Volume No. 1

Official Stenographers Report

Before the

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

DOCKET NO:

P-2105-089

ORIGINAL

LOCATION: CHICO, CA

PAGES: 1 - 57

DATE: MAY 21, 2003

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

1120 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 347-3700

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -X

IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket Numbers

UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER : P-2105-089

HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT :

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -X

Pacific Gas & Electric Company

460 Rio Lindo Avenue

Chico, California

Wednesday, May 21, 2003

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Louis Berger Group:

MARK H. FOREMAN
BRIAN MATTAX
CAROL EFIRD
FRANKIE GREEN
SCOTT AULT

On behalf of PG & E:

THOMAS A. JEREB
STUART K. RUNNING
MIKE MALLOY
CHUCK EVERETT

On behalf of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

JOHN MUDRE

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:26 a.m.)

MR. MUDRE: My name is John Mudre, and I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. And we're here today to have a scoping meeting.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is the federal agency charged with overseeing the non-federal hydropower projects in the United States.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issues licenses for and oversees the operation of the non-federal hydropower projects. And that's why we're here today, because the license for the Upper North Fork Feather River Project, FERC No. 2105, is expiring in a couple of years.

The licensee for the project, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, has decided that they want to apply for a new license for the project, and has filed their application to do that.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission must decide whether and under what conditions to issue a new license for that project. As part of that process to support the Commission's decision, Commission staff is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement.

And part of the process of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement is to conduct scoping meetings, which is basically to identify what are the issues

that need to be looked at in our Environmental Impact Statement.

So we're trying to determine what issues we need to analyze to be able to make the proper decision on, again, whether and under what conditions to issue a new license for the project.

We have a Court Reporter here today, and everything that we say is being recorded, so we can make sure that it get into the official Commission record for this proceeding.

There will be transcripts produced that are available from Margaret, our Court Reporter. If you want copies, see here after the meeting.

You can also obtain copies of the transcripts off of the FERC website in about two weeks, but if you need them sooner, Margaret could probably get them to you in about three days or so.

There are microphones scattered around the tables here. They don't actually amplify anyone's voice. They are just connected to her recorder, but we do need to speak into the microphones to make sure that whatever is said is duly recorded.

What we're doing to do first is, I'm going to have Tom Jereb give a description of the existing Upper North Fork Feather River Project, and then also to describe

some of the changes that they're proposing in their application for a new license.

After that, we're going to talk a little bit more about scoping, our schedule for the process, and then we get to the real part of the meeting, which is to obtain public or agency comments on what they think is important that we look at.

We have issued a document. We call it Scoping Document 1, and they have been handed out and so are there. This basically lists what we think the issues are, based on a review of the application.

You know, we may well have missed some important issues, and that's what we want to hear today. Once we get back to the office and review the transcripts, we may revise SD-1 and put out a new document, SD-2, which is our updated document that we will work from when we begin to prepare the EIS.

And with that, I'm going to turn the meeting over to Tom.

MR. JEREB: Okay, thank you, John. Again, my name is Tom Jereb, and I'm managing the relicensing for PG&E for the Upper North Fork Feather River Project.

I brought a couple maps that are up here on the wall that I'll be talking about, and also I have three individuals here as a part of the Upper North Fork PG&E team

for relicensing: Chuck Everett, who deals with the recreation and manages the recreation studies that were done; I have Stu Running, who is an aquatic biologist; he manages the aquatic biology studies that were done; and next to him down here is Mike Malloy; Mike is the operating superintendent who operates the system.

So they're here to answer questions if you have any.

So let me first start by describing the project. Maybe Stu, you could get up at the map and point as I describe the facility, so that I can stay by the microphone.

I'll be quick on this. We have three reservoirs relating to the Upper North Fork Project: Lake Almanor, Butt Valley Reservoir, and Belden Forebay.

The water from those three reservoirs operate five different powerhouses: The Butt Valley Powerhouse, the Caribou I and II Powerhouses, the Oak Flat Powerhouse, and the Belden Powerhouse.

Those five powerhouses produce enough energy for about 360,000 homes here in California, and that equates to about 360 megawatts, so it's an easy equation there.

The Project, over the last three or four years, we've been evaluating and studying all the different resources, and we spent about $9 million looking at this so far. We've prepared an application, and it was filed in

October of last year.

It's an eight-volume set, and it's over on the counter over there in those black binders. That's the size of it. It's available in the local libraries for anybody that wishes to view it.

All of the study results and information and our proposals are within that application.

I'd like to go over some of those proposals now and spend about five minutes, and Chuck will spend about five minutes, going over the proposals that are in that application.

Those are just proposals. We are proposing those to FERC, and we're open to discussion and comment on those proposals.

We are in a collaborative effort with a number of resource agencies and interested parties. We're meeting regularly on a monthly basis to try and resolve the issues which we have on the Project.

Our next meeting is tomorrow, here at 9:00. We're meeting regularly and the meetings are open to the public, so you're welcome to come to those, if you choose to.

So, now let me go through the proposals that we have: The first proposal is contained on page 7 of your document, and if you'd turn to page 7, I'll just go through

this list.

The first bullet there -- and I'll just proceed through them -- is an addition of 43 acres necessary for the Project in the Caribou area for an existing spoil pond, and existing road, and some penstock slope stabilization.

The next two bullets are related to water quality. We are studying the feasibility of a temperature control structure at Prattville Intake up at Almanor for the possibility of taking cold water from Lake Almanor, down the system to the lower Feather River Reaches for ecological purposes.

Again, we're studying the feasibility of that. No decisions have been made yet. The study of that is related to an agreement that we have struck with 13 different parties back in the year 2000.

That agreement was related to the relicensing of the Rock Creek-Cresta Project. That agreement then was primarily incorporated into a new FERC license that was issued in 2001, and so we're proceeding with the agreement conditions and the conditions within the new license, as looking at the feasibility for temperature control at Prattville Intake.

The next item here is doing some gate manipulation at Canyon Dam for an odor problem that we have in the Fall there, relating to the water which is withdrawn

from that into the Seneca Reach.

The next several items there have to do with river flows. At Canyon Dam, we're proposing to increase the river flow there from 35 cfs to 75, more than doubling the in-stream flow, year'round.

Down at Belden Forebay Dam, we're proposing there to continue 140 cfs release. The current release there during the summer is 140, and it switches to 60 during the winter. Our proposal is to have a year'round 140 cubic feet per second release at that dam.

We're proposing to implement a ramping rate during times of spill, and when we go in spill and out of spill, we would ramp up at a certain rate. This is 225 cfs per hour, and then ramp down at 150 csf per hour. These are primarily for ecological reasons, slow ramping up and down during times when we got into spill and come out of spill.

The last one on river flows is to block load at Belden Powerhouse at a certain flow. That's to help stabilize flows downstream from Belden Powerhouse, because we can turn it on and turn it off, and it does cause flow fluctuations downstream, so to stabilize those, that's what that measure is proposed for.

The next couple of items are relating to fisheries. There's a fish barrier down by -- it's called Gansner Bar. It's a small dam that crosses the river. It

was originally built to prevent the non-game fish from coming up into the Belden Reach. It's not longer effective and we feel that removing that would enhance the current cold-water fishery, the trout spawning, so we proposed in our application to remove that small concrete structure across the Feather River.

