PROPOSED ONEIDA PUMPED STORAGE FACILITY

BEAR RIVER HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (FERC No. 20)

LICENSE AMENDMENT JOINT MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, October 25, 2023; 7:00 o'clock p.m.

BE IT REMEMBERED that the public meeting in above matter was taken at the Preston City Hall, Preston, Idaho, before DiAnn Erdman Prock, CSR SRL 963, CCR, Court Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the State of Idaho, in the above-entitled matter.

ATTENDANCE LIST

EVENING MEETING:

MARK STENBERG, PACIFICORP
CONLEY BALDWIN, PACIFICORP
PAT GARI, WSP
JACK KOLKMAN, PACIFICORP
TODD OLSON, PACIFICORP
JEFF LOVINGER, PACIFICORP ATTORNEY
ERIC DUFFIN, CIRRUS ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
JUSTIN BARKER, CIRRUS ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
TANNER COX
DAN KELLER, MAYOR OF PRESTON
RONALD COYLE
JOHN HUTCHINS, PACIFICORP
BUFFY MORRIS, PACIFICORP
NEAL ARTZ, CIRRUS ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
SHERI ELLIS, CIRRUS ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
TIM HEMSTREET, PACIFICORP
EVE DAVIES, PACIFICORP
JAIME CAMPBELL, PACIFICORP
MARK SCANTON, BEAR LAKE WATCH
BRITTANI WATTS
SUSAN WEST
RALPH WEST
CHARLIE VINCENT, AMERICAN WHITEWATER
JEFF SEAMONS
BROCK FREYER, WSP
PAUL PURSER
SCOTT EVANS, CIRRUS ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS
DAVID LONG
JANET LONG
LESLIE POMAVILLE
LEE FRANKLIN
MICHELLE FRANKLIN
SKYLAR BUCK, UTAH WATER RIGHTS
RICO PORTUCCI
TANNER K
SHARLA McKAY
SCOTT SEAMONS
STEVEN SMITH
BRENNA GARRA
JENNIFER NORTON
DANIEL McGREGOR
CHRISTINA SPERRY
RANDOLPH SEAMONS

(The public meeting proceeded at 7:00 p.m. as follows:)

* * * * * *

MARK STENBERG: There we go. It's 7:00 o'clock.

Hey, good evening. Welcome everybody. And for the second time we've done this today. I think it's going to be a little better tonight than it was this morning.

Always, you know, get a chance to practice responding to questions and find out partway through the presentation, you know, things folks are interested in meeting about, and, you know, we talk about that, and hoping to move this up a little bit and help people with this type of information or this type of information a little bit better.

My name is Mark Stenberg with PacifiCorp, slash, Rocky Mountain Power up here. What we're going to do tonight, I've got an agenda. I have a few ad hoc remarks here first before we get into the introductions and the agenda and that stuff.

This morning we were about an hour and fifty minutes, so we were a little over our

ninety-minute target. We had lots of good discussion and lots of good comments this morning.

We've got a small group tonight which is perfect, the perfect size. I don't like it when we've got -- I told folks this morning, sometimes you'll have a public meeting in the night, everybody's here, you bring everybody and bring all our stuff, and one person shows up. And I had one of those, and the person that showed up at that one just came because they wanted to see who else came. They just wanted to see who came from the community.

So thanks for coming because this is all about getting input, seeing if, you know, how our ideas sound to folks, what kind of interest issues, folks see in that. Everything is very preliminary. That's something I'll emphasize, and Matt here as he goes through his portions of our presentation tonight, we will emphasize again and again.

This is preliminary. You know, we've got preliminary engineering. We're working through the first phases of environmental evaluation. We're just starting consultation, you know, with folks at this meeting to gather comments.

We're not coming in with fully baked, you know, oh, yeah, it's going to be this way, and

it's going to run just this way, and it's -- you know, that's not anywhere near where we're at with this proposal at this point.

And I know it can be frustrating sometimes because folks have questions like how is it going to run, Mark? Well, it could run like this or like this. You know, there's a lot of variability and a lot of detail that's not there yet.

This project we're probably running environmental studies and environmental social aspects of this ahead of engineering, you know, and you'll hear me tonight. You know, we're about maybe one percent engineering on this. You know, it's really conceptual engineering. We know how many megawatts, about how much water, where we'll put the reservoir, you know, these type of things, but, you know, details of how we get materials in to construct it, and we get them out, you know, there's a lot of just endless engineering details that have to be worked out, if we get there. All right?

So let's do introductions real quick. I'm Mark Stenberg. I work for PacifiCorp. I live in Pocatello. I've worked on Bear River stuff for eighteen years out here. I implement the Bear River

project license for the three projects: Soda, Grace, Oneida. All that environmental site of that, stick hold relations, land management, recreation sites, conservation hatchery program. That's all mine to shepherd and keep track of. That's my main role here. And now I'm working on storage siting.

Let's start here. Let's just everybody introduce themselves as we go through. We'll go row by row. We don't have that many people. It will just take a couple minutes.

Conley, do you want to lead off?

CONLEY BALDWIN: Conley Baldwin, PacifiCorp.

PAT GARI: Pat Gari, WSP consultant to PacifiCorp.

MARK STENBERG: Sir, would you like to introduce yourself?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think so.

MARK STENBERG: No worries.

RANDOLPH SEAMONS: Randolph Seamons. I live here.

MARK STENBERG: All right.

CHARLIE VINCENT: Charlie Vincent. I represent American White Water --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak up,

please? I can't hear you.

CHARLIE VINCENT: My name's Charlie Vincent. I'm here representing American White Water and I work on the Bear with Mark as part of the UCC for many years.

MARK STENBERG: So, and we'll talk about this. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that licenses our projects to operate requires us to prepare a transcript of these required meetings on a project.

So we have a court reporter here. She's going to prepare the transcript of the meeting and we'll have that, I don't know, a couple weeks down the road, and we'll post that up with the rest of our documents so folks can read the transcript, and that helps us keep track of comments, too.

JEFF SEAMONS: I'm Jeff Seamons. I'm here representing the public interest.

Where are we at?

STEVE SMITH: Steve Smith, landowner.

JACK KOLKMAN: PacifiCorp.

TODD OLSON: Todd Olson with PacifiCorp.

JEFF LOVINGER: I'm Jeff Lovinger. I'm an attorney with PacifiCorp.

ERIC DUFFIN: Eric Duffin with Cirrus

Ecological Solutions. We're a small consulting firm in Logan working with Mark. I'm working on the hydrology recreation.

JUSTIN BARKER: Justin Barker with Cirrus.

TANNER COX: Tanner Cox, resident.

DAN KELLER: Dan Keller, Preston. I'm the mayor of Preston.

RONALD COYLE: Ronald Coyle, Preston, just interested in this. I have been for a lot of years, just here to see what you've got to say here so.

SUSAN WEST: I'm Susan West, just a concerned citizen.

DAVID LONG: Just meeting what you have to say, David Long.

THE COURT REPORTER: What was that?

JANET LONG: David Long. Janet Long, just interested in what's going on.

MARK STENBERG: Excellent.

MARK SCANTON: Mark Scanton from Bear Lake Watch. Hi.

MARK STENBERG: Hi, Mark.

SHARLA McKAY: Sharla McKay, resident, long time user of the canyon and what it has to

offer, so very interested in what's going on here.

MARK STENBERG: I see.

BRITTANI WATTS: Brittani Watts, and I just live in Bear Creek.

LEE FRANKLIN: Lee and Michelle Franklin, landowner.

PAUL PURSER: Paul Purser, resident.

MARK STENBERG: Let's go to you, Brock.

BROCK FREYER: Brock Freyer, WSP brand sort and geowork assessments and wetlands studies.

SCOTT EVANS: Scott Evans, Cirrus Geological Solutions.

RICO PORTUCCI: Rico Portucci, support.

LESLIE POMAVILLE: Leslie Pomaville, WSP.

JOHN HUTCHINS: John Hutchins, PacifiCorp.

SKYLER BUCK: Skyler Buck, Utah Water Rights.

BUFFY MORRIS: PacifiCorp.

CHRISTIAN: I'm Christian, I just use the river to fish.

NEAL ARTZ: Neal Artz, with Cirrus Ecological Solutions.

SHERI ELLIS: Sheri Ellis with Cirrus

Environmental Solutions and Cultural Resources Consultant.

TIM HEMSTREET: Tim Hemstreet with PacifiCorp.

EVE DAVIES: Eve Davies with PacifiCorp.

THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear her.

EVE DAVIES: Eve Davies with PacifiCorp.

MARK STENBERG: Eve Davies.

JAIME CAMPBELL: Jaime Campbell with PacifiCorp.

MARK STENBERG: All right. I thank you all. Appreciate it.

Okay. So just a couple of kind of help maybe set the foundation for discussion, comments that aren't in the presentation.

So, you know, why -- why pump storage is the one thing I want to lead with right now. Why are we having this meeting tonight? Why is PacifiCorp interested in creating basically a very large battery of stored water that we can move back and forth between the two reservoirs.

PacifiCorp, we keep, we call it, Integrated Resource Plan, IRP, you can see it on our website, and that has our vision, our energy vision, for the future, how we're going to, you know, serve

our customers, provide low cost power to our customers.

Also, you know, our targets for decarbonization, how PacifiCorp is going to get out of greenhouse gas-emitting energy sources. And kind of regardless of how you feel about climate change and those things, it's a path that, you know, our corporation is on. We're going to be out of -- you know, we are going carbon free down the road. Okay?

As we do that, you know, we have to bring other renewable energy sources online, primarily wind power, solar power. Those two resources are what we call variable, right? Because they don't run like a coal plant.

Coal plant, you get it tuned up, yu get it running, you can just run and run and run. Solar power works during the day, doesn't work at night, right? That's variable. Wind power works when the wind blows, works less when the blows less. That's variable.

