

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

+ + + + +

City of Gonzales, Texas

Project No. 2960-005

NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE LICENSE APPLICATION,
FILING OF PREAPPLICATION DOCUMENT (PAD),
COMMENCEMENT OF PRE-FILING PROCESS, AND SCOPING;
REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THE PAD AND SCOPING DOCUMENT,
AND IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES
AND ASSOCIATED STUDY REQUESTS

Thursday, October 22, 2015

10:30 a.m.

City Building
820 St. Joseph Street
Gonzales, Texas 78629

ON BEHALF OF FERC:
RACHEL McNAMARA
MICHAEL SPENCER
888 First Street
Washington, D.C. 20426

I N D E X

1		
2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Rachel McNamara, FERC	3
4	Charlotte Garraway, Schneider Engineering	7
5	Public comment:	
6	Kevin Mayes	14
7	John Botros	16
8	Comments from FERC	22
9	Alan Barnes	23
10	Adjourn	28
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

2 MS. McNAMARA: I have 10:30, so let's go ahead
3 and begin with the meeting. I think everyone here has
4 already signed in, but if you haven't, make sure you sign
5 in to the sign-in sheet.

6 Because the group is so small, feel free to ask
7 questions as you go. When you speak, please state your
8 name, and if you can come to the podium, there's a
9 microphone so the court reporter can hear you; that would
10 be helpful.

11 And if your name needs clarification or
12 spelling, please do so. If you're using an acronym,
13 please describe it the first time you use it. Speak one
14 at a time.

15 And then you can also leave written comments
16 with us, or you can efile them or mail them to the
17 Commission. Comments on the preliminary application
18 document and the scoping document are due November 21,
19 2015.

20 So my name is Rachel McNamara. I'm the Federal
21 Energy Regulatory Commission's relicensing coordinator for
22 the project. During this meeting we'll have some brief
23 introductions; I know we said hello to everyone, so that
24 can go quickly.

25 I will give an overview of our integrated

1 licensing process and where we are in scoping, outline the
2 schedule for relicensing, and then Charlotte will give a
3 description of the project, and then we'll get into the
4 resource issues, study requests, information needs, and
5 allow a kind of open time for comment.

6 Comments can be kind of formal, comments that
7 you've prepared, or we can have a conversation. I mean,
8 it's a small group here, and we can address comments and
9 questions as we go.

10 So as I was mentioning, I'm Rachel McNamara.
11 In addition to coordinating the project, I'm the subject
12 matter expert for recreation land use and cultural
13 resources. In our Washington, D.C. office Adam Peer is
14 our aquatic resources specialist, and Nick Tackett is the
15 terrestrial resource specialist, and then they both deal
16 with threatened and endangered species as they apply to
17 their resource areas.

18 And then with me today is Michael Spencer, and
19 he's our engineer and deals with developmental resources
20 for the project.

21 So in terms of the NOI and PAD -- that's the
22 preliminary application document -- was final on July 24,
23 and we issued our scoping document in September. I think
24 we actually issued it a couple of days early, September
25 18. And then we're here at the scoping meeting now on the

1 22nd of October.

2 So scoping is required by NEPA, the National
3 Environmental Policy Act, to look at issues involved with
4 a federal undertaking. So why is this a federal
5 undertaking? We are issuing a license for a hydropower
6 project, and that's kind of what triggers NEPA in this
7 case.

8 And the purpose of scoping is to get any issues
9 relating to environmental or socioeconomic resources --
10 and we also look at recreation land use the cultural
11 resources -- identified early in the process so that when
12 the license application comes in, we have enough
13 information to be able to analyze what's happening.

14 It also helps us to know if there are not
15 issues that we need to study so we can eliminate from
16 detailed analysis anything that is not really relevant to
17 the project.

18 So coming up, the next few steps are, on the
19 21st of November, filing comments and study requests. So
20 at that point we would look for your thoughts on the
21 scoping document, to see whether we accurately captured
22 the issues, and then any requests for more information, so
23 studies that would be needed.

