

KENNEBUNK LIGHT & POWER DISTRICT
COUNTY OF YORK
STATE OF MAINE

- - -

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING MINUTES
AND
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

- - -

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING
KENNEBUNK TOWN HALL
ONE SUMMER STREET
ROOM 300/301
KENNEBUNK, MAINE 04043

- - -

TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2016
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS:

PRESIDENT: JONATHAN KILBOURN - (PRESENT)
VICE-PRESIDENT: WAYNE E. BERRY - (PRESENT)
GENERAL MANAGER/TREASURER: TODD SHEA - (PRESENT)
CLERK: MICHAEL JORDAN - (PRESENT)
TRUSTEE: DAVID CLUFF - (NOT PRESENT)
TRUSTEE: ROBERT EMMONS - (PRESENT)

ALSO PRESENT:

Kathleen A. De Marre, Transcriptionist

A P P E A R A N C E S:

John Polletto, Kennebunk

David Wayne, Kennebunk

Diane Cachia, Kennebunk

Chauncey Copeland, Kennebunk

Shawn Teague, Kennbunk

Tim Sommers, Kennebunk

Kevin Flynn, Kennebunk

Ward Hansen, Kennebunk

Beverly Freudenreich, Kennebunk

Bob Georgitis, Kennebunk

Lois Copeland, Kennebunk

Stuart Bowen, Kennebunk

Betsy Stevens, Kennebunk

John Burrows, Mousam and Kennebunk River Alliance

William Harmon, Kennebunk

Kristi Kenney, Kennebunk

Donna Teague, Kennebunk

Doug Coleman, Kennebunk

Bill Pasquill, Kennebunk

Monica Grabin, Kennebunk

Jean Hansen, Kennebunk

Peter Ashley, Ogunquit

Phillip Walker, Kennebunk

A P P E A R A N C E S (continued):

Steve Heinz, Trout Unlimited, Sebago Chapter

Landis Hudson, Yarmouth, Maine Rivers

Bill Grabin, Kennebunk

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION of this meeting is supplied to you on the condition that receipt thereof will certify the accuracy of the spoken word but not that of the speakers.

THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION of this meeting is a transcript of the recorded proceedings and since the proceedings were not taken in front of a court reporter, accuracy in the depiction of speakers cannot be guaranteed in the colloquy of the transcript.

THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION is the only official transcript which may be relied upon for purposes of verbatim citation of the proceedings.

Whereupon, President Kilbourn called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

- - -

OPEN SESSION

- - -

Whereupon, Item II, Bord Member Introductions occurred.

Whereupon, Item III, President Kilbourn's Discussion of Protocol and Format for Evening's Discussion, occurred. President Kilbourn reviewed the Agenda for this evening's meeting. He then reminded those present that no decision and no formal deliberations have occurred. President Kilbourn added that the main purpose of this evening's meeting is for the purpose of hearing from the public in regard to the dam issue. The Board will not be making any decision tonight. The Board's intent this evening is to hear from those present.

President Kilbourn stated that the Board has made every effort during the past several years to reach the public, using every avenue possible to communicate with the public including utilization of the media, e-mail, invoice messaging, public meetings, and an open door policy. The Board continues to look for the comments and thoughts of the public, and wants to ensure that the public feels that the process has been fair, no matter what the Board's decision ends up being. President Kilbourn asked that comments be made respectfully, with ratepayers speaking first, for three minutes or less, and then the floor will be open to the public. President Kilbourn reminded that all KLPD Board meetings are announced on the website and are open to the public.

Whereupon, Item IV, Overview of Timeline on Dam Alternatives Report Moving Forward, occurred. General Manager Shea took the floor stating that comments have been received from the public on both sides of the dam issue. All correspondence that has been received has been forwarded for Board review and will be available on the KLPD website in the near future. The results from the sediment sampling will also be posted on the website. Along with the comments that have been received thus far, General Manager Shea intends to use the comments heard tonight to help direct Wright-Pierce on any additional work that needs to be done within the Wright-Pierce report. General Manager Shea anticipates that in February of 2016 there will be a vote of the Board in regard to the direction that Wright-Pierce will need to take to produce a final draft of the working report. He continued by stating that within the next few months the Board will discuss and decide upon the business decision surrounding the dam issue.

General Manager Shea reminded those present that the Notice of Intent must be prepared and received by FERC by March of 2017. Open public meetings will continue to occur but further public comment meetings are not scheduled at this time, but commentary will continue to be accepted by the Board.

Whereupon, Item V, Board Review and Discussion of Wright-Pierce Preliminary Sediment Sampling Results, occurred. The Board is in receipt of the Wright-Pierce preliminary

sediment sampling report. General Manager Shea discussed the history of the dams and the areas that were chosen. The Kesslen Dam was selected as it is the dam that has been in place the longest; since 1954. Dane Perkins and Twine Mill were both breached for a period of time and then reconstructed in the early '80s. With that in mind, it was determined that the best location for determination of contaminants within the river would be behind the Kesslen Dam.

The results from the sediment sampling are favorable. Within Alternative Number 4, \$175,000 was estimated for disposal costs in regard to sediments. No sediment samples came in above the probable effect concentration guidelines that the Department of Environmental Protection currently uses. Hence, if the dams and sediment were to be removed, the sediments could be disposed of in an upland setting and could be designed for beneficial reuse. General Manager Shea stated that there are no elevated levels of contaminants in the sediments that are of concern at this point.

After further decisions have been made by the Board, further sampling may be required. General Manager Shea stated that there are a few contaminants that are not above elevated levels but that are above the levels that were anticipated. General Manager Shea continued by stating that the estimates that have been received via the report in regard to dam removal appear to be in line with what was experienced within the sampling.

President Kilbourn then asked the Board if there were any comments or questions. Vice-President Berry asked if the results would be posted on the website, in which General Manager Shea stated that the test locations, the summary overview of the report, along with the data collected from all of the tests will be available on the website.

President Kilbourn then informed those present that regardless of the direction that is chosen, the report reflects great news for the District and the Town, as there are no toxic laden sediments in front of the Kesslen Dam. General Manager Shea added that knowing the industrial operations that have occurred upstream, that is where the concern came from. He stated that on the Mousam River there has never been a high concentration of industrial facilities that would have created contamination. The concern came from what could have been coming down from upstream. With that in mind, the preliminary indications are very favorable.

Vice-President Berry then asked if the Board wanted to accept the Wright-Pierce Preliminary Sediment Sampling Results. President Kilbourn then asked for a motion to accept the Wright-Pierce Preliminary Sediment Sampling Results, in which Vice-President Berry made the motion, and it was seconded by Clerk Jordan.

With unanimous ayes heard, acceptance of the Wright-Pierce Preliminary Sediment Sampling Results occurred.

President Kilbourn reminded those present that General Manager Shea continues to read all public comments that have been received, but as there have been many recurrent comments, it has been decided that General Manager Shea will take this time to reiterate various items. General Manager Shea took the floor to express the following:

1. The Board has agreed to hold tonight's meeting due to concerns that were raised at the hydro meeting of December 22, 2015.

2. The Board will continue to deliberate on the business decision before them in the months ahead to make the decision that is in the best financial interest of all of the District's ratepayers.

3. There are several moving parts related to the financial decision, and the Board would like to hear comments this evening in an effort to assist them in gaining direction in what the final working draft of the Dam Alternatives Report will contain.

4. Some issues may only be addressed once a decision is made on the fate of the hydro sites.

5. Misconceptions that have been heard by General Manager Shea from the general public along with what has been written in commentaries are as follows:

A. Kennebunk Light & Power District's facilities are run-of-river. The District does not have the ability or the permission to operate as flood control facilities. The water that is passed down from above, no matter how large or small the quantity, is sent downstream to the ocean. The District does not and cannot, per the District's FERC license, regulate the flow of the Mousam River within the District's reach.

B. In regard to Sewer District operations, in the event that the facilities are removed, Kennebunk Sewer District's facilities and operations will not be impacted. Minimal flow requirements will not be affected should the decision be made because of KLPD's run-of-river status. Water flow requirements for Kennebunk Sewer District are tied to Old Falls Dam and the Estes Lake Dam, with KLPD having no impact upon that flow rate due to the fact that KLPD is a run-of-river facility. The overall amount of water passing the Sewer District's facilities will not change.

C. The Kennebunk, Kennebunkport, Wells Water District facilities have absolutely no facilities on the river, so the District will not impact the Water District in any fashion no matter what decision is made.

6. Preliminary sediment sampling results indicate estimates provided in Alternative Number 4 of the Dam Alternatives Report are likely accurate. Preliminary sediment sampling results indicate that sediments that do exist in the Kesslen impoundment would be able to be disposed of in upland locations and qualify for beneficial reuse should sediment removal become necessary.

7. Further followup studies may be required should Alternative Number 4 be selected.

8. The Kesslen impoundment was selected for the study of sediment samples as it is the facility that has been intact for the longest period of time. The Kesslen Dam was constructed in 1954. Twine Mill and Dane Perkins have been breached for an extended period of time and were reconstructed in the early 1980s.

9. Federal and state agencies have gone on record since the release of the Dam Alternatives Report stating that Kennebunk Light & Power District would be required to install fish passages at the District's facilities. This is not an assumption on the part of KLPD. These letters can be found on the hydro page of the District's website for further clarification.

10. The Board, tonight, will solicit input in regard to the contents of the Dam Alternatives Report. The intent of the Board is to adjourn this evening's meeting by 9:00 p.m. the Board asks that all speakers state their name and town of residence and complete the sign-up sheet located at the podium. There is also a sign-up sheet outside the door and it is requested that those who do not plan to speak this evening, to please complete that sign-in sheet. President Kilbourn added that the District is maintaining an e-mail mailing list, and if that information is provided on the sign-in sheet or provided to General Manager Shea directly, the information will be updated on the mailing list.

11. The results of the sediment sampling along with any remaining comments that have not yet been uploaded to the website will be available sometime after January 20, 2016.

Whereupon, Item VI, Meeting Opened To The Public For Questions and Comments In Regard To Draft Wright-Pierce Hydro Alternatives Report, occurred. President Kilbourn opened the meeting to the public, speaking briefly about protocol, signing in, lining up, et cetera, and reminding the public to continue to send comments and questions to tshea@klpd.org.

- - -

OPEN FORUM

(Verbatim Transcript)

- - -

MR. POLLETTO: My name is John Polletto. I live at 70 Fletcher Street in Kennebunk. I'm a ratepayer. I just have one question. At a prior meeting, I brought to the Board's attention that running underneath my side yard there's a storm water runoff culvert and I have a right of way issued from the town to maintain it. It's probably a two-foot diameter pipe that dumps directly into the Mousam River bringing the riffraff that's found along the bank in my backyard. My concern is, if the height of the river is reduced, okay, that the outfall from this pipe is not going to reach the resulting river. And the reason why I have this concern is when -- when the river was drawn down previously, I noticed that there's like a piece of earth, if you will, was visible now because the water level was low, and this -- this piece of the riverbed is actually higher in elevation than the outfall of the pipe.

My concern is that there might be, if the dams are removed, that the water depth -- there may be stagnant water that might be sitting -- now -- that the -- that the level of the water is low. So the comment was made at prior meetings that this condition would be looked into, because I believe my house is not the only one that has this storm water culvert.

So my questions is, simply, do you know if -- if this issue has been looked at yet or, if not, will it be looked at in the future?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thanks for the question. We're --we're generally going to be referring questions to our general manager. I believe this question and several others that we have heard, and may hear again tonight, relate to infrastructure and changes around the river that would be affected by the impoundments.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Preliminary indications are that it would be the responsibility of the District to redirect those flows so that there were no negative impacts on those types of properties. Any kind of road crossings, storm crossings, things like that, would have to be redirected so that they would flow into the river. So we -- I don't believe that the District would be leaving you with a mosquito breeder, I believe is what you might have said, Mr. Polletto.

MR. POLLETTO: Yeah, yeah.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: And that will be confirmed as we move forward with the report.

MR. POLLETTO: Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

MR. WAYNE: Gentlemen, my name is David Wayne. My wife Lauren and I live on River Oaks, which is about 500 meters up from the Kesslen Dam on the river. At the last meeting, where you were seeking input, you actually said three things that really resonated. One you repeated here, was we haven't -- you have not made a decision, and that's got to be difficult no matter what happens. Secondly, you were open to other alternatives or possibilities. And, thirdly, and I think really importantly, if you have people on both sides that could work together, you might come up with something that's a little bit more effective. I mean, there are certain things we know. We know that we won't have the boating the same way if the dams go down. We know that fish cannot get up to the lake and so on if the dams go down.

But our proposal, or really thought at this point, is there a way to get people together? I was -- I was chair of the International Association of Facilitators. We're a group around the world that come together to try to take parties who have disagreements and bring them together to mediate a little bit. And, you know, although I have a stake in it, I'm certainly willing, pro bono, to do -- to do something like that. It's an open process just like these meetings are, but I suggest that maybe this is -- this is a way to get people on both sides.

When I looked at the American Rivers website, for example, and they're a leader in dam removal, they acknowledge that they really don't know the answer. Dam removal is not always the answer for every river. So if we can get together, if we could have a little bit of time, and that may be four weeks or a little bit more, to try to get these people together and to come up with a solution that is an alternative, maybe we could get a little further ahead, so please consider that.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Thank you. If you -- if you would reach out to me with that information, I would greatly appreciate it.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yeah.