There's another small weir, even much smaller, up on Butt Creek. It's an old gauging weir, and it was put in many, many years ago, and so we're planning to remove that for the same reason, to improve the trout spawning.

From a wildlife perspective, we have a number of Bald Eagle nests in the Lake Almanor area, and what we've proposed to do is to continue to comply with the measures in a nesting territorial plan.

If you turn to page 8 here, we're looking at one other wildlife measure. It's a combination wildlife-recreation measure.

There is a significant population of bramble or blackberry, called Himalayan Blackberry, and we're looking at some test plots down in the Belden Reach, to test two to four sites for blackberry control in public access areas from the road to the river. So we're looking at that.

Blackberries, as you all know, are particularly difficult to deal with because they are hard to eradicate. They are quite evasive and they're everywhere, and we're

looking at two to four sites to try to provide better public access from the road to the river.

For the recreation portions, Chuck Everett will cover those, and then I'll come back and address a few more measures. So, Chuck?

MR. EVERETT: Thanks, Tom. I wanted to first mention that there is a handout that was provided up front, that provides a little more detailed description of the phasing, but it's also pretty much the same as what's on pages 8 and 9 of the Scoping Document No. 1, so you have those two references.

First, I wanted to talk about the development of a recreation resource management plan. And this is a plan that was developed with input from area residents, the County, Forest Service, the National Park Service, the 2105 Committee, and others.

And this was created between the draft and final license application and is included in the final license application. It gets into a lot of detail about the facilities and how they will be maintained over the term of the new license.

But one key point of the recreation plan is that there are six programs: The first one deals with facility development. These are facilities that PG&E would construct over the term of the new license.

The second program deals with operations and maintenance, how those facilities would be maintained.

A third program is monitoring all the activities and data that will be collected over the term of the license to make decisions about managing those resources and when new facilities would come online.

Another one is integration and coordination with other resources, how decisions about recreation would be coordinated with other resource areas such as fisheries and cultural. That includes things such as annual meetings to discuss and coordinate plans.

Another program is updating the plan over time, how that plan gets changed, and what are the actions that would occur, for example, updating the plan every ten years or so, as needed, so that it's not a static plan.

And, lastly, there is an interpretation an education program that deals with providing interpretation about cultural issues, resource protection, educating the public in the hydroelectric project, and it would also detail where signs would be located and what those messages are and things like that. So that's a plan that would get developed when the new license is issued.

Next, I wanted to kind of highlight some of the proposed facilities, starting with those that were kind of the initial category or the first ten years.

Tom's going to point out where they are on the map for those who might not be familiar with the names.

The first category of facilities deals with accessibility. Virtually every site has improvements related to compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, including amendments that should get adopted over the next year or two.

And things like that would include: Toilets in boat docks; fishing piers and platforms; picnic sites; swimming areas; and these are scattered throughout the Project area to improve accessibility.

There will be one new facility for groups at the East Shore Picnic Area that would get converted from picnic use to group use. This is a little-used picnic site that would get created as a new group site.

Next there would be conversion of several sites to improve access to the shoreline. These are both new sites and improvements to existing sites.

There will be two on the North to improve access to the Northern shoreline for residents in that area, including the Super Channel Site near Chester and a little bit to the West, and, in downtown Chester, the Stover Ranch site.

On the eastern side, there would be two new sites, Westwood Beach and Stumpy Beach, which would be day-

use access sites.

And then on the western and southern ends, there are four sites. These would include a new site at Rocky Point Campground for day use; this would be a new site conversion; Canyon Dam day-use area would get some improvements. This is a fairly well used site.

A new site is the PSAE Swim Beach in the Prattville area, and then, finally, improvements to the Almanor Beach, which is a Forest Service facility, to improve the swimming access at that location.

There are also several boat launch improvements proposed, the first one being extension of the Canyon Dam Boat Launch, which is a Forest Service facility. PG&E is proposing to co-fund extension of that, getting the facility eventually down to 4467. The Lake rarely gets to that level, but the proposal is to increase the launch ramp at ten-foot increments when that's possible to do that.

Also there will be a brand new boat launch, a $1.5 million proposed facility at the North Shore Campground. This would be a new public boat launch with its own separate access to provide boat launching on the northern shoreline area where a boat launch doesn't currently exist.

Additional boat launch improvements would include the Alder Creek Boat Launch on Butt Valley Reservoir,

providing additional capacity at that location for launching boats on Butt Valley Reservoir, and also a new cartop boat launch at the Belden Forebay. No launch exists there right now, so that would provide access for small boats onto that Forebay area.

To expand some camping capacity in this first phase would include an additional 20 sites at the Rocky Point Campground. That's the new name for the old Lake Almanor Campground, PG&E's facility.

To improve and protect resources along the southwest shoreline access area, PG&E is proposing to work with the Forest Service to provide improved developed access points, approximately four of those in the southwest shoreline area.

What that would include would be providing graveled road and parking areas down to the 4500 foot elevation, and then closing and rehabilitating a number of other existing roads to protect resources.

PG&E is proposing to also provide easements across company lands for trail development. These would be trails that would be developed by either the Forest Service, the Parks and Recreation District or others.

In Butt Valley Reservoir, we're proposing some improvements to angler access up by the Powerhouse area, by providing two improved access points, include 80-A access

and trails in that location.

On the western side of Butt Valley Reservoir, we're proposing two areas that would include both walk-in and boat-in disperse access points, so that's a new facility in those locations.

Down at the Belden rest stop, we're proposing some renovation of that facility, including additional picnic facilities and improvements to 80-A access interpretation, and toilet facilities.

And all during this initial ten-year period, PG&E would also begin permitting process and collection of easements for other facilities that would be constructed in the next ten- to 20-year period.

So kind of in the next phase after the first ten years, a lot of these facilities would be triggered by monitoring activities which would demonstrate that the facilities are needed, based on capacity. But a few of these are also items that would be done in this period, anyway.

The first of those would be construction of a new campground facility called the East Shore Campground. This is proposed to be approximately 95 campsites, both RV and tent, and include a day-use facility.

It's proposed in three phases. Those phase would like be constructed as need is demonstrated. So that's a

brand-new facility at about $7 million, I believe. So that's kind of the largest new facility we have proposed.

But there are also plans to expand a few other campgrounds to provide additional capacity as need is demonstrated, and those include additional sites at Last Chance Campground at the far northern tip, and Ponderosa Flat Campground on Butt Valley Reservoir.

Also in this second phase, there are plans to expand two group sites at Camp Conery and Ponderosa Flat to provide new facilities for groups; also to improve the Almanor Scenic Overlook, which is near the dam, to provide additional picnicking and other facilities there and interpretation.

In the northern area, Catfish Beach, there it is. This is a facility that we would need to acquire easements across adjacent private lands, but the site itself is on PG&E property, and we're proposing there, new day-use and primitive camping opportunities with improved road access to that location.

Also along Butt Valley Reservoir, there are plans for a new trail that would extend from the powerhouse angling access area, all the way down to Cool Springs Campground along the eastern shoreline.