So we need to be able to store that power, and when you're driving around and see solar farms, you may see here and there like CONEX boxes set out in solar farms right now, and some of that is lithium batteries, battery storage going in in

solar farms, and that's one way to store power.

Pump storage hydro, and we'll have a diagram of it later, you know, it's very similar to a hydroelectric plant. We move water from a lower location to a higher location so we're able to capture power when demand is low.

Or we have -- you know, say the wind's blowing all over everywhere we've got, you know, wind turbines at one time. We had surplus power. We could pump water up the hill, store it, return it at night, return it at other times during the day, wind falls off, cloudy day. We can balance that with these large storage facilities. Okay? It's part of our evolution to this green power future.

And what do I want to say about that? So we'll talk more about that. We've got a diagram, but that's the kernel of why we're here tonight to talk about that.

The company's interest in pump storage hydroelectric projects is looking for projects that we can implement fairly quickly. That may capitalize on existing facilities we have where we own land, where we have transmission, where we've got good adjacent topography.

We look for sites where we may have a

thousand feet of elevation. We move water up and down to generate power.

What else do I want to list? I lost track of where I was at.

Water rights, land ownership, existing facilities, transmission, water rights are all things that can make these projects kind of easier to put together.

And as you could probably imagine in today's environment, it's difficult to site new projects, right? So finding sites where we've got facilities so we can put these together economically, you know, it's a challenge, but we've got what we think is a fair site to work on at Oneida. It's all preliminary at this point. So that's the why with the question mark on it.

And just a little background on the Bear River hydroelectric project. So Federal Regulatory Commission licenses projects, and we have a license and we run Grace, Soda, and Oneida, and you're all probably familiar with those on the Bear River.

Those licenses have measures in them, you know, offsets, enhancements, mitigation, and those type of things. And on the Bear River, you know, we run a cutthroat trout conservation hatchery

program with Fish and Game. We fund Fish and Game to do that. We produce genetically correct cutthroat trout. They get stocked out at tributaries in the basin here.

We also run with this environmental coordination committee. Steve might have mentioned it or someone else. We do -- we provide funding through that committee for conservation easements in the area. You guys may be familiar with, like, the conservation easements that we've worked on in Mink Creek, that way.

We've been involved in about five thousand acres of conservation easements since 2006, I think, was our first one. We have done about a hundred and seventy habitat projects. If anybody has live water on your properties and you're looking for help with the fencing, stock water, those type of things, you know, my name is up here, get in touch with me. We've got a grant fund cycle coming up early next year for new projects. We do stuff for cutthroat trout and water quality.

The Oneida Canyon, you know, myself, I've been managing that landscape down there since 2005 when I got here, and you know what you see in the Oneida Canyon, when you go up there now, it's

all PacifiCorp and BLM properties up there. Our licenses require us to have a comp plan, but it's a site plan. Tells us how we manage that landscape, how we monitor it every year, weed control, you know what we fence, how we manage the areas, you know, that whole package in there.

Our hydro license also has recreation measures, the rec sites. We maintain public access. White water flows we provide in the Black Canyon. We also have a summer goal flow in Oneida Canyon. Not a lot of people know that, but we try to target that nine hundred CFS between the main holidays daytime when we're moving irrigation water. Conley works on that.

I'm sure you're aware we have five hundred float tubers up there or more, you know, on a Saturday or a Sunday up there. Busy place.

Anyway, that's just a little context about some of the stuff we do, and so let me jump into this. We've got a small group tonight, so let's just do questions as we go along, and if you just pop your hand up, and Matt or I will recognize you.

Sir?

PAUL PURCER: I didn't mean to cut you

off.

MARK STENBERG: No. That's a good test.

PAUL PURCER: When you talk storage facility, you're talking about essentially another reservoir, or is it a closed storage facility?

MARK STENBERG: It would --

PAUL PURCER: My second question --

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

PAUL PURCER: -- you said pump water in between the two bodies or the two reservoirs.

Is that the new facility and Oneida or Oneida and another facility?

MARK STENBERG: So Oneida reservoir and the new higher reservoir, and we'll have a diagram and details. So if when we get to the details, if I don't answer your question then --

THE COURT REPORTER: I need his name.

MARK STENBERG: Oh, name. And also for her, I mean, when you speak, please identify yourself and we'll --

PAUL PURCER: Paul Purcer.

MARK STENBERG: Thank you, Paul.

Meeting purpose tonight. Inform why PacifiCorp is undertaking the proposed Oneida pump

storage facility. Hopefully I covered a bit of that there.

Communicate the process and schedule under which an application for the project approval is made. We'll talk about how we interact with FERC, how we interact with agencies and the public going through this process.

Invite participation from all interested parties to identify issues and concerns with the proposed project. So the way this will lay out, I'm going to talk about the proposed facilities, and it may seem as though it's kind of vague, but FERC in this initial consultation document, they want us to have a project description. They want to know. Is it steel? Is it whatever?

So there's a project description in here, and when you read it it may sound fairly, like, vague, but we're at about one percent engineering, and things will change and tweak as we go along.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: Mark, I don't want to go an hour and fifty minutes, but I wanted to ask -- Dan Keller -- when I was at your tour today up at the dam --

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: -- I thought I heard you say that you thought PacifiCorp does not own any land north of the dam.

Did I hear that correctly? I thought you did own land above the reservoir.

MARK STENBERG: Not much. Yeah. Let me clarify that. I wish I had a map that --

MAYOR DAN KELLER: You're talking about the geographical nature.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah. Most of our, like, dry land is from the dam down the canyon.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: Correct.

MARK STENBERG: And it ends right at where the Twin Lakes cycle comes through. And above the concrete dam and the earthen dam, it's mostly BOR and private around the reservoir. And we've got rights in the reservoir, and we own some land in fee in the reservoir, and as you go all the way up to where the, you know, where the river transitions to the top of the reservoir, we own some fee land up there. It's not much, but we own some fee land out of the water up there.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: Okay. I was curious about that statement.

Thank you.

MARK STENBERG: So today, general housekeeping, emergency exit, the bathrooms over there.

Everybody please sign in so we can keep you in the loop. E-mails, if you don't want e-mail, just put an address and we'll keep you on the list. Okay? And anybody -- yeah just do that. Okay.

So today we're going to take you through this concept of this pump storage facility and the operations, potential operations, of it. We'll talk a little bit about Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC license amendment process.

The process that we are in right now to consult and develop study plans, implement study plans, and then get to the goal is to get to an application to FERC to add this to the Bear River project.

I'm going to hand over at that point to Matt, and what the consultants have been working on is a couple things, many things, but a desktop gathering of existing resource information in the Oneida Canyon. From, you know, all kinds of study works, reports from Fish and Game just, you know, we'll go through that.

Resource issues identified to date.

We'll tell you what we think the resource issues are and what we've heard so far.

Ongoing studies. We'll check in with you, you know, and I'll probably actually when we get to that slide, like we did this morning, like, here's some other issues that we heard this morning that we're going to add to the list.

Ongoing studies. What resource studies are underway, ongoing proposed studies, information collecting.

Next steps. Hopefully at that point we'll have answered most of the comments and the questions.

We did site visit this afternoon, so we won't get into that too much.

Do you have questions about the agenda before we move on?

Sir.

RALPH WEST: Ralph West. Several questions here for a minute.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah.

RALPH WEST: Okay. For thirty some years, or whatever, this has been going on and on about a dam up there.

MARK STENBERG: Hmm.

RALPH WEST: It's been shot down several times, and you may address that tonight, I don't know.

And also, on that maintenance and water storage, I go from here to Soda Springs quite a bit.

MARK STENBERG: Uh-huh.

RALPH WEST: And I come through Grace, you've got a lot going through Grace, especially in the winter, leaks so damn bad you could save tons of water if you fixed that side pump.

MARK STENBERG: I agree.

RALPH WEST: You probably wouldn't need to build a dam.

That's just a -- that's just a question on how you're going to maintain it and so forth.

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

RALPH WEST: And here again, like I say, on this stuff has been going on for thirty years. I thought up the back a ways that they decided we have, and I don't know how to put it, but I guess eloquently we didn't want it.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah. And I can talk -- and I don't want to keep people too long and -- but okay.

So Grace fall line --

RALPH WEST: Uh-huh.

MARK STENBERG: -- we are trying to figure that out. Okay? It's expensive. But Grace is a very valuable project to us, and hopefully sometime in the future, we'll figure something out there.

RALPH WEST: Is that in part of your replacement stuff?

MARK STENBERG: Not of this project. So we do -- we've been doing forever, you know, like three weeks outage every year on that. They go in and replace staves. They re-cork it, and extend the life of that.

So to your other question, about the dam process, right, so what we're proposing is not what's been proposed in Oneida Canyon before, just to be clear.

I was super involved in that last time around. And it was a really unique position for PacifiCorp and for myself, I love high power, to be in a position to be in opposition to a project. I worked on that since 2005 through 2015 almost.

You know Twin Lakes Canal Company's proposal there and, you know, our primary issue at

the time talked about our hydro license for our three projects, right? That's our business case, right?

How we run the projects, we entered into a settlement agreement to run Grace, Soda, Oneida thirty years. Company lands were going to be managed a certain way. We were going to manage recreation a certain way. And the Twin Lakes proposal was from another one hundred foot tall dam where that old geo exploration casing is.

You know, if drive up Oneida Canyon and watching the river, and when you're on that first jump PacifiCorp land after the Twin Lakes siphon, you can see that pipe, looks like a well casing, sticking up out of the river.

And that was way back when the Bureau of Reclamation was looking into the dam site there. And the proposal there for that site was a hundred foot tall dam, and it would flood the Oneida Canyon all the way back to the tail brace of the current hydro project. Okay?

Our issue with it was it just upset our whole business case for PacifiCorp's three projects. Okay? So we were in on that. Other people weren't for -- and other organizations for a lot of reasons.

