out there and look at both
14 project sites and the transmission sites.

15 This project is a little different than
16 the ALPs in that there's always a big discussion
17 at FERC as to when a proceeding starts. In the
18 ALP we always took the approach that the
19 proceeding for FERC doesn't start till the project
20 license is filed, which is several years off in
21 these two proceedings.

22 And at that point we had to start
23 documenting conversations that we made. We
24 couldn't talk about the merits after application
25 was filed.

26

1 Here it's kind of a different process.
2 We ended up shooting ourself in the foot, as
3 always, by putting some requirements on ourselves
4 that we had to at least summarize for the record
5 conversations that we make.

6 So we can still talk about issues; we
7 can still talk about things that are relative to
8 the merit of these two projects with you on the
9 phone individually. But we have to have a summary
10 in the record about them.

11 So, it differs a little bit than the
12 projects I'm used to, but that's the way this ILP
13 process evolved.

14 I mistakenly didn't put my phone number
15 up there on one of the overheads, but let me just
16 give you my phone number and email. If there's
17 more information processwise, or just you want to
18 talk about other aspects of these two projects, my
19 phone number is (202) 502-6095.

20 If you have a particular resource in
21 mind that I can grab somebody at the office who's
22 more knowledgeable of, I'll make sure I get them
23 with me and we can talk together about it.

24 My email is james.fargo@ferc.gov -- f-e-
25 r-c.gov. So feel free to call or if you've got

26

1 any questions at all about any of the process.
2 Or, as I say, we can talk about issues; we just
3 have to put, you know, stuff in the record about
4 it is my understanding the way this final ILP rule
5 came down.

6 Let's take a break now and give Debi a
7 break. And we'll come back in say ten minutes and
8 start hearing from you about some of the issues
9 and your concerns.

10 (Brief recess.)

11 MR. FARGO: All right, we'll get started
12 with the second half. John Mudre is going to be
13 covering some of the fishery-type issues, geology,
14 water quality, fishery resources. And Carolyn is
15 going to be following up with some of the
16 terrestrial, recreation, land use.

17 We'll have a break between them for
18 questions and answers. And then afterwards, of
19 course, you know, it'll be opened up for
20 questions, comments you might have.

21 I have the slide that I presented
22 earlier up on the screen. It just kind of talks
23 about some of the information and, again, of
24 course, as it's pretty evident, the two projects
25 that we're talking about today, and scoping both
26

1 of them, are in different stages. So you
2 certainly might have different kinds of questions
3 for PG&E than you might have on the Middle Fork
4 project.

5 So, John.

6 DR. MUDRE: Thanks, Jim. You've already
7 heard a lot today. Mal went over CEQA and scoping
8 and issues; and Jim's talked a little bit about it
9 and why we do it. So I'm not going to spend a
10 whole lot of time talking about things. But I
11 want to mention a couple of points.

12 (Pause.)

13 DR. MUDRE: Okay, so I just want to
14 touch on a couple of points. First is that, as
15 was mentioned, we did a NEPA because federal
16 agencies have to consider the environmental
17 impacts of proposed actions, in this case
18 licensing a hydro project, on the environment.

19 And part of NEPA is scoping. And we
20 used that as sort of the framework that we build
21 our environmental impact statement or NEPA
22 document around.

23 And then the Commission uses that EIS or
24 NEPA document to inform its licensing decision,
25 whether and under what conditions to issue a new
26

1 license for a project.

2 So we consider project-specific effects
3 on resources like the effect of having a dam on
4 the stream, or maybe how gravel moves down through
5 the river, or how fish can get from point A to
6 point B. Or maybe the effects of the reservoirs
7 on water temperature or water quality. We need to
8 consider all those project-specific effects.

9 But we also need to look at cumulative
10 effects, which are incremental effects of maybe
11 some of the proposed actions related to this
12 project when added to the effects of other actions
13 that are going on in the watershed. And that's an
14 important part of the scoping process to us is to
15 learn about what some of these other things are.

16 They could be things like plans to log,
17 you know, a large part of the watershed or
18 something like that. Not so much in this case,
19 but could be, you know, some sort of residential
20 developments or industry or something like that
21 that could alter or change the impacts that might
22 suggest, you might think would occur just solely
23 from licensing the hydro project.

24 So, if in people's scoping comments if
25 they know of things like that that may be

26

1 happening in the future, things that are on
2 someone's drawing board that maybe we, you know,
3 need to look at that and think how that might
4 interact with the effects of licensing the
5 project.

6 Another important part of scoping, too,
7 is maybe we would like to get information on what
8 things aren't really issues, that maybe in a lot
9 of cases they would be an issue, but due to some
10 site-specific or project-specific things here that
11 they're not an issue in this case. And then we
12 don't really need to spend a whole lot of time
13 looking at them in our environmental document.

14 So if people know things like that,
15 then, you know, we'd like to hear about those,
16 too, when we hear your scoping comments or when
17 you send them in.