There are a few other actions that relate to recreation: PG&E is supporting the County in adopting a new

ordinance that would restrict vehicular access below the 4500 foot elevation, so that would keep people out of sensitive areas, including cultural areas, and a new ordinance would give local law enforcement the authority to then cite people that are down in that area.

Assuming that that new ordinance is adopted, PG&E is proposing to provide additional funding to the County for additional law enforcement patrols.

PG&E is also proposing to continue to negotiate a memorandum of understanding. This is an agreement between the Company and the County for marking hazards and removing hazards on the water. This is an ongoing activity.

Finally, there are plans to provide additional signs and pamphlets to inform boaters of underwater conditions. This would be like a topographic map showing where shallow areas are, and hazards, and islands, to give people more information about the conditions they may find out on the water.

There is also, in parallel to the recreation plan, a shoreline management plan that is included in the final license application. This includes provisions for shoreline erosion and shoreline permitting. Thanks.

MR. JEREB: If we turn to page 9, you can follow along with me at the bottom of page 9, where we have some aesthetic resource improvements we're proposing.

These generally are painting, vegetative, plantings, some spoil pile regrading and contouring, and some road work.

Turn to page 10, and this moves us into the last three bullets there relating to cultural and historic resources. We're proposing a cultural resource management plan, and a draft of it is in the application, and that plan contains measures for the protection of cultural resource sites.

We're proposing protection of several National Historic-eligible Sites also. All of these would be implemented, these cultural sites would be implemented as soon as we get the license, which we're expecting sometime hopefully in 2004.

That concludes our proposal within the application. John?

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much, Tom. Next, I would like to introduce Frankie Green. Frankie is with the Louis Berger Group. And they are FERC's support contractor for preparing environmental documents.

Frankie and her team will be preparing the Environmental Impact Statement for the Commission. Frankie?

MS. GREEN: Thank you, John. I'd like to introduce the rest of the team who are here with me today.

We'll all be working together with John Mudre to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement for this project.

To my far right is a member of the public; he's not part of my team.

(Laughter.)

MS. GREEN: Next to him is Jeff Murphy, one of the fisheries biologists working with me; Carol Efird is our recreation specialist; Scott Ault is another fisheries biologist; Mark Foreman is the engineer working on this project, and next to me is Brian Mattax, who is our water quality specialist.

I'll be managing the team, managing the project, and also addressing terrestrial issues in this document.

In addition, we have a cultural resources specialist who is not with us today, as well as some other support staff members, but this is the primary team working on this. Our cultural resources specialist has been working with the local members of the Native American community to work on various issues.

Anyway, that's our team. John mentioned that we are here for scoping. I spoke to Mr. Alexander, briefly, about the purposes of scoping. I thought I'd just touch on that briefly at the beginning of my talk.

As I mentioned to Mr. Alexander, we're here to collect information on all of the issues related to the

project, anything that we may not have mentioned in our scoping document, we need to hear from you today.

We need to determine how significant the issues are that have been listed in the scoping document before you. I also would like to know if any of these issues will contribute to cumulative impacts in the watershed.

We have our -- we think we know which issues will, but we would like to hear from you if you've got some other ideas on that.

In addition to the proposal that PG&E has put before you, we'd also like to know if there are any other alternatives that should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Also, if there any issues or resource areas that we have mentioned that are not very significant, that should be focused on, we'd like to know that as well.

So we'd like to start with our schedule. This is the scoping meeting. The scoping document was issued at the end of April.

We will revise that scoping document, based on any comments we receive. Comments are due -- if there are any written comments, they are due by June 20th, so I just don't want anybody to forget that date. That is very critical.

Based on those comments and testimony we have

received at the meeting last night and today, we'll revise the scoping document, issue the second scoping document by the end of July 2003.

At about that same time, we anticipate issuing -- FERC anticipates issuing a Notice that the application is ready for Environmental Analysis. And that's when the actual analysis will begin.

We expect to have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement ready for review by the public in January of 2004, and a final Environmental Impact Statement in July of 2004.

Between the Draft and the Final Environmental Impact Statement, there will be a public meeting. If we have totally missed the mark on any of the issues that are addressed, then that gives you an opportunity to provide comments. If you think we did a good job, we'd like to hear that, too, but especially if we've missed something very critical, that's when you get an opportunity to tell us that.

Any comments you provide on this scoping document do need to go to the Secretary of the Commission. The address is provided in the scoping document. It's also on the screen in front of you. Once again, the comments need to be submitted by June 20th.

Please make sure you include the name of the project and Project Number 21052105, so that it gets

included on the proper record at the Commission.

So now I'm going to go through the resources issues that we have identified. As John mentioned and Tom, I think, as well, behind Mr. Alexander and Bob and Mike over there, are the volumes the very eight volumes of the license application that were submitted to FERC in October.

We have gone through those and determined what we think are issues that should be addressed, anything that may be affected by the operations of the project, as well as any measures that are proposed or are recommended to the Commission. So I am just going to briefly go through those.

There are seven resource issues that we have touched on in our scoping document. Those include: Water, aquatic resources, terrestrial resources, threatened and endangered species, recreation, land use and aesthetics, and development resources.

So, starting with water resources, which is what's before us, we're going to look at the effect of the project operation on a variety of thing, including: Sediment supply and transport; flows in the Upper North Fork Feather River and Butt Creek; the effects of project operations on Lake Almanor water surface levels, and on the temperatures of the water.

Several of these items will have asterisks next to them, and that indicates that we anticipate addressing

those items in our Cumulative Effects Analysis. If we've also missed something on that, please make sure you point that out in either your written or oral testimony.

Moving on, we're looking at potential deep-water releases from Prattville and Caribou No. 2, and we want to see the effects on water temperatures in the Lake Almanor and Upper North Fork Feather River, based on that; and the effect of Lake Almanor cloud-seeding on any trace metals and odors in the Upper North Fork Feather River.

We're also interested in the effects of any project-related recreation on water quality in Lake Almanor. That includes coliform bacteria, as well as MTBEs.

We're also looking at the effects of flow releases on the determination of flow releases that protect and enhance a variety of species and their habitats, as well as the overall aquatic system in the bypass reaches downstream of the Canyon and Butt Valley Dams and in the North Fork Feather River downstream of the Belden Forebay.

And then we get into species of concern. The one that comes to mind for aquatics is Hardhead. We want to know if there are any effects on Hardhead, based on any flow releases that are recommended to the Commission.

We are also interested in the effects of project discharges from Lake Almanor and the Butt Valley Reservoir on water temperatures and whether or not there's a need to

enhance temperature conditions for trout downstream of Lake Almanor.

We're interested in the effects on project operations on the amount of large woody debris in the project area, as well as any associated fish habitat.

We want to know about the effects of fish barriers, either human-made or natural, on Rainbow Trout movement and distribution in the North Fork Feather River.

We're also interested in the effects of reservoir levels on tributary access for various salmonid species, either native or introduced.

We're interested in the effects of turbine entrainment at the project powerhouses on a variety of species, both Forest Service-sensitive species and other fish species.

And we're also interested in the effects of any potential recreation flows on aquatic habitat and species. Those would include any whitewater flows that may be anticipated in this project area.