MR. WAYNE: I'd be happy to do that. Thank you, very much.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I would just say, you're right. It is in keeping with what we've been suggesting and, to me, it sounds like a great idea.

MS. CACHIA: Good evening, gentlemen. My name is Diane Cachia and I'm a ratepayer in Kennebunk.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MS. CACHIA: You can't hear me? Okay. Sorry. Diane Cachia is my name and I live in Kennebunk. You've probably heard the concerns I'm about to express, but I just wanted you to know, I appreciate an opportunity to say them to you directly in an open forum such as this. I'd like to put forward a few, somewhat rhetorical questions. I don't expect any answers to those this evening.

Following up on the American Rivers website, every river and dam is unique. There is no generic formula or quick checklist for determining if the dams should be removed. Not all benefits and costs can be quantified, nor do they apply to all dams and rivers. Judgement is required to balance and compare options.

So why are ours being considered for removal? Although many reasons have been put forth, I ask: What about the ecology that has no doubt evolved since the dams were constructed? Do we know precisely, exactly what species, both plant and animal, the Mousam now hosts? How long does the -- do the so called exotic species need to be present before we honor its life; a hundred years, 200 years, three hundred years? Are we endanger of throwing the baby, or maybe the babies, out with the bath water? What guaranty do we have that a free flowing river and the fish will come back?

What about the history the dams held with our town and its surroundings? Kennebunk, the only village in the world so called. It's a history worth preserving. And Kennebunk Light & Power's history is very much entwined in our history.

Finally, do all the effected parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision about dam removal or retention? Although I don't speak for the whole community, I am a resident and I do believe that our community is just now getting mobilized. We're kind of in a fact gathering phase and we would be ever so grateful to have a little more time to -- to gather our facts and I ask that you consider delaying your decision on dam removal until we get all of our pertinent questions answered. And I thank you, very much for your time this evening.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you. We're only listening to ratepayers. There seems to be a void at the table. Please step forward. Don't forget to sign in before you speak and it would be fine if there are two or three of you that know you want to speak, just step right up. We don't mind a bit a line there.

I'll just say that, you know, I know it's difficult to speak in public meetings. You know, many of us are not used to doing it. We're getting pretty used to it up here, but please don't be nervous about speaking. If you have something to say that's important to you, important to us, you don't have to be -- anything -- just let us know what you're thinking, would be great.

MR. COPELAND: I'm Chauncey Copeland and I'm a ratepayer. I'm here tonight to discuss the cost analysis of Option Number 1, the license renewal versus Option Number 4, which is the license surrender as presented in the Wright-Pierce report.

Many have come out in support of the removal of the three dams. They've referenced the significant cost differences between these two options. I want to discuss why focusing only on cost is very misleading.

Here are some facts: To meet the electrical needs of the District, KLPD purchased 98 percent -- 98.5 percent of the needed energy from NextEra at the current rate of a little less than eight cents per kilowatt hour. KLPD's hydro facilities produce the remaining 1.5 percent or approximately 1.4 million kilowatt hours per year and, thus, avoids approximately \$110,500 in energy purchase costs each year. I want you to remember that.

The District's customers are currently charged a rate of 10.5 cents per kilowatt hour, so the value of the hydropower that's generated by KLPD's facilities is \$147,000 a year.

The cost analysis documents for both options reflect costs from 2016 to 2022, so the value of -- let me see. Let me back up here a little bit. The cost analysis documents for both options reflect costs from 2016 to 2022 when the hydro license expires and because a new license is expected for 40 years, costs were also projected for the period of 2022 to 2062.

In this economic cost comparison, both costs, expenses, and any offsetting value of hydro-generated electricity needs to be included. This presents a much truer picture of the financial impacts.

So, let's first look at Option Number 1, which is license renewal as presented in the report. The projected costs for the period of 2016 to 2062 are approximately 11.7 billion dollars. This includes approximately 48 million dollars associated with fishways, which we've all heard about. It also includes Todd Shea's vacation trip to Hawaii.

(Laughter.)

So back to the facts. The projected costs for the period 2016 to 2062 is 11.7 billion dollars. The projected value of the generated hydropower for the same period is approximately

6.9 million dollars. Thus, the net cost of Option Number 1 is approximately 4.8 million dollars. This is the cost minus the offsetting value of the hydroelectricity generated.

Now, let's look at Option Number 4, which is the license surrender, the removal of the dams. The projected costs for the period of 2016 to 2062 are 2.3 million dollars. There are no costs identified after 2023, as the dams would have been removed by that time. The projected offsetting hydro-generated electricity is approximately \$882,000. There is no offsetting hydro-generated electricity identified after 2022 as the current hydro license would have expired. The net cost of Option Number 4, then, is approximately 1.5 million dollars. Again, the cost minus the offsetting hydro-generated electricity.

Now, remember the \$110,500 I talked about that KLP avoids in energy purchased costs because it currently generates its own hydropower? If the current hydro license expires in 2022 --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr. Copeland, we're -- we're running out of time. I don't want to -- I know this is an important piece of information --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I will sign in and relinquish my time.

MR. COPELAND: So if the current hydro license expires in 2022, you've got \$10,500 per year, so egregiously avoiding now becomes an ongoing purchased expense from NextEra. However, I didn't see this expense included in the Option Number 4 analysis for the years 2022 through 2062. At the current rate of 8 cents per kilowatt hour from NextEra, 4.4 million dollars would be required to purchase this energy that was formerly produced by KLPD's hydro facilities during this timeframe.

The Wright-Pierce report does state that projected costs to purchase replacement energy was assumed to be 10.5 cents per kilowatt hour, based upon information provided by KLPD. This would make the purchase to replace the hydropower even greater to the tune of 5.9 million dollars. The projected value of the offsetting hydro-generated electricity, up to that hydro license expiration date, remains at \$882,000.

So, rather than the 2.3 million dollars projected costs identified in the report, the more accurate costs of Alternative Number 4 is now 6.6 million dollars based on a rate of 8 cents per kilowatt hour, or 8.8 million dollars based on the projected rate of 10.5 cents per kilowatt hour.

The true net cost of Option Number 4, again, cost minus the offsetting hydro-generated electricity, should be more accurately stated as 5 point -- 5.7 million dollars at 8 cents per kilowatt hour, or 7.3 million dollars at 10.5 -- at 10.5 cents per kilowatt hour.

I'm almost done.

Now, when we compare the two options on the more accurate net cost basis, Option Number 4, surrender the license, dam removal, is approximately 1 to 2.5 million dollars more expensive than Option Number 1. Option Number 4, the license surrender, has lost, after 2022, the value of the hydro power it had been producing and it now needs to purchase the replacement

amount from NextEra. Conversely, Option Number 1, hydropower continues to be generated, so there's no need to purchase that power replacement.

Also, KLPD ratepayers made a significant investment in September of 2014 to replace the chain and gear mechanism with a hydraulic automated system --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Your time is up, sir.

MR. COPELAND: I'm --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: You're at six minutes. If you could --

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: I'd like -- I'd like to have him finish, if you don't mind.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I would, too.

MR. COPELAND: Okay. I'm almost done. I've got -- I've got that much.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Okay.

MR. COPELAND: You've got to end on a positive note.

(Laughter.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I just don't want to let it go by without letting you know.

MR. COPELAND: No, I know. At least you're smiling.

So we made a significant investment in September of 2014 to replace the chain and gear mechanism of the hydraulic automatic system to improve the ability to allow water to flow through in the event of heavy rainstorms. That capital investment would, obviously, be lost if the Kesslen Dam is removed.

So, in conclusion, I find it frustrating that, as Todd Shea has stated, the state and federal agencies involved won't come clean with their final requirements until KLPD decides which way it's going to go. I'm sure The Board of Trustees finds it equally frustrating. However, when addressing anything to do with the Wright-Pierce cost analysis, it's critically important to always focus on the net costs of the specific option. Only in that way will you clearly get a true picture of the financial aspects of the options.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much.

CLERK JORDAN: Thanks for your time. Well presented.

(Applause.)

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Mr. Copeland?

MR. COPELAND: Yes.

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Could you send a copy of that analysis into Todd?

MR. COPELAND: Sure.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yeah.

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Thank you --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It's a --

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: -- thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It's a lot to digest verbally, and we'll absolutely look at it. I think, you know, one of the things that we'll be looking hard at is -- is several aspects of the financial analysis on the final report, so it's very much appreciated.

I would also just remind you that in Todd's preliminary remarks, he indicated that we do now have definitive letters from several agencies regarding the fish ladders, so that's new news since our last meeting when we were reasonably assuming. We now have actual hard information.

MR. TEAGUE: All right. I am Shawn Teague, a resident and a ratepayer. A lot of you already know me. This is such a big issue and it's so interrelated and so complicated, the only way I can get my head around this thing is to approach it kind of like a legal brief. You have facts, issues, decision, the decision of the court, and the reasoning.

I'll start with the basic facts, and that's why we used the photographs that we did in our add. When you open the floodgates to all three dams, and you see how -- how little water is left, it is ludicrous to think that if you take the dams down completely, there is, somehow, will be more water than what you see with the drawdowns. The drawdowns give us the best approximation of what that river is going to be if those dams are taken down. That's the facts. And I would even suspect the river will be even less than what you see in the drawdowns.

Now, that impacts several groups in this room in different ways, and in very significant ways. Number one is -- is the River Alliance. And I want to go on record by saying I like fish. I really do like fish. In fact, I like them so much I don't even go fishing. But fish have to have water to swim in and when I look at those pictures of the drawdown, I can't imagine there's going to be too many fish swimming in that river, and the conditions are going to be warm, there's going to be a stagnant flow. I don't see it all being conducive to the ultimate purpose of restoring fish populations. That's a far stretch for me to get --- to get my -- to appreciate.

For the homeowners and the residents in Kennebunk, the downtown, our revitalization, the re-beautification of the Town, it's going to kill us. You can debate real estate markets here, there, and everywhere. They're too complex to just generalize. You can site numerous studies. There are people who make a lot of money doing market analysis for real estate in particular

locations. This is a -- Kennebunk is primarily a residential community. It's not a poor community; single family homes, lots of recreation on the river.

People pay a lot of money for waterfront property. If you've been through a -- if you've bought a house, you know what I'm talking about. Even the -- the imaginary river water -- winter water view will cost you lots of money, lots of additional money. You take water away, your property is going to be devalued. There's no -- there's no reason to even debate that. We're going to get killed if that river is taken away.

We bought our homes to be on that river. From the electric company's point of view, when we bought our house here in Kennebunk, I don't know, 15, 12 years ago, one of the assets of the town was the fact that it had its own power company, the KLPD. They said you're not pulled around this way and that way by getting our power from CMP. They buy it off the grid, you know, and you have to go through all the nonsense with a big, large conglomerate that just buys and sells the power off the grid. And we thought that was a great idea. You generate your own power. You're independent. It was a virtue and an asset.

Now, I'm not an electrician, and I'm not an engineer, but I know that hydropower is -- leaves no carbon footprint, it's ultimately renewable. Whatever you may say about solar and those other new forms of renewable energy, may be well, but hydro is proven, is renewable, no carbon emissions. It is a great resource. My understanding is that with some investment and some modernization of our present facilities, you guys could crank out a pretty good amount of power.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr. Teague, I hate to interrupt you, but we are at four minutes, so if --

MR. TEAGUE: All right.

So, I guess, I'm -- I'm wondering why would you not want to do that and continue to do that? It's an asset in spite of the fact that we're independent. So, anyway, from those three points of view, I just don't see that taking the dams down makes good sense for any of us. There's got to be a better solution and an alternative that can satisfy everybody and give passage to the fish.

Will it cost more money? Probably. I'm willing to pay it. I pay a lot of money for improvements on the school and I don't even have kids here. Whatever the rate -- the increase in my monthly rate, electrical bill, I'm happy to pay it if it will satisfy all these -- these concerns and interests.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much.

CLERK JORDAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. SOMMERS: Tim Sommers, resident and ratepayer, and I appreciate you having this forum. I appreciate how open you've been throughout this forum and I certainly appreciate

everybody here. I certainly have a lot of friends and neighbors that will be impacted whatever way this goes. But I want to speak a little bit in response to some questions that some of the folks that have spoken -- (INAUDIBLE).

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: We can't hear you.

MR. SOMMERS: I'd like to understand in your analysis, and I appreciate all the work you've done with that, the cost of borrowing money if the -- you know, if the fish ladder has to be added, that cost will have to be paid out immediately, from my understanding, so we would have to bond that cost and there would be a pot [sic] related to procuring that money, so I think that should also be included in the calculation.

And to the person that just spoke, I'd love to, at some point, take you fishing down below the dams, the stretch below the dam in downtown, I think, will most approximate what the river will look like, and I can assure you that -- (INAUDIBLE)

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: We can't hear you. Speak up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That exists because the Kesslen releases water.

MR. SOMMERS: From my understanding, and I'll ask this question, my understanding is that these are run-of-river dams, so the flow is actually not increased or decreased due to these dams. All that the dams do is back the water back.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: If I could, just as a point of guidance here in the conversation, I think we heard a great comment earlier, that there might some value in having the parties in this room get together and have some conversations. If I could urge you, though, tonight isn't that night.

MR. SOMMERS: Yeah, I --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Tonight is for us to hear from you. If you would like to address comments made by other folks, please feel free to do so. Others will have a chance to get up and speak, but let's keep it as a one person speaking at a time and let us listen to what you have to say.