18 We listed our preliminary take of the
19 issues in SD1, which I think everyone has copies
20 of. We'll be revising this based on the comments
21 to add any additional issues that people bring up.
22 Or we refine. They're pretty general here. We
23 may make them more specific in SD2, but we want to
24 have a good list of issues that we're going to
25 address when we get to writing the environmental
26

1 document.

2 Which sort of brings up another point.
3 Like Jim, this is the first ILP that I've really
4 been working on and it does have some differences.
5 Usually we do scoping after -- under the
6 traditional licensing process we would have an
7 application in hand before we go at it and start
8 scoping. So we have a very well defined proposed,
9 at least the applicant, proposed action.

10 Here, as Mal pointed out, there are
11 still some things unresolved. These betterments,
12 whether or not they're going to put in another
13 powerhouse and things like that. So we'll need to
14 address that in our scoping document, too. And
15 we'll probably do that in an if-then fashion. If
16 they do this, then this is going to be an issue.

17 But, you know, we won't know whether
18 they're going to do it or not until two years
19 after we're done scoping properly. So, that's a
20 difference to me, and I'll just need to get used
21 to it.

22 I think that's about all I wanted to
23 say. I mean you can read the issues that we have
24 here. And, again, if you think we missed some
25 stuff we want to know that.

26

1 MR. FARGO: Yes. And a lot of, of
2 course, we started with the PAD to develop some of
3 our issues. We might have phrased them a little
4 differently, try to make them sound a little bit
5 more defined as an issue, instead of a general
6 type statement.

7 But that's our starting point and then
8 we added issues if we thought any of the resource
9 areas needed them.

10 Carolyn's going to -- well, on the
11 aquatic-type stuff that might be questions or
12 comments that might be for John, is there anyone
13 here who would like to open up or ask something
14 about those types of issues? Okay.

15 DR. MUDRE: Or we can just get to them
16 later when things pop up.

17 MR. FARGO: Oh, you know, just have a
18 general, yeah. Carolyn's going to go ahead and go
19 over some of the remaining issues on aquatics and
20 the recreational resources, land use.

21 MS. TEMPLETON: As John said, we listed
22 out some of the preliminary things that we're
23 going to be looking at when we do our assessment.
24 And for terrestrial resources, T&E, recreation,
25 land use, those are listed on page 10 and 11,
26

1 actually through page 12 of the scoping document.

2 So, I'm not going to read them to you,
3 but just touch briefly on some of the things that
4 we look at.

5 Terrestrial resources, we often look at
6 wetlands, if there are any in the project area.
7 We'll look at habitats of wildlife. We'll look at
8 various types of vegetation and that can include
9 just your, you know, normal stuff that you'll see
10 in the project vicinity. But we'll also look at
11 noxious weeds and basically special status
12 vegetation species.

13 We'll look at wildlife, and the same
14 goes for that. We'll look at special species of
15 wildlife and we'll also look at the T&E.

16 Because there's a transmission line
17 involved we often will look at resident or
18 migratory game birds, raptors flying into lines,
19 things of that nature.

20 And for T&E species, the document here
21 lists out a couple specific things. So if you
22 know of any that weren't included or if you think
23 that there's some on there that aren't really
24 going to be affected with this particular project
25 that would be something that you might want to
26

1 raise whenever we open the floor up to all of you
2 for your comments.

3 Recreation and aesthetics will be looked
4 at. I think there is a number of opportunities
5 with the project for hiking, camping, rafting, and
6 so we'll be looking at those types of things.

7 Land use. As Jim had said earlier, this
8 project is in the Tahoe and Eldorado National
9 Forests. So we'll look at whether or not this
10 project is operating consistently with any types
11 of management plans that are listed out for those
12 forests. And like he said, those are the agencies
13 that will be submitting mandatory conditions that
14 we'll be looking at to include in the license.

15 We'll look at shoreline management,
16 buffer zones. We'll also look at aesthetics and
17 just sort of does the project have any effect on
18 how the general area is viewed. Do people have
19 problems with the way the transmission line looks.
20 All sort of generic things.

21 And are you going to talk about cultural
22 resources?

23 MR. FARGO: You can go ahead and just
24 summarize --

25 MS. TEMPLETON: I'll just finish it

26

1 up, --

2 MR. FARGO: -- it and we'll also --

3 MS. TEMPLETON: -- yeah. We'll also
4 look at cultural resources. And that involves
5 consultation with tribes, if they so desire.
6 We'll look at if there's anything in the project
7 that is historical nature that -- not just the
8 project facilities, but anything else in the area
9 that might have a historical effect. Things that
10 need to be included on the National Register that
11 aren't yet.

12 And I think that about sums it up for
13 me. Like I said, the things are listed out on
14 those pages. And if there is things that you are
15 questioning about, or if there's things that you
16 think need to be added to the list, please feel
17 free to bring that up whenever we turn the floor
18 over to you all for your comments.

19 DR. MUDRE: Just if you could -- I mean
20 the only one that would be affected here on the
21 other issues would be Carolyn for the French
22 Meadows Transmission Line project. So, you could
23 go over those.