We're also concerned that there may be some effect on potential for whirling disease in the project reservoirs, based on a change in project operations.

Moving on to terrestrial resources, we're interested if there are any effects of flow releases on the reservoir streams and associated wetlands.

There are two deer herds in the project area, and we're wondering if there any effect with changing project operations on either the winter range or summer range for those two deer herds. They migrate through this project area.

We want to know the effects of any flow release on riparian vegetation and wetlands, as well as wildlife habitat, and if there is any way to minimize those impacts.

We're interested in managing any noxious weeds that are on project lands at a variety of the facilities associated with the project.

We're also interested if there are any effects of project operations on any associated mitigation measures on a variety of special status plants and animals, including Forest Service-sensitive species, Forest Service special interest species, Forest Service Watch List Species, and California Species of Concern.

As you can see, there are a variety of plants and animals on this list, and if there any effects on those species, we are going to determine if there are any measures appropriate to minimize those impacts.

Our next resource area is threatened and endangered species, sort of building on the terrestrial issue. And there are a variety of species. I have decided to handle this a little differently today, so bear with me.

There are a variety of species in this project area or their habitats that are in the project area that are either listed by the Federal Government or by the State of California as threatened or endangered. The include: The Bald Eagle, the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, the California Red-Legged Frog, Peregrine Falcon, Willow Flycatcher, Greater Sand Hill Crane, California Wolverine, Sierra Nevada Red Fox, Hairy Orcutt Grass, and Slender Orcutt Grass, Greene's Tuctoria, Hoover Spurge, and Layne's Ragwort.

And some of those are Forest Service-sensitive species. Our scoping document covers all of those, but rather than list them all here, I thought I would give everybody a break today.

(Laughter.)

MS. GREEN: Anyway, moving on to recreation -- wasn't that nice to run right through that endangered species section?

(Laughter.)

MS. GREEN: We're looking at the effects of the proposed action and any alternatives to the proposed action on recreation access to project waters and to existing recreational activities and future recreational activities within the project area.

We're also trying to determine the ability of the

existing recreational facilities to meet current and future demand, and that includes accessibility needs for individuals who have special needs.

We're also looking at the potential effects on the proposed action and any alternatives on any angling opportunities in the bypassed reached, and that would include any altered flows. If we change any of the minimum flows or if there are any recreational flows, we would need to determine if that affects recreation, including angling.

We need to determine if there will be effects on the community of Chester if we expand the existing recreation facilities or increase the number of recreation facilities in the project area. We anticipate that there would be an increased recreational usage and a variety of other possible or potential problems of increased litter, increased fire potential, effects on public safety.

We also need to determine if any proposed actions are within the recreation opportunity spectrum of classifications included in the National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans for both the Plumas and Lassen National Forests.

Moving on to land use and aesthetics, which was that last one sort of started, we also need to determine if we are -- we need to make sure that any proposed actions or

alternatives are compliant with the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment that amended both the Plumas and Lassen National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans.

We also need to make sure the proposed action and any alternatives are consistent with the Plumas County General Plan, including their land use zones and any elements relevant to the project, including open space, scenic highways, noise, safety, conservation.

We need to make sure we're consistent with the Bureau of Land Management's Eagle Lake Resource Area objectives.

The licensee has proposed adding 34 acres of the Plumas National Forest to the project area for penstock maintenance and spoil management. We would just need to check on the effects of adding that acreage.

We need to determine if there are any effects of any flows on active mining claims in the North Fork Feather River. We also need to determine if there will be effects on law enforcement and fire management demands in the project area due to the construction of several proposed residential development projects near the project area.

We also need to determine if there will be any effects on static resources in the project, based on the project's operations.

Now, we're going to look briefly at cultural

resources. There are some other people working more on that issue, and we just need to determine if there will be any effects of the project operations and any proposed enhancement measures on prehistoric and historic archeological resources, as well as sites of cultural or religious importance.

In this area, we're primary concerned with all members of the Maidu and including the Greenville and Susanville Rancherias.

And, finally, we're also concerned if there will be any effects on any proposed mitigation or enhancement measures on project economics. We'll be looking at the economics of all of these proposals and their effects on the project.

So those are the resource issues that we have gleaned from that eight-volume license application. If there are other issues that we need to address, we'd like to hear those now, or you could please submit some written testimony by June 20th to the Commission at that address.

So --

MR. JEREB: Thank you, Frankie. What we're going to do at this point is hear any comments that people here have, and then after that, if in our question-and-answer session, we'll entertain some questions and try to give you the answers.

The first individual signed up today to speak is Michael Condon.

MR. CONDON: Good morning, my name is Michael Condon. I'm the Ecosystem Planning Staff Officer from the Plumas National Forest. I'm working with an interdisciplinary team of folks from both the Plumas and Lassen Forest, because the project crosses both forest boundaries.

We've got aquatic biologists, terrestrial biologists, hydrologists, and recreation specialists, all working together to try and provide input for our 4E conditions. I don't want to comment on those specifically; I'd like to limit my comments today just to the scope of the analysis.

Before I do that, I would like to commend the folks that we've been working with, Tom Jereb and his team from PG&E. I have been real impressed with the professionalism of the PG&E staff and their contractors in their willingness to work on this in a collaborative process. It's made it a real rewarding and fruitful exercise, I think, and we're going to continue working in that vein and hopefully get to a settlement agreement in a time that will dovetail nicely with the analysis that you will be doing.

With regard to the scope of the analysis, I just

wanted to offer a few comments, one of which I think you've heard already, having to do with the scheduling of this, vis a vis the Hamilton Branch Amendment.

As far as I can tell, everybody agrees that adding the Hamilton Branch facilities to the license is probably a very good idea, but there's a lot of concerns about adding it to this license application and what that does to our schedule and the ability to do a quality job in now what's becoming a fairly limited amount of time.

So we hope you'll take that into consideration, and if that application actually does get filed, you'll consider the best way to do it, so that it doesn't impact this particular application that we're working on now.

I would also like to comment on in terms of the scope of the analysis, the cumulative effects. It struck me that rather than limiting the cumulative effects analysis to some specific issues, that probably anytime you've got a direct or an indirect effect, there's reason to look at it in a cumulative effect sense, so it would be good, I think, to broaden that out to virtually all the issues.

And if there is no cumulative effect, at least discuss why we think there isn't a cumulative effect. There is also a little bit of a concern about the geographic extent of the cumulative analysis.

Clearly, being at the upper end of the watershed

and the upper end of a series of projects, anything that happens on this project has the potential to affect the downstream projects, so stopping the cumulative effects analysis at the border with the Rock Creek Cresta Project may limit the analysis unduly, so we'd like you to consider extending that, at least down through Lake Orville.

With respect to some of the specific issues, I think, generally, we agree with the issues that you have identified, and I just had a few comments, maybe, in terms of the details of those issues.

As you know, one of the requirements for the project is to be consistent with the Land and Resource Management Plans in place, including the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Ours, as you are aware, was amended by the Sierra Nevada Framework not too long ago, and there are some specific direction in there on hydro project relicensing.