What we're going to talk about tonight is not that. We're talking about going up the hill above Oneida dam, building a reservoir a thousand feet up the hill, and our initial simulation show you won't even be able to see the reservoir. You won't see the pipes coming down, and the new transmission lines. A new powerhouse and Old Camp that will pump, and we'll get into details of that, so it's different. It's not -- it's not the BOR proposal or the Twin Lakes proposal on that site.

Does that answer your question?

RALPH WEST: Yeah. I'll live.

MARK STENBERG: All right. Okay. Thank you. Awesome.

Okay. We'll move on.

Please remember to sign in. We introduce the PacifiCorp team. The consult team. Ask questions as we go along. Audio recording is going on.

So at this website. Do you want to take a picture of that? I'll get this presentation posted up and get it to our admins tomorrow, and it will be there in a day or two.

And also with that same location is this document. If you want to, you know, get into the

details of this document. Okay.

I feel like I'm burning up a lot of time. Sorry. PacifiCorp's proposal, you know I stated this, pretty straightforward. We'd like to amend our current hydro license for the Bear River to include an open loop, two-hundred-megawatt -- and we'll break this all down here in some subsequent slides -- two-hundred-megawatt pump storage facility, and to extend the Bear River license twenty years.

We have a current license to run the project. We have a settlement agreement around that that, includes a lot of the measures that I mentioned at the beginning of the talk. You know, our land management, our conservation hatchery, rec sites, boater flows, you know, all that stuff. So that's our goal.

I did mention the integrated resource plan and the why, you know, why are we doing this. Our, you know, our 2023 IRP, and it's on PacifiCorp website, PacifiCorp.com, you know, our vision for the west between now and 2042 and sets us on the path for these growth items.

Second bullet, that's what we're talking about here. And we're talking tonight about two

hundred megawatts of storage. You know, our growth projection is eight thousand megawatts of storage needed to get to our future here.

This includes batteries. I mentioned batteries co-located with solar standalone batteries and hydro pumped resources, and that's our focus tonight. Okay?

We could spend an hour talking about IRP stuff, so we won't. But just to orient, Bear Lake's up here. And we have our Bear Lake facilities that are separate from our hydroelectric facilities. Bear Lake facilities include Stewart Dam, Rainbow Canal, Mud Lake, Outlet Canal, Lifton Pumping Station. This is where we divert the Bear River irrigation storage, stored in Bear Lake, Mud Lake, and we moved it back to the Bear River. Soda Dam -- let me get my pointer. Sorry.

Soda Dam, Last Chance, Grace Dam, and then Oneida down here just north of the town of Preston. You all know where we are.

So the proposal, let's spend a little bit of time on this. It's worth it to talk through this with a pointer. So there's two dams at Oneida that compose, you know, kind of in quotes the Oneida dam. There's the earthen dam that you see by the

road. That's where the Day-Use Area is and the boat launch. They're right above -- right at the southern end of the reservoir.

That earthen dike, thousand some feet long, forty feet tall roughly. And then there's the concrete dam sits over here. So the concrete dam is a hundred plus feet tall, sits there. So all of that, the two pieces of that make the dam.

The current powerhouse is right here, Oneida powerhouse. What happens, water runs into the reservoir, right? The intake structure is right where the cursor is. You can see that from the Day-Use Area. There's some super structure above it. It sits out there in the reservoir a little bit from the reservation dam.

There's a flow line. Oop, I'm too far. Sorry. Makes its way through the powerhouse and back to the river. Okay?

The pump storage proposal would operate independently of that system I just described of water moving through the reservoir, through the flow line, through the powerhouse, and back through the river. That can sit there and run, do its thing, pump storage project, move water up the hill, back down the hill, and do its purpose.

There's -- when this was constructed, there were two intake pipes, basically, through the bottom of the dam. Okay? One is utilized for the current powerhouse. The other one is just sitting there. So the proposal is we would use that second pipe that's already in the dam, come across the Bear River, this would be the new powerhouse pumping station, pipe's up the hill.

And this is where we were at today. We went up and looked at the site up the hill here today. So new upper reservoir. I haven't seen twenty-six acres all day. I might be wrong. It's three acres.

So new upper reservoir, twenty-three acres in size, concrete dam, three hundred and fifteen feet high. It's very steep up there. So top is small, but it's deep. Eleven foot diameter, fifty-eight hundred feet long steel penstocks, and that's from here to the pumping station and then we have about another thousand feet here.

New powerhouse. Two, hundred-megawatt reversible pump and generator, same piece of equipment.

JEFF SEAMONS: Mark, when you get done.

MARK STENBERG: Go ahead.
JEFF SEAMONS: You said you had two penstocks.
MARK STENBERG: Well, there are two.
JEFF SEAMONS: Inlets that were put in and installed.
Are they independent of one another?
MARK STENBERG: They sit side by side.
JEFF SEAMONS: Do they adjoin one another?
MARK STENBERG: They don't. They're not open to each other.
JEFF SEAMONS: Okay.
MARK STENBERG: But they both go into the reservoir in the same --
JEFF SEAMONS: Right.
MARK STENBERG: -- intake structure.
JEFF SEAMONS: Right.
THE COURT REPORTER: Your name?
JEFF SEAMONS: Jeff Seamons. Sorry.
MARK STENBERG: Is that --
JEFF SEAMONS: Well, that -- yeah. That helps.
MARK STENBERG: Okay. Lower reservoir. Proposing to use the Oneida development, four

hundred and eighty acres. We would need a new substation in Old Camp and about a half mile of transmission line to connect that to the existing Oneida pump substation.

New permanent and temporary access roads to be determined and kind of back to my first comment, this is preliminary. One of the things that will be on Jack's plate will be, you know, a transportation road, construction study, access study, you know, and work with everybody to figure out -- figure that out. Okay?

Ownership. Land ownership. Here's the --

PAUL PURSER: Sorry. Can you go back to that other map?

Paul Purser again.

MARK STENBERG: This is the slide that -- go ahead.

PAUL PURSER: Can you just show me in correlation to this new project, where is the current bridge that you walk across like where the houses and stuff are?

MARK STENBERG: You bet. So --

JACK KOLKMAN: Kind of the bottom of that slide.

MARK STENBERG: Right here. Hold on.
PAUL PURSER: That's where the boat launch bridge is.
MARK STENBERG: It's about here.
PAUL PURSER: Thank you.
MARK STENBERG: Yeah. Yeah. So Old Camp is up here, and this is Old Camp right in this area here. Yeah. That house, wetland ponds, you know, all up there. Okay.
Any other questions on where water is flowing on this slide? Anybody?
(NO audible response.)
MARK STENBERG: Okay. Land ownership. So we start at the top.
This is on private property up top here. You know, where we worked with the owners for study plan access up there so we can come and go, conduct resource studies up there.
We've got Bureau of Reclamation lands. These purple lands, those are managed by BLM. We call them -- typically refer to them as BLM lands, but they are BOR, managed by BLM and PacifiCorp.
And you can see some of our facilities right now were that on the BOR lands, like the concrete dam, earthen dam, you know, et cetera.

Okay?

So the FERC boundary, all of these FERC projects have a boundary, and it's an exhibit that's given to FERC, but we would occupy potentially another, say, thirty-four acres of federal land in this project, and our current estimate is about thirty-five acres of private land up top here that does include a two hundred fifty foot planning buffer just around the current footprint here.

Again, everything is preliminary, so things may move around a little bit.

So --

RALPH WEST: Yeah. Ralph West.

MARK STENBERG: Sir.

RALPH WEST: Okay. Is that -- are you still going to be backing it up toward the Thatcher side of that, where you come in from Thatcher there at the river bridge?

And, if so, is it getting wind or are you going to wipe out, say, the hot springs pool that's back in there and come this way further with it or --

MARK STENBERG: So --

RALPH WEST: There's a hot springs swimming.

MARK STENBERG: Yup. Yup. Yeah.

And I've actually been involved with them off and on a little bit over the years, and tell you a funny story that happened a number of years ago. Take a moment.

God, it was -- Buffy, were you there when their surveyor called you? That was you, not Claudia?

So we get this call from the surveyor the hot springs resort's for sale, it's changing hands. And we get this call, and it's like, Hey, you know, we're doing a survey for the owner of the hot springs to sell the resort. We got the survey all laid out here. It looks like you own, like, half of the swimming pool, PacifiCorp, and some of the hot pools out in this area here.

And we're, like, really? I don't think so. You know, that's not land we've ever, like, claimed, right?

So we get the deeds out, and we get our surveyor, and we get these crack surveyors that work for us and, yeah, you know, Mark and Buffy, the deed shows you guys have, like, a third of the swimming pool at the hot spring, and some of these smaller pool in this land area.

And we're like we don't really want to be involved in that, right? So we talked to the hot springs owner and the surveyors and all this, but long story short, we just -- we decided that the intent of our original survey was just to acquire submerged lands at that location.

So we fixed our legal description to release claim for this old deed to half the swimming pool and stuff at the hot springs. It was like ten years ago.

But, yeah. So far hot springs fluctuations happen. I've seen it when we've had the reservoir down ten, twelve feet, and that hot pool comes down. I don't know if it's the current group. We've reached out to them earlier this year. We're still trying to get in touch with the owner there. Just consultations ongoing.

But we're aware, when we were down six feet, we were doing study work the other month -- I didn't measure it, but I went and peeked in. It was down four or five feet.

So there was this relationship. It's not one to one, but it's an issue that, you know, we need to talk about and have.

RALPH WEST: You are going to buy up far

with it, though.

MARK STENBERG: What will happen with pump storage. Let me show this diagram here, and I'll get to your question in a little more roundabout way.

So the diagram there, it's from the U.S. Department of Energy. So our setup would be similar to that. We're going to create an upper reservoir, penstock's downhill, and a pumping and a pipe into the reservoir.