24 But before you do, we'll also be looking
25 at how the measures proposed for the Middle Fork

26

1 project affect the economics that's in the
2 developmental resources. And the cost of any
3 measures that are proposed for the project.

4 And, Carolyn, if you could just -- on
5 the French Meadows we also have, as Devin went
6 through, kind of explained this morning earlier,
7 but there's the terrestrial and the T&E land use
8 type. Similar issues that also are going to be
9 affected on the French Meadows Transmission Line.

10 MS. TEMPLETON: Yeah, a lot of them are
11 the same that are associated with the Middle Fork
12 project. Actually some of them are verbatim.

13 As I mentioned earlier, specific to
14 transmission line projects, we'll look at raptors,
15 migratory birds that may be influenced by the
16 presence of a transmission line. We'll look at
17 botanical resources and wildlife, as well.

18 There's T&E species that are potentially
19 in the project area that we'll be looking at.
20 Those are listed on page 13.

21 For land use, again we'll look at
22 whether or not the transmission line project is
23 consistent with things that are listed out in the
24 Lake Tahoe management plan, the Eldorado National
25 Forest management plan, and any other pertinent
26

1 plans in the area.

2 We'll take a look at wildfire risk and
3 fire management. And just the effects of project
4 operations on land uses adjacent to the project
5 boundary of that transmission line.

6 And, again, cultural resources. But
7 that's very similar to what I said about the other
8 project.

9 MR. FARGO: Thanks, Carolyn. And I
10 guess another on the resources we're proposing not
11 to have a resource section on socioeconomics in
12 the Middle Fork or in the French Meadows
13 Transmission Line. That's also in the scoping
14 document. And if you wish, you could comment on
15 that.

16 At this point finally I'd like to open
17 things up, if anyone has questions, comments,
18 things they'd like to get on the record, since we
19 do have a court reporter here, and we are
20 generating a record from the scoping process.

21 So, any issues for either project or
22 related to these projects that you'd like to talk
23 about, discuss information, any of these type
24 things, raise your hand and Beverly will get you a
25 microphone.

26

1 MS. BELL: (Off microphone.)

2 MR. FARGO: You can come up or whatever.

3 MR. ESTES: Good afternoon. My name's
4 Gary Estes and I'm with Protect American River
5 Canyons.

6 I had a couple questions. There was no
7 information with regard to the transmission line.
8 What is the length of that permit or that license
9 for the transmission line?

10 MR. FARGO: Forrest, Devin? Ten miles,
11 right?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: You want the term?

13 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

14 MR. ESTES: No, I want the length of
15 years of the license.

16 MR. SULLIVAN: It's the same, I believe
17 50 years was the initial license.

18 MR. FARGO: Okay.

19 MR. SULLIVAN: It expires on the same
20 date as the Middle Fork project.

21 MR. ESTES: Okay, it wasn't made clear
22 and I just wanted to -- so it's kind of a process
23 issue --

24 MR. MALKIN: In 2013.

25 MR. ESTES: 2013, okay. During the

26

1 presentation -- basically these comments deal with
2 the transmission line piece currently.

3 They mentioned about roads for the
4 transmission line, and you mentioned there's some
5 standards for roads. And you indicate that water
6 quality was not an issue that you identify, but I
7 would suggest that if you have roads through that
8 project to maintain -- maintenance and operation
9 of the line, that any potential impacts from
10 sediment from the roads needs to be evaluated.

11 Because you indicated that the roads may
12 or may not be accessible for the general public
13 for use. One of the questions is are the roads
14 available for, if you will, public to use for
15 recreational purposes. And that sets one level of
16 potential impact upon sediment impacts from water
17 hitting a dirt road and running off versus they go
18 out there once a year, check the trees and say,
19 yeah, we got to do some work here and it's never
20 used again.

21 So I think that's an important issue for
22 sediment in the river and additional sediment
23 beyond what you would get normally if the road was
24 not there.

25 So I think I would disagree with not
26

1 putting water quality in your list.

2 MR. FARGO: Do you have any, I guess,
3 personal knowledge of issues related to that
4 particular topic that are now occurring or have
5 been occurring?

6 MR. ESTES: No. It's just a general
7 question I think you need to address. You talked
8 about in the summary that there was two levels of
9 roads, without clarifying which status of roads
10 are in the project area to know if there is an
11 issue.

12 And I don't know if these roads are
13 accessible to the general public for use. Because
14 I know we have some parts of the Sierras where too
15 much transportation by offroad vehicles creates
16 more erosion issues and creates problems.

17 So I just think we need to make that an
18 issue to be identified to address so you won't
19 have this question to come up again, because
20 somebody else will say, well, gee, -- because
21 water quality is a real major issue that we have
22 for some folks in the watershed to be mindful of.

23 That's my main comment. What I'd like
24 to do is just, as a person who's been involved
25 with this process from the beginning, I want to

26

1 give -- indicate I've really been very just
2 excited by what PCWA has done for process.