24 You can also file comments on the PAD that are
25 just general and not a request for study or addressing the

1 scoping document.

2 And then kind of between January and June, we
3 do a study planning process where we will look at the
4 studies that are proposed by the City and any that come in
5 from resource agencies or the public, and then we'll have
6 meetings that -- where we can discuss those studies, and
7 then at kind of the end of the process, the Commission
8 will issue a determination on which studies need to be
9 conducted.

10 And so that happens between January and June,
11 and then there are two years of study that, you know, a
12 study can take one year, it can take two years, it can
13 happen in the first year, it can happen in the second
14 year.

15 And the end of that, the goal is that enough
16 information will be available for the project to prepare
17 full and complete license application. So we would expect
18 the preliminary application coming in in March of 2018.

19 And then once we receive the final license
20 application in July 2018, we start working on our NEPA
21 document, and then that's kind of the process that begins
22 issuing the final license. And the license expires in
23 July of 2020, and so we would hope to have a new license
24 for the project issued before then.

25 So now I'm going to let Charlotte give a

1 description of the project.

2 MS. GARRAWAY: Okay. My name's Charlotte
3 Garraway, with Schneider Engineering. I'm going to go
4 over briefly --

5 (Pause.)

6 MR. SPENCER: I'll just mention, while we're
7 rectifying this technical difficulty, if you've just
8 arrived, if you could sign in on the sign-in sheet, and
9 then any comments you have to make, if you could make them
10 at the podium. There's a sign-in sheet on the podium, and
11 there should be a pen available.

12 That way we can identify who's attended, and
13 we'll be able to identify what comments can be attributed
14 to them.

15 (Pause.)

16 MS. GARRAWAY: That's fine. We'll start on
17 slide 2, so I'll just talk through slide 1.

18 So a brief project history: The Gonzales
19 project was initially developed in 1925 by Central Power
20 and Light of Corpus Christi, so they operated this project
21 in 1965, when the facility was abandoned.

22 In 1980 the City sought to rehabilitate the
23 project, and so that's when the restoration began, and
24 they installed three new generators and governors at the
25 site to make it operational again.

1 So currently the site consists of the dam, the
2 reservoir, powerhouse, the tailrace channel, the
3 distribution lines, and the transformer stepping up to
4 those lines.

5 So as you can see on the screen, the project is
6 located here in Gonzales County, on the Guadalupe at River
7 Mile 167, and its street address is 301 Water Street here
8 in the city of Gonzales.

9 One moment.

10 (Pause.)

11 MS. GARRAWAY: I apologize. I'm not sure why
12 that's not working with us today.

13 So we're just going to go through some photos
14 of the site quickly here. So this is the dam being shown
15 in the photo here, and this photo was taken from
16 downstream, looking back up at the facility.

17 The next slide is showing the intake
18 structures, going into the facility. Then we have the
19 headrace looking upstream; the powerhouse itself; and then
20 the tailrace fishing area, which is located down below the
21 powerhouse.

22 So project operations: It's run as a run-of-
23 river facility, so they have to have flows in excess of
24 200 cfs and a minimum of nine feet of head to be able to
25 commence operation.

1 Generation over the past five years, from 2010
2 to 2014, has averaged 1,314 megawatt-hours annually, and
3 there's no proposed facilities or operational changes
4 associated with this relicensing application.

5 And then finally, how the project
6 interconnects. So there's a riser pole at the hydro
7 facility, and so that connects through 7.2/12.5 kV
8 distribution line that runs the 9,345 feet to the Gonzales
9 substation.

10 So as you can see here on the map, the line
11 follows along 97 and traverses that roadway twice back and
12 forth. It turns at the intersection of Theo and 97,
13 crosses Theo, and then follows Harborth Street to the
14 substation. Like I say, it's 9,345 feet total, and there
15 is approximately 130 feet of overhead line within the
16 project boundary.

17 So that's all I have for this portion.

18 (Pause.)

19 MS. GARRAWAY: Where I referenced Highway 93
20 [sic], it's actually Highway 183, thanks to the Gonzales
21 experts.

22 (Pause.)