MR. SOMMERS: Agreed, yeah. Thank you for that. So, I guess, the point -- the point that I'd like to make is, Wright-Pierce is a respected engineer, and I appreciate you putting that engineer report through great expense. It's a report that clearly shows the most cost option, and the most cost economic and ecologic is to keep the dams in place.

I don't think we should be saddling the young families of this town with another 30 years of added costs and added economical damage to these -- or to keeping these dams. It just doesn't make sense and I understand completely that there are people in this room that will be impacted, but we have to make a decision based on all ratepayers in the town and the entire town, not just the few.

Again, I can appreciate everybody's -- you know, that has a stake in this, but they bought property on a dam -- on a river that has a dam, and a dam is a temporary means to impound a river and use that river in a way. The reality is, that way is just not an economically viable way anymore.

So, but -- thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you. May I just make two quick comments here, if I could. One is, as I mentioned, we will be revisiting the financial analysis based on comments that we've heard from Board members and from the public. One of the items that was mentioned, and that we will be considering, is what we I think we call the discount rate; the cost of money.

The analysis that we have presented is pretty simple and it will be a little more robust when we're done. We'll be looking at the comments we've heard from Mr. Copeland, from you, and from many others.

MR. FLYNN: Kevin Flynn and I'm a ratepayer and I've spoken last time. I've spent a lot of time canoeing and paddling on this river and fishing on this river, both in the areas not affected by the dams, meaning I've paddled and canoed from below the dam at Route 1 and also starting just at Twine Mill down to the turnpike where it's a free flowing river with, you know, rapids and everything.

And I also took a really close look at the river when they did the recent drawdown. I was really interested in what the river bottom looked like, how much water was there, and I know that was not an exact duplication of what would be there, because, of course, at one point, you were probably holding water back and then letting it back in.

But I also have a good deal of experience. I worked for many years as an environmental engineer. I worked as a surface water hydrologist and I did a lot of computer modeling of hydrological systems. I'm familiar with geology and limnology, which I've taken courses in, and I looked at the ecology of that river, and some of the things I saw in that add, and some of the things I've heard tonight, I think there's -- there are a lot of errors and a lot of misunderstandings about what's going to happen on the Mousam when the dams go away, if they go away.

The idea that we're going to lose all kinds of established species and things, I think that's really a red herring, because almost immediately after the Kesslen Dam the river starts to rise. There are a number of ledges in that river as you go up towards Twine Mill. By the time you get to Intervale Road, the drop in elevation in the water level, the change is 14 feet, I think I heard that number. At Kesslen Dam, by the time you get up to Intervale, it's probably five or six feet, and there's also various ledges in between, which creates small impoundments.

So there will be impoundments. There will be lots of water. Even if the water stopped, it will get stuck behind those places. So there will be ponds. They're going to be a lot smaller. And, of course, there's a lot of beaver, and there are otters on that river. I've seen them many times. They love that kind of river environment with the freer flowing water, and the beaver will

really thrive in all the little streams and -- and -- if they're not just hunted out to extinction, they'll build dams and create new wetlands along that river.

It's a large floodplain and that will have new forest and will also have wetlands at least as productive as the ones that are there now. I know there were a lot of wetlands created by the dams, but there will be more wetlands -- there will be many wetlands without the dams, and what you will also have is a faster flowing stream, much lower temperature. I don't know how anyone could say that the temperature is going to be high. That's not what happens with --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr. Flynn, I'm sorry to interrupt, but your time is almost up.

MR. FLYNN: Okay.

What happens with a fast flowing stream is that water isn't sitting there, the sun isn't beating down on it, and it doesn't have that -- the time to raise in temperature. There are a lot of cold springs that come into there, particularly out in West Kennebunk. The whole Branch Brook aquifer, part of that drains into the Mousam. There are lots of seeps and cold springs that come in there. That water will get more oxygenated. There will be more life in the river. That's just how it works. That's biology.

I guess my time might be up.

CLERK JORDAN: Thank you for your comments.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much. If you have more to say, you can always stick around until later.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Who's next? Next speaker, please. We're focusing on ratepayers first. Please feel free to step up and sign in so that you're ready to speak.

MR. HANSEN: I have a question to Mr. Shea. First of all, you said pulling the sediment up behind the impoundment right behind Kesslen Dam, that implies that's it's not satisfactory if the dam was taken down; is that correct?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I'm sorry, could you re --

MR. HANSEN: What I'm saying is, behind the Kesslen Dam you're implying that that sediment, while it's not dangerous --

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Right.

MR. HANSEN: -- it still needs to be excavated or moved out?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It does not have -- we don't believe it has to. We don't know whether or not it will have to be excavated at this point in time. But if it does need to be

excavated, it's within the limits to be considered not contaminated soil, so it doesn't have to go to a super site.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. So how -- how deep down would you have to excavate; six inches, a foot, three feet?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: That, we don't know. We don't know if we would have to excavate.

MR. HANSEN: Okay. I want to draw your attention, if everyone has looked at the flyover, at about the one minute point, just up from Sayward Street, there's a rock band that goes right across the river. Now, if you excavate between the dam and the rock band, and that drops a foot or two, then it raises the whole question, why would you even have fish dams? Because the fish are going to be stopped -- stopped at that rock band right then and there.

I want to address a point. A gentleman said that it's going to look like the river below the dam. No, it won't, because the terrain of the river, especially up near Sayward and Larrabee Way, is very U-shaped and so it will be very narrow. It will not be this flat, fast running river.

The bit about the temperature, I think that's nonsense, because there's a huge amount of water that's held up, what is it, Estes Lake -- and all the lakes upstream. Taking the dams down, reducing it from 13 down to 10 dams, you're only opening up a few miles, so how can you say there's going to be that much? When you look at the entire volume of water, it's very -- it's not very significant.

My other question is, has any inventory, plants or animals, been taken? Is it required that there be an environmental impact statement? And, furthermore, does anyone know if there's any endangered species in this river? Because it seems to me that, you know, you're just going to take the water out and we should know whether we're violating the law.

And, as far as property values, I want you to think about the Kennebunk River that flows through downtown Kennebunkport. And we all know what it looks like when it's high tide and the sun is shimmering, it's a beautiful spot, and you're sitting at Hurricane's watching the sun set, or any of the restaurants down there. I want you to imagine what it would be like if it was permanently at low tide with a muddy flat and the smell which you sometimes get at low tide.

The reason the property value is such an issue is because those businesses pay a lot of property tax which helps offset all the other ratepayers in Kennebunkport. The same effect will happen in Kennebunk. If the property values drop along the river corridor, that means it's going to be put onto other ratepayers throughout the district. And we have a high proportion of people on fixed income in this town and, yes, we're going to lose, our eyes are going to hurt when we look out and look at this muddy stream, but all these other people, their wallets are going to hurt. Because what you may save a few cents or dollars per month on your electric bill, you may very well get overwhelmed by your increase in property taxes for many years to come.

And, I guess, that's it, just for the moment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I'm sorry. Could you repeat your name?

MR. HANSEN: Ward Hansen.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

MS. FREUDENREICH: Hi. I'm Beverly Freudenreich. I love this town, I love this river, and I love the people here. I'm not -- this accent os from Nebraska. I'm a transplant. I don't understand what she's saying, but when I moved here, I looked at a lot of towns. I was working in Portland. It would be easier if I lived in Portland, so I looked at Falmouth, and I looked at Westbrook, and I came through Kennebunk and I go, now, this is a town with a main street, and you've got this river running through it. And now we're thinking -- I'm not the only one -- I had my neighbors just move here across the street, from Pennsylvania. They have the same feeling. They said, it's quaint, it's homey, and everybody gets along in this town, and it's an intellectual town, where people really kind of invest in where they live, okay. And so that's just a comment.

But what I want to tell you is, I looked at a couple of things and I've got curious questions, so if these are dumb questions, I apologize.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: No question is a dumb question.

MS. FREUDENREICH: Okay. Good.

On -- when I looked on the Wright-Pierce comment 4 -- Option Number 4, okay, on 5.2 page, okay, it says, and they were kind of just including a disclaimer for themselves that says: "Assessment efforts to date have not included sufficient data to accurately project the net impacts to wetland habitats associated with any dam removal scenarios." They're saying -- are you going to request any more statements, what's going to happen to existing wetlands before you make your decision? That's one question.

Okay, and then I'll run past the second one to you here. When it was talking about property owners, it said that if your deed says you're through the thread of the river, then the dry land, once the water goes down, they said would become part of my property, that's what it says in the Wright-Pierce report. Can I improve that property out there in any way that I feel like, or are you going to tell me, no, that belongs to the river? Can I clear the weeds out or do I have to have weeds? Are you going to help me pay for what I really didn't want? I didn't purchase that. Now, you're saying, well, no, this is yours, but you can't take care of it unless I tell you how to take care of it.

So those are questions that I have. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. GEORGITIS: I have to put that mic down because it bothers the heck out of me, looking at it, knowing it doesn't work.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Don't worry.

MR. GEORGITIS: My name is Bob Georgitis. I'm a ratepayer and a resident. Jay, you said something that caught my attention back in the beginning, that you've been talking about this for three years and trying to get the information out, and I think it takes time for people to build awareness, so don't -- don't hold that against us --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I don't.

MR. GEORGITIS: -- that we're just getting aware. And as we sit here and hear some of these concerns, it always triggers a new thought and it's --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Can I just say that we also -- don't hold it against us.

MR. GEORGITIS: Okay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We're with you and that's why we're here tonight.

MR. GEORGITIS: So as I was sitting there and hearing -- and this is how my brain works sometimes. I do this at the economic development committee meetings, which I'm a participant of. I think of things. And one of the things that I thought of is, it's really not your purview but it is ours as a community. We talk about costs and it hasn't been addressed -- you know, he did a great job of running through the numbers, but one of the things that we don't know about today that I know that we're going to know about tomorrow, is that -- and let's go back in history. Two hundred years ago we didn't treat for sewage outfalls. We didn't treat for storm water. We didn't do anything. We just used the river as a straight pipe to the ocean. Today we have treatment plants that are trying to treat and raise and return the quality of the rivers back to where they were as best we can.

I work for a developer. Every time I do a development, I have to put in a storm water treatment pond. I know, from my experience in municipal government, that the Town of Kennebunk is going to face having to do more storm water treatment for the houses and the businesses that are here today than we're doing right now. Right now we're not doing anything.

If I were to build a community of this size adjacent to the river, I'm guessing there's probably -- we know for a fact there are over a hundred houses -- 190 on the mailing list that we've developed above the dam. If I multiply that by a factor of five, I'm getting up to a thousand; by 10, I'm up to 2,000. I can tell you a recent condo development that I did in the town of Wells that handles storm water for 150 houses, it cost us \$300,000 to build. What I designed -- had my engineers design and build is just what we have here with the dams. We have an impoundment, we have an inflow allowing the sediments and the activity of the biology to -- to take care of those sediments and clean the water before discharge.

I know that this is not KLP's consideration. It really is a cross jurisdiction with the Board of Selectmen, but I know that we're going to be facing this and I would like you to ask the question, or at least explore the question of what that might be in terms of a cost analysis, if the Town is facing having to do storm water treatment, can we not use those dams and is that a value to add into the consideration, and then you double dip, because if you keep the power generation, then it's a win/win.

And what I've said in the letters that I've written to you is, let's just go straight to the answer and agree to pay for the fish passage, avoid having to spend all the money on consultants and studies, and just do it, but I think the cost benefit is an important consideration. And just sitting here, I think the storm water piece is something -- I don't know how you factor it in, but I wish you would.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. COPELAND: I'm going to stall just for a second here. Just as background, I worked with school students for over 25 years and --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I'm sorry, could you introduce yourself, please?

MS. COPELAND: I'm sorry. Lois Copeland. Sorry about that.

MR. COPELAND: That's why I'm standing here.

MS. COPELAND: Now, I'm going to use my playground voice, so there's not going to be any problem hearing me with or without a mic.

And I know from dealing with the students that I worked with that we are basically visual learners. You know, with all the multimedia we have in our world, most of us -- for most of us seeing is believing, and because I believe that, too, I decided rather than just talk at you, I'm going to do a little visual presentation here.

Now, with my lovely assistant, Chauncey, to help me, I should be able to make it so that you can all see. Oops, and I have to have my stuff moved a little bit. All right. All right. Let's start -- oh, just a second here.

So, good evening, everyone. Again, I'm Lois Chapman-Copeland [sic], and before I reference the Wright-Pierce report, I'd like to give a brief introduction. I've had a love affair with the Mousam since I was born in Kennebunk, umm, years ago. My husband and I have spent the better part of 50 years trying to finagle a way to move to Maine full time. Through many setbacks that I know a lot of other middle America has suffered, too, we've never lost our determination.

Now this.

(Whereupon, a poster was shown to those present.)

MS. COPELAND: Okay. Well, that happens in school, too.

My husband and I have spent the better part of 50 years and -- now, I've lost my place.

Imagine our shock and awe at the sight that greeted us on the morning after the full drawdown of November 4th and 5th. Here's a depiction. (Showing poster). We tried not to overreact, so we waited to read the Wright-Pierce report for interpretation of what we were shocked to see. One picture is worth a thousand words and seeing is believing. Well, folks, this is what we saw, and this is what made us believe. This is a blowup of the page from the Wright-Pierce report showing the river modeling results for the Mousam.