So the reservoir sits there like it is right now, you know, at our normal operating level. And Matt will talk about the water resources there throughout the year, and there's fluctuation throughout the year.

When we pump, so let's say two point four. Two feet point four. I'll get rid of the rest of the digits there. So we're at two point four, and when we pump the upper reservoir, we take water out of the reservoir so water will go down, and we'll generate and come back up.

So, you know, a full daily cycle and Conley will talk about this in a little bit, but it's kind of the full cycle where we'll get to Oneida in the morning and be at two point four feet.

During the day, we've got production stuff going on, solar, you know, we come down our six feet or so, and then we generate at night, and it comes back up. Okay.

Conley will talk about what's more likely going to happen is during peaks and lulls and surplus power during the say, it's probably going to move more like this during the day and have smaller ups and downs, or even rests where we don't need it. We've got full, we don't need power, or we don't need power to pump it back up and kind of rest force a little bit there until it's needed.

LEE FRANKLIN: Is that an assurance or is that water going to go up and down five to six feet every twenty-four hours?

MARK STENBERG: We don't have that level of detail at this point.

LEE FRANKLIN: That's incredibly important --

MARK STENBERG: Yup, uh-huh.

LEE FRANKLIN: -- because that water going down five or six feet and coming back up five or six feet, that's like -- that's like a significant tide in the homeowners association. You know, and you're going to do that at the rate of two

thousand cubic feet per second, and the end flow into the upper end of that reservoir only averages less than a hundred cubic feet a second.

So the current at the upper end of the reservoir will be tremendous. That river is almost going to dry up upstream when you are pulling water over the fourteen hours to put it up there.

MICHELLE FRANKLIN: And something we didn't talk about this morning, we didn't talk about safety and recreation, what is it going to be like to be swimming, or on a paddleboard, or in a canoe --

MARK STENBERG: Right.

MICHELLE FRANKLIN: -- when that water drops?

MARK STENBERG: One of the questions, and we're going to be working on this two-dimensional model to look at sediment transport, is also a current, what's going to happen with the current? We talked about that internally. We don't have answers to that right now.

And we're also talking about what can we do in the upper range of the reservoir to potentially, you know, mitigate draw down and kind of brainstorming some things in that area.

LEE FRANKLIN: So in actuality, you're not going to flood out the Maple Grove Hot Springs. You're going to take all the water away from them by dropping it six feet. Whatever that is --

MARK STENBERG: When we drop six feet, yeah, it looks like their pool goes down four or five feet. I'm not the hot springs operator.

LEE FRANKLIN: The distance from the bank to the water --

MARK STENBERG: Right.

LEE FRANKLIN: -- increases significantly.

MARK STENBERG: At a full cycle, you'll be down six feet. So things we're brainstorming on, and it's an issue, definitely. And like I said, we don't have the answers to everything tonight. You know, we're trying to get concerns in, make sure we understand them, get the research behind them, and try to answer questions.

We're not coming in here tonight fully baked for sure.

Jeff, and then I'll --

JEFF SEAMONS: Jeff Seamons.

Through the relicensing we have a kind of an understanding of what the downramp does to the

soils, you know, in the river system, and --

MARK STENBERG: Below Oneida.

JEFF SEAMONS: -- below Oneida, but the same effect could still happen within the Oneida reservoir when it's drawn down with those sediments that have settled in and the channel that's been created --

MARK STENBERG: Uh-huh.

JEFF SEAMONS: -- we could have a sloughing of the material, you know --

MARK STENBERG: Sure.

JEFF SEAMONS: -- into the river.

MARK STENBERG: Yup. And Matt's going to -- Matt will take us through one of the studies. He's going to take us through a suite of studies that we're going to be working on, Jeff, and one of them is bank stability, erosion soil study, so we can figure out what is going to happen there.

You know, a lot of Oneida, you know, is interesting. I was out there, it's down six feet, a lot of it is just steep, talus slopes. Maybe kind of a favorable situation for a project like this.

But then when you get to the hot springs and the bluff, you've got more sediment, you've got those emergent wetland areas and stuff that's, you

know, more at risk there to get the fluctuation. Sure.

So let me go through this here. Let me do a quick time check. Okay.

CHRISTIAN SPERRY: Yeah. I was just going to ask: How do you anticipate that the flows will change in the river beneath the reservoir, and also if they're going to change, how substantial will it impact the ecosystem?

MARK STENBERG: No. So it's all in the reservoir. All right? Everything below is regulated through the current powerhouse, and as I said earlier, that operation can remain essentially independent of the storage project. You know, we will still be a thousand CFS all summer long coming into the reservoir. We've got a thousand CFS going out of the powerhouse. Both flows are happening down there. You know, it's just like it is. Reservoir is doing its pump storage thing above it, you know.

THE COURT REPORTER: I need his name, please.

MARK STENBERG: Name, please.

CHRISTIAN SPERRY: Christian.

MR. STENBERG: Last name, please.

CHRISTIAN SPERRY: Sperry.

MARK STENBERG: How do you spell your last name?

CHRISTIAN SPERRY: S-p-e-r-r-y.

MARK STENBERG: S-p-e-r-r-y.

LEE FRANKLIN: Lee Franklin, again.

The volume of the water would not be affected, but the quality of the water could be significantly affected because we're going to have all this unusual current in the reservoir, and that's an unknown at this point.

MARK STENBERG: It is an unknown. Yeah. We're doing our sediment study. We're going to be doing our pathometry. We're going to put this model together so we can look at current and sediment movement.

Justin and I worked through this at Ashton. We rebuilt the Ashton dam. 2010, 2011. Same crew went out. We mapped sediments in the reservoir. We did put this whole model together so we could look at different flow rates through the reservoir and the elevations and model where all the sediment would go and how it would move. It's going to be interesting, you know, and we're going to work through that.

We're also doing metals testing in the sediment. DQ asked us to do that, so we're going to do metals testing in the sediment samples and see what's accumulated in the reservoir, you know, and see if we've got an issue there, too.

I'll move on. I think we've covered it all.

LEE FRANKLIN: Mark, do you want to get through this first and then let us ask the questions?

MARK STENBERG: It's going to be quicker in a minute.

JEFF SEAMONS: Do you want us to ask questions as you go?

MARK STENBERG: I just did a quick time check, and we're at 7:45. We've been at it forty-five minutes, and we've covered a tremendous amount of ground. I think we're in good shape.

FERC, I mentioned FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, independent government agency that regulates nonfederal hydroelectric projects.

They authorize construction and the operation of them. They inspect them. We have to submit reports to them. They are our regulator.

So we're talking about a capacity

amendment for this. It's a process whereby you can add additional generations to a hydroelectric project through FERC, right?

It's not relicensing, like, we were talking about new dams in Oneida. It's not a licensing process. It's an amendment process.

It's similar to licensing. It has some differences. Short story, it's what's required to add something like pump storage. Okay. We're in part of that process right now. And it's -- I think everybody has got my cell phone number from the notices we mailed out, e-mailed out. Anybody wants to talk about process, call me, e-mail me.

We talk about process because this isn't something that the average person, you know, is involved in FERC process that much. All the scheduled stuff we're on right now -- so let me talk about schedule real quick. I didn't do that.

So September 18th -- we have four different mailing lists, so on September 18th of this year, we e-mailed my Bear River environmental coordination committee. And they're the ones that work on grant funds, and conservation hatchery, and those things with PacifiCorp on the current projects.

They got an e-mail notice that we filed this with FERC, and we posted it on our website FERC. We left a copy at the Franklin County Library.

FERC also keeps a service list for our project. Anybody can tell FERC: Hey, how can you get a service list? So when things happen, you get a notice. So we pulled the FERC service list. Some had a e-mails. Some just addresses. We got e-mailed or they got it mailed address of this.

We also built a mailing list of all of our neighbors at all three projects, and all we have from those records is hard copy, so we sent a letter to everybody that's a neighbor to our hydroelectric projects, all three of them, that we filed this with FERC, and where it was available at the PacifiCorp and FERC website.

And there's another list that I've got that's just other interested folks in southeast Idaho. We used it -- it's from our Dry Canyon project we were looking at over there. So I provided notice to all of them, too, just as interested folks. A hundred and twenty-nine different notices went out, either by e-mail or letter, about this. And that kicks off the process

for us.

That's why I'm talking about it with this slide. This starts the process, and then this meeting tonight could be no sooner than thirty days from when this was sent out, and no later than sixty, and we're at thirty-seven days here tonight. There was a social media post about a hasty meeting. We put this data out thirty-seven days ago, and we're following FERC's regs to be here tonight with you.

On October 9, we provided the required notice to FERC about this meeting. We had two -- we did a press release that was picked up by two news channels. We did Friday night spots on it. We did newspaper ads that we're required to do, and we e-mailed and mailed everybody again with the details about this meeting.

So our goal is to be transparent, inclusive. We want to hear comments. We want to have the hard questions asked. You know, we've got our own questions about the project, and we need to hear your hard questions and try to work through these things, so....

JEFF SEAMONS: Mark? Jeff Seamons.

MARK STENBERG: Yep.

JEFF SEAMONS: So the twenty-year extension to the license will add twenty years to the current license.

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

JEFF SEAMONS: Is that correct?

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

JEFF SEAMONS: Okay.

MARK STENBERG: And FERC allows a license extension request when you've got large capital improvements.

JEFF SEAMONS: But on the other hand, didn't the ECC recommend just a thirty-year license?

MARK STENBERG: Yup. Yup.

JEFF SEAMONS: And FERC issued just a thirty-year license.

MARK STENBERG: Yup.

JEFF SEAMONS: Due to the fact that the ECC recommended the thirty-year license to the commission.

MARK STENBERG: Yup. And we were party to the settlement, too, and it's in the settlement. So what I'm working on, Jeff, with the ECC, and we're real preliminary, the ECC group, they're the only ones that can modify the settlement agreement.