3 We kind of talk amongst ourselves, nine
4 governmental organizations. Gee, I think we're
5 setting the standard for maybe how everybody
6 should run their relicensing process to get in
7 front of the required procedure and actually work
8 collaboratively with stakeholders in a process
9 that generates trust and confidence. And that
10 we're trying to do the best for the watershed and
11 the resources which are there.

12 And so PCWA is to be commended for their
13 efforts. So, thank you.

14 MR. FARGO: That says a lot. Thank you.
15 Nate.

16 MR. RANGEL: My name's Nate Rangel. I'm
17 representing Commercial River Outfitters vis-a-vis
18 our state association called California Outdoors.

19 And so my comments are going to be
20 reflective of and dealing with primarily river
21 recreation. And as such I won't be making any
22 comments on the transmission lines because I don't
23 think they're going to have any direct effect on
24 us. But if they are, should be interested in.

25 The recreational uses as regards at
26

1 least whitewater rafting on the Middle Fork is
2 almost entirely commercial in nature. It's a very
3 under-utilized resource vis-a-vis private boaters.
4 And I actually think that it might be interesting
5 for us to find out exactly why that is.

6 I mean I have my own kind of point of
7 view, and I have anecdotal evidence about that
8 from talking to folks. But that might be
9 something that we'd want to look at because I
10 think it's important that folks have the ability
11 to access it. And I personally would like to
12 see, you know, a wider diverse use of the river.

13 My comments are related to how this will
14 affect our specific interest. I have some
15 concerns or I'm interested in what impacts to
16 private and public lands will occur because of the
17 project operations. I'm going to have two
18 specific issues that I'm real interested in.

19 One is the private property which is
20 just downstream of Ralston and Oxbow Reservoirs
21 commonly known as Horseshoe Bend. There's a class
22 5 rapid on that section. And there's a lot of
23 impact to that private property because of the
24 boaters that are going down the river. So I'd
25 like to have some focus on those kinds of -- on

26

1 the impacts to that particular piece of property.

2 And then also when we get farther
3 downstream into the Auburn State Recreation Area,
4 the access vis-a-vis what's called Drivers Flat
5 Road is a real concern to me because of the nature
6 and the condition of that particular road. And I
7 think that's something that I'd like to have some
8 focus on during this process.

9 More specific to recreational flows,
10 this is a unique project in that PCWA owns it, and
11 they contract with PG&E to operate it. Over the
12 last 15 years, frankly, the coordination and
13 cooperation between both those agencies and with
14 us has been exemplary. And so to the degree that
15 that's happened because frankly there are people
16 in place that are real sensitive to all the
17 beneficial uses, you know, I'm thankful for.

18 But I think that needs to be addressed
19 in a formalized manner, also, in relicensing. So
20 that, you know, if all the good guys go away, you
21 know, the general public isn't left holding the
22 bag, so to speak. That was meant to be a
23 compliment, by the way. Just wanted to make that
24 clear.

25 In terms of recreational flows, we've
26

1 got some real -- this is an interesting situation
2 for us, Jim, in that this is the only relicensing
3 that I'm aware of that my industry's been involved
4 in where pretty much we're real happy with the
5 status quo.

6 To the degree that we can keep things
7 the way they've been for the last 15 years, we'd
8 be excited. We know that that's not going to be
9 the case, that there will be some changes. And so
10 we're real interested in knowing how flow-related
11 issues will impact fisheries and aquatics and the
12 general environment. And how that's going to
13 impact our ability to access the resource.

14 So this is something we're already
15 working on. In our ongoing meetings we'll be
16 looking at different flow regimes and how they
17 affect what we do. I just thought I'd put that on
18 the record that that's going to be one of the
19 things we're interested in.

20 And then the other sort of complicating
21 thing about that is that you've got a number of
22 specific, very different, at least on the peaking
23 reach, you've got specific different types of
24 water-based recreation.

25 You've got the whitewater stretch,
26

1 that's about 17 miles long. Then you've got a
2 stretch of class 1-2 stuff from typically where my
3 colleagues and I take out, on down further to the
4 confluence of the Middle and North Forks of the
5 American; and then further down to PCWA's
6 permanent pump site farther downstream, towards
7 Folsom Reservoir.

8 All those have very different needs, and
9 represent very different types of recreation. And
10 so it's going to be a challenge to see how we're
11 going to provide for all those beneficial uses.
12 How you get water at the top of the river, and 25
13 miles further downstream at the bottom of the
14 river in a way that allows for those diverse uses;
15 and allows for it to happen, say, during daylight
16 hours as opposed to, you know, in the morning.
17 And then, like at 7:00 at night, farther at the
18 bottom.

19 So that's just going to be, you know, a
20 timing and quantity issue that's going to be a
21 challenge. And I'm kind of looking forward to, in
22 a sick way, how we're going to creatively deal
23 with that.