So forget all those other rivers we've heard about with their huge dams and their wide rivers that have no relationship whatsoever to the Mousam. The only thing we need to know about the Mousam is the Mousam. So on your river modeling results chart, you see that we have the Kesslen Dam, we have the Twine Mill, and we have the Dane Perkins.

All righty, then. A lot of people have argued. They've said, there's no way this is what we're going to be left with. No way at all. You're overreacting. It's never going to be like that. Well, here it is, folks. Here's your visual.

All right. Referring to the modeling results chart, here at the Kesslen Dam we're going to have 1.2 feet of depth. Now, this is on your average day on the Mousam River. Considering all of the other environmental factors, you know, warming trends, cooling trends, flows from upriver, this is what we're going to be left with. Right here. So all of us who saw this at the drawdown, that is what we're going to have based on the Wright-Pierce report. You can't make this stuff up.

So here is the level at Sayward Street, (referring to decorated yardstick.) So that's just above the Kesslen Dam. And this is where we are at Partridge Lane. So that's even further up from us. You know, we're kind of, you know, down here for about, what, 200 yards; 200 yards above the Kesslen. But up above the bend there, you've got a whole, huge neighborhood near Partridge Lane. These folks are going to have this. (Referring to yardstick.)

Now, we've been told, oops, kayak, you're not going to lose your access. No problem, all the fish species you want to introduce, they can manage this; manage it just fine. So we're going to build all these expensive fish dams, and fish ways, and all of that. Are you aware, by the way, that when --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Excuse me. We're about at three minutes.

MS. COPELAND: Okay. When you reference --

MS. KENNEY: I'll give up my time.

MS. COPELAND: Thank you.

Well, when you reference some of the other studies, the fish species that we're trying to introduce, they need cold water. Even at standard evaporation rates in the summertime -- now, these measurements were taken in July. They weren't even taken after the drought in August of this year -- this past year. So it's just standard evaporation rates. How much of this water do you think is going to remain during warm spells?

Some of the fish ladders that we've researched have to have a supplemental water source to keep them operating properly during dry spells. Where is that going to come from? And where are we going to get it? And how much is it going to cost? And what fish are going to be able to climb up a ladder into this amount of water that lasts for hundreds of yards up the river?

Now, all righty, then. The people at the Twine Mill Dam, and that's way up in the western part of Kennebunk, they're going to do a little better. They're going to have, you know, averages, like this. (Referring to yardstick.) And the people that are at the Dane Perkins, well, they win the jackpot, because they're average daily rates are going to be this.

So this is it, folks. These are the water levels for the entire stretch without the dams. No dams, this is what we get, okay. Now, don't take my word for it. Check the river modeling results chart in the Wright-Pierce report. That's what we're dealing with here. And don't take my word for it that we are going to have a big problem, because in these conditions I have report, after report, after report. I have done a ton of research and so has my husband. (Showing a plastic storage bin containing documents.)

You're going to just put out the welcome mat for invasive species of insects, plants, and animals. So this is going to be part of this scenario, (Referring to an image laden poster.) You know, I have to laugh out loud, because people have said this is not an accurate depiction. It sure as heck is. Check -- okay. So now, we've got the invasive plants moving in --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mrs. Copeland, if I could ask you to --

MS. COPELAND: You've got invasive insects.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mrs. Copeland.

MS. COPELAND: Yes.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Excuse me. If I could ask you to try and focus in on your main point.

MS. COPELAND: Oh, absolutely.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We are out of time.

MS. COPELAND: So, you know, we've got a completely new environment.

Now, I love the Mousam, and what I love about it is that we already have a riparian forest. All a riparian forest means, folks, is right on the riverbank. That's all it means. Now, if you want to raise an environment where the forest runs right through town, when we have all

those land management issues on top of when we have no water left, you know, have at it, but, you know, I don't want a forest running through the center of Kennebunk and removing our views, you know, also competing for water sources, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

But don't take my word for it. You know, this is from our backyard and look at the native species (referring to an image laden poster.) We counted 19 turkeys one morning. Look at the water level. You know, healthy water levels for our neighbors who have kayaks out all the time. I can see 15 kayaks in my neighbor's yard from my window.

Okay. So with the dams, this is the environment we get. Without the dams, this is the environment we get. Don't take my word for it. I urge all of you to keep coming to meetings. Keep asking questions. Keep investigating, because there is publication, after publication, after publication. We've had letters. We've had publications in town, *Invasive Species Threatening our Waterways*. We had one picture in one of the publications that showed a --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mrs. Copeland, I'm sorry --

MS. COPELAND: -- hefty kayaker in a puddle.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- to interrupt you.

MS. COPELAND: Okay. I'm done. I'm going to be done.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I appreciate your -- your trying to --

MS. COPELAND: Okay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- inform people about the studies --

MS. COPELAND: All right.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- but if you could bring it to a close, we'd appreciate it.

MS. COPELAND: I surely will. All right. So in completion, I just want to say that we have worked up a list of our resources, publications and websites if you'd like to look further into my statements and check them for accuracy and form your own opinions. I'm not asking you to agree with me.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Could we have a copy of those, as well?

MS. COPELAND: Absolutely.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

MS. COPELAND: And we have plenty of copies so if anybody is just interested, because we all are coming at this from different points of view and everybody needs to understand the impacts of what we're deciding.

So in conclusion, I am a song person, so I'm going to insult your ears in my playground voice and I bring to you The Dam Song.

The Dam Song

*Oh the weather can be just frightful,
But our Mousam's still delightful,
And free is never free,
Let it be. Let it be. Leave it be.*

*Right now I teem with wildlife.
Light boaters live the good life.
As the drawdowns clearly showed,
They will go. They will go. Tell them no.*

*Rare access in the center of town,
Disappears if we tear the Kesslen down.
Fish ladders are a true eyesore.
Village views never can be restored.*

*Down river folks' properties,
All at risk if the Mousam is freed.
Don't sink local economies.
Let it be. Let it be. Let it be.*

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Will you make sure that you provide the notes to that song. We'll put the full transcript of it.

MS. COPELAND: It's in this week's Post, so if anybody wants to sing a long.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much. I do remind you that there are many people here who wish to speak. The Board has been at quite a few of these meetings and it's our volunteer job to listen and we do want to listen, but in fairness to everyone, if you could, please, without my continuing to remind you, if you could try and keep to your three minutes. We haven't even gotten to anybody beyond ratepayers.

MR. BOWEN: Stuart Bowen. I'm a ratepayer, Pleasant Street. One of the great drivers of this is the need for fish ladders and the cost involved. I don't find the information in the report compelling that the fish would even use it. It would be a tragedy to make the process be about paying for fish ladders and them staying or going only to find that the fish don't want it. And I'm wondering if there is a further study by a biologist who would be able to assess the nature of the river, these ledges that have been mentioned, low flows, seasonality. Fish don't need the fish ladders all the time, just when they are spawning, perhaps. I don't find that adequately discussed.

Would the ladders even make a difference? It might be an eyesore and a constant aggravation if they were built.

The second thought is that there are a lot of numbers involved; millions for this and millions for that. I would think it wouldn't be a -- a very daunting process to, for the ratepayers, to translate those numbers into electric rates for the average home, perhaps, or something of that sort. Are we looking at \$2 a month or \$20 a month? Somewhere in there I would find the numbers much easier to digest if that were so. I think it's doable.

The third thing I want to mention, and I'm quite sure this is beyond the scope of this group or surely [sic] it can be, I guess. I'm on the river on the -- on the impoundment and I think it's -- it should be clear to all that a house on the ocean, everything else being equal, is worth more than a house that is not on the ocean. The same thing would be true, I'm going to claim, of lakes, and I live on a lake. I would anticipate the value of my house would decrease. I don't know how much, but by something. And my neighbor's street who is not on the -- on my impoundment would find that the comparables have changed and their house is probably also worth somewhat less, so there would be a group of us around the town who would suffer if the dams were removed and it's possible that we would approach the town for a tax rate adjustment. Which I think somebody else already alluded to, that if my rate were to go down, then somebody else's rate would have to go up.

I'm quite sure this is beyond your ability to comment too much on, but it is a -- I think it's something that is going to happen, and I don't think it's been addressed at all. And I'm afraid that we're going to get beyond the decision point before it is and everything will be committed and then we'll just have to deal with those issues at another time.

(Applause.)

MS. KENNEY: I gave my time up.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I think you will find in the final report some metrics. We've had this comment several times. There will be other improvements, I think, to the financial section, so -- and thanks for your comments.

MS. STEVENS: I'm Betsy Stevens. I'm a ratepayer and I do not live on the river, but I live near downtown. I'm also a biologist, a field biologist, a marine biologist. I have experience with freshwater wetlands, and I just wanted to allay concern of people about what you've seen in the pictures that were shown. Yes, the first year, the first 10 months it may be muddy. I lived on a lake where the lake water was dropped and within less than a year a succession had started and a multitude of different species of plants were coming in to grow in the wetlands, and species of plants. And it's just amazing how quickly -- we don't even think about the number of seeds that are in the water or in the sediment just waiting for the right conditions for them to sprout.

So as a biologist I'm excited about the possibility of getting back to a more natural state and if you read the historical accounts of what that river looked like before it was dammed, there were at least five different species of fish that -- native species that moved into the river. I believe that will happen again.

I am concerned. I understand. If I lived on the river, I would probably be the only person who was excited about what the future holds. So I just wanted to go on record and I've communicated to the Board members and to Todd my feelings about this.

I'm sorry that everything has to be based on dollars and the economic impact, but I realize that that is the nature of many of the decisions that are being made. It's not just here, but throughout the country, so I just wanted to put a plug in for the future biologists of the river.

Thank you.

CLERK JORDAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Let me just say that if you're a ratepayer and you've given up your time informally to someone else, and you do have something to say, we -- we would like to hear it, and we'd also like people to try and keep to their time.

MR. BURROWS: Thank you, Jay. John Burrows, Kennebunk resident, and ratepayer. I just wanted to get back to a comment that Dr. Wayne made earlier. I think it would be a great idea to get folks together to have discussions about some of the issues that are out there; everything from what happens to the ecology to the river, the water quality, to changes in water levels, to potential impacts on property values, and trying to get some consensus or more common understanding about those issues.

It doesn't mean that folks are necessarily going to change their mind about their beliefs about whether the dams should stay or whether they should go, but until we get -- set aside the issues that are out there which aren't issues, or we get -- set aside some of the things that people are believing, which aren't true, or get more information out there, it's very hard to come -- to even start to come to some kind of consensus.

And so, tonight is the fourth meeting you guys have had in about two-and-a-half years. I think there's probably a growing sense of frustration, because a lot of it has been talking to you, getting opinions out there, but not the dialogue back and forth between folks on different sides of the issue, and I think a lot more of that is needed. And so I would hope that, whether you facilitate that, or folks from MKRA and the folks who are opposed to dam removal can get together and talk. I think that would be something we would be very happy to do.

Even just hearing tonight some of the conversations that have been talked about, the changes in the water level and other things which have been explained before, you know, there's either a lot of misconceptions that are out there or other things are going on. I think there are a lot of facts that we could probably agree on, but I'm still not hearing it after -- after a couple of years, and there are a lot of answers that are out there.

And I just wanted to ask Todd: Do you have a sense of when you'll be able to get some of the information on the hydraulic -- or hydrologic analysis from Wright-Pierce?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I forwarded the request to them.

MR. BURROWS: Okay.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I'm hoping to get it to you as soon as --

MR. BURROWS: Okay.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: -- I get it back from John.

MR. BURROWS: That would be great, because I think one of the concerns we just heard a little while ago was that you're going to have 1.2 feet of water, and the way it came across was that's the way it's going to be all the time. And what we need to understand is, that's the depth of water at one point in the river during low summer flows.

It's going to change season to season, month to month, and we only have six cross sections that were done. Two of them had depths of three or four feet and when the last drawdown happened, the vast majority of the river from Twine Mill down to Kesslen was much deeper than 1.2 feet. There were lots of places that were over my head up there still.

So when Kevin Flynn talked about radian controls and, you know, rocks and stuff in there, that's very accurate. There's going to be a lot of deep places of water with some very shallow places. That's what rivers are but it's going to be incredibly diverse.

And so, I think we need to get that out there that, yeah, at one point at certain times of the year, it's going to be like this. In the springtime, things are going to be full. It's going to look like it does today, just moving faster. And so -- that's all.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much -- (INAUDIBLE)

(Applause.)

MR. HARMON: I've already signed in. Thank you, very much, for the opportunity. I'm Bill Harmon. I live just above the Twine Mill Dam, so I'm probably one of the only property owners -- I have about 550 feet there, and I'm looking at a very beautiful old granite railroad trestle. I don't know if any of you have seen it. It's a shame that more people can't see it. It, I think, has a lot of historical value and it's going to look really weird when that river turns to a brook. There's two huge stone arches that that river flows through and you can take a boat right through either arch.

I know that's going to go away, but I do agree with the gentleman that said I do believe there's a compromise and there's another option that you don't have in your plan. I think we should explore more options, not just the four you've got there. Why can't we lower the dams a little bit, install the fish ladders, make them almost maintenance free, allow the free run of the river? Can't we compromise? I mean, it seems to me in my 71 years that the right answer has always been compromise and I would urge us to go in that direction.

(Applause.)

