

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Great Falls Hydroelectric Project on the

Passaic River

P-2814-025

SCOPING MEETING

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Rogers Meeting Center, Second Floor

32 Spruce Street

Paterson, New Jersey

7:00 p.m.

1 SPEAKER LIST

2 Chris Millard, FERC

3 Andy Bernick, FERC

4 Emily Carter, FERC

5 Ted Koroshetz, FERC

6 Michael Scarzello, FERC

7 Francis T. Blesso, Paterson Resident

8 Joe Elmo, Paterson Resident

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 MR. MILLARD: Okay, Im going to go ahead and get
3 the meeting started at 7:14. I apologize for the delay,
4 weve had some issues this evening. But nonetheless, Id like
5 to welcome everybody. My name is Chris Millard, Im with the
6 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission down in Washington,
7 D.C. and Im a fisheries biologist there and I also happen to
8 be the project coordinator for the Great Falls Hydroelectric
9 Project.

10 I also have with me a few colleagues from FERC as
11 well. I think some of you folks may have already met them,
12 but Ill introduce them, nonetheless. First is Andy Bernick.
13 Andys a wildlife biologist with the Commission, and hes
14 going to be working on the terrestrial resources issues
15 associated with the relicensing of the project, as well as
16 threatened and endangered species.

17 Theres also Emily Carter. Emilys an
18 environmental biologist and shes got a whole host of things
19 that shes going to be working on, including cultural
20 resources, recreational resources, land use and aesthetics.
21 So, shes got a tall order ahead of her, to say the least.

22 And then finally, we have Ted Koroshetz. Teds
23 with the Office of the General Counsel. Hes our attorney,
24 of course, and Teds the fellow that we go to for all our
25 legal and regulatory issues.

1 So, we have a good team. Its a comprehensive
2 team. This is how we usually address these relicensing
3 issues. We gather a bunch of folks from different resource
4 areas and try to tackle it from all angles. I also want to
5 welcome the folks from Great Falls Hydro and from the City
6 of Paterson, both agencies. And with that I guess Ill go
7 ahead and get started with the rest of the presentation.

8 So, first off, for this public hearing we have,
9 of course, some protocols, Ill just go over briefly, since I
10 think most of you folks are kind of familiar with it. We do
11 have a registration table, hopefully everyone has taken an
12 opportunity to sign-in and give their contact information.
13 We have copies of the scoping document. If you havent
14 already had a chance to take a look at it, you can grab a
15 copy and go along as we move through the presentation.

16 And then as we go through the presentation we ask
17 for comments and questions and statements and so on. We ask
18 that obviously everybody keep it related to the project
19 itself, not to stray off into maybe other topic areas. And
20 if you dont choose to submit comments today orally, you can
21 certainly do so through writing, and that can be submitted
22 to FERC, either by letter or by the e-filing process, which
23 Ill talk about a little bit later.

24 And those will be due 30 days from tonights
25 meeting. Ill also mention that we have a court reporter

1 here and shell be recording everything thats said. So, when
2 you do have a comment or a question, please make sure you
3 speak clearly. Please make sure you introduce yourself and
4 state your affiliation.

5 And if you could, maybe for the first time you
6 get up and speak, please go ahead and spell out your name so
7 that she can attribute all the comments to you. So, as an
8 overview of what Id like to kind of go over tonight, first
9 well talk a little bit about the licensing process and Great
10 Falls Hydro and the City of Paterson chose the traditional
11 licensing process, its one of the three options that we
12 have. Well talk about that a little bit.

13 Well discuss a little bit on what the scoping
14 process is and why its important to us. Matt will provide a
15 project overview, how the project is run, what proposals are
16 on the table at the moment and then well go into the
17 recourse issues, and of course ultimately well be putting
18 together an environment document which might be an
19 environmental assessment, or Environmental Impact Statement,
20 but well examine resources issues and how they may or may
21 not be affected by the project operation or maintenance.

22 And those resource issues as we present them,
23 will be kind of broad. Theyre not necessarily designed to
24 kind of drill down into the details, but just kind of an
25 overview of what well look to evaluate during the

1 relicensing process.

2 There will then be a time for general questions
3 and comments, and then well talk about the next steps and
4 how folks can stay informed with the proceeding as we go
5 through it. So, as I mentioned, the applicants chose the
6 traditional licensing process. And this process, to a large
7 extent, FERC isnt involved too much in the first three
8 years.