23 MS. McNAMARA: This is Rachel McNamara again.
24 So the information that we're requesting from you today or
25 in written comments filed by November 21 are any

1 significant environmental issues that we should look at in
2 an environmental assessment.

3 And as we identified in the scoping document,
4 at this point we are proposing to prepare a single EA, and
5 so that would just be one document, instead of a draft and
6 a final, and then we're not proposing to do an
7 environmental impact statement. We reserve the right to
8 expand the schedule later to do a single and draft or an
9 EIS if we needed to, but I think this is straightforward
10 and noncontroversial enough that the single EA is what
11 we'll do.

12 You can also provide study requests. When you
13 provide a study request, we have seven criteria, and those
14 are outlined in the scoping document, and I also have a
15 slide that shows them.

16 And so if you're requesting a study, they need
17 to address the seven study criteria, so we need to be
18 clear on why the study is being requested and what the
19 information needs are.

20 If you have information or data that describes
21 the project, the project area, or a resource area that
22 wasn't contained in the PAD, please file that information
23 so that it's in the record and we can cite to it when
24 we're doing our NEPA document.

25 And then we also look for comments on the PAD

1 or SD1, so that those comments can be used in revising
2 those documents and preparing final license application.

3 Also, if there are comprehensive plans,
4 resource plans, or any proposals in the project area that
5 we aren't aware of, please let us know about those things.

6 So those mentioning the study criteria are very
7 important when you file a study request, if you file a
8 study request, and so it's describing the goals and
9 objectives of the study proposal and the information that
10 you need to obtain; explain the resource management goals
11 of the agency who's requesting, if you're are an agency.
12 And if you're not an agency, explain the public interest
13 considerations as to why we need to have a study.

14 Describe the existing information about the
15 study proposed -- that exists for the study and then why
16 you need additional information.

17 Explain the nexus between project operations
18 and the study. This is one that we often find needs more
19 support in study requests, so why the project is affecting
20 the resource and then how you -- what the proposed
21 methodology is and how it's consistent with standard
22 practice or scientific knowledge, and then also the cost
23 or level of effort for the study.

24 So when we issue a study determination, we
25 balance -- you know, we look at the information needs and

1 the cost of the studies when we make those decisions.

2 So we've talked about these several times now,
3 but your opportunity to file the study comments is
4 November 21: comments on the PAD, comments on the scoping
5 document and study requests. And that is on a weekend, so
6 we accept comments through close of business Monday
7 following the weekend.

8 And then for looking at the studies, there'll
9 be comments due on the City's proposed studies due April
10 4, but we'll have a meeting here, if we need to, in
11 February, to discuss study requests.

12 And then there will be a revised study plan due
13 in December and comments due in May. I mean -- that date
14 in December is wrong; I apologize. Let me strike that. I
15 don't have the revised study plan date on there; that's an
16 old date.

17 But comments on that will be due in May; the
18 revised plan will be due sometime in April, and the study
19 determination will be issued at the end of June, so those
20 are kind of all the opportunities to become involved.

21 And like I mentioned before, you can file
22 written comments, you can provide them to the court
23 reporter today. You can mail paper copies to the
24 Commission, or you can file electronically using our
25 esubmit function.

1 I highly recommend, if you're interested in the
2 project, that you esubscribe to the project. Our website
3 is ferc.gov, and it has information on how you can
4 esubscribe. That's the best way to receive information.

5 If you're not on the mailing list for the
6 project -- and you would know, because if you read the
7 scoping document, people who are not in italics are
8 already on the mailing list. Anybody who's not on that
9 list or in italics is not on the mailing list.

10 And if you're on the mailing list, you would
11 receive hard copy mailings of issuances from the
12 Commission. And that's different than the distribution
13 list that the City has for the project.

14 So just make sure that if you want to be
15 involved and you want to know what's happening with the
16 project, I recommend esubscribing, and you can also add
17 yourself to the mailing list if you want the hard copies
18 mailed to you. Just make sure you're using Docket Number
19 P-2960-005; that's for the relicensing for this project.