24 I was reminded of the betterments,
25 watching Mal's presentation. And I just want to
26

1 point out that from my point of view, at least, my
2 initial read is that it seems to me that my
3 interests, my colleagues' interests and my
4 interests are probably enhanced by the betterments
5 that PCWA is looking at.

6 So depending upon how the environmental
7 studies come out on that, I think that we'd be in
8 support of those.

9 And in closing I want to echo what Gary
10 pointed out. I've been working with PCWA for
11 about 20-some years now, 15 a lot more closely.
12 And if there is an organization in California or
13 the United States that's more sensitive to a
14 diverse group of stakeholders I'm not aware of it.

15 And, in particular on this relicensing,
16 it's been really nice working with Mal and his
17 crew. And frankly with everybody that they've
18 hired, including Entrix and their contractors.
19 This has been, as Gary pointed out, they set, I
20 think, a bar that will be hard to reach by other
21 organizations. And I'm real happy to be a part of
22 this.

23 Thanks.

24 MR. FARGO: I think applause are
25 allowed.

26

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. FARGO: Nate, before you take off, I
3 mean Mal might have a question or two, but first
4 of all, it was really great to hear, you know, you
5 got this relationship for the last 15 years;
6 things have been satisfactory at the project.

7 Somehow I'll try to take credit for that
8 in some way in the document, but, you know, --

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. FARGO: -- I don't know how yet.
11 But you had that one issue about boaters who are
12 causing effects on private land. And you
13 presented that as a project-related issue.

14 Could you just show --

15 MR. RANGEL: What the nexus is?

16 MR. FARGO: Yeah.

17 MR. RANGEL: To the degree that, I mean
18 I guess the nexus is to the degree that the
19 project provides, you know, flows, and folks are
20 utilizing those flows, I guess that would be, in
21 my mind, what the nexus is.

22 And that's always kind of like, okay,
23 well, wait a minute, you know, how are we
24 responsible for your going down and having a great
25 time. And, oh, by the way, you get to make money

26

1 off these people. Why am I responsible for their
2 impacts.

3 I'm not suggesting that. I don't know
4 what the answer is to that. I just know that
5 that's a piece of private property that gets
6 impacted in a fairly significant way because of
7 the recreation that occurs on the river.

8 And we work with the private property
9 owners there cooperatively for the most part, to
10 try to mitigate those things. But I think it
11 would be good, as part of the study, to -- or part
12 of the studies and as part of the relicensing
13 choices that will be made, to look at, you know,
14 possible mitigations or measures that might
15 further or that might deal in a more proactive way
16 with those types of -- with the types of impacts
17 that are occurring there.

18 And I'm specifically talking about
19 people getting out of the boats and walking around
20 to take a look at the rapids and so --

21 MR. FARGO: So, if I'm hearing you, sort
22 of like PCWA, you know, takes sort of credit for
23 this resource that's created as part of the
24 overall project benefits, then maybe they should
25 take a look at some of these secondary effects

26

1 that are happening because of the boats. But
2 maybe you don't want them to look at providing
3 less favorable flows so there can be less effects.

4 MR. RANGEL: Something like that.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. FARGO: Yeah, okay.

7 MR. RANGEL: What I'm looking for is my
8 cake and my eating it.

9 The other thing --

10 MR. FARGO: I didn't know how to present
11 that, but you got it.

12 MR. RANGEL: Yeah. The other thing I
13 wanted to mention was, you know, we have
14 representatives from the Western States Trail
15 Foundation here.

16 That's another organization that's had a
17 good deal of experience in the canyon. I'm not
18 going to speak for them, but I will say that, you
19 know, I'm glad that they've been a part of the
20 process because they do impact the resource for a
21 few days each year. And that, of course, impacts
22 us. And so that's a separate issue, but it
23 involves recreational flows and the ability to
24 work cooperatively amongst the players there.

25 So that's something that's happened

26

1 informally up to now. Once again it'll be
2 interesting to see how we deal with it.

3 Thanks.

4 MR. FARGO: Thanks. Mal, Forrest, you
5 know, if you need clarification, just let me know
6 and --

7 Russ.

8 MR. KANZ: Hi, Russ Kanz with the State
9 Water Resources Control Board. First I have a
10 question for FERC, and that is how is it that you
11 determined that an EIS is required versus an EA?

12 DR. MUDRE: Well, we haven't made that
13 determination yet.

14 MR. FARGO: We haven't made it
15 definitive. It's just we've been doing an awful
16 lot of projects that even been close to in the
17 past, EA, we've been doing them as EISs mainly
18 because the EAs were going to be 300 pages to 400
19 pages.

20 And so at that point, you know, the
21 difference is a cover and then sending five copies
22 over to EPA. And maybe throwing in a meeting.
23 Well, we still do the meetings afterwards. So it
24 really is very little difference processwise, very
25 little difference timewise to do the two.

26

1 And then, of course, you put yourself up
2 for less criticism doing an EIS because then you
3 can deal with maybe effects that aren't, you know,
4 totally mitigatable, whereas the EA there's an
5 expectation that after mitigation everything is
6 taken care of.