9 We received the notice of intent and the
10 pre-application document back in February of 2016, and
11 shortly thereafter approved the request to use the JLP at
12 which point the applicants went and met with various
13 stakeholders, federal and state agencies and so on to
14 identify data gaps, any study request and so on, ultimately
15 leading up to their final license application which was
16 submitted in February of 2019.

17 So, at that point we got back involve ed in the
18 process for the post-filing, and on May 14th of this year we
19 came up with a list of additional information requests, and
20 also found a couple deficiencies that we needed to have
21 addressed. Initially, those responses to the AIRs and to
22 the deficiencies were due on August 12th, I believe, and we
23 got most of those resolved and theres now three outstanding
24 issues, two of which are still additional information
25 requests and one deficiency and thats due coming up on

1 November 10th.

2 And so, that brings us -- now we kind of skipped
3 ahead. Now, generally speaking, once those AIRs and
4 deficiencies are cleared, we would issue an acceptance
5 letter, but again because those are still outstanding, we
6 havent issued an acceptance letter yet, weve moved on to
7 scoping to keep the process moving forward and thats, of
8 course, where we are today.

9 The next step after the scoping will be to
10 evaluate any comments that we get within 30 days of this
11 meeting. And then once the deficiencies are cleared, and we
12 have all the information that we feel is necessary to put
13 together our environmental documents, well go ahead and
14 issue a ready for environmental analysis letter.

15 At that point, well start working on our
16 environmental documents. Thats also the point at which
17 agencies will issue their terms, conditions and
18 prescriptions and that happens within 60 days of the REA
19 notice, and also the water quality certification needs to be
20 applied for within that 60 day period as well, so its kind
21 of an important timeframe.

22 And then eventually what well finish up again, as
23 I said, with the environment documents which at this point
24 were intending to do environmental assessments on.

25 So, what is scoping? You know, this is kind of

1 an important process in any licensing proceeding, as its an
2 opportunity for us to kind of hear from all of the involved
3 stakeholders and determine the scope and the breadth of the
4 issues that need to be addressed for identifying the issues
5 related to the proposed action, and it gives us an
6 opportunity to meet with folks, again, to identify the
7 affected public and agency concerns, so we get those right.

8

9 Also, to facilitate kind of the efficient
10 processing of our environmental documents, knowing that our
11 information that were gathering, or that weve been given is
12 correct and accurate will facilitate that process.

13 We also want to define some of the issues and
14 alternatives that will be examined, of course, in those
15 documents, find out which ones are important and even some
16 that maybe arent as important as maybe we see. And then
17 ultimately, you know, we want to ensure that all the draft
18 statements that we make adequately represent the resource
19 issues and the concerns of the public and the agencies and
20 all stakeholders.

21 So, with that Matt, I think you walked in at the
22 right time. Well have a project overview, or is it Mike?
23 Mike, I guess its you then, so your stuffs all up here if
24 youd like. Do you want me to -- youre going to have to use
25 the microphone, so she can record it.

1 MR. SCARZELLO: Can I come up
2 here, or are you going to --

3 MR. MILLARD: Yeah, please, Ill move right out of
4 the way. Do you want me to do the slides for you?

5 MR. SCARZELLO: I appreciate it. Okay, hi.
6 Yeah, thank you Chris. Mike Scarzello, Regulatory Director
7 with Eagle Creek, its S-c-a-r-z-e-l-l-o, so good evening
8 everybody and thank you for the introduction and well cruise
9 right through these.

10 These should be fairly -- a fairly good review, a
11 very brief history of the project. It dates back to the
12 development of the site of useful manufacturers in 1791.

13 A couple of other highlights, in 1914, with
14 Thomas Edisons nearly 5,000 kilowatt hydro project
15 development at the location to the 1980s when the plant was
16 restored to its present three turbine total with a nameplate
17 of 10.95 megawatts up to where Eagle Creek comes into the
18 picture with its 2013 purchase from our prior owner, the
19 Algonquin Power Company to 2016, when we started relicensing
20 with a 2021 license renewal anticipated.

21 A very quick snapshot of the location of the
22 project, an overview of the project and this is details on
23 the layout of the facility. Were going to be looking at
24 this in great detail tomorrow, so Im going to basically skip
25 over the layout and the details of the project.

