

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x
City of Radford, Virginia Project No. 1235-017
- - - - - x

MUNICIPAL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

City of Radford Public Safety Bldg
10 Robertson Street
Radford, Virginia 24141

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

The public comment meeting, pursuant to notice, convened
at 10:00 a.m.

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

2 MS. CONNER: Good morning. We will open up our
3 morning scoping meeting for the Municipal Hydroelectric
4 Project at this time. Since it's a pretty small crowd,
5 we'll just go around and introduce ourselves. Our
6 affiliation. Please state your name loudly and clearly for
7 our wonderful court reporter so he can get that in the
8 record correctly.

9 I am Allyson Conner. I'm the Project Coordinator
10 on the FERC side and the outdoor recreation planner as well
11 as recreation, cultural, land use and aesthetics resources.
12

13 MR. CALLIHAN: Jody Callihan, Fish biologist at
14 FERC and I'll be working on aquatics and water quality for
15 the project.

16 MR. LOGWOOD: Tim Logwood. City of Radford
17 Electric Department Director.

18 MS. JUKUPCA: I'm Allison Jukupca, Kleinschmidt
19 and Associates.

20 MS. WALTERS: Laura Walters. New River
21 Conservancy.

22 MS. CONNER: Are you sure, Laura, have you
23 already signed in?

24 MS. WALTERS: Yes, ma'am.

25 MS. CONNER: Signed in, so we're good with that.

1 There are copies of the scoping document if you didn't get
2 one, that you're welcome to take with you. Again, I want to
3 mention that we have our court reporter with us, so all
4 comments are going to go on the record. So we understand
5 the issues that have been brought up. And again, each time
6 you speak, it will help our court reporter if we state our
7 name. Eventually, it's easy to get out of habit, so, it
8 just helps to state your name each time.

9 As far as our meeting today. This is a quick
10 overview of what we're going to go through. I'll give a
11 brief introduction to FERC. We'll talk about the licensing
12 process that we're going through. I'll explain a little
13 more in depth what scoping means. Then Alison Jakupca will
14 give an overview of the Municipal Project.

15 So, we'll get some more information on specific
16 operations. Then we'll go through the resource issues and
17 talk about anything that we want to discuss in our
18 environmental assessment. Then at the end, there will be a
19 time for any questions and comments. Just make a note of a
20 question that you have, or any comments, we definitely want
21 to have time at the end for that. So just continue on with
22 our presentation and at the end we'll have the opportunity
23 to have a question and comment period.

24 What does FERC do? There are several
25 responsibilities. The main one that we're going to talk

1 about today is the responsibility to authorize the
2 construction, operation and maintenance of non-federal
3 hydroelectric projects that are in the public interest. So,
4 this next graphic shows over 1,600 FERC regulated hydropower
5 projects. Again, there are several other federal dams and
6 dams that don't generate electricity across the U.S. So,
7 this is simply FERC-licensed hydropower projects and as you
8 can see, they're mostly concentrated on the West Coast and
9 the East Coast where there's elevations, mountainous
10 regions. This is enough electricity to power between 10 to
11 15 million households annually. So, that's a lot of
12 electricity being produced.

13 The licensing process, the end goal is a license
14 order and in this license order there are listed the terms
15 and conditions for operations. So, it talks about many
16 different aspects of how the project is operated, whether it
17 be flow constraints, recreation access, fish habitats,
18 cultural resources that are being protected. So, it lists
19 these out in a clear manner of how for the next 30 to 50
20 years the license is to be operated. We do include the
21 environmental protection mitigation and enhancement
22 measures, and this is what we're talking about today, is how
23 can we protect the environment and those will be included in
24 the license order.

25 How do we get there? Part of that process is

1 today, is receiving input from stakeholders. From the folks
2 that live nearby, the folks that access the resource, that
3 use the resource, that live near the resource. It's
4 important for us to understand how it fits into the regional
5 lifestyles of folks that live here. We are continuing that
6 process today; we are I'd say we're about halfway through
7 the relicensing process. The City of Radford has done lots
8 of studies prior to today, and the scoping process continues
9 that and starts to become more of a Commission-related
10 process as far as writing the environmental document.

