

FINAL TWO-YEAR LICENSING PROCESS WORKSHOP
March 30, 2017, from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time

Purpose: To solicit public comment on the effectiveness of the tested two-year process, in compliance with section 6 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013.

Workshop Agenda

1. Introduction **12:00 p.m. to 12:30 p.m.**

- 1.1 Opening remarks
- 1.2 Introduction of FERC staff and panel members
- 1.3 Workshop procedures

2. Background (FERC staff presentation) **12:30 p.m. to 12:45 p.m.**

- 2.1 Section 6 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 (Act)
- 2.2 Actions taken to-date to comply with the Act

3. Panel 1: Topics for Discussion on the Tested Two-Year Pilot Process
(Input solicited from panel and participants in licensing the Kentucky River Lock & Dam No. 11 Hydroelectric Project) **12:45 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.**

- 3.1 Were there project design, site selection, environmental, regulatory, or economic factors that facilitated or hindered the pilot process?
- 3.2 Were any modifications made to the participants' standard practices/processes to accommodate the pilot process schedule?
- 3.3 Was sufficient information developed during pre-filing consultation to facilitate meeting the timeframes listed in the process plan and schedule for the pilot two-year licensing process?
- 3.4 Are there any limitations on your organization's ability or resources to pursue/process a two-year process for multiple projects concurrently?
- 3.5 How should the effectiveness of the tested process be measured; was the tested process effective?

4. Panel 2: Topics for Discussion on the Practicability of Implementing a Two-Year Process on a Programmatic scale
(Input solicited from panel and participants) **3:00 p.m. to 4:50 p.m.**

- 4.1 Were the criteria in FERC's notice soliciting pilot projects reasonable and practicable; did the criteria impose any unnecessary limits; should there be additional, different, or no criteria?

4.2 Are there environmental, economic, regulatory, or legal factors that make a two-year process not practicable?

4.3 Can a two-year process be successfully implemented on a large scale (for multiple projects)?

4.4 Are there any elements of the existing licensing processes that could be applied in new ways to expedite processing of applications?

4.5 What, if any, actions could the Commission take to further facilitate the timely development of hydropower at existing dams and closed loop pumped storage projects?

5. Closing comments and next steps

4:50 p.m. to 5:00 p.m