1 Project operation is run of river. It does have
2 a max capacity of 2,130 CFS, all excess flows are discharged
3 over the Great Falls. Under normal flow conditions, the
4 project reservoir will normally vary at the spillway crest
5 elevation of 114.6 and obviously, increase with any excess
6 flows up to full discharge of 2,130 CFS into the plant.
7 Anything above that is spilled over the Great Falls.

8 We do have a minimum flow requirement pursuant to
9 the existing license, which is Article 27 to release a
10 continuous minimum flow of 200 CFS or inflow to the project,
11 whichever is less. And at present time, the co-licensees
12 have opted to operate the project without the flashboards.

13

14 A quick overview of the facility layout again,
15 which we will all see tomorrow. The Great Falls themselves,
16 inside the power station, existing and proposed boundaries
17 -- this is a good one to spend a minute or so on. So, the
18 existing project boundaries that you see blown up on the
19 right, its delineated in the blue lines. The proposed
20 project boundary that we have recently submitted with the
21 final license application as co-licensee, is labeled in red
22 and it shows the changes of what we propose to do, how to
23 shrink the project down.

24 Im going to scoot around that side of here. A
25 just quick orientation. Flow is this way, Great Falls are

1 in this vicinity, here is the dam itself and were looking to
2 shrink up this part of the project boundary down in the
3 vicinity of the powerhouse and the dam itself from the
4 original project boundary which is again, in blue to the
5 red, in anticipation of working with our co-licensee who is
6 in the process of turning over lands to the National Park
7 Service at some point in the future.

8 And if John Franco wants to speak to that in a
9 few minutes, you're able to. So, that is the proposed
10 transfer, and these are the proposed changes in the project
11 boundary that would go to the National Park Service in
12 green. So, it affects some of the project boundary in the
13 Overlook Park area, which is presently within the project
14 boundary, and then certainly the adjoining -- next to Great
15 Falls is the Kramer Park, which is already part of the Park
16 Service, so.

17 Sorry, so, proposed modification for the project
18 operations, so we propose the following modifications to the
19 existing operations pursuant to the final license. As
20 requested by the National Park Service, they would like to
21 see an increase in aesthetic flows from 200 CFS to 400 CFS
22 during periods of high visitation which occur May 1st
23 through October 31st, daylight hours and on weekends.

24 Also, they would like to see special park events
25 where we would have the additional aesthetic flow release

1 estimated at 10 events per year. At the same time, the
2 co-licensees propose to conserve energy resources and
3 decrease the aesthetic flow requirement during nighttime,
4 from 200 CFS to 50 CFS during the nighttime hours of 9 p.m.
5 to 7 a.m. when flow is less than full capacity while
6 continuing to protect aesthetic and environmental resources
7 in that part of the Passaic River.

8 Again, another quick snapshot of what Chris
9 already covered on the licensing timeline. Im not going to
10 spend a lot of detail on it only to say that were here
11 tonight for this SB1 public meeting. Okay, and I think were
12 back to you, Chris.

13 MR. MILLARD: We are back to me. Okay. And I
14 wanted to offer to John Franco, did you want to do any
15 remarks on the project boundary that I was just describing?
16 Okay, thank you. Okay, so well get right back into it.
17 Now, Im just kind of going to go over what resource groups
18 were kind of focusing on for our environmental analyses.

19 Again, as I mentioned, when the NOI, Im sorry,
20 not the NOI, the final license application rather, came in
21 back in February, the same team of folks we have here,
22 including one engineer thats appointed the office, reviewed
23 that application and these resource groups and what were
24 going to present next is derived from that review and is
25 kind of our first shot at how well put together the eventual

1 environmental documents.

2 The resource areas that were concerned with
3 looking to evaluate are geology and soil resources, aquatic
4 resources, of course, terrestrial resources, threatened and
5 endangered species, recreation land use and aesthetics,
6 cultural resources and then finally developmental resources.

7

8 So, what I'd like to do is go through each of
9 these and discuss in slightly more detail what we plan to
10 look at. And again, as I mentioned earlier, you know its
11 not designed to be filled with details. Well drill down
12 into it as we get into the formation of the environmental
13 documents, as we review more data and more information and
14 get the remaining information with the additional
15 information requests.