7 So, that's sort of been what internally
8 we've been doing. So it's got a political flavor
9 to it, along with the technical. I mean a lot of
10 these projects like this one, if everything's fine
11 being relicensed and there's settlements for these
12 issues once the study plans come in, I mean it
13 would be certainly arguable to do an EA, you know,
14 and get away with it.

15 DR. MUDRE: And I understand there's
16 more of a difference between the two from a CEQA
17 standpoint. So, if you have a preference one way
18 or the other, when you send in your comments, you
19 know, let us know if you think it ought to be an
20 EA instead of an EIS.

21 MR. KANZ: Okay. I was just curious
22 more about the decisionmaking process. Especially
23 now that you've scoped so early. You know, early
24 on it's more difficult to know, really, which way
25 you can go when the application is submitted.

26

1 The other thing is -- and we've made
2 this comment before in writing on other EISs, is I
3 really encourage you to, when you write a
4 document, to be really careful about how you
5 define the baseline and to fully describe the
6 baseline. And also to fully describe the no-
7 action, or some people call it a no-project,
8 alternative.

9 Those are very different and you need to
10 be really careful in that. And I think do a
11 better job in the future of defining what those
12 are.

13 MR. FARGO: And when you say that, Russ,
14 what's your criticism of what you've seen on our
15 definition of no-action?

16 MR. KANZ: That it often is not defined
17 what happens if there is no action, and what
18 really is under no action what happens. You know,
19 is it issuance of annual licenses in perpetuity,
20 or what really happens under a no-action.

21 MR. FARGO: Okay, so you're trying to
22 tie this string of actions that would --

23 MR. KANZ: Well, yeah. What is it? You
24 know, what is it and how is it different from the
25 baseline. And the other thing that I think

26

1 happens on baseline is that in the past FERC Staff
2 haven't, or the consultants, haven't really
3 captured the fact that a baseline is not always
4 static. And it's really important to define that
5 baseline.

6 MR. FARGO: I mean I can just say what
7 our current policy is, the baseline still is the
8 project with all the existing license conditions
9 up to date, which is not always easy to come up
10 with in itself. Because, of course, when a
11 project gets licensed 50 years ago, you've got one
12 set of conditions. And over those 50 years to try
13 to trace back all the amendments and changes and
14 agreements that the licensee has --

15 MR. KANZ: Well, I --

16 MR. FARGO: -- you know, but that's
17 what --

18 MR. KANZ: That's not the point. The
19 point is I think everyone agrees that the baseline
20 is the way the project's being operated at the
21 current point in time.

22 MR. FARGO: Right.

23 MR. KANZ: It becomes more difficult if
24 there are environmental issues that are nonstatic.

25 MR. FARGO: So you mean ongoing effects?
26

1 MR. KANZ: Ongoing effects, you know, a
2 declining fishery, some ongoing impact. And that
3 those need to be really fully fleshed out and
4 defined in the baseline.

5 MR. FARGO: While you've got the mike,
6 is there any difference in the position of the
7 Water Board to be a cooperating agency? Is that
8 still something that's --

9 MR. KANZ: We would love to cooperate
10 with FERC, but we need to be able to intervene.

11 MR. FARGO: Okay, so that's still the
12 setback is that intervention.

13 MR. KANZ: Yes.

14 MR. FARGO: Okay.

15 MR. KANZ: And we, yeah, we had a
16 discussion about that with FERC recently. And
17 there's going to be some attempt to rectify that,
18 but I'm not -- I don't know what will happen with
19 that.

20 MR. FARGO: On this project, I hope?

21 MR. KANZ: Well, we're not lead agency
22 on this project, so, you know, and of course, they
23 can't cooperate, so --

24 MR. FARGO: Okay, yeah.

25 MR. KANZ: -- because of the ex parte
26

1 rules. And I was somewhat disappointed to learn
2 today that the ex parte rule seemed to start --

3 MR. FARGO: Some form of them.

4 MR. KANZ: One the PADs filed, and
5 that's -- I just don't think that was the intent
6 of the ILP. And I'm a little disappointed to hear
7 that.

8 MR. FARGO: I'm sure it was a pretty big
9 compromise because it's not the formalized ex
10 parte rule that they are in place when a filing
11 starts. But it still looks like it was considered
12 a filing of some sort because I caution that I
13 have to put something in the record when I have a
14 talk with somebody even if it relates -- you know,
15 if it relates to issues. But I can still talk to
16 people related to issues, and so can our staff.

17 MR. KANZ: Right, and we're getting off
18 subject from the scoping meeting, but it really
19 raises issues about what is the role of FERC Staff
20 as we're developing study plans and FERC Staff
21 intend to participate and do participate. But if
22 they don't say anything, what's the point of the
23 participation.

24 MR. FARGO: Oh, I think that we are
25 supposed to be, certainly under the ILP, more

26

1 active now, you know.