20 So I guess now we'll open it up for comments.
21 Please make sure you state your name -- come to the
22 microphone, state your name, spell your name if the
23 spelling's not obvious, and define any acronyms.

24 We can take comments, and I apologize; it's
25 very formal to come up to the microphone, but that's the

1 best way for the court reporter to hear you.

2 Any comments?

3 MR. MAYES: What about questions?

4 MS. McNAMARA: Absolutely.

5 The question was, What about questions? So if
6 you have questions, please come up, and we'll try to
7 answer them the best we can, and if I can't answer about
8 process, then the City or the folks from Schneider
9 Engineering can answer those questions, if we can.

10 We just need to make sure it's captured -- the
11 questions and comments are captured on the record, so
12 that's why we're asking you to come forward.

13 MR. MAYES: Okay. My name's Kevin Mayes, M-A-
14 Y-E-S. I work for the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department.
15 My question is, in your process diagram -- I think it was
16 slide 6 -- you discuss the comment period for the initial
17 scoping document, SD1, and the PAD, and then at the same
18 deadline for study requests.

19 MS. McNAMARA: Uh-huh.

20 MR. MAYES: So if the PAD is deficient and the
21 scoping document is therefore deficient, then how do you
22 deal with potentially the scope of the study requests?

23 MS. McNAMARA: So if -- we expect -- this is
24 Rachel McNamara. We expect that the PAD will have the
25 existing information as it is known.

1 So if the PAD is deficient, then if there's a
2 question that we need addressed, that would either require
3 study or it would require revision, we'd ask you to
4 comment on that.

5 Now, with the study plan process, there are a
6 couple of different options. The study requests are
7 due -- let me pull out my schedule. (Perusing documents.)
8 So the study requests are due November 21, and at that
9 point the City prepares its proposed study plan.

10 And so we'll all be able to see the proposed
11 study plan based on what has come in in those November 21
12 comments.

13 So after that time we have a study plan meeting
14 where we can discuss the proposed study plans, and so
15 there's more time for the City to revise the study plan in
16 response to the comments that have come in before the
17 final -- so there are kind of two cuts at the studies.

18 There's this November 21 comment deadline for
19 filing a study request, and then there's a separate set of
20 comments due on the proposed study plan.

21 MR. BOTROS: And then a second scoping document
22 with --

23 THE REPORTER: Could I get your name, please?

24 MR. BOTROS: Yes. I'm sorry. My name is John
25 Botros, B-O-T-R-O-S.

1 I was wondering if the second study -- I'm
2 sorry -- the scoping document two would describe the
3 studies then agreed upon by all the participants.

4 MS. McNAMARA: So if there are substantive
5 comments on the scoping document, we will issue scoping
6 document two on January 5.

7 That's issued the same day that the City has to
8 file their proposed study plan, so it may not address
9 things that you've negotiated in the intervening time, but
10 what will end up addressing all of that is the study plan
11 determination that has to be issued in June.

12 So that's --

13 MR. SPENCER: As well as those changes would be
14 discussed at the proposed study plan meeting, which is
15 scheduled for February 4; all those agreements and all
16 those studies would be discussed at that meeting, and also
17 probably in the ensuing comments due from that meeting.

18 So it would all be on record for everyone to
19 see and discuss.

20 MS. McNAMARA: So I guess the first comment
21 period is really to identify -- I mean, so at this point,
22 in the PAD, the City has proposed doing a historic
23 resources study, and that's the only study that's been
24 proposed.

25 And so the comments on the PAD and the scoping

1 document study request would be -- this is hypothetical --
2 Hey, you didn't address X issue; we need a study on that
3 issue, and here's how we would propose that you do it.

4 Then the City will have a chance to see that
5 and make a decision on their part: Is that what we want
6 to propose in our proposed study plan, or do we want to
7 propose an alternative to that, or do we not want to
8 propose that?