And Jeff Levinger and I started

one-on-one conversations with them and had some group conversations with ECC, and this is all super preliminary, but we're talking about what modifications, you know, we could make to the settlement agreement so that folks would like it for another twenty years.

There's lots of good things in there, you know, management of Oneida Canyon. If we can extend that settlement agreement twenty years, everything doesn't have to get -- you know, go through licensing of the Bear projects.

We have a settlement pretty much, I think. Most people are favorable to the current settlement agreement. We look at the land management, recreation, water management.

If we start licensing in 2027, you know, we'll probably go through the integrated licensing process, and Jeff and I have history working through that together, you know, and who knows what will come out of that?

So if you're a stakeholder that is favorable to the current settlement agreement, my opinion, my personal opinion, that it would be in your interest and your agency's interest to figure out what tweaks you'd like to it and keep it for

twenty years versus going through an IOP process for the Bear River projects.

JEFF SEAMONS: I just don't think it's a quid pro quo event, you know, that it's an event -- the relicensing is an event for the public interest to get involved, you know.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah.

JEFF SEAMONS: And maybe through the ECC, I don't know. I haven't been to -- I haven't attended a meeting for a while up there, and I'm not, you know, privy to what's been going on, but I would assume that those predecessors to the ECC members that are working now would have had a better picture, you know, of what they wanted to see happen in the thirty-year term rather than going to a, say -- I guess it would be a fifty-year term.

MARK STENBERG: Uh-huh, yup. And it's going to be, you know, we can't force anybody to agree to that.

JEFF SEAMONS: That's true.

MARK STENBERG: They're all agencies with their own directives, right? And it will be up to them to figure out: Hey, I'd like to see this tweaked this way, and I'd be happy with another twenty.

I do want -- I'm happy to talk to you, Jeff, more about that because there's a lot of complexity around that conversation.

JEFF SEAMONS: Yeah.

MARK STENBERG: Three-stage process. That's what we're required to go through. We're in the first stage. We've issued the top, grayed-out bullet, initial consultation document.

We're at the second bullet. We're conducting a joint agency public meeting/site visit today. I'm on the timeline.

Interested parties. Third bullet. That's the sixty-day. That's FERC's timeline for comments back on this, and Matt will talk about kind of what FERC recommends for a format for comment or study request.

So sixty days, that sixty-day period falls on December 26. Just throwing that out there. That's FERC's timeline from the meeting today.

So this was out thirty-seven days ago, and then we've got sixty more days for folks to digest and comment on it.

Okay. Second phase. Complete reasonable and necessary studies. Usually one or two field seasons, and Matt will talk about what we

started this year. We wanted to get a jump on things.

And then we draft this license amendment application after studies and consultation on study results and working through, you know, what types of things might been acceptable to avoid impacts, to mitigate for impacts, or other enhancements that could happen.

Enhancements might be things that we agree to do that are not necessarily related to direct impacts, and we have the current Bear River license that has enhancements in it. And we do things that aren't directly tied to environmental impacts from the project. Okay?

We give all this to FERC, including the consultation record, so we keep track of everybody that's been involved with us, and we can keep you in the loop. Okay.

I'm going to propose, just for the sake of time, this is the schedule. It's the same stage one, you know, we've completed the ICD. We've got it out. We've provided notifications. We've published the public notice of this meeting, having the meeting. That's that slide.

Next step out there, which would be

comments on this document, and comments come to PacifiCorp. Everybody is welcome to file with FERC, too. Doesn't bother me at all. By the process, though, comments should come to us, but you're welcome to file them with FERC, too.

We'll consult with folks on comments once we get them after the comment period. Follow up and talk about how we're, you know, going to address them, if we think they're relevant, don't understand them, follow up with folks.

Perform field studies. We've started some field studies. Actually, quite a few this year. As reports are done, we'll circulate draft study reports. We'll be putting them up on the website. We'll be soliciting comments on draft reports.

This next one will prepare draft license amendment application. Final study reports, consultation records, you know, all the way to go for.

That whole package gets a ninety-day review period before it goes to FERC, and then we hand it over to FERC, and then they take it from there, and that's the third stage.

Give it to FERC. FERC may ask us

additional questions. FERC will issue a notice accepting application, ask for comments on it again. We just ask you for comments on it with the ninety-day period we give it to FERC, FERC will ask you again for comments.

There will be an environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, and FERC will make decisions. Okay.

MATT BURAK: Okay. Thank you, Mark.

So my name is Matt Burak. I'm with WSP. I'm managing -- project managing the licensing portion of this proposed project for PacifiCorp.

What we're doing now is essentially scoping of the issues. So we're soliciting feedback from everyone, general public, research agencies, what they think the primary issues are that PacifiCorp will need to collect additional information on to form an analysis of project effects.

And to do that, first we need to have an understanding of what the existing environment is, what are the resources that are present in the area. And FERC has specific resource areas to look at, and these are those here: Geology and soils, water resources, fish and aquatics, and et cetera. Those

are all listed in section four of this large document we've prepared that summarize the existing environment.

The next slides are going to focus on kind of salient findings from our preliminary information-gathering activities, so -- but and the document, of course, is described in much more detail.

So as for geology and soils, the proposed project is located on alluvial fan deposits, sedimentary rocks, quartzite, landslide deposits, and fill boulder gravels.

There are no mapped active faults in the project footprint. In the basin, relief so the topography of the area ranges from about forty-five hundred to nine thousand feet.

Soils in the area, the most common ones are Hondoho stony surface-Ricrest complex and Polumar-Ireland complex. Those types of soils have low to moderate erosion, and that refers to sheet and real erosion. So sheet erosion refers to kind of uniform flow of water over the soil surface, so just think of sheet of rain going over the soil surface. And real erosion refers to when water creates kind of a gully in the soil surface and

mobilizes the particles that way, kind of like a little channel.

Water resources. This is kind of subdivided into two areas: Water quantity and water quality.

Here water quantity refers to how much water is flowing through the river or in the reservoir. So mean monthly flows is kind of a one metric in a way that's described. And they range in the Bear River from about five hundred CFS to a little over a thousand CFS.

Instantaneous flows refers to kind of what's the flow in the river at any given moment, and that ranges from seventy to a mere thirty-five hundred CFS. Typically, the highest flows occur in July, the low flows occur in the fall and the winter.

As for the Oneida Reservoir, it's got a surface area of four hundred and eighty acres, approximately five miles in length, got a normal pool elevation of 4,882.2 feet, and its elevation varies about one to two feet from month to month, and can vary plus or minus four feet throughout a given year.

It has a useable storage capacity of

almost eleven thousand acre feet of water and has a hydraulic retention time, so how long it takes kind of a water molecule from entering the upper reservoir to exit the reservoir of about six days to do that.

And it has an average depth of twenty-four feet and a maximum of about eighty-five feet, which would be near the dam.

The water of the Bear River and the Oneida Reservoir are used primarily for hydropower generation, irrigation, and supports cold-water and warm-water biota. And is used for recreation: Fishing, boating, and swimming.

Its water quality supports cold water salmonid spawning, primarily contact recreation, industrial water, and agricultural water uses.

There's two assessment units that IDEQ, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, uses to assess and designate these uses. One is upstream of Oneida Reservoir and that extends from Oneida Reservoir to Alexander Reservoir and there's a downstream unit which starts at the tailwater of Oneida. Both are classified as high quality waters presently.

And previous and ongoing monitoring

indicates that Oneida Reservoir is a sink for total suspended solids and total phosphorus.

Right now, existing water quality data is rather limited. Water temperature ranges from half a degree to mere twenty-five degrees Celsius over the year.

The reservoir undergoes over short-term stratification, so that refers to when there's a less dense, warmer layer of water on the surface and a colder, denser layer of water, termed the hypolimnion, near the bottom.

Turbidity -- I'm sorry, and dissolved oxygen within that low, deep, cold water layer, the hypolimnion can get to near zero. Turbidity refers to kind of the cloudiness of the water, and it's higher in the in-flow section and lower near the dam.

And if you think about that, turbidity makes sense because as the flow decreases as the river hits the reservoir, sediment particles settle out. They don't -- they're no longer mobile in the water column, so water becomes more clear as you get towards the dam.

Bear River minimum water temperatures are about 1.3 degrees Celsius. Maximum summer water

temperature is about 22 degrees Celsius. Chronic water temperature standard for the salmonid fish is typically exceeded in several months. That means kind of a chronic means like a continuous exposure to a substance, in this case the water temperature would result in mortality, injury, reduced growth, repair reproduction or other adverse effects.

And dissolved oxygen levels are above state standards generally, and total phosphorus sometimes do not meet state standards presently.

As for fish and aquatic resources, so what fish are present, what other aquatic organisms are present, and what habitat supports those organisms. In the reservoir these habitats include talus slopes with large boulders and mud flaps. Downstream in the river, the habitat includes riffles, glides, pools, cobble gravel, and boulders as the primary substrates.

Oneida Reservoir is primarily managed as a sport fishery. Dominant species include walleye, carp, smallmouth bass, and perch.

Downstream sections of the Bear River are managed as a sport fishery stocked with nonnative rainbow trout. Other dominant species include Utah sucker, smallmouth bass, and mountain

white fish.

Presently, as part of the settlement agreement, there's enhancement measures to promote Bonneville cutthroat trout populations.

There's no diadromous fish present, so there's no fish species that migrate between fresh water and the ocean. There's no designated essential fish habitat present, so that refers to federally protected habitat for fish.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, there's benthic macroinvertebrates present. The most common ones are oligochaetes, so you got your worms, and your chironomids, your midges.

And at present there's no known fish entrainment or turbine mortality studies that were conducted at Oneida, so that's a potential information gap right there.

LEE FRANKLIN: I think you just said that it would be -- there will be increased water flow and that will increase the turbidity of the water, and the water gets cleaner the slower the flow is and it gets closer to the dam.

MATT BURAK: Yes, at present.