11 So, just a little bit of background, the current
12 license was issued in 1989. It was issued for a period of
13 30 years. So we have about, a little less than two years
14 until that license expires, so the goal will be to issue a
15 license before that expiration date. It is possible if some
16 other issue happens to arise, if we pass the expiration
17 date, we can issue annual licenses that allow operations to
18 continue.

19 So, to date this is a list of processes that have
20 happened. As I mentioned, the City of Radford filed their
21 license application. That was on May 30th. Then during
22 June and July, Commission Staff was reviewing the license
23 application. We were looking to see, were there questions
24 that we had, was there additional information that we
25 needed? Were there deficiencies? And that is looking at

1 the Code of Federal Regulations and saying, 'Did they
2 provide A, B, and C there, that are listed in these
3 regulations?' So, that letter was sent out August 3rd, and
4 then we also issued our scoping document which is the
5 process we're here for today, on September 1st. And then
6 that leads us to today, which is having our public scoping
7 meetings.

8 So, the first of the Additional Information
9 Request, or AIR, deficiency response was due yesterday and
10 was actually filed on Friday. That was taken care of, so
11 now our team will review the AIR and deficiency response,
12 and if we don't have any more questions, then we'll decide
13 if it's ready for environmental review. If is ready for
14 environmental review, that's when we start our environmental
15 assessment process; we start writing the document that talks
16 about the project as a whole. If we find that we have a few
17 more questions then we may possibly issue another Additional
18 Information Request. So, it's not set in stone that we have
19 to go straight into the environmental assessment. We want
20 to make sure we understand the project and we have enough
21 information to provide an analysis.

22 So, once the environmental assessment is issued,
23 that is when agencies can submit any revised terms and
24 conditions. We would analyze 10J recommendations which
25 would be mandatory Fish & Wildlife recommendations. If we

1 find that some of the 10Js are maybe not quite related to
2 fish and wildlife, we might analyze them under 10A, which is
3 more of a recommendation as opposed to a mandatory
4 condition.

5 And then we would issue a final Environmental
6 Assessment if we need to. If we found that there was a lot
7 of comments on the first environmental assessment, if we
8 got just a whole slew of things that really needed to be
9 reanalyzed. If it's somewhat minimal, then we can also
10 choose to address that in the actual license order. We
11 would include any terms and conditions and recommendations.

12

13 So, we have, again, a couple of options going
14 forward. So, we may just issue one Environmental
15 Assessment. We may find that it needs to go into a draft
16 and a final. So, that's still to be determined.

17 Then the Commission decision comes in the form of
18 a license order, as I mentioned, where it list how the
19 project is to be operated for the next license term. And
20 then once the license order is issued, there is a period of
21 30 days where parties that have intervenor status, which
22 means that they requested intervention earlier in the
23 licensing process, to have this opportunity at this moment
24 to raise their hand and say, 'Excuse me, I have a question
25 or we need to re-discuss this and come to a different

1 conclusion.' So, for a period of 30 days that we have that
2 period that allows for rehearing, that the order can be re-
3 discussed and possibly reissued with adjustments.

4 Scoping. What exactly is scoping? It is time
5 for us to identify any environmental issues and concerns.
6 We want to know what are the potential effects of the
7 project. How is the project affecting aquatics species,
8 terrestrial species, fish and their environment, how people
9 are perceiving the project, how they are using it, is it
10 accessible, is there enough water, are they able to launch a
11 boat? Just a whole broad picture of how this project is
12 impacting the environment.

13 And then to be able to do that we need lots of
14 information. If there is existing information, reports that
15 have been done in the past. There were studies done
16 specifically for this project quite recently. And then any
17 new information which is coming from any stakeholders, any
18 local landowners who want to give us information that maybe
19 we didn't have access to yet. So, there's two sources that
20 will help us to gather any information that we can use to
21 write this environmental assessment.