16 And so, again, this is just meant to be kind of a
17 broad brush. For those of you that have the scoping
18 document, all of this information is presented starting on
19 page 14 of the scoping document.

20 So, the first is the soil and -- I'm sorry,
21 geology and soil resources. And what we want to look at is
22 the effects of -- the product construction is not relevant
23 in this case necessarily, but project operation and
24 maintenance on soil resources and on shoreline erosion.
25 Again, that's something that we'll pursue more actively as we

1 get into things, but what I want to do as we go through each
2 of these resources is ask if folks think that this is a
3 critical area of need, if theres any additional comments or
4 suggestions that you might have, any data sources that you
5 might know of and so on.

6 So, as we go through each of these, Ill just give
7 you a minute to think about it and ask if anybody has any
8 comments, questions or statements. So, anything related to
9 geology and soil resources?

10 Okay, Ill go ahead and move on. The next is
11 aquatic resources. And for aquatic resources were looking
12 at the effects of project operation and maintenance on water
13 quality and quantity. Also looking again at continued
14 project operation and maintenance on fish and aquatic
15 habitat, including flow conditions of the bypass reach and
16 downstream of the project.

17 And then finally effects of continued project
18 operation and maintenance on aquatic resources, including
19 impingement -- entrainment rather, and impingement,
20 mortality of resident fishes. Does anybody have any
21 statements or comments along those lines?

22 Okay, moving on. Next is terrestrial resources.
23 Here were looking at the effects of project operation and
24 maintenance on botanical resources and wildlife, also the
25 effects of project operation and maintenance on wetland

1 habitat and associated wildlife. And then finally the
2 effects of project operation and maintenance on New Jersey
3 state-listed species. Anybody for terrestrial resources?

4 Okay, moving on. Threatened and endangered
5 species -- wed be looking at the effects of project
6 operation and maintenance on federally listed threatened and
7 endangered species identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
8 Service, which includes the endangered Indiana bat and the
9 northern long-eared bat. Anybody for T&E species?

10 Okay, moving on. Next is for recreation, land
11 use and aesthetics. Well be looking at a whole host of
12 things here, so effects of continued project operation and
13 maintenance on recreational use in the project area, the
14 adequacy of public access and recreational facilities to
15 meet the current or future recreational demand of the
16 project.

17 The effects of continued project operation and
18 maintenance on land use in the project area, and the effects
19 of continued project operation and maintenance on aesthetic
20 resources in the project area, including evaluations of
21 appropriate aesthetic flows over the Great Falls. Yes, sir?

22

23 MR. BLESSO: On a question of the adequacy of
24 public access, is this on?

25 MR. MILLARD: Yes, I just want you to state your

1 name if you would.

2 MR. BLESSO: Francis Blesso, Paterson, New
3 Jersey, resident of Paterson, New Jersey. B-l-e-s-s-o,
4 Blesso. In the existing license there is a requirement
5 for public access to the plant itself, and in some of my
6 previous comments I recommended that that -- if thats not
7 already required in the application, I didnt see any
8 reference in the application to public access, so that was a
9 suggestion that the existing requirement be continued for
10 limited and as long as it certainly would not affect the
11 operation and it would be under control conditions, what
12 there would be public access control through the Park
13 Service and the Visitors Center.

14 I have other comments, but I think they were
15 before the next category on the historic resources.

16 MR. MILLARD: Okay. So, well get right into that
17 one. The next one, so actually before we move on, was there
18 anybody else that wanted to make any comments on the
19 aesthetic and recreation resources? Okay.

20 So, yeah, next is cultural resources and here
21 were looking at the effects of continued project operation
22 and maintenance on historic resources, archeological
23 resources and traditional cultural properties that are
24 included or may be eligible for inclusion in the National
25 Register of Historic Places, including the Paterson Great

1 Falls National Historic part. Mr. Blesso, did you have
2 something else?

3 MR. BLESSO: Again, the existing license has a
4 provision for a requirement for a diversion of water before
5 the dam for the raceway, and the language is something to
6 the effect that there should be at least minimum flow
7 through the raceway system, and I would expect that thats
8 going to continue and in addition to that, the city is
9 having a study that had recommended additional flow for
10 scenic purposes for interpretative purposes about the
11 cultural information and purpose of the raceway that a
12 50-cubic foot per second flow be permitted in advance of the
13 hydroelectric plant, and so thats --