9 And so the Commission's going to be looking at
10 all of those comments that come in through the process and
11 say, Well, agency X proposed this, and the City proposed
12 Y, and then the real -- the goal of the determination is
13 that we make a decision at the very end -- hopefully after
14 everybody's negotiated and everybody's happy with the
15 decision, we make the final determination on what studies
16 need to be done. I hope that answers your question.

17 Other questions?

18 MR. BOTROS: I have some comments.

19 MS. McNAMARA: Sure, absolutely.

20 MR. BOTROS: Hi. My name's John Botros again,
21 for the record, B-O-T-R-O-S. I'm a aquatic biologist with
22 the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, working with a
23 group called River Studies Program. We do river studies,
24 river fisheries, environmental flow development, stuff
25 like that.

1 Firstly I'd like to -- appreciate -- I want to
2 thank you guys from Washington to come all the way down
3 here in Texas and to get the best information possible
4 that you can.

5 And also the folks from Gonzales to host us
6 here on this fine, mostly rainy day.

7 So I brought a few issues just to raise for you
8 all's consideration as we work our way through the
9 relicensing process over the next four years or so. And
10 I'll just start with this one:

11 The City of Gonzales's project is currently the
12 most downstream intact dam and reservoir on the Guadalupe
13 River. There's the saltwater barrier down at Tivoli, but
14 it's mostly open. There's a dam at Cuero that's been
15 mostly -- it's mostly breached; it is breached. That
16 makes this dam the most downstream dam as you're going
17 from the coast upstream.

18 So as such, this structure most likely
19 effectively blocks the migration of American eel and other
20 migratory species that utilize the Guadalupe River; they
21 come upstream from coastal habitats to spawn or do other
22 things.

23 Migratory species such as American eel or giant
24 river prawn will travel miles upstream to get to spawning
25 habitats.

1 Although there are four other hydroelectric
2 dams immediately upstream of the Gonzales dam, on the
3 Guadalupe River we feel that the San Marcos River, also
4 upstream of the Gonzales project, would be -- does contain
5 suitable habitats for American eel and other migratory
6 species to utilize.

7 So we're hoping maybe just to work with the
8 City and FERC, possibly do some sampling just below the
9 dam, see if these -- you know, if there's eel or other
10 migratory species that are kind of being trapped just
11 downstream there, and hopefully they can perhaps use our
12 help to -- we'll get them translocated to, you know,
13 suitable habitats upstream.

14 Secondly, we have a program here in Texas named
15 the Texas Instream Flow Program, or TIFP. It's an
16 interagency working team with local partners, working
17 together to investigate, develop, and recommend flow
18 regimes and priority basins across Texas.

19 The lower Guadalupe River is one of our
20 priority segments, and we are currently working on a study
21 on the lower Guadalupe. We do have a site just below the
22 Gonzales project there in Gonzales -- or here in Gonzales.

23 I just wanted to let you all know where the --
24 you know, we are doing this work basically to develop flow
25 regimes that maintain a sound ecological environment, so

1 we've got biology, water quality, geomorphology,
2 connectivity issues all kind of wrapped into one big study
3 to hopefully provide a flow regime that, you know,
4 maintains the river's functions and values, a sound
5 ecological environment as we defined it.

6 There's a chance that, you know, we would be
7 recommending monthly or seasonal like passthrough flows.
8 We realize this operation's run-of-the-river, but we may
9 be making recommendations as far as flow regimes that
10 maintain a sound ecological environment, based on the work
11 that we're conducting.

12 Just a couple of comments about the PAD, the
13 preapplication document. The PAD states that currently
14 three James Leffel & Company turbines are installed in the
15 powerhouse.

16 You'll have to excuse my ignorance of
17 hydropower turbine styles and makes. I was just wondering
18 if these turbines were considered like fish friendly or,
19 in other words, have enough space between the blades to
20 allow fish to pass through downstream without too much
21 damage or mortality.

22 I don't really know anything about them. Maybe
23 perhaps at the site visit later we'll be able to talk
24 about that. I know that's been used in other hydropower
25 projects here in Texas before.