22 It also involves identifying and receiving input
23 on resources that may be cumulatively affected. This is
24 when we consider the effect of the project in conjunction
25 with other activities in the river basin. So, imagine you

1 have a 70 mile stretch of river and maybe there's five dams
2 along the way and we're discussing the dam at the bottom of
3 those five dams on the stretch of river. Then there's
4 impacts that multiply because there are dams immediately
5 above that last dam.

6 So, we want to know, are there resources that do
7 have this cumulative impacts? We want to know are there any
8 other reasonable alternatives to the project or to the
9 applicant's proposed actions? There may be things that we
10 haven't quite thought of and it's nice to know what are some
11 other alternatives, what are the thoughts that folks have on
12 how project operations should be. We would also want
13 information on resources that maybe don't require quite of
14 an as detailed analysis but maybe just need to be
15 mentioned. Sometimes aesthetics tends to fall in this. You
16 know, is it aesthetically pleasing, is it not aesthetically
17 pleasing, how could we maybe change that up.

18 So, just be thinking about these topics. These
19 are just information gaps, places that haven't quite
20 identified everything; and again, just jot those down and we
21 can discuss those at the end of the presentation.

22 So, listed are seven resource groups, geology and
23 soils resource, aquatic, terrestrial, threatened and
24 endangered species, recreation land use, aesthetics and
25 cultural, and then developmental resources. These are

1 resources that we identified for this project specifically.
2 We'll go through those in a little bit more detail in just a
3 few minutes.

4 So, now I'm going to hand this over to Allison
5 Jakupca, and she'll give us an overview of the project.

6 MS. JAKUPCA: Thank you, Allyson. Allyson asked
7 that I give just a brief overview of the project and its
8 components, and a general outline of the project area.

9 This presentation is very similar to the one I
10 gave at the joint agency meeting. I have updated it based
11 on our discussion and proposed measures, study results.

12 So, here is a view of the project. Obviously
13 this is prior to 2014, because it's generating. You can see
14 the flow right at the powerhouse; hopefully that will be
15 happening again in the next couple of months.

16 Just a brief location-wise, it is right after the
17 Little River, it is at mile marker .45, so that's almost a
18 half a mile upstream of the confluence with the New and
19 consequently Claytor Dam is also .5 miles upstream of the
20 confluence where the Little River comes in. So, it
21 basically creates a big triangle. FERC project number 1235
22 if any of you are familiar with that, and that's how you
23 look up the project on the eLibrary if you want to find any
24 of the information that we come up with during the
25 relicensing process, or if you want to look through the

1 file.

2 It was constructed and began operation in 1934, I
3 think they began construction in 1933. Tim, I think you
4 said it took ten months or so to build the dam?

5 MR. LOGWOOD: According to the research done.

6 MS. JAKUPCA: Yes, by Bruce Harvey?

7 MR. LOGWOOD: Bruce Harvey, yes.

8 MS. JAKUPCA: If you haven't read the historical
9 report it provides a pretty interesting background of the
10 project. Owned and operated by the City of Radford. The
11 previous FERC license, it was a relicensing back then as
12 well, it was issued in 1989, and we have a couple of years
13 yet before this current license expires. I know that FERC
14 is hoping to get it issued prior to that date.

15 Just a basic overview of the project facilities.
16 The concrete dam is approximately 300 feet long or just
17 under, 293. And it is about 60 feet tall, it's 58 feet
18 high. It has 8 tainter gates and 2 sluice gates and about
19 30 feet of gross head.

20 There has been some sedimentation that has
21 occurred in the reservoir since the time it was constructed.
22 The, if you look at a recent bathymetry report, right in
23 front of the powerhouse it does have a little channel where
24 the flow obviously goes through the powerhouse, and there's
25 a little more sedimentation up towards the top of the dam.