14 MR. MILLARD: And so thats the levels of minimum
15 flow?

16 MR. BLESSO: Yes.

17 MR. MILLARD: Okay.

18 MR. BLESSO: And I certainly would support that.
19 Along those same lines, I think its important that if it is
20 going to be recognized that the flow to the raceway in a
21 certain amount takes precedence, there should be a proper
22 measuring device to control that and to evaluate that, thats
23 always been a problem in the past as to what -- how many CFS
24 are going through the system and that I certainly urge that
25 the plan and the licensing would require that there be a

1 measuring device for that flow.

2 Again, on cultural resources, and these are --
3 all these comments that Ive been making were in my
4 electronic -- and one of them that I think is quite
5 important that a preservation plan was developed several
6 years ago with funding from the New Jersey Historic Trust.

7 And that plan was an evaluation of the building,
8 its structural condition, and it made certain specific
9 recommendations for maintenance and protection of the
10 building. And my suggestion in the past has been if that
11 plan be referenced in the license itself, and that those
12 recommendations for protection and improvements be carried
13 out as a requirement of the license for the protection and
14 the continuation of the building itself. I think that
15 completes my comments. If I think of anything else, Ill
16 come back.

17 MR. MILLARD: We could come back to it.

18 MR. BLESSO: But essentially these are the same
19 comments that were submitted in writing back in, I guess it
20 was May.

21 MR. MILLARD: Thank you.

22 MR. BLESSO: Can you tell me if theres been any
23 movement on those comments? I tried to look through the
24 changes to the application and I didnt see anything in the
25 original application or in the supplemental changes or

1 response to your comments that dealt with those things, like
2 public access, like flow to the raceway proceeding and the
3 amount of flow and improvements or maintenance to the
4 building.

5 I didnt -- is that in the present application,
6 any of those things?

7 MR. MILLARD: So, the application still stands at
8 the same point it did back in February. You made comments
9 off that application if I recall correctly. It was your
10 initial comments were based on the existing application.

11 MR. BLESSO: Right.

12 MR. MILLARD: And those were reviewed by us. I
13 think to some extent they were incorporated into this kind
14 of more broad brushed approach of what were going to
15 eventually evaluate, and I think -- so Emily would be one to
16 speak to this. But if theres information that we feel is
17 missing, and shes taking a comment, I know weve talked about
18 your letters and shes considered them as well.

19 And so, it may well be that if we dont feel that
20 we need the information or we dont have the information
21 rather, to address those comments, those could be followed
22 up on through us with an additional information request.
23 The additional information request can come in response to
24 this meeting, and it can come at any number of places along
25 the licensing procedure.

1 So, its not the last opportunity to get
2 additional information and incorporate that into our
3 analysis which would be part of the environmental document.

4

5 MR. BLESSO: Okay.

6 MR. MILLARD: Emily, do you have anything to add?

7

8 MS. CARTER: I did, this is Emily Carter with
9 FERC, Carter, C-a-r-t-e-r. And I just wanted to ask you a
10 question regarding that preservation plan that you
11 mentioned, do you know if that is on the FERC public record?
12 If it has been filed with us?

13 MR. BLESSO: I dont believe that its on. The
14 city would have a copy of it. Its in electronic form.

15 MS. CARTER: Because if you want it incorporated
16 into any license or analyzed during the NEPA analysis, I
17 would need to have it on the public record to file with
18 FERC, thank you.

19 And then just to follow-up on what Chris was saying
20 regarding your comments.

21 Im familiar with your comments. They are on the
22 public record. I use them, I referenced them as I was
23 putting together my list for the scoping document and theyll
24 definitely be referenced as were working on our NEPA
25 analysis.

1 MR. BLESSO: Alright, thank you.

2 MR. MILLARD: Okay, anything else on cultural
3 resources? Okay, Ill move on to the last one and this is
4 simply the developmental resources and heres where we look
5 at the effects of the proposed -- any proposed protection
6 mitigation or enhancement measures on the economics of the
7 project, so anything along those lines, okay?

8 Okay, so if theres anything else not related to
9 what we just kind of covered, if theres something more
10 general that anybody has to bring up, now would be an
11 opportunity. Otherwise, well finish up with the next steps
12 and then how to kind of stay in touch with the project.
13 Yes, sir?