Basically it gives us some guidance to start out by looking at the natural hydrograph. It doesn't lock us into exactly -- you know, we're not bound by that. Obviously, we can't restore it, but the guidance is there that we should try and mimic that natural hydrograph.

Given that guidance and the Land and Resource Management Plan, it's a bit of a red flag to us, anytime that there are deviations from that. It doesn't mean

they're show-stoppers, but it gives us cause to step back and ask why, and so it's something that needs to be analyzed.

As a for instance, the fairly flat-line baseflows throughout the year, that's not in sync with the natural hydrograph, so that's something that needs to be looked at and perhaps an alternative considered.

Likewise, pulses during any time of year that are out of sync with that natural pattern, throw up a little bit of a red flag and would need some careful analysis.

Clearly, water is at the crux of the issue here, so we're very interested in the flows in the River, how well they mimic the natural hydrograph. We're also interested in the Lake level and the temperatures, both in the Lake and in the River.

We recognize that it's a balancing act, trying to satisfy all those sometimes-competing needs. We are working through the collaborative process, analyzing some flow schedules and looking, with the help of the analysts from PG&E, looking at how those affect the various parameters of Lake level and flow, and that we're hoping, in our settlement process, that we'll be able to come up with a proposal that may serve as an alternative to flows that have been provided by PG&E at this point.

I guess it's related to the aquatic resources and

there's been some mention of a proposal by PG&E to look at eliminating or reducing the blackberries. In all honesty, I'm not very hopeful that we'll find a way to do that, but if we are able to, I would suggest that it's not just an issue of access to the River for recreational uses, although that may be a reasonable place to start the task.

But we're really interested in any opportunities to restore the natural repairing of vegetation to those systems. The static flows that we have had in there over the years have basically allowed the Himalayan Blackberry to take over and eliminate a lot of the native riparian vegetation, and that's an issue.

Another concern that the Forest Service has, kind of spans both the terrestrial and aquatic resources, and Jackie did a really good job -- Frankie, excuse me -- of explaining the full range of species that need to be looked at this morning. It was even better than last night.

(Laughter.)

MR. CONDON: But there is a group of species that's missing from that list. In order to assure that -- I won't go through them one-by-one, I promise, but I'll provide you the list if you don't have it already -- but in order to assure consistency with the Forest Service plans, we're required to have an analysis of the effects of any project on Forest Service Management Indicator Species.

MS. GREEN: Sure, thank you.

MR. CONDON: That's another piece that so far is missing from the PG&E application.

On the recreation resources, that's been pretty well articulated at this point, and obviously that's a big concern to the Forest Service.

A lot of the focus, unfortunately, in our Land Management Plans, is sort on the quantity side of that, you know, providing facilities to meet demand. And I think the FERC regulations are worded somewhat similarly.

We also have concerns with respect to recreation about the quality of the experience. And I'm glad there was some mention of staying within the recreational opportunity spectrum. But we want to provide recreation facilities and access to meet visitor demand, but not at the expense of the quality of the experience. That's very important.

There are a couple of other subissues within recreation that we think are equally important. The focus has been on facilities' access and accessibility, which we certainly agree on, but there are also issues related to safety and there are also issues related to opportunities for interpretation.

You know, when you look at this project and how it fits in with the whole stairway of power and the ecosystems it sits in, there's a tremendous opportunity to

educate the public. I won't mention anything about last night, but there's obviously a tremendous need to educate the public about how this project works and what impact it really has on the resources that are so important to folks.

Finally, on the development resources issue, that was a fairly brief statement there, so maybe we're on the same page. But what I would hope is that when you look at the economics of the project, that we're not looking strictly at kind of the financial feasibility from the perspective of the licensee, but considering the full range of costs and benefits to the public.

That's a very important issue to the folks in Plumas County, in particular. And that's the end of my comments.

MS. GREEN: Thank you.

MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Michael. Those were very good comments. Michael was the only one that indicated that the form that he wanted to provide --

MS. GREEN: Christie said she wanted to comment.

MR. MUDRE: Oh, there's a hidden one. The second speaker today will be Christie Goodman.

MS. GOODMAN: I'm Christie Goodman, the Natural Resources Analyst for Plumas County. I work mostly on stewardship issues in the Flood Control and Conservation District in Public Works under Tom Hunter.

I'm also a staff assistant to the 2105 Committee, which is a duly-appointed committee by the Board of Supervisor of Plumas County, and includes a large amount of stakeholders, including the Forest Service, PG&E, County residents, and professionals from various resource agencies.

The 2105 Committee was able to make a presentation last night, so I will only hit briefly on those topics. The number one priority for Plumas County and the 2105 Committee is the Lake Level Agreement, which through the assistance of the Forest Service and PG&E's representatives, I think that we're doing a good job. I would also like to thank PG&E for its professionalism and willingness to come to the table.

Besides the Lake Level Agreement, we're also looking at a water quality monitoring plan, a comprehensive recreation plan, an erosion plan, and a safety plan. And we have presented these goals and objectives to PG&E last year. I think it was in February.

And since the draft license application has come out, Plumas County is looking at alternatives to the flow schedules, the shoreline management plan, the safety plan, the Lake Level Agreement, and water quality monitoring plans.

We also have some socioeconomic concerns, which in your scoping document, you cited as not being possibly

important as other factors. And this reservoir is not only a source of income for PG&E, but also for the residents of Plumas County, and we would like you to reconsider that in your scoping document.

I think that we've come a long way to an agreement with PG&E on many issues, but we still have a long way to go. And we would like FERC to consider the advantages of the collaborative process, and hope that we will not be short-shrifted on ways to implement and discuss alternatives for the management of Lake Almanor. That's all I have to say.

MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Christie. Is there anyone who has changed their mind and wants to provide oral testimony? We can take that now.

(No response.)

MR. MUDRE: Otherwise, if there are any questions, you can ask the question, and whoever is best suited to answer it, I'm sure will be glad to answer it.

(No response.)

MR. MUDRE: Barring anything further, then --

MS. GREEN: I have some questions, if nobody else does.

(Laughter.)

MS. GREEN: My turn again. I had some questions for PG&E. Based on some of the things that I learned from

going through the license application, I had some questions.

There were a few studies or analyses underway that were mentioned. I'm not sure what their status is. I just want to ask you that.

One was the Cold Water Feasibility Study that was being conducted by the University of Iowa. I understand its scheduled completion is this Spring or was this Spring. Do you know when we would see that or when that is going to be available.

MR. JEREB: The Cold Water Feasibility Study done by the University of Iowa is a modeling study for modeling the Prattville Intake and its area with a real model to determine the effectiveness of certain structures that could be implemented there.

And the results of that are forthcoming very soon, probably within a month or two.

MS. GREEN: Okay, so by July, do you think? Or you're not certain, but maybe?

MR. JEREB: Yeah. It's forthcoming. Bechtel Corporation is working with us on that.

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MR. JEREB: And so Christie and Mike have been more directly involved with that.

PARTICIPANT: I think the July date is reasonable.

PARTICIPANT: I can't hear that.

MS. GREEN: He said July of 2003.

MR. ALEXANDER: My name is Marvin Alexander, and I'm a member of the 2105 Committee. And the only reason I'm doing this and taking your time is because I think I can provide a unique perspective.