1 This is a nice clean view of the inside of the
2 powerhouse right now. It's a little torn apart as they
3 rehabilitate the unit at the moment, but it is a concrete
4 and brick powerhouse structure, and that was assessed for
5 the architectural relevance on the historical side. It has
6 a steel-lined penstock going to one turbine. The turbine is
7 1.2 megawatts. It's a Kaplan-type turbine. It has a
8 generator that's a little bit higher in capacity than the
9 turbine, so it is a turbine-limited project.

10 The turbine has a rated hydraulic capacity of 430
11 CFS. It is concrete placement right now, so the hydraulic
12 capacity will stay the same. There is a steel trash rack on
13 the intake, 3 inch by 5/16th inch trash rack. And I think
14 that 2.5 inches off center is -- well, of course, all of
15 that is correct, but that's the spacing. Some people are
16 able to visualize it better than I am.

17 The interconnection. The City is proposing to
18 alter the project boundary to account for transmission
19 changes over the previous license. The previous license,
20 the transmission line was 2.7 miles long. We did a review
21 of the TFR rig and determined that the point of
22 interconnection is this little power pole. It's very hard
23 to see on this, I should have blown it up, I don't know why
24 I didn't.

25 There's a power pole right here and it's about

1 560 feet, you notice the power lines that come across the
2 river from the powerhouse. That power pole is where we
3 determine the point of interconnection is because from that
4 point, the power lines go out to feed other sources along
5 its length. So, because of the sources distribution to the
6 grid, this power is flowing both directions.

7 So there is a slight jog in the project boundary
8 from the original maps. Although the original maps were
9 developed in 1942. So, they are a bit interesting to
10 decipher as well. We did a bathymetry study as part of the
11 relicensing. Laura, I think we went over this in our last
12 meeting, but the original measurements are the reservoir
13 were a 350-acre reservoir and a little bit over 1,100 acre-
14 feet of storage. Our bathymetry survey that we conducted
15 with the ADPT unit determined that it was - there was some
16 sedimentation that occurred. We're coming up with a 77-acre
17 reservoir at this point and 560 acre-feet of storage.

18 These numbers are reliable. The numbers back
19 from the Thirties, maybe; they probably measured things
20 differently back then. We know they did. So these are the
21 current numbers for the reservoir storage. The project
22 boundary extends about 3.5 miles upstream of the dam.

23 The existing project facilities consist of the
24 boat ramp and the canoe portage. We are proposing
25 improvements for the relicensing. The reservoir bank

1 fishing area, we're talking about putting a bench in the
2 area that people seem to be using quite a bit, right
3 upstream of the dam. And then we're discussing canoe
4 portage improvements, maybe improving the grade, the
5 signage; and we are also discussing putting a picnic
6 shelter in that big swath of open grass right as you enter
7 the recreation site and project site.

8 Project operations. This is just a general
9 overview taken from the city's plan with FERC that's on file
10 with FERC. As we know, project operations are flow-
11 dependent. It's operated as a modified run-of-river in that
12 it is used both as a run-of-river facility and as a facility
13 that operates peak shaving capabilities to the city.

14 There is a minimum flow, 25 CFS, that always
15 passes downstream. This goes around those tainter gates,
16 that was determined through that minimum flow study that was
17 done back in '88. And the city is not proposing any changes
18 to operations from how the project is currently licensed to
19 operate in the new license terms.

20 And I think that's about it. Did I miss
21 anything?

22 MS. CONNER: All right. So, on page 10 and 11 is
23 where the resource issues that we've identified thus far in
24 our scoping document are listed. Again, make note of any
25 additional issues or concerns that come up; any issues that

1 you agree and disagree with and why. We would love to hear
2 those comments at the end.

3 So, geology and soils. What we're looking at is
4 what are the effects of project-related reservoir
5 fluctuations on geology and soils; specifically with the
6 reservoir shoreline erosion and how is it being impacted.