MS. KENNEY: Kristi Kenney. I already signed in, too. I'll take your offer. My name is Kristi Kenney. I live at 35 Quail Run and I -- I do have a young family. I have two boys who are eight and ten. They -- my youngest just got his own kayak this year. I sent him out untethered for the first time and he was so excited -- in the -- in the river. We also spent a good amount of time photographing the progress the beaver had on the tree behind the house. That was very exciting every morning at six o'clock. So I just -- I don't want to see those things go away.

I really want to know the real financial impact on the taxpayers or the ratepayers. I want to know before a decision is made. Are we talking only about a few dollars on our bills to save the dams or are we talking about a lot of money to save the dams? It's a really a big different if it's not that much of a financial impact on the ratepayers and I think it would affect the way that people feel about it one way or the other.

The other thing -- I'm on the site plan committee for the Town, and we have meetings with public hearings and then there's a feedback. The public will have input, the project -- the people for the project will come back and respond, and I kind of feel there's no response. So I really would like to see a mediation session or something, because we're just speaking but we're getting no feedback from professionals or you, your committee, about where you stand on things. So I urge you to take the time to try and organize that.

That's all.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I would -- just to clarify a little bit. It's my hope that the final draft -- or the next draft of the report will address some of the key concerns that have been raised, so I understand your concern. We're trying to address that. We may not address -- undoubtedly we won't address everyone's question or concern in the next draft of the report, but we're trying to identify those items that could have a significant effect on the direction.

MS. TEAGUE: Donna Teague, 18 Oak Bluff Road. You might have just touched on the answer, 'cause I was just wondering, with all the questions that we have asked since we sort of woke up the last few months, when and in what manner those answers are going to be gotten. So I guess some of it is going to come in that final report? And then, when it's individual, you know, like one gentleman tonight talked about that storm water drain, and I know someone else in here has like an eight-foot drop, how are those people going to be answered; is it going to be like individual or what?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It will more than likely be on a case by case basis, yes.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay. So you folks would talk to whoever those people are and try to work it out?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Yes, ma'am.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COLEMAN: My name is Doug Coleman and I live on Fletcher Street, right on the river.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I think we might have to have you say that a little bit louder.

MR. COLEMAN: I'm short. It doesn't travel far.

(Laughter.)

MR. COLEMAN: My name is Doug Coleman. I live on Fletcher Street, right on the river.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you. First, let me just start by saying very quickly that I finished my graduate degree at UNH in marine biology and botany, and after I got out -- finished my PhD degree, I went to work for an environmental consulting and engineering company. Those were the days when the Water Quality Acts and the Clean Air Acts went into effect -- activation, so there was a tremendous need, demand, requirement for environmental impact assessments, the gathering of data to be able to then produce an environmental impact statement on numerous projects, primarily anything that had federal funding, or was linked somehow to the government money wise.

At any rate, my job there was to design -- put together, design and carry out multidisciplinary environmental assessment programs, and then write an environmental impact statement. And these projects ranged from projects smaller than what we're talking about here to multibillion dollar projects. I was the key person. I signed off on everything. I carried -- I was primarily responsible for it, so I have had a lot of experience in this field, and I've had a lot of experience with these kinds of meetings, and I've had a lot of experience dealing with or trying to understand both sides of a coin.

Every environmental project, anything that's going to affect the environment, any action has a reaction. Reactions can be plus or they can be negative. And we're going to -- my job was unbiased and present the facts. You people or you people had to make the decisions.

So that's where I'm coming from, so I understand that this is a tough issue for your particularly, because you have to make the decision. I appreciate it and I think a lot of people here do; at least I'm pretty sure.

There are two sides of a story, two sides of the coin. These kinds of projects can be very emotional for a lot of people. We've heard it tonight. There's a lot of -- there's a lot of deep feelings. We have -- you have a lot of emotions and emotions vested in these kinds of projects.

I have a questions, one question and then two statements that are kind of associated with this. One is, you mentioned -- you mentioned that the results of the sediment analysis down at the impoundment, down at the dam, will more sediments be analyzed upstream on the embankment if it's drawn down again or is what's happening at the impoundment right down at the dam satisfactory to kind answer those questions?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Moving forward if the decision -- if we get closer to a decision to remove the dams, it will be -- need to be further sedimentation -- sedimentation sampling done to see if that's representative of what we're experiencing -- if where we've sampled is representative of what we're experiencing in the actual watershed.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: If I could further -- on top of that, you know, ultimately, what -- what we have to do is going to be determined by forces beyond us. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, regulatory agencies, although these will not all be known in advance, what we have attempted to do in this study -- and if you could bear with me for just a minute, I won't take away from your time -- what we've attempted to do is identify, as best we can, at lowest cost, all of the key -- yeah, key indicators, the pathways that could -- could block us and what it could cost.

So, for example, with the sediments, just as one example, our goal was to understand do we have a problem this big, you know, this big or this big? And what should we make for an assumption so that we can do a cost benefit analysis. We will never answer all the questions that have to be asked in this study or before a decision is made. It's not possible. But we're trying to get all the big -- big rocks, if you will, figured out so we -- you know, we're going in the right general direction and this is -- I think we've taken the first step.

MR. COLEMAN: All right. I appreciate that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We've got a magnitude now.

MR. COLEMAN: One question related to the sediments. Is there any thought or is there any plan at this point or do you think there may be a requirement or an opportunity for sediment samples to be analyzed for oxygen; is it an aerobic environment, is it an anaerobic environment? When you -- when you look at the pictures, when you look at the drawdown when it occurred, you think of this mud hole and bad news. And if it's -- if it's an aerobic environment, that's one direction we can expect vegetation to go or organicisms. If it's anaerobic, it's a totally different ball game.

Does your -- the question -- the --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I'll just say that the study does address -- I believe the study does address, and we have received some data about the oxygen levels in the water -- in the river, the quality of the river today, as well as some suggestions about what the flowing river might do. I don't have them in my brain at the moment. Todd is taking a look at some of the stats, but I believe it is addressed to some extent.

MR. COLEMAN: And I saw that and that's the water. I'm talking about the sediments themselves.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I'm sorry.

MR. COLEMAN: So, at any rate, the other two things I wanted to mention -- or just mention is: I live on the river and I have seen -- I've been there 40 years and we have seen a

dramatic increase in recreation on the river. It is amazing. It's wonderful. It's great. So normally, looking at it and looking out our window at sunset and all of that, those things are wonderful, but the recreation is great, not only for the people who live on the river, but I know from people who live elsewhere in the community plus the school is beginning to use it for gym classes, and studies, and various classes that are there for kids to learn about the river and all of that.

The final thing I just wanted to --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: You're time is just about up.

MR. COLEMAN: I encourage -- I encourage the parties to get together. I think -- I think that would be tremendous.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: The samples -- pardon the interruption. The samples exceeded the whole time to test for oxygen, so they didn't -- they didn't get those tests quickly enough, so they weren't addressed in this report.

MR. COLEMAN: Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

MR. PASQUILL: Hi. I'm Bill Pasquill. I'm from Kennebunk. I'm a ratepayer. I have a question. If, in fact, it's determined that it's going to take three million dollars to do one of the options, is that going to be a bond issue, or how is that financially going to be --

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It will be a bond issue.

MR. PASQUILL: So there will be a vote on that -- if it is decided --

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Not necessarily. We've just verified how -- how we're bonded, what our bonding limit is, and whether -- whether we require a vote or not.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Our legal interpretation of charter and legislation in regard to Kennebunk Light & Power was that vote in 2007, the public allowed KLPD to increase their bonding limit to six million dollars, which gives us about three million dollars of additional bonding capacity. Again, legal interpretation is that the Board has the discretion to make that decision.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: So to -- to -- the answer would then be, if what we need to -- at the time we need to spend money, if -- if we need more than -- to finance more than three million dollars, as KLPD, we would need to float a bond and get approval for an increased bond capacity.

MR. PASQUILL: So, in all probability, then, a bond issue will be required?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: In the most likely scenario, the -- it --

MS. TEAGUE: What did you say?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: What did who say?

MS. TEAGUE: You went quiet and we couldn't hear you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It's possible that we wouldn't need to float a bond, but I think what Todd said is, it's likely that we will need to.

MR. PASQUILL: Just to muddy the waters, is that -- you know me. Todd knows me. I can't -- I can't help myself.

The point is, now, is this a cumulative cost or is this just at one set time from here on? Once it's decided -- in other words, right now you're accumulating costs with studies and whatever else, okay. What determines that three million dollars? Is it a total accumulation of all expenses made or --

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: That's our -- that's our anticipation, Bill. Is that all of the -- all of the funds we've been expending and pulling out of our reserve would be reimbursed to us through the bonding mechanism. So we would go to the bonding institution and say, okay, this is what we've already expended that is recoverable through a bond and that would be added to whatever that total indebtedness is.

MR. PASQUILL: Just to -- just to reiterate so we're all on the same page, would this or would this not require a vote by the ratepayers for this bond?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It's our understanding and the legal interpretation that if we need to go to a bond agency, and it's going to exceed six million dollars, which is our cap --

MR. PASQUILL: And that's a total?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It's a sum total of everything that we already to --

MR. PASQUILL: To do, yup.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: -- get in regard to the West K substation and other things that we've done, if it exceeds that limit, we would then have to go to the public, not only to ask for the funds but to ask for an increase in our debt limit.

MR. PASQUILL: Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thanks for asking the question. I think that it's good for that to be clear. We don't have a definitive answer but we have -- we know exactly how it would work.

MS. GRABIN: And this is Monica Grabin. I live in Kennebunk. I am a ratepayer. There's a lot of emotion in the room and it's very understandable. I would just like it stated at this meeting clearly: What is the responsibility, based on your mission statement, on what this

board has to make a decision based on? What does -- what is your responsibility to make -- in making this decision?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Would you like me to try and answer that?

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Yes. Go ahead.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: So our mission -- our -- our mission is -- I won't repeat it word for word, but it is to provide safe, reliable, affordable power to our ratepayers. That's our mission.

MS. GRABIN: Right.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It was asked at a prior meeting, and I'm just going to, for full transparency to everyone who is here who may or may not have heard it, it was asked of us: Are we legally required to make a decision strictly based on this financial analysis? And I believe the answer that we received from our general manager was, we are not aware that that is a requirement. That is, however, the mission. We are a utility. You would, I think, expect us to make decisions on a business basis. We are a municipal utility. Different Board members will look at this -- this very question differently.

MS. GRABIN: Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Did I do that all right? Does anyone want to comment? You get three minutes.

All right. Do we have any other ratepayers who would like to speak this point?

MS. COPELAND: Can I just clarify what you said at the beginning, 'cause I wasn't sure of what I was hearing?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yeah, sure.

MS. COPELAND: After the non-ratepayers have had a chance, can some of the ratepayers make one last comment for, say, a minute?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yeah. I think what I said was, as long as the Board is willing and we have time before we said we were going to adjourn at 8 -- 8:40.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Well, the agenda says 8:40.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: 8:40.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Or earlier.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Subject to the Board, the intent is to hear all the ratepayers at least once, hear anyone else from the public who wants to make a comment, and then go back to anyone who would like to say something more within our timeframe, and it would be up to the Board to extend beyond the time of the meeting.

MS. COPELAND: Okay. I just wanted to make one important announcement that some people might not be aware of.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I understand that. We'll try and squeeze you in.

MS. COPELAND: Okay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Do we have -- all right. So I don't see anybody else stepping forward as a ratepayer, so the floor is now open for anyone else, member of the public to make any comments you would like to make and then we'll circle back. Could you please sign in before you speak.

Again, if you would like -- one or two people waiting, it would probably make it a little quicker for everyone to sign in, in advance.

We've lost our general manager for a moment, but we're listening.

MS. HANSEN: My name is Jean Hansen. Ward is my son. I'm on Larrabee Way, last house on the right, and I've been there since 1968, so it's almost 50 years. Before that we lived in New Jersey, which I hated.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Now, I asked everyone to be respectful tonight, but you're forgiven.

(Laughter.)

MS. HANSEN: I lived in Kennebunkport and we rented which I didn't like after owning our house for twelve years.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We can't hear you.

MS. HANSEN: Finally, we met a wonderful real estate man that told us about the house, which is where I'm living now, and he plays music, and he writes music, and he sells real estate. And he had some couple from New York that were in their 70s, and my husband and I were about, oh, I guess 36, 38. We had four kids. We needed four bedrooms, and that's what the house had, and it was on a river.

In my childhood my father and mother asked me one day when I was 10 whether I wanted to go to a Y in the summer, because I hated heat, or to buy a cottage on a lake, and I opted for the lake and I learned to swim almost like Ester Williams. But, anyway, I grew to love being on -- near the river.

Everybody that has come down in the years that I've been there with my family has said we didn't know this place existed. It's a dead end street and it's not advertised. And I said, well, I like it that way. I said, it's not that I'm antisocial, but I like peace of mind and I've -- I've been satisfied ever since I moved into that house. I grew to love it. I learned how to cut a lawn. I learned how to fix a car. My son told me, when you cut the lawn, Mum, it's going to take you six miles to get to the river. I said, good. It will keep me slim.

But the point I'm trying to make is, I don't know why the hell you want to take down the God-damn dams. It doesn't make sense. I grew to love it and to boot, when Sandy Armentrout (ph) was the editor of the Star, I began to like poetry, and he published it. I didn't get any money for it. I didn't want the money. The river evokes, for me, a sense of spirit, and love, and God. And now, you people come along and you want to destroy something beautiful. It doesn't make sense. That's all I can say.