I have been working with PG&E with about eight different vice presidents for over 30 years. I have outlived them all.

(Laughter.)

MR. ALEXANDER: So I do bring an historical background that I think will be invaluable to you folks who are going to try to look at the broad picture in trying to solve the many, many problems.

I want to commend Tom Jereb for his infinite patience in listening to people like me over all of these many months.

I want to step back a little in time. The license that's expiring was put together when Lake Almanor was simply an isolated mountain lake. So, consequently, the 1954 license, which is being replaced, didn't have to pay any attention at all to the public. There was no public here at the time.

So it was a total, almost, if I can use the word, a virginal forest up here. Then shortly after the license

went into effect, suddenly the Lake was discovered, and there has grown up around this Lake, a whole recreation community.

First there was Lake Almanor Country Club. There are like 2,000 homes there. Then came a few years later, Lake Almanor West. There's about 600-700 homes there. Then, more recently, Bailey Creek opened up.

I think they will eventually have maybe 1200 to 2000 homes there. But the point is that the past -- the current license, which is expiring, didn't recognize the need at all for any kind of recreation planning.

But since that time, there's been an enormous growth of recreational demands on the Lake. And then the most recent one is the projected Dire Mountain ski resort and home development.

So all of these particular -- these are recreation communities. They are putting a great deal of recreational pressure on the Lake.

Now, it brings us to the crux of the problem. The people who have come up there, who have invested literally hundreds of millions of dollars to build their recreation homes, look upon this as a -- Lake Almanor -- as a beautiful recreational body of water.

And yet PG&E looks upon it as a corporate asset, and so these are two dichotomies that are in conflict with

one another. And the situation is made more pressure-filled by virtue of the projected growth.

There's an enormous projected growth of recreation in that area, because there is the confluence of the Lassen National Forest, the Plumas National Forest, the Park, there are all these different recreational facilities that are magnets for the public to come up to that area. So there's a projected growth of enormous pressure for recreational uses on Lake Almanor.

So it is incumbent upon this license to somehow bring together the recreational needs of a growing public and the needs of the PG&E. This, I think, is the most difficult job of this new license.

I saw this problem coming, and because this new license was going to be so important, it was I that insisted that the County, that the Plumas County Board of Supervisors, which is the governing agency in the area, assume responsibility of the negotiations for the license.

And that's why you are, in effect, negotiating with the 2105 Committee, which is a committee of Plumas County.

There are certain fundamentals that we have regarded as essentials, and one of the fundamentals and one of the most difficult ones to solve, is the Lake level. In order to have a viable recreational community, which is the

basis of the economic basis of the County and of the area, in order to be viable, there has to be a predictable quality of water during the summer recreational season.

And so this is one of the most difficult of the license problems to solve to achieve a water level during the summer recreational months that is relatively predictable. This is a hydromanagement problem. We regard that as probably one of the key elements of the new license.

The second one is the maintenance and protection of the water quality. The quality of the water in a Lake like that is very sensitive. There are so many problems, so many potential problems for pollution, that there has to be an ongoing and effect water quality program. Those are the two most important areas.

The third area that I have always felt was very essential was to provide public access, increase public access in a controlled fashion, with particular -- one of my pet requirements is to try to get access, recreational access to the Lake for the local citizens. It's a sad commentary that there is no Lake access to the people of Chester.

This is largely a result of the peculiar Lake formation. The shoreline makes it very difficult to achieve that.

So, at any rate, those are the three problems that I would like to have looked at very carefully: A predictable water level; a guarantee of water quality; and additional public access.

And I thank you for this opportunity. I hadn't counted on this when I came, but I appreciate it.

MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Marvin.

MS. GREEN: Thank you for your comments, Marvin.

I have a couple more questions for PG&E. Oh, when you get the results of the Cold Water Feasibility Study that I mentioned earlier, will that be filed with the Commission when you get it, or how do you anticipate putting that on the record?

MR. JEREB: Well, the results will first come to a group that's working on this issue as a part of the Rock Creek Cresta settlement agreement, as a part of the Rock Creek Cresta license. So that information will be processed through that group.

We can then file it with you as a part of the 2105 project, if you desire.

MS. GREEN: I think it would be helpful to have that information on the record. I would appreciate that.

MR. JEREB: All right.

MS. GREEN: And that was another question I had;

was it going to be filed as Rock Creek Cresta or 2105.

MR. JEREB: Rock Creek Cresta Project does have a requirement to file that stuff on an annual basis, but that report, of course, would not come into till early next year. But as part of the process for this relicensing, it could come in through that, so we could file that.

MS. GREEN: Thank you, great. My second question: I read that there was a second sampling effort underway, evaluating human health levels of PCBs. I'm not sure when that was supposed to be completed. It may have been completed, and I may have overlooked that.

MR. JEREB: Yes, we're conducting two additional elements. One is additional water quality sampling. And that relates to both chemistry and coliform sampling.

And then there is a second series of sampling where we're conducting fish tissue -- some additional fish tissue analysis for PCBs and heavy metals. And those are expected to be -- the water quality is expected to be done over the 4th of July week for the coliform issues.

MS. GREEN: So will you conduct that actually then?

MR. JEREB: Pardon me?

MS. GREEN: Excuse me. You're going to actually conduct that sampling the 4th of July week?

MR. JEREB: Yes, the coliform sampling, the first

week -- excuse me -- the last week in June and the first several weeks in July.

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MR. JEREB: That's the coliform sampling. The water quality sampling is ongoing. You saw the individual out there yesterday, one of our staff, installing some additional water quality monitoring systems.

The fish tissue analysis, Stu Running here is managing that. Stu, would you like to tell us about the fish tissue analysis?

MS. GREEN: Thank you.

MR. RUNNING: Yeah, I worked out a program. Last year, we got started in about, I think, probably late October or November of last year. And we're able to reflect about two-thirds of the fish species that we agreed upon before it gets too cold and we weren't finding species. So we're planning on going back in probably the first or second week of June to hopefully collect the remaining species and numbers of fish.

It will be provided to the CDF&G lab in Rancho Cordova, like we had provided the first samples. We have not yet received any of the results back yet from Ranch Cordova. They have ben extremely slow in processing the results back to us, but, again, hopefully we'll get those final fish collected here in the next few weeks.

MS. GREEN: And do you anticipate when you'll put that information -- when the results of that will be on the record for this project?

MR. RUNNING: We are kind of at the whim of Fish and Game providing it to us. Our two choices were to go back to our previous lab and then send a subsample to Fish and Game for processing, or to go to Fish and Game and eliminate that additional double effort. So, we wanted to kind of minimize the costs and reduce anybody's concerns about accuracy of the results. So we anticipate with weeks of getting that information, it will be provided to Tom and we can get that to you guys for your analysis.

MS. GREEN: Great. You mentioned that yesterday, and I just wanted it on the record that you're waiting.

MR. RUNNING: Sure.

MS. GREEN: Waiting, waiting, waiting.

Is that the -- I just want to clarify, Stu, with you, is that the same as the sampling for the total mercury concentrations that were scheduled in October?

MR. RUNNING: Correct, right. After this project, we're looking at total mercury and PCBs at various locations, depending upon issues.