7 Aquatic resources. We have multiple issues that
8 have been identified. Things like water quality; DO and
9 water temperature; the minimum flow; affects on spawning.
10 The flow fluctuations, entrainment and impingement
11 mortality. And then also how does operation and maintenance
12 impact species of special concern such as the Eastern
13 hellbender. These are issues that will be discussed in our
14 environmental assessment so that we can have a fuller
15 picture of what is going on.

16 With terrestrial resources. We want to know the
17 affects of the project's up to three foot daily reservoir
18 drawdown and any associated downstream flow fluctuations on
19 wetland and associated wildlife resources.

20 With threatened and endangered species. The
21 Virginia Fringed Mountain Snail has been identified as
22 having a habitat in this area so we want to make sure we're
23 not impacting this cute little guy.

24 Recreation resources. We want to know is what is
25 there, is it adequate? Do we need additional access? Do we

1 need better trails? We went to the site yesterday. We
2 reviewed those and we did discuss, and there are some
3 recommendations, or proposals rather, from the City of
4 Radford. So, we'll assess if that is enough to meet the
5 demand.

6 Cultural resources. What are the effects of
7 continued project operation and maintenance on historic
8 properties, archaeological resources and traditional
9 cultural properties. And the dam is 80 years old now, so it
10 could be listed - I mean it will be treated as listed,
11 being listed on the National Register of Historic Places,
12 even if it is not, surely because of its age.

13 And then developmental resources. What are the
14 effects of any recommended environmental measure on
15 economics of the project? There are certain
16 recommendations that could make the project not economical.
17 So, we want to make sure that that's not the case.

18 So submitting or filing any comments and study
19 requests, this is a little overview of how that can happen.
20 We will have the chance later to give oral comments, then
21 there will also be a 30-day period that will end November
22 2nd to file comments electronically with the Commission.
23 And eFiling is our preferred method, you can still, you
24 know, write a letter if you so choose; but instructions to
25 eFile are on, yes, page 13 of the Scoping Document as well

1 as we have some brochures in the back that explain that
2 process and give you step-by-step instructions.

3 So how do you keep in the loop, how to know what
4 is going on with the project? The FERC Online is a brochure
5 that explains how to get connected into all of our
6 eSubscription, our eLibrary resources online. With
7 eSubscription, you would receive an email notification of
8 all filings and issuances. There's a link included in that
9 email so you're not getting just big documents mailed to
10 you. It's quite easy, just click on the link and it takes
11 you to the filing or the issuance. Then eLibrary is our
12 repository for all public documents for the project. This
13 is where there are archives so you can do some history
14 research from the beginning of the project. It might be a
15 little difficult to access some of those documents, but for
16 the last 30 years it will be pretty easy to get to those
17 things through eLibrary. Again, the brochures in the back
18 will give step-by-step instructions.

19 And then we also have our mailing list. If you
20 want to receive hard copies of issuances, then that can be
21 done by requesting your name be added to the mailing list
22 through the FERConlinesupport@ferc.gov.

23 So at this point I will open the floor up for any
24 oral comments. Again, if you would state your name and your
25 affiliation, we'll take those and have a discussion and wrap

1 it up after that. So, I'll open it up.

2 If you would like to, state your name.

3 MS. WALTERS: This is Laura Walters and I guess
4 my question is - in the EA, all of our comments that were
5 previously submitted will be considered, right? So, we
6 don't need to rehash those comments. Is that correct?

7 MS. CONNER: It is correct. It's always
8 beneficial to either refer back to those comments or to
9 resubmit. We do go back through them, but again, it can be
10 easy to miss comments. We try our best not to miss
11 comments; however, sometimes our eLibrary system has a
12 malfunction or it's filed under the wrong project number.
13 So you just never quite know so to be honest, it would be
14 great if you want to, you can refile the exact same comments
15 if you so choose. You know, nothing has changed, but it's
16 nice to have the most up-to-date and recent comments if
17 possible.