CLERK JORDAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. ASHLEY: Well, I hope she started a trend. I have a little something to add to it. I want to apologize for my mother's behavior in attempting to keep me dry as a young child --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Would you introduce yourself, please.

MR. ASHLEY: Oh, I was getting to that. So --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Could we start with that?

MR. ASHLEY: -- coming home -- I will. Coming home from school as a young child on a rainy day, she always had dry clothes for me. So, in a way, she could be thought of as being responsible for those hydro electric plants somewhat, but they were going to be built anyway, and I thought, geeze, maybe this is a chance for me. So I went up and Bill Davis said, you're hired. And so I went and played in the river with Don LaPoint and all the rest of the crew for about two-and-a-half years in a stressful time in the United States when there were gas lines that were over three miles long, and all kinds of horrible stories. And we were right up against it, we thought, until we found that, no, it was sort of a semi devised situation. But I had a chance to do a lot of welding, 18 times around the butterfly valve at Twine Mill, to try and get it welded together.

But now, let's get to the point. Here is a piece of paper that I've received --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: And your name, sir?

MR. ASHLEY: Oh, you already asked me. Oh, I'm sorry. I hoping that my mother would get, you know...

Peter Ashley. I live in Cape Neddick, Maine, and I have been playing with water all my life. I'm a captain of sail and power, 50 tons for the country, for all waters, and I've worked at

the navy yard, and I was a fisherman for 10 years. I'm supposed to be an aircraft mechanic; I am. But I got laid off from Lake Aircraft in Sanford.

Anyway, let's get to the point. This is dollars and cents about the dams and it's the history of the production, et cetera, percentage, all of those things. The first thing that comes to mind, when you look down these lists, is, oh, Dane Perkins doesn't produce very much. Well, that's a fact. We knew it - I knew it, but I couldn't have any control over it when it was being built. But there is a way to probably, at least, double its output.

So I'm going to talk about three photographs and then we'll go to something that I wrote. The trustees here have in front of them three different photographs, and I'll attempt to hold them up. This is a picture of the power house at Dane Perkins as we were building it and it shows -- the centerpiece here is the support for the generator itself and the wicket gates, and all of that stuff, and the propellor. And all the water that goes downstream on the Mousam through the Dane Perkins Dam goes down through that -- the top, the hole here up at the top, and this is just a plywood frame for pouring concrete.

Now, how much water goes through there? Well, you've seen the Mousam River. It's quite a bit of water. If you do simple calculations, the water going into the stay ring around this turbine that supports it physically and guides the water somewhat, it's moving at about three feet per second according to the engineering handbooks for a dam of about 12 feet high. So three feet a second. Now, how many cubic feet a second is going down the river through these dams? Well, the Wright-Pierce report says 260, but when we were designing -- we, I mean when it was being designed and we were talking with Allis-Chalmers and everything, and the engineers, the figure was 230 cubic feet a second and so all of their engineering analysis was based on that.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: If I could ask you to try to keep right to the point that you want to express to us.

MR. ASHLEY: Yes.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We do have your written documents --

MR. ASHLEY: Yes. So --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- and we are at four minutes.

MR. ASHLEY: Okay. So that equates to 4.7 cars a second, 3,000 pound cars. You have a rotary in town. Imagine entering the rotary the wrong way, 4.7 cars a second going in the rotary the wrong way. So you will look at this picture and the intake to this structure here is in the lower right-hand corner. And the white [sic] areas on the right, all the water tends to go the wrong way around the propellor. You've looked in your washing machine when it's running full blast with a full load, and you lift up the cover and everything is going. That is what it actually looks like when you open the manhole cover, and you cannot get uniformed flow around something like a turbo charger if you send it through into a square turbo charger. You have to have a uniformed circular -- all the water is driven to the center and goes down the center to the propellor, the runner they call it. And there is the runner at the Dane Perkins Dam with a

variable pitch prop on it, and it is designed to run at the most optimum setting of the wicket gates that let the water in and the water that goes around the propellor to drive it.

So what we need to do is to go up there and design a steel shell, you might call it a nautilus, around the existing one inside the existing power house, and put it together in such a way that you could take a couple of panels off to get in and lubricate the bottom edges of the wicket gates.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr. Ashley.

MR. ASHLEY: Is that it? All right.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: If you have something else that you really want --

MR. ASHLEY: I understand that head motion. Thank you, Jay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you and if I could offer one other point. We -- we do have to -- in the -- an earlier draft of the report that everyone has been reviewing, there was some work done to evaluate potentials to increase the capacity of the generators, and we -- one of the items that we're going to make sure of in the final report is that the information from the prior report that wasn't captured gets captured. So you will see some of that addressed and we are following up with a conversation about this with our engineers, so -- and I know you'll be talking with Todd. And thank you, very much, Peter.

MR. ASHLEY: Okay. Todd has said that I can come down and talk to him.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: He has an open door policy.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: You certainly can.

MR. ASHLEY: When is your vacation, Todd?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I'm sorry?

MR. ASHLEY: When is your vacation?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I haven't heard about it yet, so I better get my affairs in order, Peter.

(Applause.)

MR. WALKER: My name is Phillip Walker. I'm a ratepayer. I live on Intervale Road, not down close to the river, unfortunately.

Money. I want to talk about money. I understand that people are concerned with many more things than money, but I do understand that part of your responsibility is providing power that is at the most economical to the ratepayers. The gentleman who spoke, what, maybe third, completely snowed me with the numbers about the cost benefits. Did he say he would provide

that report to you, and could you put it on the website so we can work on it and see if we understand it?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: All of the written comments that we receive are being posted with -- with attributions.

MR. WALKER: Oh, good. Thank you. What I want to talk about is how much money for hydro-generated power saves over purchased power. And curiously, I have not heard this figure in all of the year long discussion. If you look at page 6.2 of the -- of the Pearson report -- the Wright-Pierce report, kind of in a paragraph, not in a table, you will see what amounts to a report of how much money is saved.

1.4 million kilowatt hours are generated by the dams, which is in line with what we know is generated. The price quoted for purchased power is 10.5 cents, which is a little high, because in the last five years it's been around seven or eight cents. The cost to KLP to run the dams was quoted as \$81,000. If you worked that all out, it comes to about \$60,000 saved a year by the generated power.

I think that number is a little high, because I think the 10.5 cents is high. The \$81,000 to run the dams is definitely low. I think what was left out of that figure was the capital improvements, which have to be made every year. I have some figures from KLPD, which shows that the cost of running the dams is not \$81,000 a year, but 105. So I think probably \$40,000 a year saved is more appropriate.

Let's say that -- well, we know that the estimated costs for licensing the dams is 10 or \$11,000, so what we're doing is we are investing 10 or \$11,000 to get a return of \$40,000 saved per year, because that \$40,000 savings is like an income stream. Supposing you could invest money in some kind of an investment instrument that returned two percent on your investment. How much would you have to invest to get \$40,000 a year? Two million dollars. You would have to invest two million dollars at two percent, and I think you can get two percent with a long-term loan.

So you're thinking of investing 10 million dollars to get what you could get for an investment of two million dollars; does that make sense?

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Sorry. I lost that -- I lost that whole train of thought. If you could back up a little bit. I understood the analogy of the investment, but where did you get the 10 million dollars?

MR. WALKER: That's what it costs -- that's what it's going to cost to license the dams.

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Okay.

MR. WALKER: And you have to license --

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: I just don't know what you are referring to. That's all.

MR. WALKER: You have to license the dams to continue to get --

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Correct.

MR. WALKER: -- the generated power. So it doesn't look very financially appropriate to me. But, as I say, I understand, that's not the only consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

MR. HEINZ: I'm Steve Heinz and I live in Cumberland, and I'm representing the Sebago chapter of Trout Unlimited. We're a fishery conservation organization. We have 600 members in southwestern Maine, and 55 of them or so live in towns which are in the Mousam River watershed. I'd like to, first of all, thank the Trustees for holding these public meetings. I remember when we went to the first one, I guess, in -- well, the first one I went to in March of last year? There were a lot of questions that didn't get answered, and I think, you know, as this process goes on, we're -- we're getting a lot of the answers and I think we've come a long way.

Tonight, you know, I've got out some things I didn't know, and that is, the upstream sediments are looking promising and we're not looking at any problems there. As I understand it, that was, you know, worst case scenario is what they sampled and it was benign, so that -- that's a good thing.

We also found out that fish passage will be required. Government agencies have gone on record to say -- say that's going to happen. And what that means is, if the dam stays, you're going to have to have fish ladders. All right. If you look at fish ladders, what you find out about them is this is some really very, you know, inexact science.

I mean, if you want to look up -- up the coast and look at the Presumscot and look at the Saco, in both places they've got fish ladders in both places. They've got problems with them. And if you get relicensed, and keep the dams, they're going to have targets for what you're going to have to pass for fish, and those things are going to have to work. So this is going to be -- you know, when they install these, you can buy the best people that you can -- you can afford, but these fish ladders may or may not work and you need to be aware of that.

I think what you're going to find in the final analysis, when the professionals look at this, the folks that you're paying them to give you opinions on this, you're going to find that the removal is the least cost option, and why am I saying this? It's because if you look up -- upriver -- up the coast, again at the Presumscot and the Saccarappa, here you -- they're surrendering a licence on a facility where one dam, one generation, you know, facility -- this has essentially twice the capacity that the three dams on the Mousam River have, they couldn't figure out the -- a way to make that work economically.

Once again, one dam versus three dams, twice the generating capability. They couldn't make it work economically, and I think, in the final analysis, you're going to find, professionals are going to tell you, that removal is the lowest cost option.

I'll guarantee you, if the fish were here, they'd tell you what's best for the environment is for the dams to go out. Trust me on that one.

Some, just, other things I would like to say --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: What language?

VICE-PRESIDENT BERRY: Yeah, I've never heard a fish say that.

MR. HEINZ: Yeah, I know.

Anyway. Some other things I think, you know, that kind of came out tonight. We know the water levels are going to drop. We know the ponds are going to be turned back into a river, which is going to be pools, smaller -- smaller areas and ripples.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr Heinz, you're about at your three minutes.

MR. HEINZ: Where did it all go?

Anyway. But we know that -- we've done -- you know, I've done dam removal projects before. Where you de-water areas, it re-vegetates quickly. The river re-channelizes, so you get spots again. Nature heals itself and that's really what happens. The -- you know, I guess the way one -- some of the folks are talking, it's going to be like some big clam flat. Believe me, it won't be. All right. It's going to re-vegetated. But anyway --

MR. TEAGUE: How do you know that?

MR. HEINZ: Because it's what happens. If you go look --

MR. TEAGUE: How do you substantiate that?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Excuse me. Let's try and keep this to one speaker and, you know -- if you guys would like to have a conversation afterwards, or a larger group facilitate it, that's great.

MR. HEINZ: But anyway, just -- you know, the last thing I'd like to say is, you know, you can do more environmental studies, but what's -- I don't think it's going to bring about any kind of an epiphany for your gentlemen, and I really don't think it's going to satisfy the folks who don't want their ponds turned into a river. So, anyway, I hope you decide for the fish, and for the environment, and for your ratepayers. Thank you.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Okay. This is going to be last call for first-time speakers who are non ratepayers, and then we'll take last call for anyone.

MS. COPELAND: What did you say? Last call for who?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We're going to -- I'm asking if there are anymore non ratepayers who would like to speak, please get in line now and then we'll take last call.

MS. COPELAND: Thank you.

MS. HUDSON: My name is Landis Hudson. I have to take a breath after speaking after Steve Heinz. I come to you today from Yarmouth. I work for Maine Rivers. I live two blocks away from the Royal River, two blocks away from an ugly, nonfunctional fish ladder that basically makes it impossible for migratory fish to make their way into a watershed which is, in some ways, similar to the Mousam.

So my organization is a nonprofit. We're an advocacy organization. We base decisions on science and one of things I wanted to mention is the idea of compromise and fish ladders. So there are -- obviously, there are different -- different kinds of compromises and we've heard people talk about fish ladders as being a good technical option. They are very inefficient and, unfortunately, also very inexpensive [sic]. So one of the things we've been finding through science and experience is that as different situations have arisen like this, where federal agencies come in and say, okay, you really -- you have a river that needs to be healthy, it needs to have the migratory fish that belong here, just put a fishway in. In many cases they are very inefficient, they're very expensive, and we have a lot of examples from the State of Maine where they don't work very well.

I'd also like to take a moment to just remind us of why we are talking about this. As many of you know, there have been a lot of letters of support submitted to the trustees, and I'd like to thank you for your hard work in bringing forth a lot of opportunities for people to share their thoughts and to get a lot of information out.

Within this community, I'm sure there are a lot of conversations about why it's important to keep the dams and to try and keep things the way they are. If you take a step beyond that, there will be other voices from outside the community telling you that the science behind restoration is very strong, that rivers are resilient, that from our experiences in other parts of Maine and other parts of the United States, rivers do rebound.

If you look back to what people remember from the '60s and '70s, when rivers were tremendously polluted, obviously we've cleaned them up a lot, but the -- the migratory fish that belong here are not here. We don't see that, because we're not as familiar with it.

But the science behind restoration is very strong, which is why organizations like the Maine Lobstermen's Association, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, The Alewife Harvesters of Maine, that's why those people have taken the time and energy to remind you that you have a river that has been degraded and it deserves better. It deserves to have the fish that belong in it. It deserves to have its biotic integrity restored.