1 Furthermore, the PAD states that no known macro
2 aquatic -- I'm sorry -- macro invertebrate data was
3 available for the Guadalupe River. It reports macro
4 invertebrate data from Big Thicket Reservoir, which is in
5 East Texas.

6 Now, I'm not sure if any of y'all have been to
7 East Texas, but it's quite a lot different than the
8 topology, hydrology, geology, stream, and vegetation types
9 we have here in Gonzales County.

10 We do have access to references with
11 invertebrate data; Parks & Wildlife does have access to
12 some references. I brought a report with me that I was
13 able to borrow from a colleague that was -- mainly deals
14 with the rainbow trout diet from the Canyon Lake tailrace;
15 some of that's discussed in the PAD.

16 It has a pretty good list of invertebrates that
17 were sampled from the Guadalupe River, so maybe some
18 information more specific to the Guadalupe would maybe
19 just give a better, more representative list of what's out
20 there than the East Texas list; it's quite a bit
21 different.

22 Lastly, the PAD mentions a couple of species of
23 greatest conservation need from our Texas Conservation
24 Action Plan. In addition to those species, I just would
25 like to point out that other species that are occurring in

1 the Guadalupe River, possibly downstream of the project,
2 include, again, American eel, alligator gar, or river
3 darter, all of which are very sensitive species, and
4 potential impacts to these species should be addressed if
5 at all possible.

6 TPWD will be an active participant in this
7 relicensing process. We reserve the right to augment or
8 modify our resource protection issues in future
9 correspondence if need be.

10 And I'd just like to thank you for your time
11 and the opportunity to make these comments. Thanks.

12 MS. McNAMARA: Thank you.

13 Is there anything that you need to respond to?

14 MS. GARRAWAY: Regarding the turbines, I'm not
15 sure of that directly at this time, but that's something
16 that we can certainly look into and get you a more formal
17 response on that.

18 MR. BOTROS: Okay.

19 MS. McNAMARA: Are there other questions or
20 comments?

21 (No response.)

22 MS. McNAMARA: We have some from the Commission
23 that we'd like to talk about. And some of them may be
24 better addressed at the site visit, but I just wanted to
25 start thinking about them.

1 Maybe is there a project boundary map that you
2 could pull up? I guess one question is what's the purpose
3 of the portion of land on the left bank of the river
4 that's within the project boundary? What purpose is that
5 serving, and why is it in the project boundary?

6 I don't know if the City has anything you want
7 to say about that now, but we can talk about that also on
8 the site visit.

9 MS. GARRAWAY: I think from this side of the
10 river, since you'll be able to see the project boundary,
11 maybe we can better address that when we're out there; we
12 can kind of look across it, what that project is, unless,
13 Alan, you have comments immediately.

14 MR. BARNES: My name is Alan Barnes; I'm the
15 city manager of the City of Gonzales. I want to echo the
16 appreciation of the previous speaker for you taking time
17 and coming down to God's country.

18 It's my understanding that we're using the same
19 boundaries of the current license. Why that was licensed
20 20, 30 years ago I don't know. The City does own that
21 property across the river. It's currently being used by a
22 private citizen for grazing property. But our directions
23 to Schneider was keep the boundaries the same. So I guess
24 that's a very polite way of saying, I don't know.

25 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. We just weren't sure if

1 that was being inundated -- like if that was sometimes
2 flooded or if there were wetlands or if it was used for
3 recreation or -- you know, those are the kind of questions
4 we wanted to make sure we addressed.

5 MR. BARNES: We are a part of the paddling
6 trail by the Texas Parks & Wildlife. Originally in the
7 paddling trail that was to be a portage site.

8 However, due to a conflict with the person who
9 uses that property, portage is done through the -- on this
10 side of the river.

11 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. Is there a formal
12 portage, or it is just informal, people are taking out and
13 carrying around? Is there signage or --

14 MR. BARNES: Yes, there is signage.

15 MS. McNAMARA: And we were wondering, the PAD
16 mentions the reservoir is 300 acres. How far upstream
17 does that extend? Does it extend on both the San Marcos
18 and Guadalupe Rivers? We just didn't know the geographic
19 extent of the reservoir.