18 MR. CALLIHAN: I guess, too, it depends too, on
19 how adequate you feel the FLA addressed any questions or
20 comments that you had. If you still feel like there are
21 pieces missing and your inquiry has not been addressed
22 adequately, then that would be good to send us something
23 else, if it's not satisfied in the FLA.

24 MS. CONNER: Any other comment you would like to
25 address, Laura?

1 MS. WALTERS: No, I'll refile what I had sent in
2 previously and yes, it's just the big concern is the affect
3 on the fish habitat within the project boundary due to the
4 sedimentation and the fluctuations with operations with the
5 three foot daily fluctuation is a big concern, of course the
6 DO; to go downstream below the dam.

7 MS. CONNER: Tim, are there any clarifications or
8 anything you would like to give?

9 MR. LOGWOOD: No.

10 MS. CONNER: Do you have anything, Alison?

11 MS. JAKUPCA: I think we responded to the
12 comments as best as we could, from the City's point of view
13 in the FLA comment matrix. I know some of those questions
14 were - it's a difficult question to answer, so we responded
15 as best we could considering all of the developmental and
16 non-developmental aspects.

17 This project provides a lot of benefit to the
18 city and economics are hugely important, especially with the
19 concern of installing the new unit and proceeding in good
20 faith that everything will move forward and the project will
21 still provide a good economic benefit to the city.

22 So, in the comment matrix we only were able to
23 provide maybe answers that everyone liked or was, you know,
24 all joyous about; but we responded the best that we could.

25 MS. WALTERS: Well, I think it's doubly hard

1 because it's - we're not generating right now, so we don't
2 really know. I mean that, this just makes it all
3 difficult.

4 MS. JAKUPCA: Yes, and it's -- you're drawing the
5 kind of basic information prior to the project having the
6 turbine failure, and of course, for our FERC timeframe, that
7 couldn't have happened at a worse time. Thinking about the
8 studies that we performed and how those could have
9 potentially been affected by not operating, and I really
10 can't think of anything. The mussel study, I don't think
11 that was at all taken aback by the project not being able to
12 operate because they were able to operate because they were
13 able to look at the mussels under full pool conditions. On
14 the ABCP study for the bathymetry, they needed to do data
15 full pool anyway, so
16 even if the project was operating they would have had to try
17 and get it as high, close to the high water mark as
18 possible. Same with the wetland survey, and the historical
19 surveys were not affected by it.

20 So, I think all-in-all that the relicensing
21 process didn't - it wasn't, the study process wasn't
22 severely affected by the non-operations. If we were doing
23 some sort of fluctuation study, that would have, of course,
24 been affected. But that was not one that we ended up doing
25

as a result of scoping.

1 So I think the packet that we put together was
2
3 actually fairly complete considering all of what we were up
4 against. It's a good process. You get to know everybody
5 really well and you try and everybody has their, where
6 they're coming from and what is important to them. It's
7 been great working with all of you.

8 MS. WALTERS: Thank you.

9 MS. CONNER: One final moment to make sure
10 there's no questions left hanging in the balance.

11 MR. CALLIHAN: I have one or two.

12 MS. CONNER: Yes.

13 MR. CALLIHAN: This is a project owned and
14 operated by the City. I'm just kind of curious if you could
15 provide some insight on kind of where that electricity goes
16 and how it's serving and benefiting the city residents, if
17 you can speak to that at all.

18 MR. LOGWOOD: Sure. The electricity from the
19 plant goes into our distribution system. How that benefits
20 the citizens of Radford is it saves the city money which
21 saves our customers money by reducing the amount of energy
22 and capacity or demand that we purchase from Appalachian
23 Power.

24 MR. CALLIHAN: Thank you. There have been some
25 inquiries from landowners about knowing what the release

schedule would be ahead of time is that, is that feasible?

1 A few days to a week in advance to have some kind of flow
2 release schedule website up or not? Is that something that
3 is feasible?