2 MR. KANZ: But that so far hasn't played
3 out very well. And so we're still left to not
4 know what FERC Staff believe. And so I would
5 encourage very active participation by FERC Staff
6 in the study plan development process.

7 MR. FARGO: Okay. Thanks, Russ.

8 MR. CHRISTOFF: Thank you. My name is
9 Tom Christoff; I'd like to register some comments
10 from the Western States Trail Foundation.

11 Our representative, Mr. Gene Freeland,
12 has been providing input to our Board and is
13 really the feedback is it's been a superb
14 collaboration over the last many months with
15 respect to PCWA and the openness. And I echo what
16 Gary Estes said.

17 A couple of specific comments, though.
18 One is an information item. Both the Western
19 States Trail Foundation and the Western States
20 Endurance Run are seeking federal legislation of
21 have the Western States Trail designated as a
22 national historic and scenic trail. That should
23 not impact any of the ongoing relicensing effort.
24 I'm providing that as a point of information
25 because I did not that there was comments about
26

1 the wild river scenic comments in the document.

2 Placer County Board of Supervisors, the
3 Eldorado County Board of Supervisors, the City of
4 Auburn City Council, as well as the Placer County
5 Water Agency have all provided resolutions of
6 endorsement on that national historic and scenic.

7 With respect to access noted somebody
8 made a comment about on the transmission project
9 the access level 1, level 2. I would look for
10 opportunities on that transmission project to
11 actually incorporate recreational opportunities.

12 I note that the transmission line coming
13 to the north side of French Meadows, it's very
14 close to where the Western States Trail is coming
15 across from Robinson's Flat. There may be
16 opportunities there to provide some linkage up
17 towards the north.

18 And it may occur whether you like it or
19 not. And so the point is if there's opportunities
20 there for linkage, because that would provide a
21 very nice access down to the north side of French
22 Meadows by hikers and horseback folks. Okay.
23 Just if you look at the terrain you'll note that.

24 And I'd make that same comment on access
25 to all points of the Western States Trail along on
26

1 the federal land. There's very few access points,
2 Mal, as you know. Drivers Flat Road is one of the
3 main ones; and then you have to come down through
4 to Foresthill. If there are other opportunities I
5 would encourage us to look at that to increase the
6 opportunity for recreational.

7 And then finally with respect to river
8 flows, certainly both the ride and the run, which
9 are world class events, are dependent on crossing
10 the river at Rucky-Chucky or at downriver slightly
11 from there.

12 And so we'd had a great relationship on
13 safe crossing and worked with the rafters over a
14 number of years. I'd just like to make sure that
15 we continue that relationship in the future as we
16 move forward to insure that we can coordinate on
17 the flows, and that the economics of power may be
18 curtailed when the opportunities for our events
19 take place, which is really only a day or two a
20 year.

21 But that is really important to our
22 organization that we don't have people without
23 rafts floating -- or horses without rafts floating
24 downriver at the wrong time.

25 Other than that, I really want to
26

1 compliment PCWA. They have really stepped up and
2 have initiated a great public process here.

3 MR. FARGO: In the back there's a lady
4 who would like to speak.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Well, my name is Donna
6 Williams, and a long-time resident of Placer
7 County. And just entered the luxury group of
8 being 65 years and older. And from California
9 statistics, we are becoming -- growing in
10 population numbers three times faster than the
11 rest of California.

12 And yet we still never see that group in
13 the hikers and the walkers and the birders and the
14 geotech groups. You hardly ever see them at these
15 meetings. So, as a member, or as an individual,
16 I'd like to represent that, as well as myself, as
17 an equestrian.

18 As well as I've done numerous hours of
19 volunteer work within the state parks and the
20 county parks and derive great pleasure out of it;
21 and have unbelievable appreciation and love for
22 these American River canyons.

23 I tried to nail this down and I will go
24 ahead and give you a letter afterwards, as a
25 comment, so I can break it down. Because I was
26

1 listening, and I got to pick up some really great
2 ideas that people had to offer that we can do.

3 So part of mine actually comes into
4 being an answer to a problem we had right between
5 the rafters and the equestrians and the flow of
6 the river.

7 As I said, I've done a lot of work in
8 the Canyon, so first, one comment I'd really like
9 to make right off the bat is I'm extremely pleased
10 to see that the bureaucracies within the FERC,
11 within the PCWA and the government has actually
12 recognized it isn't just water, it isn't just
13 power, but it's environment and recreation.

14 And it's going to be a beautiful blend.
15 I mean so how do we get the answers to make that
16 happen. Well, I was thinking it over on the way
17 up and wrote down some notes.

18 So one of the things I thought would be
19 interesting is the bridge that was destroyed in
20 1964 by the flood created by the catastrophic
21 failure of the Hell Hole, the old Greenwood
22 Bridge. There's probably a lot of people here who
23 are familiar with that old bridge. Has a lot of
24 historic value.

25 At that time was there put in place
26

1 mitigation for the loss or the replacement of that
2 bridge? I had heard that there was. I don't
3 know. So that would be interesting. Of course,
4 that would be quite a few years ago, and it hasn't
5 been replaced.