LEE FRANKLIN: So if we increase the

flow, that's going to make the water more turbid, and that will, therefore, increase the temperature of the water as well, which is already in the summer over.

MATT BURAK: That's something we're going to look into.

LEE FRANKLIN: So we're like guaranteed to make the fish worse because we're going to increase the temperature of the water.

MATT BURAK: Well, we don't know that for sure.

MARK STENBERG: We don't know that until we model it and get our water quality modeling work what's going to happen with the temperature or sediment, until we get our sediment study done and our model.

That's a good question. We don't have a good answer for that yet.

JUSTIN BARKER: Those temperatures that we were looking at there, those were temperatures that in the general time of the Bear River, those are inflows to the Oneida Reservoir. The same with the turbidity, you know, because the suspended load coming into the Bear River, you know, that's four miles upstream of where the intake is. There's no

way that any flow coming back through the dam is going to interact with any of those suspended --

THE COURT REPORTER: Speak up. Those suspended --

MATT BURAK: Suspended sediments interact.

JUSTIN BARKER: The suspended load coming in from the Bear River is not going to be affected by water coming in and out of the dam.

THE COURT REPORTER: I need your name.

JUSTIN BARKER: Justin.

MARK STENBERG: We could potentially through our fluctuations, et cetera, we could resuspend sediments in the headwater area, and that's what we're going to be looking at and figure that out. And that may be, you know, a temporary period of time or, you know, we're going to figure that out.

JUSTIN BARKER: Not all of them come in in a transport model.

MARK STENBERG: Exactly.

JEFF SEAMONS: Yes. Jeff Seamons.

We're essentially introducing an unnatural river into the bottom end of the Oneida Narrows reservoir running two thousand -- excuse me,

running two thousand CFS out approximately and then back in approximately into the -- into the reservoir.

The turbidity or the actual physical presence of the flow and the effects upon the sediment that has settled out and is down at that portion of the dam is also going to be affected.

I mean, we're going to -- you're going to create a dead pool of just turbid, filthy water right there at that intake structure that's going to go down into the water through the penstock of Oneida, and we're going to push all those solids down through along with the phosphorous.

And, I mean, we've got two river systems here. We've got one coming in and one going out, and then we're creating an unnatural river system coming back into Oneida at the lower end.

MARK STENBERG: Jeff, one of the things we're going to look at with this, you know, we've got to get our model built to look at this to look at what's happening up in the headwater, the transport model for sediment, and also down at the dam. We may end up, you know, we may find, hey, we've got to armour a portion of the reservoir so water can go up, in and out without stirring up

stuff right there.

But keep in mind that the maximum capacity of the current is three thousand CFS, so at times there's three thousand CFS running through there, which is what you have in the summer. You've got a thousand CFS going through the plant, got two thousand CFS going up the hill. That's the same current. The difference, though, is the reservoir is not down.

We could be pulling three thousand just like we're running three thousand in, you know, in spring run off or something, but we've got the reservoir going up and down and three thousand coming through.

But good questions. I don't want to rush past this, but we just -- that's why we're going to build a transports model so we can look at sediment transport, and we can have an informed discussion on this.

JEFF SEAMONS: And I would also suggest that you implement a heat transport model also for the project. The reservoir has the potential of being a heat sink with the solar energy, you know, produced onto the barren reservoir bed, the riffraff rock, the concrete will affect concrete. You've got

the mile -- two-mile-long twin penstocks that are going to conduct solar energy, and you've got the pumping, two-stage pumps that are going to create heat pumping the water two hundred feet up the hill also, which are -- and then we're going to force -- put it back into the reservoir right next to the inlet of the Oneida Narrows power plant, and say, well, the temperature of the river is going to be fine. It's not. There's no way that that is going to be below state standards or even come close to, you know, meeting state standards.

And that's going to -- that's going to impact the water qualities certificate for the license.

MATT BURAK: So to summarize your concern, the effects of project operation on water quality downstream of the Oneida and Bear River.

JEFF SEAMONS: Right. Right. Correct. Heat and turbidity and the solids that are settling out and plus the phosphorus.

MATT BURAK: Uh-huh.

JEFF SEAMONS: That's one thing that really needs to be addressed, and that's a big concern.

MATT BURAK: Okay.

JEFF SEAMONS: Especially -- especially where the settlement agreement was negotiated around Bonneville cutthroat trout recovery. And, you know, and the sustaining that species of cold water salmon.

MARK STENBERG: Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF SEAMONS: Okay.

MARK STENBERG: No. It's good. It's all stuff --

JEFF SEAMONS: We can talk.

MARK STENBERG: It's all stuff we're working on. We just don't have answers, and we appreciate the thoughtful comments and the concern. As we get to the issue listed, yeah.

So thanks.

RALPH WEST: Ralph West.

If and when all this comes about, how soon do you expect to have all your, you might say, ducks in a row to start it, and when you do, how long, and how long is going to take to build it?

MARK STENBERG: So kind of roundabout, so if we got to, say, an application to FERC in early 2025, right? FERC could take a while to work through their whole process.

Hear back from FERC, still have a lot of

engineering to do, Jack, for a period of time, and I wouldn't think we're going to go full engineering when we don't have an order to build. I don't know.

But what was the target, say, for construction, three-year construction?

JACK KOLKMAN: Three to four.

MARK STENBERG: What was that?

JACK KOLKMAN: Three to four.

RALPH WEST: So you'd like to, whatever, get the okay or whatever you do if you do it, you'd like to have that by 2025.

MARK STENBERG: Well, to be able to make application to FERC if -- you know, if we get that far, right.

MATT BURAK: Uh-huh. So go ahead. Were you finished?

RALPH WEST: Yeah.

PAUL PURSER: We don't know, at least in my opinion, and maybe this is common knowledge, maybe not, but every time the river fluctuates fishing shuts off, right? The fish quit biting. It's terrible. They need a couple days to reacclimate to their new water level and surroundings as that makes an impact on not only

fishing, but the fish themselves.

And currently one of your slides said the water in the reservoir fluctuates four feet over a month period maybe, and now you're talking about fluctuating a year.

LEE FRANKLIN: A year.

PAUL PURSER: So now you're talking about fluctuating five feet every day.

LEE FRANKLIN: Or six.

PAUL PURSER: I'm sorry, but are you kidding me? You guys are intelligent people. You know -- you've done similar studies, and you know what happens to the river.

I'm sitting here trying to bite my tongue, but I can't even believe you're considering this. How is that going to impact me as a fisherman? You say it's for recreation. I'm out there on my little ten-foot pontoon. It would be a disaster.

And what about the fish? Who cares about them. They're going to be in a constant flux of hazardous environment.

THE COURT REPORTER: What was your name again?

PAUL PURSER: Paul Purser, P-u-r-s-e-r.

MARK STENBERG: Paul, one of the things we don't have good answers for right now is how the reservoir fishery is going to respond.

I have been talking to Idaho Fish and Game about this proposal since March. You know, and they definitely are -- you know, the recreational fishery is definitely in their focus. The walleye they stock there every year. Smallmouth bass, those items.

You know, I don't have good answer to that tonight, you know. I got your notes here. I'll be talking to Pat Kennedy about this a lot going forward, so I appreciate you bringing it up. I don't have an answer for you so sorry.

MATT BURAK: So moving on to wildlife and botanical resources.

Wildlife resources in the vicinity with the proposed project consist of various species of mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles that are characteristic of --

THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down.

MATT BURAK: -- the Semiarid Hills and Low Mountains ecoregion of the Northern Basin and Range ecoregions.

There's seven upland habitats present,

the most dominant one -- the most prevalent one is the sagebrush steppe. There's some noxious weeds that are present, three plant species listed as noxious species by the State of Idaho are found in the current Oneida project boundary.

Currently there's weed control in place to manage those noxious weeds. The project is located within Game Management Unit Number 77. Right now there's no -- there's no information indicating there's big game migration routes or stopovers in or around the project.

There's a land management and buffer plans included presently to prevent degradation of riparian and wetland conditions and minimize impacts from dispersed camping and dispersed vehicular access.

MARK STENBERG: Hey, Matt, I think it's -- I'd like to go back to Paul's comment for a second.

Paul, I appreciate you bringing that up. That's a great example of, you know, the purpose of this project. So concerns raised and issues raised. You know, we're going to talk to the resource managers, the resource agencies. We're going to look for data, studies, similar situations, learn

what we can about the question and come back. Similar for everything else we talked about, right?

If we find, you know, a resource impacts, right, and then we're going to start that conversation of how could we avoid it, right? Well, we don't build the project is one way to avoid impact.

Or if you really want to build the project, here's some things we can do to mitigate that impact. And just brainstorming a while tonight, but say we find out, oh, you know, this is going to impact that warm water, sport fishery and the reservoir, right? And angling opportunities are not going to be, let's just say they're not going to be what they are right now.

How can we enhance, say, flat water, warm water, you know, sport fishing opportunities in Southeast Idaho? And then you brainstorm with our partners: How can we make it better in other places, then, right? And then you go down that path of: How can we mitigate for this? Is there ways we can help that other flat water recreation to have access, improve fishing, you know, things like that that we can brainstorm, you know, and see if that's something that would be palatable to company, to

Firth, you know, to people in the package, you know, everything -- that's kind of the process everything works through here. Okay?

LEE FRANKLIN: Mark, if it would be maybe sort of kind of acceptable to sacrifice Oneida but improve something else? Is that -- that doesn't seem like a good idea to me.

Is that what you said?

MARK STENBERG: Yes. Kind of, yes. Yes.

And, you know, this is the hard thing. You know, this is the hard spot we're in, you know. I would love to come to a meeting and somebody say, like, Mark, I got the best pump storage site for you; then I call Tim right then and say, Tim, I got this great site somebody just told me about. You know, it's by our transmission line. It's got lots of elevation. The landowners got water rights we can use, and there's no sage grouse, pigmy rabbit, mule deer, elk, sport fishery. You know, it would be great.