4 MR. LOGWOOD: I think it's feasible on
5 temperature. to predict a city baseload demand, the way our
6 load is now. Historically, it has not been feasible when
7 we had large industry here, because our peak could occur at
8 any time. So trying to predict our demand on a daily or
9 weekly basis -- we can target mornings in wintertime and
10 summertime and evenings and afternoons. The other months,
11 it's harder to predict.

12 MR. CALLIHAN: Is that like, mainly like for air
13 conditioning and peak demand, say in the summer and heat in
14 the winter?

15 MR. LOGWOOD: Right, heat in the morning. The
16 other issue during the summer, the students are out, so
17 that's a big load off our system. They come at the end of
18 August and leave in May. So.

19 MS. CONNER: That's a noticeable change.

20 MR. LOGWOOD: It's a noticeable change when
21 students are here.

22 MS. CONNER: How large is the university?

23 MR. LOGWOOD: They're over six megawatts, is
24 their peak demand.

25 MR. CALLIHAN: Are there any other power plants

1 or anything that feed into that, the local grid? All right.
2 MS. CONNER: All right. Well, good. All right.

3 We'll officially close this scoping meeting, and I
4 appreciate you all coming in and the questions and the
5 discussion.

6 And again, we have until November 2nd is when we
7 ask that you eFile any comments, scoping comments. Then our
8 next issuances from the Commission would be - again, if we
9 needed more information we have another Additional
10 Information Request. If not, this coming January would be
11 the goal for us to issue our notice that says we are ready
12 to start writing our Environmental Analysis. Then from that
13 point, the EA most likely issued by September 2018. Then
14 you move forward through comments, and then hopefully
15 license issuance before May 2019.

16 Again, thank you so much for coming and have a
17 wonderful day. Oh?

18 MR. LOGWOOD: Can I add one more comment?

19 MS. CONNER: Please, yes.

20 MR. LOGWOOD: To your question, we also would
21 have water flow; that's the big factor in predicting.

22 MS. CONNER: For that you mean posting a
23 generation schedule?

24 MR. LOGWOOD: Forecasting water flow.

25 MS. CONNER: All right.

1 MR. LOGWOOD: High water flows, we don't run it.

2

It puts a lot of pressure on the turbine. Flood situations.

3 MS. CONNER: You don't.

4 MR. LOGWOOD: We have to shut it down. We have

5

to open a gate, significantly. We have to shut it down

6

because that force of water is pretty hard on the turbine.

7 MS. CONNER: So, operations don't occur in flood-

8

type situations?

9 MR. LOGWOOD: Correct.

10 MR. CALLIHAN: So like a general flow that that

11

happens?

12 MR. LOGWOOD: We generally have had a practice

13

of, if we have to open a flood gate full height or

14

something, we would have to pull -- it just saves on

15

maintenance. That hasn't always been the case but in recent

16

years it seemed to be hard on the bearing housing and

17

everything else. It kind of makes sense because the water

18

coming through the turbine is interacting with the water

19

coming out of the gate.

20 MS. JAKUPCA: Yes, the water is higher at the

21

bottom coming from the dam, then to --

22 MR. LOGWOOD: So maybe some back pressure.

23 MS. JAKUPCA: Right.

24 MR. CALLIHAN: You lose head anyway during a big

25

flood, if it's really -- head differential isn't straight.

1 MR. LOGWOOD: Right, you lose your head.

2 MS. JAKUPCA: At Claytor --

3 MR. LOGWOOD: Yes. In most cases, not in all

4 cases.

5 MS. WALTERS: Was the concern or questions from

6 residents downstream just because of the river level, or was
7 it?

8 MR. CALLIHAN: That was upstream.

9 MR. LOGWOOD: From yesterday's comments, yes.

10 MS. WALTERS: At Claytor we watched the gauges

11 all the way upstream. We could pretty well tell in flood
12 situations what's coming and what's going. You could look
13 at below the dam and above the dam at the gauges and figure
14 out if it's going to flood or not flood.

15 MR. LOGWOOD: I know at Claytor they release

16 water sometimes ahead of time. They have a bigger bathtub.