14 MR. BLESSO: The question is really not with the
15 environmental assessment, but in terms of an understanding
16 of the process from going from license to what Ill call a
17 lease. The terms that Eagle Creek and the city would end up
18 negotiating. The question is does the FERC participate in
19 that process, or is that an independent process of those two
20 -- of the applicant?

21 MR. MILLARD: Of the lease you said?

22 MR. BLESSO: Right now, the plant is owned by the
23 City of Paterson.

24 MR. MILLARD: Right.

25 MR. BLESSO: And its under a 40-year lease, which

1 coincides with the license period and Im curious as how that
2 -- the terms of that lease, the lease provides for an amount
3 of monthly rent, it provides for provisions for sharing of
4 revenue at certain gross revenue points, provides for an
5 adjustment based on the purchase price of the energy and Im
6 just curious, at what point does that get discussed and
7 resolved?

8 MR. MILLARD: Yeah, I mean in my estimation, Ted,
9 you can correct me if Im wrong, but thats not something
10 necessarily that we would have any oversight in. That would
11 be between the city and Great Falls Hydro.

12 MR. BLESSO: I kind of assumed that.

13 MR. MILLARD: Yeah.

14 MR. BLESSO: But I just wanted to clarify that.

15 MR. MILLARD: Sure.

16 MR. BLESSO: Okay, thank you.

17 MR. MILLARD: As our next step, okay, anybody
18 else for general questions? Alright, so lets talk about
19 some next steps here. I think I covered some of this a
20 little bit earlier, but I will mention too, that isnt an
21 idealized schedule, but nonetheless, its definitely
22 achievable. So, here we are in October with the scoping
23 meetings.

24 As I mentioned earlier, we have 30 days for folks
25 to submit comments in writing. Anybody that hasnt provided

1 a comment tonight can do so within 30 days for our
2 consideration. At that point theyll determine until that 30
3 day comment period and our review of those comments will
4 determine whether or not a second scoping document was
5 necessary and that will only be necessary if we feel that
6 its changed the initial scoping document appreciably.

7 After that, wed also issue that ready for
8 environmental analysis notice that I mentioned. That would
9 probably come in January of next year. And then, excuse me,
10 the next part would be to get the comments, recommendations,
11 terms and conditions, prescriptions, its all from agencies,
12 its also as I mentioned the time when the water quality
13 certification would be applied for.

14 Wed look at that issue, the Draft EA, sometime
15 around September of 2020, comments on that draft will then
16 be due in October and wed finish up finally by early
17 December, so. And then our license expiration is February
18 2021 if I remember correctly, so we would have some time to
19 get the licensing as well.

20 Any questions on any next steps? Okay? And I
21 think most of you folks know this, Ill just kind of hit the
22 highlights here. This is just for folks to know how to stay
23 informed. Of course, theres e-subscription, which gives you
24 email notifications of all the filings and issuances related
25 to the project. E-library is where we house all the

1 documentation rather, thats been filed on the record for
2 people to peruse.

3 E-comments is what you could use again, to submit
4 any comments that you might have in that 30-day comment
5 period that I just mentioned, and the mailing list I just
6 talked about a little bit earlier thats on page 17 of the
7 scoping document. That allows you to kind of be added to
8 the mailing list and receive hard copies of all the
9 issuances that we have.

10 And for those of you that may not be familiar,
11 this was just our website where you can actually access all
12 that electronic stuff that I just mentioned. Our website is
13 www.ferc.gov and if you -- yeah, under documents and filings
14 is where youll find all that, the electronic filing systems
15 and ways to kind of keep abreast of whats happening with the
16 project.

17 And again, I think most of you know this, but
18 include that docket number on anything you submit, anything
19 you comment on, the Docket Number is P-2814, and that will
20 let us keep track and make sure everything gets in the right
21 spot.

22 So, with that, unless anybody has any other
23 burning questions or statements? Seeing and hearing none,
24 Ill go ahead, and I guess, close the meeting at 7:49, okay.
25 Thanks everyone.

1 (Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

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

Name of Proceeding: Great Falls Hydroelectric
Project

Docket No.: P-2814-025
Place: Paterson, NJ
Date: Wednesday, October 23, 2019

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

Meron Tesfaye
Official Reporter