I say elk. I'm complaining a little bit, but we're trying to find a site, and we're trying to work through the process here and study the resources, study the issues, see what we can

learn about it, answer questions, and then see, you know, on that -- what we talked about was avoidance, mitigation, and enhancement, and see how we can work through resource issues.

JENNIFER NORTON: Are there other studies being done outside the company, like, for part of the park studies being conducted on microbiological resource and food chains such as wild birds and the bug ecology and disturbance of water that would impact those things?

I'm just curious to know if there are other studies being done that are not connected to this project, like objective studies on these like microbiologies.

MARK STENBERG: Sure, like the food web for, say, walleye or something like that, right?

JENNIFER NORTON: Uh-huh.

MARK STENBERG: Justin, there's all kinds of research out there.

JUSTIN BARKER: There's a lot of university research that's going on. There's, you know, dissertations and thesis throughout the Bear River.

JENNIFER NORTON: Yeah.

THE COURT REPORTER: I need names.

ERIC DUFFIN: Eric Duffin. I guess as a hydrologist and, you know, my training is to identify problems and not to hide them, so not in any way are we doing something to try to cover up this plant or --

JENNIFER NORTON: Yeah. We're talking like --

ERIC DUFFIN: We're presenting nonbiased information.

JENNIFER NORTON: Right. Yeah. Fish is one thing, you know, but I'm talking about, like, the whole picture: Birds, bugs. Like, how is this impacting all of the wildlife that is diminishing, particularly the bird population. And, you know, when you disturb one, you disturb bugs and algae and other smaller food webs, complex, delicate things that birds -- so, yeah, Fish and Game, of course. Like fish. We like fish. We like the fish hatcheries, but what about the foundational and native ecology.

THE COURT REPORTER: I need your name.

JENNIFER NORTON: Jennifer Norton.

LEE FRANKLIN: Mark, since we are talking agriculture about mitigating problems, if this was done as a closed-loop system, that

eliminates kind of all the issues that we talked about except we haven't talked about construction, environmental impact construction, but going forward that would mitigate everything if the water was taken and put into the system and closed, not put back into the river, you would eliminate that. I know it costs more.

MARK STENBERG: And we have to find a spot for it. That's the thing is the footprint, of course. Cost and footprint. If we were down in Oneida Canyon, you know, trying to build a -- when we do the quick math here, so say we're trying to build a four hundred acre lower reservoir in Oneida Canyon, then we're going to have the songbird habitat on the river, riparian loss, wetland loss, all that to work through, too. It's a tough thing to move around.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: Mark, that would be a ride if you pose that.

MARK STENBERG: Oh, yeah.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: So that's more of what Ralph West said earlier, that ain't going to happen.

MARK STENBERG: Right. Yeah. Build the lower reservoir.

MAYOR DAN KELLER: Yeah.

MARK STENBERG: Jeff brought up the opposition that happened, you know, two times in the past for the Oneida Narrows location, right, for a second dam down there.

So where was I going with this?

So just, you know, as a side topic, too, that's kind of interesting, so the Bear River -- I haven't mentioned at this meeting, so, yeah, I know Jeff knows this, that segment of the Bear River that's in our FERC boundary, the Oneida dam down to the Twin Lake side column, that's the longest free-flowing publicly accessible piece of the Bear River. That's it right there.

And the reason it looks so great down there, and you've got the wildlife and the habitat and the recreation we do is because of this licence that PacifiCorp has to run the Oneida project, right?

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak up?

MARK STENBERG: Yeah. Sorry.

We have the Oneida dam, generate power there. That's the enhancement package, right? That's the mitigation. We built these reservoirs back a hundred years ago. We're managing lands

around them, mitigation. We're managing wildlife habitat around them, mitigation. And providing recreational enhancements.

Other projects, you know, we pay to stock fish. We do these kind of things, and so we have this whole package that is the Oneida Canyon, the reservoir, everything below it, you know, I've been managing that landscape below the dam since 2005. That's been my job.

It looks the way it does because of PacifiCorp's commitments to manage that per our agreements over time. Specifically.

LEE FRANKLIN: Kudos to PacifiCorp for doing that.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah. I remember a long time ago, you know, I was at a stakeholder meeting and we were getting really beat up, and you guys are great tonight. Thank you. I've been in some rough, rough public meetings. And, you know, on us. And they were just -- you know, I wish you guys would just go away with your hydro projects, you're killing us.

And we were -- you know, we were just talking about local access and fishing and trying to get an understanding and figure out where we had

common ground so we could work for mutual gain there. And I made the comment that said, yeah, you know, let's talk about what this would look like if we weren't here, right? We have all this just local access and we do our thing.

And someone said: Well, wait a minute. This would probably all be private property. We wouldn't have any public access.

And that was really interesting. That was, like, a conversation from twenty years ago, and that was very interesting. Thing about that, on that reach of the Bear River below the Oneida dam, it's FERC boundary, it's BLM, we manage all of stuff down there. Without the Oneida project, what would be the status down there? Would we have all that public access without PacifiCorp and Oneida dam?

There's lots of things. I guess where I'm getting to with this is with projects, there's lots of stuff that we can do that could be a benefit around there, you know. Local jobs. We have to have enhancement. There's recreation. There's lots of things that could come with this.

You know, I've been involved through PacifiCorp's funding of conservation now five thousand acres of conservation easements, a bunch of

it in Mink Creek, other places up here. We helped Fish and Game buy several hundred acres of the gorge from WMA several years ago. There's a lot of things that can come along with a project like this. There were benefits.

I don't mean to soapbox you there.

BROCK FREYER: Brock Freyer. I just wanted to confirm the studies of one of the resources to be studies will be --

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear you. Stand up.

BROCK FREYER: I was just looking for confirmation going back to the basis of the food chain that benefits the macroinvertebrates are going to be studied, and that's with association with this project outside of that, Justin is the expert, but there might be others, but it is one of the resources that's catalogued and inventoried for this process.

SUSAN WEST: I'm Susan West. I've got a question. How much would it cost to build this and is it going to raise our electric rates?

TIM HEMSTREET: I'll take this. Tim Hemstreet with PacifiCorp.

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear you.

TIM HEMSTREET: Tim Hemstreet.

So the cost of this project, we don't know yet because it's not fully scoped, but it would likely been in the hundreds of billions of dollars. They will never been resources where all of us choosing the least cost impacts we can, so we are going to have to add in resources over the next twenty years as we transition --

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear.

TIM HEMSTREET: -- our generating resources, so as we do that, we will be making choices for which resources to pick to do that in the most cost effective manner.

As we transition our generation fleet, that will likely result in cost increases because we are retiring old stuff that's old but paid off, and there will be new resources, and that will cost money. But this resource will complete, among other resources, to make sure that if you look at this project, it will be because it's part of the least cost alternative for making sure our customers get power in a safe and economical way.

MATT BURAK: Okay. As for wetland, riparian, and littoral resources, there's nine wetland and waterway U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Inventory Classes that occur in the area. The most prevalent are lacustrine and riverine and palustrine.

For rare, threatened, and endangered species, there's several that have the potential to occur in the project area. Those are the wolverine, Ute-ladies' tresses, the Monarch butterfly, but there's no federally designated or proposed critical habitat in the area.

State species of greatest conservation concern with habitat found near the project include one mammal, the silver haired bat, twenty-two birds, two hundred amphibians, six invertebrates.

Bald eagles have historically nested at Oneida, and golden eagles have been observed. There's potential habitat for six BLM special status plant species.

For recreational land use resources, the area is a popular camping, boating, fishing, hunting, picnicking, swimming, and bicycling area.

There's five recreational facilities at the project presently. That's Maple Grove Campground, Oneida Day-Use Area, Oneida Campground and the Oneida Narrows Put-In and Take-Out areas.

Land uses include conservation lands,

project operation lands, and developed recreation land.

Static and visual resources, the area is currently characterized by forested hills, mountains in the distance, range lands, and agricultural lands with dispersed homes, ranches, and small towns.

There was a visual assessment conducted in 2003 that included partially developed landscapes -- I'm sorry -- that concluded that there's partially developed landscapes, low to moderate viewer sensitivity to development.

And Class III scenic classification, visual character of the landscape is partially retained and changes to the landscape do not dominate the view of the observer.

As for cultural and tribal resources, the area has a rich prehistory and history of human occupation up to fourteen thousand, five hundred years before present.

Indigenous groups associated with the area include the Northern Shoshone, Shoshone-Bannock, and the Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation.

The Oneida dam was constructed in 1923.

There's three archaeological sites, six

historical structures, one linear historical site present near the proposed facility.

There's a cultural resource management plan under the current Bear River license, that's the Historical Properties Management Plan. There's no specific tribal resources identified within the proposed facility, but there's continuing ongoing coordination with Tribal Nations or ties to the area.

Kind of a standalone resource is socioeconomic resources. So land ownership is primarily federal with some private and state lands. Employment is probably in the private sector with some public sector employment. And the mean median household income is about fifty-seven thousand.

So resources that we identified to date include geology and soils, so operation -- those are included operational effects on shoreline erosion, and we're also undergoing geotechnical investigations to support engineering design.

As for water resources, operational effects on existing water quality.

MARK STENBERG: Matt, pause for a second, because it's a little bit late.

So when I started, this is our, you

know, high level understanding of issues -- all right? -- that we're at.

So I've got a list of things I've been meeting some other issues come up tonight. This is what we came into the meeting with our understanding of issues around each of these, you know, topic areas. Okay? I just want to -- yup.

MATT BURAK: So when we speak to, like, an issue, like, for instance, operational effects on existing water quality. That doesn't mean we're going to look at doing one study. We're going to look at specific -- like center transport, operational effects on reservoir stratification. Could be multiple different studies that allude to the overall operational effect of water quality.