20 MS. GARRAWAY: I would need to go back and look
21 at previous documentation. That came from previous FERC
22 filings, so I need to go back and see what their cutoff
23 point was for that measure.

24 MR. BARNES: Empirical data: 300 surface acre-
25 feet would be exclusively on the Guadalupe. I don't think

1 it would go far enough back to reach the San Marcos.

2 MS. GARRAWAY: Okay.

3 MR. BARNES: And that's just on my personal
4 observations.

5 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. When the Commission
6 defines -- Mike, please correct me, but the extent of the
7 reservoir is the degree to which the water is impounded
8 behind the dam. Right?

9 MR. SPENCER: Right. Hydraulic impact of the
10 project, how far back it is. Usually it goes back to --
11 if it's a riverine situation as this one is, it goes back
12 to either a riffle or a part of the river where it no
13 longer has hydraulic impact.

14 If the reservoir was --

15 MR. BARNES: That's a good guess.

16 MR. SPENCER: If for some reason it was lowered
17 for repair or something, it would no longer have hydraulic
18 impact on the river above. That's what the actual
19 reservoir is generally defined as.

20 MS. GARRAWAY: We can look into getting a more
21 exact point of where that cuts off, but I'm sure we have
22 that in previous documents. I just need to go back and do
23 a little digging.

24 MS. McNAMARA: And we will provide written
25 comments to this effect, but in our licenses that we're

1 issuing now, your project boundary would have to enclose
2 the entire reservoir and the transmission line, so -- the
3 primary transmission line, so we'll look at those things
4 today, but that's something that is clearly not within the
5 project boundary as it was defined in the previous license
6 but would need to be.

7 MR. SPENCER: Right. The regulations have been
8 changed and updated in the interim time frame from when
9 the license was issued to this period of relicensing, and
10 so there's some adjustments that need to be made.

11 MS. McNAMARA: Some more information that we
12 would need -- and this is similar to the question about
13 the turbines. It's the trash tracks and the bar spacing
14 in the trash tracks that gets entrainment and impingement.

15 And I don't know if you all have that; it
16 wasn't provided in the PAD.

17 (No response.)

18 MS. McNAMARA: And another -- this is one of my
19 comments. We had seen that in the -- that you all had
20 filed this letter from the SHPO, that said that there are
21 no historic properties affected by the project.

22 So I guess the question is do you still intend
23 to do a historic property survey, given that information?
24 I understand the project is old enough to warrant a
25 historic survey.

1 Usually we default to the SHPO's opinion, so if
2 they're saying that there's no effect, then -- I mean,
3 that would be the City's decision if you want to study.

4 MS. GARRAWAY: I would think that, seeing as we
5 deferred to them for comment and they at this time had no
6 historic properties within the project boundary, that we
7 would move forward with their decision on that.

8 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. And does -- it sounded in
9 the PAD that the City does vegetation management at the
10 project in terms of mowing and keeping things clear. Is
11 there a formal plan in place for vegetation management?

12 MS. GARRAWAY: Alan or Robert, would you like
13 to address that?

14 MR. BARNES: As far as written -- Alan Barnes,
15 city manager. As far as written plan for vegetation
16 management, I am unaware of one; however, we do have a
17 city ordinance that prohibits grass from being a
18 particular height, and it's my mandate to the department
19 head that we comply with all city ordinances.

20 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. As far as I'm concerned,
21 the questions that we have, they can either file as
22 written comments or address them at the site visit.

23 Do you have any further questions or comments?

24 MR. SPENCER: I have no further questions.

25 MS. McNAMARA: Are there any other questions

1 and comments from people in here?

2 (No response.)

3 MS. McNAMARA: Okay. Well, the site visit is
4 at one o'clock, and until then I guess no further
5 questions, we will adjourn the meeting. So thank you for
6 coming.

7 (Whereupon, at 11:11 a.m., the public hearing
8 was concluded.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25