6 Why not replace the bridge now. Would
7 address the recreational and the safety issues, as
8 well as the fire, if you had it as a road where
9 you'd have fire protection going across there, as
10 well as there's use for the trail.

11 It would be an exceptional asset to
12 promoting and achieving a goal of a year-round
13 connecting world-class trail. The return value
14 would be tremendous to the general public. The
15 surrounding population supports this. Meeting the
16 needs of a section of the public not usually
17 addressed per State Parks fact sheet, is a
18 California population, as I mentioned before,
19 which now I'm a member of, faster than the general
20 population is growing.

21 The Western States Run and Horse
22 Endurance 100 Race has inspired international and
23 nationally challenges to the human spirit, as well
24 as equestrian spirit. These trails virtually are
25 used 365 days a year, and are an important
26

1 American River Canyon heritage that deserves to be
2 protected.

3 And I really would like to put out here,
4 really improve. You know, we hear -- I hear about
5 the yellow-legged frog and all this, and for their
6 environment, and I totally applaud that. We need
7 to do that because so many years in the past we
8 haven't recognized that.

9 But we also need to recognize all of our
10 different recreational areas and how can we put
11 monies and stuff back in to improve them. And if
12 any of you have been out in the canyons, and I'm
13 sure you have now, I can't even begin to tell you
14 the possibilities of making this a world class
15 trail is just phenomenal.

16 All you have to do is walk out. I mean,
17 you can see the potential. So I'm here to ask to
18 protect that trail. As well as to put some monies
19 back into doing improvements in it. And helping
20 us do that. And there's a horrendous --
21 organizations throughout this community as far as
22 volunteers. You have the birders, you have the
23 Protect the American River Canyon, you have the
24 Western States Run, you have -- there's a lot of
25 opportunity to garner phenomenal support.

26

1 And then not only that, appreciation for
2 what you do. So, are you still -- thank you.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MS. WILLIAMS: No, I just think that we
5 have an opportunity here that in two ways, by
6 putting a bridge in. One is we get fire
7 protection; the other thing we've already
8 recognized that he's having trouble with the flows
9 going up and down for the rafters. The
10 equestrians only get there twice a year.

11 So if we put the bridge in, we open an
12 opportunity for the continual 365 days a year.
13 And then you won't have the race have any problems
14 with the rafters.

15 So, I mean, sometimes there's an answer
16 out there; you just have to ferret it out. Okay.

17 MR. FARGO: Mal, is there a study plan
18 that would capture this potential opportunity in
19 the -- I mean are they broad enough to already --

20 MR. TOY: Well, we have study plans that
21 look at the various recreation opportunities. And
22 what we're doing is we're seeking information,
23 balancing of those will come later with recreation
24 and environmental and operational issues.

25 MR. FARGO: They're broad enough to
26

1 study and capture ideas such as this?

2 MR. TOY: I think so. Ed?

3 MR. BIANCHI: Yeah, I think there's a
4 couple different study plans. The REC2 is a
5 vision survey, so there's a pretty intensive
6 effort to get and interview the recreation that's
7 out there and get their impressions not only of
8 existing conditions, but potential enhancements or
9 improvements over time.

10 There's also a REC forest, stream-based
11 recreation study. And then there is a focus group
12 identified of trail users, not only equestrians
13 but runners, bikers, any kind of trail users out
14 there. We're just starting to formulate those
15 topics and get a list of participants that would
16 be invited to join this focus group and discuss
17 these types of issues.

18 MR. FARGO: Okay. Thanks, again.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

20 MR. FARGO: Anyone else?

21 MR. BIANCHI: I'd just like to add,
22 Donna, I'll make sure that you're on the list.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: (Off microphone.)

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. FARGO: Oh, Bev, do you want to

26

1 speak?

2 (Off microphone.)

3 MR. FARGO: I guess we're all done
4 unless there's anyone that participated in the
5 collaborative that didn't care for PCWA's --

6 (Laughter.)

7 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

8 MR. FARGO: Who was that guy?

9 Well, thank you for coming. Hopefully
10 I'm sure we captured some of the information that
11 came in through the transcript. The transcripts
12 are available, Debi, do you -- they'll be
13 available in our record, I know from a length of
14 time. But they can get them directly from you?
15 Right? I mean you can give them a card?

16 THE REPORTER: I can give them a card.

17 MR. FARGO: Okay, so if you want to get
18 it directly from Debi, you can get a card. It
19 always takes awhile for us to get them up.

20 So, thanks again, and we'll take it off
21 the record now.

22 (Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the Scoping
23 Meeting was adjourned.)

24 --o0o--

25

26

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, DEBI BAKER, an Electronic Reporter,
do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person
herein; that I recorded the foregoing Federal
Energy Regulatory Commission Meeting; that it was
thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of
counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said
meeting, nor in any way interested in outcome of
said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 6th day of March, 2008.

Document Content(s)

25705.DOC.....1-86