JEFF SEAMONS: Jeff Seamons. Which would include the river habitat also.

MATT BURAK: Yeah.

MARK STENBERG: And the transport model.

JEFF SEAMONS: And the transport. And then heat, also heat.

MATT BURAK: So under fish and aquatic resources, water level fluctuations on benthic macroinvertebrates.

THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please.

MATT BURAK: They're little bugs that live in the sediment.

For wildlife botanical resources, construction effects on wildlife and their habitats. Operational effects on wildlife, introduction and spread of invasive species.

For wetlands, riparian, littoral resources, habitat change from construction and operations, mainly from water level fluctuations.

For RTE species, species displacement and habitat loss from construction and operation.

For recreation and land use, reservoir water level fluctuations and access, construction operational effects on fishing, boating, and hunting opportunities.

For aesthetic and visual resources, temporary construction effects related, for example, to noise and dust. New infrastructure across the landscape, and exposed reservoir shoreline, so how does that affect the visual character of the area.

For cultural resources and tribal resources, we haven't identified any issues to date, but pending ongoing results and additional consultation with the tribes, we didn't identify any

socioeconomic resource issues.

With that said, in preparation of the -- of this initial consultation document and to support ongoing license amendment process, we're presently undergoing some field studies, and those are listed here, and the next few slides will go over what those goals are for each study and some data collection and some preliminary results thus far.

So we undertook wetlands and waters mapping, and that goal is to determine the types and quantity, and distribution of wetlands present in the project area. This was done in September, so data collection is complete, but analysis is ongoing.

Some preliminary results conclude that there will probably be temporary impacts to the wetlands likely to occur along the lacustrine fringe and the upper reach of the existing Oneida Reservoir.

These impacts would likely occur as the wetlands adjust to temporal and spatial variations water levels. The effects of the proposed operating regime on the wetlands, so the daily water level fluctuations will be a focus of the ongoing study.

We're also doing some shoreline erosion

mappings. And that goal is to identify and characterize existing areas of erosion along the shoreline of the Oneida Reservoir. Like the wetlands study, the field data was completed in September, so that is complete, but analysis is still ongoing.

In general, the Oneida Reservoir shoreline appears to be stable and naturally armored.

There are some relic erosional features that were noted during the survey, and these areas were isolated and were considered generally healed.

There is potential for erosion below the established shoreline in areas with shallower slopes and recent depositional features associated with finding materials and subsurface and subsurface water inputs, seeps and springs.

For our ongoing water quality monitoring study, the goal is to collect updated baseline water quality information in the area to support an analysis of project effects and evaluate consistency with Idaho DEQ water quality standards.

Data collection is ongoing and it's been going on for quite some time now. We're collecting data on water temperature, dissolved oxygen,

turbidity, total suspended solids, total phosphorus, and reservoir sediment.

And as Mark stated earlier on, that includes metals and sampling for metals in the sediment samples.

Some preliminary results, the reservoir does stratify with the thermocline present around fifteen meters of depth. Above this thermocline DO is at or above the state water quality standard, but below a thermocline, DO typically decreases below the state water quality standard.

And that's something that's very typical in water that's been stratified, both reservoirs and naturally occurring lakes, too.

Total phosphorus is generally less than five one-hundredths of a milligram per liter at both steppes and total suspended solids is typically less than five milligrams per liter. And sediment samples have been collected and results are pending for the metal testing.

A wildlife survey was conducted, and the goal was to determine the wildlife species that are present, including special status species, what habitats are in the area, and the potential effects the projects would have on them.

Data collection is complete, and analysis, like the other studies, are ongoing.

Our biologist did find a new bald eagle nest near the powerhouse and suspension bridge.

Wetlands at the upstream end of the reservoir have a high biodiversity presence of sensitive species, and those are listed here.

There's potential impacts may occur during the breeding season from water level fluctuations and sediments.

For federal threatened and endangered plants, noxious weed surveys, our goal is to determine if Ute-ladies' tresses were present, and BLM sensitive species are present in the area, and what the potential impacts -- what would potential impacts be on the rare orchid of project construction and operation if it's present in the area.

Do an inventory of noxious weeds in the area and assess the potential for the spread and introduction of these noxious weeds. Data collection was complete earlier this fall, and the analysis is ongoing.

Some preliminary results indicate that there's no threatening endangered species that are

around the Oneida Reservoir around the proposed upper reservoir site and the penstock alignment.

There are some noxious weeds and invasive weeds present at the upper reservoir location, and along the proposed penstock and around the Oneida Reservoir, and those are listed there.

For our recreation assessment, this study is still ongoing. Its goal is to assess the potential impact of construction and operation the project would have on the recreational facilities and activities.

Some of the ongoing field data collection is mapping boating hazards and recreational uses being monitored by trail cams and traffic counters.

For our aesthetic assessment, our goal is to determine the visibility and visual contrast of the proposed including operations on the existing landscape. Data collection is complete. Analysis is still ongoing.

Some preliminary findings indicate that the upper reservoir is likely not visible from key observation points around the existing Oneida Reservoir and downstream of the Oneida in the narrows section.

A portion of the penstocks are visible as well as effects from water level fluctuations, and some portion of the new generating pumping station would be visible as well.

And part of this study involves doing some visual simulations, so the top picture is what the condition of a viewpoint of the penstock alignment is presently, and this bottom picture is what the -- the simulation, and you can see the penstock going right across the hill there. That's what it would look like.

We are planning on doing a culture resource assessment, and the purpose is to collect information on culture resources on the lands within the proposed project area that are potentially impacted by construction operation.

Still waiting to commence field work, but we're conducting consultation with Tribal Nations and other parties. To define the area of potential effects is the first step in this process, so that process is still ongoing.

In addition to some of the other studies that we envisioned doing and that we've heard today, we also envision performing a baseline fishery survey, bathymetry survey, and a benthic

macroinvertebrate survey.

THE COURT REPORTER: And a --

MATT BURAK: Benthic macroinvertebrate survey.

So part of the whole FERC process is having the public be involved in it, and the next opportunity for that is to provide comments and study requests to PacifiCorp, and that's to be done within sixty days. That's the regulation step by the FERC, and the clock starts today, so sixty days from today.

And that date is Tuesday, December 26th, so that's an important date to mark. If you would like to file a study request with PacifiCorp, FERC does have study request criteria to follow in creation of those study requests, and those are listed here. And to help proponents of the study to develop those requests, FERC has a nice document to guide everyone, and that's at this link below.

So if you have your phone, you can take a picture of this so you could know the criteria and then.

JENNIFER NORTON: Is this not in the booklet? Are you saying this is only here?

MATT BURAK: Not in here.

JENNIFER NORTON: Is it in here?
MATT BURAK: No.
MARK STENBERG: This presentation will be up on our website in a day or two. I'll get it over the same spot that the initial consultation documents are posted, so you'll be able to go in and review work.
THE COURT REPORTER: Your name again? I need her name again.
MATT BURAK: Do you mind telling us your name again?
JENNIFER NORTON: Jennifer Norton.
MATT BURAK: Jennifer Norton.
So when framing the study request, because this is an amendment proceeding, when reviewing amendments, FERC would concentrate on proposed modification to determine the dam safety, environmental operation and other effects.
So the two kind of amendments here is the proposed pump storage, and the second one is the licenses extension. So the study requests should focus on those two aspects. All right.
So now is the time for more comments and questions, and the website that Mark was speaking to is right here at the bottom, so if you want to just

take a picture with your phone, you can reference it for later.

MARK STENBERG: And that will be the location that we'll put everything up as we move forward with our consultation study work. It will be -- everything will end up posted at that location as we go along.

MATT BURAK: And also there was a comment this morning about when would the public have continued involvement in the whole process.

And the process in the schedule that was shown here, which is also in the initial consultation document, there's a process plan in the schedule, and it comes in the form of -- it's presented in the form of a table here, and it tells and indicates which parties are responsible -- what the activities are and which party is responsible for.

So PacifiCorp will prepare a document, and then the next task would be state pulls comments on the document and gives you a time frame of when those comments would be due. So that would be another thing to reference. So and those deadlines are set by FERC.

MARK STENBERG: Yes.

MARK SCADDEN: Mark Scadden.

I glanced through the ICD fast.

MARK STENBERG: Yeah.

MARK SCADDEN: And what are the upstream effects from this project, and I'm speaking specifically about Bear Lake, to offset any impact imposed by this operation?

MARK STENBERG: That's a good question. I'm sorry, it's getting late. It's been a long day.

MARK SCADDEN: No.

MARK STENBERG: And I don't want to just off-the-cuff say I don't see an impact upstream or involvement with our Bear Lake facilities up there or Bear Lake, Mud Lake.

This is all down in Oneida, and Jeff's bringing up concerns about things moving out of the reservoir and those type of things. In my view at this point, you know, it seems pretty tight to the reservoir and the surrounding lands.

MARK STENBERG: Hey, will you guys join me in thanking our court reporter?

(Applause.)

MARK STENBERG: Thank you.

MATT BURAK: Yes, thank you.

MARK STENBERG: Other questions,

comments?

(No audible response.)

MARK STENBERG: Okay. Thank you everybody so much for coming tonight. I really appreciate the comments, the discussion, opportunity to meet folks.

That's my phone. That's my e-mail. Stay in touch. Okay.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 8:50 p.m.)

* * * * * *

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF IDAHO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF BONNEVILLE)

I, DiAnn Erdman Prock, CSR, CCR, a duly commissioned Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho, do hereby certify:

That I took down in Stenotype all of the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter at the time and place indicated, and that thereafter said Stenotype notes were transcribed into typewriting at and under my direction and supervision, and the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate record of the proceedings had.

I further certify that I have no interest in the event of the action.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 4th day of November, 2023.

DiAnn Erdman Prock
Idaho CSR SRL 963, CCR
Notary Public in and for
the State of Idaho

My commission expires November 26, 2025.

B

D

G

Q