So I -- I offer the support of my organization and others to provide the science to help you make this decision. I acknowledge that there's a great deal of emotion. The science behind restoration is very strong and I'd be happy to share -- share that with you and with other members of the community.

So thank you for that and thank you for your hard work making this decision.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thanks for coming.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: All right. Is there anyone else who hasn't spoken yet who would like an opportunity to do so; by whatever diverse name tag you would like to be called? Okay. So I don't see anymore first-time speakers. It is a little after 8:00. We're going to try and stick with our 8:40 timeframe as agendad, and so there is a little bit more time either for any of us, if you have any comments you want to make, or for additional comments or questions from the public.

The same procedure, please. You don't have to sign in again, but we would appreciate it if --

CLERK JORDAN: Could we get a show of hands on how many people want a second shot?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: That's great.

If you could, identify yourself by a show of raising your hand, if you would like a chance to speak again, so we could get a sense of that.

(Raise of hands.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Two, three, four, five, six. Okay. We can probably make that happen.

MR. BOWEN: Very, very quick. Stuart Bowen again. Are you aware of any outside money, meaning state or federal, to exist with this project; either removal, or fish ladders, or whatever?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: We are aware of removal money. I haven't found any sources of other money at this point in time.

MR. BOWEN: What are our magnitudes, are we -- will it change the equation?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It most certainly could. Federal funding is a very strange thing. So there are -- I can't commit to you, Mr. Bowen, what that amount would be, but it -- there are -- it has been told, and in other situations has been experienced, that potentially 50 percent of removal costs can be federally funded.

MR. BOWEN: I've heard that.

MR. HARMON: I heard the gentleman mention --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: I'm sorry. Please identify yourself again, just for the record.

MR. HARMON: Bill Harmon. I heard the gentleman talking about fish ladders. A couple of people have talked about fish ladders, and it seems to be that their only argument or one of their principle arguments against doing that -- keeping the dams.

I grew up on the Presumscot River. I think that river was mentioned a couple of times, and if I was a fish and I could talk, I would tell you, I do not want to go into that river. That river was polluted beyond belief when I was growing up and I can't imagine that that river is going to clean itself out for probably a thousand years. It -- S.D. Warren dumped more chemicals and stuff in that river. That bottom has got to be anaerobic and not -- I don't think there's any life in that river. Maybe a turtle or two. That's about it.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: A lot of snappers.

MR. TEAGUE: Me, again. Shawn Teague. I guess I'm always concerned, when we talk about the river, that the River Alliance is so fixated on the fish, and like I said, I like fish. Fish are wonderful things, but there are other species and habitats, from an environmental point of view, that thrive on this river, and I don't know why the concern is only about fish. Do we not care about anything else that lives and depends upon that river, including the residents of Kennebunk?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: They're an endangered species.

MR. TEAGUE: Yeah, human beings are questionable. Human beings are not going to be a problem in the environment, but just because something is a manmade structure doesn't make it evil, and I think a lot of times that is a -- that is a connotation to describe anything that man has made and that the desire is to get back to nature. I think historically George Varney in 1887 talked about two dams -- excuse me -- two falls on the Mousam, great and small, which by nature impeded free passage of fish all along the length of the river.

So I think it's a fallacy to think that there's, if we tear these dams down, the fish will have free access up and down the river. I don't think that's the case. I don't think it ever was the case. But there are other species that we enjoy in this town that live on that river not just fish, and what happens to them when that river is drained?

I like the idea about grass and trees and everything growing in, but it's not water. It will not be a river. It will be a stream. It will be a brook. It will be a drainage ditch. It's going to be ugly as hell. I'm sorry. That's just the way it is. That's what the photographs reveal. It is speculation to think it's going to be something else in the future. We don't really know. We're guessing.

The Wright-Pierce report has got some flaws. There are a lot of areas that it did not really study as well as it should have. But I think one thing that can be said, is that the drawdowns confirm that the cross sections are probably pretty accurate. So when you take those dams down, that's what you're looking at. Two feet of water. Yes, it will vary up and down the length of the river, but basically what we came up with was, when we made the comparisons, an 80 percent reduction in the width, 90 percent reduction in depth is what we're going to be left with. It may be free, but there won't be much of it. It's not going to be a river.

So what we do with that as a town, and the thing that I -- that, Jay, you mentioned earlier, is very relevant. You are a public utility, and as a public utility, you are certainly aware of the wider ramifications of the role of the KLPD with the rest of Kennebunk; how what you do is going to impact the rest of the town. So it is not just dollars and cents, what goes into the ledger sheet, what goes as profit, what goes as expense, what goes as the infrastructure, or maintenance. The costs are going to be wider and deeper than just what does it cost to keep, what is the cost to take them down. The impact is much wider to all of Kennebunk. So I think -- hopefully that takes -- is taken into consideration, as well.

Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BURROWS: Thank you again, Jay. Again, John Burrows, one of the founders of the River Alliance as we're short-handedly called. I need to clarify a couple of points that occurred. One, the Mousam and Kennebunk Rivers Alliance is concerned about the entire ecosystem. We have never talked solely about fish. We care about everything from bald eagles, to beavers, to mink, to striped bass, to whales in the Gulf of Maine, and cod. River restoration is about restoring the entire ecosystem. It's about restoring the river to a river.

The Mousam River is not a river. It is a series of artificial impoundments that are not natural, that do not support many of the needed fish species, fresh water muscles, insects, or other species that were there for 12,000 years.

Dams have been there off and on for 2 or 300 years, so we're not talking -- fish are essential to the river, and species like river herring are an ecological keystone species. They feed everything else in the freshwater, in the estuary, and in the ocean. By restoring them, you benefit everything else. That's what we're trying to do, is to improve the Mousam and the entire system.

So the science, as Landis just mentioned, is solid and it's crystal clear. You remove dams, you improve water quality, you improve sediment flow, you bring nutrients back from the ocean and down to the ocean, you bring fish up and they feed everything.

We're going to uncover close to a hundred acres of land if all three of the dams are removed. That land becomes wetlands, forest, and it's habitat for turkeys, for deer, for fur-bearing mammals, for all kinds of birds. None of the species that I've heard about or have read about in papers are going to disappear. They're going to all benefit. I think those are scientific facts. People might not believe it or want to believe it, but that is truly the case.

Again, one of the other things, which we've been kind of pinged with in the media, is not caring about property values. We care about property values quite a bit. That's why for two years we've talked to experts in Maine, around the country. We've done our research. We've talked to folks to get all the peer reviewed scientific information out there about what happens when you remove a dam, large or small, and the changes to property value. All that information has been presented to you.

We would love to have a forum to discuss that issue, or discuss the biology and ecology of the river. We can bring in experts from Maine or from other places to talk about that. But, again, we care deeply about that, and we realize it's a concern, and we've never said anything publically or privately to say we don't care about that. Just like we've never said all we care about is fish.

So we've never characterized anyone who wants to keep the dams as being selfish, or not caring about the environment, or anything else. Yet, we're painted as being extremists, or only caring about one thing or another thing. So I think that needed to be said tonight in response.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

MS. COPELAND: Lois Copeland, again. I didn't really get to this, because I can be one of the emotional ones, but I do want people to realize that we're not concerned just as abutters, not just as riverfront property owners. We have all of the things, I'm sure, that all of you have. My husband and I are fish people. We have our licenses every year. Our kids come up from Connecticut to fish in the beautiful Mousam River, and at the shore, and all that. So we're not, you know, one group or the other.

The only thing I want to mention is that I think why the River Alliance, and some of the other groups from outside these (INAUDIBLE) have got a bad wrap, is because they've taken this from an all or none approach. We have to get rid of all the dams or we have to leave all the dams. There's no in between. There's no compromise, and I think that untractable -- intractable point of view is what's got the hackles up on a lot of the rest of us. There are compromises. It makes me wonder why some of those groups are not considering some of the compromises, and here we have the river modeling results.

If we just take out the Twine and Dane, look at this whole section of the river from the Kesslen all the way up to the Twine, that will not change, okay. Then, if we take out only the Dane Perkins, all the way up to the Dane Perkins, the river as we know it today, water levels included, muddy riverbanks and everything, will not change.

So why is there only one solution to this huge problem? There isn't one solution. There are all kinds of compromises. Now, these are -- are laid out on this chart as being scenarios, so these don't exactly match the four options that were presented by the Board. They're related, but they're not included in cost analysis, per se, okay.

So I just invite all of you to go and really study this river modeling results chart. We were told trust in Wright-Pierce. Here it is, folks. Here are their results. These are the projected conditions of the river if we leave the Kesslen, if we remove two out of three, if we move -- remove all three.

Now, the other thing I want to mention, that I think is very important, is that, you know, we don't want to set up an adversarial, you know, relationship with anyone. We do believe, those of us that live in Kennebunk, since these dams are pretty much up to West Kennebunk and western Kennebunk, these are pretty much in our area, okay. So Kennebungers have the biggest skin in the game. It's a fact. That's just the way it is. Any effects, any decision will affect us and the residents of Kennebunk all the way up to West Kennebunk more than anyone else, and that's also a fact.

Now, the science that people are quoting, you know, go and read the different publications. It's not all in support of moving dams -- removing dams on every river. The American Rivers Council, check it out. They state very clearly that every river is individual, every river is unique, every dam situation is unique, and you cannot paint it all with one brush and just say, all dams have to be removed, all rivers improve, all the habitats are improved. Not true. Not even in Maine, not even next door in some of our neighboring towns where they've had problems with the dams being removed and the results no way, no way match the improvements that were presented to the public. So just keep that all in mind. All --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We're at -- we're at three minutes.

MS. COPELAND: Thank you. So my last comment: Those of you who attended the Selectmen's meeting this week, you will know that they have reluctantly agreed to look at forming a workshop, with the possibility of maybe the Town taking over some of the responsibilities for, you know, leaving dams, taking dams out, whatever, and they are talking about coming up with their own options with input from everyone, and these workshops are going to be open to the public. They're hoping to set one up for February. We don't know the exact date yet.

Some on the board are very reluctant. You know, they're right in the middle of budgets and they really, really don't want to have to deal with this. They were hoping it was a slam/dunk. Well, it just turned out not to be.

So, anyway, we encourage everybody to get involved. No matter what your opinion is, no matter if you're outside, inside, you know, get involved, because it's going to affect us in big ways; financially and otherwise. It's not just for very small groups but for everyone. So understand the impacts. Read. Go online. You know, get familiar with what exactly is out there.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

MS. COPELAND: It's not a slam/dunk to remove all the dams. Not in any way, okay. So, please, please, please get involved. And write to your selectmen and encourage them to work up these workshops and, like other people have mentioned, just get a consortium going. Get --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Excuse me.

MS. COPELAND: Get everybody in on this.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Excuse me.

MS. COPELAND: But, Kennebunkers, you need to be involved. Thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: You're very welcome.

While we're on that subject, I think you will find in the report a reference to third parties. The Town certainly has a broader scope than this board, and the -- so I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Ashley?

MR. ASHLEY: Oh, that's right. My name is Peter Ashley. I wrote a packet of information here for the Trustees that they have now and they have those three pictures in it. I thought I better explain the three pictures. They're very difficult to understand by themselves.

I wrote a letter to the selectmen and gave it to them in their package and I'll just say, quickly, two paragraphs.

Kennebunk needs to become a -- well, first of all, I should say that it's not only water that I'm interested in. It's solar energy. So I'm -- I've been a solarist scholar for quite a number of years and I've been involved with passive and active houses and building buildings, and additions, et cetera. I built a house. They took out the only heater. It's been running for ten years since then. I stopped by. They say it's working fine. They had to put in a bureau [sic].

Kennebunk needs to become a sustainable town as the world gains two billion humans in the next 35 years. All homes need insulation, newer windows, and solar-electric systems net metered to Kennebunk Light & Power District. In the near future, a large solar array farm, should be, might be seen in the future, installed at the old airport on water company land near the CMP substation feeding into Kennebunk Light & Power's grid net metered to CMP, I imagine.

How many businessmen would destroy part of their business if it could be understood that they will need it in the near future? If Kennebunk Light & Power District turns down the option to keep and possibly improve its hydro potential, I fear it will be viewed as the old saying goes, "shooting one's own foot."

If a proactive decision is made to keep the electrical production, electric school busses and homeowners' electric cars are a near future option. Kennebunk Light & Power District already has one charging station, and I imagine it's one of the first on the coast. Why not more? Each car in each homeowner's garage can net meter to Kennebunk Light & Power District in the nighttime while everybody is sleeping the way they did it with the electric water heaters.

Now, you say, oh, electric cars --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Mr. Ashley.

MR. ASHLEY: Okay. Some people have stretched things.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: This is your second time.

CLERK JORDAN: This is round two.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: With due respect to everyone else, I'd ask you to wrap it up, please.

MR. ASHLEY: I have one -- one sentence.

Tessler Motors is building a 10 million square foot space employing 6,000 people that will enable homeowners and businesses to use solar energy 24 hours a day.

That's the one sentence.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Peter, if you want a piece of encouraging news before you step down from the podium --

MR. ASHLEY: What's that?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Do you want a piece of encouraging news?

MR. ASHLEY: Yes.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: You said the District has one solar power car charging station.

MR. ASHLEY: Yes.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: And as you stand there, we have two.

(Applause.)

MR. ASHLEY: Have one at the library, so I can spend the day at the library.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: The Chamber of Commerce was the closest we could get.