MS. GREEN: Okay. I just saw something that was scheduled for October, and I wasn't sure if that had been done yet or if there were results from that.

MR. RUNNING: We were able to get most of the species from Butt Valley Reservoir, with the exception small-mouthed bass, which we were not able to pick any fish. We were not able to successfully get any suckers from Belden Forebay; we were able to get all the fish from the River below disposal pile for analysis, so that part is done, and we're just waiting for those results.

MR. MUDRE: Just to follow up on that, Stu, did you mean methyl mercury or total mercury for the edible flesh?

MR. RUNNING: We worked out looking for total mercury because 97 percent of the total mercury is methyl mercury, so we're looking at that as a substitute to give us a good cost savings.

MR. MUDRE: Because the FDA standards are expressed in terms of methyl mercury.

MR. RUNNING: This is what we had worked out. We had talked with Fish and Game and also the Office of Health or whatever.

MR. MUDRE: Okay.

MS. GREEN: Okay. And I saw a comment from the State Water Resources Control Board, and so I'm glad to see you're working with her.

Is the data associated with the temperature modeling available to us?

MR. RUNNING: Which temperature modeling?

MS. GREEN: I'd have to go back to the license application. NOAA Fisheries folks apparently commented on that. I'm sorry, I'd have to go get the license application. I can do that if you want me to.

MR. MATTAX: I can jump in there. I think the thing that -- sorry, I'm Brian Mattax from Berger.

I believe what we're looking for on that one is -- there are a couple of things: One is, we don't have, I don't believe, any access to the model and how it was exactly calibrated, et cetera. And so it's really divergent, what we want.

But so the fish guys need some or could use some information dealing with Butt Valley bathymetry, for instance, which I presume is built into that model. So that would be a plus.

Also, it would be good to see what your assumptions, et cetera, are, and I guess some of the things that we were alluding to the other day, there are so many scenarios that could be run. And it appeared, from my review, that what was in the application was increased releases from the dam, and maintaining similar generation and not foregoing any generation.

And, obviously, that affects water surface levels, and so we wanted to get a good handle on what,

exactly, you have done in that. And I personally would like to see some different alternatives, other than just the one that's in the record, or at least that I believe is in the record, based on my understanding.

MR. JEREB: This is Tom Jereb here. We've been modeling and evaluating the Feather River water temperatures issue since 1986, and so we've done a tremendous amount of modeling relating to many different scenarios, and that information is forthcoming and can be made available.

Through our collaborative group, we're evaluating as we speak, many scenarios, just as you requested, various reservoir operation levels, combined with various generation levels, combined with various in-stream flow levels affecting water temperatures.

And so we have actually three different models we're using that each feed into each other. We have a gentleman by the name of Dr. Tu, Scott Tu, who is our water quality scientist, who is the lead on a lot of the water quality sampling, and Dr. Bruce McGuirke, who is our hydrology modeler and operations modeler, so both doctors are working simultaneously with our collaborative group. They're on our teams to model as many different scenarios as we can, so that information can be made available.

I have to ask, what do you want?

MS. GREEN: Sure, we can do that.

MR. JEREB: There are hundreds of model scenarios which we're modeling.

MR. MATTAX: Have you provided a list of what the different scenarios are?

MR. RUNNING: Yes. We're working on this with a subcommittee to the 2105 group, and we have developed a series of scenarios, both in the Seneca Reach and Belden Reach at -- we are running through Bruce's model first, and then looking at also various water classifications. Then that information will be given to Scott Tu, which then he'll run through as temperature models.

I know that as of our last meeting, Scott has like 28 runs he has to do, and each run takes about half a day. We're also looking at different generation and storage scenarios as to where it comes from, but it will take a little while to get all this together, but we are actively doing this.

MS. GREEN: Okay, thank you. And I just have one more question. I understand that water samples were being collected, measuring mercury, lead, and silver, in the Fall of 2002, Spring of 2003, and Summer of 2003. When will results of that information be available?

MR. RUNNING: You probably saw Charlie out there yesterday collecting those, exactly when we were out there doing our surveys.

MS. GREEN: Right.

MR. RUNNING: I'm not sure what the exact timeframe on that is. Scott Tu would also be the appropriate person to respond to that.

MR. JEREB: The sampling supplements the sampling that we did.

MS. GREEN: I'm sorry, I meant to say that. I understand that.

MR. JEREB: We had a problem with the change in the criteria that was over the time of our sampling, and, therefore necessitating us to do additional sampling at the request of the Water Board.

MS. GREEN: Right, that was my understanding. I was just curious about when you anticipated having the results of that additional sampling available. And it sounds like it will be late, if you're still planning to do some this summer.

MR. RUNNING: Right, it probably wouldn't be till late Summer, early Fall. As we continue sampling through the early and late summer, we wouldn't be expecting results till late Summer or early Fall, probably, from that.

MS. GREEN: Okay.

MR. MUDRE: But in theory, you may be able to provide the Fall and Spring data.

MR. RUNNING: We can certainly check into that

and see what is currently available and written up. As you know, it's easier to collect it than analyze it, so --

MS. GREEN: Yes.

MR. RUNNING: With people's schedules, sometimes they are so busy collecting it in the summertime, that they don't have time to do much more than collect it.

MS. GREEN: Sure. Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

MR. MUDRE: Thank you.

MR. AULT: I have some questions. This is Scott Ault. I have a few questions for PG&E.

In the license application, you stated that a third-year fish population sampling was being conducted in the project area. Can you tell us when the results of those will be available?

MR. RUNNING: This is Stu Running. I got the first tables and graphs last week from that, and I'm expecting initial writeup from the consultant very briefly so that I can check on format and style, as we try to integrate three years' of data into one final report.

So I'm hoping to get that out the door in the next couple of months as well, but probably not for at least two months.

MR. AULT: Two months? Okay, thank you.

And also in your license application, you

mentioned that there was some additional sampling done on potential natural fish barriers by the methodology --

MR. RUNNING: Forest Service.

MR. AULT: Yes, Forest Service fish crossing methodology. Can you tell me when the results of that will be done.

(Loud hammering and laughter.)

MR. RUNNING: Do you think that syncopated?

(Laughter.)

MR. RUNNING: This is Stu Running. That report is supposed to be due to me last week, and I have been out in the field so much that I haven't gotten back to the consultant to find out why it hasn't been shipped to my in-basket yet, so later today or tomorrow I'll get back to you on it. I'll check with the consultant to see where that is, but I was informed two weeks ago that that report was -- a draft version was produced.

(Loud hammering.)

MR. RUNNING: The powers that be.

(Laughter.)

MR. RUNNING: That report, as a draft report, should be available this week to me, so that I will have time to review it, hopefully within the next two weeks I'll get that and finalize it and have that available to you for that process as well.

MR. MATTAX: Sometime like the end of June, maybe, do you think?

MR. RUNNING: Yes, I think so, yes.

MR. MATTAX: Okay, thank you.

MR. RUNNING: Again, the Forest Service methodology only refers to culvert crossings for the analysis.

MR. MATTAX: That's it.

MS. GREEN: Thank you, Scott. Does anybody else on this team, the Berger Team, have any other questions for the licensee while we're all here?