17 MS. WALTERS: They do have a bigger bathtub. For

18 Claytor, we watch the Allisonia and the Galax gauges. If
19 flow were higher in Radford and lower there, then it's going
20 down; but vice versa, and then AP will also notify Friends
21 of Claytor Lake and will put out web notices of flood
22 issues.

23 MS. CONNER: Would there be a likely scenario of

24 doing kind of summing somewhere with the Radford context?
25

Or does that seem to be not a something that has been

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

brought up as needed.

MS. WALTERS: I know that AEP notifies FOCL for landowners on the lake. If they're going to pull four feet in advance of an impending big storm coming like the hurricane that was supposed to have just come through. Supposed to just come through but really -- they'll do a notification, then we notify on our website that we put out e-mail to people to secure their waterfront; boats, docks, etcetera.

And they also put it on their website, on their facebook page and all those kinds of things. So, it could be replicated, I would think, just the different flow levels. If individuals are really interested they can get it anyway just by looking at the USGS gauges.

That is, I guess a possibility, just to add that onto the website, the Radford website.

MS. CONNER: So, the proximity -- it might make sense, for the future, we need to be able to go to one place and see what's going on. That was the comments from landowners yesterday, it would be nice to have an understanding of what the water is doing. They may not be familiar with USGS gauges and looking them up.

MS. WALTERS: I mean there are even phone apps you can get; Riverflow.net and things like that that I watch

all the time.

1 MS. CONNER: Right. Maybe in the recreation
2 plan, even just putting like, 'These are other places to
3 gather the information.' Personally, it wasn't a large
4 constituency that was asking for that but I'm sure there are
5 other landowners nearby it could impact. I wouldn't -- a
6 great effort would be required, you know, just a little bit
7 of --.

8 MS. WALTERS: Certainly downriver, AEP, the
9 Claytor project is going to affect it more than --
10 MS. CONNER: Right.

11 MR. CALLIHAN: So this, for Radford, this is more
12 of an upstream --

13 MS. CONNER: Well, it is, yes. A different
14 story.
15 One last chance.

16 MS. WALTERS: It might just include some of the
17 gauge information you can link to it. And maybe include it
18 on the website. Might solve that problem.

19 MR. LOGWOOD: That would certainly be useful.

20 MS. CONNER: Yes. The Grayson one, that's the
21 one that is --

22 MR. LOGWOOD: I mean, that's the one we use.

23 MS. CONNER: Right. I think something along
24 those lines could be beneficial. Again, minimal effort but
25

some effort.

1 MS. JAKUPCA: The AIR response to the stakeholder
2 group -- have a link to it.

3 MS. WALTERS: Thank you.

4 MS. JAKUPCA: I'll go look for it.

5 MS. CONNER: Yes, sometimes eLibrary is quite the
6 treasure hunt.

7 MS. WALTERS: That's true.

8 MS. JAKUPCA: We struggle with it ourselves. It
9 knows no, what's the saying, it knows no --. You know what
10 I'm saying?

11 MS. WALTERS: It is finicky. You have to go far
12 to find the fun stuff.

13 MS. JAKUPCA: It's taken me 13 years and I'm
14 still --

15 MS. WALTERS: I still struggle, too.

16 MS. CONNER: Jody, you good?

17 MR. CALLIHAN: Good.

18 MS. CONNER: All right. I will officially close
19 it now and again hope you all have a wonderful day. Thank
20 you so much for coming. And we are done.

21 [Whereupon, at 10:01 a.m. the public scoping
22 meeting concluded.]

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4

5 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

6

7 Matter of:

8

9 Name of Proceeding: MUNICIPAL HYDROELECTRIC

10

11 PROJECT

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 Docket No.: Project No. 1235-017

22

23 Place: Radford, VA

24

25 Date: Tuesday, October 3, 2017

26

27 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

28

29 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

30

31 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

32

33 of the proceedings.

34

35 Dan Hawkins

36

37 Official Reporter