MR. ASHLEY: Good. Great. We're on a roll.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, very much. It looks as though we have one more speaker. Two?

CLERK JORDAN: I think two.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Two. All right. Thank you.

MR. GRABIN: Bill Grabin from Kennebunk. I've been working on this for a number of years and I just wanted to say, in response to Lois' comments, that if any of you think that we're intractable or uncompromising, then you haven't talked to us, so I don't know -- you know, that's not an accurate depiction of us at all.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It's a good opportunity to remind people that it's a great town that we live in and talking to each other is -- there is no substitute and there's no board that's going to make that work, so keep trying.

MR. COPELAND: Chauncey Copeland, again. I'm just reacting to this whole fishways thing. You indicated early on --

MS. COPELAND: Chauncey, we can't hear you.

MR. COPELAND: I'm just reacting to the issue about the fishways that have to be installed. You've indicated early on that you've already been directed that it's going to be a requirement by federal?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yes. To be clear, at our prior public meeting we had good reason to believe, but we did not have written confirmation. We now do have letters that will be attached as appendicis to the next report and will be available online, as well, that indicates that is the expectation of the agencies.

MR. COPELAND: Okay. And that is based upon -- have they done studies of the Mousam's specific environment or is this just kind of a one -- you just have to do it because they say you have to do it?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: It's part of the -- that's part of the process in the FERC filing, is they have the ability to prescribe things to the river, and so the Maine Department --

MR. COPELAND: Based upon --

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: -- the Maine Department of Inland -- Marine Resources has indicated that the Mousam River is a river that will need to be restored. So the Maine Department of Marine Resources is responsible for any oceanic fish species and also -- I can never say that word --

CLERK JORDAN: Diadromous.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: The ones that, you know, spawn in the fresh water and --

CLERK JORDAN: They swim both ways.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: I could never pronounce it properly, but the Maine Department of Marine Resources has indicated that, and I don't want to site improperly the other agencies that have, but they are -- we have received letters that have stated that that will be the case.

MR. COPELAND: But we will have the opportunity to refute that if we have to -- some kinds of studies and things like that? Because we hear it -- we hear it from the scientists saying that they don't work. We heard from Trout Unlimited saying that it hasn't worked at all. The fish can't do it. So it just doesn't seem to balance right, that, you know, you're directed on one hand and it's very common that it's not going to work.

So going back to your last statement saying about the fact that there was also a third option, maybe the Town would take over responsibility for the dams, that type of thing. If you opt to get out of the hydro business, that's not the same concern as far as, then, the Town is going to be -- is that requirement for fish dams always going to be there?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Yeah, I didn't actually say exactly that, but I did indicate that it's clear that there can be interveners and there could also be other parties that could chose to take over the dams if we were to relinquish our license. So it was others who have spoken to what the Town is discussing and may do. I would just -- all I said was that the Town has a broader scope --

MR. COPELAND: Right.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- than does this utility district. We -- we -- you heard our mission and we have a limited capability. We're not in the parks business. We're not in the -- in all the other businesses.

MR. COPELAND: So you would have a responsibility for disclosure, though, to say that if some third party wanted to take this thing over, that you've got to have fish dams, and it's going to cost you 4.8 billion dollars --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: No. We wouldn't, no.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Well, we --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: It wouldn't be our responsibility.

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: The information that's out there, is out there, so that other -- those other parties would know what it is we're dealing with. We can't -- it's not like --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Everybody has to deal with FERC --

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Yes.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- is the point. The regulatory -- whoever is dealing with it, the regulatory agencies are going to have to say, and as are all the --

MR. COPELAND: But just in referring to -- you know, let's say the Town did take over the responsibility for the river, does it become a state issue at that point, versus federal, as far as -- I just find this whole fish passage thing so convoluted. Again, going back to the fact that it's going to be mandated, we have to do it, and, yet, everybody who has had exposure to it is saying

that they don't work. So you can spend a lot of money for something that doesn't work. It's like buying a --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: In many cases you're required to spend more money, which is one of the uncertainties. Thanks for the comment, though. There are things that we don't know.

MR. HEINZ: Can I just kind of make a point of clarification about fish ladders? I'm not saying that they never work, they don't work. It's just hard to make them work. The science is inexact. It's nonlinear. You know, they'll design these things and you pay big money and oh, this is going to work. They'll install them and for some reason, really only to the fish, it doesn't work.

Then, they do something like, hmm, well, the fish are stacking up over there. Maybe if we move this thing 10 feet, it will work. So they spend another 100,000, \$200,000 to move it and low and behold, it works. But that's really what we're saying. I don't -- I don't want to, you know, it's wrong to say they never work, 'cause they do. It's just hard to make them work.

And the other part of it is, I don't know of any instances where fish get -- can pass more than two fish ladders. There's certainly, you know, plenty more stuff going on upstream in the Mousam.

So, anyway, thank you.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you.

MR. HANSEN: My name is Ward Hansen. I'm not running for president, if you waited for a half-hour to be able to watch my comedy show. I just wanted to bring attention to a few items. I would urge everyone, regarding property values, to read the letter that the Copelands posted in the Post this week. You will hear people talk about studies that say, well, property values went up, but if you are careful to look at it, some of these studies might end in 2008. Well, if you took out the dams in 2003, chances are the property values at that time trashed and they went down, but we had a 20 percent appreciation for five years in a row in the real estate market, so that masked the truth. They site some real world very recent incidences right here in Kennebunk that draw attention to the value.

The second thing is about the fish ladders. I believe it was Barry Tibbetts, but I'm not sure, at the end of the November 16th meeting, there has been talk about whether there is ledge behind the Kesslen Dam. Does anyone know -- he said something like a five or six foot ledge. I guess my question is, is there a way of doing it? Could you send a scuba diver down there? Can we find out?

Because if there's ledge there, then the fish never came up or never would get up. So then you're going to hear the argument, well, let's put fish ladders in. Oh, wait a minute. Fish ladders don't work. So what's it going to be? You want to have it both ways.

And then the other thing is, as I mentioned early on about the dredging, if you dredge between where the Kesslen Dam was and up to the rock bands at Sayward Street, then they're going to face another formidable rock band that is also right above where all the kayakers put in at Berry Court. And like Mr. Coleman stated, we have seen a proliferation of kayakers, paddle boards, and canoes in the last two years. I mean, I would just have to estimate alone, there's probably 500 single trips up and down in the course of a year.

And then another issue is, Mr. Coleman mentioned about anaerobic versus aerobic. We don't know. So we really don't know whether plant life will come back on the, what I would call, the muddy banks. Down at our part of the river they are very steep and quite dangerous.

And then it was also mentioned, I think you're aware of, in the last few years, there's been a problem with Triple E, with West Nile, and Lyme Disease. Last summer -- I work outside a lot, and I don't know where I picked it up, but I picked up, not only Lyme Disease, but a tick-borne illness called Ehrlichiosis. Like many people with Obama Care, my history over the years has been that by the time I go see a doctor, I'm already getting better, so why do I want to fork over a few hundred dollars?

Well, I was fortunate, because the doctor had a lot of experience with Lyme Disease and he was very forceful in getting me to take a blood test. It's a good thing because Ehrlichiosis untreated is fatal. It doesn't take -- if -- on the other hand, if you just get Lyme Disease and you don't treat it within about a month or so, you're messed up for the rest of your life. I've seen people, I've met people, and there's even been doctors who have treated people, okay, 20 years and they're told, oh, you're crazy. There's nothing wrong with you, and it's a miserable thing.

And then the final thing was just, alewife farmers and lobstermen, fishermen were mentioned. I don't know why they play into it, because this should be about the Kennebunk ratepayers. It's our money, it's our taxes, and all these outside interests that stands to gain, I -- and I wish, also, we could finally get a per month, per ratepayer amount of all the four different options, because I hear these millions of dollars and I think it just scares the public and it frightens them into making an improper decision. I really think we should push for that.

Thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We have five more minutes. It looks like we have one more.

MR. BOWEN: I have a couple of things, one question. It was very interesting to me when the dam was drawn down to take a close look, a very close look at the actual river bottom that was there; not looking at the mud on the side which, of course, would dry out in a matter of days. But, you know, the water was down for a day and then back up again, as I understand it.

I'm wondering, number one, have you guys -- do you have any plans to draw down any of the other dams in the near future so we might see what the river bottom looks like in, you know, the upper sections?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: If and when we do those drawdowns for other reasons, it is the intent to do flyovers and so what those --

MR. BOWEN: But you don't have any plans, per se?

GENERAL MANAGER SHEA: Not at -- no, we don't. Nothing is scheduled.

MR. BOWEN: Okay. And I'll just say, this is -- this is totally my opinion, of course, when I looked at that stream when the dam was drawn down, I saw an amazing sight, to me. Because what I saw was a sandy river bottom with ledges at various places, about every hundred yards or so, as you went up the river, and I saw that the original river that had been there for 12,000 plus years was actually still there. I was amazed to see a sandy bottom right at Kesslen, except for very -- right up close to the dam, and that water -- and that is because that is the geology of York County.

If you look at the Little Ossipee River, it's very similar in size to the Mousam, you'll see that kind of river bottom, and that's the kind of thing we're going to end up with when -- you know, if the dams come down. It's not going to be a muddy swamp and, to me, it's a beautiful thing.

I think I saw sandy beaches where people would want to go out and hang out on the beach like you'd see on the Saco River. Have you ever canoed down the Saco? It's one of the most popular canoeing destinations in York County, and the reason it's so popular is that sandy bottom river, and this river has a lot of sand both -- particularly above the Kesslen Dam. You have to actually look at the bottom of the river, not look at the base that just got drawn down.

Anyway, thanks, guys.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: Thank you, Mr. Bowen. Thanks a lot.

All right. We have two minutes left. We're going to -- if you could just keep it to one. We do need to adjourn the meeting.

Do you have a quick comment?

MS. TEAGUE: Yes. Just to respond to that. Don't get too excited about sandy bottoms. If you are where we are, which is close -- it's before the turnpike, it's clay and mud and then, I understand from the Pattersons, it's all clay up where they are.

So, my questions is this: Tuesday at the Selectmen's meeting, Chairman Donovan made a very strong statement that once you folks make your decision, you know, the Town is going to get involved, or disseminate information, or -- I'm not sure what the right word is, sort of step in and help, and that he was thinking it would go to a public vote in November. Are you guys talking to each other and is that anywhere on your radar screen?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We are.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay. Great.

What happens right after the --

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: The Town and our general manager have been having regular dialogue.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay. I'm glad to hear that.

What happens right after the -- you know, when you say you're going to make a decision, does that mean you're going to make the filing or you're just going to make the decision?

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: This board has to deliberate --

MS. TEAGUE: Yes.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: -- and make a decision, and presumably, part of that decision would be what work needs to be done and when the filing will be made.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We have not had any discussion about the subject that you just brought up.

MS. TEAGUE: Okay. So the decision doesn't mean the filing? It gets confusing.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: No, no. The filing needs to be made by March of 2017.

MS. TEAGUE: Right. Okay.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: And, of course, there's preparation to make that filing.

MS. TEAGUE: Sure, sure. Okay. Thank you, very much.

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: You're welcome.

MS. TEAGUE: Thank you for this evening.

Whereupon, Item VIII, Closing Remarks and Thank You To The Public For Attending The Event, occurred as follows:

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: All right. Thanks, everybody, for coming.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT KILBOURN: We really do appreciate the feedback and I would like to very much encourage people to talk together outside of these meetings. It may be more productive.

Whereupon, as there were no additional comments from the public, the public forum concluded at 8:50 p.m.

- - -

Whereupon, Item VII, Reminder to Public of Future KLPD Board of Trustees Meeting Dates, was discussed. A discussion occurred regarding the next scheduled meeting of the KLPD Board of Trustees, which is currently scheduled for January 26, 2016. A discussion then ensued regarding the timetable facing the District in regard to the dam issue, the Board of Selectmen from the Town of Kennebunk, and the final report that will be forthcoming from Wright-Pierce.

President Kilbourn stated that General Manager Shea will be providing the Board with his recommendations to finalize the Wright-Pierce report, which will be based upon all the questions that have been heard and what the Board has given to General Manager Shea. President Kilbourn feels that after the final report is received, public deliberation would be warranted to further discuss any outstanding issues.

Vice-President Berry, along with the other Board members, discussed the timeline in regard to the timing of the receipt of the finalized Wright-Pierce report, along with the possibility of engaging with the Board of Selectmen from the Town of Kennebunk in a workshop surrounding the dam issue. The specific goals mentioned in engaging in a workshop would be to learn of the Town's intentions along with enabling the District to explain to the Board of Selectmen the timelines and constraints that the District is faced with. Vice-President Berry reminded the Board that originally the dams were offered for public purchase as strictly generating dams, in which there was no response from any potential purchaser. He stated that if the dams were to be sold, they do not have to be sold to the same party, and they don't need to be sold as electro-generating dams. Generation cessation was then briefly discussed along with other topics, including rates and power production.

General Manager Shea will converse with Barry Tibbetts in regard to the potential of a combined workshop.

General Manager Shea will provide his suggestions to the Board by January 19, 2016 in regard to the final report. The goal will be to forward those directives to Wright-Pierce by the end of the week.

There being no additional business of the District, Vice-President Berry asked for a motion to adjourn. Clerk Jordan made the motion and it was seconded by Trustee Emmons.

Whereupon, with unanimous ayes heard, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Attest: _____
Michael Jordan, Clerk