(No response.)

MS. GREEN: Thank you very much.

MR. MUDRE: Okay, I guess our timing was pretty good. The big woodpecker didn't land until the very end.

(Laughter.)

MR. MUDRE: I want to thank everyone for coming today, and we look forward to working with all of you, as this progresses. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:46 a.m., the scoping meeting was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the Matter of:

Name of Proceeding:

UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER
HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Docket No.: P-2105-089

Place: CHICO, CALIFORNIA

Date: May 21, 2003

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription of the proceedings.

Official Reporter

Look-See Concordance Report

- - -

UNIQUE WORDS: 1,635
TOTAL OCCURRENCES: 4,679
NOISE WORDS: 386
TOTAL WORDS IN FILE: 11,302

- - -

SINGLE FILE CONCORDANCE

- - -

CASE SENSITIVE

- - -

INCLUDES ALL TEXT OCCURRENCES

- - -

DATES ON

- - -

INCLUDES PURE NUMBERS

- - -

POSSESSIVE FORMS ON

- DATES -

April [1]
21:19
February [1]
36:18
January of 2004 [1]
22:9
July [5]
40:17, 24; 46:19, 24; 47:2
July, 2009 [1]
22:3
July of 2003 [1]
41:2
July of 2004 [1]
22:10
June [3]
47:1, 18; 56:1
June 20th [3]
21:22; 22:23; 30:19
May 21, 2009 [1]
1:14
November [1]
47:14
October [5]
7:1; 23:6; 47:14; 48:19, 24

- $ -

$1.5 [1]
14:19
$7 [1]
17:1
$9 [1]
6:24

- 1 -

1 [2]
5:9; 11:10
10 [1]
19:4
10:20 [1]
1:17
10:26 [1]
3:2
11:46 [1]
56:20
1200 [1]
42:8
13 [1]
8:14
140 [3]
9:7, 8, 9
150 [1]
9:14
1954 [1]
41:21
1956 [1]
51:7

- 2 -

2 [1]
24:5
2,000 [1]
42:5
20 [1]
15:7
20-year [1]
18:13
2000 [2]
8:15; 42:9
2001 [1]
8:19
2002 [1]
52:21
2003 [5]
1:14; 22:3; 41:2; 52:21
2004 [3]
19:14; 22:9, 10
20th [3]
21:22; 22:23; 30:19
21 [1]
1:14
2105 [10]
3:13; 11:15; 36:1, 6, 9; 41:4; 43:20; 45:21; 46:1; 52:6
21052105 [1]
22:25
225 [1]
9:13
29 [1]
52:13

- 3 -

30 [1]
41:8
34 [1]
29:12
35 [1]
8:4
360 [1]
6:21
360,000 [1]
6:20

- 4 -

43 [1]
8:3
4467 [1]
14:15
4500 [2]
15:16; 18:2
460 [1]
1:11
4E [1]
31:11
4th [2]
46:19, 24

- 6 -

60 [1]
9:8
600-700 [1]
42:6

- 7 -

7 [2]
7:24, 25
75 [1]
9:4

- 8 -

8 [2]
10:15; 11:10
80-A [2]
15:25; 16:8

- 9 -

9 [3]
11:10; 18:23, 24
95 [1]
16:22
97 [1]
49:12
9:00 [1]
7:19

- A -

a.m. [3]
1:17; 3:2; 56:20
ability [2]
27:25; 32:8
able [10]
4:4; 34:22; 35:4; 36:8; 47:14; 49:1, 3, 4, 5; 53:23
above-entitled [1]
1:16
access [30]
10:21; 11:2; 13:17, 19; 14:1, 10, 21; 15:4, 11, 12, 24, 25; 16:4, 8; 17:18, 22; 18:1; 25:10; 27:22; 35:5; 36:15, 19; 44:17, 18, 19, 20, 21; 45:4; 50:10
accessibility [4]
13:4, 11; 26:2; 36:19
accuracy [1]
48:10
achieve [2]
44:5, 24
acquire [1]
17:15
acreage [1]
29:15
acres [2]
8:3; 29:12
Act [1]
13:6
act [1]
34:16
action [4]
27:21; 28:5; 29:4
actions [4]
12:13; 17:24; 28:18, 25
active [1]
29:17
actively [1]
52:16
activities [4]
12:3; 16:16; 27:23
activity [1]
18:12
actual [1]
22:7
adding [4]
29:12, 15; 32:5, 7
addition [3]
8:3; 20:14; 21:10
Additional [1]
14:24
additional [18]
15:1, 7; 16:7; 17:4, 5, 12; 18:7, 8, 13; 45:4; 46:12, 13, 16; 47:7; 48:8; 53:11, 15; 55:1
address [4]
11:4; 22:21; 30:17, 19
addressed [3]
21:12; 22:14; 23:8
addressing [2]
20:13; 23:25
adjacent [1]
17:16
adjourned [2]
56:19, 21
adopted [2]
13:6; 18:6
adopting [1]
17:25
advantages [1]
39:8
aesthetic [1]
18:25
aesthetics [2]
23:15; 26:23
affect [2]
33:2; 34:20
affected [1]
23:9
affecting [1]
51:14
affects [2]
28:9; 50:24
agencies [2]
7:16; 38:5
agency [3]
3:7; 5:6; 43:17
agree [2]
33:8; 36:20
agreed [1]
47:15
Agreement [3]
38:9, 14, 22
agreement [8]
8:14, 16, 17, 19; 18:10; 31:22; 39:6; 45:17
agrees [1]
32:4
Alder [1]
14:25
ALEXANDER [2]
41:3, 11
Alexander [4]
20:21, 24; 23:4; 41:3
allowed [1]
35:10
alluding [1]
50:19
Almanor [19]
6:13; 8:8, 9; 10:12; 14:9; 15:9; 17:11; 23:22; 24:6, 8, 11, 24; 25:2; 39:10; 41:19; 42:4, 6, 22; 43:9
altered [1]
28:7
alternative [2]
34:7, 23
alternatives [8]
21:12; 27:21; 28:5; 29:1, 5; 35:20; 39:10; 51:2
amended [2]
29:2; 33:15
Amendment [2]
29:2; 32:3
amendments [1]
13:6
American [1]
20:16
Americans [1]
13:5
amount [4]
25:4; 32:9; 35:3; 51:7
amplify [1]
4:19
analyses [1]
40:2
Analysis [2]
22:6; 24:1
analysis [17]
22:7; 31:14, 23, 25; 32:15, 16, 24; 33:4, 5; 34:10; 35:24; 46:17; 47:8, 10; 48:12; 49:6; 56:7
Analyst [1]
37:23
analysts [1]
34:19
analyze [2]
4:4; 54:2
analyzed [1]
34:3
analyzing [1]
34:18
angler [1]
15:24
angling [3]
17:22; 28:5, 9
animals [2]
26:14, 19
annual [2]
12:10; 46:3
answer [3]
6:7; 39:18
answers [1]
30:25
anticipate [5]
22:4; 23:25; 28:14; 45:13; 48:1, 10

– B –

– C –

– D –

– E –

– F –

– N –

– O –

– P –

– Q –

– R –

– S –